

CHÊN-LI-FU

A STATE ON THE GULF OF SIAM AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 13TH CENTURY

by

O. W. Wolters

*School of Oriental and African Studies
University of London*

The *Sung hui yao kao* contains an unexpectedly long account of a small State called *Chên-li-fu* 真里富 which, in the years 1200-1205, made a determined and temporarily successful effort to establish official relations with the Sung dynasty.¹ It lay to the west of Cambodia and had access to the Gulf of Siam. The information contained in this account may have a bearing on the political situation on the northern shores of the Gulf at the beginning of the 13th century, though whether the rulers of *Chên-li-fu* at that time were Mon, Khmer, or Thai must remain unknown until further information—epigraphic or chronicular—becomes available.

The text

'The 20th day of the seventh month of the ninth year of *Chia ting* (= 5 August, 1216).²

'It is unknown in what year *Chên-li-fu* was first founded as a State. It is in the south-western corner.³ Its south-eastern (region) adjoins *Po-ssü-lan* 波斯蘭. Its neighbour in the south-west is *Têng-liu-mei* 登流眉. It administers more than 60 settlements. Its natural resources are ivory, rhinoceros horn, local beeswax, laka wood, 'foreign oil', coarse perfumes, cardamoms, and ebony wood. The ruler 主 lives in a palace resembling a Buddhist temple. All his utensils are of gold. His tents are of Chinese red floss silk. He wears white clothes as his privilege. His curtains are of white gauze interwoven with gold. When his officials come to court, they bow their heads and clasp their hands to salute him. The canopy over his curtains is 'dry' red in colour. Beneath it there is a madder-red one and then a striped red one and finally a green one. When (these people) use official documents they are bound together with black skin and the

characters are written in white powder. Each of the settlements has its administrator. The chief officials only use silver utensils and their tents are of flowered silk. (The people) tend to follow the law of the Buddha. When there is a dispute about grievances among them, (the parties) proceed to the Temple of the God of Potent Magic 靈驗寺 and drink the water of the Buddha in front of each other. He who remains at ease is considered to be telling the truth, while he who shows distress is considered to be lying.⁴ The people (of this country) are fond of dark red gauze and of pottery. For trade dealings in clothing and food they use pieces of lead.

(The dark red gauze and pottery which they use are commodities which Chinese ships bring to them for the purpose of commerce.)

'If one wants to go (from *Chên-li-fu*) to China one puts out to sea 放洋 from this country and reaches *Po-ssü-lan* in five days. Then one reaches the *K'un-lun* sea 崑崙洋, skirts *Chên-la* (Cambodia), and after several days reaches the country of *Pinta-yeh* 賓達椰.⁵ Several days later the borders of *Chan-ch'êng* (Champa) are reached. Then one crosses the sea for ten days. In the south-east there is a rocky reef called *Man-li* 萬里.⁶ The sea here is deep and shallow; the waters run swiftly and there are many shoals. Seven or eight of every ten ships have capsize and sunk here. There are no mountains or cliffs of any kind. Then the *Chiao-chih* (Tongking) border is reached. Five days later one arrives at Chin (chou) and Lien chou. All these times are reckoned on the basis of a favourable wind.

(By 'a favourable wind' is always meant the wind by which one sails in the summer season when the south wind blows and one can reach China. To return (to *Chên-li-fu*) it is necessary to wait for the north wind of the winter season. Otherwise it is impossible to get there.)

'On the 14th day of the eighth month of the sixth year of the *Ch'ing yüan* period (= 23 September, 1200), the *Ch'ing yüan* prefecture⁷ reported that the ruler of the State of *Chên-li-fu*,

Mo-lo-pa-kan-wu-ting-ên-ssü-li-fang-hui-chih (= *Mo-lo-pa* ?'s *Kamrateng An Śrī Fan-hui-chih*),⁸ who had been established 立 for twenty years, had sent (his) senior palace officials, *Shih-lo-pa-chih* and *Mao-yen-wu-lu*, and others⁹ as envoys to present a memorial.

(The memorial was (in the form of) a gold-engraved scroll. The ruler had written it himself in black script.)

The tribute was (in the form of) two elephants and local products.

(20 pieces of ivory, 50 pieces of rhinoceros horn, and 40 strips of local cloth.)

The Ch'ing yüan prefecture was instructed to provide hospitality in accordance with the protocol and to order men to take charge of the local products and to bring them forward. The elephants were to be kept in a suitably safe and convenient place, fed, and to await further instructions for moving them.

(The *kang shou P'u-tê-hsin* 蒲德信¹⁰ stated that (the envoys) had left the shore 岸¹¹ during the third month of that year (= between 15 April and 14 May) and on the 22nd day of the fifth month (= 4 July, 1200) had put out to sea from the estuary 海口 of their country. They had good luck with the south wind. They sailed day and night and reached the Ting hai District in sixty days.¹²)

'On the first day of the tenth month (= 9 November) the Prime Minister submitted a petition (to the emperor) in which he stated:

We have now seen the gold memorial from *Chên-li-fu*. It is a comic affair. It is merely a small gold-inscribed scroll. On (its) wooden cover something more has been written in a crooked style. Neither (of these texts) can be understood. Moreover, one of the legs of the mother-of-pearl casket containing the memorial is broken. It is really quite shocking. Inside there are several *chin* 斤 of skeined silk (the word 'cloth' at the side of the text in the *Sung hui yao kao* was erased). (*Chên-li-fu*) is

'The prefecture stated that, in accordance with the precedent of the sixth year of the Ch'ing yüan period,²⁵ hospitality in the form of rice, flour, and wine were provided for the foreign officials. Moreover, the elephant had suffered at sea from storms and great waves. It had been shaken about and had injured its four legs. It fell into a fever, could not eat or drink, and died. The tusks, memorial, and the yellow sealed envelope had been taken in charge by the staff (of the prefecture) and sent to the emperor.

'The emperor ordered the *Hsüeh shih yüan* to give a reply and to bestow as gifts 100 pieces of dark red gauze and 100 pieces of skeined red silk. 50 pieces of silk gauze were to be given to those who had come on the mission. The prefecture was instructed to distribute the gifts according to the rank (of each official), to entertain them with proper ceremony, and to send them home. Furthermore, the *kang shou* was requested by the emperor to tell the officials sent by *Chên-li-fu* that this country was far off across the difficult sea and that thereafter it was to be excused from giving tribute.'

Discussion of the text

The despatch of embassies to China by South East Asian trading States was a commonplace event in medieval times. *Chên-li-fu* undoubtedly traded with China. On the other hand, there are several reasons why this sequence of embassies is interesting.

In the first place, the Sung government at that time was no longer receiving envoys from South East Asian countries and was actually discouraging them and their trade.²⁶ *Chên-li-fu's* representatives did not arrive at a favourable time for official trading activities; more underhand methods were now necessary in the face of Chinese resistance to the calamitous export of copper cash which was a consequence of this trade.²⁷ Moreover, as the *Sung hui yao kao* makes clear, Chinese merchant ships were trading with *Chên-li-fu*. Again, the ruler whose reign began in 1180 used the Khmer title of *Kamrateng* which he, or one of his

predecessors, must have received from their overlord in Angkor. No doubt at Angkor in 1200 he was still regarded as a vassal, but an embassy from a State which was in the sphere of influence of a more powerful one suggests a background of special political circumstances. Three of them in six years amount to a persistent effort to establish relations with the Sung emperor, and indeed Mahīdharavarman in 1205 stated that he wanted to send them every year. Though the rulers' motives on these occasions were usually commercial, there must sometimes have been political reasons behind professions of homage. The Chams, for example, during the Sung period were often vassals both of the Viet and of the Chinese, and it is reasonable to believe that weak States argued that a double vassal status was a form of insurance; the paying of homage to the Chinese might strengthen the vassal's position *vis-à-vis* his overlord closer at hand.

But over and above these theoretical considerations the general background of events at the end of the 12th century gives a special interest to *Chên-li-fu's* diplomacy. The 13th century was the Thai century in the Menam valley, and Khmer authority may have come to an end in the Sukhothai region as early as 1219.²⁸ While there is no evidence that the ruler of *Chên-li-fu* was a Thai, or indeed that he was a Mon or a disloyal Khmer governor, it is possible that the weakening of Khmer power in the middle Menam valley which freed Sukhothai was part of a general decline in Khmer power in all the western provinces of the Angkorian empire. Already about 1182 Jayavarman VII, early in his reign, had to suppress a revolt at Malyang, perhaps in the south of the present province of Battambang.²⁹ Even in Champa by 1200—the year of the first embassy from *Chên-li-fu*—the fruits of the Khmer military successes nearly ten years earlier had been temporarily lost. Against this background the diplomatic initiative of *Chên-li-fu* does not appear as an entirely isolated and curious development.

Where was *Chên-li-fu*?

The estuary 海口 and port of *Chên-li-fu* were unquestionably on the Gulf of Siam, but a more precise description of the State's location is not easy. Its products were such as one would expect to come from that region.³⁰ Nor can much be inferred from the statement that the people worshipped the Buddha. It would not be surprising if the Theravāda Buddhism flourished there. Part of the recently discovered Nakon Sawan inscription, containing a date corresponding to 1167, was written in Pali.³¹

The chief geographical evidence for locating *Chên-li-fu*, though it leaves much to be desired, is supplied by the *Sung hui yao kao*. Chou Ch'ü-fei in 1178 did not mention it under that name.³² Chao Ju-kua in 1225 only listed it with *P'u-kan* = Pagan and other places among the dependencies of Cambodia. Chou Ta-kuan in 1296 did not mention it. The *Sung shih*, based on the *Sung hui yao*, merely stated that its neighbours to the south-east and south-west were *Po-ssü-lan* and *T'êng-liu-mei* respectively. Ma Tuan-lin also reproduced the information contained in the *Sung hui yao*.³³

The material in the *Sung hui yao kao* is more informative. It makes it clear beyond doubt that *Chên-li-fu* had a harbour used by ocean-going ships and that it imported Chinese pottery. The population liked this pottery. It is the only trading centre in the northern part of the Gulf of Siam known from records to have been visited by Chinese ships at that time. There must have been others, but it is a fair assumption that it was the busiest.

Again, the *Sung hui yao kao* makes it clear that *Po-ssü-lan* was also on the sea and occupied a section of the east coast of the Gulf. The statement in the *Sung shih* that *Po-ssü-lan* was south-east of *Chên-li-fu* may mean that their coasts were contiguous. It took five sailing days in favourable weather to reach that coast from *Chên-li-fu*'s port which could either be by sailing along the coast or, more likely, by making for the open sea and thereby sailing more swiftly and safely. La Loubere noted that in the southwest monsoon the currents drove ships on to the

eastern shore; to avoid this and also to avoid the land and sea breezes at this time of the year ships would probably have kept out to sea as they made their way towards Cochin-China.³⁴

The most interesting detail, however, is that the headquarters of the ruler early in 1200 would seem to have been elsewhere than at the port. The text states that the envoys left the 'shore' sometime between 15 April and 14 May and left the estuary on 4 July. *Chên-li-fu* was evidently more than a harbour State such as Pasai, for example, on the north coast of Sumatra. It would not be surprising if it had some depth from the sea and that a river provided its access to the interior.

But here two problems arise. What is meant by the term 'shore'? How far was the 'shore' from the port? It is convenient to consider the second problem first.

The evidence about the envoys' journey from the 'shore' to the port has to be interpreted with caution. It could, of course, mean that they were travelling with their elephants continuously for nearly 80 days, or from the beginning of the 'third month' to the eve of their journey on 4 July, but common sense suggests that if it took them so long to pass through their ruler's territories it is surprising that little is known of so extensive a State.

The only means of attempting to reconstruct their journey seems to be by taking into account sailing conditions at that time of the year which are determined by the south-west monsoon, the importance of which was stressed in the *Sung hui yao kao* probably because the envoys, cross-examined on the occasion of the first mission from an unknown State, made much of the point. According to the *China Sea Pilot* the south-west monsoon is established in the Gulf of Siam about the middle or end of June and is preceded by a few weeks of unsettled weather. In the Bangkok area, however, it begins to establish itself in April, though until June its direction is mainly south to south-west; it is more constant in a south-west direction in July and August.³⁵ But Mahī-

dharavarman in 1205 seems to have foreseen a voyage beginning on 'the ninth day of the fourth month' which in any year would have been before the end of May. It would therefore seem that a considerably earlier start than 4 July, the beginning of the voyage in 1200, was practicable. The envoys that year could have expected to sail any time from at least as early as the end of May. Because it is reasonable to believe that they planned in 1200 to get to the harbour early in the monsoon season—on so important a mission they would not have taken risks with their sailing programme—it is suggested that they did not leave a headquarters which was a great travelling distance from the port.³⁶ It is even possible that they were not more than a week's travelling away and that they spent some time at the port making arrangements for their voyage and waiting for the most suitable wind. This interpretation of their journey is obviously not sufficient for locating the ruler's headquarters but, if taken into consideration with other possibilities examined below, it may have some significance.³⁷

Nevertheless, the envoys' base and their final point of departure were at two different places and far enough apart for distinct times of departure to be recorded. Where, then, was the 'shore' from where they began their journey?

The Chinese expression *an* 岸 can mean 'sea coast' or 'bank of a river', and it has been rendered as 'shore' in order to avoid a translation which begs the question. The means of communication from the 'shore' to the harbour was not described.

Chou Ch'ü-fei used the expression 'shore' in a special way. He stated that Java's geographical position was 'downward' in contrast with that of Annam which was 'upward'. The distinction in the context of South East Asian geography seems to correspond with that of 'north' and 'south'; Java was therefore known as the 'lower shore'.³⁸ The same author also referred to the 'lower shore' gharu wood.³⁹ Chao Ju-kua referred to gharu wood from the 'upper and lower shores'. Cambodia and Champa were known as the 'upper shore' and the Arabs' country, Śrīvijaya,

and Java as the 'lower shore'. He explained that the expression was a colloquial one, and it was probably current among traders.⁴⁰ It is tempting to wonder whether 'shore' had some special significance at that time and meant the northern or southern 'hinterland' behind the coast of South East Asia and therefore the hinterland behind a particular coast. In the absence, however, of further evidence in support of this interpretation it is safer to reject it. One is, therefore, still faced with the problem of deciding whether the likely capital of the State in 1200 was on the coast or on a river bank.

Once again an appeal to common sense is necessary. If the ruler lived on the coast, it is hardly conceivable that he should not have chosen to live at his most important trading centre. It is much more reasonable to believe that he lived in the interior and on the bank of a river.

The suspicion that *Chên-li-fu* was a fair-sized country whose territories did more than hug the coast is strengthened by the statement that it had more than 60 'settlements', each with its own administrator. Nor would the title of *kamrateng* have been given to its ruler by the Khmer overlord if he had not been of some local importance,⁴¹ even though the Chinese called him a *chu* 主 or 'chief' and not a *wang* 王 or 'king'. The scornful attitude of the Chinese officials who compared it with a *chou* in China seems to have been their reaction to the broken memorial casket rather than an accurate estimate of its real size.

The only specific information about its extent—apart from the fact that the ruler's headquarters were some distance from the port—is that its neighbours were *Po-ssŭ-lan* and *T'êng-liu-mei* respectively; both these States lay to its south. Of *Po-ssŭ-lan*, its 'south-eastern' neighbour, nothing is known, though the name may have survived until at least the end of the 13th century.⁴² Before the much later agricultural expansion in the central part of the east coast of the Gulf, that area may have had no great significance. One imagines that *Po-ssŭ-lan* was a large and under-

administered tribal territory rather than a small and important State.

More is known of *Têng-liu-mei* which is almost certainly the same State as *Tan-liu-mei* 丹流眉 or *Tāmbraṅga* and was associated with the rising fortunes of the family of *Sūryavarman* 1 of Angkor at the end of the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh.⁴³ Its capital has been traditionally located in the Ligor area of the Malay Peninsula. In 1200 its territories extended north until they marched with those of *Chên-li-fu*. Unfortunately, it is unknown how far north *Tāmbraṅga* reached, but it has never been suggested that at any time it included the ancient sites of Petchaburi and Ratburi at the head of the Peninsula. In the seventh century the northern part of the Peninsula and the lands at the head of the Gulf were known respectively as *P'an-p'an* 盤盤 and *To-ho-lo* 壠和羅. *To-ho-lo* is probably an alternative transliteration of *To-lo-po-ti* 墮羅鉢底, also current in that century, which is usually reconstructed as *Dvāravātī*.⁴⁴ *To-ho-lo* reached *P'an-p'an* to the south and Cambodia to the east; it extended to the sea in the west and had two dependencies of which one lay to its west. It is reasonable to believe that the northern Peninsula and the territories to its north always retained separate historical identities. Unless there is evidence that Petchaburi ever belonged to *Tāmbraṅga* one has to conclude that it was part of *Chên-li-fu*.⁴⁵

If, therefore, one interprets the geographical evidence about *Chên-li-fu* literally one pictures it as part of the apex of a triangle whose two sides were formed by *Tāmbraṅga* on the northern Peninsula and *Po-ssū-lan* on the east coast of the Gulf, with the base of the triangle in the sea. Some of the 60 settlements could have straggled down either coast of the Gulf. In terms of the historical geography of that time the apex would have comprised four territories; the northern and little known part of the east coast in the Čhanthabun area, the ancient State of Lavo/Lopburi to the north of the head of the Gulf—though without any known access to the sea—, the area corresponding

approximately to the Meklong valley and the adjacent lands which are traditionally connected with the events leading to the foundation of Ayutthaya in the middle of the 14th century, and the northern part of the territory of Tāmbraliṅga. *Chên-li-fu* must have represented the first or third or both these areas.

The usual identification of *Chên-li-fu* has been with the town of Čanthabun, a few miles up a river on the north-east coast of the Gulf. This is the result of Gerini's view in 1909.⁴⁶ He quoted Ma Tuan-lin's account of *Chên-la* and stated emphatically that *Chên-li-fu*, for phonological reasons, represented Candanapura or Čanthabun. Hirth and Rockhill⁴⁷ and much later Mr. Briggs⁴⁸ accepted the identification, but Professor Coedès cautiously described it as being on the Gulf of Siam.⁴⁹ Pelliot had no occasion to be interested in it.

Mr Briggs thought that Ma Tuan-lin's description of *Chên-li-fu* implied that it was in fact separated from Tāmbraliṅga by the sea.⁵⁰ He argued that neither the Menam valley nor any part of the Malay Peninsula belonged to Cambodia at that time and, therefore, that the statement of Ma Tuan-lin that *Chên-li-fu* was on the south-western frontier of Cambodia made it impossible for Tāmbraliṅga and *Chên-li-fu* to have had a common land frontier. The latter must have been further east and thus in the area of Gerini's Čanthabun.⁵¹ It is not easy to follow this argument. Nor is it possible to describe the political situation in the Menam valley in so straight-forward a manner. The claims of Angkor to suzerainty there need not have been inconsistent with the *de facto* independence of some of its more distant vassals, and in fact the *Kamrateng* of *Chên-li-fu* in 1200 was behaving as an independent ruler. Chinese geographical information of early South East Asia was probably often only a photograph of a political situation which was much more fluid than the Chinese writers ever suspected.

Whatever may have been the correct location of *Chên-li-fu*, little can be said in favour of its identification with Čanthabun. The present site of Čanthabun is too near the sea to make

it likely that the envoys would have taken the trouble to give the details of their departure from the 'shore'. Nor is it even a satisfactory transliteration of *Candanapura*. *Fu* probably meant—*puri*,⁵² but *Chên-li* can hardly mean *Candana* without stretching the transliteration beyond recognition. Rather could it correspond to a Thai or possibly Khmer rendering of *Jalapuri*. Again, the *Sung shih*'s expression 'south-west of Cambodia' used to locate *Chên-li-fu* does not appear in the *Sung hui yao kao*; it could even mean south-west of 'China' in the context of the latter document. Anyway it should not be regarded as an exact orientation in terms of Angkor. Chao Ju-kua, for example, said that Cambodia was 'south' of Champa; 'west' would have been more accurate in modern eyes. The south-west monsoon was described as the 'south wind', and a corresponding correction of the *Sung shih*'s position of *Chên-li-fu* in terms of Angkor would in fact put that State west of Angkor and further away from the Ānāthabun region. Nor does there seem to be any strong corroborative epigraphic or archaeological evidence that in medieval times there was ever a flourishing foreign trade centre in the Ānāthabun area. Finally, the east coast of the Gulf may have been sufficiently close to Angkor to make it unlikely that the Khmers lost control of it at so early a date. Already by the first half of the seventh century Īśānavarman of *Chên-la* was responsible for a Sanskrit/Khmer inscription at Ānāthabun.⁵³ *Po-ssū-lan* which was definitely on that coast may have been under the control of Angkor at the end of the 13th century if Chou Ta-kuan's *Pa-ssū-li* is the same place, and there is no evidence in Ram Khamhaeng's inscription of Thai occupation of any part of that coast. Even in the 17th century when Ānāthabun was Thai, it was close to the Cambodian frontier.⁵⁴

Further support for the suspicion that *Chên-li-fu*'s port was not on the north-eastern part of the Gulf is perhaps suggested by the pattern of sailing directions in Ming times, probably based on information of the early 15th century. At that time

shipping charts did not describe the east coast of the Gulf from Ko Kram (12° 42' N) to the Menam delta. No harbour was mentioned in the Chonburi region, though the Čhanthabun river may have been known as the *Chan-pên* 占賁 river. More significant, however, to reach Thailand from China ships crossed the Gulf from Poulo Wai and sailed to the coast off Khao Samroi-yot on the Malay Peninsula.⁵⁵

No attempt will be made here to suggest the precise location of the port of *Chên-li-fu* or indeed the original place-name which was transliterated as *Chên-li*. Suggested renderings of place-names from Chinese sources have a habit of living on and sometimes impede progress in early South East Asian studies. It is sufficient to record the impression left on the writer's mind by the geographical evidence that the port was approached by the envoys from the hinterland and not from somewhere else on the coast, that the expression 'shore' meant the bank of a river, that the two places were some distance apart but not necessarily more than about a week's travelling, and that though the eastern part of *Chên-li-fu* was adjacent to *Po-ssŭ-lan* on the east coast of the Gulf its port and most of its hinterland were in the north-western and northern corner of the Gulf. This kind of location would explain why Mahīdharavarman foresaw a voyage to China beginning before the end of May, why it took five days at sea to reach the coast of *Po-ssŭ-lan*, and why Tāmbraliṅga and not Lavo/Lopburi was mentioned by the Chinese in connexion with the location of *Chên-li-fu*.

There seems to be no evidence to indicate the ethnic identity of the population. There must have been many Mons in the area. In the 16th century Tomé Pires, writing about Ayutthaya, regarded the population of 'Siam' as similar to that of Pegu:

'the people, and almost the language, are like those of Pegu ... They are tall swarthy men, shorn like those of Pegu'.⁵⁶

The ruler who sent the embassy in 1205 was called Mahīdharavarman. No Thai ruler known from historical records

had a name ending in this way. Yet Mahādhara-varman's predecessor did not use *-varman* in his name. He claimed to have been ruling for twenty years which makes it difficult to believe that he was a Khmer governor, though he could have been one who dug himself in during the troubled period after the Cham sack of Angkor in 1177 and founded a dynasty. On balance, however, it seems more likely that he was a local chief whose position had been recognised by the Angkor ruler.⁵⁷

There is one passage in the *Sung hui yao kao* which, if it could be elucidated, would throw some light on the identity of the ruling family. It was stated that in 1200 the ruler with the title of *Kamrateng* wrote the memorial in his own language but, fearing correctly that the Chinese would not understand it, took the precaution of having a copy made by an Indian from the Malabar region. The copy was hardly likely to have been in Pali which is a canonical and not a diplomatic language. It could have been in a southern Indian language, but this too is unlikely. It was probably in Sanskrit and the translator a Brahman at the ruler's court.⁵⁸ The language of the original memorial, if known, would answer many questions about *Chên-li-fu*. It is interesting that the ruler should have foreseen difficulties when it was submitted in China. Could the Chinese interpreters have been assumed to understand written Khmer at that time? Cambodian embassies had visited China, but there do not seem to be references to their memorials. In 1082 'Jambi-Śrīvijaya' sent a memorial in Chinese; Champa in 1167 did likewise.⁵⁹ Diplomatic communications must often have been by means of oral communications through South East Asian merchants long resident in China.

No further progress in identifying *Chên-li-fu* can be made on the basis of the geographical and other miscellaneous evidence in the *Sung hui yao kao*. Chiefly by eliminating other possibilities the writer believes that its capital lay somewhere in the north-western or northern hinterland of the head of the Gulf of Siam.

It is suggested that this conclusion is consistent with the following reconstruction of the historical background.

As a result of its conquest by Sūryavarman I of Ligor early in the eleventh century the Angkor State began to control extensive territories in the west, including Tāmbraliṅga—the ancestral home of Sūryavarman—, the Lavo/Lopburi area which Sūryavarman's father had conquered, and presumably the remaining part of the lower Menam valley. The Khmer empire now represented *Kambujadesa* / *Dvāravatī* / *Tāmbraliṅga*. The evidence for this expansion is supplied by Professor Coedès' study of the Pali Chronicles of northern Thailand,⁶⁰ the epigraphic evidence of his long campaign before he occupied Angkor, and Khmer inscriptions at Lopburi issued in the period when he was ruling at Angkor. To this impressive body of evidence the present writer has suggested that the embassy of Tāmbraliṅga in 1001 should be added.⁶¹

As long as the successor of Sūryavarman I ruled unchallenged at Angkor the western provinces, probably governed by members of the royal family or by their own chiefs, may have been content with the new situation. The tone of Khmer inscriptions found at Lopburi does not suggest a harsh rule. But, with a decline in the fortunes of that dynasty, the western provinces would have become restless. This may be the reason for the embassy from Tāmbraliṅga in 1070.⁶² For in the second half of the eleventh century the Mahīdharapura dynasty, possibly from northern Cambodia,⁶³ came to the fore, and for several decades there were in fact two dynasties competing for the control of the Angkorian empire. With the consecration of Sūryavarman II in 1113 the family of Sūryavarman I finally lost control of the remaining territories to which they had clung,⁶⁴ and the usurping family were able to lay a claim not only to the provinces of Cambodia proper but also to the heritage of Sūryavarman I's descendants in the northern Malay Peninsula, the lower Menam valley, and Lavo. This is, perhaps, the explanation of the expression 're-uniting the double kingdom' which appeared in one of Sūryavarman II's first inscriptions.⁶⁵

But in the western provinces he would have been regarded as an alien and the representative of Khmer power. This may

be why, perhaps before he was able to consolidate his position there, *Lo-hu* 羅斛 = Lavo/Lopburi sent envoys to China in 1115.⁶⁶ The Chinese knew nothing of *Lo-hu* and had to make enquiries about its location, size, and importance. If this was an attempt by Lavo to assert its independence, Sūryavarman must have repressed it quickly, and as long as he ruled it has to be assumed that the authority of Angkor was acknowledged in Lavo, the lower Menam valley, and probably in the northern Malay Peninsula.

Unfortunately, it is unknown when he died. His last inscription was of 1145. In 1155 an embassy was sent to China from *Chên-la/Lo-hu* or 'Cambodia-Lopburi'.⁶⁷ The expression is reminiscent of the earlier expression 'double kingdom'. Whether it was the last embassy from Sūryavarman II or from his successor in the capacity of ruler of the 'double kingdom' of Cambodia and at least of Lopburi or an embassy from Lopburi at the beginning of a period of Angkorian weakness cannot be determined. It is possible that the Chinese scribes tacked '*Chên-la*' on to the name of '*Lo-hu*' in order to identify its geographical position in South East Asia. At all events, in view of the revolt in the reign of Yaśovarman II, the usurpation of Tribhuvanādityavarman, and especially the Cham attack on Angkor in 1177, it is difficult to imagine that the authority of Angkor was strong in the western provinces after Sūryavarman II's death until Jayavarman VII had established himself between 1177 and 1181. It is interesting that the ruler of *Chên-li-fu* should have begun his reign in 1180, a year before the consecration of Jayavarman.

In the earlier part of Jayavarman's reign the claims of Angkor in the west would have been re-asserted. There is a reference to the suppression of a rebellion at Malyang, possibly west of Angkor.⁶⁸ In 1191 an inscription referred to the homage paid to Jayavarman by several rulers, including 'the king of Java'.⁶⁹ In 1191 there was also recorded the establishment of *Jayabuddhamahānātha* statues of the king in several towns in the Menam valley, including Petchaburi, Ratburi, and Suphan.⁷⁰ One of the king's sons seems to have been viceroy of Lopburi

under the title of 'prince of Lavo'.⁷¹ In these years and at least until 1191 one has to presume that the *Kamrateng* of *Chên-li-fu* was an obedient vassal,

But by 1200 something may have happened to change the situation, for *Chên-li-fu*'s embassy that year, like that of *Tām-bralinga* in 1070 and of Lavo in 1115 and perhaps again in 1155, must surely be regarded as at least a gesture of independence and an attempt to obtain royal recognition from the Sung emperor. The only explanation which offers itself is that once again in Angkor there was a period of weakness, for which there is some evidence in the fact that several years before then the Chams had recovered their independence. The Khmer puppet, Vidyānandana, who had been established in Pāṇḍuraṅga about 1191, defected in 1192 and beat off two Khmer expeditions in 1193 and 1194.⁷² Another consequence of the temporary weakness of the Khmers could have been a revival of the independence movement in the always restless western provinces.

It is therefore suggested that *Chên-li-fu*'s diplomacy from 1200 to 1205 should be interpreted against the background of a long tradition of disquiet in the western half of Sūryavarman II's 'double kingdom'; it is the only available background against which an embassy from a Khmer province at that time makes sense. It is also consistent with the geographical evidence about *Chên-li-fu*. In effect, it was a gesture of independence from part of the ancient *Dvāravatī* land.

The history of the *Dvāravatī* kingdoms cannot at present be reconstructed because of an absence of epigraphic evidence. All that is known is that the name probably existed at least as long ago as the seventh century and that it represented a sufficiently lively historical tradition to be incorporated as *Thawārāwadī* in the name of Ayutthaya in the middle of the 14th century.⁷³ The area at the north-western end of the Gulf of Siam was undoubtedly very important in the early centuries of the Christian era as a trade route between the Indian Ocean and southern China. As a trade route it must have continued to be im-

portant, and Professor Luce and Dr. Than Tun have reconstructed a trade between Ceylon and Cambodia through lower Burma which would have run through it.⁷⁴ It had a distinctive art tradition and was always Buddhist, though evidence of a Śiva *liṅga* has been provided by a recently recovered Sanskrit inscription near U' Thong in a seventh century script.⁷⁵ Tradition has it that it was from the U' Thong region that the dynasty which built the city of Ayutthaya came, and the continuing identity of the region may be reflected in the circumstance that a son of the ruler of *Hsien-lo* in the second half of the 14th century seems to have been called 'the prince of Suphan', a city in the U' Thong region.⁷⁶

It is suggested for consideration that, together with Lavo, *Chên-li-fu* should take its place in the framework of the historical geography of the lower Menam valley and the adjacent lands in the early 13th century. It may have been in the U' Thong territories before they were united with Lavo and have played its part in keeping alive the ancient *Dvāravatī* traditions against the day when Thai rulers, having grafted themselves on to the dynastic traditions of the former Mon rulers, incorporated the name in that of Ayutthaya.⁷⁷ There is, however, no evidence about *Chên-li-fu* to indicate that its rulers in 1180-1205 were already Thai.⁷⁸ All that can be said is that here would have been a State which, at some time, must have presented itself to the Thai as a most desirable 'beach head' with access to the sea.⁷⁹

The refusal of the Sung dynasty to receive any more embassies after 1205 has deprived the historian of further information about *Chên-li-fu*. It is unknown whether the Angkor overlord was ever able to restore his authority there. The Cham revolt was suppressed by 1203 and measures may have been taken to bring Mahīdharavarman to heel. It is even possible that the rulers of *Chên-li-fu* never formally renounced their allegiance to Angkor in spite of their bid for recognition by the Sung emperor. On the other hand, the possibility that the Khmers were expelled from Sukhothai about 1219 suggests that their authority remained

weak in the west; Khmer energies were probably absorbed in holding down the Chams. Whatever were the political changes which took place in the area in the later decades of the 13th century, the Khmers were on the retreat.

The problem remains of establishing the age of the Thai connexion with the lower Menam and of their taking over the traditions of *Dvāravatī* of which this article has suggested that *Chên-li-fu* was once to some extent the custodian.

NOTES

1. 宋會要稿, henceforth referred to as *SHYK*. Facsimile edition published for the Peking National Library, Ta tung shu chü, Peking, 1936, 華夷, 4, 99-101. It was compiled from the *Yung Lo ta tien* by Hsü Sung 徐松 in 1809-10. The passage was mentioned in 'Tāmbraliṅga', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XXI, 3, 1958, 606-7, where the author was only concerned to make the point that the 1200 embassy to China was from *Chên-li-fu* and not from Cambodia. It was also mentioned by Fujita Toyohachi in his study of Wang Ta-yüan's *Tao i chih lüo* where he quoted the itinerary in connexion with a discussion of the Paracels and Macclesfield Banks; *Hsiieh t'ang ts'ung k'o* 雪堂叢刻 edition by Lo Chên-yü 羅振玉, volume 10, 93b, published at an unidentifiable time before 1929. Pelliot referred to Toyohachi's work in 'Les grands voyages maritimes Chinois', *T'oung pao*, XXX, 1933, 353, and remarked that the *Sung hui yao* was, at that time, still unedited.

2. The significance of this date is unknown. It may have been when the documents on *Chên-li-fu* were collected together and put in order.

3. It was not disclosed in the *SHYK* at whose 'south-western corner' *Chên-li-fu* lay. The *Sung shih*, Ssü pu ts'ung k'an edition, 489, 11b, stated at the end of its section on *Chên-la* = Cambodia: 'among its (*Chên-la*'s) dependent regions there is *Chên-li-fu* in the south-western corner'. It continued according to the account in the *SHYK* until the sentence: 'it administers more than 60 settlements'. It then stated: 'in the sixth year of the *Ch'ing yüan* period its ruler had been established for twenty years. He sent envoys with a memorial, local products, and two tame elephants. The emperor thanked him. But, because the voyage was a long one, the emperor decreed that thereafter there was no need for tribute to be sent.' The *Sung hui yao* was clearly the source on *Chên-li-fu* for the *Sung shih*, and Ou-yang Hsüan, the

editor of the *Sung shih* in 1341-1345, merely chose to tack a few sentences from it on to the end of his account of Cambodia, omitting most of the *Sung hui yao* material and bringing the few excerpts he selected into a somewhat misleading sequence. The only indication in the *SHYK* that *Chên-li-fu* had been a dependency of Cambodia is the Khmer title of its ruler in 1200 which was *Kamrateng An*. Ma Tuan-lin also drew on the *Sung hui yao* in his *Wên hsien t'ung k'ao*, translated by Hervey de Saint-Denys in *Éthnographie des peuples étrangers à la Chine*, Genève, 11, 1883, 487-8. Ma Tuan-lin's borrowing was slightly more literal than Saint-Denys' translation suggests because it contained a reference to the Ch'ing yüan prefecture which reported to the emperor the embassy of 1200; this was omitted by Saint-Denys; photolithographic edition of the *Wên hsien t'ung k'ao* by the Commercial Press, 1936, which reproduces the *Shih t'ung* 十通 and also forms part of the second series of the *Wan yu wên k'u*, 332, 2605. The additional material in the *SHYK*, obtained no doubt from the records of *Chên-li-fu*'s three embassies, justifies a re-consideration of this State.

4. 'They have another sort of Proof, which is performed by certain Pills prepared by the Talapoins, and accompanied with imprecations. Both the parties do swallow them, and the token of the right cause is to be able to keep them in the stomach without casting them up; for they are vomative.' *A New Historical Relation of the Kingdom of Siam, by M. de La Loubère, Envoy Extraordinary from the French King to the King of Siam in the years 1687 and 1688*, London, 1693, 87. It is not suggested, of course, that the survival of this custom has any bearing on the identity of the population of *Chên-li-fu*.

5. Pelliot stated that in Chinese texts the sea south of Pulo Condor towards the Straits was called the 'Sea of K'un-lun'; *Notes on Marco Polo*, I, Paris, 1959, 505. *Pin-ta-yeh* is Pāṇḍuraṅga, the southern province of Champa. For other forms of this name see Pelliot, 'Textes Chinois sur Pāṇḍuraṅga', *BEFEO*, III, 1903, 649-54. He later noted Fujita Toyohachi's

discovery of the *Sung hui yao* version of the name of Pāṇḍuraṅga in *T'oung pao*, XXX, 1933, 353.

6. The *Man-li* reefs are the Paracels and the Macclesfield Banks. Pelliot discussed their nomenclature at length in his *Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge de Tchou Ta-kouan*, (Oeuvres posthumes de Paul Pelliot, III), 1951, 92-4.

7. In 1196 Ming chou 明州 in Chekiang province was raised to the status of a prefecture with the name of 'Ch'ing yüan'. Today it is known as Ning po. The *Yen hai chih chih ssü*, mentioned later in the text, was established there in 1132.

8. 摩羅巴甘勿丁思 斯里房庵整. The king of *Hsien* (Ram Khamhaeng) was described in 1294 as *Kamrateng* with a slightly different transcription: 敢木丁; *Yüan shih*, Ssü pu ts'ung k'an edition, 18, 7a. The romanisation of the other parts of this name and of all Chinese words is given in this article according to Giles' dictionary. The *Yüan shih* used the expressions *Hsien kuo wang kan-mu-ting* and *Pi-ch'a-pu-li ch'eng kan-mu-ting* (Hsien country's king *Kamrateng* and Petchaburi town's *Kamrateng*.) On the significance of the distinction between *Hsien* and Petchaburi see Professor Gaspardone's review of Professor Naojiro Sugimoto's *Tonan Asia shi kenkyu* in *Sinologica*, VI, 2, 1959, 124-7. *Mo-lo-pa* does not easily suggest *Mahārāja* and might possibly be the transliteration of a place-name and perhaps the name of the town where the ruler had his residence at that time. It would be interesting to know whether some such name can be found among the various names of cities in Thailand.

9. The characters were: 時羅跋智毛糖勿盧.

10. The *kang shou* 綱首 were prominent foreign merchants familiar with conditions in the Chinese ports and available to foreign rulers in handling their affairs in China.

11. This is an important word in the identification of *Chên-li-fu* and is discussed below.

12. Ting hai District is on Chusan island off the Chekiang coast and about 100 miles from Hangchow, the seat of the Southern Sung dynasty. It was under the Ch'ing yüan prefecture.

13. The Prime Minister. His biography is contained in *Sung shih*, 394.
14. 南卑 The region in question was certainly in the south-western part of India; Chao Ju-kua made this clear. Hirth and Rockhill thought that *Nan-pi*, with its variant forms, meant the 'Nairs' of Malabar, but Pelliot considered that it referred to the 'Namburi Brahmans of Malabar'; *T'oung pao*, XXXII, 1936, 221; *Notes on Marco Polo*, 1, 1959, 596.
15. 學士院 Translated by Professor des Rotours in respect of the T'ang institution as 'La cour des lettres'. *Traité des fonctionnaires et traité de l'armée...*, 1947, 1, 17.
16. 沿海制置司 'The Imperial Commissioner's Office for the control and organisation of the coastal areas'. Jung-pang Lo, 'China as a sea power', *Far Eastern Quarterly*, XIV, 4, 1955, 491.
17. The Department of the Affairs of State.
18. The characters in this name were 悉哩摩睺陀囉跋囉吽. The writer originally reconstructed the name as Sri Mahendrarvarman. The last three characters seem to represent *-varman*; *pa* 跋 can be used for *-va*, *lo* 囉 supplies the *r* sound, and *hung* 吽 was a conventional rendering of *Hum* and in this case can be assumed to provide the *-n*. He is greatly indebted to Professor Coedès who suggested that the first part of the name should be reconstructed as *Mahīdhara*. Professor Coedès pointed out that in the 12th century names and titles beginning with *Mahīdhara* were much more frequent than those beginning with *Mahendra* and that *Mahīdhara* seemed to fit the Chinese transliteration more satisfactorily. *Mahīdhara* certainly corresponds sufficiently closely to *Mo-hsi-t'o-lo* to appear to be an exact transcription; *mo* is *ma*, *hsi* in the form of the character 西 was conventionally used to indicate the *he* in the Chinese transcription of *Mahendra*, *t'o* provides the *-dha*, while *lo* provides the *-ra*. The reconstruction of 'Mahīdharavarman' is therefore gratefully accepted. The ruler in 1200 seems to have had a different type of name. A new ruler probably succeeded since then.
19. *Hsin chou* 新州 was, in this period, the principal port of Champa and was located in the present-day Quinhon. The ruler

seems to mean that he was always thinking of the route to China *via* Champa. See note 21 below which strengthens the view that the Cham port was meant.

20. The characters were: 安竺南字唃囉.

21. This can only mean the Cham port known to the Chinese as *Hsin chou*. At this time it was under the control of the Khmers. It provided landfall for ships from China.

22. According to Chao Ju-kua, the best species of ivory came from the Arabs and the next best from Cambodia and Champa. A large Arab tusk could weigh from 50 to 100 *chin*, but the Cambodian and Cham tusks only weighed from 10 to 20 or 30 *chin*. Evidently the ruler of *Chên-li-fu* had done his best to supply good specimens.

23. In other words, when the 'north' wind was blowing.

24. This is one of the difficult passages in this difficult memorial. It is curious that a specific sailing date for the following year should have been foreseen, but this is what the text seems to mean.

25. This was when *Chên-li-fu* sent its first mission to China.

26. The last certain embassy from Angkor had been in 1129, from Śrīvijaya in 1178, and from *Cho-p'o* = 'Java' in 1109. Honours were, however, conferred on the *Cho-p'o* ruler until 1170. The Śrīvijayan envoys in 1178 were told that they need no longer come to court. The *Chên-li-fu* envoys in 1205 were similarly treated.

27. Ch'ing yüan prefecture was one of the areas where copper cash was leaving the country, according to a ministerial complaint in 1217. *SHYK*, 刑法, 2, 142 a-b.

28. G. Coedès, 'L' année du lièvre, 1219 A.D.,' *India antiqua*, 1947, 83-8.

29. L. Finot 'Notes d'épigraphie,' *BEFEO*, IV, 1904, 939-40, 974; G. Coedès, 'Études Cambodgiennes: XXVIII. Quelques suggestions sur la méthode à suivre pour interpreter les bas-reliefs de Bantay

Chmar et de la galerie extérieure de Bayon,' *BEFEO*, XXXII, 1933, 80, note.

30. Ma Huan noted that *Hsien-lo* = Ayutthaya sent laka wood as tribute to China. He also noted that white cardamoms came from there. The ruler of *Chên-li-fu* presumably imagined that ivory and rhinoceros horn were the most acceptable form of tribute. In T'ang times there was a famous rhinoceros known as the *To-ho-lo* 墮和羅 rhinoceros; *New T'ang History*, Ssü pu ts'ung k'an edition, 222 下, 4a. *To-ho-lo* appears in texts referring to the seventh century and occupied the area at the head of the Malay Peninsula and the adjacent regions. It is discussed on page 12 above.

31. On this inscription see Kachorn Sukhabanij, 'The Thai beach-head States in the 11th-12th centuries', *The Silapakon Journal*, 1, 3-4, 1957, and G. Coedès, 'Données épigraphiques sur l'histoire de l'Indochine centrale', *Journal Asiatique*, CCXLVI, 2, 1958, 132-9. Professor Coedès has also suggested that the 1230 inscription of Ligor, though in Sanskrit, showed a strong Pali influence; *Bijdragen*, LXXXIII, 1927, 471. Professor Paranavitana has recently described some links between Ceylon and Tāmbraliṅga (*Tambaratṭha*) Buddhists in the 12th and 13th centuries; 'Ceylon and Malaysia in medieval times', *Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, VII, I, 1960.

32. He referred to *Chan-li-p'o* 占里婆 city which Gerini and Hirth and Rockhill took to be the same as *Chên-li-fu*; *Ling wai tai ta*, Pi chi hsi shou ta kuan collection, Chin pu shu chü, Shanghai, undated, 10, 8; Hirth and Rockhill, *Chau Ju-kua*..., 56. It was said to be in the kingdom of *Chên-la* and was on the sea. A Buddha was born there.

33. See note (2) above.

34. *A New Historical Relation*..., 170.

35. *China Sea Pilot*, III, second edition, 1923, 18, 160.

36. If their headquarters were inland and on a navigable river presumably their journey to the sea would have been much quicker than the pace of the elephants travelling on land.

37. The voyage in 1200 took 60 days. In 992 envoys from Java also arrived off the same coast in China after 60 days at sea. *Sung shih*, Ssü pu ts'ung k'an edition, 489, 17a. The owner of this ship seems to have been a Chinese merchant trading with Java. In 1297 Chou Ta-kuan left Kompon Chuan in the interior of Cambodia between 21 June and 20 July and anchored off the same coast on 30 August; Pelliot, *Mémoires sur les coutumes...*, 1951, 124. Chou Ta-kuan's voyage took between 40 and 70 days.

38. *Ling wai tai ta*, 2, 6a.

39. *Ibid*, 7, 1.

40. *Chu fan chih* 諸蕃志, Chung hua shu chü edition, Peking, 1956, 101; Hirth and Rockhill, *Chau Ju-kua...*, 204. On the subject of gharu wood of the 'upper shore' see R. Stein, 'Le Lin-yi...', *Han-hiue*, II, 1947, 188.

41. Professor Coedès observed in connexion with the Sukhothai dynasty, whose members also used this title, that the status implied was a very high one; 'Les origines de la dynastie de Sukhodaya', *Journal Asiatique*, XI série, XV, 1920, 241.

42. Chao Ju-kua mentioned it. Chou Ta-kuan referred to both *Pa-ssü-li* 八廝里 and *Pa-lan* 巴澗. Mr. J.V. Mills has noted in a letter to the present writer a reference in the so-called *Mao K'un* map (*Wu pei chih*, 240, f. 13) to *Hsiao-shih-lan* 小士蘭 and *Ta-shih-lan* 大士蘭 and has wondered whether they were Kok Kut and Kok Chang north of the Čhanthabun river. The *Mao K'un* map, which seems to be based on early 15th century information, is discussed in J.V. Mills, 'Chinese coastal maps', *Imago Mundi*, XI, 1954, 153-5.

43. The writer of this article still believes that the *Sung shih* reference to *Tan-mei-liu* 丹眉流 was an error for *T'an-liu-mei* 丹流眉. He bases this view on: (i) several references to *Tan-liu-mei* in the *Sung hui yao*, apparently the source for the *Sung shih*,

but not one to *Tan-mei-liu*; (ii) one of these references was to the embassy of 1001 described in the *Sung shih* reference to '*Tan-mei-liu*' (iii) a reference in the *Yü hai* to the *Tan-liu-mei* embassy of 1001; (iv) the probability that *Tan-liu-mei* was the same State as *T'êng-liu-mei* 登流眉 mentioned in later Sung sources and occupying approximately the same region west of Cambodia. The equivalence of *Tan-liu-mei* and Chao Ju-kua's *T'êng-liu-mei* was inferred in the 18th century catalogue of the Imperial Library and noted by E.J. Eitel, *The China Review*, XVIII, 5, 1889-90, 319. The catalogue ascribed *Tan-liu-mei* to the *Sung shih*. Finally, it may also be noted that the *Wu pei chih* sailing directions stated that the east coast of the isthmus of the Malay Peninsula 'produced sapan wood'; J.V. Mills, 'Malaya in the Wu-pei-chih charts', *Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, XV, III, 1937, 39. A great quantity of sapan wood had been sent by *Tan-liu-mei* during its embassy in 1001. In view of all this evidence it is submitted that it would be dangerous to use the isolated reference to *Tan-mei-liu* as a basis for historical reconstruction as long as there is a doubt about the correct rendering of the name. Since the present writer wrote on Tāmbraliṅga Dr Paul Wheatley, in a thesis which is being published on the historical geography of the Malay Peninsula before 1500 A.D., has suggested that *Kalah*, mentioned in Arab records as a dependency of the Mahārāja, was in the Mergui area. Before accepting this view one has to take into account the Dhammarājaka inscription of 1198 A.D. which indicates that the Mergui area was under the control of the Pagan ruler; G.H. Luce, 'The early *Syām* in Burma's History. A supplement', *Journal of the Siam Society*, XLVII, 1, 1959, 92, note 360. The history of the northern Malay Peninsula is exceedingly confusing. Perhaps political authority there was divided on an east and west coast basis, with the east coast normally under Tāmbraliṅga, once under Śrīvijaya, and occasionally under Khmer suzerainty after about 1000 and the west coast under Sumatran and Burman rulers. Tomé Pires noted that the west and east coasts were under different viceroys; to that extent distinct administrative and therefore historical traditions may be implied.

44. Paul Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires...', *BEFEO*, IV, 1904, 253, and note 5; G. Coedès, *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam*, 1, 1924, 1. The location of *To-ho-lo* is convincingly described in the *Old T'ang History*, Ssü pu pei yao edition, 197, 3a, and in the *New T'ang History*, 222 下, 4a. The former text also stated that west of 'Water *Chên-la*' was *To-lo-po-ti* 墮羅鉢底, obviously the place mentioned by the Chinese pilgrims in the seventh century; 197, 2b. *To-ho-lo* was undoubtedly in the *Dvāravatī* country and can hardly have been other than a transcription of that name.
45. Petchaburi under the name of *Śrī Jayavajrapurī* may have been mentioned in the Prah Khan inscription of 1191, but there is no evidence that any city corresponding to Ligor was mentioned in that inscription.
46. *Researches on Ptolemy's Geography* ..., 1909, note on page 524.
47. *Chau Ju-kua* ..., 56.
48. 'The Khmer Empire and the Malay Peninsula', *Far Eastern Quarterly*, 9, 3, 1950, 283.
49. *Les états hindouisés* ..., 1948, 304.
50. *FEQ*, 9, 3, 1950, 289, note 145.
51. *Ibid*, 283.
52. Chao Ju-kua mentioned a *T'un-li-fu* 吞里富 and the Chinese names for the *Lan-na* State of Ch'ieng Mai and probably for Suphan were *Pa-pai-hsi-fu* 八百媳婦 and *Su-mên-fu* 蘇門卑 respectively. On *Su-mên-fu* see note (76) below. Though the characters for *fu* varied, it is reasonable to suppose that they all represented the common terminal *-purī*. If Chou Ch'ü-fei's *Chan-li-p'o* was the same as *Chên-li-fu*, *p'o* would have been another rendering of *-purī*.
53. G. Coedès, *BEFEO*, XXIV, 1924, 353-8.
54. Nicolas Gervaise, *The Natural and Political History of the Kingdom of Siam, A.D. 1688*, translated by H.S. O' Neill, Bangkok, 1928, 22. Prince Damrong thought that Chonburi and Chanthabun

might in the time of Ram Khamhaeng have still formed part of the Khmer empire; 'Siamese History prior to the founding of Ayuddhya', *Journal of the Siam Society*, XIII, 2, 1919, 45. It should be remembered in fairness to those who favoured Ōchanthabun as the site of *Chên-li-fu* that they were unable to know that this State was an important trading centre which sent three embassies to China, though Saint-Denys' translation of Ma Tuan-lin indicated that *Chên-li-fu* sent an embassy in 1200.

55. For this information the writer is indebted to Mr. J.V. Mills who is at present completing a study of Ma Huan in which certain Ming sailing directions will be considered. Mr. Mills takes the view that the sailing directions in question indicate a voyage along the coast from Khao Samroiyot to the Meklong river and that at this time Chinese ships avoided the eastern shore of the Gulf.

56. *The Suma Oriental*, Hakluyt Society, 1944, 103. Gaspar da Cruz referred to the country of *Sãoes Mãos*; C.R. Boxer, *South China in the Sixteenth Century*, Hakluyt Society, 1953, 75-6. La Loubère wrote of the mixing of Thai blood with that of the 'Peguins'.

57. Other dependent rulers of the period with the title of *Kamrateng* were the ruler mentioned in the Nakon Sawan inscription, containing a date corresponding to 1167, the ruler of Sukhothai in the first half of the 13th century, and the ruler of Tāmbraliṅga in 1230.

58. Dr. Quaritch Wales, writing on Brahmanical manuscripts in the possession of the National Library at Bangkok, noted Barnett's view that the script was Pāṇḍyan and could be ascribed to a period not later than the middle of the 13th century; *Siamese State Ceremonies: their History and Function*, 1931, 55-6.

59. *SHYK*, 職官, 44, 6b; *SHYK*, 藩夷 4, 82a. According to the *Ming shih*, Ssü pu ts'ung k'an edition, 324, 18b, in 1497 on the occasion of a Thai embassy to China the *Ssü i kuan* 四夷館 had to obtain from Kuangtung the services of one who understood the

Thai language and script. On the *Ssü i kuan* and on Chinese facilities for diplomatic communications in South East Asian languages see Paul Polliot, *Le Hōjō et le Sayyid Husain de l'Histoire des Ming*, Leiden, 1948, 207-272.

60. The evidence for the incorporation of the western territories in the Angkorian empire is summarised in 'Tāmbraḷiṅga', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XXI, 3, 1958, 591-97. Recently Professor Coedès has noted that before Jayavarman VII's time Khmer occupation is not proved for certain beyond Lopburi; *Journal Asiatique*, CCXLVI, 2 1958, 127.

61. *BSOAS*, XXI, 3, 1958, 595-7.

62. *Ibid*, 598.

63. G. Coedès, 'Études cambodgiennes XXIV: Nouvelles données chronologiques et généalogiques sur la dynastie de Mahīdhara-pura', *BEFEO*, XXIX, 1930, 297-330.

64. On the problem of Nripatīndravarman, thought to be a descendant of Śūryavarman I, see G. Coedès, *Les états...*, 1948, 259, note 4. The authority of this prince in Cambodia must have been very slight.

65. The expression appeared on a Vat Phu inscription and was discussed by Professor Coedès in *BEFEO*, XXIX, 1929, 303-4. There was also a reference to the 'two masters' of the kingdom contained in the Ban That inscription; *BEFEO*, XII, 2, 1912, 27. In medieval South East Asia there must have been many such artificial political units held together in the face of ancient historical traditions. Early Śrīvijaya was described in the *New T'ang History* as a 'double kingdom', and other examples which come to mind are Pagan/Monland, northern Champa/Pāṇḍuraṅga, and Khauripan/Dara (the Majapahit kingdom).

66. *SHYK*, 蕃夷, 4, 73b-74a. This embassy was noted by Fujita Toyohachi in his study of Wang Ta-yüan, *Hsüeh t'ang ts'ung k'o* edition, 33a-b. It is also mentioned in *SHYK*, 職官, 44, 10b. One wonders whether Nripatīndravarman's supporters may have been holding out in Lopburi.

67. SHYK, 蕃夷, 7, 47a. *Yü hai*, Chiang Ning t'ao kuci t'ing, 1738, 154, 33b.

68. L. Finot, 'Notes d'épigraphie', *BEFEO*, IV, 1904, 939-40, 974. Professor Coedès discussed the identification of 'Malyang' in *BEFEO*, XXXII, 1933, 80, note. There is also the Prasat Tor inscription of 1189 or 1195 with a reference to the humbling of the 'king of the west'; G. Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, I, 1937, 227-49. Professor Coedès wondered whether this was a reference to the king of Burma. There may, however, have been a number of 'western' rulers closer to Angkor whom Jayavarman VII had to keep under control when he became ruler.

69. The Prah Khan inscription. 'Java' could refer to the island of that name, to the upper Mekong region, or, possibly, to Tambralinga whose ruler in the middle of the 13th century was described as *Jāvaka* in Ceylon records.

70. G. Coedès, *BEFEO* XLI, 1941, 295-6.

71. *Les états...*, 1948, 303.

72. L. Finot, 'Notes d'épigraphie', *BEFEO*, IV, 1904, 975.

73. Prince Dhani Nivat has presented the evidence for believing that Ayutthaya was also called by this name at the time of its foundation; 'The city of Thawārāwadī Sī Ayudhya', *Journal of the Siam Society*. XXXI, 1939, 147-53.

74. This view is available in Dr. Than Tun's articles in 'A history of Burma down to the end of the thirteenth century', *New Burma Weekly*, 23 August 1958-28 February 1959.

75. G. Coedès, 'Données épigraphiques sur l'histoire de l'Indochine centrale', 129-31. The rulers mentioned on the inscription had names ending in *-varman*.

76. The *Ming Shih*, 324, 15b, called the heir apparent the 'prince of *Su-mên-pang* 蘇門邦'. Wang Ta-yüan also referred to a place called *Su-mên-pang* [蘇門邦; edition by Shên Ts'êng-chih, Ku hsüeh hui k'an t'i i chi collection, volume 3, Kuo siu hsüeh pao shé, Shanghai, 1912-13, 16a-17a. Shên Ts'êng-chih rendered the quotation from the *Ming shih* given above as *Su-mên-fu*

蘇門 卑. Fujita Toyohachi accepted both renderings of the name and identified them with *Suvarṇapurī* or Suphan; Hsüeh t'ang ts'ung k'o edition. 56b. Rockhill seems to have omitted this notice in his translations from Wang Ta-yüan, 'Notes on the relations and trade of China...', *T'oung pao*, XVI. 1915.

77. Lavo sent embassies to China from 1289 to 1299, but cities in the U' Thong area were mentioned among the territories of Ram Khamhaeng. Presumably the union of these two areas took place in the first half of the 14th century when Sukhothai was becoming weaker. Could it have been the U' Thong State which supplied the '*Dvāravatī*' part of the name of the city of Ayutthaya?

78. The ruler of *Chên-li-fu* who sent the embassy in 1200 began his reign in 1180. According to a Thai tradition recorded by La Loubère a Thai prince was living at Petchaburi during the period covered by this reign; *A New Historical Relation...*, 8. The coincidence in dates is interesting.

79. The vivid expression 'beach-head' was coined by Mr. Kachorn Sukhabanij in his article entitled 'The Thai beach-head States in the 11th-12th centuries', *The Silapakon Journal* 1, 3-4, 1957.

Postscript

After this article had gone to press Professor Coedès brought to my notice an article written in Chinese by Mr. Fang Kuo-yu entitled 'Notes on *Chên-li-fu*—a Tributary State to China during the Sung Dynasty', *Journal of the South Seas Society*, IV, 2, December 1947, 9-11. It is an interesting study and must be added to the bibliography on the subject. Mr. Fang reproduced the text of the *Sung hui yao kao* and analysed its geographical information. He did not consider to what extent it had a hinterland but his impression of its general location was the same as mine. He concluded that it was north of Ligor on the Malay Peninsula, and he noted that Georges Maspero had suggested that it should be identified with Petchaburi (*Études asiatiques*, Paris, 1925, II,

104-5). He also agreed with me that *Hsin chou*, mentioned in the memorial of 1205, should be understood to refer to the Cham port of that name. On the other hand, he thought that *Nan-pi*, the country of the person who prepared a copy of the memorial of 1200, was a mistake for *Chan-pi* 詹卑, often thought to be Jambi on the south-eastern coast of Sumatra. I am not convinced of this.

He had no occasion to discuss the political significance of the *Chên-li-fu* embassies but he mentioned an additional source of information in the *Kung k'wei chi* 攻媿集 of Lou Yo 樓鑰 of the southern Sung dynasty which had been noted by Kuwabara in his study of P'u Shou-k'ang in the *Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko*, 7, 1935, 96-7. A wealthy *Chên-li-fu* merchant died in Ming chou in 1165. The governor, Chao Po-kuei, insisted that his corpse and property should be sent back to his own country, an act of generosity which made a great impression. The proceeds were used to build three Buddhist temples in honour of the merciful governor, and the 'leader of the barbarians' gave thanks. But the text does not prove that there were any official embassies before 1200, and it is safe to regard as authoritative the information in the *Sung hui yao kao* on the subject of embassies. The additional evidence, however, strengthens one's impression of the commercial importance of *Chên-li-fu* and gives the place-name a somewhat longer life. Nevertheless, 1165 still falls within the disturbed period between the end of the reign of Sūryavarman II and the time when Jayavarman VII restored the authority of the Khmer empire.

