

BACKGROUND TO THE SRI VIJAYA STORY

PART V (Conclusion)

Paul Wheatley, *Impressions of the Malay Peninsula in Ancient Times* (Eastern University Press, Singapore, 1964), pp. 264, plates; and O.W. Wolters, *The Fall of Sri Vijaya in Malay History* (Oxford University Press, Kuala Lumpur and Singapore, 1970), pp. 274.

22. THE POST-SRI VIJAYA PERIOD (1260-1300 A.D.)

With the death of Chandrabanu in Ceylon about 1260, the Sri Vijaya Empire, if I may call it by such a highfalutin name, came to an end. The histories of the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra then took separate courses. The city-states sent embassies to the Chinese court, which the Chinese still recorded as coming from San-fo-tsi; but complete control of the Malacca Straits, based on Muara Takus (Malayu) in Central Sumatra and Kedah on the west coast of the Peninsula, was no more.

Into this vacuum stepped the Thai and the Javanese. We have seen in section 18 that about the beginning of the 13th century, Tao U-Thong, king of Ayodhia, had already gone down the Peninsula to Bang Sapan in Prachuab Kirikhand Province and divided the Peninsula with Chao Phya Sri Thammasokaraja of Nakorn Sri Thammaraj. Half a century later Sri Intaratit, King of Sukhothai, went down to Nakorn and co-operated with Chandrabanu in acquiring the image known as the Buddha Sihing from Ceylon (section 18). By the end of the century Ram Kamhaeng, Intaratit's youngest son who came to the throne of Sukhothai about 1279, claimed sovereignty over Nakorn to "where the sea marks the limit". Some people think that this extended as far as Singapore, while others think that Ram Kamhaeng never even got control of Nakorn. If anything, they think, it was Ayodhia and not Sukhothai that controlled the south. In any case, "to where the sea marks the limit" means that whoever got control of Nakorn also controlled the Twelve Naksat Cities, ranging from Chumporn in the north to Pahang in the south (see section 1 above).

Half a century later Ayudhia followed Ayodhia or Sukhothai as the case may be.

But the main point is that the Thai came from the mountains. Whatever distance a landlubber may walk, he can only walk as far as 'Land's End'. He cannot walk across water to Sumatra, or, for that matter, even to Singapore. In this way Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula became politically separated. The Sumatran vacuum was filled by the Javanese. They were seafarers, and while they could land in some parts of Sumatra, they were unable to find a firm footing on the Peninsula before the Thai drove them into the sea again. Such is the background to the story. It is not altogether precise but it is adequate for understanding the evidence that follows.

1268 A.D. Krtanagara became King of Singhasari in East Java.

1275 A.D. Javanese sources state that Java invaded Malayu (Muara Takus in Central Sumatra.) Some scholars, however, think that this expedition, called the Pamalayu, was made in 1292, the year King Krtanagara died.

1282 A.D. Malayu sent an embassy to China led by two Muslims named Sulaiman and Shamsuddin.

1286 A.D. (a) An inscription on the base of an image of Amoghapasa-Lokesvara, found in the district of Rambahan in the Muara Takus area in Central Sumatra, tells us that it was brought from Bhumi Java to Suvarnabhumi by four high officials at the command of Maharajadhiraja Sri Krtanagara Vikrama Dharmottungadeva (King Krtanagara of Singhasari in East Java). The image was set up at Dharmasraya for the subject people of Malayu to adore. The local king was called Srimat Tribuvanaraja Mauli Varmadeva. (See also under 1347.)

(b) Sa-mu-ta-la (Samudra) sent an embassy. This toponym is thought to have referred to Sumatra, but this is by no means certain.

1292 A.D. (a) Marco Polo returned home by the sea route. On his way from China, he passed through Southeast Asia. Of the places mentioned, Pentan, 500 miles south of Locac on the mainland, was

Bandon, while Locac itself, or Lokok as the Chinese called the place in this period, was Lopburi. Malaiur, about a hundred miles to the southeast of Pentan, was Nakorn Sri Thammaraj (see also under 1295). As it is necessary to locate the key names correctly for this post-Sri Vijaya period to have any semblance of sense, I will return to this subject later.

After Malaiur, Marco Polo went on to the island of Java the Lesser (Java Minor) which is some 100 miles southeast of Pentan (Bandon). The text says "after leaving the island of Pentan, and sailing 100 miles to the southeast one finds the island of Java the Lesser. But you must understand that it is not so small but that it has a compass of 2,000 miles". Polo visited six of the eight kingdoms in this island. To me, Java the Less, 100 miles southeast of Bandon, was Malaya, but the experts, who take Pentan to have been Bintan for no particular reason that I can see except that the sounds of the two names are similar, identify the island as Sumatra. One mastermind has this to say about Java Minor:

"Having arrived at the western end of the sea route to the south of the Malay Peninsula, and having made his rather confused allusion to *Malayu*, Polo now speaks of *Java the Less* by which, following the Arab practice of applying the name Java to both Java and Sumatra, and failing to appreciate that *Malayu* was on this same island, he can only mean Sumatra."

(b) The East Javanese king, Krtanagara of Singhasari, died in this year. Before his death, the king had mutilated the face of an envoy sent by Kublai Khan, and the Emperor sent a punitive expedition to avenge the insult. Meanwhile Krtanagara had been murdered by Jayakatvang, the governor of Kadiri, who became king. However Prince Vijaya, Krtanagara's son-in-law, managed to escape. The Chinese forces were frustrated when they arrived in Java to find that the king they had come to punish was already dead. Vijaya contacted them for help in driving Jayakatvang from the throne. This done, Vijaya turned on his allies, defeated them and became king under the title of Krtarasa Jayavarddhana, with his capital at Majapahit. The reign of this king

(1292-1309) and that of his successor, Jayanagara (1309-28) were full of disturbances, and Java did not interfere in the affairs of Sri Vijaya. However, embassies to China were sent in 1297, 1298, 1300 and 1308 A.D.

1293 A.D. The Javanese forces sent to occupy Malayu (Central Sumatra) returned home. They took back with them two princesses, Dara Jingga and Dara Petak the younger of whom is said to have married the new king Krtarasa, and was known as Indresvari; while the elder, Dara Jingga, is said to have become the mother of a future king of Malayu.

1295 A.D. Kublai Khan sent a messenger to the king of Sien to say that "you should keep to the word you have given and stop killing the people of Malaiur". Sien should mean Sukhothai, and the king was Ram Kamhaeng. Malaiur was Nakorn and not Malayu in Sumatra (see under Marco Polo 1292 (a) above). It bears repeating that the Thai were landlubbers and there is no record of their interfering in the affairs of Sumatra.

There seems to be a great deal of confusion over the Chinese toponyms of the states in the Central Plain of Siam, so I will confound the whole situation just a wee bit further. There were two states roughly divided by the Menam Chao Phya (river). The Chinese called the eastern state Lokok (Marco Polo's Locac). This was Lopburi or Lawo-kok if I may call it that because Lawo was the old name of Lopburi. When the capital moved to Ayodhia/Ayudhia the name Lokok was still used.

The state on the western side was called Siemkok (Siam-kok). Early in the Christian Era, Ptolemy called this place Samarade (an inland town), which is the same as Samrattha, a name I understand the Indians still use to call Siam. It would seem that when the Thai came from the north into the Central Plain, they took over a Siam that had been occupied by other races such as the Mons, and possibly some other races before the Mons. The main locations of Sien were Nakorn or Lakorn Chaisri (present Nakorn Pathom) which the Chinese called Lang-ya-shu; Supanburi

(Subarna or Suvarna-bhumi, the land of Gold); Kanjanaburi (the City of Gold); Rajburi and Bejrburi. After Nakorn Chaisri had become deserted, the Chinese still used the name Sien or Siam. Later, when Ayudhia (Lokok) had become powerful in the Central Plain, the name was changed to Siem-Lokok. One of the Chinese records mentions a king of Supanburi called by the sound of something like Su-barn-ong. This was Indraraja, a prince of Supan who became king of Ayudhia.

In the period when Kublai Khan sent a message to the king of Sien to stop killing the people of Malaiur, Ram Kamhaeng of Sukothai had already gained control of Supanburi, Rajburi and Bejrburi, and was in the process of getting control of Nakorn, or was helping to defend Nakorn against the Javanese, as the case may be. If I remember rightly, the Chinese source says that the envoys met Ram Kamhaeng at Bejrburi, where they delivered the Khan's message.

1297 A.D. Malikul Saleh, the first ruler of Semudera, died in this year. According to the *Sejarah Melayu*, Malikul also founded the kingdom of Pasai in North Sumatra in order to provide each of his sons with a kingdom. Semudera and Pasai are twin cities on opposite sides of the same river, like Bangkok and Dhonburi.

1299 and 1301 A.D. Malayu sent embassies to the Chinese court.

About 1300 A.D. Ram Kamhaeng, who came to the throne of Sukhothai about 1279 A.D. and died about the turn of the century, stated in his inscription that his territory in the south extended to Supanbhumi (Supanburi), Rajburi, Bejrburi and Nakorn Sri Thammaraj "to where the sea marks the limit". After Ram Kamhaeng's death the states under the hegemony of Sukhothai broke away and townships set up their own chieftains.

This brings us to a natural break in the story, and I will go off on a tangent before continuing with the 14th century evidence.

23. PROFESSOR WHEATLEY'S SECOND BOOK

At the beginning, when I offered to write a paper based on physical geography in order to tear apart Professor Coedès' unscientific theory of a Sri Vijaya Empire with its capital at Palembang in South Sumatra, the Hon. Editor of this journal thought it should be done in the guise of a 'review article.' I thought, from their titles, that Professor Wolters' two books, *Early Indonesian Commerce: A Study of the Origins of Srivijaya*, and *The Fall of Srivijaya in Malay History*, would be a good starting point for any gift of the gab that I may possess. As it happened I had never seen these two books before, and while I was waiting for them to be sent, I started to comment on some of the relevant toponyms in Professor Wheatley's *The Golden Khersonese*. This took up so much space that Wolters' first book had to be treated as an annex to part I. And now this paper has gone on and on and on to such an extent that I am afraid Wolters' second book must again be treated as another annex. Not only that, but Wheatley has also produced a second book, *Impressions of the Malay Peninsula in Ancient Times*, which I think should be mentioned too, even if only as an annex to Wolters' annex. This will round things up in a very nice way, because I can then say that I have looked at two books each by the following professors—Wheatley, Wolters, de Casparis, Majumdar, Sastri and Paranavitana. The total is a full dozen, and I would add my name to this very distinguished company except that 13 is an unlucky number.

Wheatley's second book contains two chapters on Singapore and Malacca (8: The Century of Singhapura, pp. 101-118; and 9: The Century of Melaka, pp. 119-176.) According to Wheatley, Singapore was founded just before 1300 A.D. He gives the story from the *Sejarah Melayu* of the strange animal that turned out to have been a lion, which gave the name to the settlement. I might add that Singapore/Singhapura should not be confused with the other Lion City, Singora/Singhanagara. The founder of Singapore was a Sumatran prince, Sri Tri Buana, who was of the line of Raja Iskandar Dzu'l-Qarnain. Tri Buana is a variant of Tribhuvana, a title borne by two kings of Malayu (1286 and 1378) and a queen-regent

of Majapahit (1329-30). Buana ruled for 48 years and was succeeded by a son. I will give the story in Wheatley's own words, adding numbers in brackets:

"According to the *Sejarah Melayu*, Sri Tri Buana reigned for forty-eight years and was buried on the hill of Singhapura. He was succeeded by his son who assumed the style of the Paduka Sri Pikrama Wira (2), and is memorable for his repulse of the Javanese forces of Hayam Wuruk. After reigning for eighteen years he, too, died and was followed by his son, the Raja Muda, with the style of Sri Rana Wikerma (3)

"The *Sejarah Melayu* relates that after a reign of thirteen years Sri Rana Wikerma was succeeded by his son Damar Rajah, who then took the title Paduka Sri Maharaja (4). He reigned for twelve years and six months. Malay tradition asserts that he was succeeded by his son, with the style Sri Sultan Iskandar Shah (5), but there is reason to believe that this last ruler of Singhapura, elsewhere known as the Sri Parameswara, was in fact a Javanese or Sumatran renegade, who murdered Sri Rana Wikerma (3) before usurping his throne. In any case, he himself was deposed after a brief reign and fled with his household, first to Seletar and then to Muar. According to Malay lore and one European source the instrument of his defeat was the Javanese, but according to other early European writers it was either the T'ais themselves, or one of their peninsular vassals, who ousted the usurper."

Other authorities (Sir Richard Winstedt, for example), think the title of the founder of Singapore was Sang Suparba, a rather mythical prince of South Sumatra. Of the last ruler of Singapore, Winstedt writes as follows: "The title *Sri Maharaja* is, however, given in these (Malay) annals to both the father and son of the Palembang prince Parameswara, afterwards Iskandar Shah, the last lord of Singapore and founder of Malacca (1344-1424 A.D.)" We shall see later that Wolters has a different theory than those of Wheatley and Winstedt.

Meanwhile in East Java, the first two reigns of the Majapahit Dynasty (Krtarasa 1292-1309 and Jayanagara 1309-28) were a period of internal disorder until Gajah Mada stepped on the scene in 1319. He became Prime Minister in 1331 and held the reins of government until his death in 1364. We now continue with the evidence.

1331 A.D. Temasek (Singapore) is mentioned in Gajah Mada's oath when he became Prime Minister.

1343 and 1347 A.D. The name of a Prince Adityavarman is found inscribed on an image of Manjusri, set up at Chandi Jago in Java and dated 1343. Four years later he is thought to have become king of Malayu, with the title of Maharajadhiraja Udayadityavarman (or Aditya Varmodya) Prataparakrama Rajendra Mauliman Varmadeva. He is considered to have been a descendant of one of the two princesses from Malayu that the Javanese took back with them when they evacuated Sumatra in 1292. His name is found inscribed on the same image of Amoghapasa that Krtanagara had sent to Sumatra in 1286. It seems that the image was moved from its original location but the base was left *in situ*. The new inscription was added later and Professor Sastri, in his *History of Sri Vijaya* (page 136) noted : "it is impossible to give a regular translation of this gibberish which has been reproduced to give the reader an idea of the corrupt Sanskrit employed in Sumatra in the middle of the fourteenth century".

1349 A.D. Wang Ta-Yuan, in his *Description of the Barbarians of the Isles*, makes a distinction between San-fo-tsi and Kieou-kieng, and states that each had a sovereign of its own. Kieou-kieng or Ku-kang has been translated as 'Old Harbour' and is thought to refer to Palembang. If such is the case it confirms that the two parts of Sri Vijaya, Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, had become separated, and complete control of the Malacca Straits, based on Muara Takus controlling the southern entrance and Kedah controlling the northern one, was no more. The passage could not have been controlled from Ache or Pasai, say, and Muara Takus on the Sumatra side, nor from Kedah and Singapore on the

Malayan side. It might have been controlled from North Sumatra and South Malaya, but it was not, because the hinterland was unsuitable. So pirates, who had been present throughout the history of Sri Vijaya from ancient times, came into their own. The Ming annals towards the end of the century made a record of some Chinese pirates :

“At that time Java had completely conquered San-fo-tsi and changed its name to Ku-kang. When San-fo-tsi went down the whole country was disturbed, and the Javanese could not keep all the land. For this reason the Chinese who were established there stood up for themselves and a man from Nan-hai in Canton, called Liang Tauming, who had lived there for a long time and had roamed over the seas followed by several thousand men from Fukien and Canton, was taken by them as their chief. He reigned as master of a part of the country.”

1350 A.D. Foundation of Ayudhia by Ramatipati I. In the same year Hayam Wuruk came to the throne of Majapahit and reigned till 1389.

1358 A.D. The Thai Kot Montien Ban (Palace Laws of Ayudhia) mentions Ujong Tanah (Johore) and Malacca as dependencies. This should mean that after Ram Kamhaeng's death about the turn of the century, Ayodhya, followed by Ayudhia, controlled the Peninsula. But I do not think this included Singapore.

1365 A.D. The Javanese poem, *Nagara Kretagama*, written by the court poet Prapanca, listed Pahang (South Malaya) and Tumasik (Singapore), as well as many other places, as being under the Majapahits. Scholars are not in agreement that the Majapahit Empire ever extended to the Malay Peninsula. The aims of poetry and historical truth do not always coincide and, if we are to believe the chatter of court poets, the territory of the King of Siam would include the Daovadungs heaven where the god Indra holds sway. We are not told what tribute Indra pays the king. Meanwhile Wheatley, a writer with a more prosaic style than Prapanca, comments on page 112 of his book :

"Alas, the inexorable progress of historical research has stripped away the imposing facade of grandeur and shown that Majapahit at its greatest extent probably comprised little more than East Java, Madura and Bali. The other names in the impressive catalogue merely reflect the received geographical knowledge of mediæval Java, and were incorporated only to glorify the Kingdom of Majapahit in a paean of resounding praise. South-East Asian rulers have not normally been too critical of such eulogies."

I wonder if Wheatley is correct. In the first place I doubt if South-east Asian rulers read or can read or even understand the gibberish that court poets produce. Then I think the Javanese did make raids on the Malay Peninsula as well as on Singapore. The story of one such raid is told in the Thai records, the *Chronicles of Nakorn Sri Thammaraj*, but no date is given. It is inserted after the episode of Tao U-Thong of Ayodhia meeting Chao Phya Sri Thammasokaraja and dividing the peninsula with him (about 1200 A.D.) The story goes something like this :

The Javanese raided Nakorn twice and were repulsed. The King of Java then retired, but he returned and weighed anchor outside the harbour. A message was then sent to the King of Nakorn that the King of Java had brought along a daughter whom he was prepared to present to the King of Nakorn. She was more curvaceous than any curve produced in Java and could win any World Beauty Contest without the slightest doubt. So would the King of Nakorn please come and fetch her. The King of Nakorn went—and was promptly taken prisoner. Meanwhile the Queen of Nakorn set out in pursuit of her husband and arrived at an island called Koh Nang (Madame Island). The King of Nakorn was then returned and he paid a tribute to the King of Java. The tribute consisted of duck eggs.

The duck eggs are too good to be an invention, so the story probably had some foundation on fact. The Javanese, coming so far from Java, were likely very hungry and they were prepared to barter even a king for some grocery to enable them to get home again. The only

geographical information in the story is that the Queen got to a place called Koh Nang, and this island, I am told, is in the Singora Inland Sea. So the whole story might have been a Singora legend that somehow found its way into the *Chronicles of Nakorn*. Singora has not come into the limelight to any great extent in the writings on Southeast Asia, but obviously the Inland Sea played an important role in the story of the past because of its fine anchorage. Archaeological remains from there go back to ancient times.

1378 A.D. According to Eredia, Pahang, controlling Singapore, sent a mission to China. In the Chinese records of the same period, Wang Tayuan recorded a Thai defeat in trying to take Singapore, while the *Sejarah Melayu* admits a Javanese victory. Wheatley thinks the event recorded in the Malay chronicle happened in the reigns of Sri Pikrama Wira of Singapore (possibly c. 1347-62) and Hayam Wuruk of Majapahit (1350-89). On pages 115-7 of his book he gives an amusing account of the episode from the chronicle, but it is too long to quote here.

1403 A.D. The Chinese envoy, Yin Ching, visited Malacca and leaves an impression of a prosperous chiefdom nominally subject to Siam.

1405 A.D. Malacca sent an envoy to China and the Emperor appointed Parameswara as King of Malacca. Four years later the settlement was raised by imperial decree to the status of a kingdom. Ayudhia, however, continued to send expeditions against Malacca, the last recorded one being as late as in the reign of King Trailokanath (1449-87). Malacca itself fell to the Portugese in 1511 A.D.

This ends the evidence, and we now come to Wolters' *The Fall of Srivijaya in Malay History*. I have not collected all the records, and what I have collected is probably not very accurate, but the picture seems clear enough. When Chandrabanu left the peninsula, Sri Vijaya was left without a maharaja. The Thai filled the vacuum by land and the Javanese by sea. The conflict between the two enabled Malacca to set itself up. By great good luck the Chinese envoy, Yin Ching, arrived

at Malacca and Parameswara, the local chief, took the opportunity to ask for protection from the Emperor by saying that he "was aware of his duty and desired that his country should be considered a district of the empire, in return for which he would offer annual tribute" (Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese*, page 308). This theme of protection will be developed in the next section. Incidentally this section and the one following are printed almost as first drafted and interpretation of the evidence differs somewhat from that in section 20 (pp. 308-16).

24. PROFESSOR WOLTERS' SECOND BOOK

Historians of Malaya never seem to tire of writing about the founders of Singapore and Malaya. They do it *ad nauseam*. The reason of course is that some wit has stated that Malaya has no history before the foundation of Malacca. This may be true for all I know if we take Malaya to be limited by the present political boundaries, but if we broaden the scope to cover the Peninsula, then the statement is definitely false. Unfortunately historians of Malaya have gratuitously given away their evidence to Java and Sumatra, and of course jig-saw pieces will simply not fit if the game is played on the wrong table. So we have Dutch wits writing about a Sumatran period in Javanese history, and a Javanese period in Sumatran history, when they should write about a Malayan period in South Sumatran history, and a Malayan period in Central Javanese history. Such is the history of Sri Vijaya. This started with I-Ching in the 7th century and ended six centuries later with Chandrabanu in the 13th. A century or even two might be added to either end, but not convincingly because the Sri Vijaya story is based on the control of the Malacca Straits, and this control started with I-Ching's evidence when he said that "Mo-lo-yu has now become San-fo-tsi," and ended with Chandrabanu when the two parts, Sumatra and the Peninsula, became separated.

Wolters' book deals with the period just before and just after the end of the 14th century. It is about the founder (not founders) of both Singapore and Malacca. His case is based on the *Sejarah Melayu* (Raffles

M.S. 18), and he writes on page 108 of his book: "we must suppose that the first three rulers of Singapore were fictitious. The fourth ruler, the father of the Malacca founder may, on the other hand, have a genuine identity." Iskandar Shah, then, was the founder of both Singapore and Malacca. In this way Wolters leaves out the mythical Sang Suparba, Sri Tri Buana, Sri Pikrama Wira and Sri Rana Wikerma, who, Wheatley says, was murdered by Iskandar Shah (Parameswara), and instead produces a rather mythical character of his own, namely 'the Genealogist.' Also of course he has discarded all the Thai and Javanese notices of Singapore and Malacca, and yet he managed to write a whole book. I accept his theory. It makes my story simpler. Wolters gives a provisional chronology of the reign of Iskandar Shah on page 116 as follows:

1389-1390—1391-1392	three years in Palembang
1392-1393—1397-1398	six years in Singapore
1398-1399—1399-1400	en route for Malacca
1400-1401—1413-1414	fourteen years in Malacca
(Iskandar died in the 25th year of his reign.)	

Let us now look at the internal evidence from Sumatra. The South Sumatran inscriptions of the 7th century were written in old Malay, and obviously the people in South Sumatra at that time were either Malays, or at least a people who could read that language. But we do not know whether these Malays were the ruling class or the people ruled. According to Malay traditions, Sang Suparba built his palace on the Bukit Siguntang-guntang near Palembang. While we do not know how old these legends are, we do know that the king of Sri Vijaya who put up an inscription to commemorate a park called Sri Kshetra was named Sri Jayanasa or Jayanaga. The inscription was set up between 683-686 A.D.

After the 7th century Sumatra produced no more internal evidence until six centuries later. This was on the base of an Amoghapasa image sent by the East Javanese King Krtanagara in 1286. The name of the local ruler was Sri Tribhuvana or Sri Tri Buana in vulgar usage. The image was then moved, but the base was left behind, and another inscription was added in 1347. The name of the king is given as Udaya-

dityavarman. That is all except for one or two local chronicles such as the *Sejarah Melayu*. This document is on a par with the Thai chronicles of Nakorn Sri Thammaraj, of the Phra Dhatu Nakorn, of Patalung, of Patani and such, where legends are mixed with what might have been facts, but the historians of Malaya have given it a bloated importance compared to its Thai counterparts. As it happens the *Sejarah Melayu* is a Malayan and not a Sumatran document, anyway.

The Sumatran external evidence include Javanese and Chinese records but they are not very relevant. Wolters uses the Chinese records a great deal but his Sri Vijaya-Palembang and Malayu-Jambi are not realistic. One Chinese notice should be mentioned, namely the *Ming Annals* about the end of the 14th century recorded that a Chinese named Liang Tauming set himself up as master of Ku-kang or Kieou-kieng. He was a Chinese pirate.

On page 118 of his book, Wolters gives a quotation from Pires' *Suma Oriental*, of which I will requote only one sentence, namely that Parameswara "had no trade at all except that his people planted rice and fished and plundered their enemies, and lived on this in the said channel of Singapore". Meanwhile Wheatley, on page 307 of *The Golden Khersonese*, writes, "A band of corsairs from the southwards, under the leadership of a renegade Sumatran or Javanese called Parameswara, established themselves in at least two localities on the west coast of the peninsula, namely Muar and the Bertram district, some two leagues north of Malacca".

Everybody seems to agree about pirates even if Wolters calls them 'harbour princes', so I will continue with the subject. Pirates are the same the whole world over. There are two species of them, namely legal and illegal pirates. Sir Francis Drake in Elizabethan times and Samuel White in the Ayudhia period (Maurice Collis' *Siamese White*) were examples of the legal pirates. They used the king's flag (or queen's flag in the case of Drake) to enrich the royal coffers a little, and themselves a lot. The illegal pirates buried their treasure and in due course expected to buy their way to respectability. I will cite a

supposition in the Ayudhia or early Bangkok period. A pirate would set himself up in some convenient lair, and as he prospered a community would grow. To find respectability, he would send tribute to the king of Krung Sri Ayudhia, or the Phra Chao Krung Sri Bangkok, as the case may be, and the king, who probably never had an earthly notion of what was going on in his kingdom, would accept the tribute and make the donor governor of the place, perhaps even with the title of Luang. The pirate now had his protection and if he could marry his daughter off to some Chinese millionaire, quite likely a son of a pirate of an older generation, his descendants might well become so respectable that the king would turn them into Phyas, or even Chao Phyas, of the realm.

The story of the founder or founders of Singapore and Malacca is to me nothing but a story of some Sumatran pirates trying to find respectability. First they (or what Wolters calls the "Genealogist") claimed to be descended from Sang Suparba, the traditional founder of the Malay state in Palembang. Then it was as Sri Tri Buana (Sri Tribhuvana, a Shaivite-Mahayanist sort of character); after that as Sri Maharaja, a title of the Sailendras; followed by Sultan Iskander Shah, a descendant of Alexander; then as Parameswara, a descendant of some Hindu god; and finally as Mohammad Shah, a descendant of the Prophet himself. But all this was of no avail, though Parameswara had a bit of luck when a Chinese envoy visited Malacca and he was able to take the opportunity of finding some protection from the Chinese Emperor. The kings of Ayudhia, being descendants of the Buddhawamsa, did not accept any such pretence; nor did the Portugese, true sons of the Pope that they were, accept them. They captured Malacca in 1511 A.D.

It is rather regrettable that I cannot see the story of the founders of Malacca to be anything other than a story of pirates trying to make good; it is even more regrettable that I cannot see the story of the Malays in Palembang from the 7th century, when king Sri Jayanasa or Jayanaga raided them in their lairs and set up 'imprecations' in Palembang, Jambi and Bangka to keep them in order, until the time they founded Malacca to be anything but a story of pirates and more pirates; and it is

most regrettable of all that my imagination does not soar to such heights as to see in Professor Coedès' Sri Vijaya Empire in South Sumatra anything more than a story of pirates, pirates and pirates.

In Malay history

The first part to the title of Wolters' book, *The Fall of Srivijaya*, is a misnomer because the Sri Vijaya story had ended over a century before; and I rather think the second part of the title, *In Malay History*, is also inaccurate. The title of Parānavitana's book, *Ceylon and Malaysia*, seems a little loose too, but he gives a definition of exactly what he means in the first paragraph of his preface: "the name 'Malaysia' in this work has the significance in which it has been used normally by historians, that is, to indicate all those wide regions that are, or have been, inhabited by peoples of the Malay race".

Wolters does not give such a definition. He separates the Javanese and the Thai from the Malays, but he does not separate the Malays from the Sumatrans. Were the pirates of Palembang, who became princes of Malacca, Malays or Sumatrans? And were the people of Malaya, before the foundation of Malacca, Malays or of some other race? But the race that played the most important part in the Sri Vijaya story in the Malay Peninsula was the Javaka. Who were they?

Ethnic groups is a subject I know nothing about, and to me present-day political boundaries in the Western sense have no reality in the context of ancient history. The reason is simply because there were no political boundaries in the European sense before the European period. For instance, I am a Thai, possibly a fairly respectable citizen of the land today called Thailand. But the Thai Derm (original Thai) the Thai Dum and Thai Daeng (the black and red Thai), living in South China and North Viet Nam, as well as the Shans in Burma and Laos in Laoland, would not be Thai in this reckoning. Instead there are Thai Muslims, Thai Christians, Thai Animists, Thai atheists and even Thai hilltribes (Thai Meo, Thai Yao, Thai Karens, etc). It may seem

unpatriotic of me to say so, but I think all this is sheer nonsense. I feel I am a composite Thai compared to the Thai groups living outside Thailand. The Thai government however think I have a distorted sense of humour.

The same applies to Wolters' Malays. But researchers, particularly in Singapore, have started to use the terms the Tani States and the Malay States because the Malays of the east coast were culturally distinct from those of the west coast. The late Dr. C.A. Gibson-Hill of the Raffles Museum in Singapore once asked me whether the Tani States were Thai or Malay. Instead of the Tani States, he should have used the term the Ligor States, or, to call them by their ancient status, the Twelve Naksat Cities under the hegemony of Nakorn Sri Thammaraj. As these cities extended from Chumporn in the north to Pahang in the south, the answer to Gibson-Hill is the Tani States (Twelve Naksat Cities) may or may not have been Thai, but they certainly were not Malay in the sense that Wolters used this term. People have said that Malaya has no history before the foundation of Malacca, but this statement is not true if the history of Malaya is separated from the history of the Malays. I cannot see how any history of the Malays in Malaya can possibly go back beyond Malacca, but the Naksat Cities can probably be traced back a full thousand years.

This is where the original draft ended, and with the Naksat Cities we have completed a full circle because this paper started with them. Here is where I should bring this long-winded thing to a close, but let us go into orbit once more, because new evidence has come to hand since I started writing and there are one or two loose ends to tie up, as well as a few glaring errors that dropped in without being invited to correct. This will also act as a sort of recap. This part refers back to parts I and II but not to parts III and IV. To save time and trouble I will give the list of contents of these two parts. Reference will be based on these sections with the page numbers given of the relevant issues.

PART I (*JSS*, vol. 62, pt. 1, January 1974)

1. Langkasuka	page 175
2. Lakorn Chaisri	179
3. I-Ching's evidence	184
4. Takola emporium	189
5. Javadvipa and Java	193
6. Wolters' first book	202

PART II (*JSS*, vol. 62, pt. 2, July 1974)

7. The South Sumatran inscriptions	page 285
8. The Sailendra Period	291
9. The external evidence	297
10. Comments on de Casparis' theories	305
11. The building of Borobudur	312

The idea at the start was to locate some of the more important place-names in the early history of Southeast Asia. Two glaring omissions in my identifications of toponyms are Ptolemy's place-names and Marco Polo's eight states in his *Java Miror*. I will not deal with Ptolemy because it will take too long, and will limit myself to Marco Polo.

25. MARCO POLO AND THE COMING OF ISLAM

In section 5 of this paper (pp. 198-202), I identified Marco Polo's place-names between Champa (Ziampa) and the Nicobars and Andamans (Necuveran and Angaman) as follows :

<i>Marco Polo</i>	<i>Identifications</i>
Locac	Lopburi (Lokok)
Pentan	Bandon
Two Islands	Koh Samui and Pangnga
Malaiur	Nakorn Sri Thammaraj
Java Major	Borneo
Condur	Java
Sondur	Sumatra
Java Minor	Malaya (Island)

These identifications are based on Polo's sailing directions, to say nothing about wind charts and the sizes of the islands. Polo also stated that Java Minor had eight cities or states, of which he visited six and named them.

<i>Marco Polo</i>	<i>Identifications</i>
Ferlac	Perlak
Basman	Pasai
Samara	Samudra or Sumatra
Dagroian	Indragiri
Lambri	Acheh (Lambrey)
Fansur	Barus

These identifications made by modern-day experts locate all place-names in Sumatra against Marco Polo's evidence. Why should Marco Polo go to Barus on the west coast of Sumatra when it was well out of his route to Ceylon? Why should he visit Indragiri which was an inland state? Also, of course, not to identify the two unnamed states turns the whole exercise into a rather ridiculous word-game. But to reidentify these states, it is necessary to accept a few 'suppositions' first, and the first supposition is simply that my identifications of the four major islands are correct, viz. Java Minor was Malaya. Marco Polo also called Malaiur an island, and its capital, identified as Nakorn Sri Thammaraj, was also called Malaiur. Both Nakorn and Malaya had traditions of having been islands. The passage from Bhuket Bay (Krabi) running northeastward to Bandon is all flat land, and if in the old days ships could not negotiate the whole route then only short and low portages would be encountered. Then from the Singora Inland Sea there is a *klong* (canal) that runs southward to the border, and I have been told that this canal is connected with the Perlis River in Malaya. Also Kedah Peak at one time had a tradition of once having been an island. Whether these places were ever really islands or only by tradition is not of great import—Polo never went to them and only repeated what his informants told him.

Marco Polo set sail when the northeast monsoon blew, as did mariners from ancient times. (There is a windchart in section 3, p. 187.) He got to Champa (Ziampa), sailed across to the peninsula where he made landfall about Bandon (Pentan), sailed between two islands where the water was shallow (Samui and Phangan), to Nakorn (Malaiur) and from there to or past the Singora Inland Sea to the first city in Malaya (Java Minor); then down the east coast, round the peninsula, up the west coast to the last city he visited, and from there across the Andaman Sea between the Andaman and Nicobar groups (Angaman and Necuveran) to Ceylon (Silan). From Ceylon he got to the Middle East and then overland to Venice.

The fleet was a large one and contained at least 2,000 armed men. The purpose of the voyage was to deliver a Tartar princess to the court of the Ilkhan of Persia. Besides experienced mariners, the party probably included ambassadors and certainly ladies-in-waiting. Polo could get expert information from these people about the places visited or passed, but whether he made notes or not, we do not know. When he got home he became involved in a war and was taken prisoner. While a captive in Genoa he dictated his story to a fellow prisoner. In his story he might have got some minor details wrong, but I think the major aspects of his narrative would be correct, and these major aspects would include the directions and sizes of the four islands, which included Java Minor. So my first supposition can be accepted with confidence. In fact if it is not, Marco Polo's story is, and will continue to be, straight bedlam.

But Marco Polo was no better than a tourist, so let us compare him to one. Suppose a present-day tourist travelled from Bangkok to Chiangmai by a tour bus. The bus, running on a superhighway, would make its first stop at Nakorn Sawan after passing through several provinces but without actually going into any of the provincial capitals. After a stop of half an hour to fill up, it would set off again and, running through parts of the provinces of Kampaeng Pejr and Tak, make its second

stop at Mueng Tern in Lampang Province. Another fill-up and the bus then runs through Lampang and Lamphun Provinces to Chiangmai. Our tourist, if he had listened to the chatter of the tour hostess as she made explanations of the places passed, might have remembered some of the actual names; in fact, he might have taken some notes even if he had no idea of writing a book about his trip afterwards. (Marco Polo might have done the same.) Then a year or so later, when asked about his trip, our tourist could give a fair description of the two places where his bus stopped, but he might forget the names Nakorn Sawan and Tern, and say that the first stop was made at Bong-Bang (meaning Lampang), and the second at Hoo Flung Yoo Hi (meaning Lamphun, the old name of which was Haripunchai). But he would have got the names Bangkok and Chiangmai correct.

The case of Marco Polo is the same. When he dictated his story about the City States of Malaya, or what he called Java Minor, Polo lost his list if he had one, or he had two lists and got them mixed up, or he never had a list in the first place and simply made up some of the names himself. Whatever happened, the descriptions were *not* of places in Sumatra because that would be against the evidence of Marco Polo himself. So the second supposition is that Polo's City States of Java Minor were on the Malay Peninsula, even if he got the names cock-eyed.

The third supposition is that he visited the six states in the order he described them. That is, Ferlac, the first state mentioned, was the northernmost on the east coast of Java Minor; from there he coasted down south to the second state, etc., round the Peninsula and up the west coast to Fansur, the sixth and last state named, which was the northernmost location on the west coast. From there he sailed across the open seas to Ceylon. This was the route used by mariners from ancient times. Also included in this supposition is that Polo never visited any inland state. And the fourth supposition is that all these states were Naksat Cities.

Accepting these four suppositions, one can not only identify the six places named by Marco Polo, but the two unnamed places as well. In short, except for the Naksat Cities, there were no other important towns or Muengs in the Peninsula at that time. The Naksat Cities first came to our knowledge about 1200 A.D. or only a century before Marco Polo. For no particular reason I will give the Naksat years in my identifications as well.

After passing Nakorn, Polo got to or sailed past the Singora Inland Sea and arrived at the first state in Java Minor which he called Ferlac. This was Patani (Year of the Ox); from there he went south to Saiburi on the border of Patani and Narativas Provinces (Year of the Rat, Basman); on to Kelantan (Year of the Tiger, Samara); then round the Peninsula up the west coast. Pahang (Year of the Rabbit) was an inland town and Polo did not visit the place, but as this state covered both coasts he would have asked or been told about it. The first state on the west coast that Polo got to was Kedah (Year of the Big Snake, Dagroian); then Trang (Year of the Horse, Lambri); and finally Bhuket or Takua Talang (Year of the Dog, Fansur), from where he sailed to Ceylon. Of the two unnamed locations one was Pahang, and the other was either Pattalung (Year of the Little Snake) or Krabi (Year of the Monkey). Pattalung is on the land side of the Singora Inland Sea, and as Polo did not go to Singora, the chances are that it was Krabi. As Polo stopped at Bhuket (Fansur) and Krabi is on the opposite shore of Bhuket Bay, he would have been given its name. My identifications, then, are as follows:

<i>Marco Polo</i>	<i>Identifications</i>	<i>Naksat Years</i>	
Ferlac	Patani	Chaloo	Ox
Basman	Saiburi	Chuad	Rat
Samara	Kelantan	Khan	Tiger
(unnamed)	Pahang	Thoa	Rabbit
Dagroian	Kedah	Marong	Big Snake
Lambri	Trang	Mamia	Horse
Fansur	Bhuket	Chor	Dog
(unnamed)	Krabi	Vog	Monkey

The coming of Islam

Marco Polo stated that Ferlac, identified as Patani, was a Muslim state. That was in 1292. In 1297, or five years later, Malikul Saleh, the founder and Muslim ruler of Semudra in North Sumatra, died. His gravestone is still in the Semudra-Pasai District. Based on this evidence, as well as on Marco Polo's evidence on Ferlac, students of ancient Malaysian affairs, mainly Western scholars, have thought that Islam came to Southeast Asia from the west (Middle East), first to North Sumatra, then to the west coast of Malaya and on to Malacca. On the other hand, the Muslims of the east coast, or more specifically, of Patani, have a tradition that they got their religion from the East, that is, from China. The Javanese also have the same tradition. Let us look at the story of Malikul Saleh in a little more detail.

The story is found in two Malay chronicles, the *Hikayat Raja Raja Pasai* and the *Sejarah Melayu* ("Malay Annals"). Both, of course, were written down much later than Marco Polo, the *Sejarah Melayu* being at least two centuries later, where the arrival of the Portugese is included in the tale. According to the *Sejarah Melayu*, there were two brothers Merah who lived near Pasangan. The younger brother, Merah Silu, fled to Jerun when he heard that his elder brother, Merah Chaga, wanted to kill him for eating galley worms. Merah Silu then built Semudra. "Now it happened that in ancient days the Apostle of God (May God Bless Him and Give Him Peace) told his companions, 'In the latter days there shall be a city, below the wind, called Semudra. When you hear tell of this Semudra go thither with all speed and bring the people of that city into the faith of Islam, for in that city shall be born many Saints of God.'" In due course this was done and Merah Silu, who had just been converted, was installed as Raja of Semudra with the title of Malikul Saleh. The Raja had two sons. He built Pasai as a settlement for his elder son, Malikul Tahir, and when he died his younger son, Malikul Mansur, became Sultan of Semudra in his stead. Semudra and Pasai are twin cities on opposite banks of the Jambu Ayer River in Sumatra. Malikul Saleh died in 1297 and his gravestone is still in Sumatra.

The *Sejarah Melayu* has been translated by C.C. Brown as the *Malay Annals* (Oxford University Press, 1970). The translator used two texts, Raffles MS. 18 and the Shellabear Text. I will first quote a short paragraph from the Shellabear, page 30.

"The story of the Rajas of Pasai. Merah Silu is driven out by his brother and goes to the country to which he gives the name of Semudra, the Semudra of which the Prophet foretold the conversion of Islam. The voyage of the missionaries from Mecca to Semudra and the successive conversions of Fansuri, Lamiri Haru and Perlak on their way. They reached Semudra where Merah Silu is converted to Islam and made Raja of Semudra with the title of Sultan Maliku'l-Saleh."

The similarity of the place-names in this and Marco Polo's would indicate that Polo had two lists, one of places in North Sumatra and the other of the Peninsula, and he either got the lists Mixed up or lost one. This same similarity of names is a godsend to word-gamers. They write yards and yards of arguments, and even equate Polo's Samara to Malikul Saleh's Semudra, or to Sumatra the island, or to both. But the experts are in agreement on two points, namely Java Minor was Sumatra, and that Polo was a nitwit who couldn't even get his islands right. In the same way Ptolemy a thousand years before was a half-wit who didn't even know the world was round. I myself prefer to follow Polo's geographical evidence rather than play the word-game, equate Java Minor with Malaya, and locate Samara as Kelantan. And, as I have said before, the combined evidence of Marco Polo and Malikul Saleh has been used to put forward a theory that Islam came first to Southeast Asia from the West. It seems curious that while Arab and Persian merchants had been trading with the Far East a thousand years before Marco Polo, Islam should only come to Southeast Asia five hundred years after the death of the Prophet (May God Bless Him and Give Him Peace). Surely over this long period some of the merchants and mariners must have been Muslims (May God Bless Them and Give Them Peace, too). Could these Muslims not have introduced the discipline a few centuries before Marco Polo?

But now within the last decade or two, two Muslim scholars have produced a theory that Islam first came to Southeast Asia from China. This agrees with the traditions of Patani and Java, which the Muslims of Malaya that I talked to seem to accept. One of the two scholars was S.A. Fatimi, who wrote a paper, "Islam comes to Malaysia" (Malaysian Research Institute, Singapore, 1963). The second scholar was Dr. Syed Naguib Al-Attas and his paper is called "Preliminary statement on a general theory of the Islamization of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago" (*Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka*, Kuala Lumpur, 1969). As what I know about Islam is completely non-Muslim-centric, I will quote a few paragraphs from Attas' paper, from the earliest Chinese record to about 1300 A.D. Dr. Attas gives two sets of dates, of the Moslem Era first, followed by *Anno Domini*. To make the text quicker to absorb I will take the liberty of adding both the eras (M.E. and A.D.)

Concise chronology of historical events

"The earliest known record of probable Muslim settlement in the Malay-Indonesian archipelago was a Chinese report of the existence of an Arab settlement in east Sumatra (San-Fu-Chi=Sri-vijaya=Palembang), headed by an Arab chief in M.E. 55/674 A.D. A more definite statement on large-scale Muslim emigration into the archipelago was given by al-Mas'ūdi who reported that in M.E. 265/877 A.D. about 120,000 or 200,000 merchants and traders comprising mainly Muslims (Arabs and Persians) who had settled in Khanfu (Canton) were massacred following a troublesome rebellion in south China among the peasants of the T'ang emperor Hi-Tsung (M.E. 265-276/878-889 A.D.). Consequently, large numbers of Muslim merchants and traders fled Canton and sought refuge in Kalah (Kedah) on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. This considerable emigration of Muslim merchants and traders effected a transference of the entrepot for Muslim trade with the Chinese empire from Canton to Kedah. We can reasonably assume that since the Muslims had quite a considerable settlement in Canton (which dated from as early as the 1st/7th century) enjoying a high degree of religious and civil autonomy, they must have perpetuated their mode of settlement and social organization

in Kedah, and also in Palembang, whither they had similarly emigrated. This event seems to have marked the beginning of the coming of Islam in the archipelago."

The equation San-Fu-Chi= Srivijaya= Palembang is not correct. In 671 the Chinese monk I-Ching was at Chele-foche which was Sri Vijaya, which in turn was Chaiya on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula. At that time Chaiya was Buddhist, with a thousand monks. Between 683-6 the king of Sri Vijaya set up inscriptions at Palembang, Djambi, Bangka and South Lampung. The king was Buddhist, though the archaeological remains still extant in South Sumatra consist of only a large stone image, a few small stupas and some unbaked votive stupas. San-Fu-Chi seems to be a mistake because the Chinese used Chele-foche in this period. But if Attas is right, then San-Fu-Chi would be somewhere on the Peninsula and not Palembang because at that time Sri Vijaya had not conquered South Sumatra. This place might have been Patani, Saiburi, Kelanton or even Trengganu though Trengganu was not a Naksat City. The present province of Patani seems unlikely even if the people there have a tradition that Islam first came to their province. There was an older site nearby called Yarang with ancient Hindu remains. This might have been the Langasuka of Malay folklore (see below). A more probable site was Kelanton which I have equated with Marco Polo's Samara, though of course the four cities mentioned above, as well as the province of Yala, might have comprised a single kingdom of Patani. Kalah was the Arabs' name for Kedah (the Indians' Kidaram and Kadaram). Again the ancient remains of Kedah are Hindu and Buddhist, but this might have been another kingdom that included Perlis and Satul. The main point is, if we accept the above evidence, by the 9th century A.D., there were Moslem settlements on both coasts of the Peninsula. Meanwhile to continue with Attas' records:

"There is evidence of Muslim settlement in the Phan-rang region in south Champa in Cambodia in M.E. 431/1039 A.D. or earlier. The Leran inscription near Gresik in east Java dated M.E. 475/1082 A.D. indicated earlier Muslim presence in the region.

"According to the Achehnese (Malay) chronicles, Islam was introduced into the northern tip of Sumatra sometime around M.E.

506/1112 A.D. by an Arab missionary whose name is given as Shaykh 'Abdu' Llāh 'Ārif. One of his disciples, Shaykh Burhanu'l-Din, later carried on his missionary work as far as Priaman down the west coast. The date of the establishment of Islam in north Sumatra is given as M.E. 601/1204 A.D. when Johan Shāh became its first Sultān. The Hikāyat Raja-Raja Pasai related that the Sharif of Makkah sent one Shaykh Ismā'il at the head of a mission to spread Islam in north Sumatra in the middle of the 7th/13th century. The Pasai region of north Sumatra, composed of the realms of Perlak and Samudra, was already Muslim by M.E. 682/1282 A.D. The Sultān, al-Malik al-Sālih, died in M.E. 697/1297 A.D. or M.E. 707/1307 A.D.

"In Trengganu on the northeast coast of the Malay Peninsula, a stone inscription dated M.E. 702/1302 A.D. was discovered at Kuala Berang indicating earlier Muslim settlement in the region. A Muslim tombstone at Bud Dato on the island of Jolo in Sulu dated M.E. 710/1310 A.D. indicated that Muslims frequented the region, perhaps in the course of their trade relationship with China."

Attas does not mention the *Sejarah Melayu*. This chronicle is not considered a good source for history, but I think all chronicles, this as well as Thai ones, could supply one or two pointers to clear up some knotty problems. The story of Malikul Saleh contains two discrepancies. The first is that he was ruler of Semudra, and as he had two sons, he built a second city, Pasai, for his elder son while his younger son succeeded him at Semudra. Pasai and Semudra are twin cities on opposite banks of the same river. This would mean that they were really the same city, and it seems contrary to the evidence. The second discrepancy concerns the conversion of Malikul Saleh. The ship with the fakir on board set sail for Semudra and arrived at Fansuri, Lamiri and Haru, where the people were converted. From this point the story, as translated by C.C. Brown from M.S. 18, p. 32, goes:

"And the fakir asked the people (of Haru), 'Where is the country called Semudra?' And they answered, 'You have sailed past it.' So he went back on board the ship, and they sailed on

again until they made a land-fall at Perlak, where the fakir admitted the people to the Faith of Islam. The ship then sailed on to Semudra. And when they reached Semudra the fakir went ashore where he met Merah Silu hunting for shell-fish on the beach. And the fakir asked him, 'What is the name of this country?' And Merah Silu answered, 'This is Semudra.' And the fakir asked, 'What is the name of the headman of this country?' And Merah Silu replied, 'It is I who am the headman of the people here.' The fakir thereupon admitted him to the Faith of Islam and taught him the Muslim creed... Then said the fakir to Shaikh Isma'il, the master of the ship, 'This is the country of Semudra of which the Prophet (may God bless him and give him peace) spoke.' Shaikh Isma'il then took ashore from his ship the regalia he had brought with him and installed Merah Silu as Raja with the title of Sultan Maliku's-Saleh."

The question is: Why did the ship sail past Semudra in the first place? The answer of course is that it didn't. This is how I would interpret the story. Malikul Saleh was ruler of Semudra on the Malay Peninsula (say, Marco Polo's Samara which I have equated with the Naksat City Kelantan.) At that time, after the death of Chandrabunu in Ceylon about 1260 A.D., the Sri Vijaya States had split up and the Peninsula and Sumatra became politically separated. Malikul Saleh, who at that time had been converted to Islam, decided to build a retreat that he could retire to in case the situation degenerated and he had to evacuate his capital. So he built Pasai in North Sumatra which already had become Moslem. As it happened, the situation worsened and Malikul Saleh did retire to Pasai with his elder son, Malikul Tahir, leaving behind his younger son, Malikul Mansur, as ruler of Semudra. The king died in Sumatra in 1297 or 1307 and his tombstone was found in the island. When Malikul Saleh went to Sumatra the name of his city went with him, and the new name became Pasai-Semudera, though the old capital was still called Semudra. The name Semudra might merely mean 'ocean' (Skt. Samudra), that is, Pasai-Semudra was what we would today call Pasai-on-sea. But that is by the way.

Then, when the Malacca-centric authors of the *Sejarah Melayu* put their story of Malikul Saleh together, they decided to split the twin city of Pasai Semudra into two parts, but they forgot to omit the story of the fakir's ship overshooting Semudra and had to turn back. This interpretation does not look very good when put down on paper, but strangely enough there is confirmation of it in the *Sejarah Melayu* in the episode of Malikul Saleh's two sons and the King of Siam. The story is too long to give in detail.

The Raja of Shahru'n-nuwi (King of Siam) decided to capture the Raja of Semudra alive. One of his war-chiefs named Awi Dichu was sent on the mission. The Raja of Semudra was seized, and the story continues:

"The war-chiefs of the Raja of Semudra forthwith raised an outcry and drawing each man his weapon, were for fighting the war-chiefs of Shahru'n-nuwi, who however cried, 'Lay a hand on us and we'll kill your Raja, make no doubt of that!' As they could not now fight the Shahru'n-nuwi war-chiefs, the men of Pasai accordingly stayed still. Awi Dichu and his men then returned to their ships taking the Raja of Pasai with them and sailed off home with him."

The story seems to have got the two brothers thoroughly mixed up, which is natural enough because Semudra was on the Peninsula while Pasai was in Sumatra. I have already remarked that the Thai were landlubbers, and however far a landlubber may walk, he cannot walk over water to Sumatra. So the Raja of Semudra that they caught was captured in the Peninsula. This was exactly what Malikul Saleh was afraid of when he built a retreat for himself at Pasai.

The story continues. The King of Siam ordered the Raja of Semudra to tend the palace fowls. Meanwhile the Chief Minister of Pasai, Saidi 'Ali Ghitayud-din by name, disguised himself as an Arab trader, went to Siam and twice presented the king with valuable gifts each worth a *bhara* of gold, but without asking for a favour in return. Then again for the third time a gift was presented to the king. The story at this point is a little too good to leave out, so I will quote from

C.C. Brown's translation (pp. 36-7) even if it makes the paper a little long. And I will add explanations of the names in brackets for the benefit of people like myself who may find the story difficult to follow on account of the strange names.

"After a few days the season came for the return voyage and Saidi 'Ali Ghitayu'd-din (Chief Minister of Pasai) began to set the ship's gear for the voyage. He and his companions then presented themselves before the Raja of Shahru'n-nuwi (King of Siam), taking with them as gifts a pair of ducks, male and female, made of gold and studded with jewels, to the value of about a *bhara* of gold, together with a deep bowl made of gold and filled with water. The two ducks were then released into the golden bowl, where they swam, dived and chased one another. And the Raja of Shahru'n-nuwi (King of Siam) was amazed at the sight of these magic ducks, and he said, 'Now tell me the truth, what is it that you want? By the God whom I worship I will refuse you nothing that you desire.'

"Thereupon Saidi 'Ali Ghitayu'd-din (the Chief Minister) answered, 'If your Highness will graciously grant us this boon, we crave from your Highness the man who tends your fowls.' And the Raja of Shahru'n-nuwi (King of Siam) said, 'He is the Raja of Pasai; as you have asked for him, I will give him to you.' And they replied, 'It is because he is a Muslim that we crave him from your Highness.' And the Raja of Shahru'n-nuwi granted Sultan Maliku'tl-Tahir (the Raja of Pasai) to Saidi 'Ali Ghitayu'd-din, who took him to the ship. And when they had gone aboard, they lustrated him and arrayed him as a Raja. And a breeze sprang up, the anchor was weighed and the ship sailed for Semudra, where they arrived after a voyage of some days."

C.C. Brown, the translator of the *Sejarah Melayu*, has a long footnote on the Raja of Semudra (no. 145, p. 212).

"*Raja Semudra*: the annalist goes badly wrong with his nomenclature in what follows. Semudra was the kingdom of Sultan Maliku'l-Mansur; but the Raja taken in captivity to Siam

was Sultan Maliku'tl-Tahir who was Raja of Pasai. After describing the captive as Raja of Semudra the annalist suddenly tells us that *Raja Pasai* was carried off to Siam. Yet it was *Raja Semudra* who was made to tend the palace fowls in Siam. The rescue from Siam was made by the chief minister of Pasai, yet when they returned home it was to Semudra that they went!"

Obviously the reason that the *Sejarah Melayu* confused the Rajas of Semudra and Pasai in this particular episode was simply because there were two Semudras, one on the Peninsula and the other in Sumatra. Also obviously the royal house of Malacca, for whose benefit the *Sejarah Melayu* was written, preferred to get their religion from the west through a fakir sent by the Prophet (may God bless him and give him peace) from Mecca, rather than from a faker from the land of infidels (may God curse them and give them hell). I will squeeze just one more drop of juice from this particular lemon. The first of the three presents that the Chief Minister of Pasai made to the King of Siam was a tree made of gold. I would interpret this to mean that when Malikul Saleh the father, who was a vassal of Siam, quit Semudra on the Peninsula for Pasai and left his younger son as ruler, the traditional homage of gold and silver trees sent by vassals at stated intervals were not sent. This was tantamount to rebellion, so the King of Siam sent an official to investigate. The official, Ok-ya Pichai (? Awi Dichu), entered the city and took the new Raja back to Siam as hostage. When the Chief Minister followed with the necessary homage, and after explanations had been made, the captive was set free. As for the palace fowls, perhaps the King presented the Raja with a few chickens as a memento of his visit. Siamese fighting cocks, called *syamgooks* in the Balinese language, are recognised as the finest bruisers. Alternatively the Raja might have turned chicken-thief and pinched a few of the fowls under his charge that had become particularly attached to him. But of course the story might merely mean that the King of Siam, who was a Buddhist, preferred a Moslem to slit

the throats of the chicken for his table rather than have his own cooks lose merit by carrying out such a dastardly act. In short, the story of the palace fowls is straight fiction weaved out of thin air.

The Javanese and the people of Patani on the east coast of Siam have traditions that they got their religion from China. The good folks of Patani even asked me to say something about the subject in this paper. Luckily however Drs. Fatimi and Al-Attas had already submitted theses on this line, so what I say about Marco Polo and the *Sejarah Melayu* can be accepted as supporting evidence, or discarded by such people who would prefer to keep Polo and the S.M. as amusing anecdotes of no historical value whatsoever. I have no objection either way because I think Fatimi and Attas' arguments are irrefutable. Unfortunately they do not tell us how Islam got to China in the first place, whether by land or by sea. However I have been told that Islam was introduced to the Chinese court by land in the lifetime of Mohammed himself. If this is correct, it is difficult to understand how the discipline could have got to the Chinese coast by 674 A.D., let alone to San-Fu-Chi, as stated by the Chinese records. The story of Malikul Saleh and his two sons fit the general pattern of the history told by Mas'udi of the massacre of Muslims in Canton in 877, and the Muslims' subsequent refuge in Kedah seems reasonable. But the Chinese story of a Moslem settlement in San-Fu-Chi in 674 seems suspect if the religion came from China. However if Arab and Persian sailors of the Islam faith had a settlement somewhere on the Peninsula, then the Chinese evidence would be possible. But I know nothing about Islam. I do not know whether conversions have to be carried out by holy men, or anybody can take the faith without being circumcised. My ignorance is complete, so I will stop here. God knoweth the truth. To Him do we return.

26. NEW EVIDENCE AND SECOND THOUGHTS

(a) The Malay Peninsula

Lakawn Suka (Langasuka)

Raja Marong Mahawangsa founded Langasuka at Kedah on the west coast (section 1, pp. 175-179). Then in the next generation, according to the *Kedah Annals*, the settlement, or perhaps only the name, moved east to Patani. I will quote a few sentences from Professor Paul Wheatley's translation of the chronicle from his *Golden Khersonese.*, pp. 261-262:

"Thereupon King Marong Mahapodisat (son of Marong Mahawangsa) made his son (King Seri Mahawangsa) mount the elephant Gemala Johari The elephant raised its head and set off towards the rising sun . . . when they had almost reached the sea . . . the elephant Gemala Johari stopped. The princess-consort said, 'Go back to Kedah, to my royal father, and tell him that this country is called Patani' Now King Seri Mahawangsa (called King of Kedah two lines previously) did not want to stay at Langasuka as it was very far from the sea."

A geographical note might be added concerning King Seri Mahawangsa's curious remark about Langasuka being far from the sea. The previous paragraph, from Wheatley's translation on page 261, reads

"King Marong Mahawangsa saw how Pulau Lada had joined the mainland, finally being called Bukit Lada, just as Pulau Jambul was finally called Bukit Jambul. Pulau Seri was almost joined to the mainland and was eventually called Gunong Jerai on account of its height." (Pulau-island, Bukit-hill, Gunong-mountain; Gunong Jerai is Kedah Peak—Author.)

Langasuka, or Alang-kah-suka of Kedah folklore and Lakawn Suka of Patani folklore, was the fairyland of the Malays. The chief fairy was Princess Sadong, "who rules over the little people and wild goats of the lime-stone hills, and persistently refuses all suitors, be they never so high-born or otherwise eligible." (Kedah folklore, from Wheatley's *The Golden Khersonese*, page 262.) But nobody seemed to know where Lakawn Suka was located. Then in 1962 the Cambridge Univer-

sisty's Explorers' and Travellers' Club organised a sort of combined cultural and archaeological expedition to Malaya and South Siam. They made recordings and films of dances and drama, of songs and stories, and in Siam plunged into a little on-the-spot archaeological research. One of the party, Mr. Stewart Wavell, wrote a book about the trip. (*The Naga King's Daughter*, Allen and Unwin, London, 1964.) Wavell's account of *his* Princess Sadong and Lakawn Suka is charming, so I will quote extensively. First of all, travelling by train from Kelantan to Haadyai, he met a Thai girl called Golden Naga. She was a Nora dancer from Patani province—her home was at a place called Bukit Sangkalakilee in the District of Yarang some fifteen miles from the provincial capital. The party finally got to Yarang and the discoveries there recorded:

(*Quotation starts*): Her name was Golden Naga, a coincidence that made me smile at the time, but I was soon to learn that such names are not unusual in South Thailand. She came from a place called Bukit Sankalakilee in Patani, and she spoke Malay, because there was a Malay village nearby. She had not been back to her home for many years. She was a dancer in a Menora troupe which travelled throughout South Thailand.

I pointed out that in Malaya, girls' parts in Menora were taken by young boys made up to look like girls, and that, to my knowledge, girls were not allowed to perform. She did not seem surprised and said that long ago the same custom was observed in Thailand. Perhaps her most revealing answer was given to my question: "Why do you dance in Menora?" At first, she explained that her father was a Menora performer and that she had been brought up to be a dancer. Then she realized I expected something more from her answer and, as an afterthought, she said: "It is the oldest of all magic from the land of Lakawn Suka. We merely pay our respect to the Princess Sadong."

Anyone familiar with Malay folklore would have shared my excitement to hear these two ideas in immediate juxtaposition. Lakawn Suka was the Patani Malays' fairyland equivalent to Langasuka, and Princess Sadong was the Fairy Princess of Kedah "Whom all could worship but none could marry." Only recently I had heard the name again. But where? And then I remembered. In Kelantan we were told the story of a Princess who lived on top

of the limestone hill on the way to Bachok, who would not marry. She was a Thai Princess and her name was Sadong: "whom all could worship but none could marry." The words were suddenly illuminated with meaning. Sadong must have been the Sakti goddess of Langasuka, and where else would a goddess live but on top of a limestone hill?

"Where did you say your home was?" I asked the Menora girl in some excitement.

"Near Bukit Sankalakilee in Patani," she replied.

"And where did Princess Sadong live?"

"In the palace on top of the hill. I heard that when I was a child."

"Then where is Lakawn Suka?" I asked, scarcely believing that she would do anything but laugh at my naivete.

"It's just across the paddy fields," she replied. "Of course, you can't see anything, because it was there such a long time ago." (*pp. 149-150*)

The climax of our visit to Pattani came with our exploration of the ruined city of Yarang Now if Yarang were the site of the ancient capital of Langasuka, we should expect to find it some distance inland and close to a broad river. It was not unusual in ancient times for capitals to be built well upriver because of the danger of pirate attack. Lookouts could give warning of a threatening fleet and many ships could be destroyed by defenders on both banks.

On arrival at the village of Yarang . . . we stopped and scrambled up a huge earth mound littered with quantities of red laterite bricks, and from the summit looked down into a dark hole. We could see that the interior was brick-built and had once been a Buddhist stupa. There were many of these ruined stupas, we were told, scattered among rubber trees and paddy fields. All had been broken into by thieves in search of gold and many bronze Hindu gods and Buddhas had been found and sold in Patani shops. The headman did what he could to stop these thefts, but the stupas were so widely scattered that it was impossible to keep a guard on them all. He was very much afraid that when the time came for a full-scale excavation, there would be little left to discover.

We were shown the three huge protective earth walls which in centuries past had been erected to fortify the palace. In fact, the village where the palace had stood was called Brahwere, derived, the headman thought, from Brahwang, which is a Thai word for palace. We were shown the huge sloping pond which was said to have been the site of ancient Siva ceremonies, but no proof of this could be given.

Then plunging off the main track, our Malay hosts slashed a path towards a concealed granite pillar. It lay broken and entirely covered by a dense thicket of undergrowth. There were sockets in the pillar through which probably wooden horizontals would have been inserted. This was part of a temple, we were told, known as Wat Udeng. Another not far distant had been known as Wat Lubok. Both had pillars of granite and were believed to be ancient, but the local people had broken off chunks of granite and used them for grinding tools. Some examples of carving had been preserved by the monks, but this pillar in the undergrowth had been too heavy to move.

Finally, we drove to a field rich in rambutans, low trees groaning with ripe, red fruit, the finest I have seen. "These come from Kedah," I was told, "They are a special variety."

"There is a route, then, to Kedah through the jungle?" I asked.

"Oh, yes," replied the headman, "It's a very old route, indeed. It usually takes us about three days."

With a smile the headman stood up, his task of clearing earth beneath the rambutans completed.

"Look, the base of a Sivalingam!" he said.

A huge square block of granite was revealed. Incised into the centre was a square depression into which could be fitted a vertical Sivalingam or phallus. On one side of the square was groove known as the 'ooma' or vagina. These two in juxtaposition were traditionally symbolic of the creation of mankind.

To see these solid stone survivals at our feet was immensely satisfying after weeks of groping within the insubstantial world of ancient music and cultural sound. But here, undoubtedly, was

granite proof confirming so much that had been foreshadowed in our many recordings. *The Malay Annals* describe how, on conversion to Islam, the Malays destroyed their idols, and this may explain why so few relics of Siva have been discovered in Malaya. But this granite Sivalingam they could not destroy. For centuries it had lain beneath the mud of this paddy field, until recently when it was brought to the surface by a farmer working his paddy plough. And I was soon to learn that six others had been discovered in the region of Yarang.

Of legends concerning the city I was told there were few. Some people said it was once the capital of Pattani, and that its former name was Goh Ta Maha Likay. One of the kings was called Gorok Maha Chantra who was also known by the name of Sri Wangsa, but that is all. I noted the names mechanically in my book, and then looked again in surprise. SRI WANGSA. The letters stared at me from the page.

"But Sri Mahawangsa was the King of Langasuka," I said.

"This I cannot say," he replied simply.

"Where is Bukit Sankalakilee?" I asked the headman in some excitement.

"It is here in this village," he replied.

"But how could this ruined city be the capital of a kingdom?" I asked in bewilderment, "We are at least fifteen miles from the River Pattani."

"Ah, that is easy to explain," he replied, "The Pattani River has from time to time changed its course. In ancient times it flowed within a mile of Yarang." My thoughts went back in gratitude to the Menora dancer, the lady from Langasuka, whom we had met in the train. (*Quotation ends, pp. 164-167.*)

Nai Mani Vallipotama, a southern-born scholar, gives the same identification for Langasuka. Yarang should certainly be excavated. Perhaps it would be possible lay to the ghost of Lakawn Suka, which of course should not be confused with the Lakorn Chaisri of the 7th century (section 2, pp. 179-183). Also of course a few fairies might be found, who knows?

Krabi, Kraburi and Mueng Pahang

The word Krabi has two meanings; one, a monkey and two, a sword. In the days of old, the emblem of the city was a Rhesus (Naksat City), but in the modern period, when the provincial city hall was being built, an old sword was dug up, and the emblem of the city was changed to Crossed Swords. In this way the Naksat Monkey disappeared into legend.

Krabi, or Korbie as Colonel Gerini called the place, has produced as old artifacts as any place found in the South, which is saying a lot. At Klong Thom for one, and at Khao Javabrab for another, Mediterranean-type beads have been found in such profusion that some people think they were manufactured there. In the normal course of events one would have thought that beads were used by civilized merchants to barter for valuable local products gathered by ignorant natives, but in this case it seems the aborigines of Krabi turned the table on the citizens of Mediterranean lands. But all this is by the way.

In 1225, Chau-ju-kua gave a list of the fifteen city-states (dependencies) of San-Fo-Shih. In the list were Kienpi and Kia-lo-hi which should have been Krabi and Kraburi. I did not make positive identifications because I could get the names mixed up and be accused of playing the Chinese wordgame without ever having set foot on the Chinese mainland. Also Kienpi has been identified as Jambi in Sumatra. It was better to wait for my guardian angel to send new evidence.

Kia-lo-hi is thought to have been Grāhi, a name that appears on the base of a Buddha image found at Chaiya dated 1183. Professor Coedes thought Grāhi was Chaiya where the image was found, though this is contrary to the sense of the inscription itself. Kraburi is the northernmost of the Naksat Cities (Year of the Pig). It is located on the pass between the Chumporn River and Victoria Point, that is, north of Chaiya.

Mr. John Black, Corresponding Member of the Siam Society, has now been kind enough to send me a map illustrating "China in Southern Asia, 1433", which is based on information from Ma Huan's descriptions

contained in *Ying-Yai-Sheng-Lan* or "The Overall Survey of the Ocean's Shores", 1433. (Note: Ma Huan was the Muslim interpreter to the famous Cheng Ho, pre-eminent among the eunuchs of the Court of the Ming Emperor Cheng-tsu (Yung-lo). The Emperor appointed him principal envoy and commander-in-chief of six great expeditions to the 'Western Ocean', 1405-1491.) Black also identified some names on the map, as well as giving the latitudes.

<i>Toponyms</i>	<i>Latitudes</i>	<i>Identifications</i>
Chia-lo-hsi	10°99' N.	Krbi (Krburi)
Liu-k'un	8°27' N.	Nakorn
Fo-lo-an	7°33' N.	Phattalung
Sun-ku-na	7°11' N.	Songkhla (Singora)
Lang-hsi-chia	6°54' N.	Pattani (Lakawn Suka)
Chi-t'o	6°00' N.	Kedah
Chan-pei	1°35' S.	Djambi
Chiu-chieng	3°00' S.	Palembang (Old Harbour)

Chia-lo-hsi was Kraburi. If Chan-pei and Kien-pi were the same, then it was Djambi in Sumatra; if not, then Chan-pei was Djambi and Kien-pi was Krabi. Palembang appears in Chau-ju-kua as Pa-lin-fong.

Before leaving the Naksat Cities, let us look for another lost site. Mueng Pahang was the southernmost of the Naksat Cities (Year of the Rabbit). Pahang was a town or city and not a state as it is today. Some years ago I was told that Mueng Pahang was under water. As there are several traditions of cities flooded out of existence—in the lake at Payao in the North, in the Nong Harn in the Northeast—I did not follow the subject further. In any case the Naksat Cities were supposed to have formed a shield around the capitals (Chaiya, Nakorn and Singora, which were not Naksat Cities themselves), and in case of attack on any city, help could be sent from the other cities. So I thought Pahang should be looked for near the Panarican Pass. But it now seems I am wrong. The Cambridge expedition in 1962 already mentioned, got to a mount, a lake and a feeder stream of the Pahang River, all called Cheni. I will again quote at length from Stewart Wavell's book, *The Naga King's Daughter*:

"Che Yang (Malay guide) wasted no time. She agreed to come with us to our first objective—the Naga-haunted mountain of Gunong Cheni. Cheni is a jungle ridge some forty miles up the Pahang River on the east coast of Malaya. Until recently, it was inaccessible and remote, but at the time of writing a road is being cut through jungle towards the Pahang River at a point directly opposite the lake which lies at the foot of the mountain. The name 'Cheni' which is given to both lake and mountain is a Thai word meaning 'gibbon'. (pp. 34-5)

"As we set off once more in our *perahu* towards the far end of the lake my thoughts went back to many theories which had been advanced across the years that a city had once existed beneath the lake. I had first come upon a reference to it as far back as 1955 in Dr. Linehan's *History of Pahang*. "It is possible," he wrote, "that the lake did not always exist in its present form and that it covers the site of an ancient town." He gave his reasons which made sense in terms of a strategic focus for transpeninsular waterways and river routes to sources of gold and tin. An article he published in 1928 described his visit to the lake and his discovery of a huge artificial mound to the south of it 'en route' to the River Jeram. This mound captured my imagination. Across an interval of forty years, Linehan himself never went back to excavate the mound and no one else had since been there to find it. My own attempt with a friend in 1956 to discover the mound was a failure. However, the effect of subsequent broadcasts and my account of the expedition in a book created widespread interest in Lake Cheni throughout Malaya, causing many adventurers, expeditions and, more recently, tourists, to visit the lake.

"One visitor claimed to have seen a monster with eyes 'like tennis balls of fire'. To another, J. McHugh, who made several visits to the lake in search of pottery, a Semelai headman had declared that Nenek, or 'grandfather' as they affectionately called the Naga, was not, in fact, a python. Indeed, there were two kinds of Naga. I quote from McHugh:

'One has a head with two bumps on it and the other has a smaller head like a fowl.' The headman went on to describe its track in the mud, about ten inches in width, and even the noise it made. He pointed out where it was thought to live. The place is

in the same area of open lake as 'batu keramat' or sacred stones. 'Once a year,' he said, 'when the white rocks float, the Nenek moves to the other end of the lake.'

"Obviously the sacred stone would be interesting but there was little to support Linehan's proposition that a former town lay beneath the surface of the lake. Recent discoveries of pottery and other artefacts led McHugh to write that there was 'little doubt' that Cheni has a long history of human settlement. This may well have been ended by a major flood, for the Pahang River during the monsoon is said to flow up the six-mile Cheni channel and into the lake itself." (pp. 41-42)

"Tempek paddled with firm strokes, keeping close to the bank. I pointed out towards the centre of the lake where it was deep.

"Can we swim out there?" I asked in Malay.

Unknowingly, I had pointed to the 'Batu Keramat', the sacred stones. Tempek seemed surprised, but with a smile and an affirmative 'boleh', he changed direction towards the open water.

By now the sun had suffused the clouds with red. A breeze touched the surface of the lake and passed lightly over our skin. We approached a large square in the lake, its corners marked with bamboo poles. Within the square, four Semelai in a 'perahu' were laughing together and hailed us. One stood upright in the boat, striking a half-submerged paddle on something hard beneath the water. "Batu Keramat!" he called, "Come and see."

Tempek steered our 'perahu' alongside and I grasped the proffered paddle, but we drifted imperceptibly away from the rock, and it was only after the third attempt that I felt something solid beneath. By probing carefully, I formed the impression that the rock was broad at its summit; but Charles (Morris, leader of the expedition), intent on manual investigation, clutched his sarong tightly to his body and jumped into the water. It was amusing to watch the sarong come to the surface before he did, his embarrassment being the cause of much merriment among the Semelai. Eventually, I was persuaded to join him and, between us, we explored the rock's full dimensions. How tall it was we may never know. The depth of the mud in Lake Cheni is at least twenty

feet, and the depth of the water at this point could have been about fifteen feet or even deeper. The rock was about eight feet across. What interested us was that the sides seemed to descend vertically, forming what appeared to be a great pillar; and this rock, so we had been told, was the home of Nenek, or grandfather Naga If in ancient times, the Naga serpents had been worshipped in this valley, surely this great pillar of rock could have been the phallic focus of that worship!" (page 44)

Such is the evidence for what it is worth. My only comment is to suggest that scholars, instead of researching from books and making wild guesses, should go out on a few field trips, when they could produce wilder guesses that could be nearer the target. The Cambridge Expedition was not a research one, and Stewart Wavell himself wrote in the introduction, "Our own expedition to Malaya and Thailand was not archaeological in purpose: we have merely tried to survey the land." The party got to Lake Cheni in Pahang. The Malays have a tradition of a lost city in Cheni Lake and the Thai have a tradition that Mueng Pahang of the Naksat Cities was destroyed by flood. If the two traditions match, then Mueng Pahang was where Lake Cheni now is. But I have my doubts. Then the party got to Yarang in Patani. This should be Lakawn Suka without much doubt. All the evidence seem to agree without exception, including the Hindu remains of the pre-Muslim period.

Finally, the party got to Lan Kuen Pang in Nakorn Sri Thammaraj Province. "Beyond here lie the ruins of Lan Kuen Pang. They are concealed by a circle of mountains with a single entrance to the valley." It is tempting to equate Lan Kuen Pang with the capital of Chih-tu, called Lion City, because it "took more than a month to reach the capital." I will deal with Chih-tu next, but will not mention Lan Kuen Pang because I do not accept the identification.

Singora (Singhanagara)

Three of the four main Sri Vijaya locations on the Peninsula can be identified almost with certainty. Chaiya was Sri Vijaya (an inscription with that name dated 775 was found there—see section 8, pp. 291-6); it

was also I-Ching's Che-li-foche and Parānavitana's Suvārnnapura. Nakorn Sri Thammaraj was Tambralinga (an inscription with that name dated 1230 was found there), as well as Holing, Poling and Tan-ma-ling. Kedah, the second city of the Sri Vijaya City-States, was Kidaram, Kadaram, Chieh-cha and possibly the Malayapura of Parānavitana. Singora was probably Parānavitana's Singhanagara and was the capital of Chih-tu. The *T'ung Tien T'ai-p'ing Huan Yu Chi* states that the king of Chih-tu "resides in the city of Seng-chih, which also is called Shih-tzu (Lion City)." But the location of old Singora itself is tricky. Chih-tu, generally located in the Singora Inland Sea, may have to be relocated.

In 671 I-Ching set sail from Canton in a Persian ship and arrived at Chaiya in 20 days (section 3, pp. 184-9). This was probably the fastest trip on record because other ships in the same period took 30 to 40 days. Sixty years before, in 607, Chang Chun was sent as ambassador to Chih-tu. The evidence is as follows (from Wheatley's *The Golden Khersonese*, pp. 29-30):

"In the tenth moon (November or early December) of that year, Chang Chun took ship from the Nan-hai commandery (Canton). For twenty days and nights they sailed before a favourable wind (the north-east monsoon) and reached Chiao-shih (Scorched Rock) Mountain. Passing southeastward, they anchored at Ling-ch'ieh-po-pa-to Island, which faces Lin-i (Champa) on the west, and which has a temple on its summit."

Say 22 or 23 days, or 20 days sailing and a couple of days at anchor. From Champa the trip continued to Lion Rock, the mountains of Lakorn Chaisri and Fowl Cage Island. I have already identified Lion Rock as Laem Singh outside the Chandaburi River, the mountains of Lakorn Chaisri as Khao Sam Roi Yod and Fowl Cage Island as Koh Rang Kai outside Patiew in Chumphon Province (section 2, pp. 180-3).

"Then going southwards they reached Shih-tzu-shih (Lion Rock), whence there extended a chain of large and small islands. After two or three days' voyage they saw in the west the mountains of the country of Lang-ya-hsu. Then, continuing southwards to Chi-lung (Fowl Cage) Island, they reached the borders of Chih-tu."

Say about ten days from Champa to Patiew, or a little over a month from Canton to the border of Chih-tu. (Chang Chun's return journey between the same two points also took ten days.) But the point is, if Patiew was the border of Chih-tu, and Chih-tu was in the Singora Inland Sea, then the 'territory' of Chih-tu would include Chaiya and Nakorn as well. As these two cities had played bigger parts in the Sri Vijaya story than Singora, this is quite a problem.

(The King of Chih-tu) "sent the Brahman Chiu-mo-lo, with thirty ocean-going junks, to welcome them. Conches were blown and drums beaten to entertain the Sui envoys on their arrival, and a metal cable was used as a hauser for Chang-chun's vessel. It took more than a month to reach the capital."

Say another ten days from Patiew to the capital, or a total of between 40 and 45 days from Canton for the whole journey. It took between 30 and 40 days to reach Foche or Holing, and if Chih-tu was further down the coast, 'it took more than a month to reach the capital' is correct.

But this is not what the experts think at all. They think the capital was located far inland, or was up a mountain, or something, and it took more than a month to get from the borders to the capital. There is no place on the Malay Peninsula that you cannot get to in one month, and you can even walk from one coast to the other in less than that time. The picture of the thirty ocean-going junks sent by the king as being trawlers sent to berth Chang-chun's vessel as though it were the Queen Elizabeth, does not seem right to me. They were part of the welcoming ceremony, as were the conches and drums. Today fighter planes are sometimes sent to welcome V.I.P. visitors at an airport.

Other evidence is also available:

"The king sent his son, the Na-ya-chia, to welcome Chang-chun with appropriate ceremony.... On the same day at the hour of Wei (one to three p.m.), the Na-ya-chia again sent two elephants, bearing canopies of peacock feathers, to welcome the ambassadors."

If the capital was really located on a mountain, why drag a ship up there? Surely it would have been easier to give the ambassadors a lift on a few elephants and let the beasts joggle them along in comfort.

"A few days later Chang-chun and his companions were invited to a ceremonial feast. The pageantry was similar to that on their return from the first meeting, with guards leading the way. In front of the king two divans had been erected, on which were placed leaf-platters, each fifteen feet square, containing cakes of four colours, yellow, white, purple and red, together with beef, mutton, fish, turtle, pork and tortoise meats of more than a hundred sorts."

The menu seems to me to contain some delicious sea-food. If the capital had been located on some mountain one month's journey from the sea, I doubt if turtle and tortoise meat would be readily available. Also of course there would be the economic problem of finding enough land to grow rice to feed the population of a capital located in the mountains. So, without arguing with the experts, I prefer to interpret Chang-Chun's voyage of one month as being from Canton to his final destination.

For all that, locating the Lion City is still a problem. Some experts who do not need to be named, have equated Chih-tu with Sri Vijaya, others with Tambralinga, and still others have translated Seng-chih and Shih-tzu the capital, not as Lion City, but as Lion Castle. This would mean that Chih-tu, the red or copper coloured land, included Chaiya, Nakorn and Singora where red earth is ubiquitous and the capital might have been at Singora or Chaiya or Nakorn, though I have not seen Lion Castle mentioned anywhere before. For all that, locating Paronavitana's Singhanagara is still a problem. This cannot be located at the present Singora because Singora is a new settlement.

The tongue of land that separates the Singora Inland Sea and the Gulf of Siam is about 60 kms. long. There were three entrances into the Inland Sea. The northernmost is at Ranod, said to be an old site but

I have not visited the location. The middle entrance, about 30 kms. to the south, is a canal at Satingphra, which has archaeological remains and a batch of legends of its own. The southern entrance is at Laem Son where the present Singora is located. Nearby is Khao Daeng (Red Hill), an ancient site with archaeological remains. But I do not think any of these three places was the old Singhanagara. They were more likely sea forts and the capital should be looked for inland. I have been told of two old sites which I have not visited. One is called Ban Kao (I think), in the province of Patalung on the inland side of Singora Lake; and the other is Ratabhumi in the district of Haadyai in Singora Province. This latter site is near the canal that runs due south and is said to join up with the Perlis River in Malaya. One might have been Singhanagara and the other old Patalung, one of the Naksat Cities which had the year of the Little Snake as its emblem. But research and excavations are necessary before any positive identifications can be made.

The nature of this paper seems to have changed all of a sudden. The original aim was to locate a few ancient toponyms, but now it seems we are trying to find some old sites to match placenames. Thanks to Stewart Wavell, Yarang in Patani Province might have been Lakawn Suka, the Malay fairyland of Langasuka, and Lake Cheni in Pahang might have been the site of Mueng Pahang of the Naksat Cities, and thanks to me and my guessing, Ratabhumi might have been Singhanagara and Ban Kao old Patalung of the Naksat Cities. All this is conjectural but there is more to come. A site well in the hinterland of Central Sumatra might have been an old seaport, and the capital of a kingdom in Central Java might be twenty feet underground. All good conjectural fun not found in any textbook, I am afraid.

27. NEW EVIDENCE AND SECOND THOUGHTS

(b) Java and Sumatra

South Central Java

Central Java in the Sailendra or Buddhist Period, between about 700 and 900 A.D., had two contemporary dynasties: the Sailendrawamsa and the Sanjayawamsa. According to Dr. de Casparis' theory, (section 10, pp. 305-312), the latter had their seat of government at Mataram. Unfortunately de Casparis did not identify the locations of the two capitals, so his theory is not accepted by Indonesian scholars. Still I think there *were* two contemporary dynasties in Central Java. One was in the south on the Prambanan and Kedu (Borobudur) Plains, and the other in North Central Java with the main settlement probably on the Dieng Plateau. But first let us locate the two capitals in South Central Java. The names of the kings of this period are:

Kings of Mataram :

1. Rakai mataram sang ratu sanjaya
2. Sri maharaja rakai panang karan
3. Sri maharaja rakai panung galan
4. Sri maharaja rakai warak
5. Sri maharaja rakai garung
6. Sri maharaja rakai pikatan
7. Sri maharaja rakai kayu wani
8. Sri maharaja rakai watu humalang
9. Sri maharaja rakai watu kura (Balitung).

The Sailendras :

1. Sanna, brother-in-law of Sanjaya, first in the Mataram list above.
2. King Visnu of Chaiya, son of Sanna above. Set up an inscription at Chaiya dated 775.
3. Prince Panamkarana, son of Visnu (No. 2). Set up an inscription at Kalasan dated 778. He has been equated with Panang Karan,

second in the Mataram list. As he succeeded Sanjaya, I would suggest that he married one of the latter's daughters, and when he built a new capital for himself, one of Sanjaya's sons, Panang Galan (No. 3 in the Mataram list), succeeded him. When his own father Visnu died, Prince Panamkarana succeeded him in Java as King Dharanindra. He set up the Kelurak inscription dated 782.

4. Samaratunga or Samarottunga, son of Dharanindra listed above. His name appears in several inscriptions, as well as those of his father, King Indra, and his daughter's, Princess Pramodavardhani. He would appear to have had a long reign lasting fifty years.
5. Princess Pramodavardhani, daughter of Samaratunga. She married Pikatan, the sixth name in the Mataram list, and became Queen Sri Kahulunnan. Her name, both as Princess and Queen, is found on several inscriptions, two of which came from Kerang Tenah and are dated 824 and 842.
6. Kayu Wani, the seventh name in the Mataram list, was a son of Queen Kahulunnan. He succeeded his father Pikatan about 856.

We will begin from Jogjakarta to look for these "two lost capitals." Jogya, the present capital of Central Java, lies due south of Semarang, the main port on the north coast. Two roads run from Semarang to Jogya: one through Magelang, and the other through Surakarta. Prambanan lies 17 kilometers from Jogya on the road running northeast to Surakarta. On that road you first reach Chandi Kalasan on the right hand side of the road about 15 or 16 kilometers from Jogya. Kalasan was built in 778 by Paramkarana—and here I would like to correct an error I made in section 10, page 307, in which I stated the Archaeological Service of the Republic of Indonesia had a field museum at Chandi Kalasan, and the name of the district was Kalasan. Actually the name of the district is the Prambanan District, and the field museum is located in the Chandi Prambanan.

Past Kalasan on the road to Surakarta we proceed to Chandi Sari on the left side of the road, then to Chandi Bogisan on the right,

and then, before reaching the River Opak, on the left side is Chandi Bogem. Not very much remains above ground of either Bogisan or Bogem, except for a few Buddha images. These images have rather elongated bodies and can be given an early dating. Archarn Khien Yimsiri estimated that they were made between 650 and 700 A.D., or say 700 A.D.

Across the River Opak we first come to Prambanan on the left side of the road. This is the greatest Hindu temple in Java. Behind Prambanan are two small chandis, Lampung and Bubrah, and a little farther on are two of the great Buddhist complexes, Sewu and Plaosan. Khien Yimsiri thinks that Sewu and Prambanan were contemporary structures and has dated them from 775-825, while he has given Plaosan a date of 825-850.

Plaosan is a twin complex—and here I must correct another error. I thought one of the complexes was called Plaosan Lor (north complex), while the other was Plaosan Kidal (south complex). Actually both complexes comprise Plaosan Lor, and there is another, smaller, chandi nearby called Plaosan Kidal.

Plaosan Lor was begun by King Samaratunga, and his name appears in some short inscriptions found there as Sri Maharaja. When he died his daughter, Queen Sri Kahulunnan, and her husband, Pikatan, carried on the work. Their names also appear in the same set of short inscriptions from Plaosan Lor dated about 850. Plaosan Kidal seems to fall between Sewu and Plaosan Lor, say about 815-835. The images are not as squat as those at Plaosan Lor and still retain the classic expression of the Borobudur and Sewu images. There is also a feeling of femininity about the Chandi, so I would suggest that Princess Pramodavardhani founded this structure before her marriage to Pikatan, when she went to live in Mataram.

Sewu might produced as many as four inscriptions. The first is the Kelurak inscription dated 782, which recorded the setting up of a Manjusri

image by King Dharanindra (Prince Panamkarana of Kalasan, 778). The second inscription came from Sewu itself. This is dated 792 and records the enlargement of Manjusikrha. We do not know if the enlargement was made by King Dharanindra himself or by his son Samaratunga. Kelurak is the name of a place and not of a chandi. Prior to the discovery of the second Manjusri inscription, it was believed that the Kelurak stele referred to Chandi Lampung located nearby. Now, however, Boechari, the epigraphist, thinks it also came from Sewu.

Two other inscriptions that might have come from Sewu are those of Kerangtenah dated 824 and 842. The first inscription bears the names of King Indra (Dharanindra), Samaratunga, and Princess Pramodavardhani; while the name of Queen Sri Kahulunnan appears in the second. I was informed that Sewu was located in a district called Kerangtenah, but this name appears all over the country. The two inscriptions of that name have long since been moved from their provenance so no one really knows where they first came from. At any rate, Dr. de Casparis equated some of the edifices mentioned in the inscriptions as those of the Borobudur, Mendut, and Pawon group, though the inscriptions did not come from that district. But some Indonesian scholars think the inscriptions came from, and refer to, the Prambanan, Sewu and Plaosan group. Certainly the dates fit better. In 824 Princess Pramodavardhani was still unmarried and lived with her father; then in 842, after her father's death, she returned from Mataram and, as Queen Kahulunnan, set up her second inscription. An argument like this, however, without new evidence is a futile exercise.

The Javanese call Prambanan Lara Djonggrang, while the Thai call it Brahmanan (Brahma + Ananda, the Great Hindu Temple), in contrast to Borobudur (Boroma + Buddhho, the Great Buddhist Temple). There is, by the way, an interesting legend concerning Lara (Rara) Djonggrang, the Slender Maiden. She was King Ratubaka's daughter, who was turned into stone by the big, bad giant, Bandung Bandowoso. The

princess is now the statue Dewi Durga in the Prambanan complex, and is, to this day, an object of worship. Her father's palace was on the Ratubaka Plateau. If this story is based on fact, it can be said with certainty that the legendary King Ratubaka was the Sailendra King Dharanindra or his son Samaratunga.

There has been great argument as to when Prambanan was founded. There is, however, general agreement today that it was built in the 9th century. This theory was submitted by de Casparis, and Purbatjaraka, from his researches into the old texts of the Ramayana, agrees with it. More than fifty inscriptions written in red, white, and black paint have been found at the chandi. This writing is in the style of Plaosan (circa 850) and some of the inscriptions have the word "pikatan", which may or may not refer to the king of that name. Still it seems certain from the evidence that the edifice was already in existence by the first half of the 9th century. Khien Yimsiri gives a dating of 775-825 for both Prambanan and Sewu. The two Manjusri inscriptions (Sewu) are dated 782 and 792 respectively, and I believe Prambanan was begun before Sewu. Located by the river, Prambanan has a more outstanding site than Sewu and Plaosan, which are located among paddy fields. The fact that Prambanan has the priority site would indicate it was started before Sewu. At any rate, Khien Yimsiri's dating, based on the art expression, agrees with both de Casparis' epigraphic evidence and Purbatjaraka's literary evidence.

Complexes like Prambanan, Sewu and Plaosan were built by kings, although smaller chandis may have been founded by members of the royal family or by ministers of the king. To service the huge complexes, a great on-the-spot community would be required. In short, what the archaeological service today calls the Prambanan District was the capital of the Sailendras. Other evidence is also available to support this theory.

Starting again from the Opak River, there is, on the right side of the road, a range of hills that slope down to the river and run almost parallel to the road with a few small chandis, such as Sadjwan, in the foreground. These small buildings, however, need not concern us.

The hill is the Ratubaka Plateau, also called Sorogedun. A few inscriptions have been found on this range, one of which recorded the founding of a Siharama (Ceylonese monastery) by Samaratunga in 794; and another the founding of a linga by Pikatan dated 856. Opposite Prambanan, and close to the river, are ruins which, according to the legend of Lara Djonggrang, were the palace of King Ratubaka. While legends do not make very good historical evidence they can sometimes throw light on a dark spot, as we have seen in the case of the *Sejarah Melayu*. There is no agreement as to whether the ruins are those of a chandi or a royal palace. As the ground plan has no similarity to those of Prambanan, Sewu and Plaosan, I think it is safe to follow the legend of the Slender Maiden. It would seem that the Sailendras, true to their title as Lords of the Mountains, built their homes on the hills and relegated the abodes of their gods to the plain.

From the epigraphic evidence already cited, it would seem that Prince Panamkarana (Panang Karan) succeeded Sanjaya at Mataram, but moved his capital to a new site on the Opak River—one that had already been a community (Bogem and Bogisan). Panamkarana, who became King Dharanindra when his father died, built Chandi Kalasan in 778 and began Prambanan and Sewu. When he died, his son, Samaratunga, started Plaosan Lor which was completed by his daughter Queen Kahulunnan and her husband, Pikatan, who set up some short inscriptions dated 850. In 856 Pikatan turned over the kingdom to his son, Kayu Wani, and abdicated. I do not know whether Kayu Wani (seventh on the Mataram list) moved to Prambanan or continued to live at Mataram, because two more names follow his. Perhaps Prambanan was the capital and Mataram the seat of the Uparaja. We now look for the location of Sanjaya's Mataram and again start from Jogjakarta.

There were three Matarams in the history of Java. One was Sanjaya's in the 8th century, another in East Java, and the third in Jogya itself. An inscription from the Demangan district of Jogya is now kept in the Prambanan Field Museum. I was told it is dated in the 9th or 10th century but I have no further information, and anyway I do not think Jogya was the Mataram of Sanjaya. It is too far from Borobudur

and too close to Prambanan, and there would be problems in growing sufficient food to feed two capitals located in the same plain.

Borobudur in the Kedu Plain lies 42 kilometers on the road running northwest from Jogya to Magelan; 29 kilometers from Jogya on the same road is a thriving village called Mutilan, which is situated on a river whose name I have forgotten. The water is black with lava and huge boulders fill the riverbed. Ten kilometers further on we come to a junction of the Rivers Elo and Progo. On the Elo is Mendut, and across the river is a small chandi called Banon, while Pawon lies across the Progo. Borobudur is almost two kilometers further down the road. The distance from Mendut to Borobudur is three kilometers, and the three chandis lie in a straight line—which might signify something, although nobody quite knows what. Stones for the building of Borobudur were transported down the Elo and Progo rivers and landed at the junction where they were cut into rough shape before being transferred to the building site.

A great deal has been written over the years about Borobudur and it now seems possible that everybody's theory could become obsolete all of a sudden. A new metal inscription has been found in the course of the present restoration. Apparently it came from the foundation level, and, when edited, could give a truer history of this chandi than what had been conjectured. Let us hope it is not a Buddhist sermon or some useful subject like a list of medicinal herbs, but contains some information of real historical importance.

I passed Mutilan several times but did not have a chance to stop and investigate. What I say now is based on information obtained from talks and discussions, particularly with Boechari, the epigraphist. Unfortunately I had to leave Java before I could have more talks with him as we had arranged, and I did not take precise notes.

Sanjaya's Changgal Charter, dated 732, was set up near the present Mutilan. This district seems to fulfil the conditions for the location of Mataram, and I suggested as much to Boechari. He said that there was evidence, either epigraphic or figure art (I am not sure

which now), that was dug up from a depth of ten feet at a place called Medari. In response to my question as to where, then, was Mataram located, he said twenty feet underground!

Archaeologists say there is no evidence, but then what is "evidence"? Is logic evidence? Boechari differentiates between private structures, such as Kalasan, and dynastic edifices like Prambanan and Borobudur. We then separate the chandis into "functional chandis", such as Prambanan and Sewu, which serve the day-to-day needs of a community--the larger the chandi the bigger the community--and "pilgrimage chandis" like Borobudur to which people go on festivals, and which require only a small community for its upkeep in the "off season". On this basis Prambanan was the capital of the Sailendras, and Mataram, 13 kilometers from Borobudur, lies buried under ground where Medari now stands.

It seems necessary to locate Sanjaya's Mataram in order to record history properly, but excavating the site, buried under tons and tons of boulders and lava, gravel and sand, would be a far more formidable enterprise than digging up Troy--and more expensive as well. At any rate, it is submitted in this paper that the capital of the Sailendras in Java was at Prambanan; and Medari now occupies the site of Sanjaya's seventh century Mataram which was destroyed by volcanic eruptions.

North Central Java

When I was in Java, the Archaeological Service was kind enough to make arrangements for me to spend four nights each at Borobudur and Prambanan, and took me on a one day trip to the Dieng Plateau in North Central Java. The time, of course, was too short for anything but the most superficial impressions, but the trip was better than nothing.

The Dieng Plateau has produced some edifices which pre-date those of South Central Java, and the theory was that it was an Indian civilization that preceded the Buddhist Sailendras. A few small Buddha heads have been collected and are kept in the Museum storehouse on the plateau, along with an inscription which, I was told, is 9th or 10th century. Essentially, however, Dieng was a Hindu (Shaivite) civilization,

and elaborate explanations have to be made as to how and why the rulers changed from one faith to the other, and even back again.

My impression--and a strong impression it was--is that Dieng had nothing to do with the Sailendras in South Central Java. It had affinities with East Java. It was a contemporary but separate civilization to that of the Sailendras, one that started before and ended after the disintegration of the Sailendras early in the 10th century.

Several new inscriptions have been found on the coastal region of North Central Java, of which the most important came from the village of Sodjomerto. It is in Old Malay and Boechari, who edited the text, gives it a 7th century dating (Preliminary Report on the Discovery of an Old Malay Inscription at Sodjomerto, Jakarta, 1966). Two other inscriptions were found to the south and north of Sodjomerto respectively, the latter being found only two kilometers from the coast. Both are older than the Sodjomerto stele.

Old Malay inscriptions have been found in South Sumatra, and in several districts in Java. These range in date from the 7th to the end of the 10th century--the Manjusri inscription from Sewu is dated 792.

Old Malay would appear to have been the *lingua franca* of that time, or what the Chinese call *Kun-lun*, which was used all over the Archipelago. No inscription in that language has been found on the Peninsula, but it was no doubt used there too, as well as on the mainland. I now wonder whether this language was only used by Malays, or by Sumatrans, Javanese, and all sorts of other ethnic groups too.

The Sodjomerto inscription mentions a Dapunta Selendra and gives the names of his father, mother, and wife. He was a Shaivite. I will quote the text, as translated by Boechari (lines 3-10).

"Homage to Civa Bhatara Paramacvara and all the gods I honour. Hiyang--mik is the of the Honorable Dapunta Selendra. Santanu is the name of his father. Bhadravati is the name of his mother. Sampula is the name of the wife of the Honorable Selendra."

According to Boechari, the name "Selendra" is undoubtedly the Indonesian form of Sailendra, and Dapunta Selendra was the origin of the Sailendrawamsa (one of his descendants changing his religion to Buddhism). I do not accept this theory because to do so would mean leaving Visnu of Chaiya, who was the head of the Sailendra family, out of the story. It also leaves out Balaputra of the North Indian inscriptions, Culamani, Mara Vijayottunga and Sangrama Vijayottunga of the South Indian inscriptions, and Samara Vijayottunga of the Ceylonese inscriptions. It would, at the same time, change the international character of the Sailendra story into a purely Javanese one. In spite of this, however, Boechari's theory is worth further consideration from students interested in this particular game.

Central Sumatra

Maura Takus on the Kampar River in Central Sumatra, almost on the equator, was a Buddhist site. A stupa still remains, and Boechari thinks it may cover an older one. In 1286 an Amoghapasa image was sent from East Java to Rambahan in the district of Muara Takus for the people of Malayu to adore. The image has since been moved, but the inscribed base is still in situ. Moens equated I-Ching's Mo-lo-yu of the 7th century with Murara Takus. (Sri Vijaya, Java en Kataha, JMBRAS, 1940). He cited Chinese astronomical evidence, and, at the same time, supplied some literary evidence.

"Ruins have been found near the Kampar River (according to Yzerman) at Muara Takus, Bangkinang, and Durian Tinggi. The largest are at Muara Takus. Westenenk reports: 'No walls have been found on the western river shore, as Yzerman reported, but there are three such walls in existence, mostly of brick, and the outermost extends to Batoobasoerat (5 miles) and enriches nearly the whole rich plain for several hundred meters upstream of the ruin, and continues from there to the Kampar river.' Was this the capital of Sri Vijaya? Muara Takus is on the 0° 20' northern latitude, very close to the equator, and tallies well with other

information. According to Bosch, these ruins date from the 12th century. Krom states, however, that: 'beneath the outer masonry (consisting of brick in good condition) a very well preserved understructure exists; an old structure has been enlarged and reconditioned, and a second layer built around the old' (this is a known method in the East Indies). Bosch also cites a Chinese report that a brick wall of many "li" encircled the city, but this doubtless refers to San-fo-tsi, which was in an entirely different locale from Sri Vijaya. . .

"Yzerman mentions a remarkable local legend regarding Muara Takus. He relates that "under the rule of the last prince of Raja Bichau, the state was so large that a cat walking from one end of it to the other would have needed three months." This is an illustration usually used by Malays to indicate a large city, but the name "Raja Bichau" sounds much like a bastardized "Raja (Sri) Vijaya!" It was worthwhile, therefore, to go through the old literature on this subject in order to discover possible traces of this famous name. The attempt proved successful. Solomon Muller in his *Reports of Sumatra* twice mentions the name sought. He recalls that the head Penghulu (headman) of the IV Kota's, a certain "Datu Siepeijaja," lived in Chacharan of Kota Bahru (0° 5' northern latitude) on the Batang May (read *Mahat*, pronounced *Mahi*), which was the most prominent place of this country. Forty years later Rajvan Boest refers to this man as "Dato Sivijaya." This man was the chief of the adat who was authorized to grant marriage licenses, issue permits for festivities to be held, the reclamation of land, etc. . .

"The existence of extensive ruins in Muara Takus (coupled with the name "Raja Bichau," the legendary last ruler of Muara Takus), makes it appear very likely that the capital of Sri Vijaya was situated near the junction of the Kampar Kanan and Batang Mahat Rivers, in the heart of Central Sumatra, within the immediate surroundings of Muara Takus (having been transferred from the vicinity of Kelantan on the east coast of Malaya, this after the conquest of the long since known land of Malayu.)"

I followed Moens and located Mo-lo-yu and Malayu at Muara Takus. But some Indonesian scholars who have been to the site say that Muara Takus is so far inland that it could never have been a port. Although other Indonesian scholars disagree, I have to accept it because

I have never been to Sumatra. However, in this paper, pending a better site could be agreed upon, I still followed Moens and must leave this problem to the Indonesians to argue among themselves.

South Sumatra

The "Sri Vijaya-Sailendra argument" is no more. Or more specifically, Professor Coedès' Sri Vijaya Empire is now off the menu. Palembang was not Sri Vijaya. Palembang was Palambanpura, (Panuvasyara Pillar Inscription from Ceylon, 893). Coedès' theory was based on the internal evidence of four inscriptions from South Sumatra dated between 683 and 686. After his retirement, another inscription and some fragments from Palembang were edited by de Casparis, and after his death, still another was edited by Boechari.

Coedes first introduced his Sri Vijaya Empire in 1918, (*Le Royaume de Crivijaya, BEFEO*), and last wrote on the subject in 1964 (*A Possible Interpretation of the Inscription of Kedukan Bukit, Oxford*). The full list of the South Sumatran inscriptions now reads :

<i>Inscription</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Provenance</i>	<i>Editor</i>
1. Kedukan Bukit	682/3	Palembang	Coedès
2. Talang Tuwo	684	Palembang	Coedès
3. Telaga Batu		Palembang	de Casparis
4. Fragments		Palembang	de Casparis
5. Karang Brahi		Jambi	Coedès
6. Kota Kapur	686	Bangka Island	Coedès
7. Palas Pasemah		South Lampung	Boechari

All the inscriptions, with the exception of the one from Talang Tuwo (Palembang) which recorded the setting up of a park called Sri Ksetra, contain "imprecations".

Of the people who disagreed with Coedes' theory that Palembang was the capital of Sri Vijaya, Moens, Soekmono and Boechari thought that Palembang was conquered-by Sri Vijaya, and the king set up imprecations in conquered territory.

The new inscription from Palas Pasemah (South Lampung) was found in southernmost Sumatra. It is of the same age as the other

inscriptions, and the district was called Bhumi Java. This name also appears in the Kota Kapur stele (Bangka).

Coedes interpreted the text of this inscription that the king of Sri Vijaya prepared an expedition from that island to attack Java (Bhumi Java), while Boechari reinterpreted the text that the king first went from Palembang to South Lampung (Bhumi Java), where he set up an inscription. Upon his return to Bangka and Jambi he set up other inscriptions. The whole expedition to conquer South Sumatra took three or four years.

In the Ceylonese Panuvasnuvara Inscription dated 893, Palambanpura was called Suvanvaraya (the Harbor of Gold). Five hundred years later the Chinese called Po-lin-pang (Palembang) Ku-Kang or Kieou-Kieng or Chiu-Chiang (the Old Harbor). Five hundred years after that, in our day, Palembang is an inland city located some seventy miles from the coast up the winding Musi River. The transition from a harbor to an inland state in a thousand years seems a bit fast, but there it is.

In 1954, the Archaeological Service of the Republic of Indonesia carried out a geomorphological survey of the west coast of South Sumatra, both by land and by air. Soekmono, who was then head of the Service, stated that Palembang was once located on the tip of a promontory, and Jambi, today equally as far inland as Palembang, was located at the bottom of a deep gulf, (*Geomorphology and the Location of Ciriwijaya, Indonesian Journal of Cultural Studies*, 1963). Unfortunately the survey did not cover Muara Takus and the equatorial regions, and the paper did not explain how the land encroached on the sea at such a fast pace that it could cover 70 kilometers in a thousand years. Anyone interested in the subject of topographical changes in the sea coasts of Southeast Asia should read a few geological reports. I have read two: *Geological and Geographical Evidence for Changes in Sea Level During Ancient History and Late Pre-History*, by J. B. Serivenor, with an appendix, "Evidence for Recent Emergence of the Land in East Pahang" by F. H. Fitch, *JMBRAS*, 1949, and *Geologic Reconnaissance of the Mineral Deposits of Thailand, Bangkok*, 1951.

The first paper explains how offshore sandbars were formed by the action of waves and were built up until swept by breakers to the landward side to become attached to the land, when new bars were formed. The beaches of Trengganu were raised at the first stage to about 20 feet; at the second stage another ten feet or so; and at the third or present stage another four or five feet above sea level, giving a total of 35 feet or so. New beaches are forming. . . new off shore bars are forming. . . and so on.

The second paper, *Geologic Reconnaissance*, explains, and cites examples, that the Peninsula had been tilted slightly to the northwest, with beaches on the east coast at Nakorn Sri Thammaraj, Singora, and Patani. Sites originally close to the sea have now become inland sites due to emergence of the land, while the west coast shows submergence. The western shoreline is quite irregular, indented with estuaries and fringed with islands. The mountains extend down to the sea in many places; beaches are rare and small, but mangrove swamps are numerous. Beads, which one would expect to find inland, have been picked up on the shore of Pangnga Province. I do not know whether all this tilting and silting of the Peninsula by geologists has anything to do with the geomorphology of South Sumatra or not. If it does, it might help to explain the phenomenon of Palembang and Jambi, as well as Muara Takus in Central Sumatra, being located so far from the sea today.

The Ceylonese Panuvasvara Pillar Inscription mentions a princess of Palanbanpura named Raden Sangha, who became the consort of a Crown Prince of Ceylon. He later succeeded to the throne. I could never decide what part Palembang played in the overall Sri Vijaya story, but now—with this new evidence—we can say that Palembang was a full fledged member of the amalgamation of city states of Sri Vijaya. It was a capital that controlled South Sumatra, and included Jambi, Bangka Island, and South Lampung in its territory. Palembang came into the story right at the beginning and, with wide gaps, was still there after Sri Vijaya had disintegrated.

One more problem remains—a problem that runs through the whole story, and one which no one except Moens appears to have tried to solve.

28. THE CHINESE WORD-GAME

The year 1974 seems to have been a lively one in the historiography of Sri Vijaya. By the middle of the year the first two parts of this paper had been published, and after that, when I went to Java, a paper on the same subject was presented to the International History Congress held at Jogjakarta. The scholars present were extremely kind and they did not throw me out of the window. By the end of the year one Dr. Harun er Rashid, a scholar who was not present at the Jogja congress, accepted in writing that Chaiya in South Siam was Sri Vijaya. His paper is "Ancient Association between Bengal and Thailand", published in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bangladesh*, Vol. XIX, No. 3, December 1974.

Meanwhile in the same year the University of Pennsylvania Museum, under Dr. Bennet Bronson, excavated sites in South and Central Sumatra in cooperation with the Archaeological Service of the Republic of Indonesia. I was told by Americans in Bangkok and Indonesians in Java that the results were most disappointing. In fact the expeditions were complete failures. I have not seen any of the reports, which is a pity because I myself have never been to any part of Sumatra, so what I write now could contain a greater percentage of nonsense than it normally would. A pity, I repeat, because I would like to end this paper on a serious note.

However Bronson allowed Professor O.W. Wolters to read a preliminary report on the Palembang excavations in South Sumatra, and Wolters wrote a paper that is under present discussion. Wolters mentions two short accounts, "A Lost Kingdom Misaid: A Short Report on the Search for Sri Vijaya" by Bronson, and "Archaeology in Sumatra 1974" by Jan Wisseman; and he calls Bronson's unpublished report "Archaeological Research in Sumatra 1974". As this title is a little misleading I should explain that it refers only to the first or South Sumatra excavation, and not to the Central Sumatra dig carried out later in the same year (1974). Wolter's own paper is titled "Landfall on the Palembang Coast in Medieval Times," published in *Indonesia*, a series produced by Cornell (No. 20, October 1975.) My remarks that follow are based on the meagre material that Wolters used from Bronson's preliminary report.

Bronson excavated two sites in South Sumatra, namely Penyaringan Air Bersih and Geding Suro. I wonder why he never dug Kedukan Bukit, Talang Tuwo and Talaga Batu where 7th century inscriptions were set up, because normally inscriptions would surely be put up in the built-up areas of their time. Or why not dig around the large stone Buddha image and small stupas on the Bukit Seguntang? Or perhaps he did and Wolters failed to mention it. I ask this question because I have known archaeologists to have dug holes in the wrong places and produced some very nice results. There was an English archaeologist who went digging for the capital of Chih-tu at Satingphra in Singora province. She found a lovely brick wall so I didn't have the heart to tell her that she was digging at the wrong site. I wasn't sure whether she would cry or laugh. Then a French archaeologist went to dig for the old city of U-Thong in the Central Plain. As he had a reputation, some students from the Faculty of Archaeology, Silpakorn University, were sent to observe his methods of excavating. The students could not speak French nor could the Frenchman speak Thai, so there was no communication between them. So the students just stood around observing from a distance. Then some yokels came and observed too. They could not speak French either, so they asked the students, "What is Monsieur l'archaeologist digging for?" The students told them, "He is digging for the lost city of U-Thong." The yokels pondered for a while, chewing hard on their straws, and then asked, "Then why is the mongsoo digging in that old river bed?" Meanwhile the archaeologist collected his considerable booty and when he wrote his report, instead of saying what I would have said, "There has been a lot of rain here lately, hasn't there?" he thought U-Thong was destroyed by flood. I cannot vouch for the truth of this story, nor for the report which I haven't seen, but such is what one of the students who were sent to observe the excavations told me. As for Thai archaeologists, they never seem to know where to dig until thieves have taken most of the loot. Yarang in Patani province is a case in point. This site could turn out to be Langasuka, the land of the Malay fairies. But who cares, ask the archaeologists.

Meanwhile, to return to Bronson, the Air Bersih site produced sherds of the 14th centuries, and a few pieces that might have been 13th

and perhaps even 12th centuries, but "the entire area does not contain enough pre-14th century artifacts to make one small village." Geding Suro was later than Air Bersih—16th-17th centuries, or say between about 1500 to 1650-1700 A.D. The two sites had no continuity with one another or were in any way connected. Air Bersih was a Chinese settlement—I do not know whether this interpretation was made by Bronson or Wolters, but it seems to fit the facts as we have them at present—while the archaeological remains of Geding Suro have close affinities to the late and post-Majapahit style of East Java. This seems also to fit the facts, only unfortunately Wolters does not tell us whether the structures were Buddhist or Hindu. Then some four hundred votive stupas of unbaked clay were found near a house called Sarang Waty on the outskirts of Air Bersih. They have been given a dating of anything between the 8th and 14th centuries, a span far too long to be of practical value. Unbaked votive stupas have been found on the Peninsula, I think from above Chaiya to the border and perhaps even beyond; at Borobudur in South Central Java and in Bali; and now in South Sumatra. The Borobudur stupas can be dated with certainty as being 8th and 9th centuries, and some of the South Siam votives can probably be dated with the same certainty. A comparison of these finds with those from South Sumatra is indicated for a better dating. The main thing is that these votives were Buddhist and it should be possible to find some other evidence of a Buddhist period in South Sumatra. Again unfortunately Wolters does not give a dating for the small Buddhist Stupas on Bukit Seguntang, though he says, "The domestic debris at Bukit Seguntang, however, is very sparse and is attributed to the period of Air Bersih. But this debris does not prove that the Buddhist stupas were built at the time of the Chinese settlement of Air Bersih." I will flog this dead horse in midstream further. While images and inscriptions can be moved from place to place, stupas cannot; and if in the course of centuries, repairs and alterations are made, something of the original structures usually remains into which archaeologists can dig their teeth.

Bronson's interpretation is that there was no settlement in the Palembang area before Air Bersih in the 14th century, and the large Buddha image and 7th century inscriptions were moved from somewhere

else and placed in the Palembang area. If so, why not put the pieces in the same place and call it a "Private Museum?" And where were they moved from? From the Palambanpura of the 9th century Ceylonese inscription? So Bronson's interpretation is quite impossible, and I will quote a few sentences from Wolters paper (page 43). He has a very good point.

"The archaeologists in 1974 were so confident that there was no settlement in the neighbourhood of modern Palembang before the fourteenth century that they felt compelled to suggest that the inscriptions were imported from outside the region much later in time. They believed so in spite of the fact that the statuary as well as the inscriptions found on the (Bukit Seguntang) peninsula are almost exclusively associated with the Mahayana and belong to a time span approximately from the seventh to the tenth century. If these items were brought to Palembang by a latter-day collector of antiquities, the collector was not interested in a random assortment of imports. And, if Geding Suro (c. 1500—C. 1700) was the earliest settlement in the region, the presumption is that the collector of Buddhist remains was Moslem."

I have taken the liberty of adding a name in brackets to the above. According to Soekmono in his 'Geomorphology and the Location of Crijijaya', mentioned in the previous section, in the 7th century Palembang was located at the very tip of a promontory, which promontory Wolters calls the Bukit Seguntang peninsula. It would seem that Wolters and I are agreed that Bronson dug his holes in the wrong place. Wolters' paper under discussion is to suggest that excavations should be carried out south of the Musi river. The arguments are long, running to nearly sixty pages and include thirteen old maps. I will be much shorter.

Three Chinese toponyms are discussed, and four itineraries are mentioned, of which two are discussed at length. The three toponyms are contained in a sentence from Ma Huan (15th c.)

"Old Haven (Old *Kang*) is exactly the same country as that formerly called *San-fo-chi*, (and) the foreigners call it by the name *P'o-lin-pang*."

1. *San-fo-ch'i*: Wolters writes, "The original identity of San-fo-ch'i and Srivijaya need not be disputed." Indeed the identity of San-fo-ch'i should, in fact must, be disputed otherwise the history of Sri Vijaya cannot be written and made convincing. In 671 I-Ching set sail for a place he called Chele-foche (as the French spell the name, and from now on till further notice I will use this spelling). Chele-foche is thought to have been Sri Vijaya, and in such case San-fo-ch'i could not have been Sri Vijaya as well. I am not aware of anybody except Moens discussing this point. He located Chele-foche on the Peninsula and San-fo-ch'i in Sumatra. I myself located Chele-foche at Chaiya where an inscription bearing the name Sri Vijaya has been found; and I accepted that San-fo-ch'i was also Sri Vijaya, but in the context of a country rather than a city or town. The name Sri Vijaya appears four times in non-Chinese sources.

(a) *7th Century*: in some inscriptions from South Sumatra. The name had been equated with Palembang, but as we now know from a 9th century inscription from Ceylon that Palembang was called Palambanpura, Sri Vijaya in the same period must have been located elsewhere.

(b) *8th Century*: in an inscription from Chaiya dated 775 A.D.

(c) *11th Century*: South India inscription. The Chola army first raided Kedah and then went on to take Sri Vijaya. Both places, then, must have been on the Peninsula.

(d) Nepalese source: The name appears as Sri Vijayapure-Suvarnnapure Lokanatha. This was a double-barrelled name for Chaiya.

These four mentions of Sri Vijaya match the geographical evidence of I-Ching's Chele-foche and refer to Chaiya, not Palembang. I will return to San-fo-ch'i later.

2. *P'o-lin-pang* was Palembang or the Palambanpura of the 9th century Ceylonese inscription. The city was also called Suvanvaraya or the Harbour of Gold.

3. *Old Kang*: translated as Old Harbour, that is, after the 9th century Harbour of Gold of Palambanpura had become dilapidated and

a new harbour come into being, the 15th century Chinese called the Harbour of Gold by the name Old Harbour. Such is the old translation of Old Kang. Wolters now proposes to translate the toponym as Old Channel. Old channel to what? To Palambanpura the Harbour of Gold? And surely Old Channel cannot possibly be the name of a country. Let us have that short sentence from Ma Huan again, with Wolters' new translation.

"Old Channel (Old *Kang*) is exactly the same country as that formerly called *San-fo-ch'i* (Sri Vijaya), and the foreigners call it by the name *Po-lin-pang* (Palembang.)"

The reason for this new translation is because Wolters wants to find a new capital (read Old Capital, please) of Sri Vijaya south of the Musi river. The whole exercise is tedious and laboured because at the time he wrote he had not seen the 9th century Ceylonese inscription with the name Palambanpura; so for lack of energy and space I will for the present dispense with discussion of the Chinese itineraries that Wolters used as the basis for his argument. But I will quote a sentence from his paper, a sentence from one of the early paragraphs.

"The results of the 1974 expedition are probably the most fruitful contribution to the early Palembang history since Coedes in 1918 restored the meaning of the term Srivijaya." (page 2)

This sentence is ambiguous because Bronson's results seem rather negative compared to the other evidence already in hand; and Wolters himself does not accept that the 7th century inscriptions were moved to Palembang from somewhere else, especially when the period was Moslem. I started this paper by remarking that to write any history of Southeast Asia without first identifying the more important toponyms with some degree of certainty is an exercise in futility. Coedès' Sri Vijaya Empire is the classic example of this futility. And now we seem to have a new frustration on our hands. But this is not to say that Palembang did not have a history of its own. In fact I will give a pattern of that history

now. (A history of Palembang, or Palambanpura as I will now call the place, is not the same as a history of Sri Vijaya as Coedès understood the term, but it is a part thereof.) But to write any semblance of history of South Sumatra without knowing where its capital was located makes me feel rather like a double-Dutchman writing a history of Central Java in the 8th and 9th centuries without knowing where Sanjaya's Mataram and the capital of the Sailendras were. However this is not a history but only a pattern which perhaps, if accepted, can be filled up with more details and given more exact dating.

Phase I—7th Century: From the internal evidence of the South Sumatra inscriptions and I-Ching's external evidence, the king of Sri Vijaya from the Malay Peninsula conquered South Sumatra. This brought the Malacca Straits under one control, and this control lasted six centuries.

Phase II—9th Century: Palambanpura developed, became prosperous and was called the Harbour of Gold. The city had royalty and very likely the princes were related to those of the other Kalinga countries, who were Saileadras ruling in the Peninsula and Central Java. A Princess of Palambanpura, Sangha Raden by name, became Crown Princess of Ceylon and, probably, subsequently queen of the island. She was a Buddhist as were her people and the peoples of the other Kalinga lands. This we know from the internal evidence of the unbaked votive stupas at Sarang Waty, and from those found at Boroburdur and several other districts in South Siam.

Phase III—Air Bersih: In about 1260 Chandrabanu was killed on the field in Ceylon, and Sri Vijaya lost control of the Malacca Straits. Palambanpura went into a decline from attacks from East Java which could not be defended for lack of aid from the Peninsula and Central Sumatra. Chinese pirates came into their own. (Wolters mentions two pirates of the period by name, viz. Ch'en Tsu-i and Liang Tao-ming, and I wouldn't be in the least surprised if the founder of Malacca was also a Chinese

pirate from South Sumatra.) The pirates had their lair at Air Bersih, and it is not in the nature of pirates to put up religious monuments or move sacred images and inscriptions from one place to another. More likely they would have sold them to American tourists for their private museums, if such a species existed in the 14th and 15th centuries.

Phase IV—Geding Suro: Cheng-Ho put down the pirates, and a new community of indigenous people came into being at Geding Suro. According to Bronson, "The people who moved into Geding Suro may not have been exactly the same people, or had the same socio-economic setup, as the people who moved out of Air Bersih a few years earlier." According to Wolters, the Indonesians of Geding Suro were Moslems, and they would not have moved any sacred Buddha images from place to place. More likely they would have knocked the heads off the images and sold those heads to American tourists for their private museums, if such a species existed in the 16th and 17th centuries.

I will now quote a few more sentences from the last paragraph of Wolter's paper.

"In the present study I have been dealing with an environment of mud, and yet I have been unable to address myself satisfactorily to the matter that has come to preoccupy me. How did these people think about themselves in an environment where no center could ever expect to be permanently in the right place except the peninsula on which Bukit Seguntang stood? This question rather than the location of Srivijaya now seems to me to represent the real mystery of the gulf of Palembang. Perhaps my question is an unreal one. I hope, however, that a new level of enquiry will evolve with its focus on understanding the nature of early Malay civilisation. This topic is surely more worthwhile than speculation about where each group of them lived or measurements of their degree of participation in foreign trade."

I have said that the sentence quoted above from page 2 of Wolters' paper was ambiguous. It would seem that Wolters, realising that the capital of Sri Vijaya can no longer be located at Palembang, has now hedged his bets into three ways:

1. Perhaps there was "another Palembang" south of the Musi river. It bears repeating that, according to Soekmono's geomorphological paper, Palembang in the 7th century was on the tip of a promontory and the land below that was still under water. In any case, from what I have seen, if there had been another Palembang it could be found more easily from air photographs than conjecturing about it.

2. In case another Palembang cannot be found, Wolters seems to veer from straight history to a research on the changing coastline of Southeast Sumatra. Four Chinese itineraries are mentioned of which two are discussed, namely,

- (a) 7th century I-Ching,
- (b) 8th century Embassy from Pyu in upland Burma,
- (c) 11th century Embassy from South India, and
- (d) 15th century Ma Huan.

The 7th and 15th century itineraries give no trouble. The evidence is first hand by writers who visited the locations. But the 8th and 11th century itineraries are something else. The information was supplied to the Chinese by foreign embassies, probably through interpreters. It is difficult to understand why embassies going to China from Burma and South India should use the Sunda and not the Malacca Straits. Indeed if Pyu was really in upper Burma one would have expected the journey to have been made by land and not by sea at all. But this is immaterial. The main point is that if the two embassies went through the Malacca Straits, then the Chinese toponyms that Wolters located in South Sumatra could *all* be wrong. On the other hand, if the trips were really through the Sunda Straits, landmarks in the Peninsula and North Sumatra would have been sighted and probably mentioned. So *only* some of the toponyms might have been mislocated. The whole exercise smacks of playing the Chinese word-game to me. And in any case, the muddy coasts of South Sumatra is hardly a worthwhile research subject for a historian of Wolters' calibre.

3. Again, if another Palembang cannot be found, Wolters switches from history to "the nature of early Malay civilization." If the people

of South Sumatra were really Malays and not Sumatrans, or of the Javaka race, or Chinese pirates, then research on their early civilization, or the equivalent, can probably be carried out more comfortably in some backward community of Malays in Malaysia. Again, the subject, compared to straight history, is hardly a worthwhile one for a historian of Wolters' calibre.

But I hope I am wrong. I hope Wolters is not really giving up history because the History of Sri Vijaya seems to have arrived at a most interesting stage, what with about half a dozen "new inscriptions" from Central Java and three or four from Ceylon that have been recently published or are about to be published, including one from Borobudur. These pieces will have to be properly analysed and set into the structure of the Sri Vijaya Story. And some of Paranavitana's sources of interlinear writing will have to be used as plaster to cement the whole story together. Ceylonese epigraphists accept these sources of Paranavitana but second rate historians find the whole exercise too difficult to handle, so they say, though not necessarily think, that Paranavitana invented the whole thing out of thin air. But a historian of real calibre, even an orthodox but a meticulous one, should have no difficulty in picking out what should be retained and what discarded. The whole racket is a historical challenge of some dimension. I hope Wolters will accept it. I hope he will not give up the unholy ghost of history simply because the capital of Sri Vijaya can no longer be located in South Sumatra. Goodness knows, his toriaus wor king on this period are few enough. And now we will return to that most vexing of problems—San-fo-ch'i.

The early history of Southeast Asia before the European period is more a joke than a history. In proto-historic times before the various states and districts produced inscriptions of their own, the Chinese records were the most important single individual source. In due course this external evidence must be equated to some internal evidence when that evidence comes into being. Some Chinese names have been identified with virtual certainty: some have not been identified but fit the local evidence and can be accepted; but some identifications leave a

great deal to be desired, to say the very least. A few of the more controversial names include: Funan and Chenla, Chele-Foche and San-fo-ch'i, and Pyu.

Colonel Gerini was the first to interpret Funan as Banom, meaning a mountain. This is generally accepted, but of course there is no real proof and historians tend to use Funan rather than Banom in their writing. Funan was a country which some place in Cambodia, others in the Central Plain of Siam, and still others in the Isan or Northeastern Plateau. Chenla is also thought to have been a country, the state that succeeded Funan. Nobody knows what this name corresponded to, but it has generally been located in Cambodia. This is contrary to the earliest epigraphic evidence. Three inscriptions of the Chenla period, possibly earlier than any found in Cambodia, came from the Isan Plateau in present-day Siam. When this fact had been pointed out to some scholars, at least one thought that Chenla was not located where it had been thought, at least in the early period. I think Chenla was not a country at all. It was the name of a dynasty that ruled Funan. The dynasty was the Chandrawamsa which the Chinese pronounced Chenla. Some people also call me Tan Chenla because I am of the Lunar Line too, though I regret to report that others think the Loony Line would be more appropriate. But I wouldn't care to be quoted on this.

The equivalent for the 7th century Chinese name Pyu has also not been found. It is thought to refer to a people or race that lived in the district of Sri Ksetra (Prome) in upper Burma. The names of some kings (?) of Sri Ksetra written on funerary urns have been deciphered: Suryavikrama, Harivikrama, Sihavikrama, Prabhavarman, and Jayachandrarvarman. These names are Indian and it might be asked whether the Pyu were an Indian tribe, or perhaps the race has been located in the wrong place. I will make a guess, not very seriously, that the Chinese name Pyu was Phya, a title used in several countries and means King. The Chinese might have used this shorter form for Phya Sri Ksetra (*Pyu Shi-li-ch'a-ta-lo*). But in such a case, the title could have been used for any country that had come into being by the 7th century—Phya Lakorn Chaisri (*Pyu Lang-chia-shu*), Phya Kamalanka (*Puy Chia-ma-lang-chia*),

Phya Dvaravati (*Pyu To-lo-po-ti*), Phya Isanapura (*Pyu I-shang-na-pu-lo*), Phya Mahachampa or Chulani (*Pyu Mo-ho-chan-po or Lin-i*), Phya Sri Vijaya (*Pyu Chele-foche*) or even Phya Palambanapura (*Pyu P'o-lin-pang*.) From this list I venture to leave out Phya Funan and Phya Chenla. The point is, I am not convinced that if Pyu had been located in upper Burma, it would have sent embassies to China by sea through the Sunda Straits in 802 and 807. Perhaps some Sinologist would be kind enough to look further into this question.

Chelo-foche and San-fo-ch'i have both been equated with Sri Vijaya. This is quite impossible. Some people have identified these two names as Sri Bodhi and Sam Bodhi, but I prefer Sri Vijaya because this name appears four times in non-Chinese sources. I place Chele-Foche at Chaiya, and this identification can be accepted with confidence. Several scholars have already done so, though as at writing I have only seen one written case.

I seem to remember that San-fo-shih sent embassies to the Chinese Empire before Shih-li-fo-shih (as I will now spell the two names), but I can no longer find the reference. But never mind. The Peninsula had long sent embassies before I-Ching mentions Shih-li-fo-shih in the 7th century. The list, from Wang Gunwu's *The Nanhai Trade*, JMBRAS, 1958, is:

608	Chia-lo-shih (Kraburi)
608, 609, 610	Chih-tu (Singora or possibly Chaiya on the Bandon Bight, or both)
635	Pan-pan (Viengsra on the Bandon Bight, also on the Bight was Kan-to-li)
644	Mo-lo-yu (Malayu, Muara Takus)
647	To-po-teng (Trang, Taptieng)
648, 666	Holing (Nakorn, Tambralinga)
671-695	Shih-li-fo-shih (I-Ching)
716, 724, 728, 742	(Shih-li) Fo-shih (Chaiya on the Bandon Bight)
767, 768, 813, 815, 818	Holing (Nakorn)
820, 831, 860-873	Shepo (Chaiya).

It would seem that the seat of the Maharaja moved between Chaiya and Nakorn between 716 and 860-873.

904-5, 960

(San) Fo-shih.

The Chinese word-game is out of bounds as far as I am concerned, but I have, in this paper, ventured to step in where I once feared even to tread.

In the 14th century, the Chinese stated that San-fo-shih had broken into three parts, and the names of the rulers of the three states were given as Tam-ma-sa-na-ho, Ma-na-ha-pau-lin-pang, and Seng-ka-liet-yu-lan. Embassies were sent in 1373, 1374, and 1375. I have identified these names as :

Tam-ma-sa-na-ho = Dharmasoka (Chaiya or Nakorn),

Ma-na-ha-pau-lin-pang = Something, perhaps Maharaja, of Palembang, and Seng-ka-liet-yu-lan = Nissamka Alakesvara (Rayigama).

If these suggestions are in any way plausible, then the three areas San-fo-shih broke into were the Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, and Ceylon. Therefore, let us return to the Chinese word-game again, but this time to a version of my own.

Instead of transcribing the names San-fo-shih and Shih-li-fo-shih, let us translate them. San-fo-shih or San-fo-chi, would then be Three-Fo-shih (the Peninsula, Sumatra and Ceylon). A sinologist once told me that San-fo-chi could be translated as "three Buddhas of equal standing". This could mean three lands of Buddhism, or three Buddhist lands, I suppose. But I will dispense with this translation, as well as with Vijaya, and simply use Fo-shih.

In the beginning it was Three Fo-shih, and Shih-tse (Ceylon) sent embassies as early as 405. When Central Java entered the Sri Vijaya story in the 7th century, the name Three Fo-shih could no longer be applied, so the Chinese changed it to Shih-li-fo-shi. This might have been Sri Fo-shih, or even Four Fo-shih, though less likely. Then, early in

the 10th century, the Sailendras in Java disappeared from the Sri Vijaya story, so Sri Fo-shih was no longer applicable, and the Chinese subsequently changed the name back to Three Fo-shih. This name was used over the next half millenium. That is all there is to the problem of San-fo-shih and Shih-li-fo-shih. It brings Professor Coedès' theory of a Sri Vijaya Empire which was put forward over half a century ago, possibly an epoch covering a full century of historical research based almost entirely on epigraphic and literary sources, as well as this paper of mine, to an end. Sawadee !

M.C. Chand Chirayu Rajani

Chiangmai University