Jurnal Arkeologi Malaysia, 20, 2007

Archaeology of Peninsular Thailand

by

*NIK HASSAN SHUHAIMI NIK ABDUL RAHMAN, Ph.D.**

Introduction

This study focusses on the following sites: Takuapa area: The area is situated on the north western coast of Peninsular Thailand and about 96 kilometres from the rich tin mining centre, Phuket Island, in the south. The area comprises Takuapa town and environs which includes Kokhau Island. Takuapa town is on the southern bank of Takuapa River and about 4 kilometres from the coast. Kokhau Island, at the mouth of Takuapa River, the southern most of three islands which shelter the Takuapa town and environs from the south west monsoon, is about 400 metres from the mainland. From the mainland, the island appears to be covered with mangrove swamps especially near its estuary
side. The island and the rest of the Takuapa area are in the tin mining belt. Tin mining activities are still going on.[1] This scenery reminds us of the area on the upper reaches of the Bujang Valley, the Merbok area in Kedah where tin mining activities are still going on and they are located not far from the coast. A very prominent route links the area with the east coast particularly the Bay of Bandon. This is the Takuapa River and Girrisastra River route mentioned earlier.[2] Besides the trans-peninsular river route, the area is linked with both Peninsular Malaysia and the rest of Thailand by roads.

Archaeological interest in the area has been prompted by the work of W.W.

---

* The writer is a Professor and Very Senior Research Fellow, Institut Alam dan Tamadun Melayu, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

1 W. Donner, *The five faces of Thailand*, Fig. 88, p. 454.

2 See note 294, Chapter 2. Nik Hassan Shuhaimi Nik Abd. Rahman, 1984 Archaeology, Art and Early Kingdoms in the Malay Peninsular and Sumatera, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London.

Bourke, an inspector of mines in 1902,[3] which was summarized by Colonel Gerini in 1904.[4] His discovery of archaeological sites in the area encouraged Lajonquière, a French archaeologist, to make further investigations in 1909.[5] He made sketches of the finds. No other archaeologist visited the area until 1934, when Quaritch-Wales on his quest for evidence of the eastward march of Indian colonists, with the help of the Siamese Tin Syndicate and their local manager, Mr J. Farrington, surveyed and carried out a much more extensive and detailed research.[6] He was the first to publish photographs of the important archaeological finds. The area continues to attract other scholars. In 1961, Alastair Lamb in his effort to see the relationship between Takuapa and other archaeological sites in the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra made a visit to the area.[7] Much more detailed photographs of significant finds were published. Other scholars, who did not visit the site, but include E.H. Hultzsch[8] and Nilakanta Sastri[9] who discussed among other things the significance of the inscription from Takuapa which they identified as Tamil. Le May,[10] Dupont[11] and a few Thai art historians discussed the sculptures found at Takuapa. Stanley O'Connor, who also visisted the area, re-studied the sculptures.[12]

The archaeological survey of the area indicates that there are three main sites. They are outside the town. These are T'ung T'uk, Pra No Hill, and Pra Narai Hill. T'ung T'uk which literally means the "plain of the monument" is situated towards the southern extremity of the Khokhau Island. This part of the island is low and sandy with a number of scattered open grassy stretches. T'ung T'uk is in one of these grassy stretches. Three mounds located by Quaritch-Wales have been identified as temple sites.[13] It is, however, impossible to establish the exact shape and size of these monuments. The only traceable finds are the bricks which are scattered about.

It appears that most parts of the open grassy, sandy plain of the monuments, covering several acres, are strewn with thousands of ceramic sherds from varieties of ceramics, earthenware and glass and there are also varities of beads and also broken pieces of bricks. From the general first impression, the concentration of the finds and the area and the variety, one feels that one is looking at a site

---

3 W.W. Bourke, "Some archaeological notes on Monthon Puket", *JSS*, 2, 1905, 49-62.

4 Colonel G.E. Gerini, "Siamese archaeology: A synoptical sketch" *JRAS*, 1904, 233-248.

5 Lunet de Lanjonqui'eire,"La domaine, archeologique du Siam" *BCAI*, 1, 1909, 188-262. The sketches are on page 235; "Essai d'inventaire archeologique du Siam" *BCAI*, 1912-1913, 19-181.

6 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of ancient Indian cultural expansion", 1-31.

7 Alastair Lamb, "Three statues in a tree: A note on the Pra Narai group, Takuapa" *FMJ*, 6, 1961, 64-68.

8 E.H. Hultzsch, "Supplementary note on a Tamil inscription in Siam", *JRAS*, 1, 1914, 397-398.

9 Nilakanta Sastri, "Takuapa and its Tamil inscription" *JMBRAS*, 22, 1 (1949), 29-30.

10 Reginald le May, *A concise history of Buddhist art in Siam*, figs. 41, 42.

11 Pierre Dupont, "Le Buddha de Grahi et l'ecole de Chaiya", *BEFEO* 42, 1942, 105-106; "Visnu mitrè's de l'Indochines occidentale" *BEFEO*, 41, (1941), 233-254.

12 Stanley 9'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam*, Chapters IV and V.

13 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of ancient Indian cultural expansion", 9.

contemporaneous with Sungai Emas site in the Kuala Muda River Valley. Both Quaritch-Wales[14] and Alastair Lamb[15] collected ceramic sherds during their visits to the site. The sherds were examined by the experts in the British Museum. The collection by Quaritch-Wales was examined by R.L. Hobson who identified one of them as belonging to the Six Dynasties period (220-589 A.D.).[16] The rest of them were classified as T'ang dynasty period and the blue glazed Middle Eastern type also contemporary with them. Basil Gray and Pinder-Wilson identified the sample collected by Alastair Lamb as being not later than the T'ang period and not earlier than the seventh century.[17] Sherds of the Middle Eastern type were dated to the seventh to ninth century. In the light of the latest discovery of the typical site at Sungai Emas in 1979 the nature of the blue-glazed Middle Eastern ceramic has been further defined. It has been recognised and identified as being Sasana-Islamic, Persian or Iraq type which can be dated as seventh to early ninth century. No other site in South East Asia, so far, is known to have produced such Middle Eastern sherds. According to Stanley O'Connor who visisted the site and sent a sample of the sherds to Tom Harrisson to compare with the excavated material from Sarawak River Delta, the Chinese sherds could be fitted into types associated with the T'ang and Sung periods found there.[18] There is no evidence of the existence of the blue-glazed Middle Eastern sherds in the Sarawak River Delta.[19]

The result of the discovery of Chinese stonewares and porcellaneous wares mixed together with earthenwares either local or imported and the Sasana-Islamic blue-glazed wares led scholars to believe that Takuapa area was an important entrepôt. It must have had trade contact with the Middle East, India and China. Alastair Lamb called it a pre-Melaka entrepôt along the west coast of the Malay Peninsula.[20] From the geographical point of view this may be possible because the area is very well sheltered, both the Takuapa estuary and the estuary of the stream on the Khokhau Island. It could provide the facilities for off loading cargoes, revictualling and refitting. But there is no evidence of warehouses and domestic buildings, and the number of identifiable structures either religious or domestic is very small when compared to the site at Sungai Emas. Presumably all other buildings were made from perishable materials which did not leave any trace.

On the mainland, Pra No Hill is a small hill situated in almost the same latitude as T'ung T'uk. The hill is about 60 metres high and 1.8 metres standing stone Visnu was recovered from its summit. A foundation, presumably, belonging to a

14 *Ibid.*, 10.
15 Alastair Lamb, "Some glass beads from Kakao Island" *FMJ*, 6, 1961, 48.
16 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of ancient Indian cultural expansion", 10.
17 Alastair Lamb, "Some glass beads from Kakao Island", 48.
18 Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam*, 50.
19 *Ibid.*, 50.
20 Alastair Lamb, "Takuapa: the probable site of a pre-Malaccan entrepôt in the Malay Peninsula", 76-86.

small shrine measuring 6.35 x 6.35 m and 60 cm high was found. The structure has its entrance on the east where there was once a flight of steps.[21]

The stone Visnu from Pra No Hill has been identified positively by a number of scholars even though it has lost its attributes. The image was transferred to the National Museum Bangkok prior to the visit of Quaritch-Wales to Takuapa in 1934. It has been identified as one of the mitred gly argues that it was Visnu and Stanley O'Connor convincing the product of a fully developed isthmian workshop between 650 and 800 A.D.

The Pra Narai Hill or "Visnu Hill" is situated on the southern bank of the Takuapa River about 36 kilometres from its mouth and just above its junction with its tributary the Klong Pong. It is a low hill about 40 metres high covered with bamboo and tropical vegetation. 'On the summit are traces of an ancient structure of stone and brick, measuring about 2.73 metres x 2.73 metres.[22] On the northern bank of the Takuapa River just across from the hill was once located a group of sculpture which comprises a standing male figure with four arms, a female figure, and a bust of a male figure with two arms.[23] Other finds from the spot are a roughly circular stone slab with inscription which has been identified as Tamil inscription first by E. Hultzsch[24] and later by Nilakanta Sastril,[25] an incomplete low relief sculpture of a seated figure, a number of stone slabs and some of which had been worked upon and one of them had a.shape of a flattened *linga.* The finds are believed to have originated from somewhere else in view of the fact that the site where they are found has not produced any indication of a religious structure. The remains of the sculpture and other finds from the site have been removed to Nakhon Si Thammarat Museum after the destruction to the head of the sculptures by thieves.

The question of the origin of the group of three sculptures has created lively discussion among scholars. According to Quaritch-Wales, the sculptures originated from the brick shrine on Khokhau Island.[26] It was transported by the Indian colonists up the Takuapa River to the site in the process of the Indian migrations to the east. Lajonquière suggested that it came from the brick shrine on the Pra Narai Hill,[27] and so too Alastair Lamb.[28] I believe that the reasons put forward by Alastair Lamb are strong enough to believe that the finds located at the site were originally from the shrine on the Pra Narai Hill.

---

21 H.G Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of ancient Indian cultural expansion", 9.

22 Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam*, 48.

23 Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of ancient Indian cultural expansion", 11-12.

24 E.H. Hultzsch, "Supplementary note on a Tamil inscription in Siam", 397-398.

25 Nilakanta Sastri, "Takuapa and its Tamil inscription", 29-30.

26 H.G Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of ancient Indian cultural expansion" 11-12; in *Towards Anvkor*, he concluded that "if those images had not been carried twelve miles up the Takuapa River, Angkor in Cambodia would never have existed", 49-50.

27 Lunet de Lajonquiére, "Essai d'inventaire archéologique du Siam", 166-169.

28 Alastair Lamb, "Takuapa: the probable site of a pre-Malaccan entrepôt in the Malay Peninsula", 78.

Various views have been forwarded regarding the identification of the sculptures.[29] In view of the fact that the discussion on the iconography of these sculptures will be dealt with later, it is sufficient at the moment to consider their style. This is because the style of these images will throw some light on the presence of the Tamil inscription at Takuapa. Those scholars who have studied the images agree that they belonged to the Pallava style of South India, and according to Stanley O'Connor, they show late Pallava style and can be dated around the last part of the ninth century A.D.[30] This reinforced the belief that they were contemporary with the Tamil inscription and show the presence of Tamil traders in the area.

The inscription has two slightly different readings. Below are the two readings by E. Hultzsch and Nilakanta Sastri:

1. E. Hultzsch[31]	2. Nilakanta Sastri[32]
1. ... ravaman Ku[na]	1. ... (ya) varmakku
2. [m]an tan Nangur=a[d]ai	2. ... man tan nang(u)r(u) dai (ya)
3. =[t] totta kulam per Sri [Ava] [ni]	3. n totta kulam per sri A (vani)
4. Naranam Manikkiramattar[k]	4. naranam manikkiramattar (k)
5. [k]um senamugattarkkum	5. kum Senamukattarkkum
6. [m=ulu]darkkum adaikkalam	6. patarkkum adarkalam

Translation 1:
"The tank (by) name Sri [Avanil Naranam which was dug [near] Nangur by ... ravarman Gu[na] ... [m]an himself, is placed under the protection of the members of Manigramam and of the men of the vanguard and/cultivators"

Translation 2 (line 2 to 6):
"The tank dug by Nangur udaian (and) called Avaninaranam (is placed under) the protection of the Manikkiramam, the residents of the military camp and ..."

The two scholars differ on two points. E. Hultzsch suggested that *Nangur* was the site for the tank but Nilakanta Sastri said that *Nangur-udaian* was the name of the person responsible for building the tank. The other point concerned the people

29 H.G Quaritch-Wales saw a parallel example, the Gangadhara group of sculptures at Trichinopoly, see, "A newly explored route of ancient Indian cultural expansion" 15; Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam*, 53 and Nilakanta Sastri, "Takuapaand its Tamil inscription", 26, identified them as aivite. But Quaritch-Wales in "Recent Malayan excavations and some wider implications" *JRAS*, 1946, 147, re-identified the central figure as a Visnu. In 1961, he returned to the Saivite implication of the Gangadhara parallel. See, "Review of Chandi Bukit Batu Pahat"by Alastair Lamb, *JSEAH*, 2, 3 (1961) 109; Alastair Lamb, "Takuapa: the probable site of pre-Malaccan entrepôt on the Malay Peninsula", 79, note 1, identifies it as Visnu.

30 Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam*, 54.

31 E. Hultzsch, "Supplementary note on a Tamil inscription in Siam", 397-398.

32 Nilakanta Sastri, "Takuapa and its Tamil inscription", 25-30.

associated with the tank. Besides the members of the merchant guild E. Hultzsch mentioned vanguard and cultivators but Nilakanta Sastri mentioned only the residents of a military camp. The residents of this military camp were the merchants who belonged to the powerful mercantile community which Nilakanta Sastri recognised as belongin to the *Vanik-graman* (guild of merchants) in South India.[33] The period was ninth century A.D. on the evidence the term *Avani-naranan* (Visnu on the earth) found on the inscription that can be associated with the title of King Nandivarman III of late Pallava (826-50 A.D.) who ruled at Kancipuram.[34]

The inscription while indicating the presence of traders and soldiers, does not in any way prove the idea of Indian colonising activity over the area. The trading community formed an extension of the Tamil merchant guild of South India. Presumably, they were given separate quarters by the ruling group at Takuapa. The presence of an extension of the Tamil merchant guild in South East Asia has been further highlighted by the Lubok Tua inscription of Sumatra dated Saka 1010 (L088 A.D.).[35] During the Melaka Sultanate in the 15th century the South Indian merchants played a very significant role and just as other trading communities they were given separate quarters. The tradition must have continued from the Takuapa period or earlier.

The existence of entrepôts on the Malay Peninsula was known to early Arab geographers. One such entrepôt was *Kalah*.[36] Scholars are divided over its location. But there is more unanimity in locating the place on the peninsula. Among the proposed sites are Kedah, Kra, Mergui District and Takuapa. Arab accounts describe *Kalah* as a town, an island, a kingdom and also a region.[37] The only sites which satisfy the description on the evidence of geography and archaeology are Takuapa and Kedah. When Alastair Lamb proposed Takuapa as the possible site the knowledge about the site at Sungai Emas was not known yet. But the term *Kalah* is quite close to Kedah. On othe other hand if one considers the fact that tin mines were found in the fortress of *Kalah*, then Takuapa would fit in with the geography of *Kalah*.

Chaiya: A small provincial east coast town situated about 6 km from the Bay of Bandon. It has abundant supplies of rice and fish being in the rice growing area and near to the fishing area of the Gulf of Thailand and China Sea. In the past it could have been the eastern terminus of the trans-peninsula portage, the Takuapa River and Girisastra River mentioned earlier. Today it is linked with the rest of Thailand by roads, railways and sea. Archaeological discoveries in the town and its environs are strong evidence for the existence of ancient settlement in the area.

---

33 *Ibid.*, 29-30.
34 *Ibid.*, 29-30.
35 Nilakanta Sastri, "A Tamil merchant guild in Sumatra," 711, *TBG.*, 72, 1932, 314-327.
36 Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese,* 216-220.
37 *Ibid.*, 216-220.

A number of archaeologists visited the area but only Claeys[38] and Quaritch-Wales[39] carried out excavations. Among the ancient sites located in Chaiya and its environs are Wat Hua Wiang, Wat Long, Wat Keo, Wat Phra Baromathat, Wat Mai Cholathan and Wat Sala Thong.[40] In addition to these, there are the two hills situated several miles to the east of the town. named Sai Smo Hilland Nang-I Hill where several small *stapa*-like monuments or cedis were noted to have existed.[41] The majority of the finds which have been attributed to Peninsular Thailand came from Chaiya. Archaeological research in Chaiya reveals that the finds from Chaiya comprise religious objects, inscription and domestic goods such as trade ceramics and earthenwares. Most of the religious objects were recovered not through proper excavation.

The three most important sites in Chaiya are the Wat Hua Wiang, Wat Long and Wat Keo. They are situated on the western side of the railway line that runs north-south through the town. They are located at equidistance, 200 metres apart. There is a belief existing among the local archaeologists that the three temples are those temples mentioned in the Ligor inscription face "A" which has been dated to 775 A.D.[42] This belief is based on the assumption that the Ligor inscription originated from Wat Hua Wiang, Chaiya and not from Wat Sema Muang, Nakhon Si Thammarat (Ligor).[43] The Chandrabhanu inscription which has been labelled as from Chaiya is believed to have come from Nakhon Si Thammarat. The mix-up followed the transfer of the two inscriptions to the National Museum Bangkok. Evidence for the mix-up in the labelling has been shown by Thai scholars.[44] Among other things the inscription.mentions the fact that, "This king, the lord of Srtvijaya.... has erected this triad of excellent brick houses, the abode of Padmapani, the Mara-slayer (i.e. Sakyamuni) and Vajrapani...". But the evidence from the ruins of the three temples does not show with certainty that they belonged to the period, though all the three temples are made from brick.

Among the three temples, the most prominent is Wat Keo. This is because certain parts of the walls are still standing and it is still possible to trace the decorations on some parts of these walls. Quaritch-Wales described the monument following Coedes as a brick sanctuary, constructed on a plan analogous to that of Candi Kalasan in Java, but of which the architecture recalls closely the cubic art.of Campa and the pre-Khmer of archaic type, Prasat Krahan of Phnom Kulen (Cambodia).[45] Archaeological investigation and restoration from 1976-1979 by the

38 J.Y. Claeys, "L'archeologie du Siam", *BEFEO* 31, 1931, 280-283.
39 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of Indian cultural expansion", 19-21.
40 *Ibid.*, 19.
41 *Ibid.*, 20.
42 For the inscription, see, Nilakanta Sastri, *The history. of Srivijaya,* 119-121.
43 *Ibid.*, 125.
44 Boribal Buribhand and A.B. Griswold, Sculpture of Peninsular Thailand in Ayutthya period", *JSS*, 38, 2 (1951) note 17.
45 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of Indian cultural expansion", 21.

Thai Fine Arts Department, revealed that it was built on a square foundation, 24 x 24 m.[46] Its ground plan is definitely of the cruciform type and resembles that of the Javanese temples such as the main temple of Chandi Sewu and also Chandi Kalasan.[47] But it is not as complex as the Javanese temples. The central part of the temple is surrounded by four cellas and only the eastern cella leads to the main chamber. There is no evidence of the existence of a processional path consisting of passage-ways behind the minor cellas alternating with stretches of open gallery as in the case of the Sewu main temple.[48] Although much of the top part of the temple is missing, it is still possible to recognise that each cella had a roof of its own, behind which rose the central roof of the temple. The largest cella is the one on the east having measurements, 4.20 x 4.20 m and 5 m high. The roof of the temples must have been adorned with *stupas.* Remains of these stupas in red sandstone have been found during the investigation.

The general plan of the temple reminds us of the pian of the foundation and base of the temple found at site 21 in the Bujang Valley Kedah and also the decorations on the stone pedestal from site 24 Bujang Valley Kedah known as *Raja Bersiong flag post.* The scheme of the decoration on the facades indicate strong resemblance to Cham tradition; the style of the pillars on the south side and the mouldings can be compared to those of the central tower of Phô-hài,[49] and the arrangements of the arches next to the pillars and the pilasters remind us of the similar arrangement and style of a subsidiary temple at Mi Son.[50] The view regarding the style of the temple is based on the best preserved part, that is, the southern facade which still retains the features which are probably common to the other three facades.

In the temple are located a number of Hindu and Buddhist artifacts. These included Buddha images, red sandstone stupas, a hand holding a lotus, *lingas,* and a red sandstone Ganesa. The templ e is Buddhist. This is based on the assumption that all the Hindu artifacts found in the temple were not from the temple but were deposited there. The Buddhist artifacts can be classified as those that are contemporaneous with the temple and those that were added later. The first group probably included the seated headless red sandstone Buddha: decorated with *vajra* and lions on the sides of the pedestal. The second group included most other Buddha images. The first group may be dated to the eighth to tenth century period while the second to the Ayutthayan period, sixteenth to seventh century period. This indicates that the temple must have been restored and reused during the Ayutthayan period.

---

46 M.C. Subhadradis Diskul, "Chedi at Wat Keo, Chaiya, Suratthani," *JMBRAS,* 53, 2 (1980) 1.

47 For comparison, see, Bernert Kempers, *Ancient Indonesian Art,* Pl. 99-105 (Chandi Kalasan) p. 56, fig. 4 (Chandi Sewu).

48 *Ibid.,* 55. Fig. 4.

49 See G. Maspéro, *Le rovaume du Champa,* Paris Librairie Nationale d'art et d'histoire, 1928, Pl. XVI.

50 Paramentier, *Inventaire descriptif des monuments Chams de l'Annam.* 1909, Vol. 1, fig. 73.

The other impressive monument in Chaiya is the Phra Baromathat. It resembles the general plan of some of the monuments depicted on the relief of Borobudur.[51] The monument has four porches on the four sides. Its superstructure is divided into tiers and each tier is decorated with model *stupa* located at each corner. The largest *stupa* crowned the top. It has been reported that it was reconstructed in 1901[52] and during the reconstruction it was noticed that its base was buried about 1 m below the ground level. The restorers saw evidence of the earlier reconstruction. In 1930 it was again re-restored.[53] Most of the adornments are believed to be later style than the monument. Nevertheless, it is believed that it still retains the original general form. Most scholars agree that the temple belonged to the ninth to tenth century period.

Scholars who have studied the archaeological finds from Chaiya have drawn significant conclusions concerning the history of Chaiya prior to the fourteenth century . Stanley O'Connor who studied the Visnu images from the area concludes that the "aberrent" statue of Visnu is the oldest Visnu image in South. East Asia, and dates it to not later than the fourth century.[54] He believes that the existence of such an early Visnu image may confirm the belief that Chaiya was the ancient kingdom *P'an-p'an* from where Fu-nan received its second phase of Indianization.[55] This re-affirms the belief of scholars such as Groeneveldt, Pelliot, Ferrand, Luce, Fujita Toyohachi and Briggs who unanimously locate *P'an-p'an* on or near the Bay of'Bandon.[56] If it is a truism that the Indianizati6n of Fu-nan came from *P'an-p'an* at the end of the fourth century, then *Plan-p'an* received its Indian influence at an early date. The date of the foundation of *P'an-p'an* according to Luce was third century.[57] It was founded by a Funanese general Fan Shih man and named the kingdom in honour of (Hun) *P'an-p'an,* the reigning king of Fu-nan. The earliest source that mentions this kingdom is *Liang-shu* on the section of Fu-nan and it features as partisan in the plot which placed Kaundinya II on the throne of Fu-nan.[58] According to the translated notices, *P'an-p'an* established relations with China in the fifth century, and featured prominently in the dynastic histories until T'ang times.[59]

The other important aspect of the history of Chaiya is its political status in the history of Srivijaya. There are scholars who believe that Chaiya was the site of the capital of Srivijaya. Quaritch-Wales, for instance, while not denying the

51 For comparison, see, Parmonto Atmadi, *Pelita Borobudur,* Laporan Kegiatan proyek pemugaran Candi Borobudur, Seri C, No. 2, Jakarta, 1979, 257 and 260.

52 M.C. Subhadradis Diskul, *The art of Srivijaya,* 40.

53 *Ibid.,* 40.

54 Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam,* 39.

55 *!bid.,* 40.

56 The views have been discussed by Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese,* 50.

57 G. Luce, "Countries neighbouring Burma", *JBRS* 14, 2 (1925), 169 note 1.

58 Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese,* 50.

59 *Ibid.,* 48-50.

existence of a Sumatran kingdom called Srivijaya believes that the Sailendra dynasty that ruled Srivijaya had its capital at Chaiya from 775 A.D.[60] The name Srivijaya was adopted either through the conquest of Sumatran kingdom or through independent preference. Originally the kingdom was called *Javaka*.[61] In 1979, he changed his opinion slightly by assuming that the Sumatran kingdom absorbed Chaiya and changed its name to Srivijaya,[62] but although he did not discuss the location of the capital it can be assumed that the capital was at Chaiya after 755 A.D. Prior to 755 A.D. the capital of Srivijaya was in Sumatra. This is in line with the majority view, but the capital of Srivijaya was not at Chaiya from 775 A.D. Most scholars believe that after 775 A.D. Chaiya became a part of Srivijaya and the capital was still in Sumatra. But the transfer of the capital took place only in the eleventh century and the capital was at ,Jambi according to Wolters.[63] But according to Quaritch-Wales the capital was at Nakhon Si Thammarat after the twelfth century.[64] The main arguments for Chaiya were its name which is very close to *jaya;* that there is a hill called Srivijaya Hill: also the discovery of many artifacts, particularly Buddhist images, which art historians classified as"Srivijayan Art".[65]

The Hindu and Buddhist artifacts from Chaiva display a variety of styles and influence: various Indian ones as well as Cham, Khmer, Javanese and Sumatran. This characteristic would be due to its international contacts and also its position on the Bay of Bandon in the context of the geography of South East Asia. The most important artifact is the dated seated bronze Buddha discovered from Wat Hua Wiang. It is very important because besides having a date which is difficult to interpret since it contains five figures, also there are details of its foundation by maha *senapati* named *Talani* during the reign of king *kamraten an maharaja srimat-Trailokyaraja-Maulibhusanayarmadeva*.[66] The inscription is in Old Khmer but the script is Old Javanese (more correctly Old Sumatran).[67] According to the inscription the image was made by the order of the ruler of *Grahi.*

The date given on the inscription was originally read as 11006 of the era, a

---

60 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of Indian cultural expansion" 4 and M.C. Chand., "Background to Srivijaya story" *JSS*, 62, 1 (1974), 210-211.

61 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of Indian cultural expansion", 4. Among his views were, "the Sailendra dynasty is always spoken of in Chola inscription, as reigning over Kadara or Kidara and Srivijaya, Kadara (Kedah) being that part of Javaka kingdom best known to the Indians, and the power of whose ruler spread over Srivijaya perhaps over the end of the eighth century A.D.".

62 *Ibid.*, 4.

63 O.W. Wolters, "A note on the capital of Srivijaya after eleventh century", 228-230.

64 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of Indian cultural expansion", 4.

65 See Chapter 1 for the discussion on the various problems related to the terminology.

66 J.G. de Casparis, "The date of Buddha Grahi" *JSS*, 55, 1 (1967), 31. See also G. Coedès, "Recueil de inscriptions du Siam", 2, 1929, 25-29.

67 J.G. de Casparis, "The date of Buddha Grahi," 31.

year of the hare.[68] All agree that the reading was not doubtful except for the last one. De Casparis agrees with Krom that the last number should be 4.[69] But Coedès who was the first to read the inscription suggested the last date could possibly be 5 and that the reading of the date should be 1105 (Saka) because 1104 and 1106 were not the year of the hare.[70] He deleted the last zero and so this date corresponds with 1183 A.D. There are however scholars who are puzzled about the relationship of the inscription and the Buddha image seated under the serpents-hood. This is because Dupont argued that the style of the Buddha is related to the Sukhotai Buddhas, that is, not much earlier than the end of the thirteenth century.[71] There are those who suggest that the Buddha image belonged to the thirteenth century while the serpents hood or *Naga* and the inscription belonged to the twelfth century.[72] De Casparis who was quite certain of the dating of the Buddha image by Dupont suggests a date of not earlier than the end of the thirteenth century for the inscription based on historical arguments. Hismain arguments are firstly the dating by the animal year was unknown prior to the inscription of Rama Khamheng, more than a hundred years after 1183.[73] Second, the king ruling in Sumatra mentioned in the inscription of Sumatra, the Rambahan I inscription 1286 A.D., sri maharaja Tribhuvanaraja-Maulivarmadeva, by name was the same king as the one mentioned in the Buddha Grahi inscription and that it does not merely imply dynastic relationship.[74] However, he does not attempt to consider the correct reading of the date on the inscription. In view of the fact that evidence has been forwarded to show that the dating by the animal-year was known to have existed in inscriptions as early as1041 A.D.[75] and that there are a number of examples of Buddha images having a mixed heritage of styles as Grahi Buddha[76] which can be dated to the twelfth century A.D. it is possible to say that Grahi Buddha belonged to the same hood. Furthermore, period as the inscription and the *Naga*-hood. Furthermore, it is meaningless to have another Buddha replacing the original Buddha to which the inscription has been dedicated. The implication of the similarity of the dynastic title of the Buddha Grahi inscription and the Rambahan, the Amoghapasa image (1286 A.D.) and Rambahan II, the Bhairava image (1347 A.D.) once again indicating the close political relationship between the two areas. Grahi then must be at Chaiya as suggested by Paul

---

68 *Ibid.*, 32.
69 *Ibid.*, 32.
70 *Ibid.*, 33.
71 P. Dupont, "Varieties, archeologiques, Le Buddha de Grahi et l'ecole de C'aiya", *BEFEO*, 42, 1942, 105-13, Pls. VI-VII; J.G de Casparis, "The date of Buddha Grahi", 33.
72 *Ibid.*, 31-40; see also Reginald le May, *A concise history of Buddhist art,* 49.
73 J.G de Casparis, "The date of Buddha Grahi", 34.
74 *Ibid.*, 35-36.
75 H.W. Woodward, "Studies in the art of Central Siam, 950-1350" *Ph.D. Thesis,* Yale University, Vol. 1, 1975, 91-101.
76 *Ibid.*, 91-101.

Wheatley.[77] Presumably, the Maharaja belonged to the ruling family of S. Tvijaya at Jambi.

Nakhon Si Thammarat and environs: archaeological sites and settlements

Nakhon Si Thammarat is also known as Nagara Sri Dharmaraja. But to the local people it is simply called, Lakhon and in the Malay history it has always been Ligor. The town of Nakhon Si Thammarat is about 96 kilometres to the south-east of Chaiya. It is about 8 kilometres from the coast, but in the past it must have been very much closer. To the west of the town is the Nakhon Si Thammarat Range which rises to a height of about 2000 metres. Just like Chaiya and other towns in Peninsular Thailand, its location offers a variety of occupational outlets to the people such as rice-growing, fishing, rubber-tapping and industrial enterprise. According to the economic census, Nakhon Si Thammarat and Songkhla have the largest share of the industrial enterprises in Peninsular Thailand.[78]

The town of Nakhon Si Thammarat can be divided into two main areas. The area that lies within a walled enclosure has many religious structures. It is situated to the south of the more modern part of the town. The southern most part of the old town has many ruins of temples and also ruins of ancient walls. According to the,report of Lajonquière, in 1912 there were as many as fifty monastries in the town but many of them were in ruins.[79] Today, the number is very much less but it still provides a visitor with an impression of being crowded with them. Those that survived are active centres of Buddhist religion. Most of the surviving temples and also those in ruins are believed to have belonged to the Thai period. This assumption is based on the stylistic observation where they show styles of Ayutthayan and later Thai periods in their architecture. The surviving temples must have been restored many times. Among the few temples that have been classified as pre-Thai period are the miniature shrine in the court yard of Wat Pra That, the inner part of Wat Pra That itself, the Siva temple called Ho Pra Tsuon,[80] and another Siva temple situated about 200 metres to the south and was deserted about 80 years ago.[81]

Wat Prathat has been the most revered Buddhist shrine in Nakhon Si Thammarat area. It is very imposing with its bell-shaped *stupa* surrounded by 160 smaller *stupas*.[82] It has been suggested that the shrine was modified to its present

77 Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese,* 71.

78 W. Donner, *The five faces of Thailand,* 528.

79 Lunet de Lajonquière, "Essai d'inventaire du Siam", 148.

80 For the description and location of the temple, see H.G. Quaritch-Wales "A newly explored route of Indian cultural expansion", 23.

81 *Ibid.,* 25.

82 For its plan and elevation, see the drawings in Lunet de Lajonquière, "Essai d'inventaire du Siam", 149.

architectural form in about the last quarter of the 13th century A.D. The style chosen was due to influence from Sri Lanka.[83] Many Thai monks went to Sri Lanka for ordination after the Thai kingdom of Sukhodayya made its initial contacts with the fountain head of Theravada Buddhism, Sri Lanka, in about the last quarter of the thirteenth century A.D.[84]

M. Claeys who provided plan and elevation of a small reliquary in the court yard of Wat Prathat suggested that it represents afminiature reproduction of the original shrine of Wat Prathat.[85] The original shrine was encased in the present day Wat Prathat. The custom of encasing an older shrine in a later one was widespread. It was practised by Monks, Javanese and Thai. In the case of the custom of reconstructing a replica of the original temple has been noted by M. Claeys in Bejraphuri Nagara Pathma, and Chiang Mai.[86] The style of the reliquary is reminiscent of the general style of Wat Pra That in Chaiya.

Lajonquière,[87] M. Claeys,[88] Coedes,[89] Alastair Lamb[90] and O'Connor[91] have made significant contributions to the knowledge of the archaeology of Nakhon Si Thammarat and its environs. But only Quaritch-Wales conducted excavations.[92] His excavation site was at the deserted Siva temple in the southern part of the town. From the remains of structures he noticed vestiges of Javanese architectural style which both he and M. Claeys had noticed in the Siva temple sheltered under the wooden shed, the Ho Pra Tsuon temple.[93] But the views cannot be verified with certainty because the site which he had excavated has been destroyed. On the evidence of the Sung type of ceramics, it is possible that the site may be dated to a period not earlier than 10th or 11th century.

There is other evidence for the antiquity of Hindu practice in Nakhon Si Thammarat area. Among these are the Visuu images, *lingas* and inscriptions. The Visnu images which are kept in the museum within the precinct of Wat Pra-that bear very close resemblance in style to the Chaiya Visnu. Stanley O'Connor who was the first to study these images believes that they belonged to the seventh century A.D.[94]

---

83 Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam,* 22 note 14. He quoted the view put forward by A.B. Griswold and Prince Damrong Rajanubhab.

84 *Ibid.,* 22.

85 M. Claeys, "L'archeologie du Siam", 374-377, Fig. 39, Pl. xxxvii; Fig. 4.

86 *Ibid.,* 374.

87 Lunet de Lajonquière, "Essai d'inventaire du Siam".

88 M. Claeys, "L'archeologie du Siam".

89 G. Coedès, "Les collections archeologiques du Musee National de Bangkok".

90 Alastair Lamb, "Miscellaneous papers on early Hindu and Buddhist settlements in northern Malaya and Southern Thailand".

91 Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam,* "Si Chon: an early settlement in Peninsular Siam," *JSS,* 56, 1 (1968), 1-18.

92 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of Indian cultural expansion".

93 *Ibid.,* 24 and M. Claeys, "L'archeologie du Siam", 377.

94 Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam,* figs. 2 and 3.

The existence of *lingas* in Nakhon Si Thammarat area was first noted by Lajonquière in his report on the Siva temples.[95] He mentioned five *lingas*, four of which according to him were designed in three sections; a square base, octagonal middle portion, and a rounded upper portion with a ridge in the middle representing the frenum. These *lingas* must have been those that are now in the museum at Nakhon Si Thammarat. In view of the fact that the liAgas from the Malay Peninsula and Sumatra will be dealt with in detail later, it is sufficient to agree with O'Connor at the moment that they suggest an early date. But the question of their stylistic relationship with Oc-Eo area and the early sixth or seventh century date which Stanley O'Connor proposes cannot be, settled at.the moment by just using the criteria "greater or less realism" for the dating of *lingas* without considering other related evidence.[96]

The testimony of the antiquity of Hindu practice from epigraphy is attested by the inscribed granite slab which is not included in the inscriptions edited by Coedès. This inscription was photographed by Alastair Lamb in 1961 and is now in the Nakhon Si Thammarat museum.[97] De Casparis, who read the inscription from the photograph saw a reference to Siva, and he also dated the inscription to a period not later than sixth century on the basis of the script used.[98] Of other inscriptions from the museum, one is the illegible inscription of eight lines which has been recognised as Tamil inscription dating to the Cola period.[99] The other is the single line inscription on the stairway near the door to the museum which Coedès dated to the fifth or sixth century because of the archaism of the script used.[100] The third inscription in the museum is the 14-line Tamil inscription which, among other things, mentions Dharmasenapati. Dharmasenapati must be the ruler or the governor responsible for giving the order for the inscription to be inscribed. The date of the inscription is believed to be ninth to eleventh century.[102]

The other very important inscription is the inscription of Candrabhanu. It has a date of kaliyuga 4332 which according to Coedès is equivalent to 1230 A.D.[103] The inscription was edited by Coedès and he attributed its provenance as Wat Hua Wiang in Chaiya. But it is now believed that its provenance was Nakhon Si Thammarat in view of the fact that its provenance was mixed up with that of the Ligor inscription. Candrabhanu had the title Sri Dharmaraja and was "the Lord of Tambralinga".

---

95 Lunet de Lajonquière, "Essai dl inventaire du Siam", 178.

96 See Stanley O'Connor, *Hindu Gods of Peninsular Siam,* 23-24.

97 Alastair Lamb, "Miscellaneous papers on early Hindu and Buddhist settlement in northern Malaya and Southern Thailand", 70, Pl. 117.

98 *Ibid.*, 70.

99 G. Coedès, "Recueil des inscriptions du Siam", 1, 37.

100 *Ibid.*, 37.

101 *Ibid.*, 38-40.

102 *Ibid.*, 38.

103 *Ibid.*, 25-28; Nilakanta Sastri, *The History of Srivijaya,* 133-134 provided the English translation.

Several scholars have attempted to speculate on the whereabouts of *Tambralinga.* Three Chinese place-name transcriptions have been associated with it. They are *Tan-mei-liu* in respect of 1101 A.D., *Teng-liu-mei* and *Tan-ma-ling* in respect of 1225 A.D.[104] Among the three, only *Tan-ma-ling* could possibly be associated with *Tambralinga* on the evidence of the geographical and historical descriptions attributed to those places.[105] As late as 1225 A.D. it appears that the area still retains relationship with Srivijaya.[106] According to Coedès, *Tan-ma-ling* seemed a probable rendering of "Madamalingam" which appeared in the list of Cola targets in the Tanjore inscription of 1030-1 A.D. referring to the great raids of 1025.[107] The geographical identity of *Tambralinga* has been established with some degree of certainty now even though in the past scholars such as Takakusu, Schelegel, Pelliot and Gerini favoured its location to be outside the Nakhon Si Thammarat area. Scholars such as Paul Wheatley[108] and Wolters[109] locate the site in the Nakhon Si Thammarat area. Paul Wheatley, for instance, believes that *Tambralinga, Madamalingam* and *Tan-ma-ling* all refer to "a state in the Ligor district".[110] The Candrabhanu inscription is an allusion to the Nakhon Si Thammarat area and according to the inscription of Rama Khamheng of 1292, Nagarli Sri Dharmaraja was the later Thai name for the area.[111]

Tambrilinga as a kingdom must have existed prior to 1025 A.A. in view of the fact that *Madamalingam,* the Cola name for *Tambrilinga,* was among the countries raided. The raids have been associated with a Cola's attempt to break the commercial power of Srivijaya.[113] The existence of Candrabhanu inscription may indicate that by 1230 Timbrilifiga was already an independent state. But in 1225, according to Chau Ju-kua, *Tan-ma-ling* was still a dependency of Srivijaya. We are not certain what degree of political control Srivijaya had and the location of its capital during that time. Nevertheless, after the Cola raids, Nakhon Si Thammarat area and Chaiya area were still under the influence of Srivijaya on the evidence from Chau Ju-kua. The evidence from the Grahi Buddha inscription shows that the family ruling at Chaiya and that of Padang Lawas area in Sumatra came from an identical lineage as we have seen in the earlier discussion. But little is known of the extent, north or south of *Tambrilinga.* To the south it may have bordered the state of *Langkasuka* which scholars, to day, tend to locate in the Patani area. To the

104 O.W. Wolters, "Tambralifiga" *BSOAS*, 21, 3 (1958), 589.
105 Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese,* 66-67.
106 F. Hirth and W.W. Rockhill, *Chau Ju-kua,* 53, 57-58.
107 G. Coedès, "Les Royaume de Çrivijaya" *BEFEO,* 18, 1918, 6, 15-18. O.W. Wolters, "Tambralinga", 589.
108 *Ibid.,* 587.
109 Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese,* 67.
110 *Ibid.*, 67.
111 See G. Coedes, "Recueil des inscriptions du Siam", 1. 48.
112 O.W. Wolters, "Tambralinga" 592.
113 F. Hirth and W.W. Rockhill, *Chau Ju-kua,* 65 note I.

north it may have extended as far as the Chaiya area.

Several archaeological sites outside the town have been located. Three sites are known to have existed in the vicinity of a village called Si Chon.[114] The village is located on the east coast between the Bay of Bandon and Nakhon Si Thammarat. It is about 60 kilometres north of Nakhon Si Thammarat from where it can be reached by road, which appears to cross an ancient beach.

The three sites are at Wat Jom Tong, Wat Sra Si Mum and Na Khou Ban. Outside Si Chon is another site. It is called Khao Ca. All these sites have yielded both Hindu and Buddhist artifacts.[115] Some of these are still at the sites while others have been removed and kept in private collections by various people in Si Chon and Nakhon Si Thammarat.

At Wat Jom Tong, the finds are a male figure with four arms, wearing conical headdress and *dhoti*, and presumably a Visnu on the stylistic evidence; two stucco heads (male and female); a Buddhist votive tablet. At the village of Na Khom, south of Si Chon, among the finds are the remains of an ancient structure, five *lingas* and an ancient tank. A very rare artifact, a crystal *linga* was kept in the Wat Sra Si Alum. It is the only known example from South East Asia.[116]

Another very important site located in the Nakhon Si Thammarat area is Wiang Sa. It is situated in the Luong River Valley. Archaeological finds from the area have been described by Lajonquière,[117] Coedès[118] and Quaritch-Wales.[119] There were traces of an ancient settlement. The area was bounded by a narrow moat and mound on the south and east sides respectively, and by a stream which is a branch of Luong River on the other two sides. A number of finds were made by Quaritch-Wales when he excavated a site within the ancient settlement which he called San Pra Narai.[120] The finds included a brick structure, a few pieces of earthenware sherds and a 17 cm high sandstone Buddhist figure identified as Buddha by Griswold.[121] It was reported also that a Visnu image which resembled the Pra No Hill Takuapa Visnu was also recovered from Wiang Sa.[122]

From Srivijaya Hill, asite situated between Bandon and Surat came a stone Visnu image which is now in the National Museum Bangkok,[123] and two sandstone

---

114 The existence of these sites was reported by Stanley O'Connor, "Si Chon: an early settlement in Peninsular Thailand", *JSS,* 56, 1 (1968), 1-18.

115 *Ibid.*

116 *Ibid.*

117 Lunet de Lajonquière, "Essai d'inventaire du Siam".

118 G. Coedès, "Les collections archeologique du Musèe National Bangkok".

119 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of the ancient Indian cultural expansion".

120 *Ibid.*, 17-18.

121 A.B. Griswold, "Imported images and the nature of copying in the art of Siam", *AA* (Suppl. 2), 1966, Fig. 22.

122 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A newly explored route of the Indian cultural expansion" 18; G. Coedes, "Les collections archeologique du Siam" Pl. IX.

123 *Ibid.*, 19, Pl. X.

images of a Visnu and Siva in his terrible form which are also in the National Museum, Bangkok.[124] Tha.Sala, another site located on the coast just to the north of Nakhon Si Thammarat produced two very interesting finds. The first is that of a stone image wearing a long dhoti but lacking head and arms and height about 70 cm and the second is a torso, height 54 cm.[125] They are both believed to be that of Visnu on the assumption that the style of the sculpture particularly the *dhoti* which are identical to the style common to the images of Visnu in the peninsula. These finds are now in the Nakhon Si Thammarat Museum.

On the evidence of the archaeological finds from sites such as Wiang Sa. Tha Sala, Srivijaya Hill and Si Chon in the area between Nakhon Si Thammarat and Chaiya, it appears that the whole fertile lands were dotted.with settlements that practised Hindu and Buddhist religions from as early as the fifth or sixth century A.D. or earlier. There was the kingdom of *P'an-p'an* with its capital at Chaiya in the fourth century or earlier century controlling the area. By 775 A.D. Srivijayan influence was dominant in the area and presumably both Chaiya and Nakhon Si Thammarat were under one kingdom. By the year 1186 A.D., on the evidence of the Grahi Buddha inscription the area was under the kingdom of *Grahi* which had political connections with the ruling family in the Batangttari River Valley area. Presumably with the rise of the kingdom of *Tambralinga* in the thirteenth century, the whole area came under the rule of King Candrabhanu of *Tambralinga.*

Sathingphra and Patani area

Sathingphra is situated about 32 kilometres to the north of Songkhla, on the narrow Sathingphra Peninsula which has on its west the four inland lakes: Thala Noi, Thala Luang, Thala Sap and Thala Sap Songkhla. The Peninsula borders the Gulf of Thailand. The old town of Songkhla is on the southern tip of the peninsula. The Peninsula is about 75 kilometres long and 4.5 kilometres broad. The modern town of Songkhla is opposite the old town at the entrance to the Thala Sap Songkhla. It is believed that the Gulf of Thailand a thousand years ago, reached up to Phathalung and that the Sathingphra Peninsula was an island. The town of Sathingphra was at the tip of the island in the north while old Songkhla was at the southern tip.

There is an area in Sathingphra where remains of an ancient site has been located. It has an area of about 120 metres square. It is surrounded by a low brick wall and a moat, about 70 metres from the sea. The area is made up of sandy soil and the surrounding area is strewn with ceramics with many fragments of Sung type celadons.

---

124 *Ibid.*, 19.

125 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "Langkasuka and Tambralinga some archaeological notes" *JMBRAS,* 47, 1 (1974), 39, Pl. 14.

The Peninsula from Ranot to old Songkhla is dotted with many monumental remains. A record of the monuments is kept by the Fine Arts Department at Songkhla. Among the monuments which have been designated by the Fine Arts Department to the Srivijayan period are Wat Sii Yang, Wat Chedi Ngam, and Wat Sathingphra. They are *stupas* built on a cruciform plan. These *stupas* have undergone restorations just as other monuments in other areas. Nevertheless, the basic plan has been retained. It is on the evidence of this basic structure that they have been thus classified.

About 80 kilometres to the southeast of Songkhla is Patani, the capital of Patani District. It is the southernmost part of the ninth administrative region of the Fine Arts Department of Thailand, the headquarters of which is at Songkhla. Patani is situated on the bank of the Patani River and on the coast of the Gulf of Thailand. The town is closely linked with other areas in Peninsular Thailand by roads. It has strong traditional links with the east coast state of Peninsular Malayasia, Kelantan, as the majority of the population are of the Malay ethnic stock and many of them have relatives in Kelantan, since the existence of large rubber plantations in Patani and its environs have attracted people of Kelantan to go and work there.

Interest in the archaeology of Patani area can be attributed to the belief that Patani area was the location of the kingdom of *Langkasuka.* Articles dealing with archaeological finds from Sathingphra area and Patani District started to be published from 1964. The scholars that contributed their archaeological knowledge of the two areas are Alastair Lamb,[126] O'Connor,[127] Quaritch Wales[128] and Janice Stargadt.[129] Alastair Lamb published and described the ceramics and bronze images from Sathingphra area that are in the museum at Songkhla, the Wat Matchemawas.[130] The images comprised a bronze bust of Avalokitesvara, a bronze standing Siva, a seated bronze Kuvera, a seated bronze bodhisattva, a standing bronze bodhisattva and a standing figure. The ceramics included both stonewares and eartbenwares. They very closely resemble those of Pengkalan Bujang but are not necessarily identical. This is due to the fact that the majority of them belonged to the late Sung and early Ming type. Sawangkalok wares which are not common in Pengkalan Bujang are in great numbers at Sathingphra. Beads from Sathingphra are of glass and very small in number and variety. Other glass objectes which are very common in the Pengkalan Bujang sites are unknown to Sathingphra.

The differences in the detail components of the archaeological finds from Pengkalan Bujang and Sathingphra area perhaps should not be attributed to

---

126 Alastair Lamb, "Notes on Sathingphra", 74-87.

127 Stanley O'Connor, "An early Brahmanic, Songkhla" *JSS* , 52, 2, (1964), 163-169; 'Sathingphra an expanded chronology" *JMBRAS*, 39, 1 (966), 137-144.

128 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A stone casket from Sathingphra" *JSS,* 52, 2 (1964), 217-223.

129 Janice Stargadt "Southern Thai waterwyas. Archaeological evidence on agriculture, shipping and trade in the Srivijayan period" *MAN,* 8, 1 (1973), 7.

130 Alastair Lamb, "Notes on Sathingphra", 74-87.

difference in period but rather to the failure to carry out proper archaeological excavation in the area. The ceramics, many still intact, in the collection are from random discoveries. But those from Pengkalan Bujang are in fragments. There is reason to believe that at Sathingphra there could be sites which have ceramics belonging to the phase similar to the Pengkalan Bujang phase, the site near to the older part of Sathingphra yielded Sung celadon sherds but no blue and white ceramic sherds. Perhaps if excavation is carried out in the area a more reliable result would be achieved.

There is an interesting find in the museum at Sathingphra, a stone casket with five chambers.[131] This reminds us of the stone caskets found *in situ* in the Pengkalan Bujang sites. The difference is that the stone caskets from Pengkalan Bujang have nine chambers. Presumably, they share a common function, to hold foundation deposits serving to consecrate a temple site, though only if they contain gems and religious symbols but not ashes.[132] The sites that yielded the stone caskets are believed to belong to the period after the tenth century.

Stanley O'Connor described and discussed three stone Hindu sculptures which are kept in the museum at Songkhla.[133] They are a broken torso which he identified as the mitred type of Visnu, another standing stone Visnu and a stone Ganesa. On the evidence of the three stone sculptures, it is possible that developed settlements already existed in the Sathingphra Peninsula by at least the sixth century. 500 By the thirteenth century the area was flourishing from the evidence of ceramics, pointing to a demand for luxury goods.

In Patani district, there is a site which has come to the notice of scholars interested in the history of the Malay Peninsula. The site is near Yarang. It is situated on the bank of the Patani River and is about 20 kilometres from Patani town. Paul Wheatley and Roland Bradell have made it clear that the capital of *Langkasuka* was in the Patani District. With the discovery of the ancient site at Yarang, Thai archaeologists in Southern Thailand are of the opinion that they have discovered the site of the capital of *Langkasuka.*

The site is located about 5 kilometres from Yarang. A rough sketch of the site has been published by Quaritch-Wales.[135] The area of the site is more than 1100 x 1100 m. It is surrounded by three concentric ramparts. The finds that are known to have come from the site are terracotta votive, *stupa* finial, *dharmacakra* from greenish stone, an image of Buddha from greenish stone, stone bas-relief of Buddha

131 Alastair Lamb, "Notes on Sathingphra" 85, fig. 1; and E.G. Quaritch-Wales, "A stone casket from Sathingphra", Plate opposite to page 218.

132 *Ibid.,* 218.

133 Stanley O'Connor, "An early Brahmanical sculpture at Songkhla" *JSS,* 52, 2 (1964), 163-169, figs. 1-3.

134 *Ibid.,* 166. He dated the image as sixth century A.D.

135 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "Tambralinga and Langkasuka: some archaeological notes" 15-18, fig. 2.

under the Bo tree, a stone door sill and a polished granite *linga.*[136] These finds indicate a date in the range of sixth and early ninth century. This is based on the style of the Buddha image and the *dharmacakra* which have Dvaravati characteristics. At the moment, there is no report of the discovery of any ceramics or sculpture with characteristics similar to those found in Sathinghphra, Nakhon Si Thammarat area of Chaiya and attributed to Srivijayan period.

Other sites in the Sathingphra and Patani districts that have produced archaeological finds that belonged to the period prior to the fourteenth century are Pathallung, Yala and Sungei Kolok. The caves at Pathallung and Yala produced numerous examples of votive tablets which are attributed to the ninth and tenth century period. At Sungei Kolok, a bronze image of a standing Buddha which can be dated to the second half of the fifth century was found.[137]

The evidence from Sathingphra and Patani districts show that settlements with a rather complex state of development had evolved at the latest in the sixth century. This dating fits in with the Chinese textual evidence as summarised by Paul Wheatley of the presence of a kingdom called *Langkasuka* believed to be located in the Patani District.[138] There is not enough evidence to locate with certainty in any specific part of Sathingphra or Patani District. But Quaritch-Wales argues that the site of *Langkasuka* was at Yarang,[139] his arguments being based on the finds mentioned earlier. The kingdom of *Langkasuka* was possibly of early foundation but it long formed part of the Fu-nan kingdom and emerged as an independent kingdom in the sixth century. In the sixth century, it sent four embassies to China.[140] During the seventh century it was a regular port of call on the sea route to India. T'ang histories omitted it from their records and its importance waned during the ninth and tenth century. At that time it came under the influence of Srivijaya and it was raided by Cola in the eleventh century.[141] Chau Ju-kua in 1225 claimed that Langkasuka was still under Srivijayan influence.[142] The site of Langkasuka after the ninth century was not at Yarang but at Sathingphra accordimg to Quaritch-Wales.[143] Archaeological evidence tends to suggest that the whole area between Patani and Sathingphra could be the area under the kingdom of Langkasuka with the capital at Yarang from the sixth to the thirteenth century. There is no evidence to suggest that its capital was transferred.

---

136 *Ibid.*, Pl. 1-8.
137 See, A.B. Griswold, "Imported images and the nature of copying in the art of Siam", 55, Pl. 5.
138 Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese,* 263-264.
139 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "Tambralinga and Langkasuka: some archaeological notes" 15-28.
140 Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese,* 264.
141 *Ibid.*
142 *Ibid.*
143 H.G. Quaritch-Wales, "Tambralinga and Langkasuka: some archaeological notes", 28.