

Asia Research Institute

Working Paper Series

No. 37

Champa revised

Michael Vickery

vickery_michael@hotmail.com

March 2005



The **ARI Working Paper Series** is published electronically by the Asia Research Institute of the National University of Singapore.

© Copyright is held by the author or authors of each Working Paper.

ARI Working Papers cannot be republished, reprinted, or reproduced in any format without the permission of the paper's author or authors.

Note: The views expressed in each paper are those of the author or authors of the paper. They do not necessarily represent or reflect the views of the Asia Research Institute, its Editorial Committee or of the National University of Singapore.

Citations of this electronic publication should be made in the following manner: Author, "Title," ARI Working Paper, No. #, Date, www.nus.ari.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm. For instance, Smith, John, "Ethnic Relations in Singapore," ARI Working Paper, No. 1, June 2003, www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm.

Asia Research Institute Editorial Committee

Geoffrey Wade

Tim Winter

Shen Hsiu-Hua

Manjit Kaur

Asia Research Institute

National University of Singapore

Shaw Foundation Building, Block AS7, Level 4

5 Arts Link, Singapore 117570

Tel: (65) 6874 3810

Fax: (65) 6779 1428

Website: www.ari.nus.edu.sg

Email: arisec@nus.edu.sg

The Asia Research Institute (ARI) was established as a university-level institute in July 2001 as one of the strategic initiatives of the National University of Singapore (NUS). The mission of the Institute is to provide a world-class focus and resource for research on the Asian region, located at one of its communications hubs. ARI engages the social sciences broadly defined, and especially interdisciplinary frontiers between and beyond disciplines. Through frequent provision of short-term research appointments it seeks to be a place of encounters between the region and the world. Within NUS it works particularly with the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Business, Law and Design, to support conferences, lectures, and graduate study at the highest level.

Champa revised*

Michael Vickery

As the title of this paper implies, I consider that the history of Champa, which, as a whole, has hardly been given critical study since Georges Maspéro's 1928 book, is in need of revision.¹

The important points which require revision are the following:

(a) The origins of the Austronesian-speaking Cham who now live in Vietnam and Cambodia.

(b) The Linyi problem. Was Linyi identical with Champa, from the beginning of records concerning it, or from a later date, or if not, what was it?²

(c) Relations with Vietnam, in particular the notion that Champa, including Linyi, was always a victim of expansionism by its northern neighbor.

(d) The narrative of the history of Champa as conceived by Maspéro. Although his book received critical attention soon after its publication and more thoroughly later on from Rolf Stein, his main conclusions passed literally into the famous synthesis by Georges Coedès, and have continued to exert strong influence on further work, including total acceptance by some linguists within the last decade.³

This revision includes examination of the political-administrative status of the areas inhabited by the Cham as identified by architectural and epigraphic remains and extending from

*The assistance of Bruce Lockhart in preparing this manuscript for publication is gratefully acknowledged—ARI Working Papers Series editor.

¹ Georges Maspéro, *Le Royaume de Champa* (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient reprint, 1988); the original imprint was Paris and Brussels: Éd. G. Van Oest, 1928.

² I have decided on this spelling of 'Linyi'. Usage in Vietnam today drops the hyphen which formerly separated the elements of two-term geographical names. It has usually been spelled Lin-I or Lin-Yi, as in Rolf Stein, *Le Lin-Yi, sa localisation, sa contribution à la formation du Champa et ses liens avec la Chine*, in *Han-Hiue, Bulletin du Centre d'Études Sinologiques de Pékin*, 2 (1947). Toponyms and names of Champa temples will also be spelled as in current Vietnamese literature.

³ Louis Finot, review of Maspéro, *Le Royaume de Champa*, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* (henceforth *BEFEO*), 28 (1928): 285-92; reprinted in the 1988 edition of Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*; George Coedès, *Histoire ancienne des états hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient* (Hanoi: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient, 1944); Coedès, *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie* (Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1948); Coedès, *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie*, rev. edn (Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1964); Coedès, *The Indianized states of Southeast Asia*, ed. Walter F. Vella, tr. Sue Brown Cowing (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1968); Graham Thurgood, *From ancient Cham to modern dialects, two thousand years of language contact and change* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1999).

Quảng Bình to south of Phan Rang. That is, was there a single unitary state/kingdom of Champa, as depicted in the standard classical scholarship, a federation of polities dominated by the Austronesian-speaking Cham, or two or more quite distinct, sometimes competing, polities?⁴

Sources

There are three types of sources for Champa history: (1) physical remains – brick structures considered to be temples, associated sculpture, and materials obtained from archaeological excavation; (2) inscriptions in Old Cham and Sanskrit; and (3) references in Chinese and Vietnamese histories about relations between those countries and the various polities south of the Chinese provinces in what is now northern Vietnam and, after the late tenth century south, of territory claimed by Vietnam.

Physical remains

The physical remains above ground, the temples, show through their architecture at least three regions which began their development at approximately the same time – roughly, on that evidence, the eighth to ninth centuries. However, it is certain that there was earlier architecture which has disappeared and that the real beginnings were earlier. From North to South these regions are (1) Quảng Nam, in particular the Thu Bồn valley, the location of Mỹ Sơn, Trà Kiệu and Đồng Dương; (2) the region of Nha Trang with the Pô Nagar complex, and (3) the region of Phan Rang, where parts of Hòa Lai may date back to the eighth century, and which should perhaps be considered to include the structures of Pô Dam and Phan Thiết farther South.⁵

⁴ For the early historians and epigraphers of Champa it was assumed that there had been a single Champa from the appearance of Linyi. See Étienne Aymonier, 'Première étude sur les inscriptions tchames', *Journal Asiatique* (henceforth *JA*), *série* 8, 17 (1891): 5-86; Louis Finot, 'Stèle de Śambhuvarman à Mi-so'n', *BEFEO*, 3 (1903): 206-11; Louis Finot, 'Notes d'épigraphie VI: Inscriptions de Quảng Nam', *BEFEO*, 4 (1904): 83-115 (see p. 113); Finot, 'Notes d'épigraphie XI: Les inscriptions de Mi-so'n', *BEFEO*, 4 (1904): 897-977; Finot, 'Les inscriptions du Musée de Hanoi', *BEFEO*, 15 (1915): 1-19; Paul Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIIIe siècle', *BEFEO*, 4 (1904): 131-385; and the sources cited in the previous footnote. More recent studies which treat Champa as a federation can be found in *Actes du séminaire sur le Campā, organisé à l'Université de Copenhague le 23 mai 1987* (Paris: Centre d'Histoire et Civilisations de la Péninsule Indochinoise, 1988).

⁵ William Aelred Southworth, 'The origins of Campā in Central Vietnam, a preliminary review' (Ph.D. diss., School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 2001), pp. 416-7. Table 3 shows the architectural sequence proposed by Philippe Stern, *L'art du Champa (ancien Annam) et son évolution* (Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve, 1942), and Table 4 Southworth's revised proposal. He has omitted any reference to Pô Nagar of Nha Trang, even though his table is

Another region where the temple remains are quantitatively very significant is around Quy Nhơn, but the structures there have been dated to the eleventh to thirteenth centuries, with no earlier remains.

All of these regions were located at very good river-mouth ports or on rivers not far from the sea. One ancient site in the Thu Bồn valley where complete above-ground structures had disappeared by the time the subject received modern interest, but where impressive sculpture was still found, is Trà Kiệu, some 20-30 km from Mỹ Sơn; its importance since perhaps the first century has been revealed by archaeology.⁶

There are two more rivers which must have been important in early Champa, although so far they have not received adequate attention. One – which, as I shall show, has never been given the attention it deserves – is the Trà Kúk in Quảng Ngãi, with two citadels: Châu Sa (apparently a large fortified city) and Cổ Lũy (where some important sculpture, perhaps dating from the seventh to eighth centuries, has been found). The citadels are on either side of the river near its mouth, along with the remains of a temple with interesting sculpture, Chánh Lộ, dated to the eleventh century. The relative neglect of Châu Sa by the early explorers was probably because they found no impressive temples, and only one inscription.⁷ The other river is the Đà Rằng (Sông Ba), which flows into the sea at Tuy Hòa, between Quy Nhơn and Nha Trang; it is the largest river valley in Vietnam. Remains from different periods have been found along its length, a fifth-century Sanskrit inscription at its mouth, and the later citadel of Thành Hồ (larger than Châu Sa) about 15 km inland. It was no doubt an important route far into the interior.⁸

One more neglected area is that of Champa's northernmost expansion in Quảng Trị and Quảng Bình, apparently during the ninth to tenth centuries, when Indrapura and the temple of Đồng Dương were flourishing and when impressive related Mahayana sites developed in Ron/Bắc Hạ, Đại Hữu, Mỹ Đức and Hà Trung.⁹ The area was probably included in the domain

entitled 'Localised sequence of the architecture of Campā up to the beginning of the eleventh century CE', a time period from which parts of Pô Nagar may not be omitted.

⁶ Ibid., citing earlier work by Claeys and Glover.

⁷ This is the case even when the inscription (C61) is cited, as in Édouard Huber, 'L'épigraphie de la dynastie de Đồng Dương', *BEFEO*, 11 (1911) 282; Finot, 'Inscriptions du Musée', p. 11; Southworth, 'Origins of Campā', pp. 149, 151. For Chánh Lộ see Jean Boisselier, *La statuaire du Champa* (Paris: Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1963, p. 214.

⁸ Charles Higham, *The archaeology of mainland Southeast Asia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 304-5; Ngô Văn Doanh, *Champa ancient towers: Reality & legend* (Hanoi: Institute for South-East Asian Studies, 2002), pp. 281-92.

⁹ Boisselier, *Statuaire du Champa*, pp. 118, 101, 133-9, 141, 147-8, 276.

of Maspéro's 'sixth dynasty', but its monuments had not been studied when he was writing, and the region has never been given the importance it deserves. Moreover, its significance has been obscured in the literature by assigning its work to 'styles' named for centers farther south, such as Đồng Dương, Mỹ Sơn, etc.¹⁰ Requisite attention to this area will force reinterpretation of the history of events in the tenth to eleventh centuries.

It must be emphasized that the dating of many of the architectural remains and surface finds of sculpture must still be considered tentative because it is based on reasoning no longer accepted. Examples include Mỹ Sơn E-1, dated by reference to a Cambodian sculpture over 700 km distant with a vaguely associated inscription; the edifice at Hòa Lai (Phan Rang), whose dating has been influenced by Damrei Krap (on Phnom Kulen in Cambodia), ultimately dated by a possibly mythical (i.e., not truly historical) section of the Cambodian Sdok Kak Thom inscription; the Tháp Mẫm style (in Bình Định) based on one of the more fictional treatments in Maspéro; and the Mỹ Sơn A1 style based first on a prejudice of Henri Parmentier and a misused inscription and now not clearly distinguished from Trà Kiệu, about which there is now much lack of agreement resulting from different Trà Kiệu styles discovered through field archaeology.¹¹ Thus, at this stage of research, architecture and sculpture are of little help in more than loose relative dating of the history of Champa.

Inscriptions

¹⁰ Examples are L'Association Française des Amis de l'Orient, *Le Musée de sculpture Caü de Đà Nẵng* (Paris: Éditions de l'AFAO, 1997), p. 142, no. 121, from Hà Trung (Mỹ Sơn style); p. 144, no. 124, from Đại An (Mỹ Sơn style); and p. 175, no. 192, from Mỹ Đức (Đồng Dương style).

¹¹ Stern, *Art du Champa*, p. 70, in spite of having claimed not to have used any inscription in his dating of the monuments, dated Damrei Krap to the early ninth century (around 802) on the basis of the story of Jayavarman II in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription of Cambodia (AD 1052), but with the date 802 attributed to Jayavarman from other late inscriptions. For Mỹ Sơn A1, Stern pointed out (p. 94) that Parmentier 'is working on the principle that the more perfect of two art forms is the older'. It was this preconception which resulted in the mistaken very early dating of Mỹ Sơn A-1, which then seemed supported by an early inscription which was found nearby but was not really related to the monument. For Tháp Mẫm Boisselier's treatment was awkward, perhaps because he too tamely follows Stern's denomination of it as Bình Định style. Boisselier first suggested that the style should have come soon after the capital allegedly moved to Bình Định (around 1000, according to Maspéro), but then, seeing the difficulty of that, he placed it – still awkwardly – in the twelfth century, where it certainly does not fit with the main standing monuments of that area, the towers around Quy Nhơn (Boisselier, *Statuaire du Champa*, pp. 223, 256-274, 308-9). Its monsters, nicely preserved in the Đà Nẵng museum, show Vietnamese/Chinese influence (Boisselier, pp. 291-3) and must be later, say fourteenth or even fifteenth century. As William Southworth (personal communication, 10 Nov. 2004), has also noted, 'The entire period and the whole of the Bình Định architectural and art historical sequence needs to be re-examined in much greater detail ... [and] the Tháp Mẫm site itself may in fact date from the late fourteenth to fifteenth centuries'.

The inscriptions of Champa are in two languages, Cham and Sanskrit. The inscription considered oldest on palaeographic grounds is that of Võ Cạnh, from a site near Nha Trang. It has been dated between the second and fourth centuries, and gave rise to a lengthy controversy as to whether it belonged to Champa or to a ruler of Funan occupying that region which was subsequently part of Champa. Coedès' final opinion, shared by Maspéro, was that it belonged to Funan, that the apparent chief named Śrī Māra was the Funan ruler known to the Chinese as 'Fan Shi Man', and that the religion of the time was Buddhism. That opinion prevailed until 1969, when Jean Filliozat argued that the title 'Māra' more probably derived from a Pandyan royal title, and that the content of the inscription could just as well imply Hinduism as Buddhism. This last treatment seems to show that the Võ Cạnh inscription may not be definitely ascribed to either Funan or Champa, and certainly not to Linyi.¹²

Now, however, William Southworth has called attention to certain features of the inscription's contents, which seem to reflect Austronesian society; if his argument is accepted, it may be reinstated as the first inscription of a Cham entity, although not of Linyi. As Southworth notes, following the translations of Filliozat and Claude Jacques,

the author of the inscription may not be a descendant of Śrī Māra at all, but a son-in-law who had married into the ruling matrilineage. The pivotal focus of this lineage is clearly the daughter of the grandson of Śrī Māra, to whose family the author belongs, and this female hierarchy is suggested by the content of the inscription.

That is, the type of donations described in the inscription are 'common in matrilineal societies', and the inscription was 'primarily motivated by indigenous social concerns'. The name Śrī Māra could still be of Tamil origin as proposed by Filliozat – learned by the Cham on their voyages to India and adapted for a time until the Sanskrit *varma* became popular in later times. Nha Trang, as Southworth describes it, was a port on 'the main maritime trade route through Southeast Asia' from India to northern Vietnam and southern China, 'providing a logical geographic and historical context for the carving of the Vo Canh inscription'.¹³ The inscription considered next oldest – from the fourth century, again based on palaeography – is the first Cham text, from

¹² Coedès, *Indianized states*, p. 40; Jean Filliozat, 'L'inscription dite de "Vô [sic]-Cạnh"', *BEFEO*, 55 (1969): 107-16; Claude Jacques, 'Notes sur la stèle de "Vô [sic]-Cạnh"', pp. 117-24 of the same issue; Michael Vickery, 'Funan reviewed: Deconstructing the ancients', *BEFEO*, 90-91 (2003-4): 101-43; and the discussion in Southworth, 'Origins of Campā', noted below.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 204-5.

Đông Yên Châu near Trà Kiệu. Found in the Thu Bồn area, not far from Mỹ Sơn, it is also the oldest writing in any Austronesian or Southeast Asian language.¹⁴

Both of these early inscriptions are isolated and may not be integrated with the rest of the corpus, surviving inscriptions of which are not distributed in total conformity with the physical remains. The first coherent group of inscriptions is linked with the early development of the Thu Bồn valley, site of Mỹ Sơn, at a time when there are only isolated texts elsewhere. From the fifth to the late eighth centuries, there are 20 inscriptions, all in Sanskrit and all but two located in or near Mỹ Sơn. According to statistics compiled by Southworth, 19 inscriptions with 279 lines of text are in Quảng Nam, with 12 inscriptions and 258 lines in Mỹ Sơn and only three inscriptions with 13 lines elsewhere.¹⁵ Then from the mid-eighth to mid-ninth centuries – between 774 and 854 – there is a coherent group of eight inscriptions in the South. Most of these are in Phan Rang but some are in Nha Trang; five of them are entirely or partly in Cham.

Following that, from 875 (or perhaps slightly earlier) until 965, there are 25 inscriptions ascribed to the Indrapura/Đông Dương dynasty – again in the North in the Thu Bồn area, but distinct from Mỹ Sơn. These inscriptions delineate a coherent area from Quảng Nam to Quảng Bình and include the only epigraphy in the published corpus found north of Huế. Four inscriptions of this group are in the South, and 16 are entirely or partly in Cham.¹⁶ One more Cham-language inscription, possibly related, is from Mỹ Sơn, dated 991 (on this see below).

Thereafter inscriptions are rather equally distributed between North and South until the early thirteenth century, after which there are 32 in the South and only six in Mỹ Sơn, the last dated in 1263. After 991, of the 75 known inscriptions until the last in 1456, only five are in Sanskrit (all of them before 1263), and the rest are in Cham. During the same period, there are 18 inscriptions from Mỹ Sơn until the last dated one in 1263 and another from the end of the twelfth

¹⁴ This earliest Cham inscription is C174, unknown to Maspéro and omitted in Anne-Valérie Schweyer, 'Chronologie des inscriptions publiées de Campā, Études d'épigraphie cam-1', *BEFEO*, 86 (1999): 321-44. See George Coedès, 'La plus ancienne inscription en langue chame', in *Eastern and Indian Studies in honour of F. W. Thomas, C. I. E.* (Bombay: New Indian Antiquary Extra Series I, No. 48), pp. 39-52..

¹⁵ Southworth, 'Origins of Campā', 241.

¹⁶ Anne-Valérie Schweyer, 'Le dynastie d'Indrapura (Quảng Nam, Viet Nam)', *Southeast Asian Archaeology 1998: Proceedings of the 7th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists*, ed. Wibke Lobo and Stefanie Reimann (Hull: University of Hull Centre for South to East Asian Studies, 1998), pp. 205-17; Schweyer, 'Chronologie des inscriptions'. Schweyer, 'La vaisselle en argent de la dynastie d'Indrapura (Quảng Nam, Việt Nam), Études d'épigraphie cam - II', *BEFEO*, 86 (1991): 345-55 proposed that the area of the inscriptions delineated the area under control of that dynasty. William Southworth objected very strongly to the use of Indrapura for more than the site of Đông Dương, and he apparently did not accept Schweyer's view of a dynasty; see Southworth, 'Notes on the political geography of Campā in central Vietnam during the late 8th and early 9th centuries AD', in Lobo and Reimann ed., *Southeast Asian Archaeology 1998*, pp. 237-44.

century *śaka*, two hundred years after the Champa kings had allegedly – according to Maspéro – been driven south to Vijaya under Vietnamese pressure, a circumstance which should force reconsideration of the relations between the two polities.

Peculiarly, Binh Định/Quy Nhơn, in spite of its obvious importance as revealed by brick towers and the apparent attention given it in Champa and Cambodian sources, has produced only seven very short inscriptions – all very late, and only one of which contains much of historical value (C53 and C54/1178-1278, C58/1259, C55/1265, C52/twelfth century *ś.*, C47/1401, C56/1456). All major inscriptions by rulers believed to have controlled Binh Định before the thirteenth century were engraved at Mỹ Sơn. (On this see further below in the section on ‘Vijaya’.)

The largest coherent and detailed body of inscriptions, at least a dozen texts, concerns the twelfth to early thirteenth century relations, almost entirely bellicose, with Cambodia. Detailed discussion of the inscriptions can be found in the section on narrative history below. The first work on Champa inscriptions began toward the end of the nineteenth century. Abel Bergaigne began summarizing information from the inscriptions in 1888, and published the Sanskrit texts in 1893. The first work on Cham-language inscriptions was by Étienne Aymonier in 1891. Then in a series of articles, Louis Finot treated both Sanskrit and Cham inscriptions, modifying on some points Aymonier’s interpretations of the latter. Further important work was done by Édouard Huber.¹⁷

There are still problems with the literal interpretation of some of the Cham-language texts. For most of the inscriptions treated in Aymonier’s 1891 article, he did not publish the text itself, nor try to offer a full translation, but only gave a summary of important details. Obviously, some of these will require new interpretation when eventually given attention by a competent Chamist. When Louis Finot continued the work of publishing and translating the Cham inscriptions, he usually chose texts which Aymonier had not treated; and since he was not a specialist in the language, it is not possible to accept all of his translations without question. Because of this uncertain quality of translations from Old Cham – in particular the work of Aymonier, but also that of Finot – all interpretations of historical events based on them must be presented with the caveat that better translations may ultimately force revisions of some details.

¹⁷ Aymonier, ‘Première étude’; Finot, articles cited in footnote 4; Abel Bergaigne, ‘L’ancien royaume de Campā dans l’Indochine, d’après les inscriptions’, reprinted from *Journal Asiatique* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1888); Bergaigne, *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā, Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1893); Huber, ‘Épigraphie de la dynastie’.

There is now new work by Anne-Valérie Schweyer on the inscriptions of Champa which serves as a guide to all of the publications. It purports to list all the inscriptions about which there have been publications in order of their corrected dates, with columns for registry number, location, names of persons and gods mentioned and the related publications.¹⁸ Except for Schweyer's work, there has been no new original study of the Cham-language inscriptions since before 1920, and the standard bibliographical list of Champa inscriptions, both Cham and Sanskrit, dates from 1923.¹⁹

Chinese and Vietnamese histories

The Chinese sources used by Maspéro were the standard dynastic histories plus extracts from Ma Duanlin's *Wenxian tongkao*, translated into French by Hervey de Saint-Denys as *Ethnographie des peuples étrangers* and cited by Maspéro as *Méridionaux*.²⁰ Recently Geoff Wade has translated the Champa sections of another text not used by Maspéro – the *Song huiyao*, which differs in certain significant details from the *Song shi* cited by Maspéro, as will be noted below. For some periods of Champa history these Chinese histories were compiled long after the event, and obviously at second hand. As described by Wade, the *Song huiyao* was compiled 'in a process which extended from the early eleventh century until the middle of the thirteenth ... but was never printed'. Then it was used as a source for the *Song shi* compiled in the fourteenth century, after which nearly half of the *Song huiyao* was lost, the remaining portions included in a fifteenth-century encyclopaedia and later reworked into its present form in the nineteenth century.²¹ Given these conditions, it requires religious faith to insist that all their details for Champa in, say, the tenth to eleventh centuries must be accepted as factual, and their inconsistencies require close attention.

¹⁸ Schweyer, as noted, missed the very first Cham-language inscription, C174 from Đông Yên Châu, published in Coedès, 'Plus ancienne inscription'. It is also missing from the list in *Études épigraphiques sur le pays cham*, ed. Claude Jacques (Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1995). Schweyer has also prepared some new transcriptions and translations of the Cham inscriptions of Pô Nagar, Nha Trang, which appear in *Aséanie*, 14 (2004): 109-40 and 15 (2005), forthcoming. These will be cited here as 'Po Nagar'. I wish to thank her for sharing them with me.

¹⁹ The list is in George Coedès and Henri Parmentier, *Listes générales des inscriptions et des monuments du Champa et du Cambodge* (Hanoi, Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1923).

²⁰ Ma Duanlin, *Ethnographie des peuples étrangers à la Chine*, tr. Léon Hervey de Saint-Denys (Farnborough: Gregg, 1972 reprint); the original edition was published in 1876 by H. Georg in Geneva.

²¹ See Geoff Wade's chapter in Lockhart and Tra (eds.), *New Scholarship on Champa*, 2006.

The Vietnamese sources which have been used for Champa history are the *Đại Việt sử ký toàn thư (Tt)*, *Khâm định Việt sử thông giám cương mục (Cm)*, and *Việt sử lược (Vsl)*.²² A problem in the use of the Vietnamese histories which is obscured in Maspéro and not given attention in subsequent work is the existence of two main chronicle traditions which diverge with respect to some of the events involving Champa (and others as well). The first is *Tt*, followed by *Cm*, and the second is *Vsl*. Maspéro adopted the versions of one or the other, apparently according to his arbitrary decision of what ‘should have happened’. Examples will be given below.

These Chinese and Vietnamese histories begin, for the region in question, with references to a polity named Linyi, situated south of Jiaozhi/Giao Chi, the Vietnamese provinces which were considered to be under Chinese administration; it was first noted with that name in 220-230, and the last reference appeared in 757. Linyi was a problem area because of its aggressive activities against Jiaozhou to its north. After the disappearance of ‘Linyi’ from Chinese records, the official Chinese histories for a century referred occasionally to a polity named Huanwang (Viet. Hoàn Vương), apparently in the old Linyi area, until in mid-ninth century they recognized Champa in the name Zhan Cheng (Viet. Chiêm Thành), ‘City of the Cham’.

Throughout the Linyi period until the mid-seventh century – that is, a century before the name itself disappeared – Linyi chiefs in the Chinese histories were entitled ‘*Fan*’ followed by one- to three-syllable names, with the last *Fan* chief, Fan Zhenlong, named around 645. In general it is impossible to reasonably identify the *Fan* names with names of rulers in the contemporary Champa inscriptions, although this was attempted by Maspéro and has been followed by later historians. During the mid-eighth to late ninth centuries, when all the inscriptions are in the South, the Chinese record no *Fan* titles and their references to Huanwang do not show names of rulers of that polity in any form.

Names in Chinese and Vietnamese histories apparently attributable to rulers of Champa begin again in the 860s and continue – though with significant breaks – until the late twelfth century, after which for nearly one hundred years during the time of Angkorean intervention in Champa, the Chinese and Vietnamese apparently paid it little attention. Those sources begin to

²² Ngô Sĩ Liên, *Đại Việt sử ký Toàn thư* (henceforth *Tt*), tr. Hoàng Văn Lâu, ed. Hà Văn Tấn (Hà Nội: NXB Khoa học Xã hội, 1993); Quốc sử quán Triều Nguyễn, *Khâm định Việt sử thông giám cương mục* (henceforth *Cm*) (Hà Nội: NXB Giáo dục, 1998); *Việt sử lược* (henceforth *Vsl*), ed. Trần Quốc Vượng (Hà Nội: NXB Văn Sử Địa, 1960).

provide names for Champa rulers again from the early fourteenth century, and continuing through several decades when there are no Champa inscriptions.

As was already emphasized by Stein, it is impossible to identify most of the names in the Chinese and Vietnamese texts with the names in inscriptions. Most of the latter are titles in *-varma*, for which there was a standard Chinese transcription with ‘-*ba-mo*’ (跋摩). During the entire history of Champa from the first *-varma* (perhaps in the fourth century) until 1471, there are only four instances of Chinese transcriptions in ‘- *ba-mo*’, all in the sixth to seventh centuries, and very few instances in which other elements of the Chinese transcription may be identified with a local title; one of these rare exceptions is Chinese *lu-tuo-luo* (庐陀罗) and *lu-tuo* (庐陀) for Rudra-[varman] in mid-eighth century. There is also one instance of a credible Chinese and Vietnamese transcription of the Cham title *yāi po ku vijaya śrī* (see below). As I have argued with respect to one case in an earlier paper, and shall argue further below, the reason for this discrepancy is probably because the Chinese and Vietnamese were not dealing with the same Champa polity that was recorded in the inscriptions.²³

Champa history and its revisions

I. The origins of Champa and the Cham

Until relatively recently, the Cham were considered to be part of one of the ‘waves’ of population movement which were believed to have proceeded successively out of China into mainland Southeast Asia, with some of them continuing on to the islands of Nusantara. These population groups were generally defined in terms of physical anthropologically. First came the Australoid-Melanesoid, resembling the Australian aborigines and the peoples of Papua New Guinea, then two successive groups of ‘Indonesians’ (Proto- and Deutero-). The Cham – for those who recognized their language as ‘Indonesian’ (now called ‘Austronesian’), an affiliation which was not at that time universally accepted – were considered to be remnants of these ‘Indonesians’ who had remained on the mainland after the rest had moved on to the islands under pressure from the last wave of arrivals, the Mon-Khmer. In this view all of these movements would have been completed before the beginning of the Common Era. Implicitly, then, Champa

²³ Michael Vickery, ‘Cambodia and its neighbors in the fifteenth century’, National University of Singapore Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series No. 27, www.ari.nus.edu.sg/docs/wps/wps04_027.pdf, ‘Appendix to note 15’, pp. 49-52.

was a land power, as was, in that view, its southern neighbor Funan. With occasional minor variations, this was accepted by all the early scholars, including Coedès, Maspéro and Stein; the continental origin of the Cham has most recently been retained by Jacques Népote, and is implicit in the ‘Copenhagen papers’ of 1987.²⁴ It was also recognized that the Tai/Thai had moved into their present habitat much later than the migrations outlined above, and it was believed that the Vietnamese, thought to be a Sinitic branch, had moved into what is now northern Vietnam independently of those migrations.

Starting around thirty years ago, when physical-anthropological groupings were no longer in vogue and linguistics had become more advanced, it was determined that the Austronesian languages (including Cham) spread not via peoples migrating overland out of China across mainland Southeast Asia and then into the islands, but via the sea – probably starting in Taiwan, then to the Philippines, Indonesia, the Pacific islands, Madagascar, and among the latest moves, the ancestors of the Cham from Borneo to the coast of what is now Vietnam, at a time estimated as somewhere between 500 BCE and the early years of the Common Era, although such dating is still very approximate.²⁵ It has long been held by some archaeologists that the Sa Huỳnh Culture of the central coast is the first material evidence of the Cham, although ongoing research may modify this, and it is probable that there was more than a single landfall by the first seaborne Cham.²⁶ There is no longer doubt that Cham is an Austronesian language, closely related to Achenese and Malay and more distantly to other languages of Indonesia, the Philippines, Polynesia and Madagascar.

²⁴ Jacques Népote, ‘Champa, propositions pour une histoire de temps long’, *Péninsule, nouvelle série*, 26 (1993): 3-54 and 27 (1993): 65-119. For the ‘Copenhagen papers’, see *Actes du séminaire*, notably Tâm Quach-Langlet, ‘Le cadre géographique de l’ancien Campā’, pp. 28-47, who treats Champa as a land-based economy and shows no awareness of its maritime background or activity.

²⁵ Peter Bellwood, ‘Southeast Asia before history’, in *The Cambridge history of Southeast Asia*, ed. Nicholas Tarling, Vol. I, pp. 53-136; see also Bellwood, ‘Cultural and biological differentiation in Peninsular Malaysia: The last 10,000 years’, *Asian Perspectives*, 32, 2 (1993): 50, where he refers to the ‘differentiation of Malayo-Chamic [still in southeast Kalimantan] commencing in the third or fourth century BCE’; Robert Blust, ‘The Austronesian homeland: A linguistic perspective’, *Asian Perspectives*, 26 (1984-5): 45-67; Blust comments elsewhere that ‘probably during the last two or three centuries before the Christian era, the Chamic languages and Malay became established in mainland Southeast Asia along the coasts of the South China Sea’; Blust, ‘The Austronesian settlement of mainland Southeast Asia’, in *Papers from the second annual meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 1992*, ed. Karen L. Adams and Thomas John Hudak (Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University Program for Southeast Asian Studies, 1994), p. 30. Graham Thurgood posits a Chamic arrival on the mainland about 2000 years ago (*From ancient Cham*, p. 5).

²⁶ Peter Bellwood, *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago* (Orlando: Academic Press, 1985); Bellwood, ‘Southeast Asia’; Higham, *Archaeology of mainland Southeast Asia*, pp. 230-97.

As the prehistorian Peter Bellwood has put it, ‘the old idea, so often repeated in popular works today, that the Austronesians migrated from the Asian mainland through the Malay Peninsula or Vietnam, is absolutely wrong’. Bellwood, moreover, considers that the archaeological remains of Sa Huỳnh may be identified with the earliest Cham, who would have arrived in the first millennium BCE. Or, again quoting Bellwood, ‘Heine Geldern (1932) was clearly wrong ... when he suggested that early Austronesians migrated from Mainland Asia through the Malay Peninsula into Indonesia. The true course of Austronesian expansion was in the other direction’.²⁷ Of course, there may well have been more than one landfall along the coast, but the earliest known Champa remains suggest that they would have been south of Huế. When they arrived there, the region was already inhabited by people speaking Mon-Khmer languages. In fact, mainland Southeast Asia at that time would have been linguistically a solid Mon-Khmer block.²⁸

Rolf Stein, whose major study of Linyi disagreed strongly with Maspéro on many details and seems to show definitely that before the fifth century, at least, Linyi and Champa may have been distinct, also examined evidence for Linyi’s linguistic position, which he believed to be Mon-Khmer. We must emphasize again that Stein still believed that the Cham had moved overland and that they had thus been in the region of southern China – northern Vietnam for hundreds or even thousands of years. Stein did not say this explicitly, but it is clear from his remarks that he accepted it as a basic fact which did not need to be evoked anew. Thus, assuming that the Cham had been in contact with the Chinese for so long, he analyzed the Archaic (eighth to third centuries BCE) and Ancient (sixth century CE) pronunciations of the Chinese characters used for ‘Linyi’ and ‘Cham’ and found that they were nearly identical, beginning with a cluster ‘KR-’ or ‘PR-’. Through this analysis he sought to discover the original pronunciation of the relevant Chinese characters, and he considered that Linyi, and Cham as well, were Mon-Khmer.²⁹

Now, however, it is understood that the Cham did not arrive on the coast before the first millennium BCE, and in a region which would have had little or no contact with the Chinese by the time the latter were taking notice of and writing about them. The Chinese character used to

²⁷ Bellwood, *Prehistory*, pp. 124, 275; Bellwood, ‘Cultural and biological’, p. 53. The ‘old idea’ is still repeated in some scholarly work, such as Népote, ‘Propositions’.

²⁸ ‘Peninsular Malaysia is one of the few places in the Austronesian world (the other major ones being southern Viet Nam and western Melanesia) where Austronesian settlers found agriculturalists, in this case Austroasiatic speakers, in prior occupation’ (Bellwood, ‘Cultural and biological’, p. 51).

²⁹ Stein, *Lin-Yi*, p. 221 gives definitions of Ancient and Archaic Chinese.

denote them would therefore have acquired something close to its modern pronunciation and would probably have represented – as Stein, following Bergaigne, recognized – some designation the Cham were using for themselves, but about which we can now have no knowledge. Stein’s study of the archaic pronunciations of the characters is thus of no relevance, as already noted by Paul Demiéville.³⁰

This new understanding of Cham origins based on linguistics means that the Cham must be understood as one of the great navigator peoples of prehistoric Southeast Asia, and that the political-economic status of Champa must be revised accordingly. There is now a consensus that until the twelfth century, navigation and maritime trade within Southeast Asia and between Southeast Asia and China and India were dominated by local groups, prominent among whom were the speakers of Austronesian languages, including Cham. This interpretation of Cham origins and the approximate date of their arrival on the coast of what is now Vietnam casts doubt on the insistence of some researchers on the polyethnicity of ancient Champa, at least in its description of the ethnic groups as including the separate (but closely related) Cham, Jarai, Rhadé, Chru and Roglai as well as various Mon-Khmer groups. It is now understood that Jarai, Rhadé, Chru, Roglai and any other Austronesian languages in late Champa and Vietnam developed out of Cham, and were probably not distinct languages during the period of classical Champa up to the fifteenth century. Since the first Cham inserted themselves into Mon-Khmer territory, no doubt the Champa polities always included some of them, and because Champa consisted of port cities at the mouths of major rivers, some of the intervening territory may always have had a more Mon-Khmer than Austronesian population.³¹

As the Mon-Khmer specialist Gérard Diffloth describes the process:

The linguistic evidence suggests that what actually happened was that speakers of (Old) Cham moved into a territory (the Highlands) which was at the time entirely occupied by Mon-Khmer speakers (specifically speakers of early forms of Bahnar, Sre, Mnong, perhaps also Sedang and others), established political control over

³⁰ Ibid., p. 234, n. 223, citing Bergaigne, ‘Ancien royaume’ ; Paul Demiéville, ‘R.A. Stein, “Le Lin-yi, sa localisation, sa contribution à la formation du Champa et ses liens avec la Chine”’, *T’oung Pao*, 40 (1951): 345, quoted in Southworth, ‘Origins of Campā’, p. 373.

³¹ Bernard Gay, ‘Vue nouvelle sur la composition ethnique du Campā’ in *Actes du séminaire*, pp. 49-57; Gay is also obsolete (p. 51) in his treatment of the Vat Luang Kau inscription as showing Champa expansion up to the Mekong near Vat Phu in the fifth century, and in his acceptance of old Cambodian legends without historical value. On Vat Luang Kau see Claude Jacques, ‘Notes sur l’inscription de la stèle de Văt Luong Kău’, *JA*, 250 (1962): 249-56 and the discussion in Michael Vickery, *Society, economics and politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia: The seventh to eighth centuries* (Tokyo. Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, Toyo Bunko, 1998), pp. 73-4.

them, and eventually made them switch language, forsaking their original Mon-Khmer language and adopting Chamic, which has now become Jarai, Rhadé, etc... This is made very clear by the fact that these Chamic languages are structurally typically Bahnaric and not Austronesian, and their vocabulary contains hundreds of Bahnaric items which are not borrowings but retentions from the earlier languages. The Mon-Khmer substratum in Mountain Chamic is so visible and striking that it fooled the early researchers, including Schmidt, who included Chamic in the Mon-Khmer family [also Stein, *Le Lin-Yi*, see below], considering them ‘mixed-languages’, a concept which is no longer used’.³²

The Copenhagen crowd has also maintained an old idea of Finot that the term ‘Cham/Cam’ was not the name of an ethnic group, but only an *apocope* of ‘Champa’. This is a peculiar position to hold. The name ‘Champa’ may be understood as an imitation of the Champa in India, but its choice for a region on the Southeast Asian coast, as Stein recognized, would have been because the name of the people for themselves sounded something like /cam/. The name was probably chosen by themselves after their voyages to India and not imposed by arriving Indians, as Finot no doubt believed. The 1906 dictionary of Aymonier and Antoine Cabaton gives *čai* as the current name for themselves in their own language, as does the 1971 dictionary of Gérard Moussay (same spelling in Cham script, transcribed there as *căm*). Their modern neighbors, no doubt innocent of Indological preconceptions, call them *čam* (Rade), *cam* (Jarai, Chru), *cap* (Roglai), etc.; and what was the Vietnamese ‘Chiêm’ in their historical accounts of ancient Champa but their version of ‘Cham’, just as the official Chinese designation for Champa after the ninth century (*Zhancheng*) was ‘city of the Cham’, **not** ‘city of Champa? Even Po Dharma, a Cham himself, when not concerned with the ideology of his Paris group, can unself-consciously entitle his book *Quatre lexiques malais-cam anciens*, treating not really ancient Cham, but that of the nineteenth century.³³

II. The Linyi Problem

For the first Europeans interested in the subject, Champa history began with a polity named ‘Linyi’ (ancient pronunciation **Liəm--iep*) which was first noted in the Chinese histories

³² Gérard Diffloth, ‘The outward influence of Chamic into Mon-Khmer speaking areas’, Symposium on New Scholarship on Champa, Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore, 5-6 August 2004 ; and personal communication.

³³ Finot, review of Maspéro, p. 286; Gay, ‘Vue nouvelle’; Étienne Aymonier and Antoine Cabaton, *Dictionnaire čam-français* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1906), p. 116; Gérard Moussay, *Dictionnaire căm-vietnamien-français* (Phan Rang: Centre Culturel Căm, 1971), p. 39; Thurgood, *From ancient Cham*, pp. 2, 336; Po Dharma, *Quatre lexiques malais-cam anciens rédigés au Campā* (Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1999).

as having revolted against the authorities in Giao-Chi in the third century CE. Throughout the following centuries until the name ‘Linyi’ disappears from the Chinese (and later Vietnamese) histories after 757, it was depicted as an aggressive entity constantly pressing northward against the Chinese provinces in what is now northern Vietnam. The first Chinese records thus situated it in the North, but historians such as Maspéro believed that the Võ-Cạnh inscription near Nha Trang belonged to the same polity, and therefore that the original Linyi extended from the far North to the mid-South of modern Vietnam. The Sanskrit and Cham inscriptions which began in the fifth century in the Thu Bồn valley – most importantly in Mỹ Sơn – and continued in number and importance to the eighth century were also attributed to the same polity named Linyi by the Chinese, and this assumption reinforced the view that Linyi and Champa were one.

There is nothing in the Chinese accounts of Linyi, at least as described in current literature, which provides specific indication of ethnicity or language. If the archaeological remains of Sa Huỳnh indeed represent the Cham, they are far south of the region which seems to be reflected in the Chinese records of Linyi. Moreover, other than archaeological remains there are no other local contemporary records (such as inscriptions) until the first Cham-language inscription dated hypothetically to the fourth century, and other slightly later Sanskrit inscriptions associated with Champa, but all of which seem also to be south of Linyi as described by the Chinese. Stein took note of these matters and, after a close reading of the relevant Chinese sources, proposed that the center of early Linyi was at Qusu/Badon, north of what seemed to be the main Cham center, and that amalgamation of the two – if it occurred – was not until the sixth century. He accepted, however, that the Linyi capital which the Chinese sacked in 605 was probably Trà Kiệu, which archaeological investigation seems to show as belonging to Champa, and which was probably a Champa center from the first or second centuries.³⁴

In an earlier publication I proposed that Linyi was linguistically Mon-Khmer, but I would accept that part of its area may have been absorbed by Champa at a time when the Chinese were still using the name Linyi, and that this is reflected in the invasion of 605 as analyzed by Stein.³⁵ I would still prefer to argue that the main ethno-linguistic group of Linyi was Mon-Khmer, perhaps of the Katuic branch, or even a branch of Vietic or Viet-Mường moving northward when the Chinese first became aware of them, until they merged into what eventually became the first Viet Nam. Linguists now consider that the area of origin of the Viet-Mường languages was in

³⁴ Southworth, ‘Origins of Campā’; Stein, *Lin-yi*, pp. 317-8.

³⁵ Vickery, *Society, economics and politics*.

Nghê An, and that the *Urheimat* of Katuic was in central Laos.³⁶ Along with this process the Cham, whose first center may well have been at Trà Kiệu, also expanded northward into what had been old Linyi territory and the Chinese – unaware of, or unconcerned with, the ethno-linguistic complexities – continued to call the region ‘Linyi’ until the mid-eighth century.

My initial suggestion that Linyi was Mon-Khmer was based on the title *Fan* used by the Chinese for both rulers of Linyi and some early chiefs of Funan, and which, for Funan, I considered to represent the local chiefly title *poñ*, found often in seventh-century Khmer inscriptions but never after the mid-eighth century. *Poñ* is the only Khmer title which bears any resemblance at all to *Fan*, ancient pronunciation *b'iwAm*.³⁷ The first *Fan* in Linyi – Fan Xiong/Phạm Hùng – is recorded in the fourth century and the last in the seventh century. Thereafter no *Fan* appears in the Chinese and Vietnamese lists of Linyi and Champa chiefs.

Just as some *Fan* in the Chinese records of Funan are described as ‘generals’ but not reigning chiefs, and some *poñ* in the seventh-century Khmer inscriptions were other than paramount figures in their areas, so in Linyi as well there were *Fan* who were not considered to be its rulers. A certain Wen, of poor background but who eventually became *Fan*, is described as having served a chief in Xiquan (Tây Quyên), not a ruler of Linyi, named Fan Chui; there was a Fan Jian, a general of the Linyi chief Fan Huda; two more non-king *Fan* are listed in the reign of Fan Yang Mah; an envoy of Fan Yang Mah II was entitled Fan Long Pa; and a certain Phạm (= Fan) Côn Sa Đạt, not mentioned by Maspéro, is recorded in a standard Vietnamese history. There was also a second Fan Xiong who seemed to be competing with the Linyi ruler Fan Huda by sending an envoy to China, leading Maspéro to concoct a bit of historical fiction.³⁸

From the fifth until the mid-eighth centuries there were two sets of records – inscriptions in Cham and Sanskrit and Chinese records of the activities (usually bellicose) of Linyi under leaders entitled *Fan*. For Maspéro, and for most later historians, the two sets of records concerned the same polity, and the Indic names in the inscriptions were identified with the names of the *Fan* as seen through Chinese. The seventh- to eighth-century architectural remains south

³⁶ On Viet-Mường and Katuic see Gérard Diffloth, ‘Vietnamese as a Mon-Khmer language’, in *Papers from the first annual meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society*, ed. Martha Ratliff and Eric Schiller (Tempe, AZ, Arizona State University Press, 1992), pp. 125-39 and a paper by the same author presented at the Institute of Linguistics (Viện Ngôn ngữ học) in Hà Nội, cited in Nguyễn Hữu Hoàn, *Tiếng Katu cấu tạo từ* (Hà Nội: NXB Khoa học Xã hội, 1995), pp. 21-2, 219.

³⁷ Vickery, *Society, economics and politics*; Vickery, ‘Funan reviewed’; Paul Pelliot, ‘Le Fou-Nan’, *BEFEO*, 3 (1903): 248-303, gives the ancient pronunciation.

³⁸ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 54-55, 62, 72, 74, 61 respectively; Phạm Côn Sa Đạt is in *Tt, Ngoại ký*, 4:11b (v. 1, p. 175).

of Hué in the Thu Bồn valley, obviously belonging to an entity which could reasonably be called ‘Champa’, supplemented the inscriptions, while Chinese and then Vietnamese histories continued to provide names which Maspéro identified with the same rulers, often with a large input of imagination.

Serious confusion in Maspéro’s treatment of the Chinese histories and the Champa epigraphic records starts early, in his ‘second dynasty’ (336-420) for which he lists the first Bhadravarman (known, apparently, from three inscriptions dated on palaeographic grounds to the fifth century) followed by a certain Gaṅgārāja whom he identifies with a certain Di Zhen in the Chinese records of Linyi; Gaṅgārāja, however, is only mentioned retrospectively in the 658 inscription C96 of Vikrāntavarman. Then, during the entire period from the early fifth to the seventh centuries and the C96 inscription, there are no inscriptions and thus no authentic Sanskrit name which may reasonably be construed to represent a *Fan* ruler until Rudravarman I, named retrospectively in the 658 inscription and whose name is convincingly transcribed by the Chinese as *Lu-tuo-luo-ba-mo* in a record of 529.³⁹ Another *varma* (Chinese *ba-mo*) name, *Pi-cui-ba-mo* appears in a slightly earlier Chinese record, dated in Maspéro to 526-7; he construed it as *Vijayavarman* – not unreasonable, but unknown from epigraphy. The reconstituted name of Vijayavarman’s predecessor, however – ‘Devavarman’, from Fan Tiankai, is not acceptable, even if not totally rejected by Pelliot.⁴⁰ Thus for what Maspéro calls the ‘third dynasty’ (420-530), I would say that what we have is Linyi as seen by the Chinese, but perhaps nothing at all about Champa. For the ‘fourth dynasty’ (529-757) all the Sanskrit names are of predecessors named in Vikrāntavarman’s 658 inscription, except the second Rudravarman.

The most thorough new treatment of this subject is in Southworth. He accepts the Chinese textual evidence that the original Linyi was north of Hué and presents a new discovery from the Chinese sources – ‘one of the great surprises of this thesis’, namely ‘the existence of specific Chinese references to ten kingdoms along the central coast of Vietnam, including the kingdom of Xitu [Sino-Vietnamese Tây Đô]...the foremost among the independent states located close to Lin-yi’, 200 *li* (100-120 km) to the south, which ‘strongly suggests the placement of this country in the Thu Bồn valley system’.⁴¹ Then, during the fifth to sixth centuries (the period

³⁹. There are other seventh-century inscriptions without year dates naming some of those listed in C96 (Schweyer, ‘Chronologie des inscriptions’, p. 326).

⁴⁰ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 245-6; Pelliot ‘Deux itinéraires’, p. 384, n. 3; in this particular case they argued that the Chinese term represented a translation rather than a transliteration of the alleged Cham name.

⁴¹ Southworth, ‘Origins of Campā’, pp. 335, 292-3, 291 respectively.

when Stein and Boisselier agreed that the original Linyi might have merged with early Champa), ‘the earlier distinction between Linyi and Xitu in the Chinese histories gradually becomes confused and their historical traditions combined’. This is seen in the contradictions between two different Chinese histories of the period. In the *Nan ji*, the Linyi king Fan Hu-da, for whom the last recorded date is 413, was succeeded by a son Fan Yang-mai, whose first date – that of a mission to China – was in 421. In the *Liang shu*, however, Fan Hu-da was succeeded by a son Di Zhen who abdicated in favor of a nephew who was killed, after which a brother of Di Zhen was made king with the name Wen Di. He in turn was killed by a son of the king of Funan; another Fan, Fan Zhou-nong, then became king and was succeeded by his son Fan Yang-mai who sent an envoy in 421.⁴²

As Southworth notes, there is hardly time for all of this between the dates of 413 and 421, and the Chinese must have erroneously inserted a story from another polity. The name-title Di/Địch (Chinese/Sino-Vietnamese) is entirely outside the Linyi tradition as recorded by the Chinese, and their report that Di Zhen/Địch Chân abdicated and went on a pilgrimage to the Ganges in India identifies him with the Gaḡgārāja of M̃y Son inscription C96. Thus the Địch were from the Thu Bồn valley, probably Xitu, and this is the ‘earliest clear correspondence between a King of Linyi known from Chinese sources and a ruler listed in epigraphy from the Thu Bồn valley’.⁴³ I would prefer to consider Gaḡgārāja not as a historical king but as a mythical ancestor of the first Thu Bồn lineage, who is mentioned not only in C96, but also in C73A as Gaḡgeśa and in C81 as Gaḡgeśvara. Thus the Chinese in their story of Di Zhen were recording Thu Bồn mythology. This does not lessen the value of Southworth’s conclusion about a correspondence between Chinese sources on Linyi and Thu Bồn epigraphy.

From then on, according to Southworth, the name Linyi may be taken as referring to the Chamic Thu Bồn valley; and his conclusion is that the previously recognized state of Xitu absorbed ‘the former territory, political traditions, and trading concessions of its northern neighbor, Linyi’.⁴⁴ This does not help, however, with the eight *Fan* chiefs registered by the Chinese from around 420 to the mid-sixth century at a time when there is no Champa epigraphy; and if it is true that Linyi and the title *Fan* were Mon-Khmer, it is difficult to accept that *Fan* was

⁴² Ibid., pp. 303-4. See also the summary of these events and sources in Pelliot, ‘Deux itinéraires’, pp. 382-3, n. 9, where the family relationships are more clearly expressed than in Southworth.

⁴³ Southworth, ‘Origins of Campā’, pp. 302-4. Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 63-5 already saw the identity of Di Zhen (his ‘Ti Tchen’) with Gaḡgārāja, but because of his conviction that Linyi and Champa were one did not give it any special significance.

⁴⁴ Southworth, ‘Origins of Campā’, p. 318.

taken over by Cham who were already adopting Sanskritic titles in *-varma* and *-dharma*. It is true, of course, that *yang* (a title indicating sacred or royal) *mai/mah* (gold) sounds Austronesian, and the record of C96 – allegedly going back to the fifth century – indicates that the Cham may not yet have entirely adopted a tradition of *varma* (Chinese *ba-mo*) names for their rulers.

Southworth is not concerned with a possible ethno-linguistic difference between Linyi and Champa. He accepts that they may have been the same – that is, Austronesian – but does not give any attention to the question, saying merely that when the Chinese sacked the capital of Linyi in 605 they found books in the Kunlun language, ‘almost certainly a proto Cau or Austronesian dialect’.⁴⁵ This is not certain. The references to ‘Kunlun’ show only that it meant something in maritime Southeast Asia, and could have referred to Mon-Khmer as well as Austronesian. In fact, if Kunlun was a Chinese representation of *kurui*, as some have argued, it was almost certainly Mon-Khmer rather than Austronesian. Southworth was assuming that the sacked capital was Trà Kiệu, the earliest archaeologically studied Cham site.

The first instance in which the Chinese records of Linyi seem to literally agree with a name of a Champa ruler in an inscription is Lu-tuo-ba-mo for Rudravarman early in the sixth century. Following this the Chinese recorded three more Fan, whose names, *pace* Maspéro, do not agree at all with the Champa inscriptions. Thereafter, except for the three mentioned above, there are no more Fan in Linyi or Champa, but the Phạm (Vietnamese transcription of *Fan*, same Chinese character) were important thereafter in Vietnamese history. Until the seventh century all *Fan/Phạm*, with possibly one exception, were Linyi rulers, generals, or other high officials. The last Linyi king with that title was Fan Zhenlong in the mid-seventh century; thereafter the title was never used in Vietnamese histories for Champa, but only for Vietnamese. The single unclear case serves to prove the point: this was the mid-sixth-century Phạm Tu, a general of the Vietnamese rebel Lý Bí (Lý Bôn), described in Maspéro as an ‘Annamite’ who had overthrown the ‘legitimate’ Chinese governor. Phạm Tu defeated an attack by Rudravarman of Linyi.⁴⁶ Phạm Tu could very well have been someone of old Linyi serving a Vietnamese faction, consistent with old Linyi’s *bắc tiến* (Northward movement), while the Chinese were applying the

⁴⁵ Ibid., p. 312.

⁴⁶ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 81; Keith W. Taylor, *The birth of Vietnam* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 136ff. Maspéro uses the form ‘Lý Bôn’, an alternate reading which has evolved because some areas of northern Vietnam avoid pronouncing the name ‘Bí’ out of respect for his memory.

name ‘Linyi’ to another power center, that of Champa.⁴⁷ My proposal is that by the time of Rudravarman, the Mon-Khmer (Katuic or Viet-Mường) chiefs of Linyi had moved north and integrated with the Vietic peoples of Giao Chỉ, maintaining themselves as a high status group.⁴⁸

Thereafter, from the mid-eighth century, Linyi disappears, new epigraphy appears in the South, and there are no Chinese records of rulers there or in what they called Huanwang. This period will be discussed below. In its introduction, the *Song Huiyao* (new translation by Geoff Wade) says, ‘in previous dynasties, this country [Zhancheng] rarely had contact with China’, which seems to indicate that the Chinese historians of the Song dynasty did not consider Champa to have been Linyi, the history of which is based entirely on Chinese records of relations with it.⁴⁹ Further doubt about the identity of early Champa and Linyi is implied in the seventh-century writings of Xuanzang and Yijing, who spoke of ‘Zhan-po’, clearly an attempt at a phonetic rendering of ‘Champa’. This suggests that the official Chinese histories, writing then only of Linyi, ignored the already existing and separate Champa, perhaps because the latter centers were not yet sufficiently developed to become of interest to China as trading partners or subordinate polities.⁵⁰

All of the earlier historians who identified Linyi as early Champa believed that the Cham had moved overland into their modern habitat and had thus been present in what is now northern and central Vietnam for hundreds, perhaps even thousands, of years. Given the new consensus based on linguistics that the Cham only arrived by sea in the last centuries BCE, probably in relatively small numbers, in an area already populated by other ethno-linguistic groups, and then expanded westward into the highlands, it seems incredible that by the early centuries CE they

⁴⁷ Southworth, ‘Origins of Campā’, p. 309, where he has mistranslated Maspéro concerning the result of the fight between Rudravarman and Phạm Tu, saying that the former was victorious and that it marked the final victory of Xitu over Lin-yi. Maspéro (*Royaume de Champa*, p. 81) wrote, ‘Il [Rudravarman] y rencontre un général de Ly Bon, Phạm Tu, est défait et réintègre son royaume’ (‘he met a general of Lý Bôn, Phạm Tu, was defeated and regained/returned to his kingdom’). Southworth (p. 309) rendered this as ‘Rudravarman ... attack[ed] one of the generals of Lý Bôn named ... Phạm Tu, whose territory was defeated and reintegrated by Linyi’. Taylor, *Birth of Vietnam*, p. 138, notes correctly that ‘the Lin-i army was defeated and withdrew’.

⁴⁸ It must be emphasized that the terms ‘Mon-Khmer’, ‘Vietic’, and ‘Viet-Mường’ are linguistic terms and that all are now included by linguists within the linguistic grouping Mon-Khmer. This means that even if the name ‘Việt’ derives from the ‘Yue’ of ancient southern China, the latter were not the linguistic ancestors of modern Vietnam, the languages and dialects of which (except for the Tai of the Northwest and some small Tibeto-Burman and Kadai groups) had their origins in Nghệ An and neighboring regions of Laos. No doubt, taking this into consideration, the prehistory of Vietnam must be revised.

⁴⁹ Geoff Wade, translation of the *Song Huiyao*. As Wade puts it, ‘earlier polity names which are **today** [emphasis added] associated with Champa, such as Lin-yi and Huan wang, were not associated by the SHYJG compilers with this polity of Zhan-cheng’. It must not be forgotten that the modern association of the names Linyi and Huanwang with Champa dates only from the time of European scholarship.

⁵⁰ Stein, *Linyi*, pp. 234-5.

could have dominated the region farther north which Chinese accounts of Linyi imply. Much later they did expand into former Linyi territory in Quảng Trị and Quảng Bình and for a time the Chinese seem to have used the old name ‘Linyi’ for what was really the new ‘Zhan-po’.

III. Relations with Giao Chi and Vietnam

The standard view of relations between Champa and its northern neighbors (including Linyi) has been that of constant aggression from the north. As Nayan Chanda quoted Paul Mus, the Vietnamese ‘flowed across Indochina like a flood carrying off other peoples wherever they occupied lowland rice field[s] or where it could be put under rice’. For many years Michael Cotter’s treatment of ‘the Vietnamese Southward Movement’ (*Nam tiến*) was the standard.⁵¹ Until very recently, when there has been progress among Vietnam specialists, no historian took a critical view of this *mantra* about the political economy of ancient Vietnam.⁵² On the contrary, the Chinese records of Linyi, which are the only original records of that entity, complain constantly of Linyi aggression against Giao Chi, a real *Bắc Tiến* (northward movement) rather than the *Nam Tiến* imputed to the Vietnamese as their constant policy. As will be seen below, this continued into the time of the first attempt at an independent Vietnam by Lý Bí, and the first war between fully independent Vietnam in the tenth century and Champa began with the latter’s intervention into the former’s internal politics.

Thereafter the conflicts between the two parties were mostly between equals, and in the last quarter of the fourteenth century (1360-90) the Cham very nearly conquered all of Vietnam. Only after the failure of that adventure was Đại Việt clearly dominant; thus the term *Nam Tiến*, if accurate at all, may only be applied from the beginning of the fifteenth century. Indeed, a new generation of scholars of Vietnam reject entirely the concept of *Nam Tiến*. As Li Tana puts it, it was a ‘series of different episodes responding to particular events or opportunities’; and Keith Taylor, one of the leading historians of Vietnam, has written, ‘I do not believe that such an event [*Nam Tiến*] ever took place’. Like Li Tana, he writes in more detail of a series of episodes.⁵³

⁵¹ Nayan Chanda, *Brother enemy* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1986), p. 49, quoting Paul Mus, *Việt-nam: sociologie d’une guerre* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1952), p. 17; Michael G. Cotter, ‘Towards a social history of the Vietnamese Southward Movement’, *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, 9, 1 (1968): 12–24.

⁵² For an extended discussion of this and other such *mantra* see Michael Vickery, ‘Two historical records of the Kingdom of Vientiane’, in *Contesting visions of the Lao past: Lao historiography at the crossroads*, ed. Christopher E. Goscha and Søren Ivarsson (Richmond: Curzon Press, 2004), pp. 3–35.

⁵³ Li Tana, *Nguyễn Cochinchina, Southern Vietnam in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries* (Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program, 1998), pp. 19, 21, 28; Keith W. Taylor, ‘Surface orientations in Vietnam: Beyond histories of nation and region’, *Journal of Asian Studies*, 57, 4 (1998): 951, 960.

IV. The Narrative History of Champa

This section is concerned with a criticism of the history of events as described in Maspéro, a history which has been adopted by most later writers. One, who issued an early warning on Maspéro, was Rolf Stein, who said that

historians who are not Sinologists and who have access only to Maspéro's work can easily be led astray, not only by a certain number of errors in [its] translations but also, most importantly, because Maspéro's descriptions are always reconstructions: the [Chinese] texts are almost always incomplete and often contradictory. Maspéro has taken the various components [of these texts] and, without any critical comparison, combined them into a continuous story which seems to be backed up by the texts when in fact [this is the case] only for its various elements coming from different sources of different dates."⁵⁴

That is, Maspéro's narrative history of Champa is sometimes historical fiction.

Although Stein was then studying only the Linyi problem, his criticism of Maspéro is valid throughout the latter's *Le royaume de Champa*, with respect not only to his use of Chinese sources but also to his treatment of inscriptions; one of the objectives here will be to sort out the evidence behind Maspéro's overenthusiastic synthesis. Except for the Linyi problem, however, I shall be concerned only with those periods of Champa history for which there is adequate evidence from Champa inscriptions to compare with Maspéro's syntheses based on the use of Chinese and Vietnamese sources. There are long periods – for example, Maspéro's chapter 8 ('Struggle with the Mongols') and much of chapter 9 ('Zenith'), such as the late fourteenth-century invasion of Vietnam by the Cham and events leading up to the Vietnamese occupation of Vijaya in 1471 – for which there are no inscriptions and the history to date has been compiled entirely on the basis of Chinese and Vietnamese histories, on which new work must still rely. There are no doubt errors there, too, but correction will depend on thorough revision of those sources by competent specialists.

In particular, I intend to show that there was no single kingdom or state of Champa, and that the regions distinguished by their epigraphy (discussed above) and corresponding to their geography, were often quite separate, even rival, polities. I shall take it as given, following the discussion above, that Linyi was not Champa – except possibly from the early seventh century,

⁵⁴ Stein, *Linyi*, p. 72. Further critiques of Maspéro are found throughout Stein's study, and, where relevant, will be noted below.

when an expanding Champa polity occupied former Linyi territory and was given that name in Chinese reports on the region. The first objection to that interpretation in a solid historical work of which I am aware was by Keith W. Taylor: ‘Champa is a generic term for the polities organized by Austronesian speaking peoples along the central coast of Vietnam... an archipelagically-defined cultural-political space’. Taylor’s assertion is based on research and writing by Nora Taylor, whose ‘basic argument is that Champa was never a unified kingdom but rather pockets of power that competed with each other’ – the position adopted here. Among currently active Champa specialists, William Southworth has also stated without hesitation that ‘Champa’ consisted of independent entities.⁵⁵

As noted above, the first two inscriptions – Võ-Cạnh near Nha Trang and Đông Yên Châu – are isolated records which cannot yet be integrated into Champa history, and the first Champa in which continuing development is revealed by inscriptions was situated in the Thu Bồn valley centered on Mỹ Sơn, in the modern province of Quảng Nam.

The first kings named in inscriptions

Except for the misconceived identification with Linyi chiefs and the further interpretations resulting therefrom, there is little that is controversial in Maspéro’s treatment of the earliest Champa chiefs. The next three inscriptions, dated on palaeographic grounds in the fifth century, offer devotion to a god Bhadréśvarasvāmin; the author of two of them was a Bhadravarman, who has been assumed as the author of the third as well. Although the first two are in Sanskrit and do not name ‘Champa’, their locations, following the Đông Yên Châu evidence, permit their identification with Champa. One was found at Mỹ Sơn, one nearby, and the third at the mouth of the Đà Rằng river near Tuy Hòa, far in the South. This distribution fits well with the identification of Champa as a seafaring society – though not, however, with Finot’s conclusion that ‘the three inscriptions...in Bhadravarman’s name prove, moreover, that the Cham people formed a unitary State and not a series of small independent kingdoms’.⁵⁶ Finot was certainly wrong about Champa unity.

The next important record of early Champa royalty has been considered to be inscription C96 dated 658, in Sanskrit; it is interesting not only for Champa history, but for the sojourn of a

⁵⁵ See Keith W. Taylor, ‘The early kingdoms’, in Tarling ed., *Cambridge History of Southeast Asia*, p. 153 and Southworth, ‘Notes on the political geography’; the quotation on Nora Taylor’s argument is from a personal communication with her.

⁵⁶ Louis Finot, ‘Deux nouvelles inscriptions de Bhadravarman Ier’, *BEFEO*, 2 (1902): 185-91.

Champa prince at the major seventh-century center of Cambodia where he married a daughter of King Īśānavarman – a rare instance of amicable relations between regions which were later so often at war. This is the first local record of the name ‘Champa’ (in the Sanskrit terms *Campāpura* and *Campānagara*) and it is approximately contemporary with the Cambodian Sanskrit inscription K.53, recording in 667 CE an envoy sent to the ‘ruler of Campā’ (*Campeśvara*). Inscription C96 starts with a king Gaḡgārāja who abdicated in order to go and see the Ganges. Then there were kings named ‘Manorathavarman’ (? , a name restored hypothetically by Coedès), Rudravarman, Śambhuvarman, Kandharpadharma, and others, with the last, Prakāśadharmā-Vikrāntavarman, following the intercalated story concerning Cambodia.⁵⁷

Part of the same Champa royal genealogy seems to be found in the badly damaged, and untranslated, C73A, also from M̃y Son, which lists Gaḡgeśa, Rudravarman, Śambhuvarman, Kandharpadharma, and Prakāśadharmā, along with an apparently retrospective reference to Bhadravarman (not named in C96).⁵⁸ Reflections of the same story are also in the very fragmentary C81 at M̃y Son, in which a Champa king Prakāśadharmā, possibly also named Vikrāntavarman, appears to be called ‘of the lineage of Gaḡgeśvara’ (*Gaḡgeśvaravaiśajap*). Named also are a Bhadravarman and a Rudravarman.⁵⁹

This of course conflicts with the interesting proposal by Southworth, noted above, that a Chinese story of a certain Di Zhen/Địch Ch̃n who abdicated and went on a pilgrimage to the Ganges in India identifies him with the Gaḡgārāja of M̃y Son inscription C96, and is the first concordance of an individual recorded by the Chinese with a king in a Champa inscription. Maspéro also made this identification, but for him it was of no special significance given his assumption of Linyi-Champa identity. For Maspéro Bhadravarman was the Linyi chief Fan Huda and Di Zhen- Gaḡgārāja was his son.⁶⁰ I would say, however, that the concordance is as important as seen by Southworth, but that the Chinese were recording a Champa tradition known to them – probably mythical and not necessarily factual events in the life of a real king.

In contrast to Maspéro, who identified Bhadravarman with the Fan Huda of Linyi, preceding Gaḡgārāja, Southworth considers that the ‘religious content, regnal titles, and palaeography of the inscriptions of Bhadravarman do not support such an early datation’ and that

⁵⁷ Coedès’ reconstruction is in his ‘Note sur deux inscriptions du Champa’, *BEFEO*, 12, 8 (1908): 15-7.

⁵⁸ The correspondence is improved by Finot’s redating of the inscription from fifth century to sixth century *śaka*; Finot, ‘Stèle de Śambhuvarman’, p. 207 and Finot, ‘Inscriptions du Musée’, p. 5.

⁵⁹ For Inscription C81, see Jacques ed., *Études épigraphiques*, pp. 110-1, where it is numbered “VI”.

⁶⁰ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 64-5.

his ‘reign can be placed in the temporal displacement between Manorathavarman and ... Rudravarman’. This does not agree with the apparent readings of the fragmentary C73A and C81, not given attention by either Maspéro or Southworth, and which (especially C73A) seem to refer back to Bhadravarman as an ancestor and the founder of the temple of Śrīśānabhadreśvara at Mỹ Sơn.⁶¹

Some of the important works of architecture and sculpture are believed to date from this period; in this respect Trà Kiệu, the importance of which has been shown by archaeology, may have been more impressive than Mỹ Sơn, although no buildings have survived until modern times, and the site lacks inscriptions. Following this long period of predominance of the Thu Bồn valley, which for the Chinese was still Linyi, the historical scene shifts abruptly to the South, Phan Rang (Pāḍōuraiga) and Nha Trang, which Maspéro termed – incorrectly, as I shall show – ‘Huanwang and Pāḍōuraiga Hegemony’.⁶²

Huanwang

Huanwang appears in Chinese histories in the mid-eighth century, just when the name Linyi drops out of use; in fact, some official histories are explicit that the name ‘Huanwang’ replaced that of ‘Linyi’. The name has never been successfully explained, but its literal meaning is apparently ‘ring’, ‘circle’ [of] ‘King(s)’.⁶³ Because Huanwang appeared just when epigraphy ended in north Champa and continued for over 100 years in the South (Phan Rang and Nha Trang), the early students of the area (in particular Maspéro), continuing in their belief that Linyi and Champa were one and singular, identified Huanwang with Champa, and more particularly with the ‘hegemony of Pāḍōuraiga’, in spite of the great distance between the latter and what appears to have been the region of Huanwang in the Chinese sources.

Pelliot looked at the location of Huanwang in his study of the route taken by Jiadan, and deduced that its frontier was at Đòng Hới, with six more days travel’ to its capital. Stein, however, considered that the frontier which Pelliot located at Đòng Hới was farther north on the Gianh River. They were also in disagreement about the capital of Huanwang, several days to the south. Pelliot, believing that Huanwang was Champa, wished to place it in Quảng Nam on the basis of the names of Cham capitals which Aymonier had found in their chronicles. Stein was

⁶¹ Finot, ‘Stèle de Śambhuvarman’, pp. 206-11; Finot, ‘Notes d’épigraphie XI’, pp. 928-9.

⁶² Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, ch. IV.

⁶³ See *ibid.*, p. 95, n. 1 for some of the sources. The literal translation of ‘Huanwang’ is from Geoff Wade, personal communication.

more circumspect – favoring, it would appear, a location between Quảng Trị and Huế. Both, however, were overly concerned with the supposed identity of Huanwang and Linyi and whether the capital of one was the capital of the other, and also a capital of Champa.⁶⁴ Accepting that Huanwang was a region in the North, quite distinct from Cham Pāḍouraiga, means that very little may be said about it, for the Chinese notes on it are sparse and short, with no names of chiefs, but indicating that Huanwang was a source of trouble like earlier Linyi and the northern Champa regions. In either case, this would make Huanwang a fit with the area of Maspéro's later 'sixth dynasty', that of Đổng Dương/Indrapura, which left important monuments as far as Quảng Bình (see below).

The official Chinese histories stopped using the name Huanwang by 877, saying that it had been replaced by 'Zhan-cheng' (city of the Cham), not the phonetic transcription 'Zhan-po' known since the seventh century; in one Chinese source, however, that replacement had already been made in 809. Noting the *Song Huiyao* remark quoted above about the paucity of China-Champa contact in earlier centuries, it may be conjectured that Huanwang, although perhaps ethno-linguistically Cham, was not identical with the polity which the Chinese had known as 'Zhan-po' since the seventh century.⁶⁵

As Boisselier cogently put it,

'Maspéro has rather artificially connected the new 'dynasty' [Panduranga] to the 'Areca clan'... contrasting it with the 'Coconut clan', from which the Northern dynasties had supposedly sprung 'more directly', he believes that this Huanwang period corresponds to 'Panduranga hegemony'....Nothing, in any case, indicates that Panduranga...exercised any kind of hegemony during the Huanwang period.⁶⁶

Here Boisselier was referring to a firm belief by Maspéro that the ruling families of Champa were divided into two clans, the Areca clan and the Coconut clan; 'these two clans', Maspéro suggested, 'fought for supremacy down through the centuries...The Areca clan ruled the State of Panduranga [while] the Coconut clan dominated the North'. He evoked them in several contexts in his history of Champa – stating, for example, that 'the inscriptions allude to

⁶⁴ Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires', pp. 184-6; Stein, *Linyi*, pp. 79-81. Pelliot, of course, did not know of the inscriptions which give importance to Pāḍouraiga (Nha Trang and Phan Rang) in the eighth century.

⁶⁵ On the date 809 see Stein, *Linyi*, p. 234 and Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires', p. 196. This detail was brought to my attention by Népote, 'Champa, propositions', part 2, p. 87. Together with his citations of seventh-century 'Zhanbo' from Xuancang and Yijing, Stein added, 'I have given up trying to explain the transitional but short-lived name of Huanwang'.

⁶⁶ Boisselier, *Statuaire du Champa*, pp. 61-2.

mythical traditions...there are two traditions, one of which seems to belong to the country of the “Areca clan” and the other to that of the “Coconut clan”. Uroja, Maspéro added, was the ‘mythical ancestor’ of the latter clan.⁶⁷ In fact, however, there is only one inscription which mentions these clans at all: C90A from Mý Son, dated 1080, in which it is said that a king Harivarman, Prince Thāi, descended from both clans, the Coconut on his father’s side and the Areca on his mother’s. There is nothing in this inscription which provides evidence for a geographical location of either clan. As Huber had already noted, ‘the inscriptions give us no information on these Areca and Coconut clans; and as Boisselier reemphasized, ‘the references to the “Areca”...and “Coconut” clans...only appear fairly late in Cham epigraphy and almost by accident’.⁶⁸ Thus, along with the supposition that Huanwang represented Pāḍouraiga hegemony, all of Maspéro’s remarks about the importance of these clans in intra-Champa relations must be rejected.

Pāḍouraiga

Contrary to the standard interpretation, we have seen that Huanwang probably did not represent all of Champa, and given the logistics of the time it is aberrant to assume that Huanwang, clearly in the North according to Chinese records, could have been equated with Pāḍouraiga in the far South. Huanwang could have been seen by the Chinese as replacing Linyi, in terms of political geography as well as in name, and to that extent Maspéro may have been correct in accepting the Chinese statements that the name Huanwang replaced the name Linyi. However, a major objective here has been to demonstrate that Linyi was not Champa and thus neither was Huanwang if it was just a replacement for Linyi.

All of the Champa inscriptions of this period (with dates from 774 to 854) are in the South, either in the region of Phan Rang (most of them) or at the Pô Nagar temple in Nha Trang. Although three of the rulers named asserted that they ruled over all of Champa (Pḥthivīndravarman and Indravarman in Phan Rang) or over *Campa-pura* (Harivarman in Nha Trang), given the absence of all remains from their time in the North, there is no need to believe that they had effective control over territory much beyond Nha Trang, any more than one needs

⁶⁷Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 18, 43, 154.

⁶⁸On the inscription see Finot, ‘Notes d’*épigraphie* XI’, pp. 933-40; Jacques ed., *Études épigraphiques*, pp. 115-22. Quotations are from Édouard Huber, ‘Le clan de l’aréquier’, *BEFEO*, 5 (1905): 170-5; and Boisselier, *Statuaire du Champa*, pp. 61-2.

to believe the claims of Angkor kings that they held sway as far away as China. All we may accept about the claims of the Pāḍōuraīga rulers is that they considered their region to be part of Champa, as seen in the inscription of Harivarman in his *Campa-pura* at Nha Trang, giving the charge of Pāḍōuraīga *-pura* (presumably the Phan Rang area) to his son Vikrāntavarman.

Maspéro began this chapter, after listing the kings, with a major excursus into historical fiction, at the time of the shift of the important Champa center from M̃y Son to the South. He wrote that ‘on Rudravarman’s death, around 757, the powerful men [*les Grands*] gave the crown to one of their own’. First, however, the name of that Rudravarman is nowhere attested in an inscription. The last inscriptions in M̃y Son are of a king Vikrāntavarman (C77, C80, C97, C99, all dated only in the seventh century *śaka* [AD 678-778], and C74/741. The first inscription in the South is C38/774, 784, referring to Satyavarman and a Vikrāntavarman – who, given his genealogy, was not the Vikrāntavarman of M̃y Son. Around 749, the Chinese referred to a certain Lu-duo-luo or Lu-duo (which may reasonably be interpreted as ‘Rudra’) as ruler of Linyi, apparently the last whom they recognized.⁶⁹ The date 757 in Maspéro is merely a guess, apparently based on the fact that after 758 the Chinese no longer used the name Linyi.

The ‘*Grand*’ who was then given the crown and who was assumed by Maspéro to have originally been in the North, was Pḥthivīndravarman, the name of an ancestor with which the Pāḍōuraīga inscriptions begin their genealogy. Maspéro wrote that ‘it was probably [sic] following his [Rudravarman’s] death that Pḥthivīndravarman shifted the royal residence to the South. The new ruler, Maspéro believed, ‘probably [sic] belonged to the great princely family of Pāḍōuraīga, the “Areca clan”, and he continued to live in the South’.⁷⁰ Of course, there is no record of Pḥthivīndravarman belonging to the Areca clan, nor any reference to such clans at that date; and prior to that there is no information about a ‘great princely family of Pāḍōuraīga’. All of Maspéro’s imaginative text was due to his assumption that there was a unity of Linyi and Champa as far as Phan Rang; that therefore the successor of the last Linyi king known to the Chinese must have assumed power in the North; and that because the following local records are from the South, that must have been the original clan home of that successor (Pḥthivīndravarman), named there as uncle (Bergaigne) or father (Maspéro) of the second king to leave an inscription, Indravarman.

⁶⁹ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 93 and note 3 and p. 246, table. On the inscriptions see Bergaigne, ‘Ancien royaume’, pp. 242-60. Maspéro referred to Vikrāntavarman II and III.

⁷⁰ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 96-7 and note 7. See above on the Areca and Coconut clans.

Maspéro continued on the status of Pçthivīndravarman, justifying in a peculiar way the assumption that he did not inherit the throne but was named by the ‘*grands*’ – by citing the first dynastic inscription of the following Đòng Dương dynasty dated 875. Here, however, he may be excused for following an interpretation of Finot. This inscription is for the glorification of another Indravarman over a century later, but at one point refers to him as Pçthivīndravarman (*Pçthivī*-Indravarman, just as still another Indravarman was named at one point Rājendravarman (*rāja*-Indravarman).⁷¹

This point requires elaboration. This inscription, C66 – ‘the first stela from Đòng-Dương’ according to Finot – was erected by King Indravarman to the glory of himself and his ancestors. Like the records of this dynasty in general and the architectural remains of the site, it indicates devotion to a type of Mahāyana Buddhism, unlike the records of either earlier Mý Son or Pāóúraiga. There is also a list of ancestors beginning with Bhçgu, different from the tradition of their predecessors and at least two of whom are quite legendary: Parameśvara (Śiva) and Uroja (‘breast’), then Dharmarāja, Rudravarman, Bhadravarman (son of Rudravarman) and Indravarman (son of Bhadravarman). Finot commented that the name ‘Uroja’, although Sanskrit, is peculiar to Champa mythology and unknown in India, and that ‘Dharmarāja’ sounds peculiar for the name of a Champa king. He proposed that they were both fictitious and that Indravarman’s dynasty only began with his grandfather Rudravarman. Certainly ‘Uroja’ is mythical, but ‘Dharmarāja’ does not sound peculiar in a polity devoted to Buddhism.

Although Buddhist, Indravarman also praised the traditional Mý Son *lingam* of Śaübhubhadreśvara. Finot was surprised that he did not repeat the ‘true story’ of that shrine and instead inserted a new mythical lineage, and he therefore described Indravarman as a ‘usurper’. This is because Finot, like Maspéro later, assumed a single unified Champa from Linyi throughout, so that kings who could not be attached to previous rulers must have usurped the throne. What we see in C66 is a new mythology of a new chiefly family applied to an already traditional site. If we accept instead that Champa was never a unitary polity, there is no problem with chiefs in Đòng Dương – whose religion and prehistoric legends were different – becoming important separately from other kings in the South. It is not necessary to go along with Finot’s idea that ‘here we are perhaps seeing once again the reluctance of a usurper to proclaim the

⁷¹ See inscription C25 in Bergaigne, ‘Ancien royaume’, number XXII, A, ii: ‘*Srīmān Rājendra(va)rmā*’, translated by Bergaigne as ‘this king Śrī Indravarman’. This type of double naming was recognized as *metri causa* by Schweyer (‘Dynastie d’Indrapura’, p. 207).

works of a dynasty whose place he had taken' (meaning the earlier dynasty of Mỹ Sơn), or his astonishment that Indravarman 'mentions the name of Pṛthivīndravarman, who reigned around [778]'.⁷² Given the structure of the text, it is preferable to take the title Pṛthivīndravarman here as belonging to the Indravarman of Đông Dương around 875, not the Pṛthivīndravarman of Pāṇḍuraiga.

Returning to the problem of Pāṇḍuraiga, Maspéro, engaged in some clear historical fiction in identifying Huanwang with Pāṇḍuraiga and in pasting together the Chinese reports on Huanwang and the Champa inscriptions from the far South (Phan Rang and Nha Trang). 'Having scarcely taken power', he begins, Harivarman (successor of Indravarman according to the inscriptions) in 803 invaded the Chinese provinces of Hoan and Ái, located in present-day Nghệ An and Hà Tĩnh. This is because the Chinese sources recorded that Huanwang had attacked but without mentioning any names of rulers. It is true that Harivarman's Sanskrit inscription says that he 'burned the Chinese', but in that context it must be taken as the same type of hyperbole as seen in Angkor kings' exaggerated claims of the extent of their borders and subordinate kingdoms (which, in one inscription of Jayavarman VII, included Vietnam and Java). The logistic possibilities of the time would not have permitted a Pāṇḍuraiga attack on Hoan and Ái, unless it was an expedition by sea. Besides the distance, Pāṇḍuraiga is separated from those provinces by the three great physical barriers along the coast of Vietnam: Mũi Đại Lãnh (the French Cap Varella); Đèo Hải Vân (Pass of the Clouds or Col des Nuages), just north of Đà Nẵng; and Đèo Ngang at Hoàn Sơn in Hà Tĩnh. The Chinese records of invasions by Huanwang cited by Maspéro, however, imply attacks overland.⁷³

What, then, can we say about eighth- to ninth-century Pāṇḍuraiga on the basis of its own inscriptions? Very little, except for a list of rulers, and the emergence of a new mythical lineage ancestor, Vicitrāsagara. Boisselier remarked that the Phan Rang inscriptions were by dignitaries, while those in Pô Nagar were royal.⁷⁴ This does not seem to be accurate. C38/774, 784 is indeed royal, but so are C25/799, C24/801, and C14/854 from the Phan Rang area. The inscriptions which give particular importance to an official – C19/seventh century ś. (Phan Rang), C37/813 (Pô Nagar), C31/817 (Pô Nagar) – relate the exploits of a famous warrior, Senāpati Pār, who claimed victories over the Cambodians, but in form they too are royal inscriptions.

⁷² For inscription C66 see Finot, 'Notes d'épigraphie VI', pp. 84-99.

⁷³ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 105.

⁷⁴ Boisselier, *Statuaire du Champa*, p. 62.

The names of gods, kings, and mythical lineage ancestors show clearly that Pāḍōuraiga did not represent an emigration of royalty from North to South. The records indicate the emergence of a local elite – probably, as Southworth describes, because

the collapse of the early Tang trade and the demise of Guangzhou during the mid-eighth century CE also destroyed the commercial dominance of the Thu Bồn valley system, and when the South China Sea trade was transferred to the ports of the Red river delta during the late eighth century CE, an entirely new pattern of trade emerged... [There was] a major shift in the displacement of trade wealth to south to central Vietnam, in particular to the ports of Nha Trang and Phanrang, on the sea-route from Java to northern Vietnam'... [and] the independent states of Kauñhāra and Pāḍōuraiga ... flourished here during the late eighth and early ninth centuries.⁷⁵

From Pāḍōuraiga back to the North

An example of the unnecessary problems caused by the assumption of a unitary Champa is seen in the Maspéro-Finot controversy over the beginning of what Maspéro called the 'sixth dynasty': that of Đōng Dương, again in the Thu Bồn but not at Mỹ Sơn, at the end of the ninth century following the 'hegemony of Pāḍōuraiga'. For Maspéro this dynasty began with a king Indravarman mentioned in the so-called 'first inscription' of Đōng Dương (C66 dated 875) as King of Champa. He became king because the 'childless Vikrāntavarman [last king of the southern dynasty in Pāḍōuraiga, last date C14/854] would himself have chosen him as successor'.⁷⁶ There is no record of what children Vikrāntavarman did or did not have; Maspéro was here indulging in pure historical fiction. The inscription in question (C66), however, says that Indravarman was son and grandson of Bhadravarman and Rudravarman, both called 'king', although according to Maspéro they did not reign. His unexpressed reason for that belief was that in their time the king of Champa was still in Pāḍōuraiga. Indravarman's ancestry possibly also went back to still another king named Dharmarāja.

Finot, on the other hand, argued that they did reign, and that for Bhadravarman this belief was supported by the inscription of An-Thái dated 902 – from the reign of Indravarman, but referring to Bhadravarman as a previous king. In Finot's review of Maspéro, however, there is a

⁷⁵ Southworth, 'Origins of Campā', p. 318.

⁷⁶ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 109-11. 'First' has been the traditional designation of this inscription, also discussed above, although Schweyer, 'Chronologie des inscriptions' precedes it with two newly discovered and undated texts from that period (C205 and 206) which refer to Rudravarman, a predecessor of Indravarman; she has published these texts in 'Vaisselle en argent'.

curious statement relating to Maspéro's suggestion that Indravarman had granted his ancestors fictitious titles. Finot said, 'For supposing that a Cham ruler was able to bestow the title of king on his ancestors...he could certainly not call them kings of Champa, which everyone knew they had not been'. In the view of Finot, like Maspéro, the real kings of Champa in the time of Bhadravarman and Rudravarman were in Pāḍōuraiga.⁷⁷ Of course, between the last date of Vikrāntavarman of Pāḍōuraiga (854) and the first date of Indravarman (875) there is room for two ancestors of Indravarman in the North, and it should be assumed that he had been preceded in the Thu Bôn valley region by at least two named ancestors who were contemporary with the last kings known in Pāḍōuraiga.

The controversy could have been avoided if it had been recognized that the 'Champa' of the region of Đông Dương was a quite separate polity from Pāḍōuraiga, and that the dynasty represented by Indravarman could well have begun with his father, grandfather and great-grandfather, even though no inscriptions from their reigns have been found.⁷⁸ That is, *pace* Finot, Maspéro and Schweyer, there was no transferal of the capital from North to South in the eighth century, nor again from South to North in the ninth; rather, a new political economic ascendance of the North took place, probably related to changes in the international maritime routes. Like the rise of Pāḍōuraiga and the apparent decline of the Thu Bôn area in the eighth to ninth centuries, the reemergence of the North was undoubtedly linked to another change in the international trade routes from China to Indonesia and India.

Maspéro began the events of the reign of the first Indravarman of Đông Dương with a piece of total fiction based on a misunderstanding of Cambodian history which was in vogue until undermined in 1927 by Philippe Stern and given the *coup de grâce* by Coedès in 1928, namely the elief that the monuments and some of the associated inscriptions now known to date from Jayavarman VII (1181-1220?) belonged to the ninth century. Thus, relying on Aymonier's erroneous interpretation of the Banteay Chhmar inscription, Maspéro garbled an account of a Cambodian intervention in Champa in what he thought was the late ninth or early tenth centuries, but which actually belongs in the twelfth century, as demonstrated later by Coedès.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Finot, review of Maspéro, p. 290.

⁷⁸ The two inscriptions (C205, C206) on silver objects published by Schweyer (see footnote 75) and attributed to Đông Dương, naming a Rudravarman whom she accepts as grandfather of Indravarman, are small movable objects in a private collection, and the attribution can only be hypothetical.

⁷⁹ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 113; Philippe Stern, *Le Bayon d'Angkor Thom et l'évolution de l'art khmer* (Paris: Librairie Orientale Paul Geuthner; George Coedès, 'La date du Bayon',

From the mid-tenth century reign of the king whom Maspéro named Indravarman III but Schweyer Indravarman II, the Chinese again provide names of Champa rulers, none of which agrees with any *-varma* name in their inscriptions.⁸⁰ An interesting aspect of this period is that this so-called ‘Đông Dương, or Indrapura, dynasty’ expanded its area northward as far as Quảng Bình, as evidenced by the fact that nearly half of their inscriptions were set up north of Huế – a subject not touched upon by Maspéro but given importance in the special studies of this period by Schweyer.⁸¹ As Boisselier noted, moreover, in two of these extreme northern locations there were large sanctuaries reminiscent of Đông Dương itself: at Đại Hữu and, in particular, Mỹ Đức. In Boisselier’s words, ‘this fairly large complex [Mỹ Đức] was made up of a front section of three sanctuaries, coming after a tower with three doors and a southern building, inside a wall which closed off a large room...’ These dispositions were reminiscent of Đại Hữu and Đông Dương and, as Huber remarked, ‘the large stela of Lạc-Thành’ (farther south in Quảng Nam), which he described as ‘along with the great inscription of Hà-trung in Quảng Trị, the most beautiful epigraphical monument left behind by this dynasty’. The Đà Nẵng museum catalogue also lists several objects from another site in Quảng Trị named Đa Nghi.⁸²

This is important to note because in the 980s the first war with Vietnam broke out, ending with a Champa defeat, a change of dynasty and – in the standard interpretation – a new southward move of ‘the capital’. The story has been told based almost entirely on the Chinese records, with names of Champa kings from epigraphy fitted in haphazardly; the result, I shall argue, is serious misunderstandings in the literature to date. Let us start with an inscription of a king Jaya Indravarman at Pô Nagar in Nha Trang dated 965 (C38D2), the only inscription so far ascribed to the Đông Dương dynasty in the South. This would be Schweyer’s Indravarman II, who reigned from about 916 to 972 and was the author of an inscription (C148) in Lai Trung (Thừa Thiên), not far from Huế. He was probably also responsible for another inscription at Pô Nagar (C39) which can only be dated to sometime within that century. Maspéro also mentioned

BEFEO, 28 (1928): 81-103; Coedès, ‘Nouvelles données chronologiques et généalogiques sur la dynastie de Mahīdharapura’, *BEFEO*, 29 (1929): 297-330, including the inscription of Banteay Chhmar (pp. 309-315).

⁸⁰ Schweyer is quite right to say that ‘it seems impossible to me to use continuous numbering for the kings of Campā as Maspéro does...for [they] belong to different dynasties, each of which must have had its own internal numbering system’ (‘Dynastie d’Indrapura’, p. 205, n.1). This statement, however, implicitly negates her acceptance elsewhere of a single Champa with kings shifting capitals between very distant locations.

⁸¹ *Ibid.* and Schweyer, ‘Vaisselle en argent’.

⁸² Boisselier, *Statuaire du Champa*, pp. 133,136; Huber, ‘Épigraphie de la dynastie’, pp. 285 and 298-9 (in Jacques ed., *Études épigraphiques*, pp. 259 and 272-3); Association Française des Amis de l’Orient, *Musée de sculpture*, p. 179. Note that in the latter source Hà Trung is erroneously placed in Quảng Nam.

such a Jaya Indravarman, but as successor of his Indravarman III (Schweyer's II), apparently because of a slight change in the Chinese designation; this perhaps led Maspéro, who took every name in the Chinese accounts literally, to invent a non-existent king. Schweyer seems to have recognized this, attributing it to confusion in the annals at the time of dynastic change in China.⁸³

According to Maspéro, based entirely on Chinese and Vietnamese sources, the Cham offended the Vietnamese by seizing their ambassador. Vietnam invaded in 982, and the king (who had reigned since 972) – let us say King A, because he is not mentioned in an inscription and the Chinese transcription is not intelligible – was killed. The Vietnamese sacked the Cham capital (for Maspéro Indrapura/Đồng Dương) and the next Cham king – based on Chinese transcriptions, King B – fled, ‘probably to Phan Rang’ – a supposition for which there is no justification either in the Chinese and Vietnamese sources or in extant inscriptions. Maspéro admitted that for the events of this period, ‘these struggles...are not overly clear’ and that in 978, when his King A would still have been alive, the Chinese records note a Champa king ‘Ji-nan-da-zhi’, different from either A or B, who sent tribute.⁸⁴ This is not a problem so long as it is recognized that there was no single Champa.

It is interesting that the chronicle *Tt* merely says that the Vietnamese attacked ‘Chiêm Thành’ (the Cham capital) and seized much booty; there is no indication of where the capital was. Then, under the date 983, it says that ‘before, when the king went to attack Chiêm Thành, Lưu Kế Tông ran away to that country and someone was sent to seize him’. The next sentence is, ‘the new canal on the sea route has been completed’, and the reason for this is in the continuing entry: ‘When the king went to attack Chiêm Thành, via the Đồng Cổ mountain and the Bà Hoa river, the mountain route was dangerous and difficult’. In footnotes to the text, those two locations are said to be in Thanh Hoá, which might suggest that the Chiêm Thành concerned was in the far north of Champa – not surprising given the northward expansion of the Cham rulers of the time.⁸⁵

Maspéro, based on Chinese sources, says that Lưu Kế Tông (whose name he incorrectly transcribes as ‘Lưu Ký Tông’) did not disappear until 988. Under this ‘usurper’ many people fled to Hainan, while others ‘gathered around a *national claimant* [to the throne] and took him off to

⁸³ Schweyer, ‘Dynastie d’Indrapura’, p. 208.

⁸⁴ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 122-4. Maspéro (p. 121, note 1) wished to read the Chinese transcriptions (variously *Bo-mei-shui*, *Xi-li-tuo-ban-yin-cha*, *Bo-mei-shui-he-yin-cha* and *Bo-mei-shui-yang-bu-yin-cha*) as ‘Parameśvaravarman’, and this has been accepted by Schweyer, ‘Dynastie d’Indrapura’, p. 208, but this requires a large input of imagination.

⁸⁵ *TT*, *Bản kỷ*, 1: 16a-b, v. 1, p. 222 and notes 2, 3.

Vijaya in 988’, where he took the name Harivarman II. However, in a long footnote Maspéro wrote that ‘at least this is what seems to come out of the rather vague information provided by the chronicles. He added that according to the Chinese source, in 988 a certain Bǎng Vương La of Champa set himself up in Phật Thành (literally, ‘Buddha city’) and Maspéro wished to interpret the king’s titles via Chinese (Ju-shi-li-he-shen-pai-ma-luo, Viet. Cu-thi-lợi-hà-thân-bàì-mà-la) as indicating the ruler he had identified as Indravarman IV.⁸⁶ Not only is there no epigraphic record for such a person, but the identification from the Chinese source is not acceptable.

Now, where was the ‘Buddha city’ whither a Champa king moved after defeat by Vietnamese at a place which the sources do not name clearly? The most likely place to be called ‘Buddha city’ at the time was Đồng Dương, famous from its remains as a very large Mahayana site. For the traditionalists, however, that construal was impossible because they believed that Đồng Dương was the capital of what Maspéro called the ‘sixth dynasty’ (875- 991), which the Vietnamese attacked and plundered in 982. In the standard treatment since Maspéro, that Phật thành or Phật thệ thành (*Foshicheng*) has been considered to be Vijaya, modern Quy Nhơn. The interpretation of Phật thành as Vijaya results in part from another entry in the Vietnamese annals *Đại Việt sử ký tiền biên* in 988, citing ‘old [Chinese? Vietnamese?] annals’ as saying that in 1000 a Champa king with the titles ‘*yāi po ku vijaya*’ retreated to *Phật thệ thành*, ‘700 li away from the former capital’.⁸⁷

Within Southeast Asian toponymy it has become accepted since Coedès’ study of Śrī Vijaya that Chinese ‘*Fo-shi*’ (Viet. *Phật thệ*) may designate ‘*vijaya*’ – although this was not the accepted construal in the time of Pelliot, who transcribed it as ‘*bhoja*’ – and *Vijaya* has so far been the interpretation of *Phật thệ thành* in Champa at that time. In this case, however, it should be noted that the titles of the king concerned, known from epigraphy as *yāi po ku vijaya śrī*, were rendered comprehensibly in the Sino-Vietnamese transcriptions. Following characters which may reasonably be construed as ‘*yāi po ku*’, the next term in transcription is *bì-sà-xà*, not unreasonably *vijaya*. But why, then, did the Vietnamese and Chinese historians not transcribe the name of the city in a similar manner as well? Given that they had a reasonably phonetic transcription for the Sanskrit term *vijaya*, there is nothing known about the Champa polity of

⁸⁶ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 125-6 and 126 note 3; emphasis added.

⁸⁷ Viện Nghiên Cứu Hán Nôm, *Đại Việt sử ký tiền biên* (Hanoi: Khoa học Xã hội, 1997), *bản ký*, 1:25a, p. 172.

Vijaya that should have obliged them to transcribe its name in a way also denoting ‘Buddha city’.⁸⁸

The *Vijaya* problem

Before continuing with the historical narrative, it is necessary to open a discussion of *Vijaya*, which appears – or has been interpreted as appearing – in later entries of the Chinese and Vietnamese chronicles and in the eleventh- to twelfth-century inscriptions. It will be argued here that ‘*Vijaya*’ has been misunderstood as both a name and a location, leading to erroneous interpretations in the historical narrative. The name ‘*Vijaya*’ in all modern literature on Champa is conventionally understood as the old Champa center in Bình Định near the modern city of Quy Nhơn. The old generations of historians, starting already with Finot and continuing emphatically with Maspéro, assumed that this was the capital of Champa, briefly from around 1000 CE and definitively from at least 1044. As Southworth notes, for Finot ‘*Vijaya*’ was one in a ‘list of provinces’ of the kingdom of Champa which ‘has remained essentially unchallenged, being cited for all periods from the second to fifteenth centuries’.⁸⁹ Even one of the new generation, Pierre-Bernard Lafont, referred to ‘Campā, whose capital was *Vijaya*’; ‘the north of the country [apparently in that context everything north of Phan Rang], which had *Vijaya* as its capital’; and ‘*Vijaya*, center of Cam power and civilization until its annexation by the Vietnamese in 1471’.⁹⁰

This situation of *Vijaya* was not, however, the immediate interpretation of the first Chamists. Aymonier at first believed that *Vijaya* ‘must have been a small buffer state located in the present-day plain of Phantiet [i.e., Phan Thiét]’; In 1903 Finot said that ‘*Vijaya* has not been located’ in reference to inscription C17 with dates from 1147 to 1160 CE, in which Jaya Harivarman, ‘having been attacked...by the Cambodian army together with that of *Vijaya*, defeated them at Caklyang’.⁹¹ A year later, however, Finot compared inscriptions C101, C17, C30 and C92 (all concerning the twelfth-century wars with Cambodia) and saw that *Nagara*

⁸⁸ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 126, n. 3. This true Chinese rendition of the title *vijaya* is also seen at that time in the *Song huiyao* (see Wade translation).

⁸⁹ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 25; Finot, ‘Notes d’épigraphie XI’, p. 915 (Jacques ed., *Études épigraphiques*, p. 97); quotation from Southworth, ‘Notes on the political geography’, p. 237.

⁹⁰ Pierre-Bernard Lafont, ‘Études Cam III. Pour une réhabilitation des chroniques rédigées en Caü moderne’, *BEFEO*, 66 (1979): 107, 109, n. 1, 111.

⁹¹ Finot, ‘Stèle de Śambhuvarman’, p. 639 and n. 1. Aymonier’s opinion is in Étienne Aymonier, *Le Cambodge III, Le Groupe d’Angkor et l’histoire* (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1904, p. 514), cited in Finot, ‘Notes d’épigraphie XI’, p. 906, n. 1. This inscription in Cham has not been published in its entirety; its contents were summarized in Aymonier, ‘Première étude’, pp. 39-41.

Campā was then *Vijaya*; ‘at this time’, he said, ‘the capital was at Bình Định’. Thence came the new certainty that *Vijaya/Nagara Campa* was at Bình Định, a certainty which was less absolute a few pages further in the same article: ‘*Vijaya probably* corresponds to the province of Bình-định, and the name of this city was *probably* *Chà-bàn*’.⁹²

Finot did not explain the change of view, but with respect to *Chà Bàn*, it may have been influenced by the discussion in Pelliot and by Aymonier’s work on the legendary histories of the Cham.⁹³ Pelliot indeed showed convincingly on the basis of Chinese histories that in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries there was a Cham ‘capital’ in Bình Định, but he did not yet recognize the name ‘*Vijaya*’, and thought that its name was *Chà Bàn*, a name which he said first appeared in the Vietnamese histories in 1312. He also thought that the Cham capital *Foshi/Phật thế* attacked by the Vietnamese in 1044 and 1069 was at or near *Chà Bàn*. However, he restored ‘*Foshi*’ not as ‘*vijaya*’ but as ‘*bhoja*’.⁹⁴

William Southworth has most strongly – and correctly, I believe – insisted that ‘*Champa*’ was neither a unitary polity nor even a federation, but rather consisted of several separate entities, the interrelationships among which varied from time to time (total separation, alliance, peace, hostility, trade). He has asserted firmly that ‘the earliest surviving reference to *Vijaya*’ is in an inscription (C101), probably dating to *c.* 1153-84, and that ‘its application to earlier periods in the academic literature should therefore be considered an historical anachronism’.⁹⁵ Well said – but then what about the earlier references to places interpreted as located in Bình Định, the site later named *Vijaya* and sometimes referred to as such in the academic literature? Southworth does not get into this problem.

Before continuing, I wish to emphasize that although the general acceptance of Bình Định as the location of the *Vijaya* named in twelfth to thirteenth century inscriptions is eminently reasonable, there is no document showing unequivocally that such is true. *Champa* and Cambodian inscriptions indicate Angkor hegemony in ‘*Vijaya*’ (written thus in Sanskrit, Khmer

⁹² Finot, ‘Notes d’épigraphie XI’, p. 906, n. 1 and p. 915, n. 4 (emphasis added).

⁹³ Étienne Aymonier, ‘Chronique des anciens rois du Cambodge’, *Excursions et Reconnaissances*, 4, 2 (1880): 149-8.

⁹⁴ Pelliot, ‘Deux itinéraires’, pp. 202-7. He observed that ‘this name *Foshi* is identical to that of the country of *Foshi*... which existed at the time of the Tang and which shows up in *Jiadan*’s second itinerary. There is more or less general agreement that the name *Foshi* from the Tang era should be reconstructed as *Bhoja*; the same solution should probably be adopted for the Cham capital at the end of the tenth century’ (p. 202 note 2).

⁹⁵ Southworth, ‘Notes on the political geography’, p. 238; see Finot, ‘Notes d’épigraphie XI’, pp. 963-5 for the inscription. Since the inscription contains no dates, it is uncertain how Southworth found those he proposed; C17 may in fact be earlier, but this is of no consequence, for they are both from the same reign.

and Cham) in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries. The seven brick towers and tower complexes still standing, which are the most prominent evidence for the importance of Bình Định-Quy Nhơn at the time, have been described as exhibiting Angkorean architectural influence (although I find it difficult to recognize), but as architectural wholes they are quite different from anything in Cambodia.

For Maspéro and those who followed him, the first reference to Vijaya-Bình Định was in 988, when following a Vietnamese victory the Cham king retreated to Phật Thành or Phật Thệ Thành, which Maspéro believed was Vijaya in Bình Định. Again in 1044 the Vietnamese attacked and ‘arrived in Vijaya’. Here Maspéro refers to the *Vsl* which first records a Vietnamese attack on Chiêm Thành, then finally that they reached the city of Phật Thệ.⁹⁶ Once more, in 1069, the Vietnamese attacked. The Vietnamese histories *Ti* and *Cm* record very briefly that their king went to attack Chiêm Thành, location unspecified, and captured the Cham king Chế Củ, taking him as hostage until he gave up as ransom the three districts of Địa Lý, Ma Linh and Bồ Chính, far in the north in Quảng Trị and Quảng Bình. For the account of that operation Maspéro relied on *Vsl* which has a much more detailed account in which the Vietnamese arrived ‘at the port of Śrī Banöy’, which Maspéro accepted as the port of Vijaya-Bình Định, called Thị-Lợi-Bì-nại (Ch. Shi-li-pi-nai) in *Vsl*. Then they pursued the Cham king to Phật Thệ.⁹⁷

Although Maspéro did not refer to a source, the name ‘Śrī Banöy’ is from the Cham ‘légendes historiques’ published by Aymonier, the literal geographical details of which were never accepted and which have now received a new interpretation. According to the research of Po Dharma, followed by Lafont, the first of the legendary capitals – ‘Bal Sri Banay’, presumably Śrī Banöy – was in Pāḍōuraiga. None of the five legendary capitals was placed in Bình Định. In other contexts, however, they place ‘Binnai’ – a name which seems to be a fairly accurate transcription of the names in Vietnamese and Chinese histories of the time, and which Pelliot and Maspéro called Śrī Banöy – in Quảng Ngãi.⁹⁸ I shall take this up in discussion of the narrative below.

⁹⁶ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 136; *Cm*, *Chinh biên*, 3: 7-9, p. 326; *VSL*, 2: 7b-8a, pp. 86-7.

⁹⁷ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 141-2; *Vsl*, 2: 13b, p. 104.

⁹⁸ I have not seen Po Dharma’s thesis in which he discusses the five legendary capitals, and rely for its details on Lafont, ‘Études Cam III’, p. 109, which apparently follows Po Dharma. For the location of Binnai see Po Dharma, *Le Pāḍōuraiga (Campā) 1802-1835* (Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1987), vol. II, first map in ‘Annexe 4’ (following p. 227), entitled ‘Le Campā et les étapes de l’expansion vietnamienne vers le sud’; and the map in *Actes du séminaire*, p. 1.

After the war of 1069, according to Maspéro, the Cham rulers returned to Indrapura/Đông Duong and there is no further reference to Vijaya-Binh Định until it really appears in epigraphy in the twelfth- to thirteenth-century wars with Cambodia, which will be discussed later on. The term ‘*vijaya*’, however, occurs in other contexts – not specifically as a place name but in contexts which may have misled Finot, Maspéro and others, including Coedès, who in his study of Śrī Vijaya in Sumatra said that ‘it is known for certain from epigraphy that at this time [the late tenth century and during the tenth century] the Cham capital was in Binh-định and was called *Vijaya*’.⁹⁹ Coedès, as I shall show, was mistaken about the epigraphy, for ‘*vijaya*’ as the name of a capital does not appear until the twelfth century. Two Cham kings (both named Harivarmadeva) in two Cham-language inscriptions from Mỹ Sơn (C75 and C94, dated 991 and 978-1078 respectively) took the titles *yāi po ku vijaya śrī*. This may have misled Maspéro and others concerning ‘*vijaya*’, resulting in erroneous interpretations of historical events as discussed below. In these titles the term ‘*vijaya*’ probably had no relationship with a location, but rather indicated ‘victory, victorious’, as construed for one context by Bergaigne.¹⁰⁰

In addition to its use as a toponym for a particular place (which does not appear in the epigraphic record until mid- to late twelfth century), the term *vijaya* (literally, ‘victory’) was used in the eleventh to twelfth centuries to designate a geographic-administrative division, for which one would expect the term *Viṣaya*. Finot gave attention to this and listed the names of 12 ‘*vijaya*’, usually associated with an elite individual who in some way was involved with that *vijaya*. Aymonier at first thought it meant that he had been victorious in the region named. This use of *vijaya* was very late in Cham epigraphy, the first instance being in C89/1088 and the last in C83C/1263, with six in a single inscription, C92/1170; all were in Mỹ Sơn. In addition to those 12 *vijaya* (perhaps meaning *viṣaya*) listed by Finot, two more – *śilāvandhavijaya* (C29B) and *manāhvijaya* (C31) – are in the inscriptions of Pô Nagar in the same period, and a *iauk glauī vijaya* is in the very late inscription of Biên Hoà, C1/1421. This last occurrence has been erroneously construed as the name-title of a prince. The text, however, refers to king (*yāi po ku śrī*) Jaya Siihavarmadeva, a ‘man (*urai*) [of] *iok gloi vijaya*’ – clearly a place name, but translated by Aymonier as ‘person (*urai*) on a high (*iok gloi*) victory (*vijaya*)’.¹⁰¹

⁹⁹ George Coedès, ‘Le royaume de Śrī Vijaya’, *BEFEO* 18, 6 (1918): 24 (emphasis added).

¹⁰⁰ Bergaigne, ‘Ancien royaume’, pp. 282-5, construed ‘*vijaya*’ in the title *ratnabhūmivijaya* as ‘victory’.

¹⁰¹ Schweyer, ‘Chronologie des inscriptions’, p. 343; Finot, ‘Inscriptions du Musée’, p. 14 (‘prince *ḍauk Glauī Vijaya*’); Aymonier, ‘Première étude’, pp. 84-5.

The expected *viṣaya*, in ‘Caum viṣayāu’, occurs in the Sanskrit of the seventh-century C96.¹⁰² This apparent confusion of ‘*vijaya*’ and ‘*viṣaya*’ occurs once in Old Khmer epigraphy, in the Khmer part of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription (K.235); there it refers to *vijaya* Indrapura, recognized by Coedès and Dupont as a confusion with *viṣaya*, which appears in the corresponding Sanskrit section.¹⁰³ The few inscriptions found in Bình Định are not of much help. None employs the name ‘Vijaya’, and when it appears in epigraphy in the twelfth century and may with confidence be localized near Quy Nhơn, it is never referred to in Chinese and Vietnamese sources as ‘Foshi/Phật Thê’. The identification of Foshi/Phật Thê with *Vijaya* has been accepted since Coedès’ study of Śrīvijaya in Sumatra, where the term *vijaya* was known from local inscriptions; some of the Chinese writers, beginning with Yijing, called it ‘*Foshi*’. Thus we must take a new look at Coedès’ study of the problem.

On re-reading Pelliot and then Coedès on this question, it seems to me that there was circularity in the argument: the Sumatran evidence was used to justify an explanation of the Champa evidence, which was in turn used to support the explanation for Sumatra. Besides that, the reasoning of Coedès was a bit slippery. His argument appeared in his article of 1918, ‘Le royaume de Çrīvijaya’, and the problem was to reconcile the name ‘*Srīvijaya*’ – known from inscriptions and found in Cola records of places they attacked – with the name ‘Shilifoshi’. This term, found first in Yijing, was believed to represent a highly developed port city in Sumatra, probably at Palembang, known to Chinese Buddhists as an important center for the study of Sanskrit and Buddhism and considered by them as an important stage for preliminary study before proceeding to India. Coedès’ solution was that the Chinese *Shilifoshi* was a transcription of *Srī vijaya*. That transcription was not straightforward and involved discussion of the phonetics of both *vijaya* and *Foshi*. The Chinese ‘Shili’ for *śrī* was not, and has not since been, controversial.¹⁰⁴

The first European interpretation of ‘*Foshi*’, seen in Pelliot, was ‘*bhoja*’, troubling because it had no relevant meaning, but there was agreement that the character *fo*佛 (‘Buddha’), could only represent syllables with vowels /o/ or /u/. There was also a problem with the *che* in

¹⁰² Ibid., p.42; Finot, ‘Notes d’*épigraphie* XI’, pp. 915-6, 921.

¹⁰³ George Coedès and Pierre Dupont, ‘Les stèles de Sdok Kāk Thom, Phnom Sandak et Prāh Vihār’, *BEFEO*, 43 (1943-46): 104-5 and note 9. The opposite confusion – ‘*viṣaya*’ for ‘*vijaya*’ – occurred in the Tamil inscriptions concerning Śrīvijaya in Sumatra, apparently because of a peculiarity in Tamil script (Coedès, ‘Royaume de Çrī Vijaya’, pp. 4-5).

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., p. 23 insisted that it was the name *Foshi* ‘appeared for the first time’ in Yijing’s text’.

Foshi which, it was thought, could only represent syllables with /i/ or /e/, but not with /a/. Thus Coedès first rejected ‘*bhoja*’ but asked, ‘is *Foshi* = *vijaya* any better?’ First, it could be shown that Yijing, the first to write of ‘Shilifoshi’, had in other writings used that same *shi* character to represent /je/, /ji/, and also /jai/ and /jaya/ in other Sanskrit terms, which seemed to solve one problem. However, he continued, ‘the correspondence between *fo* = *vi* is less satisfactory. I think, though, that it is possible.’ The old pronunciation of *fo*, he said was **pwⁱδ*. (Now, according to Geoff Wade it seems to be /but/). ‘For the change from *vi*, or more exactly *bi* [because in the Southeast Asian languages in question an alternation of initial *v/b* is common] to *bu* through labialisation is...possible, and examples do exist, which is enough to justify the use of *fo*. In fact, *fo-che* (*foshi*) *fo-tsⁱ* may represent a form *bujai*, a corrupted spoken form of *vijaya*’. ‘*Bujai*’, let us not forget now, is a completely speculative form, not found in any text.¹⁰⁵

The examples offered by Coedès as support for *bi* > *bu* were taken from the representations of original Sanskrit words in modern Khmer, and are not at all good evidence. Coedès’ three examples were Sanskrit *vīja*, ‘seed’ > Khmer *bīj* (*puč*); *bimba*, ‘picture’ > *bum* (*pūm*); and *bhīmasena*, a type of camphor, > *bumsen* (*pūmsèn*). I repeat, these are modern Khmer forms, and it is not certain they derive directly from Sanskrit. In Angkor Khmer-language inscriptions, however, we still find *vija* (seed) in the fourteenth century and *bhimasena* in the eleventh century, meaning that the Sanskrit vocalization was still maintained with only shortening of the vowel and that the *ī/i* > *ū/u* in Khmer was a later development and thus of no relevance for the argument about *vijaya* > hypothetical *bujai* in seventh-century Śrī Vijaya. Neither ‘*bimba*’ nor ‘*bum*’ occur in published Khmer inscriptions. Moreover, Coedès acknowledged that Sanskrit *vijaya* has remained *bijai* in modern Khmer and Thai.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, even if the development in Khmer had been as Coedès proposed, it would be of no significance for *vijaya* > *bujai* = *foshi* in Sumatra, where the language was Malay, whose phonetic development could not be hypothesized on the basis of Khmer.

If, then, the proposal for *vijaya/bijaya* > *bujai* as a ‘corrupted spoken form’ is quite weak, in fact Coedès’ main argument for *Foshi* = *vijaya* collapses. What, then, did Yijing mean with his *Foshi*, especially when we know that the Chinese had a perfectly transparent transcription for

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 23 (‘Is...any better?’) and 24 (phonetic discussion). Information on the reconstruction of the earlier form is from Geoff Wade, personal communication.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., p. 24, notes 4 and 3 respectively. The Khmer examples are respectively in inscriptions K.470 and K.455. K.470 is in George Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, Vol. 2 (Hanoi: Imprimerie d’Extrême-Orient, 1942), p. 188 and K.455 is in Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, Vol. 7 (Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1964), p. 80.

vijaya (*bi-sà-xà*) in their reports concerning Champa and that there was a king Harivarman whose titles in inscriptions were *yāi po ku vijaya śrī*, with *vijaya* written exactly as in inscriptions referring to locations named ‘*vijaya*’?

Not only did the Chinese transcribe *vijaya* correctly in Cham royal titles, but in texts other than Yijing’s they had more accurate transcriptions for *Śrī Vijaya* in Sumatra. Coedès already noted in 1918 that other Chinese transcribed the name of what was apparently the same place in Sumatra as *Jin-li-pu-shi*, with the character *jin* a scribal error for the very similar *shi*, which in the full Chinese transcription ‘represents very precisely *Çrībijaya = Çrīvijaya*’. Wade has made the same point, citing tenth-century Chinese texts referring to ‘Jin-li-pi-jia’ and ‘Jin-li-pi-shi’, accepted as the same place in Sumatra and with ‘jin’ as scribal error for ‘shi’.¹⁰⁷ It would thus seem that Yijing’s *foshi* for *v(b)ijaya* was his own idiosyncratic choice. Why?

Yijing was a good Sanskritist, and he would have known that the country’s official name was *Śrī Vijaya*, written that way in their own inscriptions, and the Buddhist intellectual elite with whom he probably mixed would have pronounced it that way, or at least as /bijaya/. Why would he have adopted a ‘corrupted spoken form’ which, if it existed (on dubious evidence), would have been that of the streets? Even if he had assimilated that spoken form, why transcribe it with precisely the character which means ‘Buddha’? Yijing was not only a Sanskritist who would have understood *vijaya*, he was also a devout Buddhist who was in *Śrī Vijaya* because of its reputation as a Sanskrit and Buddhist studies center. I propose that his choice was deliberate, to represent not a popular, non-literate pronunciation of the local name, but what for him was the important character of the place, its Buddhism. Thus *Foshi = but* (Buddha) *jay(a)*, ‘Buddha victory’.

As supplementary support for his argument, which I have treated as circular above, Coedès turned to Champa, where, ‘at the end of the tenth century and over the course of the eleventh, the Chinese and Vietnamese mention the city of *Foshi* [written just like the *Foshi* in Sumatra] as the capital of Champa... We know for certain from the epigraphy that at this time the Cham capital was in Bình Định and was called *Vijaya*’.¹⁰⁸ Here, as in the evidence concerning ‘*bi > bu*’, Coedès slid over some of the details. The epigraphic evidence which he cited for *Vijaya* as a capital, allegedly in Bình Định is not from the tenth to eleventh centuries, but from the twelfth; and at that time the Vietnamese chronicles do not write of *Phật Thệ* (*Foshi*),

¹⁰⁷Coedès, ‘Royaume de Çrī Vijaya’, p. 24; Geoff Wade, personal communication, 3 Dec. 2004.

¹⁰⁸ Coedès, ‘Royaume de Çrī Vijaya’, p. 24; emphasis added.

but only of *Chiêm Thành*, ‘Cham city’. They also have very little to say about the Champa-Cambodia warfare which accounts for the frequent references to Vijaya in the epigraphy. Even when the Vietnamese chronicles are concerned with the real Cham center in Bình Định (possibly Vijaya), in the fifteenth century before and during the conquest of 1471, they still write only of Chiêm Thành, Chà/Đồ Bàn, or Thị Nai. That is, the real Vijaya of Champa, in contexts where contemporary epigraphy shows that it was certainly the site of reference, was never called Foshi/Phật Thệ by the Chinese and Vietnamese, just as the Cham royal title ‘vijaya’ was never transcribed as *foshi*, but with characters truly representing *vi(bi)jaya*.

This should, I think, engender some doubt about *Foshi* representing *vijaya* in Champa. The first references to ‘Phật thệ’ plus ‘thành’ (‘city’) are in the 980s – the time of the first war between newly independent Viet Nam and a Champa entity whose ‘capital’ had been established by 875 in Indrapura (the ruins of which are now known as Đồng Dương), where the dominant religion was Mahayana Buddhism. The first Vietnamese reference to their victory, moreover, calls the location not *Phật thệ thành*, but *Phật thành*, ‘Buddha city’, an understandable epithet for Đồng Dương.¹⁰⁹

The reason that the identity *Phật thành/Phật thệ thành* = Đồng Dương /Indrapura was not understood in the time of Pelliot, Coedès and Maspéro was that the Chinese had reports of the Cham elite withdrawing 700 *li* after their defeat, Đồng Dương was considered the northernmost important Champa city in the ninth to tenth centuries, and from there to Vijaya in Bình Định was precisely 700 *li*. The extension of Champa territory at that time, demonstrated by large-scale structures and epigraphy throughout Quảng Trị and Quảng Bình, was not yet well-known. Now, however, it is easy to understand that the Chiêm Thành which the Vietnamese attacked in 982 was somewhere in that northern area, from which the distance to the ‘Buddha city’ Đồng Dương/Indrapura was also around 700 *li*. This could explain the Chinese note of 989 in the *Song Shi* about *Foshiguo* (‘The country of *Foshi*’) being ‘newly established’ as meaning simply that a new Champa ruler re-established his capital at ‘Buddha city’ Đồng Dương, where it had been located – except for the expansions northward – since at least 875. A later Chinese report (also from the *Song Shi*) of a Cham envoy in 1007 saying that ‘my country was formerly subject to Jiaozhou, then we fled to Foshi, 700 li south of our former location’, fits well with a Viet attack

¹⁰⁹ Pelliot, ‘Deux itinéraires’, p. 204, n. 2, insisted that this was an error, and should be corrected to *Phật thệ thành*, the Sino-Vietnamese equivalent of *Foshicheng* found in the Chinese chronicles, as though the Vietnamese did not know the name of their conquest.

in 982 in Quảng Bình and a Cham retreat to Đồng Dương. The insistence of the Vietnamese chronicle *Cương Mục* that Foshi was Huế, if not quite accurate, is not as confusing as Pelliot thought, given that Huế is close to the latitude of Đồng Dương.¹¹⁰

Maspéro himself was forced to admit, after an unconvincing story of a retreat southward even as far as Phan Rang, that the Cham rulers soon returned to Indrapura, the city where the Đồng Dương temple complex was located. That is, when his fiction about the two decades or so after 982 is bracketed out, it is easy to see that there was no move of Cham kings or capital south of the Indrapura - Huế region.¹¹¹ At the date of that first Champa-Vietnam war, however, there was a real king Harivarman, known from his late tenth-century inscriptions (C75/991 and probably C78) as *yān po ku vijaya śrī*, which undoubtedly influenced Maspéro's belief that he had retreated to Vijaya. The inscriptions are from Mỹ Sơn, however, and thus do not justify an argument that he had moved to the Vijaya in Bình Định. He is one of only two kings known from inscriptions with these titles – the other appearing nearly a century later and neither of them having any connection to the city of Vijaya – and it was probably to him that the Vietnamese referred in their chronicle entry for 1000.

Moreover, to add to the confusion, Maspéro says that in 990 – that is, after Harivarman had supposedly moved to Vijaya – the Vietnamese attacked again and ‘devastated’ ‘the citadel’ of Địa Lý. The latter, as Maspéro himself notes, was in Quảng Bình, far north of the 700 *li* of territory believed lost in the alleged withdrawal from Indrapura to Vijaya and thus of no relevance to a Champa center supposedly located in Vijaya. Nevertheless, Maspéro says that ‘Harivarman’ – in the Chinese text just ‘a new king’ whose title in Chinese transcription seemed to him to be ‘Indravarman’ of Foshi, which he believed to be Vijaya – complained to the Chinese. A Cham king making such a complaint was more likely in Indrapura or somewhere in the North, not in Vijaya-Bình Định, and was probably the Harivarman who in 991 left an inscription in Mỹ Sơn. Two years later the Vietnamese released 360 prisoners whom they had taken in that battle, and the *Ti* refers to Địa Lý as *cựu thành* (Ch. *jiucheng*), ‘old city’ – perhaps, in this context, even ‘old capital’, given that ‘Chiêm Thành’ was the conventional Vietnamese reference for the Champa capital. The Champa inscriptions, together with the Vietnamese and Chinese sources

¹¹⁰ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 132, has the quotation from the *Song Shi*; Pelliot, ‘Deux itinéraires’, p. 203, for the *Cm* citation locating Foshi at Huế. The *Cm* (*Chính biên*, 3:9, v. 1, p. 327), citing the Chinese gazetteer *Qing yitongzhi*, places it in what was then Hương Thủy district of Thừa Thiên province.

¹¹¹ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 126-30.

used by Maspéro, still imply that the area of Champa-Vietnamese contact was from Quảng Nam northward to Quảng Bình.¹¹²

Some slightly different details appear in Geoff Wade's new translation of *Song Huiyao*. First, in 990 a new Champa king named in Chinese Yang-Tuo-pai 'claimed that he had been born (自稱所生) in the country of 'Vijaya (*Foshiguo* 佛逝國)'; the latter is thus designated as a 'guo' (country) instead of the usual 'cheng' (城), meaning 'city'. A problem here, however, is that the *Song huiyao* says that in 990 the new king only claimed to have been born in *Foshiguo*, not that he had newly re-established it, as written in the *Song Shi*. Obviously one or the other Chinese text is corrupt. Then in 1006 the Cham king sent an envoy to China, and he 'advised that their country had formerly been subject to Jiao-zhou... but later it had given its allegiance [or 'fled to'] to *Foshi* (佛逝) (Vijaya)'. Wade's treatment of this is peculiar, writing in his main text that Champa 'had given its allegiance to Fo-shi', but in a note saying 'literally: "fled to"', apparently like the *Song Shi*. Obviously 'giving allegiance' and 'fleeing to' imply quite different historical circumstances. This seems to be a case in which the Chinese scribes, writing long after the event and at second hand, did not understand the situation. In this second entry, of 1006, the Champa envoy said that 'to the north they lost 700 *li* of their former territory'; as noted above, this could correspond to the territory north of Indrapura as far as Quảng Bình, which had been occupied with impressive monuments by the Indrapura/Đông Dương 'dynasty', and in which the 'old city' of Địa Lý was located.

In conclusion, concerning *Vijaya*, the identification of *Foshi/Phật thế* in Champa with *vijaya* must be rejected.

Narrative history continued

Champa activity in the far North resumed in 995 and 997 with attacks on Hoan and Ái again, beyond Quảng Bình northward in Nghệ An and Hà Tĩnh – hardly attributable to a Cham polity in Vijaya-Binh Định which had lost 700 *li* of territory between Binh Định and Indrapura to the Vietnamese. The Vietnamese emperor Lê Hoàn is said to have commented to the Chinese that his borders were contiguous with Champa. Perhaps that is why Maspéro wrote that Harivarman, 'although he had been proclaimed king in Vijaya, had re-established the court in

¹¹² Ibid.; *TT, Bản kỷ*, 1:20a, v. 1, p. 227.

Indrapura [Đồng Dương]’.¹¹³ Neither of these claims is justified by anything in the texts, but it seems that Maspéro finally saw that the defeat of 982 must have been farther north and that Đồng Dương/Indrapura – or at least the Thu Bồn region – became the main northern Cham center again after that war. There is no evidence that *yāi po ku vijaya śrī* Harivarman, Maspéro’s ‘national claimant to the throne’, ever moved to Bình Định, and there is thus no need to hypothesize a subsequent return to Indrapura. The northern Champa rulers of the time had always been in that region, and they were probably responsible for the earlier attacks on Hoan and Ái in 803, noted above. Here we may understand the significance of what initially appear to be contradictory contexts in the the *Song huiyao*. The introduction says that it was two days by sea from Champa to the Red River delta, but by 1076 the same trip is recorded as having taken 17 days; Wade interprets the difference as resulting from a loss of Champa territory after the ‘presumably ... earlier time’.¹¹⁴ If the two-day sail is not a textual error, it can only refer to Champa’s farthest northern extent (northern Quảng Bình) and an attack on Hoan and Ái; the territory lost by 1076 would have been those far northern provinces, not the territory from Indrapura to Bình Định.

In Maspéro’s interpretation, Harivarman’s successor – known only by his titles, *yāi po ku vijaya śrī*, as transcribed in Chinese – moved definitely to Vijaya in 1000; there is no source for this assertion, which is probably based only on his title. As noted above, this was probably still the same Harivarman. Maspéro’s story continues from the Chinese, with *yāi po ku vijaya śrī* replaced in 1010 by another ‘Harivarman’ (inferred from a Chinese transcription but probably the same Harivarman). In 1018 the Chinese transcription changed to *Shi-mei-pai-mo-die* and Maspéro interpreted it unconvincingly as ‘Parameśvaravarman’, a new king. In fact, following *yāi po ku vijaya śrī* Harivarman, the Chinese transcriptions of Cham royal names up to 1044 changed four times in ways that give little support to Maspéro’s interpretations.¹¹⁵

In the 1020s and 1030s there was more warfare in Quảng Bình, odd if the Champa center was in Vijaya; then in 1044, the Vietnamese decided on a major invasion, which has always been interpreted as a conquest of Vijaya in Bình Định. The campaign began in January, and the fighting (described in the same detail in both Maspéro and *Tt*) took place north of Huế and around Đà Nẵng. The Vietnamese moved by boat; having reached a branch of the Thu Bồn River,

¹¹³ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 129; in note 3 he quotes the Vietnamese source *An Nam Chí Lược*, 11:7b, which quotes Lê Hoàn’s remarks to the Song.

¹¹⁴ Wade, *Song huiyao*.

¹¹⁵ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 133-6.

they left the boats and landed, defeating the Champa army there. It is impossible from the description to determine how long they took to reach that region, but the next statement, immediately after the description of the battle, is that in the seventh month ‘the king took his soldiers and entered the city of Phật Thệ’. This implies a site not far from the battlefield, that is the ‘Buddha city’ (Đồng Dương), not Vijaya as has conventionally been construed in modern academic literature. A march from the Thu Bồn to a Vijaya in Bình Định would have taken nearly another month, probably with more fighting on the way, or at least at their destination; by sea it would have taken almost as long, but in the eighth month they had already returned to Nghệ An. A campaign from the Thu Bồn to Bình Định and return to Nghệ An could not have been compressed into the specified time period.¹¹⁶ Thus, it should be accepted that the so-called invasion of Vijaya in 1044 was in fact an attack on the Thu Bồn valley region and that this was a final Vietnamese attempt to defeat the successors of the so-called ‘Đồng Dương dynasty’ who had taken over the old Linyi policy of pushing northward and had established important centers as far North as Quảng Bình.

Champa in the eleventh century

The period from the war of 1044 to the war of 1069, which Maspéro – on the basis of one Vietnamese source but not the most official chronicles – called another attack on Vijaya, is perhaps the most fictionalized segment of his history. (Peculiarly, it should be noted, the *Song Huiyao* makes no reference to the Vietnamese attacks on Champa in 1044 and 1069). Following the events of 1044, a new ruler, ‘whose ancestors were merely warriors, Īśvaras, vassals of the preceding rulers...took power and had himself crowned under the name of Jaya Parameśvaravarman’.¹¹⁷ How do the inscriptions contribute to Maspéro’s interpretation? First, they provide no information at all about Vijaya until the late twelfth century, when that name appears for the first time in connection with Champa-Cambodia warfare. After the 991 inscription of *yāi po ku vijaya śrī* Harivarman in Mỹ Sơn there are no more inscriptions until 1050, and throughout the eleventh century all inscriptions were set up either in Mỹ Sơn (or at least in Quảng Nam) or in the South in Nha Trang and Phan Rang. In particular, the two kings,

¹¹⁶ Stein, *Linyi*, p. 129, cites a Chinese text (the *Qianhanshu*) which says that an army on the march covered only 30 *li* per day, whereas the distance from Đồng Dương to Bình Định was considered to be 700 *li*, a nearly 50-day round-trip trek, not counting time in Vijaya-Bình Định. By sea, the distance from the Thu Bồn to Bình Định is about half the distance from the Thu Bồn back to Nghệ An, thus more or less a month.

¹¹⁷ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 137.

both named Harivarman and holding the title *yai po ku vijaya śrī*, showed no interest in the site of the later Vijaya (Bình Định) in their inscriptions, and that term in their titles was probably intended as ‘victorious’, without any territorial connotation.

Following the war of 1044, between 1050 and 1064, two new kings, Parameśvaravarman and Rudravarman, left inscriptions at Pô Nagar in Nha Trang; the second of these rulers is mentioned in credible transcriptions in Chinese. The first, who between 1050 and 1055 left two inscriptions in Pô Nagar of Nha Trang or its surrounding province, four in Phan Rang and one in Quảng Nam, seemed particularly concerned with troubles in Pāōuraiga, not warfare with Vietnam. Maspéro abusively said he ‘had quite a job to rebuild the ruins that the Vietnamese armies and civil wars had left behind.... In fact, neither in the inscription cited nor elsewhere did this king refer to Vietnamese; he mentioned only *‘this Kali age where Conflict holds sway over the world’*, a standard formula for ‘modern’ times in contrast to better days in the past.¹¹⁸ He made no reference to previous kings, least of all to say that his family had been their vassals. Then in 1064 King Rudravarman left a Sanskrit inscription in Pô Nagar, saying that he ‘belonged to the noble family of Īśvaras [not ‘mere warriors...vassals of the preceding rulers], of Śrī Parameśvara [perhaps Parameśvaravarman]’. He also claimed that he was the younger brother of Śrī Bhadravarman, perhaps the immediate successor (briefly) of Parameśvaravarman, as reasonably interpreted by Maspéro – who added without reason, however, that Rudravarman ‘may have had some connection with the death of his older brother’.

In the meantime, in C95/1056, a certain Śrī Yuvarāja Mahāsenāpati set up an inscription in Mý Son, in which he boasted of having conquered the city of Śaübhupura in Cambodia, destroying its sanctuaries and taking Khmer prisoners whom he offered to the sanctuaries of Śrīśānabhadreśvara, the main temple of Mý Son, thus following in the traditions of former kings of Champa who honored this site. There is no indication of his family, and no reason to connect him with the family of Parameśvaravarman-Bhadravarman-Rudravarman who were ruling in Nha Trang-Phan Rang between 1050-64, at least. If he may be connected with any previous rulers, it would be with the family of the Harivarman of 991, and later. It must be accepted that there were still ruling chiefs in the Thu Bôn valley concurrently with the kings in the South, both before and after the war of 1044.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁸ Ibid., p.139 and notes 6-7.

¹¹⁹ Inscription C95, in Finot, ‘Notes d’épigraphie XI’, pp. 943-6. Note that at the time of their publication the numerical dates in the Champa inscriptions were often not properly understood. Finot (p. 946) read its date as 789

Finot believed this Śrī Yuvarāja Mahāsenāpati was the Yuvarāja Mahāsenāpati Prince Pāi (younger brother of another Harivarman), who became King Paramabodhisatva. He is mentioned with those qualities in the dated inscription C89/1088, as Yuvarāja in the undated (tenth c. *ś.* [AD 978-1078]) inscriptions C93 and C94, and as Paramabodhisatva in C30A1. This still makes a link with the Harivarman of C75/991, because the ruler of that name who was the elder brother of the Yuvarāja (later Paramabodhisatva) also had the titles *yāi po ku vijaya śrī* in C94. Thus from 991 until 1088 there are records of a line of related kings leaving their inscriptions at M̃y Son concurrently – from 1050 to 1064 – with Parameśvaravarman and Rudravarman in Nha Trang and Phan Rang.

In the time of Rudravarman there seems to have been contact between his part of Champa and China, for the Chinese on occasion recorded a credible phonetic transcription of his name. It is not certain, however, that all the envoys recorded as coming to China from ‘Champa’ were from the same region. In Maspéro’s interpretation of the Chinese sources, the Cham were preparing to attack Vietnam, although the interpretation requires a certain element of imagination. Thus, at a date which he does not make clear, a Chinese source says that because of attacks by Giao Chi, Champa was preparing its forces to resist. Then the Champa king ‘continued his preparations’, as evidenced by a request to buy mules from China; and finally ‘he launched hostilities along the border’ – the provocation for a Vietnamese invasion in 1069. Maspéro’s citation is from *Tt*, which in fact makes light of the incident, saying that in 1068 Chiêm Thành offered a white elephant and then ‘caused trouble along the border’.¹²⁰

Maspéro’s citation of *Tt* here is peculiar, since for the full campaign (which does not appear in *Tt*), he uses *Vsl*, the only one of the Vietnamese histories which contains it. The other histories say only that the Vietnamese king attacked Chiêm Thành, captured the Cham king Ché Cũ, and held him for ransom. Moreover, the border was far in the north in Quảng Bình-Quảng Trị, as we shall see from the outcome of the war, while the inscriptions show two Champa centers, one in the Thu Bồn and one in Nha Trang-Phan Rang; the latter could hardly have been involved in squabbles along the northern border.

śaka/867, rather than 978/1056, and thought it must have referred to a previous reign. He also said that it ‘appears to be a continuation of the preceding inscription’ (C94), which seems correct. I attribute the undated C94 to the time of Harivarman of M̃y Son, whose other inscriptions are C75/991 and C93/tenth c. *śaka*, i.e. 978-1078 CE. For the corrections of the numerical dates in general see Finot, ‘Les inscriptions du Musée’; on the date for C95 see Finot, ‘Errata et addenda’, *BEFEO*, 15, 2 (1915): 191: ‘IV, 944...and 946... “798”: read “978” and eliminate the note on p. 946’. Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, describes the event (p. 145) but provides no date, situating it in his narrative between other events in 1076 and 1080; the same is true for Coedès, *Indianized states*, p. 152.

¹²⁰ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 140-41, citing the *Song Shi* and the *Tt*.

The so-called campaign against Vijaya in 1069, based only on *Vsl*, proceeded as follows. The Vietnamese fleet set out in the third month and reached Thị Lợi Bi Nai where the troops disembarked and fought with the Cham, killing many. The Cham king, Đê Cù (Chế Củ in the other Vietnamese histories) – for Maspéro Rudravarman of Phan Rang – fled to *Phật thệ* but was pursued and captured on the border of Cambodia in the fourth month. The Vietnamese remained about one month in *Phật thệ* and started their return to their own capital in the fifth month. Thus the journey from Thăng Long (modern-day Hanoi) to *Phật thệ* took less than one month and the return nearly two months.

Pelliot commented on the same passage of *Vsl* and was convinced that the object of the invasion was Vijaya-Bình Định. He identified Maspéro's Đà Dùm, one of the ports en route (reached on the 28th day of the third month), as Tư Dùm, the southern entrance to the lagoon of Huế, and said that the voyage from there to 'Vijaya' (that is Thị Lợi Bi Nai, reached on the third day of the fourth month) was only six days. This seems a very short time, given that the distance from Huế to Quy Nhơn is more than half the total distance of the campaign from the Vietnamese capital which *Vsl* says took two months.¹²¹ This is enough to show that the Thị Lợi Bi Nai and *Phật thệ* in this account were not in Bình Định. In any case, it should be noted for comment below on subsequent events, that the story found in *Vsl* has the Vietnamese fleet and troops proceeding directly to their goal, and after success returning directly home.

I maintain that this story is incoherent and results from Maspéro's insistence on a single Champa and confusion about supposed references to 'Vijaya'. As we have seen, all the inscriptions from the end of the tenth century to the 1060s, and later, were in Mỹ Sơn, Nha Trang and Phan Rang. None shows any interest in Vijaya-Bình Định, but some of them do show concern with Pāṇḍuraiga. The border problems which supposedly provoked the Vietnamese attack had been far in the North in Quảng Bình, as were the provinces which Vietnam obtained as a king's ransom following the war. Cham chiefs in Nha Trang and Phan Rang would have had little interest or military power in that area, and those who left inscriptions in Mỹ Sơn were more preoccupied with the far South. The Cham king there was Rudravarman in Maspéro's version, but the Cham king in the Vietnamese histories was Chế Củ or Đê Cù. He was captured and taken prisoner, and in order to gain release he ceded Địa Lý, Ma Linh and Bồ Chính (far to the north in

¹²¹ Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires', pp. 206-7. Đê Cù as the name of the Cham king is also from Pelliot's reading.

Quảng Bình and Quảng Trị) to Vietnam. That was the border where *Tt* recorded that the Cham had been causing trouble.

Did the 1069 Vietnamese invasion reach Bình Định, however? According to Maspéro, the Vietnamese arrived ‘at the port of Śrī Banöy’, called Shili Pinai in Chinese and Thị Lộ’i Bi Nai in the Vietnamese *Vsl*; thus ‘Śrī Banöy’ was his construal of the Chinese and Vietnamese names. It is the name of one of the Champa capitals in the historical legends collected and published by Aymonier; the latter had placed it in Quảng Bình, but Pelliot argued that it should be identified with the port of Chà Bàn in Quy Nhơn.¹²² Recent work by modern Chamists, however, has given a completely new and contradictory reading of the Cham historical chronicles. According to the new interpretations, those chronicles were formerly discredited because it was believed that they claimed to refer to kings ruling in Vijaya, whereas in fact they were only intended as chronicles of Pāḍōuraïga /Phan Rang. The major revisionist work in this area is the thesis by Po Dharma, which I have not seen, but maps in his Pāḍōuraïga work and in the Copenhagen papers place Binnai in Quảng Ngãi. According to him, the first of the five legendary capitals – ‘Bal Sri Banay’, presumably Śrī Banöy – was in Pāḍōuraïga, and none of them was located in Bình Định.¹²³

Quảng Ngãi is the site of a large citadel (in fact the remains of an ancient city) now called Châu Sa, and another citadel, Cổ Lũy, on the north and south banks of the Trà Khúc river near its mouth; there is also the ruined temple of Chánh Lộ, dated to the eleventh century, from which important works of sculpture have been retrieved. The two citadel sites were never explored by the French, but it is clear that like other river mouths of Champa, that delta was also important. I thus propose that the Vietnamese attack of 1069 was on Châu Sa – a more credible but still very rapid six-day sail from Huế – and that Chế Củ was not Rudravarman, but a Cham chief somewhere in the North.¹²⁴

¹²² Ibid., p. 209;

¹²³ See Pierre-Bernard Lafont, ‘Avant propos’ and ‘Les recherches sur le Campā et leur évolution’, in *Actes du séminaire*, pp. 3-5 and 7-25 respectively. Lafont notes (p. 15) that Po Dharma, *Pāḍōuraïga* ‘has shown that the list of kings given in the chronicles [written] in “modern” Cham does not correspond to those appearing in the epigraphy because the former is a list of kings who ruled in the South after the fifteenth century, while the latter are kings who ruled in the North before the fifteenth century’.

¹²⁴ Southworth, ‘Origins of Campā’ shows that Châu Sa may have been an important center as early as the seventh to eighth centuries (pp.149, 151, 170). Eventually Pelliot’s identification of places along the route may have to be modified.

How do subsequent Champa inscriptions fit with Maspéro's story of the 1069 invasion? He says that while Ché Cù-Rudravarman was in captivity in Đại Việt, the country of Champa collapsed in civil war, with more than ten chiefs fighting for the title of king. This assertion is based on a single Cham inscription, C30A1 from Nha Trang; its translation gave Aymonier some difficulty, and in his study most of the original Cham text is not published, but only summarized. Contrary to Maspéro, it says nothing about 'Annamites', and the warfare about which it speaks seems to have involved Phan Rang and Nha Trang. The date of this inscription is 1084 and the king was named *yāi po ku śrī* Paramabodhisatva. He is said to have preserved the realm of *Nagara Campā* during the disasters of the war. Then there are terms which Aymonier did not understand, followed by 'went in to capture *yā= pu ku* Rudravarman' and expel him from *Nagara Campā* (the words 'expel him' are reinterpreted by Maspéro as 'sack the capital'), and Champa was at war for 16 years with ten men struggling for the throne. One man in Phan Rang ruled there for 16 years until removed by Paramabodhisatva. After his success Paramabodhisatva was sole king and he and his son gave offerings to Pô Nagar in Nha Trang.¹²⁵ In a vague way, then, this inscription does seem to reflect a war around 1069 (in traditional arithmetic 16 years before 1084) and a bad end for Rudravarman, but not a war with Vietnam. The important struggle was between Nha Trang and Phan Rang, and we must not lose sight of the Vietnamese story, which relates only an attack on Thị Lợi Bi Nai and a rapid return to Đại Việt, without any action farther south.

Another problem with the story of 1069 is the appearance in 1080 of another group of royalty, led by a Harivarman Prince Thāi, who from the combined evidence of C93, C94, C90A/1080-1081 and C89 (all in Mỹ Sơn) is seen as the elder brother of Prince Pāi, later King Paramabodhisatva. This group had established themselves in the Thu Bồn. Their story starts with a king Prāleyeśvara Dharmarāja who had a son Harivarmadeva, Prince Thāi. It says that the temple of Śrīśānabhadreśvara had been taken and devastated, something which might have been connected with a war around 1069. Prince Thāi defeated enemies a dozen times – but not 'Annamites', *pace* Maspéro. In particular, he defeated the Cambodians at a place named Someśvara and took much booty. Prince Thāi's son was *pu lyai śrī* Rājadvāra. He was raised in rank to *yāi po ku śrī* Jaya Indravarmadeva when he was only nine years old, and his father died in 1081. The story continues in C89 with Prince Pāi= Paramabodhisatva replacing his nephew,

¹²⁵ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 143 note 1, citing Aymonier, 'Première étude', pp. 33-4; the words '*les Annamites*' are inserted by Maspéro in parentheses as the subject of the verbs translated as 'went in to capture'.

but the latter became king again with the title *Jaya Indravarmadeva ya= Devatāmūrtti* and was ruling when the inscription was erected in 1088. During that time they rebuilt the temples of Mỹ Sơn because, for an unspecified reason, the city of Champa (*Nagara Campa*) was ruined and deserted.¹²⁶

The same story of ruin in Mỹ Sơn is related in C94, with restoration by Harivarman (apparently Prince Thāi) and his younger brother (elsewhere called Prince Pāi). This inscription starts as follows: ‘the enemies had entered the kingdom (*nagara*) of Champa, installed themselves as masters, and had taken all the royal possessions and all the wealth of the gods’. Who were the enemies? Since C90A/1080-81, written during the period when Mỹ Sơn was undergoing restoration, boasts of a successful invasion of Cambodia with much rich booty taken and presented to the temples of Mỹ Sơn, and makes no reference to Vietnamese, it would appear that the cause of the devastation had been a war with Cambodia. Moreover, if the Vietnamese had attacked Bình Định in 1069 as described by Maspéro, their route would have completely by-passed the Thu Bồn area. The operations of Paramabodhisatva against Phan Rang related in C30A1/1084 indicate that the rulers based in Mỹ Sơn were expanding their influence as far south as Phan Rang, which had been in a state of civil war for 16 years. This could hardly have been related to a Vietnamese attack on Bình Định in 1069 as described by Maspéro, relying on *Vsl*.

The story of a Vietnamese attack on Bình Định in 1069 is thus discredited. Inscriptions from separate polities in Thu Bồn and in Phan Rang suggest wars at about that time, but not with Đại Việt; in the North the enemy was most likely Cambodia, and in the South the conflicts were local. If the Vietnamese had attacked Bình Định on the route described in *Vsl* and Maspéro, they would have by-passed the Thu Bồn, and there is no suggestion in that account that they were involved with Phan Rang. If, however, they attacked Binnai-Quảng Ngãi, the warfare could perhaps have spread to the Thu Bồn, although the later inscriptions show more concern with Cambodia than with Đại Việt. As mentioned above, Chế Củ, whom the Vietnamese said they captured and then released for a ransom of three northern provinces, was not the Rudravarman in the South, but a Cham chief somewhere in the North.

There is now a new full reading and translation of C30A1 by Schweyer, and I offer it here as information to be eventually confirmed. It still contains some incoherence, but if correct in its main lines it totally changes the picture, saying that it was King Paramabodhisatva who

¹²⁶ These inscriptions are found in Jacques ed., *Études épigraphiques*; see the index on pp. i-iii.

went to Phan Rang and captured Rudravarman. If so, this is conclusive evidence that Rudravarman had not been king in whatever place the Vietnamese attacked.¹²⁷

Some final questions on the alleged withdrawal of the Champa capital to the South and loss of 700 *li* of territory in the 980s: If that had been the territory from Indrapura to Vijaya-Bình Định, why would the Vietnamese have found it necessary to attack the ‘old city’ of Địa Lý in Quảng Bình in 990? How was it then possible for the Cham later in the 990s to attack Hoan and Aí even farther to the North beyond Quảng Bình? And how, supposedly based in Vijaya-Bình Định, did they regain those northern provinces in Quảng Bình-Quảng Trị which they were able to give to Vietnam as ransom for the captured king Chế Củ? These statements only make sense if the war in the 980s was in Quảng Bình, where the Indrapura kings had established important centers, one of them important enough to be considered as Chiêm Thành (‘city of the Cham’) by the Vietnamese and from which the Cham were forced – though only temporarily – to withdraw 700 *li* to the original capital of that dynasty in the Thu Bồn valley, Indrapura-Đồng Dương.

Champa and Cambodia, twelfth to thirteenth centuries

The next section in Maspéro concerns the wars between Champa and Cambodia in the second half of the twelfth century, in particular in the reigns of the Cambodian kings Sūryavarman II (1113?-1145/50?) and Jayavarman VII (1181-1220?). There is less controversy about the Champa inscriptions concerning these events because they are much more precise and detailed, but there is still considerable confusion in the interpretation of the events based on syntheses of the Champa and Cambodian inscriptions and the Chinese sources. The currently accepted outline, as summarized in Coedès’ *Indianized states* (which is based literally on Maspéro for the Champa details), is that both Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII attacked Champa – the first with some short-term success and the second restoring Cambodia after a Cham invasion of Angkor in 1177 and effecting a real conquest of Champa for over 20 years, starting in 1190.¹²⁸

There is in fact nothing about these events in the Cambodian epigraphy from Sūryavarman’s time, and all that is known comes from Champa inscriptions and Vietnamese histories. For the second period, there are brief – and vague – references in post-1181

¹²⁷ See Schweyer, ‘Po Nagar’, *deuxième partie*.

¹²⁸ Coedès, *Indianized states*, pp. 169-70.

inscriptions of Jayavarman VII concerning a large-scale invasion by Champa sometime before that date, which in the synthesis of events since Maspéro has been attributed to 1177. That date for the event is not entirely secure, however, and in fact the details of the invasion and its preparations come from Chinese sources, which in some cases are wrong. Much detail about this second period, the reign of Jayavarman VII, is found in the inscriptions of Champa, but – peculiarly, given their boasts about earlier victories over Cambodia – there is nothing certain about a major Champa attack around 1177.

To facilitate the argument, we must keep in mind that Maspéro and Coedès held the view that the Cham were the remnants of an ‘Indonesian’ migration out of China which went through the mainland and on to the islands, and their maritime skills were not given sufficient attention. It is also obvious from the epigraphy of both peoples that the Cham and Khmer had been in close contact from earliest historical times, probably from a distant prehistoric period, and that each was familiar with all the land and sea routes into the territory of its neighbor. This new period of bellicose relations between Champa and Cambodia was initiated by a new type of foreign expansion toward the East and the coast of Champa under Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII, together with attacks on Vietnam and new contacts with China by Sūryavarman, credibly in the interest of participating in the growing maritime economy. After a break of several reigns, relations with China were renewed by Sūryavarman II, with missions sent from Angkor in 1116 and 1120, and in 1128 the conferral of special dignity on the Cambodian king.¹²⁹

Sūryavarman also attacked Đại Việt, but without success; on the other hand, he succeeded in subjugating part of Champa for a short time. Both areas were important for their coastal access. Unfortunately the Angkor epigraphic record is quite unhelpful in terms of details about this aspect of state activity, and it is in fact only an assumption that the attacks on Champa in the 1140s were by Sūryavarman (see below).¹³⁰ The seaward expansionism of Angkor at this time fits precisely into the terms of the relationship between Chinese commercial policy and the rise, decline and transformation of Southeast Asian states. Sūryavarman’s reign coincided almost exactly with the first years of the Southern Song, whose dependence on the sea after land routes westward had been cut impelled them to open trade with Southeast Asia beyond the level allowed by previous dynasties.

¹²⁹ Lawrence Palmer Briggs, *The ancient Khmer Empire* (Bangkok: White Lotus reprint, 1999), p. 189; Coedès, *Indianized states*, pp. 159, 161-2.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 159-60.

If the various treatments of these events in Champa and Cambodia are compared, we see that near-total confusion reigns. First, let us take the details in Coedès. Very briefly, he wrote that the Champa king Jaya Indravarman IV (who in Maspéro's interpretation had usurped power in 1166-7) attacked Cambodia twice, the first time in 1170 by land – “moving his army on carts”, says one inscription, but the fighting remained stalemated'. So, seven years later (in 1177), guided by a shipwrecked Chinese, Jaya Indravarman went up the Mekong and Tonle Sap, surprised the Cambodians and pillaged the city. The source of these details is inscription K.485 from the Phimeanakas, written some time after 1181 when Jayavarman had reconquered his country, but apparently no earlier than 1191 as it records offerings by the queen to the Preah Khan. The inscription records, without date, **one** apparently land-based ('moving his army on carts') Cham invasion. Why, if we follow the interpretation of Coedès in that context, did Jayavarman refer only to a first – unsuccessful – Cham invasion in 1170, and what is the source for that event? In another context he implied that the inscription did refer to the final battle, referring to 'the heavy task [faced by Jayavarman VII] of pulling Cambodia “out of the sea of misfortune into which it had been plunged” by the Cham invasion of 1177', the latter date being inserted by Coedès. He also said that Jayavarman 'fought a series of battles against the Cham, in particular a naval battle...which liberated the country once and for all'. Thus, for Coedès there were three major battles – 1170, 1177 and a naval battle – before Jayavarman became king.¹³¹

The confusion of Coedès is understandable, for he was following – very succinctly – the interpretation of Maspéro (also based on confusing sources), so let us look there. The usual reference to Maspéro is to his *Royaume*, first written in 1911 and then republished in 1928. There he also occasionally refers to his treatment of events in *Empire khmer*, in particular concerning the alleged attack of 1170. Jayavarman VII, he wrote in *Empire khmer*, 'had to repel several Cham incursions led by Jaya Harivarman. The one which took place in 1170 (1092 s.) was particularly disastrous for the Khmer.' The reason for Maspéro's interpretation here is not clear. Chinese sources record warfare in 1170, but it was not 'disastrous'; they say the two sides were equal and the result a stalemate. Then, again in Maspéro, 'in 1175...Jaya Harivarman's successor Sri Jaya Indravarman II carried out his own invasion of Cambodia and caused considerable

¹³¹ Ibid., pp. 299-300, 309-10. In fact Coedès' statements on these events were anything but straightforward. In his 1929 article, he considered that the Cham invasion with their troops on chariots was in 1177 and resulted in the seizure of the city ('Nouvelles données, p. 324), but in 1964 his treatment permitted the inference that the land invasion had been in 1170 and that the final successful invasion was upriver in 1177. The Phimeanakas inscription is translated in Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, v. 2 (Hanoi : Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient, 1942), pp. 161-81.

damage there. He reached the very gates of the capital, which Jayavarman had to flee in haste.’ After this, Jayavarman reorganized his army for revenge, ensured the neutrality of the Vietnamese, and invaded Champa in 1190. Here there was no mention of a Cham occupation of Angkor, nor of any event in 1177, but rather of two earlier attacks.¹³² Of course, at that time Maspéro was mistaken about the dates of Jayavarman’s reign, which in his text began in 1162, but this seems to be where the attack of 1170 had its origin in modern scholarship.

Before continuing with a critique of the various interpretations, it may be good to review the evidence on which they are based. There is the Phimeanakas inscription, described above, which refers to a single land invasion from Champa – undated, but before 1181 (when Jayavarman dated the beginning of his reign) and after 1166 (the date of the so-called usurping King Tribhūvanādityavarman, overthrown by that invasion. This inscription also records that Jayavarman had been in Vijaya at some time before the invasion. There is also the still incompletely understood inscription K.227 of Banteay Chhmar, recording a battle between Khmer and Cham somewhere in Champa in which the Khmer were defeated and their leader nearly killed. Coedès believed that it was the story of a campaign by a son of Jayavarman VII in Champa before Jayavarman became king, thus sometime in the 1160s. Other, less direct, evidence is in the bas-reliefs of the Bayon and Banteay Chhmar. They depict scenes of combat in boats between two sides distinguished by different headgear – interpreted without epigraphic evidence as Cham and Khmer. They also show land warfare with infantry and elephant troops, again distinguished by headgear but mixed, as though some of the warriors believed to be Cham were fighting on the side of the Khmer.

Coedès summarized the main points of the epigraphic records as follows. In K.288, one of the Chrung inscriptions, Jayavarman VII gave an outline of the reign sequence preceding his own: ‘Dharanīndravarman [I] was despoiled by Sūryavarman [II], Yaśovarman [II] despoiled by Tribhūvanādityavarman, despoiled by the king of the Cham named Jaya Indravarman’. There is no controversy about the first event, and since the last date of Sūryavarman has been hypothesised – without epigraphic confirmation – as between 1145 and 1150, the time of Yaśovarman and Tribhūvanādityavarman would have been between the end of the reign of Sūryavarman and the victorious Cham invasion, which for Maspéro (followed by Coedès) was 1177. Tribhūvanādityavarman is dated by one inscription (K.418) to 1166, and there are no other

¹³² Maspéro, *Empire khmer*, p. 45.

inscriptions after 1145 (the last dated inscription to name Sūryavarman II during his lifetime) until Jayavarman VII.¹³³ Except for lack of mention of that or any other date except Jayavarman's claim to enthronement in 1181, this seems to agree with the passage in K.485, Phimeanakas: 'Yaśovarman [II] having been ...[effaced] by a servant with ambitions to obtain royal power [presumably Tribhūvanādityavarman], the king [Jayavarman VII] returned from Vijaya ... to come to the aid of the ruler [Yaśovarman]'. Yaśovarman had already been overthrown, however, and Jayavarman VII waited; thus he claimed to have been in Vijaya at some time before he became king in 1181.

Other relevant passages in this badly damaged inscription are of interest. 'Śrī Jaya Indravarman, king of the Cāmpas...transporting his army on carts, went to fight the country of Kambu...'; and a following badly damaged passage which Coedès interpreted as 'he (Jaya Indravarman) killed the usurper (Tribhūvanādityavarman)'. Finally, 'having...defeated this (king of the Chams) in battle...he (Jayavarman VII) had possession of...through the conquest of Vijaya and the other countries'; and in one more context a reference to 'the Vijaya expedition'.

As will be clear below in the discussion of the Champa inscriptions, Coedès (following Maspéro) was mistaken in amalgamating two Jaya Indravarmans of Champa – one denoted as of Grāmapuravijaya and the other as Oī Vatuv – into a fictional Jaya Indravarman IV. It was undoubtedly the first who led the campaign(s) against Cambodia which overthrew Tribhūvanādityavarman and attacked Angkor, but his last dates in the Champa records are 1163, 1164, 1165, 1167, 1168, 1170 and possibly 1183.¹³⁴ The Phimeanakas inscription thus implies that Jayavarman VII already occupied Vijaya in the 1180s. Thus, during some period of the 1160s when there were internal conflicts in both Cambodia and Champa, the future king Jayavarman VII of Angkor had been in Champa (Vijaya). Although he said that he tried to return to help Yaśovarman, he was too late; he did not challenge Tribhūvanādityavarman, but waited until the latter had been overthrown by the Cham.¹³⁵

¹³³ In fact, the nature of the the inscription is peculiar and its provenance is uncertain. K.418 is really two inscriptions on two trays ('plateaux') (thus easily movable) found at Phnom Svām in the far south of Vietnam. The date is on one and on the other the name-title *Kamrate=añ śrī Tribhuvanādityavarmadeva*.

¹³⁴ The referent of the last date, in inscription C30A3, is uncertain; only the date 1167 refers with certainty to Jaya Indravarman Grāmapuravijaya

¹³⁵ Coedès, *Indianized states*, p. 169 considered that he was on an expedition to Vijaya, which seems to fit the available evidence. Vittorio Roveda, *Khmer mythology, secrets of Angkor* (Bangkok: River Books, 2000) proposed that 'like Rama, he had been unjustly exiled' (p. 33), but there is no evidence for this.

The question which stares one in the face is: what were the relations between the future Jayavarman VII in Vijaya and the contending Cham factions of the time, in particular the Jaya Indravarman who allegedly invaded Cambodia? The Champa inscriptions discussed below, although giving much detail about relations between Cham princes and Jayavarman VII, have nothing about an invasion in 1177 or a Champa occupation of Angkor at any date. This date and that of 1170 for a first attack were extrapolated from Chinese sources, which are hardly credible, as we shall see. The Vietnamese recorded very little about these events, but one of their records casts doubt on the likelihood of a great invasion in 1177.

Bernard-Philippe Groslier attempted an original interpretation of the events of the time through a detailed discussion of the Bayon bas-reliefs. For him, Jayavarman VII ‘was in Vjaya around 1165...He presumably was making war as G. Coedès has interpreted stela K 485 from the Phimeanakas’; ‘like Coedès’, Groslier added, ‘I would lean towards [the idea of] a military expedition in Vijaya around 1165’. He also hypothesized that Jayavarman returned from Vijaya in 1165-6, and from then until 1177 resided at the Preah Khan of Kompong Svay. This last is of course pure speculation.¹³⁶ Groslier’s discussion here is concerned with the interpretation of an impressive Cham victory over the Khmer depicted on the East side of the northern outer gallery of the Bayon – but what event was it? The Cham assault against... Tribhuvanadityavarman ... between 1170-71 and 1177 quite naturally comes to mind. Indeed, Jaya Indravarman IV of Champa, after having ensured the neutrality of Đại Việt, attempted a first attack on Cambodia around this date. It came by land...[with] carts’ (K. 485). ‘This attack by land having been inconclusive, however, the Cham, with the help of a Chinese pilot, took to the sea and then went up the Mekong in 1177, taking Angkor by surprise, burning it, and killing the usurper’.¹³⁷

Still referring to the scene at the Bayon, however, Groslier wondered whether it was really the Cham victory over Tribhūvanādityavarman: ‘If they wanted to emphasize this decisive moment, then why choose the first assault by land, which remained inconclusive, rather than the naval invasion which dealt the final blow? Groslier’s conclusion was that this scene of a great Cham victory represented the story in the Banteay Chhmar inscription, but with the future Jayavarman VII as the endangered Cambodian leader rather than his son, as Coedès had

¹³⁶ Bernard Philippe Groslier, ‘Inscriptions du Bayon’, in Jacques Dumarçay, *Le Bayon histoire architecturale du temple* (Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1973), pp. 149-52.

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 156.

proposed.¹³⁸ The obvious negative response to this is that Jayavarman VII would hardly have taken the story of an embarrassing defeat as the subject of a major scene in his central temple. The same question may be asked about the Phimeanakas inscription, in which Jayavarman recorded his final victory after a Cham invasion. Why refer only to the supposedly failed land assault (speculatively dated by Coedès, Maspéro and Groslier to 1170) instead of the final Cham victory in 1177, from which Jayavarman wished, some time after 1181, to claim that he saved the country?

Groslier continued, still in the context of an explanation of the Bayon reliefs: ‘We know that a new Cham attack occurred after Jayavarman had come to power and after the pacification of Malyang and before the conquest of Vijaya around 1190...all reasons for dating this battle around 1182-83 and [locating it] on the very site of the future Preah Khan of Angkor’. (K.908 says it was the site of a victory). This explanation is based on Maspéro’s remark that ‘in 1112 ś. (1190) King Jaya Indravarman on Vatuv revolted against the King of Cambodia’ (Mÿ Son inscription 92B); Groslier impermissibly adjusted the 1190 date, which is explicit in the Champa inscriptions.¹³⁹ In contrast to other versions of the history of this period in which the Cham attack (or revolt) was in 1190 and was soon followed by Jayavarman’s conquest of Champa, Groslier, having put the event in 1182, says that ‘the naval expedition against Champa which ensued must have been around 1183-84’; his interpretation was based on the apparent naval battle scenes at the Bayon.¹⁴⁰ For him, the final victory over the invading Cham was this naval battle in the 1180s, not the conquest of Champa which occurred in 1190.

Groslier’s reconstructions of events are much too speculative to be acceptable, in particular with respect to his new (hypothesized) dates, sometimes in conflict with inscriptions, and his illegitimate multiplication of battles. Because of the lack of information from Cambodia, and the uncertainty about the period between Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII as well as the latter’s background, the Champa records are also of importance for reconstructing the history of Cambodia at that time. There are four inscriptions of what was apparently a new royal faction: C17 (Phan Rang), C30A2 (Nha Trang), and C100 and C101 (Mÿ Son). They tell of a king Jaya Harivarmadeva (Prince Śivananda), who was the son of Jaya Rudravarmadeva (C17, C30) – posthumous name (Parama) Brahmaloka (C100, C101) – and the queen Nai Jiññyaï (C100), also

¹³⁸ Ibid., p. 156.

¹³⁹ Ibid., p. 164; Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 164 n. 9.

¹⁴⁰ Groslier, ‘Inscriptions du Bayon’, p. 164.

called Paramasundarīdevī (C101). This king was the grandson of Rudraloka and of the lineage of Paramabodhisatva (C101), who was himself a person of Ratnabhumivijaya.¹⁴¹

In 1147 Jaya Harivarman followed his father Jaya Rudravarman to Pāḍōuraiga, where the latter died and the people asked the son to reign. In that year troops of Cambodia and Vijaya attacked Pāḍōuraiga (C17); in 1148 Jaya Harivarman defeated them at battles in Caklyai and Vīrapura (C17). When he went to the South, the king of Cambodia (presumably Sūryavarman II) sent a general (*senāpati*) Śaikara to attack in the plain of Rājapura. (The precise locations of these three toponyms are unknown, but the context suggests that they were somewhere between Quy Nhơn and Phan Rang.) The Cambodians were defeated; the king then sent a much stronger force to fight in the plain of Vīrapura, and it was also defeated (C101). (These events are not dated in C101, but they agree with the dates in C17). The Cambodian ruler had installed his brother-in-law Harideva, accompanied by troops, as king in Vijaya (C101); in 1149 Harideva was captured by Jaya Harivarmadeva (C17). There were more victories over the Cambodians: in Cambodia, presumably in the time of Yaśovarman II; in Vijaya in 1151, 1155 (C17), 1157 (C100) and 1160 (C17, C30); and over the Vietnamese (C30). During this time Jaya Harivarman had been victorious in the North as far as Amarāvati (Quảng Nam) and in the South down to Pāḍōuraiga (C30); he defeated Cambodian and Cham opponents and reigned supreme after that, presumably in both Vijaya and the South (C101). The future Jayavarman VII must have been involved in some of the last of these campaigns.

It is in fact not certain which Cambodian king was reigning at the time of the attacks between 1147 and 1160, recorded in the Champa inscriptions. The last mention of Sūryavarman II is in 1145 and there are no more Cambodian inscriptions until the time of Jayavarman VII in the 1180s, except for one recording Tribhuvanādityavarman in 1166. It has been assumed that the Cambodian conquests in Champa in the 1140s and the attacks on Đại Việt recorded in the Vietnamese sources were by Sūryavarman because of his reputation and the assumption that his successors were weak; thus Coedès was willing to extend his reign to 1150 because the Vietnamese histories record an attack on Nghệ An by Cambodia at that date.¹⁴² But then why not allow Sūryavarman to have lived until the invasions of Champa in the 1150s? Because they all

¹⁴¹ I would propose that the *pu po nei yāi cei* Dav Veōi Lakūmī Sinyān of C91 was a princess who later became queen Nai Jiññyāi, with *nei* and *nai* representing Cham *vinai* ‘woman’ and the *lakūmī* certainly indicating a female. It is quite aberrant for Schweyer (‘Vaisselle en argent’, p. 335) to insert ‘[Jaya Indravarman]’ as part of her name-title.

¹⁴² Coedès, *Indianized states*, p. 160; see *Tt, Bản kỷ*, 1:7a, vol. 1, p. 318.

ended in defeats? We must realize that quite arbitrary choices have been made by Maspéro and Coedès.

Then there was war with the ‘Kirāña’, hitherto interpreted as the non-Cham peoples in the mountains and forests to the West of the Champa coast; the fighting was in ‘the plain and forest in the South’, and Jaya Harivarman defeated them (C101). After that, the text of C101 is confusing, probably because Finot was unable to translate the Cham completely. As it reads, the chiefs of the Kirāña proclaimed Jaya Harivarman’s brother-in-law Vaiśarāja as king in the city of Madhyamagrāma. Jaya Harivarman defeated him, and the Cham text says that he killed (*vunuḥ*) him; Finot’s translation, however, only says that they fought.¹⁴³ Then, the translation continues, ‘the king of the *Yavana* [Vietnamese] proclaimed as king “a man of Champa” named Vaiśarāja and gave him several *Yavana senāpati* and troops.’ Jaya Harivarman deployed the troops of Vijaya and defeated these opponents, afterward giving much booty to various temples, including a temple to his father Paramabrahmaloka and another to his mother Jiñjyāi (C101) (presumably the Nai Jiñjyāi cited above from C100).¹⁴⁴

Finot’s version, in addition to translation problems, is obviously corrupt here. First he makes Vaiśarāja a Cham prince chosen as king by the Kirāña, then after his defeat says that ‘a man of Champa’ named Vaiśarāja was chosen by the Vietnamese, with the added incongruity that they proclaimed him king of Champa because they had learned that the king of Cambodia was raising obstacles to Jaya Harivarman. Maspéro ‘solved’ the problem by concluding that there was a single Vaiśarāja who, after his first defeat by Jaya Harivarman, fled to Vietnam, where he obtained support. Of course, if the Vaiśarāja of the first context was killed, he could not have escaped to Vietnam, nor been appointed as king by the Vietnamese. Perhaps, for a different speculation, ‘*vaiśarāja*’ should be construed literally as ‘lineage chief’, rather than as a name. At least, if the inscription has been read at all accurately, it means that there were two individuals whom the Cham called *vaiśarāja*.

As usual, the Vietnamese sources are hard to use, because of the completely different names for the individuals concerned. They do say that in 1152 the Vietnamese king appointed a Cham named Ung Minh Ta Điệp as king of ‘Chiêm Thành’ (‘Champa city’), but he was killed by

¹⁴³ The text is *m̄csuḥ vunuḥ* of which the first term was translated consistently by Aymonier and Finot as ‘*combattre*’. Finot and the glossary in Jacques ed., *Études épigraphiques* translate *vunuḥ* as ‘*combattre*’ as well, which in the given context is redundant, and as cognate with Malay *bunuh* it must be taken as ‘kill’. I suggest that here Finot was forcing a translation into a misunderstood context.

¹⁴⁴ Finot’s translation is in Jacques ed., *Études épigraphiques*, pp. 145-8; Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 158-9.

the Champa king Ché Bì La Bút.¹⁴⁵ *Ché*, as in all Vietnamese records concerning Champa, is probably the Cham princely title *cei/ciy*, but ‘Bì La Bút’ cannot be restored as anything related to Jaya Harivarman. Even if this may coincide with the Cham inscription concerning Vaiśarāja appointed by the Vietnamese, it does not justify Maspéro’s supposition about his escape to Vietnam after a first defeat.

The time period of these events is from near the end of the reign of Sūryavarman II in Cambodia to the time (presumably) of Yaśovarman, and reflects the initial victory of the Cambodians in Vijaya in the time of Sūryavarman. It would seem that the move of Jaya Rudravarman and his son Jaya Harivarman to Pāḍouraiga might have resulted from that first Cambodian victory in Vijaya; the story of Jaya Harivarman would then reflect their eventual defeat and a greater unification of Champa than before: at least Pāḍouraiga with Vijaya, implicitly including Nha Trang (site of C30B4) and possibly extending to Amarāvati in the North.

It has been accepted since the writings of Maspéro and Coedès that some 10-20 years after the above events, the Cham invaded Angkor, after which in 1181 Jayavarman VII became king in Cambodia and, starting in 1190, reconquered Champa. Before going on to the relevant Champa inscriptions, let us summarize their version of the history of Champa in that period. Maspéro starts the story in 1167 with a new king in Champa whom he calls Jaya Indravarman IV, a ‘usurper’, an amalgamation of two persons named in the inscriptions as Jaya Indravarman oī Vatuv and Jaya Indravarman of Grāmapuravijaya. This introduces the confusion found in his recounting of events because, those two individuals were not the same person, as Finot had pointed out. Maspéro’s Jaya Indravarman IV, preserved in Coedès, is thus a fiction.¹⁴⁶ Based on Chinese reports, Maspéro then says that this Jaya Indravarman attacked Cambodia in 1170, but the two sides were equal and the struggle inconclusive. Then a shipwrecked Chinese officer showed him how to maneuver cavalry and shoot arrows from horseback. Thinking that this would give him an advantage over the Cambodians, Jaya Indravarman tried to buy horses from Hainan but was refused, the Chinese emperor saying that it was forbidden to export horses from China.¹⁴⁷

Part of this, of course, is utter nonsense. The bas-reliefs both of Angkor Wat and of the Bayon show that the Cambodians were perfectly familiar with the use of cavalry, and if so, the

¹⁴⁵ *TT, Bản kỷ*, 4:10a-b, v. 1, p. 320.

¹⁴⁶ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p.161 and n. 5, where he rejected Finot’s correction (‘Inscriptions du Musée’, p. 250 n. 2).

¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 163-4.

Cham must have had equal familiarity. Given the divisions within Champa and the long relations between the two countries, the Cham could conceivably have obtained horses from Cambodia, if they had not already known them as early as the Cambodians – probably the true situation. Wade’s new translation of the *Song Huiyao* shows that the Cham were very familiar with horses and had been receiving them from China since at least the tenth century. Pictorial proof of Cham horsemanship is in sculpted scenes of Cham polo players and horsemen, and their general familiarity with horses is demonstrated in scenes on the pedestal of the Vihāra of Đông Dương.¹⁴⁸

Failing to get horses, Jaya Indravarman, according to Maspéro, decided on a naval attack; guided by (another?) shipwrecked Chinese person, in 1177 his fleet went down the coast then up the river (Mekong-Tonle Sap), surprised and pillaged the Cambodian capital and returned with enormous booty. Note that in this version the Cham did not remain in occupation of Angkor, as some later interpretations would have it.¹⁴⁹ Here is more nonsense. First of all, it expressly contradicted by the passage of the Phimeanakas inscription quoted above that ‘Śrī Jaya Indravarman, king of the Cāmpas... transporting his army on carts, went to fight the country of Kambu...’ Moreover, after centuries of close relations with Cambodia, both amicable and bellicose, including several invasions of their neighbor’s territory, the Cham knew well all the routes into Cambodia and had no need of a shipwrecked Chinese to show them the way. Moreover, whether by land or by river, the campaign would have taken weeks, and they could not possibly have taken Angkor by surprise. This story was only credible at the time when it was believed that the Cham were remnants of an overland migration by ‘Indonesians’ and their own seafaring abilities were ignored, and when the French scholars studying Indochina considered that everything written in Chinese should be taken literally as holy writ. The date 1177, which has become a solid ‘factoid’ in everything written subsequently, has its origin here, but in this case even Maspéro recognized that its source was wrong on another date; this, together with the tales of shipwrecked Chinese helping the Cham, casts doubt on its other details.¹⁵⁰

So far, then, there is a problem as to whether the main Cham attack was by land or sea. If by sea, why did Jayavarman VII in his inscription – written after defeating the Cham – portray

¹⁴⁸ Geoff Wade 2004; Association Française des Amis de l’Orient, *Musée de sculpture*, respectively figures 124, 126, 38, 44. In the new section of the Đà Nẵng Museum, and not illustrated in the catalogue, is a small (82 cm high) sculpture (number DN 19, tenth century) of a pair of horses being ridden and guided by a single rider straddling the backs of both – just the sort of scene common among people familiar with raising and using horses.

¹⁴⁹ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p.164; Népote, ‘Champa propositions’, part 2, p. 98.

¹⁵⁰ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 164, n. 6, 8.

the latter as having arrived on chariots? Before going further let us take a look at the Chinese sources (as interpreted by Maspéro) for the date 1177, and the real primary sources, the Cambodian and Champa inscriptions.

First, let us look at the date 1170. Chinese histories record an unsuccessful Champa attack on Cambodia at that date; as will be noted below, a Champa inscription allows the inference that 1170 was the last of a series of incursions beginning in the 1160s. This inscription was not used by Maspéro, however, and it seems that his evocation of 1170 was based on an imaginative construction of the records of Champa-Vietnamese diplomatic relations, in addition to the Chinese histories. Thus he said that Jaya Indravarman, having secured the neutrality of Đại Việt by a mission in that year, tried to attack Cambodia by land. Indeed, the standard Vietnamese chronicles say that in that year ‘Chiêm-thành’ came to *cống* (offer tribute). They have the same entry in 1152, 1153, 1160, 1164, and so on.¹⁵¹ This was part of normal Champa-Vietnam relations, and it is impossible to give a special significance to any such record.

Then for the date 1177, Maspéro relied on late Chinese sources – which he considered to be in error, however, because they situated Jayavarman’s conquest of Champa in 1195-1201 rather than the accepted date of 1190.¹⁵² Based on that, and on the clear fiction of the Cham depending on a Chinese pilot to find the way into Cambodia, it seems to be possible to say that the date 1177 was also in error. Nevertheless, the *Song Huiyao* says that in 1177 – without a shipwrecked Chinese guide – ‘Champa used a boat-borne force to attack Cambodia... [the Cambodians] sued for peace but were ignored and massacred’. This source apparently does not claim that the Cham invaded and occupied Angkor, nor is it clear where the attack on the Cambodians took place. The text continues that in 1198-9 ‘Cambodia launched a massive attack on Champa ... Champa sent a missive indicating their surrender, but the Cambodians exterminated everyone and established a Cambodian as ruler of the area’. The date here and the ‘extermination’ are contradicted by Champa epigraphy; this casts some doubt on the interpretation of 1177 as referring to a Cham conquest of Angkor, and even on the date itself.¹⁵³

The problem of 1177 is made more complex by the Vietnamese histories, which record that in that year the Cham attacked Nghệ An. If, as I have argued, there was no unified Champa, the northernmost Champa entity could have attacked Nghệ An while another was invading

¹⁵¹ See *Tt* and *Vsl* under the entries for these years.

¹⁵² Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p.164 and n. 4, citing the *Wenxian tongkao* (referred to by French scholars as *Méridionaux*) and the *Song Shi*.

¹⁵³ Extract from the *Song Huiyao*, personal communication from Geoff Wade.

Cambodia. Then, however, if only one region/chiefdom of Champa attacked Cambodia, the invasion might well have been less violent than has been interpreted. Maspéro, interestingly, recognized the problem presented by the Vietnamese histories but slyly pushed it aside, writing that as in 1170, Champa sent a mission to Đại Việt in 1184. ‘This’, he commented, ‘did not stop the Chams from the northern provinces from occasionally raiding Nghệ An’; he failed to mention, however, that such an event only took place in 1177.¹⁵⁴ Maspéro was here really cheating in refusing to report that the Vietnamese sources were in conflict with the hypothesis of a major Champa attack on Angkor in 1177. As noted above, the records of Champa envoys to Đại Việt are frequent, differ in no way one from another, and may not be exaggerated as special attempts to gain Vietnamese neutrality.

After the Cham attack, Jayavarman VII – again according to a Chinese source – vowed to take a terrible revenge’; in 1190, ‘profiting from an act of aggression by the Cham’, he attacked and eventually conquered Champa.¹⁵⁵ Coedès summarized the same story, differing from Maspéro only in recognizing that the father of Jayavarman VII, Dharanīndravarman II, followed Sūryavarman II, and was in turn succeeded by two more kings, Yaśovarman II and Tribhūvanādityavarman; the last was displaced by the Cham. Maspéro had believed that Jayavarman VII directly succeeded his father.¹⁵⁶

In addition to a rejection of the Chinese tales of Chinese guides, adopted by Maspéro and Coedès, the next Champa inscriptions force more nuances of interpretation in the story. Following the inscriptions related to the intervention in Champa of Sūryavarman II, there are two short inscriptions (C53, C54) in Bình Định which name a king Jaya Indravarmadeva; Bergaigne, dates them only to the end of the eleventh century *śaka* (1178-1278 CE) apparently on palaeographic grounds. They are difficult to relate to anything else because of the uncertain date and lack of concrete information, but they may be relevant evidence for the growing importance of Vijaya in the twelfth century. Because C53 records a donation to *yāi pu nagara*, usually considered to be the goddess of Pô Nagar in Nha Trang, that may have been the center of Jaya Indravarman’s territory.

Perhaps this Jaya Indravarman was the Jaya Indravarman of Grāmapura *pradeśa/vijaya* mentioned in C85/1163 and C92A in Mỹ Sơn and C30A3 in Nha Trang. In the first he is only

¹⁵⁴ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 163, n. 5.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 164, note 6, citing *Wenxian tongkao*.

¹⁵⁶ Coedès, *Indianized states*, pp. 164, 168-9; Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 164 note 7.

named, with no other information, but the second contains a list of his donations to various temples/gods in the years 1163, 1164, 1165, 1167, 1168 and 1170. These included Śrīśānabadreśvara, the main temple of Mỹ Sơn; a Buddha Lokeśvara, which suggests the site of Indrapura/Đông Dương; and two Bhagavatī, of which one must have been the temple in Nha Trang. This type of donation suggests the results of a victorious campaign, or campaigns; it would seem that at the dates implied – between 1160 and 1170 – this can only mean, successful warfare against Cambodia.

In this connection it is interesting to note that in spite of their great detail concerning the struggles with Cambodia in the reigns of Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII, the Champa inscriptions are silent about the supposed great victory over Angkor in ‘1177’. This stands in contrast to the earlier boasts of the exploits (apparently in southern Cambodia) of a famous warrior, Senāpati Pār (C19/seventh c. *ś.*, C37/813, C31/817, in Phan Rang and Nha Trang, see above), and later about pillaging Śambhupura (C95/1056, see above). There is only the fragmentary C30A3 from Nha Trang containing two dates, 1167 and 1183; lists of donations by Jaya Indravarman of Grāmapuravijaya to a Bhagavatī Kauthāreśvarī, certainly in Nha Trang but not one of those mentioned in C92A; and a truncated phrase about ‘going to conquer Cambodia’, which Aymonier construed as ‘*lorsqu’il va*’ (‘when he went’), but which Maspéro preferred to render as ‘*étant allé*’ (‘having gone’). In addition to Aymonier, Maspéro cited Bergaigne; the latter, however, did not recognize the phrase in question at all, but only the word ‘*Kamvujadeśa*’ with a footnoted query, ‘still another victory over the Cambodians?’¹⁵⁷

In Schweyer’s new and allegedly complete reading of this inscription, the phrase in question is ‘*niy ... nau* [‘go’] *mak* [‘take’] *Kamvujadeśa*’. Schweyer has preferred to follow Maspéro and translate ‘*après être allé*’ (‘after going/having gone’), but that is an impossible rendition of *niy*, a simple demonstrative which is closer to Aymonier’s ‘*lorsque*’ (when).¹⁵⁸ The problem is determining which of the two dates relates to ‘go take Cambodia’. Those who translate ‘after going’ assume that the date of the campaign must have been 1177 and that the date at the end of the text (1183) refers back to it. Even if a retrospective interpretation may be possible, the translation ‘after having gone’ is not. The earlier date, 1167, relates just as well – even better, I would say – to the incomplete phrase, and it fits better with the series of important donations listed between 1163 and 1170 in C92A.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., p. 164, n.6; Aymonier, ‘Première étude’, pp. 44-5; Bergaigne, ‘Ancien royaume’, p. 87.

¹⁵⁸ Schweyer, ‘Po Nagar’, *deuxième partie*.

The combined evidence of these two inscriptions, however, does not suggest a great conquest in 1177 as implied by the the versions of Maspéro and Coedès, which were based on admittedly poor Chinese sources, some compiled long after the event and obviously at second hand. These inscriptions suggest rather a series of successful raids in the 1160s and 1170s, when Cambodia was in political turmoil and the future Jayavarman VII was himself in Champa, according to his own inscriptions in Vijaya. Coedès, moreover, embellished the story with a naval battle, presumably suggested by the Bayon and Banteay Chhmar reliefs which show two different forces, believed to be Cham and Khmer, fighting in boats which look like very large pirogues or canoes. He claimed that this was recorded in Verse LXX of the Phimeanakas inscription, but that text is so vague and allegorical that were it not for the reliefs, it would not have been interpreted as recording a naval battle.¹⁵⁹

The next inscriptions are C92B and C92C in Mÿ Son, with dates 1182, 1190, 1192, 1193 and 1194 – that is, after the supposed Cham conquest of Angkor, their expulsion by Jayavarman VII, his coronation in 1181 and then during the period beginning in 1190 when the traditional academic treatment says that he effected his conquest of Champa. These inscriptions relate the story of a Cham king Sūryavarmadeva (Prince Vidyānanda of Tumpraukviijaya) who went to Cambodia in 1182 and was taken into the service of the king of Angkor.¹⁶⁰ In that capacity he led troops to put down a rebellion in Malyang, believed to be in western Cambodia, and he was then made *Yuvarāja* by the king of Cambodia. Then in 1190 there was a rebellion, apparently within Champa, by a king Śrī Jaya Indravarman oī Vatuv; Maspéro, forcing the story into his preconception of events, called it a ‘Cham aggression’, while Coedès referred to ‘a new attack by the Cham king Jaya Indravarman ong Vatuv’ – who, in fact, does not appear in any of the earlier records. This provoked the invasion of Champa by Jayavarman VII.¹⁶¹ Against this rebellion the king of Cambodia sent the prince (Sūryavarmadeva) with Cambodian troops to take Vijaya and capture Jaya Indravarman oī Vatuv; he succeeded, and the latter was sent to Cambodia.

¹⁵⁹ The text as rendered by Coedès (*Inscriptions du Cambodge*, v. 2, p. 177) is ‘Having through his patience in the midst of misfortune [or with vessels whose strength...] defeated in combat this (king of the Cham) whose warriors were like an endless ocean, after having received royal consecration, he possessed, through the conquest of Vijaya and other countries...’. It takes real imagination to see evidence of a naval battle here, and the reference to vessels seems to have been only a secondary possibility in translating the complex Sanskrit.

¹⁶⁰ In Cham royal titles of the time names of men entitled ‘king’ (*pu po tana raya*) are often followed by their (presumably earlier) princely (*cei, ciy*, ‘prince’) title, as in this case.

¹⁶¹ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 164; Coedès, *Indianized states*, p.170. As noted above, Maspéro erroneously assimilated Jaya Indravarman oī Vatuv to Jaya Indravarman of Grāmapuravijaya, and Coedès was following that misinterpretation; Finot was certainly correct to object to this.

It should be noted here that if the event of 1190 was a rebellion within Champa but an act hostile to Cambodia, it implies that Champa – or at least the part under Jaya Indravarman oī Vatuv (Vijaya, it would seem, where the future Jayavarman VII resided sometime in the 1160s or 1170s) – had already been conquered by Cambodia, as implied in the Phimeanakas inscription. In the same operation in 1190 a certain Śrī Sūryajayavarmadeva Prince In, brother-in-law of the king of Cambodia, was established as ruler in Vijaya, following which the prince [Sūryavarmadeva] went to reign in Rājapura, Phan Rang. Prince In was expelled by a Prince Raṅupati/Raghupati, who then ruled in Vijaya with the title Śrī Jaya Indravarmadeva (a third prince with that name-title).¹⁶²

In 1192 the king of Angkor sent Cambodian generals with Jaya Indravarman oī Vatuv (who had implicitly switched sides and joined the Cambodians); he came to meet the prince (Sūryavarmadeva) in Rājapura. They led the Cambodian troops, took Vijaya and captured and killed Jaya Indravarman *cei* (‘prince’) Raṅ(gh)upati; the prince [Sūryavarmadeva] then reigned in Vijaya. Later in the same year Jaya Indravarman oī Vatuv deserted the Cambodians and went to Amarāvati (Thu Bôn valley, Mỹ Sơn). He rebelled, raised troops from several locations and went to take Vijaya. The prince [Sūryavarmadeva] pursued and killed him and ‘then reigned without opposition’. The following sentence of the inscription is damaged, but apparently there was a break between the prince (Sūryavarmadeva) and the king of Cambodia, for in 1194 ‘the prince fought and defeated the Cambodians’. Two years later, the king of Cambodia sent more troops, who were also defeated, following which the prince [Sūryavarmadeva] went to Amarāvati and made offerings to Śrīśānabhadreśvara.

A view of those last events from another point of view is in C90D, undated but easily placed in the same temporal context. It is by a *Yuvarāja* oī Dhanapatigrāma, whose career at first paralleled that of Sūryavarmadeva, for he also went to Cambodia and led troops to suppress the rebellion in Malyang. The inscription continues immediately, ‘King Sūryavarmadeva rebelled against the king of Cambodia’, who ordered Dhanapatigrāma to take Cambodian troops and capture him. The results of the campaign are not mentioned, but it was apparently successful, and was followed by another rebellion by King Ājñā Ku whom Dhanapatigrāma captured and sent to Cambodia. The last sentences in the inscription are unclear. Maspéro, relying on Vietnamese

¹⁶² Finot read the name as Raṅupati, but now Schweyer (‘Chronologie des inscriptions’, p. 337) and Claude Jacques (*Études épigraphiques*, p. xvi note 10) prefer the reading ‘Raghupati’. This is a question which I leave to the Sanskritists, but I think that this new reading, which originated with Jacques, is probably correct.

histories, says that Sūryavarmadeva finally sought refuge in Vietnam, but because of differences in names between the Champa inscriptions and these texts, that conjecture may not for the moment be considered reliable. He also, on the basis of uncertain interpretations of the Vietnamese sources, says that Dhanapatigrāma was paternal uncle of Sūryavarmadeva. Coedès here follows Maspéro.¹⁶³

All of these details from the Champa inscriptions, contrary to the standard histories, imply that Champa – at least the center and South, but perhaps not the Thu Bôn area (Amarāvātī) – was subordinate to Cambodia since sometime before 1190 and that the victories of Jayavarman VII both at home and in Champa had depended to a large extent on Cham supporters, but that once given authority in their homeland, the latter were unreliable. These Champa inscriptions of the end of the twelfth century were the work of Champa chieftains who had at times been allies of Jayavarman VII, and they reflect some degree of sympathy with his activities.

There is then a long break in the epigraphy until the 1220s, when three inscriptions (C4/1220, 1227, Phan Rang, C30B4/1226, Nha Trang, and C86/1230, 1234, Mỹ Sơn) refer retrospectively to a 32-year war with Cambodia and show a quite different attitude toward their neighbour and its relations with Champa. The first two are available in the usual summaries by Aymonier, which make control of their contents impossible. In the third (C86) a King Jaya Parameśvaravarmadeva oī Aīśarāja of Turaiyvijaya claims to have been sole ruler in Champa during that time, thus leaving the fate of Dhanapatigrāma uncertain. Taken together they say that in 1190 Jayavarmadeva of Cambodia conquered the earth and took *nagara* Champa or that in 1201 he came, appointed a *Yuvarāja* and left. There was a 32-year war until 1220 (which would thus have begun in 1188), when the Cambodians went to *Vraṭ Nagar* (Angkor) and the Cham went to Vijaya. In 1226 King Jaya Parameśvaravarman was enthroned.¹⁶⁴

Maspéro embellished the story without sources, saying that Oī Aīśarāja of Turaiyvijaya ‘was raised at the court of Jayavarman VII...receiving in 1201 the title of *yuvarāja* and permission to rejoin the governor Dhanapatigrāma in Champa’, all of which could be true, but without textual evidence is historical fiction. The fate of Dhanapatigrāma is unknown, although Maspéro assimilates him to a *Yuvarāja* Mnaḡaḡia oī Dhanapati who in a very brief inscription (C92C, following the story of Sūryavarmadeva) dated 1244 claimed to govern (uncertain

¹⁶³ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p.166; Coedès, *Indianized states*, p.171.

¹⁶⁴ Although this last detail is from Aymonier, ‘Première étude’, pp. 50-52, the Cham text in this case is supplied and does indeed seem to say this. Note that a full treatment of inscriptions C4 and C30B4 is in Schweyer, ‘Po Nagar’, *deuxième partie*.

translation) Champa. This is in conflict with King Jaya Parameśvaravarman's inscription C6 in Phan Rang in the same year and implies that the two were rivals controlling different Champas, one in the North and one in the South – a situation which was not unusual, as has been emphasized here. Jaya Parameśvaravarman was certainly an important figure. He is named in six inscriptions dated between 1220 and 1244 and four others without dates; all but two of these are in Nha Trang or Phan Rang, C86 is in Mỹ Sơn and C52 in Bình Định.

Maspéro, mentions Cham warfare with Viet Nam, but says that 'the documents are not in agreement either on the dates or results'.¹⁶⁵ The documents are a Cham inscription (C4) from Phan Rang and the Vietnamese histories. The inscription is one of those which Aymonier only summarized without a complete transcription and translation, and which seems to say that there was a joint Cambodian-Champa campaign to seize some *Yvan*, presumably Vietnamese, in *śaka* 1123/CE 1201 (date corrected by Claude Jacques in marginal notes to my copy of Aymonier from Aymonier's and Maspéro's 1129/1207), and that both *Yvan* and Khmer suffered losses. However, much is unclear in the text presented by Aymonier, and so far no attempt has been made to restudy it, except for Jacques' informal correction of the dates. It does not say where the battles took place. Moreover, the text continues with the date 1142/1220, saying – this time clearly – that 'the Khmer went to *Vrah Nagar* [undoubtedly Angkor] and the people of Champa came to Vijaya' (*kvir nau Vrah Nagar urai Campa marai Vijaya*). The last date in the text is 1148/1226 (corrected by Jacques from Aymonier's 1149/1227), when the Champa ruler was crowned and built palaces, temples, gods, etc in Śrī Vijaya. Given the great timespread indicated by these readings and the fragmentary character of the text as read by Aymonier, it is possible that the first date of 1201 is incorrect. Aymonier and Maspéro believed that the Cham chief in question was Jaya Parameśvaravarman, but his own inscriptions do not begin until 1220.

The Vietnamese histories say that in 1216 and 1218 Cambodia and Champa jointly attacked Nghe An but were easily defeated. Perhaps Aymonier's date of *śaka* 1129 (1123 for Jacques) should be re-read as 1138/1216, given the known confusions between 9 and 8, 2 and 3. These vague sources, like the Champa inscriptions of the 1190s, seem to suggest that the situation was still as it had been preceding the domination of Jayavarman VII in Cambodia, when, in the words of Claude Jacques, 'there were Khmer and Cham against different groups of Khmer

¹⁶⁵ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, p. 168.

and Cham’ (as is clear in the Bayon reliefs). ‘There were several kingdoms in the area of Champa and different alliances were formed with diverse Khmer factions’.¹⁶⁶

All of this suggests that the traditional academic history of the time needs revision. There is no good evidence of a great Cham conquest of Angkor in 1177, certainly not with the details supplied by the Chinese. During the time when Cambodia was in turmoil in the 1160s and 1170s, there may have been more or less successful raids from Champa while the future Jayavarman VII was in Vijaya and, we may assume, was part of the Champa political scene. We may accept his own statements that he saw a King Jaya Indravarman (presumably the one from Grāmapuravijaya) as a rival, but I would suggest that the real conquest of Angkor was by Jayavarman VII and his Cham allies – probably in the 1170s, at least before 1181 – and that the subordination of central and southern Champa to him dated from that time. This is because one M̃y Son inscription called the event of 1190 a ‘rebellion’ against him in Champa, apparently in Vijaya – not a Cham aggression which offered him an excuse to invade and conquer Champa, as stated by Maspéro and Coedès. The other reference to that date (C30B4) has indeed been interpreted as saying that he conquered the ‘earth’ (*sarvadvīpa*, literally ‘all continents’) and took *nagara* Champa, but it is from Nha Trang and may only mean that he then took that particular *nagara* Champa.¹⁶⁷

One of the interesting, and very large, bas-relief panels at the Bayon (north outer gallery east side) is the only panel showing a victorious army pursuing – indeed routing – their enemies who are fleeing in panic; it depicts the forces who have always been interpreted as the Cham victors. Coedès did not discuss it in his article on the subject, but Groslier interpreted it as the story of a Cambodian defeat before the reign of Jayavarman recorded in the Banteay Chhmar inscription.¹⁶⁸ Why would Jayavarman VII have this scene given such importance in his central temple unless that Cham army was his own? In the opinion of Claude Jacques, the interpretations to date of the bas-reliefs

¹⁶⁶ Michael Freeman and Claude Jacques, *Ancient Angkor* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1999), p. 85. The Vietnamese reference is in *TT, bản kỷ*, 4:29b, vol. 1, p. 337. On the confusion of numbers see Finot, ‘Inscriptions du Jaya Parameśvaravarman’, in Jacques ed., *Études épigraphiques*, pp. 187-200, especially pp. 51/199 on the period in question here.

¹⁶⁷ Both in Aymonier’s summary (‘Première étude’, pp. 47-8) and in Schweyer’s newer unpublished reading (‘Po Nagar’, *deuxième partie*), the word for ‘conquer’ is conjectural, and another word preceding ‘come take *Nagara Campa*’ could not be translated.

¹⁶⁸ Coedès, ‘Nouvelles données’ and Coedès, ‘Quelques suggestions sur la méthode à suivre pour interpréter les bas-reliefs de Bantāy Chmār et de la galerie extérieure du Bāyon’, *BEFEO*, 32 (1932): 71-81; Groslier, ‘Inscriptions du Bayon’, discussed above.

remain conjectural in spite of everything...Generally speaking, the interpretation of the scenes on the second storey as a Cham defeat of the Khmer seems improbable: the Khmers were scarcely in the habit of talking about their defeats, and I have difficulty believing that they would have depicted them on their State temple...I must admit, however, that I have no alternative solution.¹⁶⁹

Here I have proposed an ‘alternative solution’ in which all the known details fit together.

Besides that scene, other battle scenes on the east outer gallery north side show Cham military (including what are apparently officers on elephants) among the Khmer troops fighting other Cham, as well as a group of what seem to be Chinese military mixed in with the Khmer forces. At the very least, these reliefs in the Bayon galleries do not support a story of strictly Khmer versus Cham warfare. We may recall in this connection that after becoming king, Jayavarman VII broke with certain traditions. After nearly 300 years of the increasing use of Khmer language in the epigraphy, all of his important inscriptions are in Sanskrit, which could be seen as an international elite language serving both countries, and he adopted as his state religion Mahāyāna Buddhism, which had always been more important in Champa than in Cambodia. Perhaps it was his Champa associations rather than religion which sparked the so-called Hinduist reaction against his creations – allegedly in the thirteenth century, a date which is completely hypothetical. Although it was natural for Europeans in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to assume hostility between different religions, the entire history of pre-Angkorean and Angkorean Cambodia shows religious co-existence.

The conquest, sacking and occupation of Angkor by the Cham in ‘1177’ must be accounted a bit of academic folklore, based on an uncritical synthesis of poor quality sources. In fact, according to the Vietnamese *Tt*, in that year ‘Chiêm Thành raided [*khâu* 寇] the *châu* [Ch. *zhou*, an administrative division] of Nghê An’.¹⁷⁰ Of course, once more we do not know which Champa was involved, but it was almost certainly not the Champa which was either at war with Cambodia or under Cambodian occupation. This reinforces the interpretation of the *Song Huiyao* story of 1177 as relating not to a great invasion of Angkor, but to some lesser battle between Cham and Cambodians.

¹⁶⁹ Claude Jacques, ‘Le Bayon et l’*épigraphie*’, in *First symposium on the Bayon, Siem Reap, 31 August 1996, final report*, vol. I, p. 82.

¹⁷⁰ *TT, Bản kỷ*, 4:18a, v. 1, p. 327.

Following the epigraphy of Jaya Paramésvaravarman, whose last record is from the mid-thirteenth century, there are 23 more inscriptions: 14 from Nha Trang or the Phan Rang region; four in Bình Định, which contain no useful information but at least show that the Cham were maintaining an interest there; two in Mỹ Sơn; two in the highlands west of Nha Trang and Qui Nhơn; and one dated perhaps to 1421 in Biên Hoà, just north of Saigon. By this time the political center of Champa was indeed moving southward under Vietnamese pressure. These inscriptions of the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries do not together provide much more than names of chiefs, and I shall not try to pursue the story of Champa history further. All of the important events – war with the Mongols (1278-88), the near conquest of Vietnam by the Cham warrior Chế Bồng Nga (1360-90) (for both of which periods there are no inscriptions) and the further struggles leading to the Vietnamese conquest of Vijaya in 1471 – must be pieced together from Vietnamese and Chinese histories and competently restudied.

There is, however, an interesting story of new friendly and then again hostile relations between the two neighbours after the failed Mongol interventions in both Vietnam and in Champa. Trần Nhân Tông (r. 1278-93), the old Vietnamese emperor who had led the country against the Mongols, abdicated and went to Champa for nine months to visit the holy sites – undoubtedly, since he was a Buddhist, the Mahayana temples in Quảng Bình, Quảng Trị and Đông Dương. His visit was thus probably restricted to northern Champa. While there, he and a Champa ruler whom the Vietnamese sources call Chế Mân agreed on the marriage of a Vietnamese princess with the latter in exchange for the northern Champa provinces of Ô and Lý. According to *Tt*, the princess was sent to Champa in the sixth month of 1306. The following year the Cham king Chế Mân died, and the Trần court sent envoys to rescue the princess who otherwise, according to the Vietnamese sources, would have been cremated with the corpse of her husband.¹⁷¹

In Maspéro's synthesis one of the late inscriptions – that of Po Sah (C22) near Phan Rang, with dates 1274, 1298, 1300, 1301 and 1306 – has been assimilated awkwardly to the story of royal marriage and exchange of northern provinces found in Vietnamese histories. This inscription is of intrinsic interest because its dates cover the period of war with the Mongols, though without reference to it, and because of its apparent record of Champa relations with Java. When carefully analyzed, it shows that at the time of the marriage of a Vietnamese princess with

¹⁷¹ See the account in *ibid.*, *Bản kỷ*, 6: 21a-23a, v. 2, pp. 90-92.

a Champa king and ensuing conflicts, the South of Champa (Nha Trang and Pāōuraiga) was a separate entity from the Thu Bồn area in the North. The full treatment of this inscription, which I summarize here, has been published elsewhere.¹⁷²

The inscription records two queens – one apparently from Java – of a King Jaya Siuhavarman, the third of that name in Maspéro's list of kings. The identity of the other queen was uncertain (at least in the literal readings of the inscription), but Aymonier, Finot and Coedès eventually agreed that she must have been the Trần princess who the Vietnamese histories say was given to a Champa king entitled Ché Mân. As Coedès concluded, after the discussions of Aymonier and Finot, Jaya Siuhavarman III 'married a Javanese princess, the queen Tapasī' and in 1306 married a sister of the reigning Vietnamese emperor (Trần Anh Tông, son of Nhân Tông) who received the title *paramésvarī*.¹⁷³ A problem with this interpretation is that the Po Sah inscription, which mentions a princess in the beginning who is well established as a *paramésvarī* (literally, 'top queen'), ends in 1306 – the year in which Cham-Vietnamese negotiations over the marriage, as related in the Vietnamese histories, were just being concluded and the princess newly sent to Champa.

Another unresolved question is the identity of 'Champa'. Aymonier, Finot, Maspéro and Coedès all assumed that there was a single unified Cham 'kingdom' and that it was possible to identify kings named in Cham inscriptions with the quite different names of contemporary Cham kings in the Vietnamese histories. The Po Sah inscription provides evidence for one of the main points in the present discussion: that there was no unified Champa kingdom, that at least the North (Quảng Nam, Thu Bồn and beyond) was always quite separate from the South (Nha Trang and Phan Rang), and that inscriptions from other parts of Champa (especially the South) may not be related to Vietnamese or Chinese records of the North. The Po Sah inscription was found near Phan Rang in the far South, and none of the other three inscriptions of that king (Jaya Siuhavarman III in Maspéro's numbering) was farther north than Nha Trang, while the Vietnamese histories seem to indicate dealings with a Champa located in the area between Huế and Quy Nhon, and the negotiations concerned the districts of Ô and Lý, north Huế. Thus I would propose that there is no connection between the Po Sah inscription and the Vietnamese princess given to a northern Cham king in 1306.

¹⁷² Vickery, 'Cambodia and its neighbors'.

¹⁷³ Coedès, *Indianized states*, p. 217; Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 189-90.

From another angle, all of Jaya Simhavarman's inscriptions show devotion to Śiva, whereas the former Vietnamese emperor was Buddhist. In a visit to Champa to see holy sites he would only have been interested in those which were Buddhist, all of which were in the North. The events of 1306 and Jaya Simhavarman's inscriptions show a clear separation between Śivaitic Pāṇḍuraiga and those Buddhist centers.

The 'Chế Mân' – Jaya Simhavarman connection is weak on linguistic grounds as well. Maspéro said of the king whom the Vietnamese histories call Chế Mân, 'Chế is the Annamite transcription of Śrī. Man represents the final sound of the name Jaya Siṃhavarman'. He was wrong on both points. The term rendered as 'ché' in Vietnamese (*cei/ciy* in Cham inscriptions) is 'prince', and as L.-C. Damais explained, '*varman*' is impossible: 'there is no reason to restore a form which, even in Sanskrit, is only theoretical [*varman*], for only the forms in *-warm(m)a* actually existed'.¹⁷⁴ Moreover, this is the only case in which a Cham royal '*varma(n)*' name is rendered in the Vietnamese histories by a term ending in '*man*'. This was a noteworthy example of special pleading by Maspéro.

For the rest of the fourteenth century (1306-1401) there are no inscriptions, and historical reconstruction depends on Vietnamese and Chinese sources, in particular the former. They relate frequent conflict – interesting in that the Cham, under princes entitled 'Chế' by the Vietnamese, were attacking and trying to recover the northern provinces of Ô and Lý in Quảng Trị. The 'capital' of the Champa leaders is not certain, perhaps Vijaya but certainly not Pāṇḍuraiga. Another interesting twist in the story of Champa-Vietnam relations follows the death of Chế Bồng Nga in 1390 and the end of the threat to Đại Việt from Champa after thirty years of warfare, a period in which there are no Champa inscriptions against which to check the story in Chinese and Vietnamese sources. According to Maspéro, following Vietnamese sources, two sons of Chế Bồng Nga joined the Vietnamese after their father's death. Although they received no material support from the Trần, after the latter's overthrow by Hồ Quý Ly in 1400, he appointed one of the sons to govern a northern Cham province ceded (again) after 1390; this Cham prince died fighting off other Cham trying to reconquer it.¹⁷⁵ This, of course, is typical of the splits in Champa noted throughout its history and the total absence of any 'national consciousness'.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., p. 188, n. 2; Louis-Charles Damais, review of *Riwajat Indonesia* by Poeratjaraka, *BEFEO*, 48, 2 (1957): 608, n. 2.

¹⁷⁵ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 219-24. According to Maspéro the province in question was Indrapura, only then finally ceded to Vietnam after having been 'conquered' more than once in the past.

Until that point in time the traditional view in modern historical literature (first Western, then taken up by modern Vietnamese historians) that Viet Nam was an aggressive nation pushing constantly against its southern neighbors, Champa and Cambodia, is certainly inaccurate.¹⁷⁶ If Linyi was early Champa, the Chinese records describe it as constantly menacing the Chinese-dominated provinces to its north, and the Chinese were still concerned by attacks of Linyi's immediate successor, Huanwang, on the districts of Hoan and Ái far north in Nghệ An and Hà Tĩnh.¹⁷⁷ If that view of Linyi is rejected, still the first Champa-Viet warfare was brought about by attempted Cham intervention into Vietnamese internal politics near the end of the tenth century. Thereafter both sides alternated as aggressors, with the Cham nearly conquering Viet Nam at the end of the fourteenth century.

Only from the beginning of the fifteenth century is the traditional conception of a continuous push southward (*Nam tiến*) by the Vietnamese at all accurate.¹⁷⁸ This is another period for which there is only the sparse record of the Vietnamese histories, which have never been given the critical study they require with respect to Champa. Conflict continued, and in 1402 the Cham gave up large parts of Quảng Nam and Quảng Ngãi to Hồ Quý Ly. They were plagued by their traditional disunity in the face of Vietnamese pressure, which eventually led to the decisive event – the conquest of Vijaya-Quy Nhon in 1471, after which only the southern provinces of Kauñhāra (Nha Trang) and Pāḍōuraiga were left as Champa.

Although there were no more inscriptions and little solid architecture – Pô Rômê near Phan Rang attributed to the sixteenth century and perhaps other structures and vestiges in the central highlands, there was still a Champa which did not completely disappear until the early nineteenth century.¹⁷⁹ Its history has been reconstructed by Po Dharma in his *Le Pāḍōuraiga* and summarized in his 'Survól de l'histoire du Campā' in the catalogue of the Cham museum in Đà

¹⁷⁶ This is not an impression which comes forth directly from an objective reading of the primary sources, and it no doubt developed to serve the needs of colonialists searching for a benevolent impulse in the conquest of a Vietnam constantly menacing its neighbors. Even Paul Mus was mesmerized by this view of a malignant Vietnam; see his *Việt-nam: sociologie*, p. 17, and the last page of Mus, *L'Inde vu de l'Est: Cultes indiens et indigènes au Champa* (Hanoi: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient, 1934). Then Vietnamese nationalist writers adopted it as evidence for the greatness of their country in the past.

¹⁷⁷ Maspéro, *Royaume de Champa*, pp. 102,105.

¹⁷⁸ Indeed, a new generation of scholars of Vietnam reject entirely the concept of *Nam tiến*. As Li Tana puts it, it was a 'series of different episodes responding to particular events or opportunities'; Li, *Nguyễn Cochinchina*, pp. 19, 21, 28. Keith Taylor, one of the leading historians of Vietnam, also sees it as episodic, writing that 'I do not believe that such an event [*Nam tiến*] ever took place' ('Surface orientations', pp. 951, 960).

¹⁷⁹ On this later architecture see Doanh, *Chāmpa ancient towers*, ch. 20 (including notes).

Năng.¹⁸⁰ By the end of the next century the Cham had regained territory as far north as Cù Mông, just south of Quy Nhơn. Pushing farther north into Quảng Nam, however, they provoked a Vietnamese reaction which in 1611 took all the territory as far as Cape Varella south of the mouth of the Đà Rằng river almost as far as Nha Trang. In 1653 the Cham attempted another push northward and lost everything but Pāōouraiga, in 1692 the Vietnamese court stopped using the name ‘Chiêm Thành’; ‘Pāōouraiga, the last vestige of Campā, ceased to exist as an independent country’, although it still had a special status. Revolts nevertheless continued throughout the eighteenth century until in 1832 its territory was divided between two Vietnamese districts and, ‘Campā definitively ceased to exist’.¹⁸¹

At some time during the last centuries (there is no evidence of it in epigraphy or architecture) many Cham, including kings mentioned in their chronicles, adopted Islam, which is the religion of all but a few small communities of Cham in Cambodia.¹⁸² The largest community of Cham today in Vietnam, however, around Phan Rang, are still not Muslim.

Toward a new history of Champa

First, the history of Linyi must be separated from that of early Champa. Then it must be realized that there was never a unified Champa, and that events recorded for one part of Champa, whatever the source, may not be extrapolated to the rest. Students of the subject must also be aware that the Vietnamese and Chinese histories are not always the best sources and that their data may not automatically be assimilated to what is in the Champa inscriptions – which, where they exist, must be treated as the primary sources. The Chinese sources, in particular, require new study by competent Sinologists. With respect to events, Champa must be seen as consisting, from the time of the earliest sources, of at least three equally important regions: (1) the North, consisting of the Thu Bồn valley (Mỹ Sơn, Trà Kiệu, Đông Dương/Indrapura, and extending at times into Quảng Trị and Quảng Bình; (2) Nha Trang; and (3) Phan Rang/ Pāōouraiga. Each of these regions could be called *nagara campā*, in the Vietnamese records ‘Chiêm Thành’ (‘Cham city’). Vijaya, now Quy Nhơn, became important later and was also then a ‘Chiêm Thành’ and *nagara campā*.

¹⁸⁰ Association Française des Amis de l’Orient, *Musée de sculpture*, pp. 39-56.

¹⁸¹ Po Dharma, ‘Surviv’, pp. 51, 53. See also Po Dharma, ‘Les frontières du Campā (Dernier état des recherches)’, in *Les frontières du Vietnam: Histoire des frontières de la péninsule indochinoise*, ed. P. B. Lafont (Paris: L’Harmattan, 1989), pp. 128-35.

¹⁸² Pierre-Yves Manguin, ‘L’introduction de l’Islam au Campā’, *BEFEO*, 66 (1979): 255-87.

Champa was founded by Austronesians who arrived by sea and established themselves in river port areas, and the rise and decline of one or another region depended on the vicissitudes of the international maritime trade networks from China through what is now northern Vietnam, along the Champa coasts and on to southern Cambodia, Nusantara and India. The shifts in predominance of one or another region were neither the result nor the cause of royalty moving from one center to another. Major shifts in dominance were from the Thu Bồn region of the North to Pāḍōuraiga in mid-eighth century and then, a century later, the reemergence of the North in another location when the so-called Đông Dương/Indrapura dynasty appeared as the dominant entity. A new feature of this new northern dominance was expansion well into Quảng Trị and Quảng Bình, as the earlier Linyi had done, and one of the important centers was probably there. In the eleventh century Nha Trang and Pāḍōuraiga show increasing importance in the epigraphic record, while in the twelfth to thirteenth centuries Vijaya in Bình Định midway between the Thu Bồn valley and the South may have been the most important economically and strategically.

Detailed study of Champa's international trade relationships, which could not be undertaken here, will be of major importance in further work. The importance of maritime activity for Champa has been recognized but not studied in detail for the pre-fifteenth century period. K.R. Hall's treatment is too speculative and not based on solid sources, although he is quite correct in saying that 'the authority of a Cham monarch was concentrated within his own river-mouth plain'; Anthony Reid's discussion focuses on a later period and the information about Champa in early European sources. A beginning in the type of study required now is an article by Momoki Shiro in which he cites the Chinese sources for the products exported from or traded by Champa, some of which are not native to Champa and thus indicate involvement in entrepot trading. More detail on such matters may help to understand the development and decline of the different Champa ports and river-valley hinterlands in accordance with changes in demand for different products in China.¹⁸³

Struggles between north Champa and Vietnam began after the latter's independence in the late tenth century, but it was not, as conventionally believed, a constant push southward by the Vietnamese. The first war, and others later, was provoked by the Cham. Real Champa

¹⁸³ Kenneth R. Hall, *Maritime trade and state development in early Southeast Asia* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii, 1985), pp. 253-4; Anthony Reid, *Changing the shape of early modern Southeast Asia* (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 1999); Momoki Shiro, 'Champa chỉ là một thể chế biển?' [Was Champa only [a] maritime polity?], *Nghiên Cứu Đông Nam Á (Southeast Asian Studies)*, 4 (37) (1999): 43-8.

weakness with respect to Đại Việt began only after the 30 years of involvement with Cambodia in the twelfth to thirteenth centuries, which may have caused more political and economic damage to Champa than any previous intervention from Vietnam.

Bibliography

- L'Association française des amis de l'orient (AFAO),
 1997 *Le Musée de sculpture Ca ∞ de Đà Nẵng*, Editions de l'AFAO, Paris.
- Aymonier, Étienne
 1880 "Chronique des anciens rois du Cambodge". *Excursions et Reconnaissances*, IV, 2 (1880), pp. 149-80.
 1891 "Première étude sur les inscriptions tchames", *Journal Asiatique*, janvier-février 1891, pp. 5-86.
 1901, 1904 *Le Cambodge. Vol I: Le royaume actuel*. Paris: Ernest Leroux. Editeur, 1900. Vol. II: *Les provinces siamoises*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, Editeur, 1901. Vol III: *Le Groupe d'Angkor et l'histoire*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, Editeur, 1904.
 1911 "L'inscription came de Po Sah", *Bulletin de la Commission Archéologique de l'Indochne*, pp. 13-19.
- Aymonier, Étienne et Antoine Cabaton
 1906 *Dictionnaire Čam-Français*, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, Ernest Leroux, Éditeur.
- Bellwood, Peter
 1985 *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago*, Orlando, Academic Press.
 1992 "Southeast Asia Before History", *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia* Volume I, pp. 53-136.
 1993 "Cultural and Biological Differentiation in Peninsular Malaysia: The Last 10,000 Years", *Asian Perspectives* Vol. 32, No. 2 (Fall 1993), pp. 37-59.
- Bergaigne, Abel**
- 1888 "L'Ancien royaume de Campā dans l'Indochine, d'après les inscriptions", Extrait du *Journal Asiatique*, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale.
 1893 *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā*, *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Tome 27, (1ere partie), 2e fascicule, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale.
- Blust, Robert A.
 1988 "The Austronesian Homeland: A Linguistic Perspective", *Asian Perspectives* 26, pp. 45-67.
 1992 "The Austronesian Settlement of Mainland Southeast Asia", in *Papers From the Second Annual Meeting of the southeast Asian Linguistics Society 1992*, Edited by Karen L. Adams and Thomas John Hudak Arizona Sate University, Program for Southeast Asian Studies, Tempe, Arizona, 1994.

Coedès, George

- 1918 “Le royaume de Çrī Vijaya”, *BEFEO* 18, 6 (1918), pp. 1-28
- 1928 “La date du Bayon”, *BEFEO* 28, pp. 81-103
- 1929 “Nouvelles données chronologiques et généalogiques sur la dynastie de Mahīdharapura”, *BEFEO* 29, pp. 297-330, including the inscription of Banteay Chhmar, pp. 309-315.
- 1932 “Quelques suggestions sur la méthode à suivre pour interpreter les bas-reliefs de Bantāy Chmār et de la galerie extérieure du Bāyon”, *BEFEO* 32, pp. 71-81.
- 1939 “La plus ancienne inscription en langue chame”, in *Eastern and Indian Studies in honour of F.W. Thomas, C.I.E.*, pp. 46, ff.
1942. *Inscriptions du Cambodge* Vol. 2. École Française d’Extrême-Orient. Collection de textes et documents sur l’Indochine III. Hanoi: Imprimerie d’Extrême-Orient.
- 1944 *Histoire ancienne des états hindouisés d’extrême-orient*. Hanoi. Imprimerie d’extrême-orient.
- 1964a *Les états hindouisés d’Indochine et d’Indonésie*. Nouvelle édition revue et mise à jour. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.
- 1964b *Inscriptions du Cambodge* Vol. 7. École Française d’Extrême-Orient. Collection de textes et documents sur l’Indochine III. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
- 1966 *Inscriptions du Cambodge* Vol. 8. Paris, École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
- 1968 *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, edited by Walter F. Vella, translated by Sue Brown Cowing. Honolulu, University of Hawaii Press.

Coedès, George et Pierre Dupont

- 1943-46 “Les stèles de Sdòk KaŶk Thom, Phnom Sandak et Prāh Vihār.” *BEFEO* 43:56-154.

Coedès, George et Henri Parmentier

- 1923 *Listes générales des inscriptions et des monuments du Champa et du Cambodge*, Hanoi, Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1923.

Copenhagen

- 1988 Actes du séminaire sur le Campā, organisé à l’Université de Copenhague le 23 mai 1987, Paris, Travaux du centre d’histoire et civilisations de la péninsule indochinoise. 1988

Damais, L[ouis]-C[harles]

- 1957 Review of Prof. Dr. Poerbatjaraka. *Riwayat Indonesia*, djilid 1 (*Histoire de l’Indonésie*, vol. 1). Djakarta. Jajasan Pembangunan. *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* 48 (1957), pt. 2, pp. 607-49.

- Demienville, Paul
1951 “R.A. Stein, ‘Le Lin-yi, sa localisation, sa contribution à la formation du Champa et ses liens avec la Chine’”, *T’oung Pao* 40:336-351.
- Diffloth, Gérard
1992 “Vietnamese as a Mon-Khmer Language”, in *Papers from the 1st Annual Meeting of the South to East Asian Linguistics Society*. M. Ratliff and E. Schiller, eds., Tucson, Arizona State University Press, pp. 125-139.
1995 Paper presented in Hanoi, cited in Nguyễn Hu’u Hoành, *Tiếng Katu*, 21-22, 219.
- ÉÉPC
1995 Études Épigraphiques sur le Pays Cham, réunies par Claude Jacques. Paris: Presses de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient, Réimpression No 7
- Filliozat, Jean
1969 ‘L’inscription dite de ‘Võ [sic! Võ]-Cạnh’”, *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* 55 (1969), pp. 107-116.
- Finot, Louis
1902 “Deux nouvelles inscriptions de Bhadravarman Ier”, *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* II, pp. 185-191.
1903 “Stèle de Śambhuvarman à Mi-so’n”, *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* III (1903), pp. 206-211
1904a “Notes d’épigraphie VI: Inscriptions de Quảng Nam”, *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* IV (1904), pp. 83-115
1904b “Notes d’épigraphie XI: Les inscriptions de Mi-so’n”, *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* IV (1904), pp. 897-977
1915 “Les inscriptions du Musée de Hanoi, *BEFEO* XV (1915), pp. 1-19
1915 b ‘Les inscriptions du Jaya Paramēśvaravarman I roi du Champa’, *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient*, 15/2, pp. 39-43.
1915c ‘Errata et Addenda’, *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient*, 15/2, pp. 185-192.
1928 Review of Maspéro, Le royaume de Champa, *BEFEO* XXVIII, pp. 285-292. Reprinted in Maspéro 1928.
- Glover, Ian
1997 "The Excavations of J.-Y. Claeys at Trà Kiệu , Central Vietnam, 1927-28: from unpublished archives of the EFEO, Paris, and records in the possession of the Claeys family", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Volume 85, Parts 1&2, pp. 173-186.

- Groslier, Bernard Philippe
 1973 *Inscriptions du Bayon*, in Jacques Dumarçay, *Le Bayon histoire architecturale du temple*, Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Mémoires Archéologiques III-2, Paris, l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, 1973, pp. 83-306.
- Hall, Kenneth R.
 1985 *Maritime Trade and State Development in Early Southeast Asia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1985
- Huber, Edouard
 1905 "Le clan de l'aréquier", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* V, 1905, pp. 170-5.
 1911 "L'épigraphie de la dynastie de Đông Dương", *BEFEO* 11, pp. 268-311.
- Jacques, Claude
 1969 "Notes sur la stèle de 'Vò [sic! Vō]-Cạnh'", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 55 (1969), pp. 117-124.
 1995 *Études Épigraphiques sur le Pays Cham*, réunies par Claude Jacques. Paris: Presses de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Réimpression No 7.
 1996 "Le Bayon et l'épigraphie", in *First Symposium on the Bayon, Final Report – Volume I*, pp. 78-86.
- Lafont, Pierre-Bernard
 1979 "Études Cam III. Pour une réhabilitation des chroniques rédigées en Ca ∞ moderne", *BEFEO* 1979, pp. 105-111.
 1988 "Avant Propos", *Actes du séminaire sur le Campā*, organisé à l'Université de Copenhague le 23 mai 1987, Paris, *Travaux du centre d'histoire et civilisations de la péninsule*
- Li Tana
 1998 *Nguyễn Cochinchina, Southern Vietnam in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program Publications.
- Pierre-Yves Manguin
 1979 "L'Introduction de l'Islam au Campā", *BEFEO*, LXVI, 1979, pp. 255-287.
- Maspéro, Georges
 1928 [1988] *Le royaume de Champa*, réimpression de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Paris.
- Moussay, Gerard
 1971 *Dictionnaire Căm-Vietnamien-Français*, Phanrang, Centre Culturel Căm.

- Népote, Jacques
1993 (1-2) “Champa, propositions pour une histoire de temps long”,
Péninsule, Nouvelle série, 26-27.
- Pelliot, Paul
1903 “Le Fou-Nan”, Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient III,
1903, Hanoi, pp. 248-303.
1904 “Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII^e siècle”, *Bulletin de
l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* IV, Hanoi, pp. 131-385.
- Po Dharma
1987 (I-II) *Le P^oḍuraṅga (Camp^o) 1802-1835*, tomes I-II. Paris,
Publications de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
1988 "Etat des dernières recherches sur la date de l’absorption du
Campā par le Vietnam", *Actes du séminaire sur le Campā*,
organisé à l’Université de Copenhague le 23 mai 1987, Paris,
*Travaux du centre d’histoire et civilisations de la péninsule
indochinoise*, pp. 58-69.
1999 *Quatre lexiques malais-can anciens rédigés au Campā*, Presses de
l’École française d’Extrême-Orient, Paris.
- Reid, Anthony
1999 *Changing the Shape of Early Modern Southeast Asia*, Chiang Mai,
Silkworm Books
1999
- Roveda, Vittorio
2000 *Khmer Mythology, Secrets of Angkor*. Bangkok, River
Books.
- Schweyer, Anne-Valérie
1998 “Le dynastie d’Indrapura (Quảng Nam, Viet Nam)”,
Southeast Asian Archaeology 1998, Proceedings of the 7th
International Conference of the European Association of
Southeast Asian Archaeologists, Berlin, 31 August – 4
September 1998, Wibke Lobo and Stefanie Reimann Editors,
Centre for South to East Asian Studies, University of Hull,
Special Issue & Ethnologisches Museum, Staatliche Museen
zu Berlin, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, pp. 205-217.
1999a “Chronologie des inscriptions publiées de Camp^o, Études
d’épigraphie cam-1”, *Bulletin de l’École Française
d’Extrême-Orient* 86, pp. 321-344.
1999b "La vaisselle en argent de la dynastie d’Indrapura (Quảng
Nam, Việt Nam, Études d’épigraphie cam - II", *Bulletin de
l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* 86, pp. 345-355.
2004 ‘Po Nagar de Nha Trang’, *Aséanie*, 14, pp. 109-40.
2005 ‘Po Nagar de Nha Trang’, *deuxième partie, Aséanie*, 15, forthcoming.

- Southworth, William Aelred
2001 “The Origins of Campā in Central Vietnam, A Preliminary Review”, Ph.D. thesis, Archaeology, SOAS, University of London, 2001
- Stern, Philippe
1927 *Le Bayon d’Angkor Thom et l’évolution de l’art khmer*. Paris: Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque de vulgarisation, no. 47. Librairie orientale Paul Geuthner.
1942 Philippe Stern, *L’Art du Champa (Ancien Annam) et son Evolution*, Toulouse.
- Stein, Rolf
1947 *Le Lin-Yi, sa localisation, sa contribution à la formation du Champa et ses liens avec la Chine*. In Han-Hiue, *Bulletin du*
- Taylor, Keith W.
1983 *The Birth of Vietnam*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
1998 “Surface Orientations in Vietnam: Beyond Histories of Nation and Region”, *Journal of Asian Studies*, vol. 57, no. 4, 1998, pp. 949–978.
- Thurgood, Graham
1999 *From Ancient Cham to Modern Dialects, Two Thousand Years of Language Contact and Change*. Honolulu, University of Hawaii.
- Vickery, Michael
1998 *Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia: The 7th to eighth Centuries*. Tokyo. The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, The Toyo Bunko.
2003 “Funan Reviewed: Deconstructing the Ancients”, publication pending in *BEFEO*.
2004a “Two Historical Records of the Kingdom of Vientiane”, in Christopher E. Goscha and Sören Ivarsson (eds.), *Contesting Visions of the Lao Past Lao Historiography at the Crossroads*, Richmond: Curzon Press.
2004b *Cambodia and its Neighbors in the 15th Century*, Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series No. 27, Singapore. www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm
- Wade, Geoff
2005 *Champa in the Song hui-yao: A Draft Translation*, Asia Research Institute Online Working Paper Series, No. 53, Singapore. http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/docs/wps/wps05_053.pdf

*

*

*

Vietnamese histories.

Cm *Khâm Định Việt Sử Tông Giám Cương Mục*

Tt *Đại Việt Sử Ký Toàn Thư*

Vsl *Việt Sử Lược*