

Siamese History prior to the founding
of Ayuddhyā.

Translated from the Siamese

OF

H.R.H. Prince Damrong Rājānubhāb

BY

J. Crosby.

NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR

The following is an attempt at a translation into English of a part of the preface placed by His Royal Highness Prince Damrong before his edition of the Royal Autograph version of the History of Siam during the Ayuddhyā period.

The version in question is a revised one which was drawn up by order of His late Majesty King Mcngkut (Rama IV.). It derives its name from the circumstance that one of the manuscripts in which it exists contains corrections in that King's own handwriting. The first volume of Prince Damrong's edition, with a preface and notes by His Royal Highness, was printed in Bangkok by order of the Committee of the Vajirañāṇa National Library in 1914. The preliminary portion of the preface deals with the sources available for a study of the history of Siam and has already been translated by Dr. Frankfurter. (See Journal of the Siam Society, Volume XI., Part 2, 1914.) The second and concluding portion (here done into English) gives a condensed account of Siamese history during the centuries which preceded the founding of Ayuddhyā by King U Thong in the year of the Buddhist era 1893 (A. D. 1350).

No apology is needed for introducing the present essay to the consideration of students who are not familiar with the Siamese language. It forms a *résumé*—which, so far as the translator knows, is unique—of the main events occurring during a very obscure period. As Prince Damrong is himself the first to admit, some of the conclusions at which he arrives are original and daring, but they will have justified themselves if they do no more than serve to stimulate discussion on the part of competent critics.

I would express my grateful thanks to His Royal Highness for permission to undertake the work of translation, and for valuable help in the revision of the proofs. It should be explained that

I have not always followed the text as published in the printed volume ; recent researches have necessitated various alterations.

To Professor Cœdès, the Chief Librarian of the National Library in Bangkok, I am also deeply indebted, both for assistance in revising the proofs and for a great number of important emendations and suggestions.

The Chinese names appearing in the original Siamese have been transliterated by Prince Damrong in accordance with a Southern form of pronunciation. In my translation these names have for the most part, with the kind help of Professor Cœdès, been rendered according to the Northern Mandarin form after the system adopted by Professor Giles, though in a few instances it has not been practicable to do this.

My thanks are due to Luang Javakārapāñjā for helpful and effective supervision in the task of converting the Siamese text into English.

For the convenience of those who may not be acquainted with the system of reckoning followed by Prince Damrong, it may be noted that the Buddhist era commences with the year B. C. 544 and the Chula era with the year A. D. 639. The present year of the Christian era, 1919, is thus 2462 of the Buddhist, and 1281 of the Chula, eras.

I have adopted no recognised method in the transliteration of purely Siamese words, for the sufficient reason that no such method exists.

CORRIGENDA.

Page	3, line 16.	For	"Szechuan"	read	"Ssüch'uan."
"	3, " 16.	"	"Yunnan"	"	"Yünman."
"	10, 3rd line from bottom	"	"prāṅg"	"	"prāṅg."
"	14, line 22.	"	"Magadhese"	"	"Pāli."
"	14, " 25.	"	"Magadhese"	"	"Pāli."
"	58, last line.	"	"Mahādharmarājā."	"	"Mahādharmarājā"

CORRIGENDA

	For	Page	Page	
	Page	10	10	
	Page	10	10	
	Page	14	14	
	Page	14	14	
	Page	28	28	
	Page	28	28	
	Page	28	28	

EXPLANATORY REMARKS IN REGARD TO THE PERIOD OF SIAMESE
HISTORY ANTECEDENT TO THE FOUNDING OF AYUDDHYĀ.

The Royal Autograph version of the history of Siam begins with the founding of Ayuddhyā by King Phra Chao U Thong in the year of the tiger, Chula Era 712, Buddhist Era 1893. Before turning to this version, students of history will no doubt seek information as to the condition of Siam in the pre-Ayuddhyā period, as to who King Phra Chao U Thong was and as to the circumstances which led to his founding the city. Ancient writings contain many narratives bearing upon the period in question, as I have shewn in the chapter dealing with historical sources, and there are also various monuments of antiquity which, if considered in conjunction with the accounts furnished by neighbouring countries, serve to throw some light upon the early history of our land. I have therefore attempted, for the benefit of those who desire information, to collate and compile, in the form of a preface to the present work, the evidence offered by such narratives as refer to Siam in the times which preceded the founding of Ayuddhyā. But the work of collating ancient documents is a laborious one, since it is necessary to search for, to copy out and to make selection among narratives and authorities which are to be found in so many different places that it is difficult to examine them all. Moreover, the compositions of the old writers sometimes set forth occurrences of such an extraordinary nature as to be unworthy of credence at the present day; at other times, different accounts of the same events are so contradictory that the student must decide for himself as to which of them is correct. For this reason, the ensuing compilation contains much that is conjecture on my part, and, as conjecture is a process which may lead to error, the reader should exercise his own powers of discrimination when perusing the pages which follow.

HISTORY OF SIAM IN THE PERIOD ANTECEDENT TO THE FOUNDING
OF AYUDDHYA BY KING PHRA CHAO U THONG.

The territory of which Siam is now made up was originally occupied by people of two races, the Khmers (𑄎𑄓𑄗) and the Lāo. The domain of the Khmers comprised the low-lying land to the South, that is to say, the present Kingdom of Cambodia and a tract along the sea-coast which extended into the Southern valley of the Chao Phyā River* and reached as far as Pegu. The domain of the Lāo was situated in the highlands to the North within the valley of the Mekhong River, beginning at the line of hills which forms the frontier of Cambodia. It thus comprised the present provincial circles of Nagor Rājasimā, Ubol (Ubon), Roi Et and Utor (Udorn), and it extended as far as the left bank of the Mekhong. The provincial circle of Bāyab (Payab)† in the valley of the River Chao Phyā was also included in the original domain occupied by the Lāo, the Southern limits of which appear to have joined the territory inhabited by the Khmers in the neighbourhood of Svargalok (Sawankalōk) and Raheng.

Who were the original Khmers and Lāo? To-day we only know that the peoples designated under the names of Khā, Khamu, Cambodians, Mons and Meng all speak languages which are of Khmer stock. We may conclude, therefore, that these peoples are descended from the Khmers. As for the original Lāo, they are to be identified in the people styled to-day Luǎ (𑄎𑄓𑄗) or Lawā (𑄎𑄓𑄗), who are still to be found among the forests and hills in almost all the provincial circles included in the old Lāo domain, and who speak a distinct language of their own. The name Luǎ or Lawā comes from the same word as the name Lāo, a

*Generally known to Europeans as the River Menam. [Translator's Note.]

†Since the above was written, the former provincial circle of Bāyab has been divided up into two distinct circles, that of Bāyab on the West and of Mahārāshtra on the East. [Translator's Note.]

fact which enables us to identify them with the original Lāo people.*

In this connection, I would observe that by Southern Siamese (Thai) the present inhabitants of the provincial circles of Bāyab, Utor, Roi Et and Ubol are generally considered to be Lāo and are termed such. It is true that the provincial circles mentioned were formerly occupied by Lāo, but the majority of the inhabitants to-day are Thai, and so regard themselves equally with us Siamese of the South.

With regard to the Thai race, it is now divided up into many branches which are styled under different names, as, for example, Thō, Thai, Phū Thai, Phuen, Chān, Chieng, Ngiu, Lū and Khōn. All these branches speak a Thai language and their traditions prove them to be Thai. The original home of the Thai was in what is now known as Southern China, in a region stretching from the Yangtse River through Szechuan and Yunnan down to the Lāo country. The whole of this region was once inhabited by the Thai. How then did it come about that the latter established themselves in Siam? In order to answer this question, I must first of all give some account of the Khmers.

THE KHMERS.

For the investigation of Khmer history the study of no written documents or authorities is so useful as an examination of the ancient monuments erected by this people, such as the *cetiyyas* and temples of stone which are still scattered over our country and the stone inscriptions and other objects which have been discovered in the course of excavation. These relics of the past should be studied and compared with similar relics existing in other countries, as well as with the historical narratives composed there; by this

*The translator has been informed by another authority, however, that the word "Lāo" is of Thai origin and that it is still employed by at least one of the Thai-speaking tribes of South-Western China with the meaning of "person". [Translator's Note.]

means we may arrive at an approximate idea of Khmer civilisation as it once was.

I have already said that the domain of the Khmers comprised formerly the low-lying land to the South extending from Cambodia along the sea-coast to the valley of the Chao Phya River and thence as far as Pegu. Proof of this assertion is to be found in the fact that the original inhabitants of the region described spoke the same language. Even to-day the Malays everywhere make use of Khmer terms when addressing words of command in the employment of elephants. Additional proof is afforded by the many old buildings erected by the Khmers throughout the same region. There is one noticeable feature about these erections; in the Eastern portion of the valley of the River Chao Phya they consist generally of Brahmanic temples; in the Western portion, from the extremity of the Malay Peninsula up to Pegu, they consist as a rule of monasteries and *cetiya*s connected with the Buddhist religion. Further, the style of architecture in the case of all Khmer monuments found in this part of the world, both in the East and in the West, whether they be Brahmanic temples or Buddhist monasteries, betrays unmistakably an Indian origin. In the districts once occupied by the Lāo within the valley of the Mekhong River there exist at very many spots Brahmanic temples built by the Khmers, but it is apparent that they are of more recent date. Of ancient Buddhist monasteries there is only one, which is still to be seen at Nagor Phanom and is now called Phra Dhātu Phanom. On the other hand, in the Lāo country comprised within the valley of the Chao Phya River in the provincial circle of Bāyab, no Brahmanic temples exist, the ancient monuments there being connected exclusively with the Buddhist faith.

A consideration of the various historical monuments referred to above leads us to the inevitable conclusion that in olden times parties of Indians must have visited the Khmer country for the purposes of trade, and that they must have remained there until at last they either acquired power in the capacity of preceptors, or became the actual rulers of the land. But it is difficult to gather

reliable evidence as to when this immigration from India took place. An indication is perhaps to be found in a rock inscription of the Indian King Asōka, which recounts an invasion by him of the country of Kalinga in Southern India some time after the year of the Buddhist Era 200, when he had been seated on the throne for 9 years and before he had embraced the Buddhist faith. The inscription states that in this campaign, before the conquest of the country by King Asōka could be effected, large numbers of the people of Kalinga were slain and that over a hundred thousand of them figured as prisoners alone. It is permissible to assume from the above account that, at the period in question, many of the inhabitants of Southern India fled from King Asōka and emigrated to the region occupied by the Khmers. This supposition is consistent with the lettering and language, which are exclusively Southern Indian, of the stone inscriptions found in that region. If, therefore, we wish to fix the date when visitors from India first arrived in the Khmer country, we may assume that they came for the purposes of trade from about the beginning of the Buddhist Era or earlier, and that they then became acquainted with the country. Subsequently, some time after the year B. E. 200, the inhabitants of Southern India suffered through the conquest of their country by King Asōka and an emigration on their part then took place to the Khmer region, this being the first occasion upon which they settled there in considerable numbers. A parallel is afforded by the immigration into Siam of Mons in the time of Dhanapurī and during the second reign of the present dynasty, when large settlements were established; the populations of Muang Pradumdhāni and of Muang Nagor Khüen Khandh (Paklat) consist to this day in great measure of persons of Mon extraction. The Indian emigrants whom we are discussing must have established themselves in several different places. Once an Indian colony had arisen, it received continual additions in the shape of fresh emigrants who were in search of a new home, either in order to earn a living or because they were fleeing from some threatened danger. (In the same way, there is an influx of Chinese into Siam at the present time.) But these Indians were a civilised people, possessing a knowledge superior to that of the Khmers who,

though owners of the country, were still only jungle-folk. In course of time, they came to acquire power as teachers and finally developed into the ruling race, the Khmers being subject to their domination. It was during this period that they erected their monasteries and their temples.

According to Vincent A. Smith's work on Indian architecture, a comparative study of the ancient monuments of India shews that the oldest of these were all built in the time of King Asōka and that they are of Buddhist origin. The Brahmanic monuments, such as prāṅgs and temples, are of later date. It has also been discovered that Buddhist and Brahmanic religious edifices in India differ as to the respective purposes for which they were built. In the case of Buddhist edifices, the stūpa was of primary importance and was usually made of brick; it served either as a shrine to enclose relics, or else to mark some sacred place as, for example, the spot where the Buddha expounded the Wheel of the Law. At first the stūpa was round in shape, like an inverted basin or cup; later, a base and a spire were added so as to form a *cetiya*. Further, we do not meet with representations of the Buddha in the time of King Asōka; we find instead representations of a wheel (to typify the Wheel of the Law), or of the Buddha's pulpit, or of His footprint. Representations of the Buddha only appear some three or four hundred years after the period of King Asōka, and become frequent after the rise of the Northern form of Buddhism. Buddhist temples in King Asōka's day, in addition to the stūpa, had attached to them also in nearly every case cells and a place of assembly (*vihāra*) for the monks. Brahmanic temples, on the other hand, of whatever size, consisted merely of shrines for the reception of the images of the gods for purposes of public worship. From these statements of Vincent A. Smith we may conclude that the oldest Indian monuments in this country are those appertaining to the Buddhist religion, which ante-date the stone edifices erected in connection with the Brahmanic faith. This presumption is borne out by the style of construction, Buddhist monasteries such as that at Nagor Pathom being built with less care for detail and for appearance than the Brahmanic temples in the East, as for instance that at Angkor or the one at Phimāi. The

reason for this circumstance is that the Buddhist *cetiya*s and *vihāras* were constructed before Indian architecture had had time to develop itself; the Brahmanic shrines, on the contrary, were built after the Indian peoples had learnt architecture from the Greeks and by practice had cultivated skill in the art. Able constructors then appeared who furnished plans and supervised the work of building in our own country. We have already stated that the early Buddhist monuments in Siam are to be found principally in the West. It may, therefore, be opined that the earliest Indian immigrants settled along the Western sea-coast from Pegu down through the Malay Peninsula, and that from thence they crossed over to Nagor Pathom on the Gulf of Siam. Long afterwards, having become familiar with the country and its routes, the Indian colonists crossed to the Eastern shores of the Gulf, in order to trade and settle in what is now Cambodia.

A consideration of the rock inscriptions taken in conjunction with the "Mahāvamsa" enables us to give the following account of King Asōka. In the year 218 of the Buddhist Era, King Piyadassi Dharmāsōka (or, to give him his short name, King Asōka), of the royal family of Mōriya, was the ruler of Magadha and had established his capital at Pātaliputta. In the ninth year of his reign (B. E. 227), he invaded and conquered the country of Kalinga, on the Southern sea coast, making of it a dependency of his own. But after witnessing the great slaughter of his enemies which took place in this campaign, he was seized with pity and lost all desire further to extend his dominions and increase his glory by having resort to war. He vowed, therefore, from that time onwards solely to acquire renown by governing his realm through the power of righteousness. On his return to his capital, he devoted himself to a consideration of the various creeds then professed in the Kingdom of Magadha, and decided that the Buddhist faith above all others embodied the highest form of truth. He then declared himself to be the patron of Buddhism, which became the chief creed of the country and the precepts of which he set up as a guide for the government of his dominions. After embracing the Buddhist faith King Asōka shewed himself to be a generous supporter of the monks. Seeing that the latter were so well cared

for, many unbelievers, to the scandal of true monks, falsely took the vows. When this came to the knowledge of King Asōka, he purged the Church by expelling the unbelievers from the monastic circle. He then invited the monk Moggaliputtatissa to preside over the third Council of the Church at Pātaliputta in the eighteenth year of his reign (B. E. 236.). After the holding of this Council, he evinced the desire to spread Buddhism in other lands and sent out missionaries to preach the faith in various countries. From the rock inscriptions, it appears that the missionaries of King Asōka carried their message in the West as far as Syria and Egypt, and also to Macedonia in Europe. With regard to countries adjacent to his own and to Eastern lands, it appears that King Asōka invited the monk Moggaliputtatissa to select and despatch for the task of preaching the faith a number of other *arahants*, whose names, as well as the countries over which they dispersed themselves, are set forth in the following verses of the "Mahāvaiṣa":—

“ When the thera Moggaliputta, the illuminator of the
 “ religion of the Conqueror, had brought the (third) council to an
 “ end and when, looking into the future, he had beheld the founding
 “ of the religion in adjacent countries, (then) in the month Kattika
 “ he sent forth theras, one here and one there. The thera
 “ Majjhantika he sent to Kasmira and Gandhāra, the thera
 “ Mahādeva he sent to Mahisamaṇḍala. To Vanavāsa he sent the
 “ thera named Rakkhita, and to Aparantaka the Yona named
 “ Dhammarakkhita; to Mahāratṭha (he sent) the thera named
 “ Mahādhammarakkhita, but the thera Mahārakkhita he sent into
 “ the country of the Yona. He sent the thera Majjhima to the
 “ Himalaya country, and to Suvarṇabhūmi he sent the two theras
 “ Soṇa and Uttara. The great thera Mahinda, the theras
 “ Itthiya, Uttiya, Sambala and Bhaddasāla, his disciples, these five
 “ theras he sent forth with the charge: ‘Ye shall found in the
 “ lovely island of Laṅkā (Ceylon) the lovely religion of the
 “ Conqueror.’ ”*

* Translation of Geiger and Bode.

Professor Rhys Davids in his work on Buddhism thus identifies the countries mentioned in the above verses :—

The monk Majjhanīka visited Kasmīra and Gandhāra, i.e., the countries now known as Kashmir and Afghanistan, on the North-West frontier of India.

The monk Mahādeva visited the country of Mahis, i.e., the district in India South of the Godavery River within the present territory of the Nizam of Hyderabad.

The monk Rakkhita visited Vanavāsa, which Professor Rhys Davids understands to lie on the edge of the desert within the district of Rajputana in India.

The monk Dhammarakkhita visited Aparantaka, which is understood to be on the Western border of the Punjab.

The monk Mahādhammarakkhita visited Mahāratt̥ha, which is in the Mahratta district towards the source of the Godavery River, 150 miles North-East of Bombay.

The monk Mahārakkhita visited the country of the Yona, which is now known as Bactria, in Persia.

The monk Majjhima visited Himavanta, i.e., the countries situated among the Himalaya mountains.

The monks Sōṇa and Uttara visited Suvarṇabhūmi, which Professor Rhys Davids explains as consisting of the region extending from Pegu down through the Malay Peninsula.

The monk Mahinda, who was a son of King Asōka, and several other monks, visited Ceylon.

Subsequent corroboration of the account given in the Mahāvanisa of the mission of these monks in the time of King Asōka has been furnished by a stūpa containing sacred relics, which forms one among a group of commemorative *ceṭiyas* in India. On this stūpa there is an inscription in stone to the effect that the enclosed relics are those of the monk Majjhima, who preached the Buddhist religion in the land of Himavanta and who, after his return, died

and was cremated at that spot. And in Ceylon many other proofs are forthcoming to shew that the monk Mahinda actually did introduce Buddhism into that island.

The Mons allege that the land of Suvarṇabhūmi, in which the monks Sōṇa and Uttara established the Buddhist faith, is identical with the district of Thatōn on the Gulf of Martaban. But I think that we Siamese, with better reason than the Mons, may place it in our own country. For we have a district called U Thong (source or repository of gold) which corresponds to the old name Suvarṇabhūmi (land of gold); if the latter name was derived from the presence of gold, it is significant that in Pegu there are no gold mines, although such exist in Siam. But it is unnecessary to dispute on this point. I agree with the explanation of Professor Rhys Davids, who states that by Suvarṇabhūmi is meant the region extending from Pegu to Western Siam, or perhaps even as far as what is now Annam. The whole of this region was formerly known to the Indians as Suvarṇabhūmi. The monks Sōṇa and Uttara doubtless landed at some place on the shores of the Bay of Bengal, possibly at Thatōn. But there is one established fact not yet known to archaeologists in other countries, namely, that in Western Siam there exists a certain ancient city with the remains of many stūpas, cetiyas and vihāras. In the whole of Suvarṇabhūmi, from Burma and Pegu down through the Malay Peninsula, there is no city at once larger and older than this one. In ancient writings it is called Jaya-Çiri or Çiri-Jaya, and it was already abandoned before the foundation of the old capital at Sukhōdaya. Only recently has it become a town once more after the construction of the railway, its present name being Nagor Pathom. Many later proofs have been discovered to support the view of His Majesty King Mongkut, who set up a stone inscription at the *cetiya* there, declaring that the Buddhist religion was introduced into the city in the time of King Asōka. Firstly, the shape of the stūpa resembles that of the commemorative stūpas constructed under King Asōka. (Consider the model which has been made of the ancient *cetiya*, excluding the prāṅg added later by Phya Bhāṅ.). Moreover, like those of King Asoka's day, the stūpa is of brick. Secondly, there have been dug up at Nagor Pathom many stones

fashioned in the shape of a wheel (typifying the wheel of the law). These were employed as religious emblems in place of statues of the Buddha, as appears from the investigations of archaeologists in India, who state that in the period of King Asōka statues of the Buddha were not made, but that they are products of a later date. I have not heard that anywhere else in neighbouring countries have so many of these representations of the wheel of the law been dug up as at Nagor Pathom. I arrive therefore at the following conclusion. When King Asōka was disseminating the Buddhist religion abroad—it matters not whether this was accomplished through the agency of monks, or of state officials, or of pious Indians who had gone forth on trading expeditions—in any case, I believe that the Indians already then established in power at Nagor Pathom were the first to be converted and—after them—the original population. In this connection, it should not be forgotten that missionaries must understand the language of those to whom they preach. Inasmuch as the Buddhist faith was professed at Nagor Pathom before it was adopted in any other of the cities of Suvarṇabhūmi, the earliest *cetiya* erected there was from its first foundation called “Phra Pathom Cetiya” (พระปฐมเจดีย์)* Later on, the same faith was spread from Nagor Pathom to other cities, and it is for this reason that Buddhism is professed by most of the peoples who live on the Western shores of the Gulf of Siam, as also by the inhabitants of the Lāo country in the provincial circle of Bāyab and by the Mons and Burmans. For the same reason, the ancient monuments found among these peoples consist only of monasteries and inscriptions connected with Buddhism and are not of Brahmanic origin, as is the case in the regions lying to the East. We are not, however, to conclude that the Buddhist religion did not at that time extend further Eastwards; the shrine (Phra Dhātu) at Phanom, on the banks of the Mekhong River, affords evidence to the contrary. I have myself visited this shrine and examined it during several

*Such was also the usual modern name of the town of Nagor Pathom until quite recently, its present designation having been officially assigned to it only a few years ago. “Pathom”—“pathama”—(ปฐม) means “first.”—[Translator’s Note.]

days. Its style is peculiar, the sculptures being in that of King Asōka's period and not resembling the work of the builders of the Brahmanic temples in Cambodia.

Indian history tells us that, even at the time when King Asōka established Buddhism as the principal creed in most of the countries of India, there were still adherents of the Brahmanic faith to be found everywhere, since Buddhism and Brahmanism were not directly opposed to each other. There were many points of similarity between the tenets of the two religions, although the former attached chief importance to the moral law, whilst the latter concerned itself mainly with the physical universe. (The same distinction may be observed in our own country). King Asōka did not, therefore, suppress Brahmanism, but merely refrained from supporting it as he did Buddhism. After his death, no monarch of the Mōriya line exercised the same power as he, and the Kingdom of Magadha gradually declined, many cities which had been subject to King Asōka regaining their independence. Of these, the rulers in some cases professed the Buddhist faith; others were adherents to the Brahmanic religion, and the same held good of the ordinary populace.

Ceylon received the Buddhist faith in the reign of King Devānaṃpiyatissa. In our account of the Church Councils it is stated that, in the year of the Buddhist Era 238, the monk Mahinda, who first introduced Buddhism into the island, summoned the fourth of the Councils. Later, in the year B. E. 433, King Vatagāminī overcame the Tamils and, after re-establishing the independence of Ceylon, became imbued with the desire to restore the Buddhist creed to its former state of purity. The ecclesiastics of the day were apprehensive lest the faith should disappear as a result of the conquest of their country by the unbelieving Tamils on two occasions. The Council of the Church named the fifth in our account was therefore convened and led to the preparation of the first written version of the Tripitaka, which was inscribed upon palm leaves. (Professor Rhys Davids fixes the year B. E. 330 as the date of this Council.) Of the written version then made, only the sacred text was in the language of Magadha; the

commentaries and glosses were at that time all of them still in the Cinghalese tongue.

In the year B. E. 553,* King Kanishka, of the Kusāna line, was lord over the realm of Gandhāra and set up his capital at Purush (known to-day as Peshawar), in North-Western India. Like King Asōka he was ruler of a broad domain and was a devout follower of Buddhism, which form of religion he wished to set up as the first in the land, as had been the case in King Asoka's time. For this cause he invited 500 monks, the monk Vasubandhu being at their head, to assemble in a Council of the Church at Purush. The Council summoned by King Kanishka is not mentioned in the ecclesiastical history of us Southern Buddhists. It is chiefly to be noted for having adopted the Sanskrit tongue as the language of the Tripitaka, and from it dates the rise in Northern India of the "mahā yāna" sect. The origin of this sect is to be explained by the fact that a division based upon differences in points of doctrine had sprung up among the monks in India, first commencing, as we may assume, from the date of the second Church Council in B. E. 100. One party adhered strictly to the precepts of the Buddha and refused to alter them to suit the wishes of individuals. Another party attached special importance to the making of converts and in so doing followed the example of the Brahman teachers, who, observing that large numbers of persons were attracted by the Buddhist faith, had modified their own religion by embodying in it certain of the popular features of Buddhism and by this means had satisfied the public taste. Subsequently, in King Kanishka's day, when the number of those who were drawn to the Brahmanic form of religion had increased, such among the Buddhist monks as set their chief store upon public approbation endeavoured to acquire popularity by changing the tenets of their faith. They named this altered body of doctrine the "mahā yāna" (great vehicle), implying thereby that by means of it escape from the circle of existence would be assured to more

* More correctly, not earlier than the end of the first century of the Christian era. [Emendation by H. R. H. Prince Damrong].

living creatures and more rapidly than by means of the old form of Buddhism. The "mahā yāna" doctrines were propagated first of all in the Kingdom of Gandhāra. King Kanishka sent out missionaries to preach Buddhism in foreign lands, as was done in the time of King Asōka, except that most of these new missionaries proceeded towards the North. In this manner, Buddhism first reached China and Thibet in King Kanishka's reign,* and it is, therefore, the "mahā yāna" or Northern form of it which prevails in China, in Japan and even in Annam, as may be seen to-day from the Chinese and Annamite monks who live in our midst. On the other hand, Ceylon, Burma, Pegu and Siam received the Buddhist faith from Magadha in the time of King Asōka, and in those countries the Southern form (known to the followers of the "mahā yāna" as the "hīna yāna" or "lower vehicle") has always been practised. From those same times there dates also a difference in regard to the Tripitaka, which in the case of the Northern form of Buddhism are in the Sanskrit tongue and have also been translated into Chinese. By the followers of the Southern form, however, they are still read in the language of Magadha, both as regards the canonical text and the commentaries, which latter the monk Buddha Ghōsha, of Buddha Gayā in India, translated from Cinghalese into Magadhese about the year B. E. 596. From that time, the religious commentaries, glosses, etc., of the Southern form of Buddhism, which were originally in Cinghalese, have been in the Magadhese language, and those of later date have also been composed in the same tongue.

The Northern form of Buddhism must have been to some extent introduced into Suvarṇabhūmi, for in that region have been discovered ancient statues of the Buddha describing with finger and thumb a circle so as to emblemize the wheel of the law. Statues having this peculiarity are called "Gandhārese" after the name of King Kanishka's country and are to be seen at Nagor Pathom and in many other ancient cities of this part of the world.

* Probably even earlier. [Emendation by H. R. H. Prince Damrong].

After the reign of King Kanishka, the Brahmanic creed regained its ascendancy in India, but there still remained kings and peoples who were followers of the Buddhist faith. In the year B. E. 1172, a Chinese monk named Hiouen Tshang or Yuan Chwang travelled to India overland for the purpose of investigating Buddhism. He has placed it on record that, at that period, the Brahmanic form of religion was everywhere disputing for supremacy with the Buddhist, and that there was a certain monarch named King Çilāditya, the ruler of the country of Kanyākūbja (now known as Kanauj), who was a devout supporter of Buddhism after the fashion of King Asōka both within his own dominions and in foreign lands, to which latter he despatched missionaries. But in the reign of King Çilāditya Buddhism had, for two reasons which have already been noted, become even more changed than before. In the first place, the dissensions among its followers tended to increase, and in the second, the adherents to Brahmanism continued to preach their doctrines in opposition to those of the Buddhist creed. The monk Hiouen Tshang witnessed the summoning by King Çilāditya of Buddhist monks and Brahman preceptors, together with the rulers of dependent states, to a common Church Council. The first day's deliberations were held in the presence of a statue of the Buddha, those of the second day in that of a representation of Indrāditya, and those of the third day in that of a representation of Çiva. This Council was apparently held in the endeavour to reconcile the various conflicting forms of belief. Hiouen Tshang states that the differences in doctrine between Buddhism and Brahmanism were first of all discussed, and that afterwards there was a discussion upon the differences of system between the followers of the Northern form of Buddhism upon the one hand and the followers of the Southern form of the same religion upon the other.

I believe that the despatch of missionaries by King Çilāditya had results which reached as far as this country, as is evidenced for example by the discovery of stamped impressions of sacred figures which have been discovered at Nagor Pathom and at Rājapurī (Ratburi), or which have been found littered about caves in the provincial circles of Nagor Crī Dharmarāj (Nakhon Si

Tammarat), Bhūkech (Puket) and Pattānī. All these stamped impressions are to be connected with the later stages of the "mahā yāna" form of Buddhism; they consist of representations both of the Buddha and of various Bōdhisatvas, the latter either male or female, some of them being depicted with many arms. The letters appearing on the back of the impressions are in the Devanāgarī character and differ from inscriptions of earlier date. In my opinion, the sacred shrines (พระมหาธาตุ) at Jayā and Nagor, Cī Dharmarāj (before the construction of the Cinghalese *cetiya*s which now enclose them) were both of them connected with the "mahā yāna", and were probably erected at the time of the missionary efforts put forth under King Çiladitya towards the year B. E. 1200. At this same period were erected the *cetiya*s called "tjandi" by the Javanese which exist at several places in Java.

There is nothing to shew exactly when were introduced into our part of the world those forms of Brahmanism especially connected with the worship of Çiva or of Vishnu. But we may assume that, after the establishment of Indian colonies in the region occupied by the Khmers, intercourse with the parent country was always maintained and that any changes (including those effected in religious matters) occurring in the latter would make themselves felt in the former also. As the Brahmanic religion became more popular in India, there must have been devotees who introduced it into and spread it throughout our own neighbourhood, just as had happened before at the time when Buddhism itself was first introduced.

There is a legend to the effect that an Indian prince once emigrated to the region which is now known as Cambodia, where he married a royal lady, (it is not stated whether she was herself the ruler of the country, or merely a King's daughter), and subsequently became sovereign of the land and the ancestor of many subsequent rulers. This tale accords with the evidence furnished by stone inscriptions found in Cambodia and containing the names of many Khmer Kings who were apparently of Indian origin.

These Kings are as follows:—Crutavarman, Cresthavarman, Bhavavarman I, Mahendrarvarman, Īcānavarman, Bhavavarman II, Jayavarman I, Jayavarman II (B. E. 1345—1412), Jayavarman III, Indrarvarman I, Yaçovarman (B. E. 1432—53), Harṣavarman I, Īcānavarman II, Jayavarman IV, Harṣavarman II, Rājendrarvarman, Jayavarman V, Udayādityavarman I, Sūryavarman I (B. E. 1545—92), Udayādityavarman II, Harṣavarman III, Jayavarman VI, Dharaṇīndrarvarman I, Sūryavarman II (B. E. 1655—95), Harṣavarman IV (?), Dharaṇīndrarvarman II, Jayavarman VII (B. E. 1725—44), Indrarvarman II, Çrī Indrarvarman, Çrī Indrarjayavarman and Jayavarmaparamaçvara.*

The inscriptions indicate that all these “Varman” Kings were followers of Brahmanism. In his work on Cambodia, Aymonier tells us that King Jaya Varman II. built the stone temple at Angkor Thom about the year B. E. 1400, and that King Sūryavarman II. built that at Angkor Wat about the year B. E. 1650.

From the indications outlined above, we may assume that those Indians who crossed the Gulf of Siam and settled to the East of it were not originally converts to Buddhism. Later, whether on account of a war at some date or for other reasons of which we are ignorant, certain princes from Southern India who were followers of the Brahmanic form of religion emigrated with their followings to Suvarṇabhūmi, but, not being content to dwell with the Buddhist settlers in the West, they crossed over and joined themselves to the Brahman colonists who had established themselves to the East. Other emigrants from India must have followed continually, until at last these colonists succeeded in setting up a great and powerful state which, after securing its position in the Southern portion of the Khmer region, extended its dominion over neighbouring districts. The Indian settlers in Cambodia must have been ruled by a long

*The above list has been furnished by Prince Damrong in substitution for the one originally printed, and has been extracted from Professor Finot's “Notes d'Epigraphie Indochinoise” which were published in the Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Volume XV., No. 2. [Translator's Note.]

succession of powerful monarchs; they were thus able to possess themselves of the Lāo country both in the valley of the River Mekhong and in that of the River Chao Phyā, and they shewed themselves capable of erecting stone temples such as those at Angkor Thom and at Angkor Wat, which are unequalled for size in the whole world. Moreover, when they had acquired any fresh territory, they proved that they could govern it in their own way and establish their own religion in it. This may be seen from the many stone temples which the Khmers erected at various spots and which are to be found almost everywhere in the neighbourhood of our country. It should not be forgotten that at that period the means available for building purposes were not what they are to-day, human labour and patience being then the chief requisites. In the construction of any of these temples, consider how many men must have been employed and how much time and patience have been expended, in order to quarry and shape the blocks of stone, to raise them and fit them into position according to plan, and then to carve them and polish them to perfection. Hundreds of men must have been utilised for the erection of any one temple, and in the case of such huge edifices as Angkor Wat thousands must have been employed. Further, the work of construction must everywhere have been carried on throughout successive reigns, ceasing only when calamity overtook the state, or when its resources became too enfeebled for the continuation of the task. For these reasons—(His Royal Highness Prince Sarbasiddhi Prasong was the first to notice the fact, which I myself observed after him)—all the stone temples built by the Khmers, wherever they may be or whatever may be their size, wear to this day the appearance of having never been completed. The incredulous may verify this statement by inspecting any one of such buildings at will.

The Khmers reached the zenith of their power about the year B. E. 1400; they had their capital at Angkor Thom, known in Siamese as Phra Nagor Luang, not far from Angkor Wat. They selected also Lavō (the modern Lobpurī) as the seat of a Viceroy, who governed the Khmer possessions in the valley of the River Chao Phyā. North of the chain of hills in the valley of the

Mekhong, we can gather from the size of the temples still existing at Phimai that that place was also the residence of a Viceroy and the seat of government in that region. There was perhaps still another such seat of government in the neighbourhood of Surindra and Khu Khandh. The Brahmanic customs and the Sanskrit terms which are to this day intermingled with the usages and language of the Siamese may be held to have been first introduced by the Brahmans at the period when the Khmers of Cambodia were masters of the country. In a certain temple in Cambodia there is a stone inscription relating to a grant of the use of land to the temple by a Khmer King; it is stipulated that, should the King ever come to the country in which this temple is situated, the Brahmans must receive him with divine honours. We may have here the origin of the rites performed by the Brahmans for the reception of the Phya who presides over our swinging festival (and who represents the sovereign of the country). During the course of the swinging ceremonies, this official is still received by the Brahmans into the city as though he were a god upon one day, and is similarly escorted out of it again by them upon another.

THE THAI.

I have said previously that the Thai had their first home in Southern China, where they formed already an important element of the population before the commencement of the Buddhist Era. There are still in Southern China to-day many tribes who speak a Thai language and who are to be recognised as members of the original Thai stock. The people known to us as Ho are in reality Thai and not Chinese. In Chinese historical works, and especially in the narrative designated "Sām Kok"* ("The Three Kingdoms"), mention is made of wars between the Chinese and the "Huen." European students of the antiquities of China have discovered that the people called "Huen" in these compositions were really none other than the Thai. As, however, the Chinese gave another name to them, their identity was not

* Known to Europeans as "San Kuo Chih."

known until scholars had ascertained that the four provinces of Southern China now called Yunnan, Kuei Chou, Kuang Tung and Kuang Si formerly comprised a region in which the Thai had established several independent states. From about the year B. E. 400, as a result of over-population, these Thai began to emigrate to the South-West and South. Later on, the Chinese, as their power increased, extended their frontiers so as to encroach upon the domain of the Thai who, being thus pressed, were unable to dwell in comfort in the region which they had first occupied. Knowing from their fellows who had emigrated previously that it was easier to support life in the lands to the South-West and South, the Thai thereupon descended into those parts in ever growing numbers. They came down in two directions, those who travelled in a South-Westerly direction establishing themselves in the valley of the River Salwin, whilst those who came down in a Southerly direction settled in the valley of the River Mekhong. The emigrants into the Salwin region set up an independent Thai state about the year B. E. 800 with its capital at Muang Phong, (which may be identified with the modern Muang Hāng Luang). The emigrants who descended into the valley of the Mekhong established independent Thai states in the region now-called the "Sibsong Chu Thai" (สิบสองจุไทย), from the words "twelve Chao Thai" (twelve Thai rulers), owing to the fact that there were at first a number of small separate principalities thus set up. Subsequently, a Thai ruler named Khun Parama obtained sufficient ascendancy to unite the Thai states in the Mekhong valley into one, the capital of which he established at Muang Thaeng. The Thai having thus come down from China in two separate directions and having set up two states independent of one another, this circumstance led afterwards to a distinction in the matter of names. Those who had settled in the valley of the Salwin came to be known as Thai Yai (greater Thai) and are the people now called Shans ("ngiu"—^ขเงี้ยว) by us; those who had established themselves in the state of Muang Thaeng came to be known as Thai Noi (lesser Thai).

According to European writers, those members of the Thai

race who had remained in their original home continued to be hard pressed by the Chinese until, in the year B. E. 1192, there arose a Thai monarch called in the Chinese Annals Hsi Nu Lo who united six Thai states under his rule and set up his capital at a place to the North-West of the town of Hua T'ing in what is now the province of Yünnan. After the Thai had in this way been merged into one state they became sufficiently strong to protect themselves and to resist pressure from the Chinese. The family of King Hsi Nu Lo reigned for four generations, the last of the dynasty being a Thai monarch who is named in the Chinese annals Ko Lo Fung and who ruled in B. E. 1291. This king was a great warrior and made his capital at Muang Nong Sae, the Ta-li-fu of the Chinese (which exists in the province of Yünnan to this day). The territory over which his sway extended was called by the Chinese Nan Chao; he waged several wars with the Chinese and Thibetans, afterwards becoming reconciled with the former, who agreed to a marriage between his son and a Chinese princess.

On ascertaining from the works of European scholars that the original home of the Thai was known to the Chinese as Nan Chao, I commissioned Khun Chen Chin Akshara (Sut Chai) to examine the historical works in the Chinese language which are to be found in the National Library at Bangkok. In the composition named "The 24 Dynastic Histories" under the section designated "T'ang Annals," which deals with foreign countries at the time when the T'ang dynasty ruled in China, he discovered the following account of Nan Chao.

Nan Chao was situated in the present Chinese province of Yünnan; on the North-West it bordered upon the country of T'u Fan (*i.e.*, Thibet), and on the South-West upon that of Ch'iao Chih (*i.e.*, that portion of the Khmer dominions which forms the Annam of to-day.) The region of Nan Chao included six large independent states, namely, Mung Sui, Yüeh Shê, Lang Ch'ung, Têng T'an, Shih Lang and Mung Shê. Of these the largest was Mung Shê, which lay far to the South and at the present time exists still as a frontier-post.

The word "Nan" in the name Nan Chao means "South" in the Chinese language; "Chao" was an honorific title given by the

people themselves to their king and is identical with the Siamese word "chao" (lord), which corresponds to the Chinese "Ong" (องค์). Nan Chao may thus be translated as "the country of the Southern Lord." (For the better understanding of my readers I shall henceforward refer to Nan Chao as "the original country of the Thai").

The "24 Dynastic Histories" makes its first mention of the above country at the period when the Chinese Empire was divided up into three kingdoms, the ruler of one of which was King Liu Pei who reigned over Ssüch'uan. The latter was succeeded on his death by King Hou Chu, in the second year of whose reign (B. E. 768) K'ung Ming invaded and conquered the Thai country. (In the composition known as "Sām Kok" this invasion is referred to as the war with Mêng Huo). The six Thai states were unable to withstand K'ung Ming, and they accordingly acknowledged the suzerainty of Ssüch'uan. No further allusion is made to the Thai until the year B. E. 1193, when it is stated that, in the reign of the Chinese Emperor Kao Tsung (the third monarch of the T'ang dynasty), there was a Thai King named Hsi Nu Lo who ruled at Mung Shê and who despatched an embassy to cultivate friendly relations with the sovereign of China. The narrative recounts further that, after the death of King Hsi Nu Lo, there followed a succession of Thai rulers one of whom, King P'i Lo Ko, united to his own state the five other Thai principalities (termed by the Chinese "Chao") which had still retained their independence. This King P'i Lo Ko also despatched an embassy to cultivate friendly relations with the Emperor of China.

Later, in the year B. E. 1286, in the reign of the Chinese Emperor Yüan Tsung (the sixth of the T'ang dynasty), ambassadors from the original country of the Thai again visited China; the Emperor sent an imperial letter and presents in return and a close friendship between the Chinese and the Thai was established. Soon afterwards King P'i Lo Ko conquered several dependencies comprised within the frontiers of Thibet, in one of which he set up a new capital.

King P'i Lo Ko died in the year B. E. 1293 and was succeeded by his son Ko Lo Fung, who in his turn established relations of friendship with China. One day, whilst on a visit to the Chinese border where it adjoined Thai territory at the city of Yünnan, he was treated disrespectfully by the Chinese officials in charge of the frontier districts. Incensed at this treatment King Ko Lo Fung led an army into China, capturing thirty-two districts in the province of Yünnan and setting up his capital at Yünnan city.

In B. E. 1294, the Emperor of China despatched a great army to retake this same city. King Ko Lo Fung thereupon sent messengers to the Chinese commander to announce his willingness to make a treaty of friendship as before, and to return certain of the conquered districts to China. The Chinese commander, however, would not agree to these proposals; he imprisoned the Thai emissaries and proceeded to attack Yünnan city but was defeated and forced to retreat by King Ko Lo Fung. The Emperor of China then ordered the raising of a new army; but the troops had not yet begun their march when news was received that cholera had broken out at Yünnan. The Chinese soldiers deserted from fear of this disease, and the threatened attack was consequently never delivered. Anticipating that he would be obliged to wage war with China again, King Ko Lo Fung thereupon made a treaty with the King of Thibet, hoping for assistance from that country in combating the Chinese.

In B. E. 1297, the Chinese advanced to the attack of Yünnan city once more. On that occasion King Ko Lo Fung lured them into marching to the city of Ta Ho Ch'ing, where he surrounded them with his own troops, thus cutting off supplies and preventing a further advance on the part of the enemy. The Chinese army being compelled to retire owing to lack of provisions and to an outbreak of cholera in its ranks, King Ko Lo Fung led the Thai forces in pursuit of it and routed it. The Chinese attacked Yünnan city on many subsequent occasions, but were in every case repulsed by the Thai with great loss.

In B. E. 1322, in the reign of the Emperor Tai Tsung, the eighth of the T'ang dynasty, King Ko Lo Fung died. He was followed as ruler of the original country of the Thai by his grandson, I Mou Hsün. In the same year, a Thai army in conjunction with troops from Thibet advanced against Ssüch'uan, but the attack failed and the combined forces were obliged to retire.

In B. E. 1330, in the reign of the Emperor Tê Tsung, the ninth of the T'ang dynasty, the chief minister of state in the original Thai country was a nobleman of Chinese race named Chên Kuei. This personage had formerly been a district officer in the district of Shui Chou and had been taken prisoner by the Thai when King Ko Lo Fung invaded China. The King observed that he was a man of learning and appointed him tutor to his grandson I Mou Hsün, who on ascending the throne made of him his first minister. Chên Kuei perceived that the people suffered great hardship and much loss of life on account of the continual wars between the Thai, the Thibetans and the Chinese. He realised that, if the Thai and the Chinese became friends, the Thibetans would no longer dare to invade China and that an end would be put to these wars. He submitted the above considerations to King I Mou Hsün, who concurred in them and despatched ambassadors to China with proposals of friendship. The Emperor of China was agreeable; in his turn he sent an embassy to the Thai King, and from that time forward the original country of the Thai and China were on amicable terms. But the Thibetans, on hearing news of this, became distrustful of the Thai.

In B. E. 1337, the King of Thibet led an army against China and sent a letter asking for help from the Thai. King I Mou Hsün made a pretence of advancing with his forces to the assistance of the Thibetans, but when a suitable opportunity occurred he fell upon their army and dispersed it. He took possession of sixteen Thibetan provinces and led many Thibetans into captivity.

In B. E. 1372, in the reign of the Emperor Wê Tsung, the fourteenth of the T'ang dynasty, the Chinese

governor of Ssüch'uan oppressed the people of his province heavily and numbers of Chinese soldiers fled to the king of the original Thai country for protection. The Thai king at that period was a monarch named Ts'o Tien, by whom the refugees from Ssüch'uan were treated with great kindness. He placed them later in the van of an army with which he attacked and seized the districts of Shui Chou, Yung Chou and Kung Chou, dependencies of Ssüch'uan. The Chinese forces, however, were assembled in time to meet him at the inner frontier of the province. Perceiving that they could not conquer Ssüch'uan itself, the Thai retreated to their own country carrying with them much booty and many captives.

In B. E. 1401, in the reign of the Emperor Hsüan Tsung, the sixteenth of the T'ang dynasty, the ruler of Annam, which was then a dependency of China, was led by his cupidity into buying horses and cattle from thieves who had stolen them from the original Thai country. For this reason a Thai army advanced into Annam, pillaging the land before it returned home.

In the original country of the Thai the royal line descended as far as King Fung Yu, who at his death was followed on the throne by his son, King Shih Lung. The Emperor of China held the latter in aversion for bearing a name identical with that of one of the sovereigns of the T'ang dynasty. The Emperor refrained, therefore, from sending a mission to attend the obsequies of King Fung Yu in accordance with the custom between friendly states. King Shih Lung, being incensed on account of this treatment, invaded and conquered the district of Po Chou in China.

In B. E. 1403, in the reign of the Emperor I Tsung, the seventeenth of the T'ang dynasty, one Tü Sio Cheng, who may have been either a Thai or a Chinese and who lived on the borders of Annam, entered into that country with a following and pillaged a number of districts. This individual engaged in combat with the ruler of Annam, by whom he was slain, and his adherents fled to Po Chou for refuge, whereupon the ruler of Annam pursued them with his army and crossed the frontier into

Po Chou. In revenge for this action the Thai invaded and conquered Annam, and they subsequently attacked also the district of Yung Chou, in the province of Kuang Tung in China. The Annamites, however, succeeded in regaining possession of their country.

In B. E. 1404, a high Chinese mandarin of Sieng An named Tū Chong represented to the Emperor of China that, as the Thai had grown very powerful, whilst the Chinese forces guarding the marches of Ssüch'uan on the other hand were insufficient and feeble, it would be well to make a friend of the Thai King with a view to dissuading him from disturbing China. The Emperor agreed and was about to despatch an embassy for this purpose, when he heard that a Thai army had taken Shui Chou. The sending of an embassy was therefore postponed.

In B. E. 1405, a Thai army again invaded Annam, the ruler of which country requested help from the Chinese. On learning that a Chinese force was advancing to assist the Annamites, the Thai withdrew.

In B. E. 1406, the king of the original country of the Thai invaded Annam with yet another army. The Annamites again sought the aid of the Chinese, but the Thai had overcome them before the Chinese troops could arrive. Having thus subdued Annam, the Thai king appointed officers to take charge of the country and returned home once more.

In B. E. 1407, the Thai attacked and took Yung Chou in China, but the Chinese were able to win the district back.

In B. E. 1409, the Emperor of China sent an army into Annam which was successful in winning it back from the Thai.

In B. E. 1413, the Thai king invaded the province of Ssüch'uan, subduing the districts on the road to Ch'êng Tu, the capital, which he reached and to which he laid siege. But the Emperor of China despatched an army to the relief of the city and saved it from capture by the Thai, who thereupon withdrew and returned home.

In B. E. 1418, in the reign of the Emperor Hsi Tsung, the eighteenth of the Tang dynasty, the Thai made another, but unsuccessful, effort to seize the frontier districts of Ssüch'uan.

In B. E. 1420, the Thai monarch Shih Lung died and was succeeded by his son Fa. (It would seem that this latter prince before his accession must have borne the title of "Phra" in some capacity, and that the Chinese, not knowing his real name, called him simply "Fa.") This king sent a letter to the Emperor of China containing proposals for peace. Inasmuch as, during the previous twenty years, Thai armies had invaded China almost every year, thereby bringing the greatest calamities upon the population, the Emperor agreed to the proposals in question. After friendly relations had been thus established, the Emperor wished to repair the fortifications on the border between China and the original Thai country, but he feared lest the Thai monarch should suspect his motive for doing so. He therefore arranged a stratagem, in accordance with which a Chinese monk named Cheng King Sjen was sent to visit the original Thai country in the guise of a wandering ascetic. This monk was received by King Fa with respect and was admitted to terms of intimacy with him. He then advised the monarch to cement his alliance with China by seeking the Emperor's daughter in marriage for his son. King Fa agreed to the suggestion and, in B. E. 1423, despatched an embassy for the purpose of bearing a letter and presents to the Emperor of China, who consented to the bestowal of his daughter's hand as desired.

In B. E. 1424, King Fa accordingly sent a mission to receive the Princess An Hoa Tch'ang, who was duly married to his son.

The composition known as "The 24 Dynastic Histories" gives no further account of Nan Chao (*i.e.*, the original country of the Thai). As regards the Chinese rendering of the names of the Thai Kings, it is quite impossible to say what were the various equivalents in the Thai language.

For the subsequent history of the original Thai country we must turn to the works of European scholars, which tell us that the family of King Hsi Nu Lo ruled for thirteen generations, extending over a period of 255 years. The customs of the country became more and more assimilated to those of China, owing to the continual influx of Chinese settlers, which probably began from the date when the Emperor's daughter was given in marriage to the son of King Fa. In B. E. 1797, the Mongols of the Yüan dynasty conquered China, extending their territory to the South-West and subduing the original Thai country at the same time as they conquered Burma. Nan Chao thereafter lost its independence and came under the suzerainty of China.

At the period when the Thai were still powerful in their original home, those of the same race who had set up an independent state in the valley of the Salwin began to feel the pressure of over-population. Numbers of them for that reason emigrated further and settled to the Westward in the valley of the River Irawaddy, in what is now Burma. Hence we find that even in Arakan and Assam there was once a Thai population, the descendants of which exist to the present day. It will be remembered that other Thai settlers had established themselves in the state of Muang Thaeng. The "Phongsāwadān Yonok" agrees with the annals of Wieng Chand (Vien-tiane) in saying that Khun Parama whilst he was king extended the frontiers of this state as follows. To the East, Thai settlers were sent out to the region of the Hua Phaṅ Hā Thang Hok and to Tonkin; to the West, they were sent out to the region known to-day as the Sibsong Phan Nā; whilst to the South, they were sent out to the district of Muang Sao (the present Luang Phrabāng), thus for the first time bringing country occupied by the Thai in that direction into contiguity with that of the Khmers. From that period onwards, the Thai continued to found colonies in the South in increasing numbers until, about the year 1400, a powerful Thai monarch named King Brahma (the first of King U Thong's line) succeeded in wresting territory from the Khmers as far down as Muang Chalieng, thus pushing the frontiers of the Thai country into what is now the provincial circle of Bāyab. King Brahma then built the

city of *Jaya Prākār* (now *Muang Jaya* in the district of *Chieng Rāi*), which was the first Thai settlement on the Southern bank of the River *Mekhong*.

THE BURMESE.

The Burmese and Peguan annals, like our own Northern annals, give to events a date earlier than the actual facts warrant. The reason for this lies in the desire of the compilers to link up the history of their own country with the period of the Buddha, so that they may have the glory of referring back to the Sakya line, to the person of the Buddha himself and to the astrological predictions connected with him. The chronology of the earlier portions of the Burmese and Peguan annals thus furnishes points of much difficulty for conjecture on the part of students of antiquity. In the following account I shall only narrate events in accordance with what we may believe to be the truth. Long ago, a branch of the Mon-Khmer (ᩉ᩠ᩅᩢᩣ) race, which came afterwards to be called Mons or Peguans (ᩉ᩠ᩅᩢᩣ), had extended their settlements as far as the lower valley of the Irawaddy River. To the North of them dwelt another race, the origins of which are not exactly known, but which may have had affinities with the Lāo. At about the beginning of the Buddhist era, a body of Indian emigrants descended the upper waters of the Irawaddy and established the independent state of *Thatôn*. Later on, when the Thai who had settled in the valley of the *Salwin* grew more powerful, they pushed their frontiers into the Irawaddy valley and took possession of *Thatôn*. The people of the latter country fled Southwards from the Thai and founded the state of *Sārakhetr* near the district in which the city of *Prae* or *Prome* was afterwards built. At that time, Indian merchants were in the habit of visiting *Burma* and *Pegu* and had established settlements there, just as had happened further South. There was also a people, afterwards known as the Burmese, which had come down from their original home on the confines of *India* and *Thibet* and had settled in the Irawaddy valley. These Burmans descended in increasing

numbers and finally became masters in that region by wresting the power from the hands of the greater Thai and of the first founders of Thatôn. They had a king who set up his capital at Pagan, where an independent Burmese state was established about the year B. E. 1200. A succession of monarchs followed until, about B. E. 1600, there reigned at Pagan a powerful king named Anuruddha, who is called Anōradhā Mang Cho in our Northern annals and who subdued the various other states situated in the valleys of the Irawaddy and of the Salwin. The period was one in which the might of the Khmers was declining; King Anuruddha accordingly brought them into subjection under him and extended his territory as far as the valley of the River Chao Phyā. Our Northern annals tell us that his dominions reached to the city of Lavō.

The Burmese and Peguan annals agree with many accounts of our own in stating that King Anuruddha was a very devout follower of the Buddhist faith, which he supported in our part of the world as King Asōka had done formerly in Magadha. The circulation of the Tripitaka in our land dates from the time when King Anuruddha procured copies of them from Ceylon.

The Burmese annals state that there existed formerly a city called Thatôn under an independent ruler who was a devout Buddhist and the builder of many splendid cetiyas and vihāras. In the course of the wars which King Anuruddha waged in order to extend his dominions, he is said to have attacked and taken this city of Thatôn, leading away its population into captivity at Pagan. Thatôn remained thenceforward in a state of abandonment; plans were, however, made of such of its monasteries, cetiyas and vihāras as attracted the eye of King Anuruddha and these plans were followed by him and by his successors in the erection of new buildings at Pagan. Thus it is that Pagan possesses a larger number of old cetiyas and vihāras than is to be found in any other city of Burma or Pegu, as may be seen at the present day. When dealing with this subject in his work on Burma, Sir George Scott says that there are no indications that there were at Thatôn very many ancient cetiyas and vihāras, as alleged in the Burmese

Annals. He imagines that King Anuruddha must have taken his models from Angkor Wat in Cambodia. On reading the above expression of opinion, I could not help regretting that Sir George Scott had not investigated this question when he was British Chargé d'Affaires in Siam, as he was a friend of mine and, if he had mentioned the matter to me, I would have taken him on a week's visit to Nagor Pathom to search among the ruins there. He would then have seen the still visible traces of an abundance of ancient cetiyas and vihāras which date from before the period of King Anuruddha. The models for the buildings at Pagan were taken from no other place than Nagor Pathom. I venture to insist on this statement, inasmuch as at Angkor Wat there are no stūpas of the Buddhist type. And other evidence exists to support my assertion in the shape of the printed impressions of the Buddha which have been dug up at Nagor Pathom and the like of which have not been found anywhere else in our part of the world, excepting only at Pagan. Still further proof is furnished by the discovery at Nagor Pathom of some ancient silver coins bearing a conch upon one side. I sent specimens of these to various quarters, including the British Museum in England, enquiring whether similar coins had been found at other places. I received a reply to the effect that their counterpart had been discovered only at Pagan. The above evidence is sufficient to justify the belief that the city of Thatôn which King Anuruddha is said to have conquered was in reality Nagor Pathom. He may even, perhaps, have received the Buddhist faith there. As Nagor Pathom was abandoned from the year B. E. 1600 onwards, no local history of the place exists.

We do not know for certain how far King Anuruddha succeeded in extending his dominions. The Burmese and Peguan annals say that they were vast, that on the South the conquests of this monarch reached as far as the chief centre of Khmer rule at Angkor Wat and that on the North he fought even with China (in order to obtain possession of a tooth of the Buddha.) In so far as Siam is concerned, we may believe that King Anuruddha destroyed the power of the Khmers throughout the whole of the valley of the Chao Phyā River on both of its banks. When he had

seized upon this region, it would appear that he set up in it a number of small separate states each of them under the suzerainty of Pagan. This is possibly to be gathered from our Northern annals, where it is stated that King Candajōti of Lavō gave his elder sister Chao Fā Kaeo Prabāl to King Anuruddha in marriage and that Lavō and Pagan thereafter remained on terms of friendship. (The compiler of the Northern Annals wrongly gives to Pagan the name of Thatôn.)

THE RISE OF SIAM UNDER THE THAI.

In the "Phongsāwādan Yōnok" it is stated that, about the year B. E. 1400, King Brahma came down and wrested territory from the Khmers in the modern provincial circle of Bāyab, where he built the Thai city of Jaya Prākār. We may assume that from this period onwards, after an advance had thus been effected into Bāyab, the number of Thai emigrants who penetrated into that district increased steadily. But it would seem from the "Phongsāwādān Yōnok" that the country occupied by those of the Thai who crossed to the South of the Mekhong River was split up into petty principalities independent of one another, with no common centre of government unless such existed in the parent state which had been established in the region of the Sibsong Chu Thai. I believe that it was between the years B. E. 1400 and 1600 that the Thai first began to settle in the lower valley of the Chao Phyā River, which was then still in the hands of the Khmers. When, soon after B. E. 1600, King Anuruddha overcame the Khmers numbers of the Thai were in all probability already established there. After the conquests of King Anuruddha the Khmer power came to an end; but I think that the Burmese from Pagan kept a real hold over the valley of the Chao Phyā only during the reign of King Anuruddha or for a very short time afterwards. Thai from the North subsequently came down and joined with the earlier Thai settlers in overcoming both the Khmers and the Burmese from Pagan. From that time power over the various states in the lower Chao Phyā valley passed into the hands of the Thai.

For the space of two hundred years, between B. E. 1650 or a little later and B. E. 1850, the Thai who had remained in their original home in Yünnan were gradually losing their independence before the onsets of Kublai Khan and the Mongols who were the conquerors of China and of Burma. On the other hand, the Thai who had emigrated in the direction of Siam rose to a great height of power, the lesser Thai obtaining possession of the valley of the River Chao Phyā and of the whole of the Malay Peninsula. They may perhaps also have acquired at that time territory occupied by the Khmers in the valley of the Mekhong, but we do not yet know exactly where the frontiers of the Thai and the Khmers then met. As regards Burma, soon after the conquest of Pagan by the Mongols in B. E. 1287, the greater Thai obtained dominion over that Kingdom and thus became masters of the land. In Southern Pegu a Thai family which hailed from Sukhōdaya—the family of Makathō, who are said by Sir Arthur Phayre in his history of Burma to have been Thai and not Mons—secured possession of the country, over which their kings ruled for several generations throughout the dynasty of King Rājādhirāja.

From an examination of the geography and antiquities of the region, I believe that some nine large states were set up by the Thai who at that period acquired dominion over the lower portion of the valley of the River Chao Phyā. These states were as follows:—On the East Svargalōk (Sawankaloke), Sukhodaya (Sukhothai), and Kambaeng Bējr (Kamphaeng Phet); on the West, U Thong, Nagor Pathom, Rājapurī (Ratburi), Bējrpurī (Petchaburi), Jayā (Chaiya), and Nagor Āri Dharmarāj (Nakhon Si Thammarat).

We do not know what was originally the religion of the Thai. Such records as we have tell us that the Thai, including those in China as well as those who settled in the valleys of the Mekhong and of the Chao Phyā, or in those of the Salwin and the Irawaddy, were all of them followers of the Buddhist faith. When the Thai came down and made themselves masters of the lower valley of the Chao Phyā, the religion professed by the people of those parts then probably consisted of a mixture of Buddhism and Brahmanism. The doctrines of the former were observed, but the cosmogony

accepted was that of the Brahman teachers, whose religion was accordingly held in reverence. The Thai on their arrival must have adopted the religious beliefs and the customs of the original population.

As regards the various legends which are reproduced in our Northern annals, such as those of Phya Kong and Phya Bhan, of Phra Phan Vassā, of King Sai Nam Phung and of Phra Ruang, I believe that they date from the days when the Thai were in process of establishing themselves in the South and that they rest upon a distinct foundation of truth. But they relate to a number of different places, and at first must have taken the form of tales which were narrated orally from one person to another. Afterwards, they were selected and were brought together so as to make a connected history; but the compiler had no means of discovering the proper sequence of the stories or how far in the course of oral tradition they had deviated from the truth. He merely attempted to arrange the legends which were current into a chronological order of a sort, the result being medley and confusion. This may be seen from an examination of the story of Phya Kong and Phya Bhan. The Northern annals tell us that at first Phya Bhan did not know that Phya Kong was his father; after he had killed the latter he became aware of the relationship and desired to expiate his offence. He was advised for this purpose to build a cetiya which should be as high as a dove can soar. Phya Bhan was unequal to performing this task but, discovering the great cetiya at Nagor Pathom, which was then a deserted city, he surmounted it with a prang the summit of which attained the requisite height. This account assuredly has a basis of truth, for the representation of the cetiya as it once was, which is to be found upon its South side, still exists to-day as evidence of the fact that a prang actually was built on top of the original cetiya. But a story similar to that of Phya Kong and Phya Bhan as related in the Northern annals has been found by His Majesty the present King in Brahmanic literature, from which it appears that the tale is really an account of an incident which occurred long ago in the country of Majjhima. Hence we may perceive that some parallel incident must have taken place in Siam, which was recounted orally from person to

person until the story became confused with the Indian tale as heard from the Brabmans, the two combining to form one legend. So also with the stories of Phra Ruang Aruṅ Kumāra and of Phra Ruang Sui Nam which are set forth in the Northern annals. From the stone inscriptions and from subsequent investigations we learn that these two legends are in reality one and the same tale, and that they refer to events which actually occurred, though without the portents and marvels related in the annals. They took place shortly before the founding of Ayuddhyā, that is to say, at dates later than those which the annals assign to them.

THE HISTORY OF KING U THONG.

Among the legends which arose at the period when the Thai were establishing themselves in the lower valley of the River Chao Phya, there is one in especial which is connected with the history of Ayuddhyā, namely, the story of how the ancestors of King U Thong came to settle in the South. Both the "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" and the short history of Prince Paramānujit agree in giving the following account.

About the year of the dog 550 of the Chula era (B. E. 1731), there lived a Thai King of the dynasty of King Brahma, (the monarch who first extended the Thai domain by overcoming the Khmers and who took possession of the present provincial circle of Bāyab as far down as Muang Chalieng.) The above-mentioned descendant of King Brahma was named King Jaya Ciri and he reigned at Jaya Prākār. His country was invaded by the Peguans and, being unable to withstand his enemies, he fled Southwards, where he came upon a deserted city named Muang Paeb, in the neighbourhood of Kambaeng Bejr. On the site of this city he established a new capital which was called Traitrungs. King Jaya Ciri ruled over Muang Paeb until his death and had been followed by four other monarchs of his dynasty, when King U Thong was born about 160 years afterwards.

In recounting the circumstances attending King U Thong's birth, the short history states that a daughter of the king

of Muang Paeb gave birth to a son the identity of whose father was unknown. On consulting the omens it was ascertained that he was not of royal blood. (The short history states that he was of humble origin and was named Nai Saen Pom.) Being overcome with shame, the King of Muang Paeb thereupon drove his daughter and her son out of the city together with the child's father. The latter was blessed with good fortune and founded the city of Deb Nagor, over which he became ruler in the year of the goat 681 of the Chula era (B. E. 1862) under the title of King Ciri Jaya Chieng Saen. He is said to have made a cradle ("U"— U^{u}) of gold ("thong kham"— ทองคำ) for his son to sleep in it, the child being therefore named Prince U Thong because he lay in a golden cradle. King Ciri Jaya Chieng Saen reigned at Deb Nagor for twenty-five years and died in the year of the monkey 706 of the Chula era (B. E. 1887.) He was succeeded by King U Thong.

The Northern annals furnish a different version of King U Thong's life from the above—a version which we have no means of corroborating. They state that, after Phya Kraek had been followed by three successors on the throne, there remained only a Princess to continue the royal line. Two rich nobles named Jōṭaka and Kāla, respectively, then deliberated together and selected the lord U Thong, who was a son of the former, to marry the Princess and to rule over the city (the name of which is not given.) Six years later, the city was visited by a pestilence, whereupon King U Thong abandoned it and founded the city of Ayuddhyā at Nong Sanō.

In an account which His Majesty King Mongkut composed and gave to Dr. Dean and which was published in the "Chinese Repository" at Canton in the year of the pig 1213 of the Chula era (A. D. 1851), it is said that King U Thong was the son-in-law of King Ciri Jaya Chieng Saen, that he inherited the throne through his consort and that, when he had reigned for six years, his capital was visited by a pestilence with the result that he set up a new capital at Ayuddhyā.

The history of King U Thong, as given in old writings, is as set forth above.

Yet another account is current to this day in the district of Subarnapurī (Suphanburi), according to which King U Thong formerly lived in that neighbourhood, the ruins of the city over which he ruled still existing on the banks of the river Chorakhe Sām Phan between the present town of Subarnapurī and Kāñcanapurī (Kanburi). In the year of the hare 1265 of the Chula era (A. D. 1903), I myself paid a visit to this city of U Thong and found there the traces of an ancient town with the remnants of great walls. The town is very old and must date from the time of the ancient city at Nagor Pathom, for statues of the Buddha and silver coins have been dug up there which are of the same kind as those found at the latter place. It must, however, be of later origin, since it contains traces of monasteries the shape and construction of which shew that they belong to the early period of Ayuddhyā. It occurred to me at the time of my visit that by the Subarnabhūmi or Suvarnabhūmi mentioned on stone inscriptions and in ancient writings may have been meant this very city of U Thong, and not the present town of Subarnapurī which was built subsequently. The word "Suvarnabhūmi" signifies in the Pāli language "source of gold" ("thong"— $\eta\theta\eta$ —"gold"), or "place where gold exists." In Siamese this may be rendered by "U thong" ($\eta\theta\eta$), just as we talk of "U khao" ($\eta\theta\eta$ —a source of rice, a granary) or of "U nam" ($\eta\theta\eta$ —a source from which water is supplied, a reservoir.) U Thong may thus have been the Thai equivalent of the name Suvarnabhūmi. This conclusion led me to the further one that the name King U Thong was not derived from the fact that the bearer of it slept in a golden cradle, as is asserted by the histories; it may have been a name indicating the rulers of the city of U Thong. (Similarly we may speak of the Chief of Chiengmai or of Nān.) Each ruler of U Thong must have borne this title, and therefore the King (of) U Thong who founded Ayuddhyā, (it matters not from what line he may have been descended or what may have been his origin), must

previously to the establishment of the new city have ruled at U Thong or, as it is called in Pāli, Suvannabhūmi. The story current to-day among the people of Subarṇapurī is thus a true one. I embodied the above considerations in an official report which I drew up on the district in question and which was printed in February of the year of the snake, 1267 of the Chula era (A. D. 1905). The members of the Historical Research Society of Siam afterwards declared their concurrence with my views.

I do not think we can believe the statement in the short history, to the effect that King Jaya Çiri, the ancestor of King U Thong, after he had been vanquished and had suffered the loss of his capital at the hands of the Mahārāja of Sittaung (เมือง สิบสอง), fled with his people and set up a new city at Muang Paeb, which was a deserted town on the opposite bank of the river from Kambaeng Bejr. A monarch who had undergone defeat and lost his territory to an enemy would usually be able only to save his own person. It would be difficult for him, at a time when the enemy was already occupying the approaches to his capital, to escape together with his people. Moreover, it is a far journey from Jaya Prākār to Kambaeng Bejr, and it seems likely that King Jaya Çiri, when his capital had been taken, would have fled accompanied only by his immediate following, as did the King of Dhanapurī when he fled from the Burmans to Jalapurī (Chonburi). King Jaya Çiri must thereafter have settled among the Thai inhabitants who had previously colonised the district to which he escaped, and these, observing that he was of high rank, not improbably chose him for their chief. Further, with reference to the statement in the short history that King Jaya Çiri established his new capital at Muang Paeb, where he founded a dynasty which ruled for 160 years before the birth of King U Thong, my studies into the history of that period have shewn to me that the monarch first mentioned cannot have reigned solely at Muang Paeb. There are several grounds for taking this view and they are as follows.

(1) In the "Phongsāwadān Yonok" the founder of a dynasty who is alleged to have come down to Muang Paeb is called King Jaya

Çiri; in the abridged history of Prince Paramānujit the father of King U Thong is named King Çiri Jaya Chīng Saen. I believe these two names to be identical; the respective compilers of the works in question may have caught the sound differently and have thus made a distinction. Jaya Çiri or Çiri Jaya is also the old name of Nagor Pathom. As I have already explained, it was the ancient custom to call the kings of other countries after the state over which they reigned, as for example the king of U Thong, the Chief of Chiengmai or the Chief of Nān, and this custom has survived until the present time. By the King Jaya Çiri or Çiri Jaya of the Northern records may well have been meant, therefore, the king who ruled over the state of that name, and this consideration leads me to believe that the founder of King U Thong's dynasty settled at Jaya Çiri or Çiri Jaya, *i. e.*, the Nagor Pathom of to-day.

(2) The old records tell us that the founder of King U Thong's dynasty discovered a deserted city, on the site of which he set up his capital. At that period Nagor Pathom had been deserted for nearly a hundred years, ever since the time when King Anuruddha had attacked it and led its inhabitants away into captivity. This circumstance serves further to corroborate my opinion.

(3). In the account written by His Majesty King Mongkut it is stated that King U Thong, before ascending the throne, was the son-in-law of his predecessor. The cities of U Thong and Nagor Pathom are close to one another, and intercourse between them would have been easier than between the former and Deb Nagor, which is said to have been situated at a short distance below Kambaeng Bejr and a full ten days' journey from U Thong.

(4). The founder of King U Thong's dynasty is said to have come down and established himself at Muang Paeb in the year B. E. 1731; he and his successors are stated to have reigned over the city for a period of 160 years prior to the birth of King U Thong. As a matter of fact, that period witnessed the rise of the Kingdom of Sukhodaya under four monarchs of the dynasty of

Phra Ruang, and the establishment of a Western capital of the kingdom at Nagor Pu* upon the site of the present town of Kambaeng Bejr on the bank of the river Me Phing. The ancestors of King U Thong may conceivably have reigned in the neighbourhood of Kambaeng Bejr before Phra Ruang had built up his kingdom, but they could not well have reigned contemporaneously with him after he had done so.

For the above reasons I consider as erroneous the statement appearing in the abridged history of Prince Paramānujit, to the effect that King U Thong's ancestors reigned at Muang Paeb in the neighbourhood of Kambaeng Bejr until the birth of King U Thong himself. I believe that they established themselves at Nagor Pathom, if not at first, then at some later date. I leave it to the student of antiquity to accept my opinion for what it is worth.

At the time of the founding of Ayuddhyā by King U Thong in the year B. E. 1893, the territory occupied by the Thai in the valley of the River Chao Phyā was divided up between two large independent kingdoms, namely, that of Siam—consisting of the realm of Sukhōdaya, with its capital at the city of the same name—and that of Lān Nā Thai—consisting of the realm of Haribhūnjaya, with its capital at Chiengmai.

I must give an account, even though it be but a brief one, of these two kingdoms, inasmuch as their history is intimately bound up with, and if known will lead to a better understanding of, the history of Ayuddhyā.

THE KINGDOM OF SUKHĪDAYA.

As far as can be conjectured to-day, the Kingdom of Sukhōdaya was established as an independent state about the year of the Chula Era 600, coinciding with the year 1160 of the Great Era (Mahā Çakarāj) and with the year 1781 of the

* "Nagor Pu" is the result of misreading an inscription. The correct form is "Nagor (Phra) Jum." [Translator's Note.]

Buddhist Era. We are accustomed to call every one of the kings of Sukhodaya by the name of Phra Ruang, a fact which might lead to the supposition that there was only one such King. In reality there were five of them throughout the period when Sukhodaya existed as a sovereign state. The first of these monarchs whose name appears is called in a stone inscription Pho* Khun Crī Indrāditya. His Majesty the present King, who has made a close study of the Sukhodaya period, is of the opinion that the explanation for our giving to every king of that realm the name of Phra Ruang is to be found in the circumstance that King Crī Indrāditya was originally so called before he ascended the throne. This sovereign is probably identical with the Phra Ruang Sui Nam of Lavō who is said in the Northern annals to have fled Northwards from the Khmers and to have become king of Sukhodaya; Phra Ruang Sui Nam is stated to have borne the royal name of King Crī Candradhipatī, which very much resembles that of Crī Indrāditya. My own investigations into this period tend to support His Majesty's pronouncement that King Crī Indrāditya was formerly called Phra Ruang. The custom of thus calling a monarch by his original name is met with later on, as in the cases of (the) King (of) U Thong and of King Mang Long,† and it seems likely that at the time in question King Crī Indrāditya was by many people similarly known as Phra Ruang. The word "Ruang" (รุ่ง) here means "bright" (รุ่งเรือง) and not "to fall off" (หลุดลง). When the monarch under discussion adopted a Sanskrit name for his official designation, he was called Indrāditya, which means in Brahmanic parlance "lord of light." In documents written subsequently in Pāli the name Phra Ruang is turned into that language in many ways. The meaning of "bright" is rendered by "Rōcarāja" or by "Arunarāja"; the sound "ruang" is in other instances reproduced by words of similar sound in Pāli, such as "Raṅgarāja", "Surāṅgarāja", "Seyyaraṅgarāja", or "Seyyanaṅgarāja." But

* พ่อ *i.e.*, "father." [Translator's Note].

† Known to Europeans as Alaung Phra.

it is remarkable that all these Pali renderings of the name Ruang refer to King C_{ri} Indrāditya alone, the other kings being known by other names in every case. We may assume, therefore, that Phra Ruang was the original name of Pho Khun C_{ri} Indrāditya. In compositions written in the Siamese language, however, every king of Sukhōdāya came afterwards to be wrongly styled Phra Ruang.

The stone inscription states that King C_{ri} Indrāditya had three sons, the name of the eldest of whom is not known, as he died in youth. The second was called Bān Muang (บางเมือง). The original name of the third is likewise not known to us: but after he had overcome Khun Sām Chon in a single encounter which took place on elephant-back, his father marked his services by giving to him the name of Phra Rāma Khamhaeng.

In the two compositions known as “Sihingānidāna” and “Jinakālamālinī,” respectively, it is stated that C_{iri} Dharma Nagor (*i.e.*, Nagor C_{ri} Dharmarāj) was a dependency of Sukhōdāya from the time of King C_{ri} Indrāditya,* and that the ruler of the former country procured from Ceylon the statue of the Buddha named “Phra Buddha Sihingā” and presented it to Rōcarāja, King of Sukhōdāya, in the year B. E. 1500. I believe that the authors of the works mentioned have assigned too early a date to the above incident. I think that the statue known as “Phra Buddha Sihingā” must have been obtained in the reign of King Rāma Khamhaeng and not in that of King C_{ri} Indrāditya, for in the latter’s day the kingdom of Sukhōdāya was not as yet a very large one. This appears from the stone inscription which recounts

*The “Jinakālamālinī” calls the King of Sukhōdāya at that time by the name of Rōcarāja; the “Sihingānidāna” gives to him the names of Seyyaraṅga, Suraraṅga or Ranaraṅga. There is little doubt that this monarch is to be identified with the Phra Ruang of popular tradition, whom Prince Damrong again identifies with King C_{ri} Indrāditya. Vide “Documents sur la Dynastie de Sukhodaya” by Professor Cœdès, published in the Bulletin de l’Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient, Volume XVII, No. 2, pp. 43-44. [Translator’s Note.]

how Khun Sām Chon, the lord of Muang Chot (ᨲᨾᨿ) (on the River Salwin, known, to-day as the Amphur of Me Sot in the district of Raheng), attacked Raheng with an army, how King Crī Indrāditya advanced to meet him but was routed, and how King Rāma Khamhaeng—then still a Prince—urged his elephant forward to engage that upon which was mounted Khun Sām Chon, whom he defeated and put to flight. Now Raheng is only three days' journey from Sukhodaya and Muang Chot is distant a further ourney of but three or four days. The situation of these places shows that at that time the frontiers of the Kingdom of Sukhodaya did not reach very far. It is true that the stone inscription relates how King Rāma Khamhaeng extended them by various conquests during the lifetime of his father, but at that date there does not seem to have been sufficient time for the inclusion of Nagor Crī Dharmarāj in such acquisitions of territory.*

There is nothing to indicate the year of King Crī Indrāditya's death; we only know that he was succeeded by Phra Bān Muang his son, who is also named Pālarāja in some documents. We are equally ignorant of any events which marked this latter monarch's reign, as well as of the date of his death. I believe that his reign was not a long one. He was succeeded by King Rāma Khamhaeng, named also in some documents Rāmarāja.

We have many authorities for events occurring in the reign of King Rāma Khamhaeng and for their dates. In the first place we learn from the "Rājādhirāja" that Makathō defeated Alima Māng and obtained possession of Martaban in the year of the snake 643 of the Chula Era (B.E. 1824.) This Makathō subsequently became King Fa Rua (or Wareru) and was the founder of the dynasty of King Rājādhirāja. In Sir Arthur Phayre's history of Burma he is said to have been a Thai and not a Mon, an assertion which is borne out by the account given in the "Rājādhirāja," where it is stated that Makathō was originally in the service of the King of Sukhodaya, with whose assistance he afterwards made himself master of Pegu.

* See, however, footnote on page 48. [Translator's Note.]

Further corroboration exists in the statement appearing on the stone inscription to the effect that Pegu (Hamsāvati) became a dependency of Sukhodaya in the reign of King Rāma Khamhaeng.

From the circumstance that Makathō obtained ascendancy over Pegu in the year B. E. 1824 we may infer that King Rāma Khamhaeng was then already seated on the throne of Sukhodaya. Moreover, he must have commenced his reign some years previously, for the tale runs that Makathō remained in the royal service at Sukhodaya until he became a high official before establishing himself in Pegu. It is permissible to assume that King Rāma Khamhaeng ascended the throne not earlier than in the year of the ox 639 of the Chula era (B. E. 1820), that is to say, four years prior to the conquest of Martaban by Makathō.

King Rāma Khamhaeng was a very powerful monarch and is to be considered as one of the greatest of the Thai sovereigns. By bringing neighbouring states under his sway, he extended the frontiers of the realm of Sukhodaya to further limits than had hitherto been known. The stone inscription enumerates his dominions clearly as follows. On the North—Phrae, Nān and the country extending as far as Muang Chawā (*i.e.*, the Luang Phrabāng of to-day); on the East—Muang Sra Luang (*i.e.*, Bichitr¹), Muang Song Khwae (*i.e.*, the Eastern half of Bisnulōk),² Muang Lom (*i.e.*, Muang Lom Kao or old Muang Lom), Muang Bāchāi (probably Muang Črī Deb in the valley of the Nam Sak River), Muang Sra Khā (apparently Muang Nong Har or Sakol Nagor), and the country reaching to the Mekhong River as far as Wieng Chand³ and Wieng Kham (the latter being a town situated below Wieng Chand at a spot not as yet identified); on the South—Muang Gaṇḍī (believed to be the present Bān Gōn,⁴ between Kambaeng Bejr and Nagor Svarga), Muang Phrabāng (*i.e.*, the Nagor Svarga⁵ of to-day), Muang Phraek (*i.e.*, Sargapuri),⁶ Subarṇabhūmi (*i.e.* U Thong), Rājapuri,⁷ Bejrpuri,⁸ Nagor Črī Dharmarāj⁹

1 Phichit.
5 Nakhon Sawan,

2 Pitsanuloke.
6 Sankhaburi.

3 Vien-Chan.
7 Ratburi.

4 Ban Khone.
8 Petchaburi.

9 Nakhon Si Thammarat.

and the country stretching as far as the outer sea; on the West—Muang Chot, and as we may guess from the inscription, which is here partly obliterated, Tenasserim, Tavoy, Martaban and Toung U, as well as Hamsāvati as far as the five seas (*i.e.*, the Bay of Bengal). The above were all included within the frontiers of Sukhōdaya in the reign of King Rāma Khamhaeng.

It is to be noted that among the states thus mentioned in the stone inscription are not included many which were situated in the modern provincial circle of Bāyab, as for example, Haribhūñjaya and Chieng Rāi. Similarly, we miss the names of Lavō, Ayōddhyā, Nagor Nāyok, Prāchin, Jalapurī¹ and Chandapurī² in the South-East. All these states at that time probably bore different names from their present ones, but we may believe that they were already in existence. Why then are they omitted from the stone inscription of King Rāma Khamhaeng? As regards the states situated within the provincial circle of Bāyab we know the true reason, for in the "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" it is stated that at the period in question Khun Meng Rāi was in the ascendancy in Lān Nā Thai, where his dominions comprised an independent realm including Khelāng (*i.e.*, the present Nagor Lampāng), Haribhūñjaya (*i.e.*, the Nagor Lamphūn of to-day), Chiengmai, Chieng Rāi and Nagor Ngōn Yāng (นครเงินยาง—*i.e.*, Chieng Saen). Phayao formed another independent state under Khun Ngam Muang and, as will be seen later when I shall have to deal with Lān Nā Thai, both Khun Meng Rāi and Khun Ngam Muang were on terms of friendship with King Rāma Khamhaeng. For this reason their respective countries did not become subject to Sukhōdaya. The omission from the stone inscription of the states lying to the South-East is probably to be explained in a different way. I think that Lavō and Ayōddhyā were then either abandoned or included within the frontiers of the state of U Thong. The remaining states may perhaps have still formed part of the ancient Khmer empire.

1 Chonburi.

2 Chantaburi.

Among the states subject to Sukhōdaya in the reign of King Rāma Khamhaeng many appear to have been governed by feudal princes of their own. This was certainly so in the case of seven of them, namely, Muang Chawa (Luang Phrabāng), Nān, U Thong, Nagor Çrī Dhārmārāj, Martaban, Hainsāvati, and Toung U. In some instances, the rulers of these states were related to the royal family of Sukhōdaya.

In the Chinese records translated by Khun Chen Chīn Akshara (Sut Chai), which deal with the treaty relations between Siam and China, our country is called "Hsien Lo." (This name is employed by the Chinese even to-day.) The records explain that "Hsien Lo" consisted formerly of two countries, namely, "Hsien" in the North and "Lo Hu" in the South. Afterwards, "Lo Hu" was conquered by "Hsien," and the two states became merged into one (presumably in the reign of King Phra Parama Rājādhirāja the First of Ayuddhya).^{*} From that time onwards the Chinese name of "Hsien Lo" came into use. The Chinese word "Hsien" is a rendering of "Siam" and undoubtedly signified the kingdom of Sukhōdaya. The name of the country called by the Chinese "Lo Hu", which is said to have lain to the South of "Hsien", can only be identified with the word "Lavō." The Chinese may have used this term from the days when Lavō still formed part of the Khmer dominions, or when it was still governed by rulers of the dynasty of King Candajōti. It is, however, remarkable that, according to the Chinese records, "Lo Hu" was existing till as late as the period of King Rāma Khamhaeng, as will be seen from the narrative of events which I am about to furnish. We may conclude that by the Chinese name "Lo Hu" was meant latterly the dominions of the King of U Thong. In the reign of King Rāma Khamhaeng, Lavō and Ayōddhya must have formed part of the King of U Thong's dominions, to which the Chinese applied the designation of "Lo Hu" already in use among them.

^{*} In reality before that King's accession. The actual date was B. E. 1892 (A. D. 1349), that is to say, about the time when Ayuddhya was founded. (Professor Huber, B.E.F.E.-O. IX. p. 586). [Translator's Note.]

In the following paragraphs I have endeavoured to set forth in order the events occurring under the reign of King Rama Khamhaeng which I have traced in the various records.

In the year of the horse 644 of the Chula Era (B. E. 1825), the Mongol Emperor of China Kublai Khan despatched a mandarin called Ho Tzū Chih on an embassy to "Hsien" for the purpose of cultivating friendly relations.

In the year of the goat 645 of the Chula era (B. E. 1826), the stone inscription tells us that King Rāma Khamhaeng devised the Siamese alphabet.

In the year of the dog 648 of the Chula era (B. E. 1829), the "Rājādhirāja" states that King Rama Khamhaeng placed Makathō upon the throne of Martaban with the title of King Fa Rua.

In the year of the pig 649 of the Chula era (B. E. 1830),* according to the stone inscription, King Rāma Khamhaeng caused the sacred relics at Cṛī Sajanālaya to be exhumed in order that the people might venerate them; he then placed them in a shrine over which was built a cetiya and surrounded the whole with a wall of rock.

In the year of the ox 651 of the Chula era (B. E. 1832), the Chinese records state that "Lo Hu" (the King of U Thong) despatched a first embassy to China.

In the year of the hare 653 of the Chula era (B. E. 1834), according to the Chinese records, "Lo Hu" despatched a second embassy to China.

In the year of the dragon 654 of the Chula era (B. E. 1835),

* Or possibly in the year of the cock 647 of the Chula era (B. E. 1828). See Professor Coedès, "Notes critiques sur l'inscription de Rāma Khamheng", published in the Journal of the Siam Society, volume XII, part 1, p. 19. [Translator's Note.]

the stone inscription tells us that King Rāma Khamhaeng caused the Manang Çilā* stone seat to be erected.

In the year of the snake 655 of the Chula era (B. E. 1836), the Chinese records state that a second embassy from China came to "Hsien."

In the year of the horse 656 of the Chula era (B. E. 1837), according to the Chinese records, the King of "Hsien," who was named Kan Mu Ting, was summoned to appear at the Imperial Court of China or to send hostages in his stead.

In the year of the goat 657 of the Chula era (B. E. 1838), according to the Chinese records, a first embassy was despatched from "Hsien" to China. At that time "Hsien" was at war with Ma Li Yü Êrh† and the Emperor of China made peace between them.

* มั่ง ๕๓๗๗๗. The meaning of this phrase is discussed by Professor Cœdès, *loc. cit.*, pp. 17-18. [Translator's Note.]

† The translator is indebted to Professor Cœdès for the following very interesting note :—

“ Here is the full text of the passage :—

“(In 1295 A. D.) the kingdom of Hsien presented a petition in letters of gold, begging the Court to send a mission into that kingdom. Now, before the arrival of this petition, a mission had already been sent; doubtless, those persons (*i.e.*, the people of Hsien) were not yet aware of the fact. A tablet of plain gold was given to the envoy to wear at his belt. The envoy returned home immediately; an imperial order sent a mission to go with him. As the people of Hsien had been fighting for a long time previously with the Ma-li-yü-êrh, all parties made their submission at that moment. An imperial order was issued enjoining on the people of Hsien : ‘ Do not harm the Ma-li-yü-êrh, in order that you may keep your promise.’ ” (Translation by Pelliot, B. E. F. E.-O., IV, p. 242.)

“ Professor Pelliot says in a note that that the Ma-li-yü-êrh are probably the people of the “Malaiur” of Marco Polo.

“ In an important memoir published in the “Journal Asiatique” (May-June and July-August, 1918), Monsieur G. Ferrand seeks to prove that the word “Malāyu,” which originally designated the state of Minangkabaw in Sumatra, afterwards came to designate the Malay settlement in the Peninsula, around Malacca. His conclusions, if exact, go to show that, at the period of Rāma Khamhaeng, the Thai of Sukhodaya had “a long time previously” reached the South of the Malay Peninsula, and that they

In the year of the monkey 658 of the Chula era (B. E. 1839), the "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" states that Phya Meng Rāi founded

had consequently passed beyond Nagor Çrī Dharmarāj. It is possible, however, that the struggles between the Thai and the Malays to which the Chinese text alludes may have been waged in a theatre more to the North. Here are my reasons for this supposition.

"The inscription in Cambodian which is engraved upon the base of a statue of the Buddha at Wat Penchamapabitra in Bangkok, and which I have studied in my "Royaume de Çrivijaya" (B. E. F. E.-O. XVIII., vi., pp. 33 *et seq.*), is in the name of a king named Mahārāja Çrīmat Trailokyarāja Maulibhūsanavarmadeva. This king, whom I had taken to be a king of San-fo-ch'i = Çrivijaya = Palembang in Sumatra, is in reality a king belonging to a dynasty which reigned in Malāyu = Minangkabaw in Sumatra in the 13th and 14th centuries A.D. (Vide: N. J. Krom—"Een Sumatraansche Inschrift van Koning Kṛtanagara"—Verslagen en Mededeelingen, 1916, pp. 327, 333.) Now the above statue was found at Jaiya. Even if that locality is not its true place of origin, it assuredly comes from the North of the Peninsula, for the inscription is in Cambodian and emanates from the country of Grāhi, the Chia-lo-hsi of the Chinese, which we know to have bordered on South-Western Cambodia. Thus, at the period when the statue was cast (probably in the 13th. century), the influence of Malāyu, i. e. of Minangkabaw in Sumatra, extended as far up as Jaiya and the Bay of Bandon. The Thai from Sukhodaya in their descent Southwards may, therefore, have entered into conflict with the Malays much further North than Malacca. But that they pushed their raids very far to the South appears from the following passage in the Chinese work "Tao I Chih Lio," composed towards 1350 A.D. :

"The people of Hsien are much given to piracy; whenever there is an uprising in any other country, they at once embark in as many as an hundred junks with full cargo of sago (as food) and start off and by the vigor of their attack they secure what they want. (Thus) in recent years they came with seventy odd junks and raided Tan-ma-hsi (=Tumasik=Singapore or Johore) and attacked the city moat. (The town) resisted for a month, the place having closed its gates and defending itself, and they not daring to assault it. It happened just that an Imperial envoy [of the Chinese Court] was passing by (Tan-ma-hsi), so the men of Hsien drew off and hid, after plundering Hsi-li." (Translation by Rockhill, T'oung-Pao, XVI, pp. 99-100.)

"To sum up, it is possible that, from the time of Çrī Indrāditya, the Thai of Sukhodaya—those bold adventurers—may have reached and gone beyond Nagor Çrī Dharmarāj. But even in the time of Rāma Khamhaeng their suzerainty over this region must have been somewhat restricted, since Marco Polo, who visited the country of Nagor Çrī Dharmarāj at that very period and who describes it in his book under the name of Locac, (see Ferrand, *loc. cit.*, Journal Asiatique, July-August, 1918, p. 138, note 3), tells us that "it is a good country and rich; and it has a king of its own."

Chīngmai and that he invited Phya Ruang (*i.e.*, King Rāma Khamhaeng), and Phya Ngam Muang, the ruler of Phayao, to come and help him in choosing a site for the new city.

In the year of the cock 659 of the Chula era (B. E. 1840), the Chinese records imply that a second embassy was despatched from "Hsien" to China.

In the year of the rat 662 of the Chula era (B. E. 1843), according to the Chinese records, yet another mission from "Hsien" visited China.

The events of King Rāma Khamhaeng's reign, as known to us from all sources, may be considered from three points of view: (1) that of his internal administration; (2) that of his military conquests; and (3) that of his treaty relations with foreign powers. We shall then see that King Rāma Khamhaeng did not merely use his power to bring neighbouring states under subjection to him, but that he was also a zealous supporter of the Buddhist religion and a benefactor of all the Thai in many ways, as is set forth in the stone inscription dating from his reign. His most important achievement was the invention of the Siamese alphabet, whereby he rendered to the Siamese people a signal service the effects of which are felt to this very day. As regards his relations with foreign states, the following is to be noted. We have positive evidence to show that intercourse between Siam and India existed from the commencement of the Buddhist era or even earlier. Later on, visitors to this country came from Ceylon upon business connected with religious matters; Chāms, Javanese, Malays and finally Chinese also entered into intercourse with Siam from an early period. But there are no records other than the Chinese records already quoted which indicate with certainty what treaty relations, if any, had been set up between our own country and other states. At the period with which the Chinese records deal, however, the Emperors of the Yüan dynasty were in power and had conquered all the regions adjacent to China down as far as Siam. The reigning Emperor, hearing probably that Sukhōdaya

(called "Hsien" by the Chinese) was a powerful state in our part of the world, despatched a first embassy for the purpose of establishing intercourse with its monarch in the year B. E. 1825. Our Northern annals advance the statement that Phra Ruang himself visited China and brought back with him Chinese potters who were the makers of the Saṅgalōk ware. Although this alleged journey on the part of Phra Ruang may not be credited, it is true that Saṅgalōk pottery exists and there can be no doubt that it was manufactured by Chinese artificers both at Svargalōk (Sawankaloke) and at Sukhodaya. The artificers in question may well have accompanied one or other of the missions sent to China on their return to the latter city.

No record is to be found anywhere of the date of King Rāma Khamhaeng's death; we know only that he was succeeded on the throne by his son King Lō Thai* who reigned until the year of the horse 716 of the Chula Era (B. E. 1897), when he died. But the "Rājādhirāja" affords us an indication which enables us to guess at the respective lengths of the reigns of King Rāma Khamhaeng and of King Lō Thai. The history in question states that King Fa Rua died in the year of the ox 675 of the Chula era (B. E. 1856) and was succeeded by his younger brother Makatā. The latter sent to request that His Majesty Phra Ruang would confer upon him a royal title, as had been done in the case of King Fa Rua, and received the name of King Rāma Pradōt (Pratishṭha?). We may infer from this that in the year B. E. 1856 King Rāma Khamhaeng was still alive. We learn further from the "Rājādhirāja" that, one year after his accession, King Rāma Pradōt was killed by his brother-in-law Saming Mang La, who placed upon the throne his own eldest son, Prince Āo, a grandson of King Fa Rua. This event occurred in the year of the tiger 676 of the Chula era (B. E. 1857), and Prince Āo received from His Majesty Phra Ruang the name of King Saen Muang Ming. In the year just mentioned, therefore, we may again take it that King Rāma Khamhaeng was not yet dead. The "Rājādhirāja" goes on to say that, in the year of the horse 680 of the Chula era

* See second footnote on page 52. [Translator's Note.]

(B. E. 1861), King Saen Muang Ming invaded Tavoy and Tenasserim; it may be assumed that this took place after King Rāma Khamhaeng's death, for during his lifetime King Saen Muang Ming would scarcely have dared to invade territory comprised within the realm of Sukhodaya. Basing our conclusions upon the dates thus furnished, we must infer that King Rāma Khamhaeng died about the year of the snake 679 of the Chula era (B. E. 1860) after a reign of some forty years, and that his son and successor King Lö Thai reigned for a further period of thirty-six years* after him

King Lö Thai† is known by many names. In a stone inscription which employs the Siamese language he is called Phyā Sūa Thai; in the Traibhūmi of Phra Ruang he appears as Phyā Leli Thai; in the stone inscription written in the Khmer language he is named Rūthai Jaya Jettha; whilst in the composition styled "Jinakālamālinī" his name is given as Udakajjhōtthatarāja (meaning "the lord who was drowned," an appellation which serves to identify him with the King who is said in the Northern annals to have fallen into the water and to have disappeared.)

We know little of the reign of King Lö Thai, inasmuch as no stone inscriptions of that period have been found.

* See, however, footnote on page 53. [Translator's Note.]

† Professor Cœdès points out that the name Rūthai Jaya Jettha is not to be found in the Khmer inscription, but that it appears to have been arbitrarily inserted in the Siamese translation of that inscription made by order of His Majesty the late King Mongkut. Similarly, he shews that the rendering Phyā Sūa Thai is due to the mistaken reading of the letter "s" for "l" in the inscription of Nagor Jum. Professor Cœdès concludes that the name of this monarch should properly be written

เลอไทย = Lö Thai; he regards as doubtful the identity of the king designated Udakajjhōtthata by the "Jinakālamālinī." (See "Documents sur la Dynastie de Sukhodaya."—B.E.F.E.-O., XVII, ii.) [Translator's Note.]

But such indications as exist lead us to believe that after King Rāma Khamhaeng's death the power of Sukhōdaya began steadily to wane. We learn from the Burmese annals that, in the year of the horse 692 of the Chula era (B. E. 1873), after the death of King Saen Muang Ming, Pegu revolted and that King Lō Thai endeavoured unsuccessfully to quell the rebellion. But although the whole of Pegu then regained its independence, the Burmese annals state that the Thai recovered Tavoy and Tenasserim. These events apparently took place after the founding of Ayuddhyā by King U Thong, and it may perhaps have been his forces, and not those of the King of Sukhōdaya, which gained possession of the two provinces just mentioned, bringing them thereby for the first time under subjection to Ayuddhyā.

In the stone inscription written in the Khmer language which was set up by King Kamrateng Añ Çrī Sūryavaṃṣa Rāma (i.e. Phyā Li Thai Mahādharmarāja), the following account is given. In the year of the pig 709 of the Chula era (B. E. 1890),* King Lō Thai appointed his son Phyā Li Thai, who had received the name of Phra Çrī Dharmarāja, to be Viceroy over the province of

* The account which follows would appear to be based on a misunderstanding of the Khmer inscription, arising out of the translation made by King Mongkut's pandits. The inscription merely says:—"1269 çaka [B. E. 1890] (year of the pig, His Majesty Lidaiyarāja, who is the grandson of His Majesty Çrī Rāmarāja, led all his troops out of Çrī Sajanālaya.....to provide exactly for.....Friday the fifth day of the waxing moon of jēstha (sic). At that moment the King orderedto lead.....blood, took all the gates (?), the axe.....struck the enemy.....Then afterwards the King diverted himselfsupremacy.....Sukhodaya (?).....succeeding to his father and to his grandfather.....(The sovereigns) of the four cardinal points had.....(gave to him) the white umbrella, sprinkled him and gave to him the name of Braḥ Pāda Kamratēn Añ Çrī Sūryavaṃṣa Rāma Mahādharmarājadhīrāja." (Cœdès, *loc. cit.*, page 13.) It will be seen that, in connection with all the above events, the inscription mentions only one year (B. E. 1890) which, as Professor Cœdès points out, was that of King Li Thai's coronation (abhīṣeka.) His father, King Lō Thai, was presumably already dead at that date. It seems probable that King Li Thai had for seven years previously ruled over Çrī Sajanālaya in the capacity of Uparāja during King Lō Thai's lifetime. [Translator's Note.]

Çrī Sajanałaya ; (three years afterwards, in the year of the tiger 712 of the Chula era—B. E. 1893—King U Thong founded Ayud-dhyā.) When Phra Çrī Dharmarāja had held the office of Viceroy for seven years, i.e. in the year of the horse 716 of the Chula era (B. E. 1897), King Lō Thai fell ill. (The language of the stone inscription would seem to indicate that disturbances had broken out at Sukhōdaya at that time and that an attempt was being made upon the throne.) On learning the serious state of his father's health, Phra Çrī Dharmarāja set out with an army from Çrī Sajanałaya on the fifth day of the waxing moon and reached Sukhōdaya on the first day of the waning moon in the eighth month. (The distance from Çrī Sajanałaya to Sukhōdaya is not more than 75 miles; Phra Çrī Dharmarāja spent eleven days upon the journey and must have encountered opposition on the way.) The stone inscription goes on to relate how Phra Çrī Dharmarāja entered with his army through the North-Western gate of the city, and how, after subduing his enemies and putting to death such as had harboured evil designs, he ascended the throne in place of his father, who had in the meantime passed away. We must assume from the above narrative that Phra Çrī Dharmarāja did not come by his crown easily and that he had to deal with some trouble, the details of which are unknown to us. He was crowned under the royal name of King Çrī Sūryavaṃça Rāma Mahādharma-rajādhira; in other documents he is called either Phya Li Thai after his original name, or else Phra Mahādharma-rajā. The stone inscriptions extol the virtues of this monarch at great length; in the following paragraphs I have embodied the gist of the information so furnished in regard to him, and I have endeavoured to corroborate it by means of particulars gleaned from other sources.

(1). Phra Mahādharma-rajā Li Thai was well versed in the Tripitaka (as is evidenced by the Traibhūmi of Phra Ruang which was framed at his instigation and has been printed in later times.)

(2). He was skilled in astrology and was able to cast the calendar with precision. (The statement in the Northern annals that Phra Ruang changed the era of reckoning may perhaps refer

to Phra Ruang Li Thai. Evidence to this effect is supplied by the fact that the Traibhūmi of Phra Ruang purports to have been drawn up in the year of the cock, "the 23rd. of the era." I have heard of no other King of Sukhōdaya changing the era of reckoning.)

(3). He was versed in vedic ritual and was the first to observe the system laid down in the Sātrāgama. (There is perhaps a connection here with the series of monthly festivals which are stated in the book of the Lady Nabamās to have been held at Sukhōdaya.)

(4). He built a royal residence of brick faced with plaster. (The Lady Nabamās gives the names of the royal residences at Sukhōdaya as follows:—Indrābhisheka, Atirekabhiramya, Uttamarājaçakti, Jayajambhala, Jalavinnāna, Viçālasaurasa, Ratananārī, and Crī Apsaras. All the above names have a very modern sound; but, if the buildings thus designated really existed, they must have dated from the period now under discussion and the Lady Nabamās must have been one of the concubines (พระสนม) of King Phra Ruang Mahādharmarājā Li Thai.)

(5). After the erection of his royal residence, King Phra Mahādharmarājā arranged for monks to study the Tripitaka and for Brahmans to study the vedic arts and sciences within its precincts. (It would seem that this refers to the establishment of a school. In the third reign of the present dynasty a similar custom prevailed of arranging for monks to study the sacred texts within the royal palace.)

(6). King Phra Mahādharmarājā sent a mission to bring away certain relics of the Buddha from Ceylon. This statement is corroborated by the other stone inscription which records how, on Friday the fifth day of the waxing moon in the eighth month of the year of the cock 719 of the Chula era (B. E. 1900), King Phra Mahādharmarājā Li Thai erected a

shrine for the reception of sacred relics at Nagor Jum (an old city, the site of which is that of the present town of Kambaeng Bejr.)

(7). In the year of the ox 723 of the Chula era (B. E. 1904), King Mahādharmarājā despatched learned men to invite the Patriarch Mahā Svāmī to come from Ceylon to Sukhodaya, whither he repaired and resided at the Pā Mamuang (Ambavanā-rāma) monastery. At the close of Lent in that same year a festival was held to celebrate the casting in "samriddhi" metal (សំរិទ្ធិ) of a life-sized statue of the Buddha, which was installed in the centre of the city of Sukhodaya to the East of the shrine enclosing the sacred relics preserved there. (This statue of the Buddha was probably the one known as Phra Ḷrī Sakyamunī or as the great statue of the Sudasna monastery, which without doubt was originally set up in the vihāra mentioned in the stone inscription. By "life-sized" is meant of the dimensions then ascribed to the person of the Buddha. Phra Mahādharmarājā Li Thai was an adept at calculation, as may be seen from the computation of the age of the Buddhist religion on the stone inscription of Nagor Jum.)

(8). In the year of the ox 723 of the Chula era (B. E. 1904), King Phra Mahādharmarājā adopted the life of a hermit, and was subsequently received into the novitiate by the Patriarch Mahā Svāmī in the Royal Palace. Later he proceeded, together with a chapter of the clergy, to the Pā Mamuang monastery where he was received into full orders as a monk. The stone inscription tells us that, when he was being ordained, there was an earthquake accompanied by various other miraculous disturbances of nature, which the learned men in the King's service recorded by means of the inscription, in order that his merits might become known. We do not know how long King Phra Mahādharmarājā remained in holy orders.* [The stone inscription merely says that,

* The next few sentences—enclosed within brackets—advance statements which are not to be found in the Khmer inscription; they appear only in the so-called translation prepared for King Mongkut. [Translator's Note.]

at the instance of the military and civil officers of state, he abandoned the religious life and was crowned a second time under the style of King Çrī Mahādharmikarājādhirāja. From the Patriarch Mahā Svāmī he also received the additional designations of King Çrī Traibhavadharaṇī Jitasuriyajōti Mahādharmikarājādhirāja.

(9). In memory of his royal father, King Phra Mahādharmarājā caused canals to be dug and a road to be constructed leading from Sukhōdaya to Çrī Sajanālaya and to a number of other towns large and small.] This road is still known as Phra Ruang's highway and runs from Kambaeng Bejr to Sukhōdaya and from thence on to Svargalōk. His Majesty the present King, whilst he was still Crown Prince, traversed its whole length and has given a detailed account of the cities through which it passes in his "Journey through the country of Phra Ruang."

The stone inscription proclaims the state of prosperity which existed at Sukhōdaya during the reign of King Mahādharmarājā; it tells us that the citizens were happy, that there was no slavery and that no foes came to disturb the peace. In brief, it may be said that, just as King Rāma Khamhaeng distinguished himself as an administrator and by the way in which he extended his dominions and augmented his power at the expense of his enemies, so also the just King Mahādharmarājā. Li Thai was equally distinguished by the manner in which he governed his realm through the power of righteousness.

It is not known in what year King Mahādharmarājā Li Thai died; towards the end of his reign the history of Sukhōdaya becomes linked up with that of Ayuddhya, as will be explained later when dealing with the reign of His Majesty Rāmāhipatī the First. It is my opinion that his death occurred shortly before that of the last named monarch. According to the "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" he was succeeded by his son, called Phyā Sai Lü Thai, who is called Phra Mahādharmarājā of Bisnulok (Pitsanuloke) in the

history of Ayuddhyā. It was he who engaged in war with His Majesty Paramarājādhirāja the First.

All the written documents agree with the stone inscriptions in stating that the Kings who ruled over Sukhōdaya during the period of its independence were five in number. To these may be added a sixth in the person of Phra Mahādharmarājā of Bisṇulok who has just been mentioned.

I would here beg for an opportunity of correcting a mistake which I have made elsewhere, and more especially in my preface to the Traibhūmi of Phra Ruang. I have stated that the King of Sukhōdaya named Phyā Li Thai is a different personage from King Çri Sūryavaṃṣa Rīma. As a matter of fact, these two names designated the same monarch. My error was due to an incorrect reading of the dates appearing on the stone inscription of Nagor Jum. I have but recently ascertained that both names without doubt belonged to the same king.

THE REGION OF LĀN NĀ THAI.

The region of Lān Nā Thai consisted of what is now the Provincial Circle of Bāyab which, as I have already stated, was originally inhabited by the Lāo. Exact authorities are lacking for the history of this region during the Lāo period, inasmuch as no Lāo antiquities or stone inscriptions exist for us to examine. Phyā Prajākich Korachakr (Chaem Bunnāk) has endeavoured in the "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" to collect and collate the various written accounts which have been found in the Northern portion of the original Lāo country. There are many such accounts, among them being the story of Suvarṇa Khōm Kham, the story of Siṅhanavati, and compositions in the Pāli language like the story of Chāma-devivongs or the Jinakālamālinī. But all these works were

composed by Thai authors after the country had fallen under the sway of the Thai, the writers stating that they had gathered their materials from local tradition. A study of them shews that they cannot in the least degree be regarded as constituting authorities, even approximately accurate, for the history of this part of Siam during the time when the Lāo were masters of it; this statement applies equally to dates, to the names of persons and to the names of places. As I have said previously, we know in a general way that the Northern portion of Siam was occupied formerly by inhabitants of Lāo race. When the Khmers had pushed their frontiers Northwards, the Khmer ruler who resided at Lavō is said to have despatched his daughter, the Princess Chāmadevī, to govern the city of Haribhuñjaya (the present Nagor Lamphūn), which became a seat of government in the North under the Khmers of Lavō and included within its jurisdiction all the Lāo in Bāyab. Truth can scarcely attach to the Northern legend that, at the request of the people of Haribhuñjaya, the King of Lavō sent the Princess Chāmadevī away from her husband to rule over them at a time when she was pregnant. It seems more probable that he despatched his son-in-law, the consort of his daughter, to govern Haribhuñjaya, and that the Princess accompanied him. After founding the state of Haribhuñjaya, the Khmers established yet other colonies in Bāyab, of which the chief one was at Nagor Lampāng (then known as Nagor Khelāng). Later, according to the Northern accounts, began the gradual invasion by the Greater and the Lesser Thai of the Northern part of the Lāo country. A short time subsequently to the year B. E. 1600, however, when King Anuruddha had advanced into the valley of the River Chao Phya, the Lāo succeeded in setting up an independent state once more at Chieng Saen. The Northern accounts say that the founder of the dynasty which reigned there at that period was named Lāo Chok; compositions in the Pāli language call him Lava Chakkarāja and state that he had many successors who ruled over the Northern portion of the Provincial Circle of Bāyab. One of these, named Khun Chūang, extended his conquests as far as Luang Phrabāng and Annam and was killed in warfare. The Northern Annals assert that the dynasty of Lava Chakkarāja continued to rule

over Northern Bāyab until the time of Khun Meng Rāi (who founded Chiengmai in the year B. E. 1839) and of Khun Ngam Muang, (the King of Phayao), both of whom were independent monarchs and contemporaries of King Rāma Khamhaeng. I believe, however, that Khun Meng Rāi and Khun Ngam Muang were in reality Thai who came down to settle in those parts at the same period as other colonists of Thai race were establishing themselves in the South. I do not think that they were Lāo, as the Northern accounts assert, for the region included within the Provincial Circle of Bāyab lay even then between country held by the Thai both to the North and to the South of it; Thai from the North would be obliged to traverse it when going to settle in the South, and it is not likely that the Lāo could have retained their mastery over intermediate territory thus situated. In my opinion, what probably happened was this. When King Anuruddha had carried his conquests into the valley of the Chao Phyā, the Lāo under Lava Chakkarāja regained their independence soon after the year B. E. 1600, but did not keep it for many generations. Then the Thai obtained possession of the country, which remained in their power thenceforward, and acquired from that circumstance the name of Lān Nā Thai.

Reliable dates and narratives in regard to the history of Lān Nā Thai exist from about the year 600 of the Chula era (B. E. 1781.) We learn that at that epoch the region was split up into small states, which were for the most part independent of one another. Of these the three principal were:— (1) Haribhuñjaya, which was formerly the Northern capital of the Khmers in the time of Lavō and which, together with Nagor Khelāng, was still governed by an independent ruler (presumably of Thai race) of its own; (2) Ngōn Yāng (afterwards called Chieng Saen), which was also under an independent Thai ruler; and (3) Phayao which, equally with Haribhuñjaya and Ngōn Yāng, possessed an independent Thai government.

About the year 640 of the Chula era (B. E. 1821), two notable figures had arisen in Lān Nā Thai. One of these was

Phyā Ngam Muang, King of Phayao, whom the astrologers' records state to have been born on Thursday, the 15th day of the waxing moon in the 6th month of the year of the dog, 600 of the Chula era (B. E. 1781.) The other was Phyā Meng Rāi, King of Ngōn Yāng, who, according to the records of the astrologers, was born on Sunday, the 9th day of the waning moon in the 3rd month of the same year. The "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" states that Phyā Ngam Muang was a friend of Phra Ruang of Sukhōdaya, (the time is that of King Rāma Khamhaeng), with whom he had studied under the same preceptor and whom he resembled in his miraculous gifts. Phra Ruang paid frequent visits to him at Phayao and finally became the lover of his Queen (นาง ทราย) Phyā Ngam Muang discovered this intrigue and called upon Phyā Meng Rāi to adjudicate in the matter. Seeing that a quarrel was threatened which must involve the respective countries of Phra Ruang and of Phyā Ngam Muang in war, Phyā Meng Rāi reconciled the disputants and all three monarchs thereupon swore an oath of friendship for the future.

The above account resembles that given in the Northern Annals, where it is said that Phra Ruang (Arūṇa Kumāra), by following the string of a kite, visited the daughter of Phyā (พระ ทราย) Tong U. The two stories probably refer to the same incident.

According to the "Phongsāwadān Yonok" Phyā Meng Rāi founded the city of Chieng Rāi, at which he established his capital and where he resided for a period. Subsequently, he wrested Haribhuñjaya from Phyā (พระ ทราย) Yī Bā and then founded Chiengmai in the year of the monkey 658 of the Chula era (B. E. 1839), during the reign of King Rāma Khamhaeng of Sukhōdaya. The "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" states further that, when about to do this, he invited Phra Ruang and Phyā Ngam Muang, the lord of Phayao, to help him in choosing a site for the new city. Chiengmai became thenceforth the

the capital of Lān Nā Thai for the remainder of King Meng Rāi's reign.

We may accept as true the account appearing in the "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" as to the friendly relations existing between Sukhodaya on the one hand and Chiengmai and Phayao on the other, for it is to be noted that the stone inscription of King Rāma Khamhaeng omits the names of any cities situated in these two kingdoms of the Lān Nā Thai region from the list of states which owned allegiance to him.

The "Phongsāwadān Yōnok" goes on to say that King Meng Rāi died in the year of the snake 679 of the Chula era (B. E. 1860.) He had three sons, of whom the eldest was named Chao Khrüang. This prince plotted against his father and was executed. The second son was called Chao Khrām and distinguished himself by effecting the conquest of Nagor Khelāng; as a reward, King Meng Rāi conferred upon him the title of Phra Jaya Songrām and appointed him to rule over Chieng Rāi. The third son, who was named Chao Khrüa and who was governor of Muang Phrāo, was guilty of misconduct with the wife of Phra Jaya Songrām. For this reason King Meng Rāi banished him to Muang Pāi, of which place he became governor. On the death of King Meng Rāi, Phra Jaya Songrām succeeded to the throne. Not caring to reside at Chiengmai, as soon as the rites in connection with his own accession and with the funeral of his father were completed, he entrusted the government of that city to his eldest son Chao Saen Bhū and himself returned to Chieng Rāi, which once more became the capital of Lān Nā Thai. Chao Khrüa, who had been banished to Muang Pāi, afterwards advanced with an army against Chiengmai, which he captured. King Jaya Songrām in his turn then despatched troops under the command of his second son, Chao Nam Thuom, to regain possession of the city. Chao Nam Thuom succeeded in this task and was himself appointed governor. Later, as King Jaya Songrām had become distrustful of him, he was banished to Muang Khemaratha (i.e. Keng Tung), and Chao Saen Bhū was installed as governor of Chiengmai again.

King Jaya Songrām died in the year of the hare 689 of the Chula era (B. E. 1870.) He was followed on the throne by Chao Saen Bhū, who handed over the government of Chīngmai to his son Chao Kham Fū and took up his own residence at Chīng Rāi. King Saen Bhū afterwards built a city at Chīng Saen (formerly known as Ngön Yang), and made of it the capital of Lān Nā Thai.

King Saen Bhū died in the year of the dog 696 of the Chula era (B. E. 1877.) His successor was King Kham Fū who, after appointing his son Chao Phā Yū to be governor of Chīngmai, proceeded to take up the reins of government at Chīng Saen.

King Kham Fū died by drowning in the year of the dragon 702 of the Chula era (B. E. 1883) and was succeeded by Chao Phā Yū. The latter, after nominating his son Tū Nā as governor of Chīngmai, reigned at Chīng Saen for a period of five years. In the year of the cock 707 of the Chula era (B. E. 1888), he returned, however, to Chīngmai where he established his capital. He died in the year of the goat 729 of the Chula era (B. E. 1910.)

Nān and Phrae were not included in Lān Nā Thai, since they were dependencies of Sukhōdaya. As regards Phayao, after Phayā Ngam Muang had been followed as king by two successors, that state was absorbed and became one kingdom with the rest of Lān Nā Thai.

Such was the history of Lān Nā Thai prior to the founding of Ayuddhyā by King U Thong.

HOW KING U THONG CAME TO FOUND AYUDDHYA.

From the preceding account of the history of Siam prior to the founding of Ayuddhyā by King U Thong, it has been seen that U Thong was originally a state which acknowledged the suzerainty of Sukhōdaya. When, in the reign of King Lō Thai, the power of Sukhōdaya began to wane, most of the states subject to that kingdom must have harboured the design of establishing their independence. They were, however, not all of

them equally strong. The weaker among them, realising that they could not hope to succeed in any such endeavour, turned their attention solely to the question of preserving their existence. Even the larger and stronger states were obliged to husband their resources for long in advance, and those which achieved their object were few in number, inasmuch as capable leadership was necessary in addition to material strength. U Thong was probably one of these larger feudatory states, and we may believe that the idea of establishing its independence occurred to the predecessor on the throne of King U Thong Rāmādhīpatī. The former monarch, observing the latter to be fitted by reason of his abilities to aid him in this plan, may well have given his daughter to him in marriage on that account. My reason for thinking that the idea of independence dated from the predecessor of King U Thong Rāmādhīpatī is as follows. When King U Thong founded Ayuddhyā, it was not necessary for him to engage in conflict with any of the neighbouring states; his frontiers extended on the South down through the Malay Peninsula; on the West he was master of Tenasserim and Tavoy; on the North his borders stretched as far as Muang Sarga; whilst on the East they reached to the frontier of the Khmer dominions. For the acquisition of so large a territory as this, a longer period must have been required than the six years during which King U Thong Rāmādhīpatī reigned prior to the founding of Ayuddhyā. I believe that that sovereign's predecessor, perceiving that the power of Sukhōdaya was declining irrecoverably, and fearing that the Mons and the people of Chīengmai might design to seize possession of the states lying towards the South, had himself set about uniting those states under his own sway many years before. In any event, after the Mons had regained their independence, U Thong must under the reign of King U Thong Rāmādhīpatī's predecessor have at least made some stand against Sukhōdaya.

More than one reason may be adduced to account for the erection of his capital at Ayuddhyā by King U Thong Rāmādhīpatī. In the first place the bed of the Chorakhe Sām Phan River was silting up, owing to the fact that the water was seeking a new

channel along the course of the Subarṇa River. (The modern town of Subarna is called Bandhumpurī in an old map appearing in the Traibhūmi.) There was thus a growing scarcity of water at U Thong which the digging of many reservoirs did not suffice to alleviate, and which resulted in the outbreak of fevers and finally of a pestilence. King U Thong, being unable to find a remedy for this state of affairs, must have been obliged to abandon the city and to transfer his capital elsewhere, as stated in the story of Subarna. A second and a true cause for the transfer of the capital to the site of the ancient city of Ayōddhyā* is assigned in the short history of Prince Paramanujit, namely, the abundant resources of the district in question. But there was a still further reason for the selection of this spot. The land from Ayuddhyā upwards consisted in great part formerly of low and marshy ground near the sea. Travellers by the Northern Railway at the present time, if they take note, will observe at Bān Phra Kaeo a rise in the ground which marks the old sea-coast. Lobpurī, when it was first built, stood upon the sea, and even the city at Phra Pathom and the city of U Thong were not far distant from it at the time of their foundation. But the *detritus* brought down by the volume of water flowing from above caused the sea-bed to silt up, as is happening to-day at the mouth of the River Chao Phyā, where the sea-bed and low-lying mud are being converted into raised land and the channel through which the water flows is gradually becoming the bed of the river. When King U Thong set up his capital at Ayōddhyā, all the principal water-courses of the region met together at that place, which thus derived importance as being situated at the mouth of a river and as being the gateway to the whole of the North from Sukhōdaya up to Chīngmai. In a similar way, Bangkok later on became in its turn the capital of Siam. Owing to the importance which thus again attached to Ayōddhyā as a centre of communication, King U Thong selected the site of that old city for his new capital.

* อโยทธยา — not to be confused with Ayuddhyā (อยุทธยา.)

[Translator's note.]

The casual reader of the history of Siam may think that, when King U Thong came to Ayōddhyā, he straightway set about building a city upon the place where Ayuddhyā now stands and that he constructed his palace on the confines of Nong Sanō (i. e. Būng Phra Rāma.) As a matter of fact such was not the case. A careful perusal of the history will shew that King U Thong on his first arrival built a small city at the spot which is occupied to-day by the Buddhai Savarya monastery. I gather from the dates appearing in the records of the astrologers that King U Thong first of all set up a city at Wieng Lek (เวียงเหล็ก — where the Buddhai Savarya monastery was afterwards built), in the year of the pig 709 of the Chula era (B. E. 1890), and that he remained there for three years. When he perceived that the time was ripe for an open declaration of independence, he founded the city of Ayuddhyā, performing the rites of accession and proclaiming his assumption of the prerogatives of sovereignty in the year of the tiger (really in that of the hare), being the second of the decade, 712 of the Chula era (B. E. 1893).
