THE ORIGINS OF THE SUKHODAYA DYNASTY

BY

G. CŒDÈS

Chief Librarian of the Vajirañāṇa National Library. (1)

The dynasty which reigned during a part of the XIIIth. and the first half of the XIVth. centuries at Sukhodaya and at Śrī Sajjanālaya, on the upper Mēnam Yom, is the first historical Siamese dynasty. It has a double claim to this title, both because its cradle was precisely in the country designated by foreigners as "Siam" (Khmer: Syāṃ; Chinese: Sien, etc.), and because it is this dynasty which, by freeing the Thai principalities from the Cambodian yoke and by gradually extending its conquests as far as the Malay Peninsula, paved the way for the formation of the Kingdom of Siam properly so called. Its role in the history of Indo-Chinese arts and institutions is not less important than its political role: inheriting as it did the succession of the Khmer Kingdom, which sank in part beneath the blows that it administered, it has transmitted to the Siam of Ayudhya a good number of Cambodian art-forms and institutions which still subsist in the Siam of to-day.

The study of the dynasty in question is thus of great interest for the history of Indo-China. The sources for such a study are as follows: the local epigraphy, some Pāli historical texts of the beginning of the XVIth. century, the cycle of legends preserved in the Siamese work entitled "Northern Annals," and finally the Chinese Dynastic Annals.

Professor L. Finot has characterised in very happy terms the main features of the old Thai epigraphy (Bulletin de l'Ecole Française

(1) The translation of this paper, which has been read at a joint Session of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, Société Asiatique, and American Oriental Society, and published in the Journal Asiatique (April-June 1920), is the work of Mr. J. Crosby, to whom the author begs to tend his heartiest thanks.

d'Extrême-Orient, XVI, iii, p. 23): "The old Thai inscriptions have a great historical interest — not only the general interest which results from the scarcity of authentic documents and from the insufficiency of narrative sources, — but also that which they derive from the abundance of details foreign to their proper subject-matter. The Kings of Sukhodaya very fortunately do not aim at *imperatoria brevitas*: they take pleasure in talking about themselves, they are prolix in their own praise, but instead of drowning themselves, like the kings of Cambodia, in a flood of monotonous and common-place rhetoric, they are fond of real and precise details." The inscriptions hitherto published(1) shew us the Kingdom of Sukhodaya already constituted and in all its brilliance, but they teach us nothing as to the origin of that Kingdom or as to the personality of the King Srī Indrāditya who seems to have been the founder of the dynasty.

The Pāli historical texts composed at Xieng-Mai at the beginning of the XVIth. century, to which attention was first drawn by H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab(2) and which have been translated by myself(3) give dynastic lists coinciding partly with those of the inscriptions and disclose interesting details concerning the fall of the Kingdom. Moreover, they furnish in especial an early form of the legend of Phra Ruang.

This legend, as preserved in the "Northern Annals" appears to be a medley of all the popular recollections relative to the various Kings of Sukhodaya. It is a curious fact that this text, of no great historical value in itself, is the only one which alludes to an event of first-rate importance for the history of the Thai, namely, their release from the domination of Cambodia.

The Chinese texts translated by Professor P. Pelliot(4) make

---

(1) Mission Pavie, Etudes diverses, tome II.— Fournereau, Le Siam ancien.—Bradley, The oldest known writing in Siamese (Journal Siam Society, VI, i, 1909).—Cœdès, Documents sur la dynastie de Sukhodaya (B. E. F. E. O., XVII, ii).

(2) The history of Siam, Bangkok, 1914, vol. I, Introd. (in Siamese).

(3) Loc. cit.

(4) B. E. F. E. O, IV, p. 240. The same texts have been communicated by Phra Chen Chin Aksor (Sutchai) to H. R. H. Prince Damrong, who has made use of them (loc. cit.)

mention almost exclusively of embassies and provide no information as to the origin of the Kingdom of Sukhodaya.

From this rapid inventory of the documents utilised up till now, it will be seen that the Sukhodaya dynasty enters into history somewhat abruptly, and that its origins and beginnings are still wrapped in mystery. The object of the present communication is to make known a text which throws some light on this problem.

The text in question consists of an inscription from Sukhodaya which has already been indicated by Fournereau and studied in part by Father Schmitt (Siam Ancien, II, p. 35). But the whole of the portion upon which I am about to comment has been entirely neglected by the latter and may therefore be considered as new. Fournereau states that the pillar upon which this inscription is engraved originally came from Vat Si Xum, but the information furnished by this author regarding the place of origin of inscriptions is generally very suspect. In the National Library at Bangkok, where the stone is preserved, it is held to have come from Vat Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya; this is very likely, for the inscription, which does not number less than 200 lines, is probably the "detailed inscription placed in front of the Great Shrine at Sukhodaya" which is mentioned on the pillar, dating from A. D. 1357, known as that of "Nagara Jum" (Face B, l. 47). (Journal Siam Society, XIII, iii, p. 19). But the exact origin of the inscription is of secondary importance and the uncertainty which exists on this point in no way detracts from its interest. The text bears no date—at least in those portions of it which have been preserved: assuming that it is the one to which the inscription of Nagara Jum makes reference, it cannot be assigned to a later year than A. D. 1357; as a matter of fact, it probably goes back to the reign of the son and successor of Rāma Khamhēng, *i. e.* King Lo'dai, who, as will be seen later, is the last King of Sukhodaya named in it. The missing portions at the beginning and end of the text prevent us from grasping clearly the occasion upon which it was composed and engraved. The hero of it is an eminent monk named "Somdet Phra Mahāthera Śrī Sradhārājacūlāmūṇī (*sic*) Śrī Rattanalaṅkadipa Mahāsāmi pen chao", grand-son of a Thai prince, Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang. The biography and pious works of this holy personage are related with a

great wealth of details — often picturesque and always very instructive. But since I hope to publish this inscription in its entirety in the "Corpus of Thai inscriptions" upon which I am working at the present moment, I shall here only study its opening passages, these latter being particularly important for the history of the Sukhodaya dynasty. The state in which the text has come down to us confirms, unfortunately, the rule which weighs like a curse upon epigraphic studies and which ordains that, in a partly ruined inscription, the most important passages (dates, historical facts, etc.) are precisely those which are the least well preserved.

The characters which still remain enable us only to make an imperfect guess at the general sense of the first twenty lines. The first legible name is that of the Mahāthera Śrī Sradhārājacūlāmūnī (l.3). The text afterwards seems to refer back for several generations: following on the names of Mu'ang Chōt เมือง ฉอด (well known from the inscription of Khun Rāma Khamhēng) and of Mu'ang Lāmphong เมือง ลำพง, it mentions the construction of the Dantadhātusugandhacetiya (l.5), the towns of Saraluang สรลวง and of Sōng Khwē สอง แคว (l.6,—equally known from the inscription of Khun Rāma Khamhēng), and finally the foundation of two other towns, "the one named Sukhodaya and the other Śrī (Sajjanālaya)" (l.7). A little further on the text seems to be stating the limits of a principality or kingdom (ll.11 to 13): "On the South-West as far as Chōt.....On the North-West as far as Xieng Sēn, Phyao ชยง แสน, พยาว .....On the North as far as....." Lines 14 to 20 are almost indecypherable. With line 20 the text improves, and from line 25 onwards the missing portions are insignificant.

At line 20 occurs the entry upon the scene of two personages who are to take a very prominent part in the establishment of the Sukhodaya dynasty: Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo พ่อ ขุน บาง กลาง หาว and Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang Chao Mu'ang Rāt พ่อ ขุน ผา เมือง เจ้า เมือง ราด.

The situation of Mu'ang Rāt is unfortunately not known. All that can be said of it is that it formed part of the kingdom of Sukhodaya in A. D. 1359, and that it probably lay to the East. The name occurs again in a still unpublished inscription of A. D. 1359 (or a little later), where we read that, on the occasion of a religious festival, King Lo'dai headed a procession composed of inhabitants of the Mu'angs of Saraluang Sōng Khwē (Phitsanulok), Pāk Yom Phra Bāng (Nakhon Savan), Xākanrāo, Suphan, Nagara Phra Jum (Kamphēng Phet), Phān (some kilometres to the South-West of Sukhodaya) (5), Rāt, Sakhā and Lombāchāi สรลวง, สอง แคว,ป่าก ยำ พระ บาง, ชากานราว, สุพรรณ, นคร พระ ชุ่, เมือง พาน, เมือง ราด, เมือง สะค่ำ, เมือง ลับาจาย.

These two last Mu'angs are mentioned in the inscription of Khun Rāma Khamhēng as forming part of the Eastern territories of the kingdom: Mu'ang Rāt, which is named immediately before them in the above list, was perhaps situated in the same region.

The Chao of Mu'ang Rāt, Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang, whose name — though somewhat obscure — recalls the names, well known from inscriptions, of Ngām Mu'ang งำ เมือง (Covering of the City), and Bān Mu'ang บาล เมือง (Protector of the City), was the grand-father of the Mahāthera Srī Sradhārājcūlāmūṇī. As for Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo, let us anticipate a little and say at once that he is the future Indrāditya, father of Khun Rāma Khamhēng, a circumstance which places in the second half of the XIIIth. century the events which will be narrated to us. This being premised, here is what the text of the inscription says:

"Formerly, Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo.....Mu'ang Bāng Yāng, made.....the army of Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang, Chief of Mu'ang Rāt. Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang divided.....Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo took possession of Mu'ang Srī Sajjanālaya.....Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang, Chief of Mu'ang Rāt brought his army..... Bāng Khlong.....entrusted the government of Bāng Khlong

(5) Vide: Ru'ang thiao Mu'ang Phra Ruang, map facing p. 42.

to Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang. Afterwards Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang brought his army. At the time when Mu'ang Rāt was flourishing.....Srī Sajjanālai Sukhodaya, the bold Khōm (named) Khloñ Lāmphong fought....." (ll.20 to 23)

Here then, after a passage unfortunately incomplete, in which it can, however, be discerned that there was a question of the movements of troops directed by Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang, a new actor enters on the scene: Khloñ Lāmphong, the bold Khōm ขอม สมาด โขลญ ลำพง. His name is very significant: we have to do with a Cambodian military leader. "Khōm" is to-day in Siamese an equivalent of "khamen"—"khmer". The etymology of Khōm is not clear, and we should even be justified in suspecting its translation by "Cambodian", if the inscription now under consideration did not remove all doubts in this respect: in speaking of a monument erected by the efforts of the Mahāthera Srī Sradhārājacūlāmūnī, the texts says that this monument, named Phra Mahādhātu Luang is called "Praḥ Thom" พระ ธ์ by the Khōm. "Prah Thom" is pure Cambodian and there can be no doubt, therefore, that in this inscription Khōm is a synonym of Khmer. Moreover, the title of Khloñ borne by the personage who is coming to attack Mu'ang Rāt is well known through Khmer epigraphy, in which it denotes an official, generally military, of inferior rank.

Khloñ Lāmphong, the bold Khōm, was thus undoubtedly a representative of Cambodia, and, if we here see him attacking Mu'ang Rāt, it must apparently have been because the movements of the two Thai leaders were beginning to cause anxiety to the Khmer kingdom. Here is what the text reveals to us afterwards of this struggle between Thai and Khmers:

"Then Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo went.....the army of Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang, Chief of Mu'ang Rāt..... caused the army to be assembled. Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo and Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang mounted on elephants.....the Phyas assembled.....to mount together on the head of the elephant. Once the situation had been examined, Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo and the bold Khōm Khloñ Lāmphong

engaged in combat. Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo sent to warn Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang. Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang.....the bold Khōm Khloñ Lāmphong was completely vanquished" (ll.23 to 27).

In spite of regrettable gaps, this passage is sufficiently clear, especially as regards the final result. The Cambodian who was occupying Sukhodaya, or who was at least barring the road to it, is routed, and, the text continues:

"Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang could then enter Mu'ang Sukhodaya. He entrusted the government of it to Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo. But Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo did not dare to enter (Sukhodaya) out of deference towards his ally. Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang withdrew his army, and then Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo entered the city" (ll.27 to 29).

The little incident here related is characteristic. The word เกรง which I have translated "out of deference" might equally well be rendered by "through fear". It seems that, from motives either of fear or of respect, Bāng Klāng Thāo insisted on the army of his ally evacuating the town before he would take up the government of Sukhodaya. There was doubtless a good reason for this precaution, and the passage which has been quoted is full of implications.

The entry of Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo into Sukhodaya is followed by his consecration by Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang:

"Afterwards Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang consecrated (abhisheka) Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo as Chao Mu'ang Sukhodaya, and conferred his own name on his ally, that is to say the name of Srī Indrapatīndrāditya, with the title of Kamratēng Añ Phā Mu'ang" (ll.29-30).

The above is tantamount to saying that Bāng Klāng Thāo, on his accession as king of Sukhodaya, received the name of Kamratēng Añ Phā Mu'ang Srī Indrapatīndrāditya. Why did Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang, Chief of Mu'ang Rāt, thus give his own titles to his friend, and in virtue of what powers did he do so? The inscription explains this to us immediately afterwards:

"Previously, the God, Chao Mu'ang of Srī Sodharapura had given to Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang his daughter named Nāng Sikhara-

mahādevī, the sword Jaiyaśrī, and an honorific title similar to his own. Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo received the name of Śrī Indrapatīndrāditya, because Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang took his own name in order to give it in his turn to his friend.....of Mu'ang Sukhodai. That is why" (ll.31 to 33).

The form of this explanation is a little confused, but its meaning is clear enough; it indicates that the title of Kamratēng Añ Śrī Indrapatīndrāditya, given by Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang to Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo, had been conferred previously on Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang by a personage designated under the expression :— the God (phi fā) Chao Mu'ang S'rī Sodharapura. Is it possible to identify this latter ?

In modern documents, Cambodian or Siamese, Śrī Sodharapura appears as one of the elements of the literary name of the kingdom (or of the capital) of Cambodia. The Cambodian Annals recount that on the foundation of Phnom Penh in the XVth. century by King Poñā Yàt, the town received the name of: "Catummukha Maṅgala Sakalakambujādhipati Śrīsodhara Pavara Indapattapuri Raṭṭharājasīmā Mahānagara". A fragment from a Cambodian chronicle translated into Siamese (published in Praxum Phongsāvādān, iv), to which I have recently drawn attention (B. E. F. E.-O., XVIII, ix, p. 24), states that King Mahānibbāna, the first known King of modern Cambodia, reigned at Śrī Sodararājadhānī. At the present day, it is generally spelt Siri Sandhara (Srei Santhor): but the form Śrī Sodhara is the only one which can be shewn to have been employed in former times.

The above name long puzzled me. I have successively tried to restore it under the forms "Siridhara" (B. E. F. E.-O., XIII, vi, p. 9), and "Siri Sundara" (Ibid., XVIII, ix, p. 24), but without being satisfied by either of these two attempts. Quite recently I lit by chance upon the key to the enigma whilst examining facsimile of letters addressed by the King of Cambodia to the King of Japan during the course of the XVIIth century. In these documents emanating from the Cambodian Chancery the name of Cambodia is written: "Kambujādhipati Śrīyasodhara braḥ

Mahānagara Indraprastha Rastharājadhānī." This spelling proves that Śrī Sodharapura is quite simply an altered form of Śrī Yaśodharapura, the old name of Angkor Thom at the period of the inscriptions. The dropping of the "ya" is easily explained: in the Khmer script a parasitic "y" is frequently added after the vowel "i" and the diphtongs "ai" or "ei", the word Śrīyaśodharapura thus becoming without difficulty Śriy-Śodharapura, Śrī Sodharapura. The presence of this latter form in the inscription from Sukhodaya tends to prove that this alteration is an old one.

Even if this explanation of the name Śrī Sodharapura be not accepted, it is none the less certain that the term denotes exclusively Cambodia. The Chao Mu'ang of Śrī Sodharapura is thus none other than the King of Cambodia. His epithet of "god" need not surprise us, for it is known that the kings of ancient Cambodia attached the word "deva" to their name during their own lifetime. In saying that the King of Cambodia conferred on Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang a title similar (or equal) to his own, the text of the inscription is not exaggerating greatly, for the dignity of Kamratēng Añ was a very high one: the title was borne by the King himself, generally preceded by the words "braḥ pāda" to which the sovereign alone had a right.

The identity of the King of Śrī Sodharapura being thus established, it will doubtless not be forcing much the meaning of the passage in which he is mentioned, if we seek in it the echo of a considerable event which marked a turning-point in the history of Indo-China. Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang had received some kind of investiture at the hands of the quasi-divine personage who was then the sovereign of the Khmer kingdom; he must therefore have found himself in the position of a vassal of the latter. But after his victory over the bold Khōm and his entry into Sukhodaya, he doubtless thought himself to be a sufficiently important person to play the suzerain in his turn, to confer the abhisheka on his ally Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thāo, and to award to him the very same titles which he had received from his old master. It appears as if we were lighting here upon the exact moment when the Thai principality of Sukhodaya

freed itself from the tutelage of Cambodia. It is to be noted further that there was not a complete rupture: on the contrary, the text of the inscription is very careful to make it clear that the titles of the first King of Sukhodaya came to him from Cambodia, trying thereby to legitimise this new dynasty. The Cambodian title of Kamratēng Añ will continue, moreover to be borne by the successors of Srī Indrāditya: the King of Sien, *i. e.* of Sukhodaya, who despatched an embassy to China in 1294, (and who can only have been Rāma Khamhēng), bore, according to the Chinese, the name of Kan-mouting, i.e. Kamratēng, and the same title of Kamratēng Añ figures in the first line of the Khmer inscription of Lidai (Srī Sūryavaṃśa Rāma Mahādharmarājadhirāja).

After the proclamation of Srī Indrāditya as King of Sukhodaya, the country resumes the aspect which it had worn before the war:

"Phō Khun Srī Indrāditya and Phō Khun Phā Mu'ang disposed the army and let it away.....When it had left the country, everywhere people installed themselves again in the villages and the cities as before" (ll. 33. 34).

A few words follow as to the successors of Srī Indrāditya:

"The son of Phō Khun Srī Indrāditya, named Phō Khun Rāmarāja, knowing the dharma, constructed a Srī Ratanadhātu at Srī Sajjanālaya" (ll. 34. 35).

We have here, naturally, to do with Rāma Khamhēng and with the construction of the great Phra Chedi, on the west of the Phra Prāng at Savankhalok, which began in A.D. 1285 or 1287 according to the inscription of Rāma Khamhēng (Journal of the Siam Society, IX, p. 29 and XII, p. 19).

"A grand-son of Phō Khun Srī Indrāditya named Dharmarāja, knowing the merits, knowing the dharma, was endowed with boundless wisdom" (ll. 35. 36).

At first sight one might be tempted to identify this learned monarch with the author of the Khmer inscription and of that of Nagara Jum — the king who had studied the whole of the Tripiṭaka

from beginning to end, the reformer of the calendar and the author of the Traiphum, who bore the very title of Dharmarājādhirāja. But we know from the inscription of Nagara Jum and from the exordium of the Traiphum that this latter was the grand-son of Rāma Khamhēng, and the son of King Lo'dai (B. E. F. E.-O., XVII, ii, p. 4 et seq.). Further, I have already put forward the theory (Ibid., p. 45), which I have based on the Jinakālamālinī, that this King Lo'dai may himself also have borne the title or surname of Dharmarāja. It would seem that the passage in the inscription which we have just been studying goes to confirm this theory, and the king named here is indeed Lo'dai, son of Rāma Khamhēng and grand-son of Śrī Indrāditya.

With the name of this King there comes an end to the information which is to be extracted from our inscription relative to the Sukhodaya dynasty. In spite of its bad state of preservation, this text has furnished us with a good number of new data based upon readings which are beyond the reach of discussion. The Sukhodaya dynasty emerges gradually from the mystery which has enveloped its origins. Its liberation from the suzerainty of Cambodia, the memory of which had been preserved hitherto only in legend, finds for the first time an echo in epigraphy. It is on these grounds that the inscription has seemed to me to be worthy of attention.