

## THE CITY OF THAWARAWADI SRI AYUDHYA.

by

HIS HIGHNESS PRINCE DHANI NIVAT.

In our critical notes on Thai documents of the 17th century which were secured from Copenhagen, (JSS. Vol. XXXI, pt. 1), Major Seidenfaden and I remarked upon the twin name of the former capital—Thawārāwadi Sṛī Ayudhyā—and went on to say that it was the earliest use yet found in the written contemporary literature of the country. In fact I wrote a separate note setting out instances of how the capital was referred to in what survived of the national literature as well as in documents preserved abroad in the form of treaties and official correspondence. An attempt was made to come to some conclusion as to how the twin name crept in. There were, however, many other contributions to the *Journal of the Siam Society*, some of which had been pending publication for a long time. As a member of the Editorial Committee, it seemed incumbent upon me to waive my right before those of others. That note was therefore postponed. In the meantime further reading has induced me to modify some of my conclusions and the present article has been rewritten altogether.

In that former note I started out with the statement that modern Thailand knows the former capital of the country by the twin name referred to above. The immediate authority for it was the history of Prince Paramanujit, which a generation ago was the only source of historical knowledge within the access of the public. That work, however, was written some four and a half centuries after the founding of Ayudhya and its alleged naming. There seemed to be reasons on more than one ground for doubting whether the name really existed at the time of the establishment of the capital in 1350.

Firstly, on the ground of its significance, the History of Prince Paramanujit tells us that since the founder of the city adopted the

style and title of *Rama the Sovereign* (Ramadhipati) the analogy was carried on by naming his capital after that of the Indian hero of the epics. Instead, however, of naming it *Ayodhya*, it was said to have been named *Thawārāwadī Sri Ayudhyā*. (The middle word *Srī* is a mere eulogic expletive often employed in nomenclature.) The question therefore arises as to the wherefore of the first part of the name. *Thawārāwadī* was in all likelihood meant to refer to *Dvāravatī*, an alternative version of the name of *Dvārakā*, the capital of the hero Krishna, who, however, was a much later figure in Indian chronological tradition. Moreover no connection with this personage has ever been claimed by the Thai monarchy; and Krishna has been almost unknown, and in any case never an inspiration to the Thai at any time. It was also explained there that as the new capital was situated on an island in the river and therefore surrounded by water like the ancient *Dvaravati*, it was so named. Now, although the Indian city of *Dvārakā* is said to have been submerged in the sea, the name, of course, means *the city of gates*. It is not quite clear whether that explanation was one handed down from the time of its foundation, or an interpolation. In any case the name must have in time become accepted as a matter of course, to such an extent that when King Rama I. of Bangkok wrote his story of Rama—the *Ramakien*—he explained that the capital of Rama, the Indian hero, was founded in *the forest called Thawārāwadī*, which name was made up of the initial letters of the four seers who helped to choose the site (*Aḥṅkāwī*, *Yuka-akra*, *Thaba*, and *Yākamunī*) thus resulting in the combination of *Thawārāwadī* + *Srī* + *Ayudhyā*. There is also an undated prose work called *Nārāi Sibpāng* which relates the same story, and it was probably this work which supplied King Rama I. with the material for his *Ramakien*. It will be seen, therefore, that the reason given for the combination of the names on the ground of significance is hardly plausible, although the combination might have been accepted for some time past.

On the ground of usage I was at first inclined to believe that the combination was a late interpolation, but have since changed my opinion. Among the legal enactments of King Ramadhipati I., the founder of Ayudhya, the combination of the names is found in the Law of Evidence(1350), the Law on Royal Authority(1351), and the Law on Ordeals(1355); whilst only *Srī Ayudhya* is used in the Law on Receiving Plaints(1355) and the Law on Abduction(1356), and

others again had no occasion to refer to the name of the capital at all. It will not be necessary to cite later Laws, for they are like the ones just mentioned in that both the combination form and the form Ayudhya by itself are found. Taking other evidences in a chronological order, we find that the *Ratanabimbavamsa*, a history of the Emerald effigy of the Buddha written in Chiengmai in 1429, called our capital *Ayojjhā*, the Pali equivalent of Ayodhyā; whilst another history of Buddhism, the *Jinakālamālinī*, written also in Pali and also in Chiengmai about 1516, adopted a slightly different form of the same name—*Ayojjā*. Neither seemed to have been aware of the combination.

The *Yuan Phui*, a heroic poem in Siamese written during the latter half of the 15th century, referred twice to *Ayodhyā*.<sup>1</sup>

The Inscription of Dāūsāi,<sup>2</sup> dated 1560, adopted a formal tone as being an official document but did not include *Thawārāwadi*. It referred to the capital as *Phra Mahānakon Sri Ayodhyā, mahādīlo-kaphobh nobharatna*. . . This was the identical form of the official full name which has been handed down to this day, with the exception of *Thawārāwadi*, which should have been inserted in front of *Sri Ayodhyā*.

The next evidence is the letter (cited above) from the Governor of Tenasserim to Denmark, dated 1620, which I have pointed out as being the earliest instance yet met with of the full combination being used in a contemporary written document. In the correspondence with the Prince of Orange, we find references only to Ayudhya, thus: *Judia*,<sup>3</sup> the latter reference being dated 1636. There are other instances of Ayudhya being used alone, especially by foreigners, such for instance as the British version of *Oudea*.<sup>4</sup> In 1664, a treaty was concluded with the Dutch in which the name appeared just *Judia*.<sup>5</sup> Then we have the Franco-Siamese treaty of 1688<sup>6</sup> which did not use the word *Thawārāwadi* either, merely using the form *Sri Ayudhyā*. Within a few years of the treaty, we have the *Historical Relation*

<sup>1</sup> Stanzas 63 & 65, Royal Library edition, B. E. 2456.

<sup>2</sup> BEFEO. XV, 2. Finot: *Notes d'epigraphie*, pp. 32-3.

<sup>3</sup> JSS. XXX, 3. p. 315, & 316.

<sup>4</sup> *ibid.* p. 299.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.* p. 326.

<sup>6</sup> JSS. XIV, 2. 1921.

of the Kingdom of Siam by Monsieur de la Loubère, who said that the capital was called *Si-yo-thi-ya*, with the additional explanation that the *o* of the second syllable was closer than our diphthong *au*. He also gave the full official name of *Crung-thepa-pra-mahanacon*, which seems to confirm the inscription of Dānsāi.

The half century following the above period was a time of trouble and we have no evidence from any source until 1757, when the Prime Minister, Chao Phya Chamnan Boriraks, wrote in Pali<sup>1</sup> to the Prime Minister of the Kandyan Kingdom in Ceylon making use of the full title thus.

..... *Deva-Mahā-nagara Pavara Dvārāvati siri Ayudhīyā Mahātilakabhava nabaratana rājadhānī puriramyā.*

Poetry of this late period of Ayudhya, for instance the *Bannowal*, used either part of the name separately and freely.

It may be summed up then that in point of usage the full name of *Thawārāvadi Svi Ayudhīyā* occurred in some of the Law preambles even as early as the time of the founder of the city himself but was not invariably used. Even solemn official documents, such as the Dānsāi inscription, did not employ it. Almost all foreign reference dropped the *Thawārāvadi* part of it altogether.

Before coming to a definite conclusion, let us now examine the word on the ground of etymology. *Thawārāvadi* is, as has been already pointed out above, the more or less phonetic transcription according to the way it is pronounced in the Thai language of the Sanskrit word *Dvārāvati*. I had been inclined when originally writing this article to doubt whether it really referred to *Dvārakā*, the capital of Krishna, or something else. Further examination of a wider range of materials has convinced me that it did without doubt refer to *Dvārakā*. The gist of the Mahabharata is contained in a birth-story of the Buddha (*Ghatapanḍita Jātaka*, section x of the *Jātaka*), and in that the capital of Krishna is invariably called *Dvārāvati*. It proves that in Buddhist India, before the epoch of classical Sanskrit and even before the Epics, that capital was known as such rather than as *Dvārakā*. This fact is moreover interesting in that it supplies yet another proof of the theory that a great deal of Indian culture as it is found in this part of the World antedates the classical period

<sup>1</sup> see Prince Damrong: *The Establishment of the Siam Sect of the Buddhist Clergy in Ceylon*, in Thai, B.E. 2459.

of Sanskrit literature. Other evidences tending that way have been recognised, such as the Law codes, in which the account of the genesis was different from that of the orthodox Hindu Law codes of Manu. With the identification therefore of Thawārāwadi with Dvāravatī and Dvārakā, there remains hardly any more doubt as to the word's etymology. This automatically clears up what doubt there was when examining the word from the source of its significance and we may assume that the adoption of the name was intentional. We are left, therefore, with no other alternative solution than that the capital was given the full name of Thawārāwadi Sṛī Ayudhyā *from the time of its foundation*.

For historians who might wish to argue against the acceptance of the evidence of the authenticity of the age of the Laws, I should like to plead in defence of those old Laws as far as the preambles are concerned. It is true that the Laws underwent a thorough revision in 1805. It is also possible that modifications and deletions, or even additions, were made from time to time affecting the Laws; but those changes were probably limited to the articles of the Statutes rather than the preambles, which could not have undergone any change except through inaccuracies of copying. The enactments of Rama-  
dhipati I. are singularly distinct and recognisable by their employment of the Buddhist era, and I feel that there is really no reason to suspect the authenticity of their preambles.

The name Dvaravati was not used only in this instance, but has been applied to other places. I am indebted to Phya Indra Montri for the information he secured for me from Burma that Sandoway and Arrakan were both known by the name of Dvaravati. It has also been adopted by M. Cœdès—provisionally, for want of a more definitely accurate name<sup>1</sup> to designate a state which was existing on the lower Menam valley. Neither of these instances, however, have anything to do with the case in point and may therefore be passed over.

While discussing the name Dvaravati, it may not be out of place to bring up another aspect of the question—*how to spell the name*. Without wishing, as M. Burnay wrote,<sup>2</sup> to be bringing up for ever a

<sup>1</sup>. cf. *Recueil des Inscriptions*, Vol. I, p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>. JSS. XXIV, 1.

discussion which is somewhat byzantine, I am strongly tempted to put in a word in defence of those *Siamois du XIX<sup>me</sup> siècle, à commencer par le Roi Mongkut* who were *étymologistes impénitents, parfois fantaisistes*, through whose fault, it seems, *an anarchy in matters orthographical has remained to our days.*

Long before the *anarchy*, said to have been started by King Mongkut and his contemporaries, set in, we have a poem dating from the time of King Narai which used the short form of *Tharwārāvādī*, thus:

ปางพระจักรีแปรเป็น	กฤษณราชรอดูเขญ
อรินทรเสียนสยบมา	
เสด็จเนาในเมืองทวา	รพติสมยา
คือวิษณุโลกยปान	

*Anirudh Kham Chand.*

Now, it may be contended that the short form was a matter of poetical licence; but, as it happens, this type of verse does not require quantitative exactitude. A long *rā* would have been equally correct. I do not know what other reason there may have been but that of the admissibility of the short syllable *rā*.

Towards the end of the 18th century, when Ayudhya was still the capital, we have among others the following passages, where the short form occurs:

แว่นแคว้นกรุงเทพทวา	รวดีมหา
ดิลกเลศไพบุลย	

*Bunnowād*

and—

เป็นสุริยวงศทวารวดี	หน่อไทรวิศตรี
ทศรฐอันเรืองเดชา	

*Kham phāk Rāmakien.*

Then within half a century of that *anarchy* itself:

เจดอมเฝ้าภพแผ่นธรณี	ทวารวดีศรี
ออยุเขศเขตสยาม	

*Sanplusith Kham Chand.*

เป็นขัณนรานิกรหมุ่	มุขฆมาตยมนตรี
ในกรุงทวารวดีศรี	ศุภะภาคยไพบุลย

*Sudhanū Kham Chand.*

In none of these instances, I believe, could it be said that a short syllable is required by prosody. Why then is it short?

It is not my intention here to challenge M. Burnay's theory of the quantitative structure of - o - for all words in the Thai language, my argument concerning just the word Dvaravati. Even here nevertheless there are already two syllables preceding the quantitative structure of - o -. Were I to explain why the third syllable has been lengthened in so many cases in the Thai application of this word, I should be inclined to put the blame, not on those *fantastic etymologists* of the 19th century, but on those early pioneers of Indianisation who misapplied the rules of Sanskrit grammar by *insisting on* the third syllable being lengthened. There is, of course, a certain process in Sanskrit grammar which permits (but does not *insist on*) the lengthening of the short *a* preceding the suffix *vatī*. The process is known to Sanskritists as that of *gunating*, the name having been coined from the Sanskrit word *guna*, quality, because in lengthening it, more quality is thereby given to the short vowel *ā*.

Bangkok, August 11th, 1939.

