

**SUKHOTHAI - MONGOL RELATIONS : A NOTE  
ON RELEVANT CHINESE AND THAI SOURCES  
( WITH TRANSLATIONS )**

by  
E. Thadeus Flood

**PLAN OF THE PAPER**

I.	Introductory Remarks . . . . .	203
II.	Primary Chinese Sources . . . . .	204
	A. The <i>Yuan Shih</i> . . . . .	204
	B. The "Ching-shih ta-tien" . . . . .	209
	C. The Phra Ceenciin Translations . . . . .	211
III.	Primary Thai Sources . . . . .	213
	A. The "Phon̄saawadaan Nya" . . . . .	214
	B. The "Culajudthakaarawon̄" . . . . .	217
IV.	Relevant Passages in Translation . . . . .	220
	A. From the Chinese Sources . . . . .	220
	B. From the Thai Sources . . . . .	227
V.	Some Tentative Conclusions . . . . .	234

## Note to the Reader

In the text of this paper Thai words have been transliterated according to the Mary Haas system as found in her *Thai-English Student's Dictionary* (Stanford, 1964) with certain modifications including the omission of the glottal stop symbol, tone signs and certain other diacritical marks. In addition such well-known terms as Sukhothai, Thai, Petchaburi, etc., and the names of certain living persons have been given a more "conventional" spelling in the text, though not in the footnotes. Chinese terms have been transliterated according to the modified Wade-Giles system as found in R.H. Mathews, *Chinese-English Dictionary* (Rev. Edition, Harvard, 1957), except that diacritical marks other than the apostrophe have been omitted.

## I. Introductory Remarks

The problem of Sukhothai relations with the Yuan 元 or Mongol Court in China in the late 13th and early 14th centuries has received curiously little sustained attention from Western scholars as a subject worthy of treatment in its own right. Most of the references to it in serious Western studies have treated it only *en passant*, in connection with other investigations.

The pioneer contribution to the subject by Paul Pelliot in 1904 was actually a by-product of other inquiries, though it must be said that Pelliot's remarkably thorough research left very little undone: the footnotes to the present paper are adequate testimony to this. Unfortunately, Pelliot's 1904 study and a posthumous 1951 work containing some revisions of certain points in it have not been as widely utilised as they should have been, particularly by English language writers.<sup>1</sup>

Georges Maspero's 1928 work in the Chinese records yielded some new insights on Sukhothai-Mongol relations but they were peripheral to Maspero's main interest, which was in Champa-Mongol relations, and in addition they were largely buried in rather formidable footnotes. In any case Maspero's work, too, has not received the wide audience it deserves.<sup>2</sup>

The researches of the Thai-Chinese scholar Hsieh Yu-jung published in Chinese in 1949 (revised in 1953) on Thai-Chinese relations added to our data on Sukhothai-Mongol relations, though his work was by no means as thorough as the earlier studies of Pelliot

---

1) See Pelliot, (1904), 234-64, esp. 240-44 for relevant translations from the *Yuan Shih* into French; Pelliot, (1951), 110 ff and *passim* for his later corrections and additions.

The discussion by Sir John Bowring, (1857), I, 69, ff on Siam's relations with China (actually based on data furnished him by the British diplomat and Sinologue, Sir Francis Wade) is badly outdated and will not be further considered. I have not had access to Colonel Gerini's work, "Siam's Intercourse with China", *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, XIII (1902), 119-32, nor have I been able to review the relevant translations of Schlegel which appeared in several issues of *T'oung Pao* in the early 20th century. In any case Pelliot, (1904) has made full use of these works.

2) Maspero, (1928), esp. Chapter VII, 153 ff.

and Maspero. In any case, Hsieh's work has apparently not been utilised by Western (or Thai) scholars, with the exception of Skinner's recent study (cf. bibliography appended).<sup>3</sup>

The work of G.W. Luce in the Chinese records in 1958-59 brought our knowledge of the subject to a new level of refinement. Again, however, Luce's scholarship was directed at other matters and his references to Sukhothai-Mongol relations were somewhat sketchy.<sup>4</sup>

Despite the existence of these and other studies in a number of languages (including Japanese), the Western scholar who attempts to obtain a clear, integrated picture of Sukhothai-Mongol relations is very apt to get only a partial picture, and even an erroneous picture, both in terms of relevant sources and established facts. As a preliminary step towards correcting this situation, the present paper proposes (1) to critically evaluate the Chinese and Thai historical sources most directly relevant to the study of Sukhothai-Mongol relations, (2) to present pertinent passages from these sources in fresh translations for easy reference purposes, and (3) to offer a few tentative and summary observations on some of the immediate implications of the materials translated.

It must be stressed that no claims are made to exhaustiveness, nor will there be any attempt to present a full-blown history of Sukhothai-Mongol relations. What follows is a preliminary bibliographic essay on the problem. It is hoped that it might serve as the groundwork for further studies in this field and at the same time might provide the growing army of Western textbook writers with integrated data on Sukhothai-Mongol relations.

## II. Primary Chinese Sources

### A. *The Yuan Shih* 元史

Clarification of the problem of Sukhothai-Mongol relations must rest ultimately on those records in Chinese and Thai closest in time to the events in question. No brief study of this kind could

3) Hsieh, (1949), esp. 45-46, and notes, and same author (1953), 48-49 for the results of his research in the *Yuan Shih* concerning Sukhothai-Mongol relations.

4) Luce, (1958), esp. 139-40 and notes, and same author, (1959), esp. 60-62, 90 and notes for his translations and commentary on the *Yuan Shih*'s Sukhothai notices.

possibly discuss all the many Chinese sources from the 14th century onwards that carry some notice of this subject, nor in fact would this be particularly useful. The basic problem is to identify and evaluate the most "primary" Chinese records we can find on the premise that these have been the source for most, if not all subsequent notices in Chinese historical literature concerning Sukhothai-Mongol relations. I have not, of course, substantiated this premise perfectly by perusing the entire range of Chinese literature that makes mention of Sukhothai-Mongol relations. The writings that have come to my attention, however, invariably indicate that their common source in regard to the problem of Sukhothai-Mongol relations was the standard dynastic history of the Mongol Dynasty, the *Yuan Shih*.<sup>5</sup> In short, the most

5) The following are the principal Ming and Ch'ing Dynasty Chinese works that I have seen which carry notices of any sort on Sukhothaj-Mongol relations (exclusive of these discussed in the present article) with locations of the notices (cited in Chinese):

(1) *Yuan-shih lei-pien* 元史類編卷 42 附載. Compiled in 1699 in forty-two chüan, this work was ostensibly based on Yuan Dynasty documents. On the Yuan Court's relations with Hsien, or Sukhothaj, it simply paraphrases a few random notices from the "Chuan" and "Annals" sections of the *Yuan Shih* and should not be confused with that work.

(2) *Hai-kuo t'u-chih* 海國圖志卷 8 暹羅國. First published in 1842, this work includes only a brief paraphrase from the *Yuan Shih* concerning Sukhothaj-Mongol relations.

(3) *Ta-Ming I-t'ung-chih* 大明一統志卷 90 暹羅. The extant version of this work was completed in 1461. It features a 12-character reference to Siam-Mongol relations drawn from the *Yuan Shih*.

(4) *Ku-chin t'u-shu chi-ch'eng* 古今圖書集成邊裔典卷 101 暹羅部. First published in 1728, this was the largest encyclopedic work (in 10,000 chuan) ever compiled in China. It contains a very accurate section on Hsien relations with Mongol China, entirely drawn, however, from the "Chuan" and "Annals" sections of the *Yuan Shih*.

(5) *Tung-hsi yang-k'ao* 東西洋考卷之西洋列國考暹羅六坤. Probably printed around 1618, this work contains a lengthy paraphrase of the "Chuan" section of the *Yuan Shih* on Hsien tribute missions to the Mongol Court.

(6) *Ta-Ch'ing I-t'ung-chih* 大清一統志卷 423 之 3 暹羅. Completed in 1743, printed in 1744, this work reproduces an extract from the *Yuan Shih*'s "Chuan" section on Hsien-Mongol relations.

Since all of these works are based on the still-extant *Yuan Shih*, which is utilised in the present study, there is patently no need to discuss them further in connection with Sukhothaj-Mongol relations. Their value for later Thai-Chinese relations, and indeed for certain aspects of domestic Thai history, is very great.

"primary" relevant source and the one closest to the events of the late 13th and early 14th centuries in question was (with the one exception noted below) the *Yuan Shih*. It is appropriate, then, that historians dealing with Sukhothai-Mongol relations have some idea of the nature of this source.<sup>6</sup>

The *Yuan Shih* was drawn up in the standard pattern of other dynastic histories, featuring the typical arrangement into four parts or sections: the "Annals" (*chi* or *pen-chi* 本紀), the "Tables" (*piao* 表), the "Treatises" (*chih* 志), and the 傳 "Chuan" or "Lieh-chuan", sometimes translated "Memoires" or "Biographies", but referred to simply as "Chuan" in this paper.

Of these four parts, the only two which carry notices on Sukhothai-Mongol relations are the first one, the "Annals", and the last, the "Chuan".

The *Yuan Shih* was drawn up under the dynasty that succeeded the Mongols, that of the Ming 明 (1368-1644). It was completed in 1369, less than two years after the establishment of the Ming Dynasty by Emperor Hung Wu 洪武. The work of putting this lengthy history together was first undertaken in February, 1369. The sections dealing with the first thirteen Mongol Emperors were already completed in August of that same year.

The rapidity of this compilation has led certain Chinese and other historians in the past to impugn its reliability on the grounds that it was too hastily and hence carelessly drawn up. This is in fact quite undeserved, however, for the completion of a major portion of the *Yuan Shih* in such a short space of time was not so much due to unseemly haste as to the fact that the Ming Court's "Historical Section" (*shih-chü* 史局) had direct access to the no-longer-extant collection "Shih-san-ch'ao Shih-lu" 十三朝實錄 or "Veritable Records of the Thirteen Reigns", or, as they shall be referred to in this paper, the "Veritable Records". The Ming redactors also had at their

6) The discussion that follows in the text on Chinese dynastic histories and on the *Yuan Shih* in particular is based especially on: Naito, (1949), esp. 337-40; Ishida, (1945), 225-37; Ichimura, (1943), esp. 439-58; Sugimoto, (1959), 1-5; TRD, (1941), II, 483-84; ARJ, (1959), III, 151; Beasley and Pulleyblank, (1961), *passim*; Dubs, (1946), 23-43.

disposal other records, as will be noted shortly, but the "Veritable Records" were of pivotal importance for them in their work. This is clear from the fact that they completed the history of the first thirteen reigns, for each of which they had a collection of "Veritable Records", in only seven months. On the other hand, a full year (August, 1369-July, 1370) was required to write the history of the last reign, for which the Ming redactors had no "Veritable Records".

It is significant to note that for each of the four Mongol Emperor's reigns during which we know that Sukhothai was in contact with the Mongol Court, there were "Veritable Records" available to the compilers of the *Yuan Shih*. Those for the reign of Khubilai Khan, or Shih Tsu 世祖 (r. 1260-95), as he is known in Chinese records, were drawn up in 1304 by a special committee; those for Ch'eng Tsung's reign (r.1295-1308) were similarly drawn up in 1312; those for Jen Tsung (r.1312-1320) were compiled in 1320, and those for the reign of Ying Tsung (r.1321-24) were compiled in 1330.<sup>7</sup>

It is well to note, too, that the "Veritable Records" themselves were based on even more "primary" documents written during the reign of a particular emperor. Most prominent and reliable of these were the "Dairy of Activity and Repose" (*Ch'i-chü-chu* 起居注) and the "Compilations on Current Government" (*Shih-cheng-pien* 時政編).<sup>8</sup> These were very detailed, voluminous daily records which have now disappeared. We know definitely that the "Veritable Records" for the reign of Shih Tsu (during which Sukhothai's contacts with the Mongols began) were themselves based on these most

7) Li Shan-ch'ang 李善長, one of the compilers of the *Yuan Shih*, gives us this information in his preface to the work. See 進元史表卷1 folio 2, verso (cf. the bibliography appended herein for the edition of the *Yuan Shih* cited in this paper). Concerning the "Veritable Records", see esp. Ichimura, (1948), 441 ff; Sugimoto, (1959) 2-4; the article by Franke on the "Veritable Records" of the Ming Dynasty in Beasley and Pulleyblank (1961), 60-77; the article on the "Veritable Records" of the Sung Dynasty by Naito, (1949), 313 ff.

8) My English renditions of these terms follow Yang Lien-sheng's article in Beasley and Pulleyblank, (1961), 44 ff.

reliable of contemporary records.<sup>9</sup> It is hardly to be doubted that the same is true for the subsequent three reigns that span the period of Sukhothai-Mongol contact.

It is the "Annals" section of the *Yuan Shih* that reflects the heaviest reliance on the "Veritable Records"; indeed the former appears to be simply a drastic abridgement of the more voluminous material in the latter.<sup>10</sup> The "Annals" section mirrors this reliance on detailed primary sources in that it reports events in a very precise, chronicular fashion with very business-like concern for dating, usually down to the year, month, and day and even the hour on occasion. Now that the "Veritable Records" of the Yuan Dynasty have been lost, the "Annals" of the *Yuan Shih* are of particular value. The "Annals" are, however, very difficult to use simply because events are faithfully recorded as they actually occurred, that is, in a discrete, unordered jumble. For this and other reasons it is very possible that there still remain in the "Annals" section of the *Yuan Shih* references to Sukhothai that have not yet come to anyone's attention.

The "Chuan" section of the *Yuan Shih* contains not only biographies of notable persons of the Yuan period but also in its latter part carries short, comprehensive accounts of the Yuan Court's relations with various "tributary states" in East and Southeast Asia.<sup>11</sup> It has, for example, a "sub-section" on Sukhothai (the "*Hsien-chuan*" 暹傳) and one on Champa (the "*Chan-ch'eng-chuan*" 占城傳) and these are, for the present study, of key importance.

9) Direct evidence of this comes from Wang Yun 王惲 (1228-1304), a Hanlin scholar who was responsible for drawing up the "Veritable Records" of the reign of Shih Tsu. See 元文類卷 16, 204 (cf. bibliography for edition cited herein) for Wang's testimony. I am indebted to Professor Sugimoto, (1959), 3-4 for this and the citation in note 7 above.

10) See Sugimoto, (1959), 3-4 for tables comparing the number of volumes in the "Veritable Records" with the number of volumes in the "Annals" section of the *Yuan Shih*. See also Ichimura, (1943), 439-46.

11) See Beasley and Pulleyblank, (1961), 4, 5, 36-37, and 95-114 for discussions in English concerning the nature of the "Chuan" sections of the Chinese dynastic histories.



Internal evidence suggests that the Sukhothai sub-section of the "Chuan" section of the *Yuan Shih* was also based to some extent on the "Veritable Records" discussed above, but they lack the specific dating and the precision found in the "Annals". They also show evidence of more "editing" and revision at the hands of Ming Court redactors than do the "Annals".<sup>12</sup> Yet they sometimes include material not to be found in the "Annals" section (cf. translations below) and of course they have the advantage of focussing on a particular subject—either a person or one of the "tribute states" and dwelling on it at some length. In this regard they are much easier to use and of course have attracted the attention of scholars much more readily than the formidable mass of unordered material in the "Annals".<sup>13</sup>

#### B. The "Ching-shih ta-tien" 經世大典

Although we do not possess the "Veritable Records" or other prior documents which served as the basis particularly for the "Annals" section of the *Yuan Shih*, we do have fragments of one earlier document which the compilers of the *Yuan Shih* drew on for some of the "Chuan" sub-sections about foreign countries. This document is the "Ching-shih ta-tien" (meaning something like "Universal Governance Codes"), and it would appear to be the earliest Chinese source (from the point of view of date of compilation) that mentions Sukhothai-Mongol relations.<sup>14</sup>

---

12) Sugimoto, (1959), 4-5 for arguments and evidence.

13) Cf. Pelliot, (1904), 240-41. T. Grimm's translation of materials relating to Siam from the *Ming Shih* is taken entirely from the "Chuan" of that work. Grimm makes no mention of notices on Siam in the "Annals" section of the *Ming Shih*. A full use of that source would entail culling the "Annals" section as well, and, even better, the "Veritable Records of the Ming", texts of which are still extant. For Grimm's translations see JSS, XLIX, Part 1, (July, 1961), 2 ff.

14) The discussion which follows in the text concerning the lost "Ching-shih ta-tien" is based primarily on an article originally written in 1920 by the great Japanese Sinologist, Ichimura, (1943), 447, ff, and on Naito, (1949), 333-34; ARJ, III, 107; Pelliot, (1951), 110 ff; same author, BEFEO, IX, (1909), 130; and chüan 16 and 40-43 of the *Yuan-wen-lei*. Sugimoto (1959) does not mention this source nor does Ishida (1945).

The "Ching-shih ta-tien" was begun at Imperial order in 1329. Officials were commanded to collect all the notices on the dynasty (i.e., the Yuan) up until that time and to compile them on the model of the "Hui-yao" 會要 ("Collected Statutes") of the Sung and T'ang Dynasties, which had dealt with political, social and economic developments of those eras. The work was completed in 1332. Fortunately for posterity, parts of it were incorporated two years later (1334) into a collection of Yuan dynasty writings entitled *Yuan-wen-lei* 元文類 (= "Yuan Literary Miscellany"), for the original "Ching-shih ta-tien" was subsequently lost—some time between 1400 and 1600. Hence the only fragments we have of this work are preserved in the *Yuan-wen-lei* of 1334.<sup>15</sup>

One of the sections of the old "Ching-shih ta-tien" which still survives in the *Yuan-wen-lei* is of particular interest for us. This was a section entitled "Cheng-fa" 征伐 or "Punitive Expeditions". Probably based on "Veritable Records" or similar sources, this section was the source for much of the later *Yuan Shih's* account of Mongol relations with certain Southeast Asian countries which occurs in the latter part of the "Chuan" section of that work. The *Yuan Shih's* sub-section on Champa, which contains information crucial to Sukhothai-Mongol relations, was obviously copied in large part from the "Cheng-fa" section of the older work, the "Ching-shih ta-tien", which had a somewhat lengthier account of Mongol relations with Champa.<sup>16</sup>

The "Ching-shih ta-tien" may have had an account of Mongol relations with Sukhothai as well. If it did, it would have been no doubt a lengthier one than the one we possess in the *Yuan Shih*, but in any case it did not survive.

In summary, then, it may be said that in the matter of Sukhothai-Mongol relations, there are no Chinese (and as we will see, no

15) For further details on this work see, inter al., ARJ, III, 172; Naito, (1949), 336.

16) For the "Cheng-fa" section of the "Ching-shih ta-tien" see 元文類卷 41 (pagination refers to edition used herein only); for the "Chan-ch'eng chuan" section of the *Yuan Shih*, see 元史列傳卷 97, folio 6, verso, 28926 ff.

Thai) records closer to the events in question than the "Ching-shih ta-tien" and the *Yuan Shih*. Both of them are based on detailed, primary sources such as the "Veritable Records" and are quite precise in dating and detail. These two sources will assume even more importance when certain other Chinese pseudo-sources and finally the Thai documentation are critically evaluated.

As noted earlier, there are many Chinese sources written subsequent to the two discussed above that mention Sukhothai-Mongol relations.<sup>17</sup> It would be futile to examine these in detail, however, for all of their accounts derive from the *Yuan Shih* in what concerns Sukhothai-Mongol relations, and none of them add any new information (to the present writer's knowledge). One of these latter has served, through a curious train of events, to distort and obscure our knowledge of the problem and so it will be appropriate to conclude our discussion of relevant Chinese sources with brief mention of the translations—or rather mistranslations—into Thai of a Ch'ing Dynasty work by the old Thai-Chinese scholar, Phra Ceenciin, in 1909.<sup>18</sup>

### C. *Phra Ceenciin Translations*

As part of the general effort spearheaded by Prince Damrong in the latter part of the Fifth Reign and throughout the next two reigns to reconstruct Thai history and gather pertinent documents to that end, Phra Ceenciin Agsoon พระเจนจันฉักร, an official in the old Wachirajaan Library, was commissioned by Damrong to translate passages from Chinese history works relevant to Thai history. Phra Ceenciin finished his task in 1909 and presented it to Rama V in that year. It consisted of extracts on Thai-Chinese relations translated into Thai from three Chinese historical works. In 1913 it was first published as a "Cremation Volume" (หนังสือแจกงานศพ) under a title meaning "On the Friendship Between Siam and China" (cf. bibliography). In the same year it was incorporated as "phaag 5" of the *Prachum Phongsawadaan* series then beginning to appear. In 1917 Prince Damrong added his own explanatory comments to it and, reprinted several times thereafter, it soon became part and parcel of the "primary

17) Cf. note 6 above.

18) Phra Ceenciin's work will be cited in the present paper as CRPSC (1964). See the bibliography for full citations.

sources" for early Thai history available to scholars, and it was so characterised by Prince Damrong himself.<sup>19</sup>

No Chinese characters were provided for the titles of the three Chinese works used by Phra Ceenciin in the editions of his book available to this writer, but his information on them and the Teochiu-Chinese sounds of the characters permit us some fairly safe guesses. The one work from which he translated passages concerning Sukhothai-Mongol relations was the Imperial Edition (Ch'in-t'ing 欽定) of the 續通志 *Hsu-t'ung-chih*, compiled in 1767, in the reign of Ch'ien Lung of the Ch'ing (Manchu) Dynasty.<sup>20</sup> This compendium was a

19) Cf. the prefatory remarks (khamnam คำนำ) by the Thai Department of Fine Arts in CRPSC (1964). In addition to the translations done by Phra Ceenciin, the latter work also carries an explanatory comment added to the translations in 1917 by Prince Damrong สมเด็จพระเจ้าบรมวงศ์เธอกรมพระยาเทววงศ์วโรปการ. For the latter's initial evaluation of Phra Ceenciin's translations, see PPCPH, (1952), 5 and 143. There is a very uncritical and misleading review of CRPSC (1964), in JSS, LII, Part, 2 (July, 1964), 248-50.

20) CRPSC, (1964), 11 and 13 for Phra Ceenciin's description of this work. Phra Ceenciin also extracted and translated notices on Thai-Chinese relations in the Ajudthajaa and Bangkok periods from two other Chinese historical works, both of which date from the Ch'ing Period. One of these was the 300-chuan *Huang-ch'ao wen-hsien t'ung-k'ao* 皇朝文献通考 (Shang-wu Yin-shu-kuan; Shanghai, 1936). This encyclopedic work was commissioned by Emperor Ch'ien Lung and covered the period from the founding of the Ch'ing (or Manchu) Dynasty (1644) down to the date of compilation, which was 1786. The primary sources on which it was based are for the most part still extant and in this sense it is not of crucial importance. It made no reference to Sukhothaj-Mongol relations. For an abstract of sections of this work dealing with Siam, see Gunji, (1942), 1177-85. For a general description of the work, ARJ, III, 285. The other work from which Phra Ceenciin translated certain passages was the standard history of the Ming Dynasty, *Erh-shih-ssu shih: Ming Shih* 二十四史明史, completed in 1735. Although this source, too, is of no significance for the problem of Sukhothaj-Mongol relations, it is worth noting that Phra Ceenciin makes many of the same translation errors here that he made in translating the *Yuan Shih*. The rendition of "chao-yu" 招諭 as "chuan . . . haj pen majtrii" ชวน . . . ให้เป็นมิตร, "to invite . . . to be friends" definitely distorts the meaning of that oft-recurring term, and indeed of the whole Sino-Confucian conception of foreign relations. A much more satisfactory rendition of the *Ming Shih* (or at least its "Chuan" section) is the English translation by T. Grimm, cited in note 13 above.

product of the flourishing historical renaissance that characterised the reign of that Emperor. An authoritative edition was reprinted in Shanghai in 1937.<sup>21</sup>

The *Hsu-t'ung-chih* recounted events in Chinese history from T'ang (618-905) through Mongol (1280-1368) times, largely by plagiarizing parts of earlier histories. In its treatment of the Yuan Dynasty, for example, it reproduced in an abridged form the "Annals" sections of the *Yuan Shih* (discussed above). It was from this material that Phra Ceencin made his 1909 translations.

The *Hsu-t'ung-chih* is generally considered by Sinologists to have been carefully compiled and to be reasonable accurate. If the *Yuan Shih* were not available it would probably be the next best thing.<sup>22</sup> Unfortunately Phra Ceenciin was unequal to the task of rendering it out of Chinese and into Thai. As will be noted in our commentary (Section V) below, his mistranslations formed the root cause of many of the misconceptions about Sukhothai-Mongol relations that are still current. It is mainly for this reason that his work must be discussed in a bibliographic review of this kind.

### III. Primary Thai Sources

#### A. The "*Phonsaawadaan Nya*"

The old adage "Les peuples heureux n'ont pas d'histoire" inevitably comes to mind when we ponder the state of Thai historical literature for the Sukhothai period. The ravages of time and tropical weather have left to the student of that era only a few stone inscriptions, the accounts of neighboring countries, and some manuscripts of doubtful antiquity and provenience.

To the extent that stone inscriptions of the Sukhothai period have been deciphered, it would appear that they make no direct mention of Sukhothai relations with the Mongols in China. They are of course indispensable for the history of the period in general, but insofar as they do not provide any direct information on the

21) See the bibliography for the full citation of this three-volume work. The Yuan Dynasty material which appears in this *Hsu t'ung chih* (only some of which was noticed by Phra Ceenciin) appears in volume one, and is simply copied from the *Yuan Shih*.

22) See also the description of this work in TRD, III, 320-21, and V, 385.

problem at hand, it will not be necessary to remark further on this category of evidence.<sup>23</sup>

In the category of contemporary accounts from neighboring countries, the only ones that make direct mention of Sukhothai-Mongol relations are the Chinese historical sources briefly described in the preceeding section.

There remains then the category of Thai manuscripts. In this regard we may turn for guidance to the works of Prince Damrong and George Coedès. Perhaps the most basic historiographical treatise on Thai manuscripts was that authored in 1914 by Prince Damrong and first published as an introduction to the 1914 edition of the *Prachum Phongsawadaan*. (ประชุมพงศาวดาร). This is an exceptionally knowledgeable study of extent Thai and Pali manuscripts relevant to the history of Sukhothai and Ayuthia times. Although some additional contributions have been made to the field since 1914, notably by the leading Western scholar on this subject, George Coedès, Damrong's article nevertheless remains the most authoritative extended discussion of manuscript materials on pre-modern Thai history.<sup>24</sup>

- 23) The basic epigraphic materials relative to Sukhothaj appear in the following series: Krom Sinlapaakoon (compiler) กรมศิลปากร, *Prachum Silaacaaryg Paag thii nyi* ประชุมศิลาจารึกภาคที่หนึ่ง (3rd edition, Bangkok: 1957); Krom Sinlapaakoon (compiler), *Prachum Silaacaaryg Paag thii song* (2nd edition, Bangkok: 1961); Samnag Naajogradthamontrii (compiler) สำนักนายกรัฐมนตรี, *Prachum Silaacaaryg Paag thii saam* (1st edition, Bangkok: 1965).
- 24) Prince Damrong's 1914 essay was reprinted in PPCPH, (1952), 1-50. Almost immediately after it was first written it was rendered into English by the German Orientalist, O. Frankfurter, as "The Story of the Records of Siamese History", JSS, XI, part 2 (1914-1915), 1-20. However, references in the present paper are to the Thai version reprinted in 1952. For George Coedès' contribution on Thai manuscript materials see, *inter alia*, Coedès, (1920), 233-35. I have not had access to an older French work, L. Bazangeon, *Phongsavadan: Les Annales Officielles Siamois* (Rochefort-sur-mer, 1892), nor do I have any information on its contents. In recent years a number of bibliographic guides for Thai studies have appeared but of these only two are particularly useful for vernacular materials. The first is the well annotated bibliography by Klaus Wenk, (1962), an extremely comprehensive and useful work. Of almost equal value is the more recent work by Japan's leading authority on Thai vernacular literature and Thai history, Professor Ishii Yoneo of Kyoto University: "Taigo Bunken ni tsuite" タイ語文献についで in *Tōnan Ajia Kenkyū* 東南アジア研究, I, No. 4 (June, 1964), 2 ff; II, No. 1 (September, 1964), 13 ff; II, No. 2 (December, 1964), 67 ff; and VI, No. 4 (March, 1965), 38 ff. This too is an instructive and knowledgeable bibliographic guide and deserves a wider audience. I have greatly benefitted in the present study from both these works, in addition to those of Damrong and Coedès.

Of the manuscripts discussed by Damroṅ and Coedès, only one, mentioned by both authors, touches on the matter of Thai intercourse with China in the Sukhothai era.<sup>25</sup> This is the collection of legends known in Thai as the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya", or "Annals of the North", and it will thus be appropriate in a review of this kind to say something of this source.<sup>26</sup>

On the immediate circumstances surrounding its compilation, we may rely on the words of the compiler himself, as they appear on the original manuscript of the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya":

I, Phra Wichienphriichaa (น้อย) พระวิเชียรปรีชา (น้อย), the Cawkrom Raadchabandit เจ้ากรมราชบัณฑิต of the Right, was commissioned to compile the history of Siam in what concerned the principalities of the north beginning from the time that Baa Tham-maraad บัชรมราช established Sadchanaalaj สัชนาลัย (Sawankhaloog สวรรคโลก) and ascended the throne with the name Phracaw Thammaraachaathiraad พระเจ้าธรรมราชาธิราช, down to the time that Phracaw Uthoṅṅ พระเจ้าอู่ทอง established the old capital Krunṣii Ajudthayaa กรุงศรีอยุธยา. I accomplished this task with my modest powers and wit and made a royal presentation of it.<sup>27</sup>

Prince Damroṅ further informs us that Kromphraraadchawan บัชรม สัชนาลัย (at that time Heir

25) Damroṅ also discussed Phra Ceenciin's translations from the Chinese (cf. Section II, C above). Coedès mentioned them as well but incorrectly attributed them to Damroṅ. See Coedès, (1920), 235.

26) The very identity of the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya" has sometimes been confused by Western writers, as in a recent work by Charles Nelson Spinks, *The Ceramic Wares of Thailand*, (Bangkok, 1965), 12, note 4, and 15, note 8, where the author mistakenly identifies the "Annals of the North" with the Thai work *Phonṣaawadaan Joonog* and attributes to the latter a number of references to Sukhothaj-Mongol relations. In fact the latter work is not concerned with Sukhothaj history and makes no such allusions. See Phrajaṇ Prachaakidkoracag (compiler) พระยาประชากิจกรจักร, *Phonṣaawadaan Joonog* พงศาวดารโยนก (Bangkok, 1955).

27) Translated from Prince Damroṅ's prefatory remarks on the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya" in the first volume of the *Prachum Phonṣaawadaan*, 1914 edition, as reproduced in PP, (1963), ง-จ.

Apparent, shortly to become Rama II) actually commissioned the undertaking in 1807.<sup>28</sup>

Of the work itself, Damron notes that it was simply a collection of stories that have survived from the Ayuthia era. Originally, he states, they were separate legends retained in oral tradition, and he recalled seeing several of them in other places. They were only brought together when Phra Wichien was ordered to compile the history of northern Siam, in 1807.

Damron remarked that the method of compilation was extremely unsystematic and haphazard. Sometimes the same story occurred in two different places in Phra Wichien's work. Basically, the latter simply collected all the old manuscripts he could find that touched upon matters in the north and he added to them stories that he had heard from old people in the north who recalled the old oral traditions.

It is little wonder then that many of the events, and most of the chronology of the "Phonsaawadaan Nya" are of questionable historicity.

The "Phonsaawadaan Nya" was first set down in print in this condition in 1869, by order of Rama V. In 1914 it was reprinted in the *Prachum Phonsaawadaan* edited by Prince Damron and on this occasion the latter attempted to instill some order into the chaotic work of Phra Wichien by adding titles or captions for the various legends and by weeding out those stories that were repeated. Apart from this he made no alterations in the work. It remained essentially as Bishop Pallegoix had first described it in 1854 when he used the

28) PP, (1963), n, ff. In his 1914 essay on the records of Siamese history, Damron stated that it was Krompharaadchawanbawoon Mahaasurasighanaad who had commissioned Phra Wichien in 1807 to compile this work. PPCPH, (1952), 6, and Frankfurter's English version: JSS. XI, (1914-15), 3. In fact this Heir Apparent had died in 1803 and the Heir Apparent in 1807 was the future Rama II, named in the text. Cf. the reference work by "Sawwanid" (compiler) "เสาวนิต", *Phranaam Cawfaa Phraongcaw Momcaw naj Raadchawoy Cagkrii le Raachaasab* พระนามเจ้าฟ้า พระองค์เจ้า หม่อมเจ้าในราชวงศ์จักรีและราชสกุล (Bangkok, 1962), 2, 9.



unprinted manuscript in his own study of Thai history: "...pleine de fables, et présente peu de faits historiques..."<sup>29</sup>

It is from Damron's text that pertinent passages have been translated below.<sup>30</sup>

In sum, it is clear that the "Phonsaawadaan Nya" is not a particularly "ancient" manuscript, since it dates from 1807, some seven centuries after the events of the Mongol period of interest here. The events recounted often surpass credulity, and its chronology is very confused. At best it is a source that must be used with extreme care, particularly in regard to Sukhothai relations with China. In fact the events it describes in this regard are not dated at all, although the context might suggest the 6th century A.D.

### B. The "Culajudthakaurawon"

Unknown to almost all writers on the subject of Sukhothai-Mongol relations is another Thai primary source which actually dealt

29) PP, (1963), ๔-๖. Pallegoix, (1854) II, 58. This remarkable savant was one of the earliest, if not the first, Westerner to take serious note of the "Phonsaawadaan Nya". He listed it in his "Catalogus praecipuorum librorum Linguae Thai" carried in Chapter XXIX of his *Grammatica Linguae Thai* (Bangkok, 1850), 172, under the title "Annales regnorum septentrionis" (the "regnorum" translating the word "myang" เมือง which occurred between "Phonsaawadaan" and "Nya" in Pallegoix' manuscript, though recent versions do not carry this term). The work was also discussed at length in Pallegoix, (1854), II, 58 ff, and by Le Marquis de Crozier in "Notice des manuscrits siamois de la Bibliothèque nationale", *Mémoires de la société académique Indo-chinoise* No. 1 (1877-78), 263. See also Wenk, (1962), 233, and Ishii Yoneo, "Taigo Bunken ni tsuite", *Tōnan Ajia Kenkyū*, No. 4 (June, 1964), 6-12.

30) I.e., from the work cited herein as PP, (1963). Cf. bibliography for full citation. The text of the "Phonsaawadaan Nya" was also printed in full in Khurusaphaa (compiler) คุรุสภา, *Phraraadcha Phonsaawadaan krung Srii Ajudthajaa le Phonsaawadaan Nya* พระราชพงศาวดารกรุงศรีอยุธยา และพงศาวดารเหนือ (Bangkok, 1961) and was partially reproduced (including the part dealt with herein) in a "cremation volume" entitled *Ryay kiaw kab Myay Sawankhaloog, Myay Sukhothaj le Myay Phidsanuloog* เรื่องเกี่ยวกับเมืองสวรรคโลก เมืองสุโขทัยและเมืองพิษณุโลก (Bangkok, 1965). It was also translated into French by Camille Notton, *Legendes sur le Siam et le Cambodge* (Bangkok, 1939), IV, 13 ff.

at greater length with Sukhothai-Chinese relations. This is the recently-uncovered Pali manuscript known (in Thai) as the "Culajudthakaarawoṃ" (roughly: "Lesser Dynastic Wars").

In Prince Damroṃ's historiographical treatise of 1914 it is noted that this document had not yet been located, although the Prince had heard rumors of its existence and he even attempted some guesses (which later proved wide of the mark) as to its possible content and authorship. According to Damroṃ, around the turn of the century a rumor was current that there was a history of Thailand written originally in Pali by Somded Phra Wannarad สมเด็จพระวันรัตน์ the First in the reign of Rama I. Damroṃ and others had been searching over the years for it, but without success. The history was said to be divided into two parts, a "Mahaajudthakaarawoṃ" (Greater Dynastic Wars) and a "Culajudthakaarawoṃ".<sup>31</sup> Prince Damroṃ had all but given the search up as hopeless when, in 1917, parts of it were located in the monks chambers of the Phracheedtuphon วัดพระเชตุพน Temple, which happened to be the old headquarters of its purported author, Somded Phra Wannarad.<sup>32</sup>

Subsequent investigations revealed that the Pali history, composed of the "Mahaajudthakaarawoṃ" and the "Culajudthakaarawoṃ", had indeed been written by Somded Phra Wannarad. The portion of the latter section dealing with Ayuthia history had been used by the famous early 19th century scholar-monk, Kromsomdedphra Pōra-manuchid กรมสมเด็จพระปรมานุชิต, who translated it into Thai and used it in his own history of that period.<sup>33</sup>

31) See PPCPH, (1952), 37 ff. Cf. also Damron's remarks written in 1917 in CRPSC, (1964), 3.

32) For details of the search and discovery of the second part of this manuscript see CRPT, (1920), esp. ก-ค. This was a "cremation volume" issued on the occasion of the cremation of the late Phrajaa Phahonjothin Raaminphagdiī. It gives the Thai-Pali version (but without Thai translation) of the second part only of the "Culajudthakaarawoṃ" with an explanatory preface by Prince Damroṃ. This latter has been almost my sole source of information about this manucript.

33) On Kromsomdedphra Pōra-manuchid, see Schweisguth, (1951), 248 ff. This work makes no mention of the "Culajudthakaarawoṃ".

In publishing a Thai-Pali version of the newly-discovered manuscript in 1920, however, Prince Damrong noted that only the second part (phuug သော့ နုဂ္ဂလိဒ္ဓိ) of the "Culajudthakaarawon" had been found in 1917. The section of that work dealing with pre-Ayuthia history was still missing, and its contents were still unknown.<sup>34</sup>

The research for the present paper has been pursued in the United States and this writer has been unable to discover precisely when or how the first part of the "Culajudthakaarawon" was discovered. It may be inferred, however, that it was located sometime between 1920 and 1937 from the fact that Klaus Wenk's comprehensive bibliography lists it as being printed in the *Prachum Phoṇsaawadaan*, phaag 66 ภาค ๖๖ in 1937.<sup>35</sup> It is this segment that deals with the pre-Ayuthia phase of Thai history from its obscure beginnings up until the time of the Prince of Uuthawon (c. 1341). It is in this first part, only recently come to light, that is found a hitherto unknown reference to Sukhothai relations with China—a much lengthier, better dated and somewhat more reliable reference than the oft-cited (but seldom-seen) "Phoṇsaawadaan Nya", discussed earlier.

Most of Prince Damrong's remarks about the latter part of the "Culajudthakaarawon" (dealing with Ayuthia history) are equally applicable to the first part. It too was composed by Somded Phra Wannarad in the reign of Rama I when so much of the history of old Siam was being reconstructed. As with the "Phoṇsaawadaan Nya", it is a very recent version of events of the 13th and 14th centuries. We know almost nothing of the quality or even the identity of the sources upon which it was based.

---

34) See CRPT, (1920), loc. cit.

35) Klaus Wenk, (1962), 253. This first part (သော့ တုၤ တုၤ ထံၤ) later appeared in several publications on Sukhothaj history, including the very useful *Prawadsaad Sukhothaj le Caaryg krug Sukhothaj* ประวัติศาสตร์สุโขทัยและอาณาจักรสุโขทัย (Bangkok, 1955), 147-94, and the "cremation volume" *Chumnum Ryan kiaw kab krug Sukhothaj* ชุมชุมเพลิงเกี่ยวกับกรุงสุโขทัย (Bangkok, 1955), 30-103. It is from this latter work that the translation offered below has been taken. I have not had access to phaag 66 ภาค ๖๖ of the *Prachum Phoṇsaawadaan* of 1937.

On the other hand, the "Culajudthakaarawoṇ" is definitely more intelligible and logically ordered than the collection of stories in the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya". Perhaps this is due in part to the erudition and scholarly bent of its author, and in part to the fact that it was couched originally in the Pali language, which is susceptible to more precision than is the Thai language. The chronology of the "Culajudthakaarawoṇ" is much more satisfactory than that of the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya". The former gives no specific date for its account of the Sukhothai monarch's relations with China but the context would at least suggest the third quarter of the 13th century, which would be within 25 years of the events recounted in so much more detail in the Chinese records.<sup>36</sup>

It would be beyond the scope of the present paper and surely beyond the competency of the present writer to comment on the overall worth of the "Culajudthakaarawoṇ" as a historical document. Yet a perusal of the passages translated below will show that it, too, contains much that is purely mythical. In truth, we must regretfully conclude that its historicity is only a shade less to be doubted than the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya". This will be more evident when pertinent passages are presented in translation for comparison.

#### IV. Relevant Passages in Translation

The aim of this section is to present in translation the passages from the Chinese and the Thai sources described above. These will be briefly discussed as to some of their implications in Section V below.<sup>37</sup>

##### A. *From the Chinese Sources*

1. [Undated but probably after 1278 and before 1282; definitely before 1287] :

---

36) Cf. the translations of pertinent passages from this work in Section IV below.

37) The following translations are by the present writer, although due reference has been made to previous translations. Significant points of difference between the present translations and earlier ones are indicated in the corresponding footnotes. For the convenience of specialists the citations for the passages translated are given in Chinese. The page numbers at the end of the citations are from the editions used herein only (cf. bibliography) which are available at the University of California library at Berkeley.

The Court deliberated on raising an army to attack the country of Hsien 遼 and the countries of Lo-hu 羅斛, Ma-pa-erh 馬八兒, Chü-lan 俱藍, and Su-mu-tu-la 蘇木都剌. But Chia-lu-na-ta-ssu 迦魯納荅思 expressed himself thus to the throne: "These are all small, unimportant kingdoms; even if we are able to acquire them, wherein lies the advantage? To raise an army against them destroys men's lives; would it not be well to succeed or fail by sending emissaries to persuade them? If they then do not submit, it will not yet be too late to attack". The Emperor accepted his words and ordered Yo-la-yeh-nu-t'ieh-mieh 岳剌也奴帖滅 and others to proceed on missions. Over twenty kingdoms submitted.<sup>38</sup>

2. July 17, 1282:

It was ordered that Ho Tzu-chi 何子志 the Commander of 10,000 Households, be dispatched to the country of Hsien.<sup>39</sup>

3. November, 1282:

The [ Commander of ] 10,000 Households, Ho Tzu-chi, and the [ Commander of ] 1000 Households, Huang-fu Chieh 皇甫傑 and others were dispatched to the country of Hsien. In addition, the Pacification Commissioners

38) From 元史列傳卷 21 (元史卷 134) 迦魯納荅思 folio 18, recto and verso (28223). This passage was missed by Pelliot, Maspero, Hsieh, and Sugimoto. It was first pointed out by Yamamoto, (1950), 109 ff, who reproduced the Chinese text. It was subsequently translated into English by Luce (1959), 76-77, but the phrase 莫若遣使諭以禍福 is, I believe, mistranslated in Luce's version, which differs in this and a few other minor respects from my own.

39) From 元史本紀世祖卷 12 (至元 19 年 6 月己亥), folio 6, verso (26785). This passage was first translated into French by Pelliot (1904), 241-42, and, in slightly altered form, by the same author, (1951), 113. It was reproduced in the original Chinese by Hsieh, (1949), 45 and (1953), 48 (with some omissions) and by Sugimoto, (1959), 6, ff. It was cited also by Maspero, (1928), 196, note 3, and Luce, (1958), 140.

Yu-Yung-hsien 尤永賢 and Ya Lan 亞蘭 and others were dispatched to Ma-pa-erh 馬八兒. Their ship traversed the sea lanes off Chan-chêng 占城 and they were all taken prisoner. Soldiers were therefore dispatched to punish [the Chams].<sup>40</sup>

4. February 14, 1283:

They killed Yung-hsien, Ya Lan, and others.<sup>41</sup>

5. February 20, 1283:

On this day Ho Tzu-chi, Huang-fu Chieh, and over one hundred others were also slain.<sup>42</sup>

- 
- 40) From 經世大典征伐占城 (元文類卷 41, P. 570). This notice was first discussed by Pelliot, (1951), 111, and note 3. It and the whole "Chan-chêng" section from which it was taken was the source for a similar passage in the *Yuan Shih*: 元史列傳卷 97, (元史卷 214) 占城 (世祖 19 年 10 月), folio 7, recto (28927). The latter was first translated by Pelliot, (1904), 241. At that time he construed the orthography for Yu Yung-hsien and Ya Lan to mean one person instead of two. He corrected this error on the basis of the Pai-na edition of the *Yuan Shih* (used herein) in 1951. Maspero, (1928), 177-78, made the same mistake Pelliot made in 1904, apparently on the basis of the same faulty text. The *Yuan Shih* version was reproduced (without translation) and discussed in Yamamoto, (1950), 111. Hsieh, (1949) overlooked both versions of the passage but took note of it in his revised work (1953), 61, note 9. It was also discussed without translation by Luce, (1958), 140, and Sugimoto, (1959), 7. The *Yuan Shih* version differs only slightly from the earlier "Ching-shih ta-tien" version, notably in the omission in the former of the term meaning "sea lanes" or "maritime route".
- 41) From 經世大典征伐占城 (元文類卷 41, P. 570). This passage was reproduced verbatim in the *Yuan Shih*: 元史列傳卷 97 (元史卷 214) 占城 (世祖 20 年正月 16 日), folio 8, recto (28927). The latter was cited by Maspero, (1928), 178, paraphrased by Pelliot (1951), 118, quoted (without translation) and discussed by Yamamoto, (1950), 188 ff, and Sugimoto, (1959), 7.
- 42) From 經世大典征伐占城 (元文類卷 41, P. 571), in which the name of the captured emissary to Sukhothaj, Ho Tzu-chih, is written 何子智, although the more common orthography 何子志 occurs on the previous page. The latter orthography is given too in the *Yuan Shih*'s "Champa" section, where this passage is reproduced verbatim: 元史列傳卷 97 (元使卷 214) 占城 (世祖 20 年正月 23 日), folio 9, recto (28928). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 242 (from the *Yuan Shih*), cited by Maspero, (1928), 180, and by Luce, (1958), 140. It was quoted in the original by Yamamoto, (1950), 119, and by Sugimoto, (1959), 7.

## 6. November 26, 1292:

The Pacification Office of the Kwangtung Circuit 廣東道 sent a person who arrived at the capital bearing a golden missive (chin-ts'e 金冊] proffered by the chief (chü 主) of the country of Hsien.<sup>43</sup>

## 7. June 4, 1293:

There was an Imperial Order that an emissary be dispatched to summon and persuade (chao-yu 招諭) Hsien.<sup>44</sup>

## 8. July 5, 1294:

The Kan-mu-ting 朥木丁 of the city of Pi-ch'a-pu-li 必察不里 sent an emissary who came bearing tribute.<sup>45</sup>

## 9. August 18, 1294:

There was an Imperial Order that the King (wang 王) of Hsien, Kan-mu-ting, be summoned and persuaded and that he come to the Court or, should this prove difficult,

---

43) From 元史本紀世祖卷 17 (至元 29 年 10 月 甲辰), folio 13, verso (26854). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 242. It was cited by Maspero, (1928), 196, note 3 and by Luce, (1958), 140. The original Chinese was reproduced without translation in Hsieh, (1949), 45, and same author, (1953), 48, and in Sugimoto, (1959), 8.

44) From 元史本紀世祖卷 17 (至元 30 年 4 月 甲寅), folio 19, recto (26857). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 242. In this paper I have translated the term "chao-yu" 招諭 as "summon and persuade", which, while less apt from the stylistic point of view, is, I think, more accurate in the context of the time than Pelliot's "ordres imperiaux" or Luce's "orders" (1958, 140). This passage was cited by Maspero, (1928), 196, note 3, and was quoted without translation by Hsieh (1949), 45, and (1953), 48, and by Sugimoto, (1959), 9.

45) From 元史本紀成宗卷 18 (至元 31 年 6 月 庚寅), folio 4, verso (26861). This passage was overlooked by Pelliot in 1904 but was subsequently discovered by him in 1928, as noted by Coedès, (1968), 205 and note 104, to whom Pelliot communicated his findings. It was also overlooked by Hsieh. Luce, (1958), 140, cited it. Sugimoto quoted the original without translation in (1955), 563 ff, and in (1959), 9, where he discussed its implications extensively.

that his sons and brothers and vassal-retainers present themselves as security.<sup>46</sup>

#### 10. 1295:

In the first year of the Yuan-chen 元貞 Era of Ch'eng Tsung, the country of Hsien presented a gold-lettered tributary missive (chin-tzu-piao 金字表) and desired that the Court dispatch an emissary to its country.<sup>47</sup>

#### 11. 1295:

When their [Hsien's] missive arrived an emissary had already been dispatched there [toward Hsien]. Since he had not known of this, a pure gold amulet to fasten at his waist was bestowed on this emissary who had come [from Hsien]. He hurriedly went back in order to overtake [the Chinese emissary already dispatched]. A [new] Chinese emissary was ordered to accompany him on his return.<sup>48</sup>

46) From 元史本紀成宗卷18(至元31年7月甲戌), folio 7, recto (26863). This passage was translated in Pelliot, (1904), 242 and in minor respects his differs from my own. Pelliot's rendition of 陪臣 as "envoyés" seems patently incorrect; this compound rather implies "court retainers" or "vassal retainers". This passage was quoted in the original by Hsieh (1949), 46, and (1953), 48, and by Sugimoto (1959), 9, though neither author translated it. It was cited by Maspero (1928), 196, note 3, and Luce, (1958), 140.

47) From 元史列傳卷97, (元史卷210) 遯(成宗元貞元年), folio 11, recto (28929). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 242, quoted in the original Chinese by Hsieh (1949), 46, and (1953), 48, and Sugimoto, (1959), 11. It should be noted that this passage combined with Nos. 11, 12, and 15 (in that order) constitutes a translation of the entire "Hsien" (i.e., Sukhoothaj) section of the "Chuan" division of the *Yuan Shih*. They have been separated in this paper for analytical purposes but they actually form one integral section in the *Yuan Shih*.

48) From 元史列傳卷97(元史卷210) 遯(成宗元貞元年), folio 11, recto (28929). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 242. There are minor differences between Pelliot's and my own rendition, notably in regard to the verb 追 which I construe to include the meaning of "to overtake". It seems clear from the context that the Hsien emissary was indeed sent back to follow and overtake the Chinese mission already sent out to his country. Sugimoto, (1959), 12, quotes the Chinese text and so construes it in his discussion. The original was also reproduced in Hsieh, (1949), 46, and (1953), 48.



## 12. 1295:

Since the peoples of Hsien and Ma-li-yu-erh 麻里予兒 have for a long time slain each other and since they are all in submission at this moment, an Imperial Order was issued telling the people of Hsien not to harm the Ma-li-yu-erh and to keep to their promise.<sup>49</sup>

## 13. May 2, 1297:

Diverse garments were bestowed on the Hsien and Lo-hu persons who had come to Court.<sup>50</sup>

## 14. February 2, 1299:

On the first day, kuei-wei 癸未 of the first month in the spring of the third year [of Ch'eng Tsung] the barbarians of Hsien 遼番 and the countries of Mo-la-yu 沒刺由 and Lo-hu each came with their local products to pay tribute. [The Emperor] bestowed a Tiger-talisman (hu-fu 虎符) on the Heir Apparent of the Hsien barbarians.<sup>51</sup>

## 15. 1299:

The Chief (chu 主) of the country of Hsien presented a petition: when his father reigned the Court [of the Mongols] used to bestow saddles, bridle-bits, white horses and golden-threaded garments on him. [The Chief] begged that these former precedents be considered and that [such gifts] be bestowed. Because the State Secretary Wan Che, the Ta-la-han, advised that if their small country were given an Imperial gift of horses it was to be feared

49) From 元史列傳, place cited in note 48.

50) From 元史本紀成宗卷19, (大德元年4月壬寅), folio 12, verso (26876). This passage was translated by Pelliot (1904), 243 in a version slightly different from my own. Hsieh overlooked it; Sugimoto, (1959), 12, quoted the Chinese, and Luce, (1958), cited it.

51) From 元史本紀成宗卷20, (大德3年正月癸未朔), folio 1, recto (26883). This passage was translated by Pelliot (1904), 243, quoted without translation by Hsieh (1949), 46, and (1953), 48, and by Sugimoto, (1959), 12 (cf. also 10). Luce, (1958), 140, merely cited it.

that their neighbor, Hsin-tu 忻都, might criticise and complain, the Emperor thereupon deliberated and then bestowed golden-threaded garments but did not bestow horses.<sup>52</sup>

16. June 15, 1299:

The barbarians of Hainan 海南, Su-ku-t'ai 速古臺 Su-lung-tan 速龍探 and Pen-hsi-li arrived at Court bearing tribute of tigers, elephants and *sha-lo* 抄羅 wood boats.<sup>53</sup>

17. July 7, 1300:

Twenty-two persons from Chao-wa 爪哇, the country of Hsien, Chan-pa 巖八 and other places came to Court. Clothing was bestowed on them and they were sent back.<sup>54</sup>

52) From 元史列傳, place cited in note 48. This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 243, reproduced in Chinese by Hsieh, (1949), 46, and (1953), 48, and by Sugimoto, (1959), 12, though neither of the latter two authors translated it. It was cited by Luce, (1958), 140.

53) From 元史本紀成宗卷20, (大德3年5月壬午), folio 4, recto (26884). This passage was discussed by Pelliot, (1904) 244, note 3, but not translated since he was not convinced that the "Su-ku-t'ai" 速古臺 of the text should be equated with the Thai state of Sukhothaj. Hsieh overlooked this passage; Luce, (1958), 140 referred to it; Sugimoto (1959), 13 quoted the Chinese text, but incorrectly in the case of the two characters 海南 which he reproduced as 南海. These characters came into use to designate Hainan Island, it is said, during the Mongol Period when part of Hainan Island belonged to an administrative unit called the "Hainan-tao" or "Hainan Circuit." See ARJ, II, 106. It is thus possible that the characters 海南 in this passage refer to "barbarians" from Hainan Island and do not mean "maritime south". In any case the more usual designation for "maritime south" would be "nanhai" 南海. My translation leaves either possibility open.

54) From 元史本紀成宗卷20 (大德4年6月甲子), folio 8, recto (26886). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 243, though he neglected to render the character 等 "and other places", and the characters 遣之 meaning "sent them back". Luce, (1958), 140, noted this passage and Sugimoto, (1959), 10, quoted the Chinese text. Hsieh overlooked it entirely.

## 18. April 4, 1314:

On kuei-mao day, the King (wang 王) of the country of Hsien sent his minister 臣, Ai-tan 愛耽 bringing tribute.<sup>55</sup>

## 19. January 22, 1319:

On the first day, ting-ssu 丁巳 of the first month in the spring of the sixth year [of the Yan-yu Era] the country of Hsien sent an emissary to offer the tributary missive (*piao* 表) and to bring tribute of local products.<sup>56</sup>

## 20. February 6, 1323:

On the first day, kuei-ssu, 癸巳, of the first month in the spring of the third year [of the Chih-chih Era] the country of Hsien and the Headman of the Pa-fan 八番 Cave Barbarians each dispatched emissaries who brought tribute.<sup>57</sup>

### B. From the Thai Sources

## 1. From the "Phonsaawadaan Nya":

Phra Ruang พระรามา spoke to Caw Ridthikumaan เจ้าฤทธิภูมิ saying: "Why did not the King of China (Phrajaan Krunj Ciin พระยากรุงจีน) come and help us replace the old era (lop sagkaraad lothakaraa)? Let us brothers go and make the King of China our servant." After the two brothers

55) From 元史本紀仁宗卷 25 (延祐元年 2 月癸卯), folio 1, verso (26955). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 244, though his rendition of 臣 as "sujet" is inaccurate; "minister" would be closer, I believe. Hsieh, (1949), 46 and (1953), 49, and Sugimoto, (1959), 13-14, quoted the Chinese text of this passage; Luce (1958), 140, noted it.

56) From 元史本紀仁宗卷 26, (延祐 6 年正月丁巳朔), folio 12, verso (26967). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 243. The Chinese text was quoted by Hsieh, (1949), 46, and (1953), 49 and by Sugimoto, (1959), 14.

57) From 元史本紀英宗卷 28, (至治 3 年正月癸巳朔), folio 10, recto (26987). This passage was translated by Pelliot, (1904), 244. Both Hsieh, (1949), 46, (1953) 49, and Sugimoto, (1959), 14 quoted it without translation.

had consulted together they then ordered the officials to prepare a boat eight *waa* in length and four *soog* in beam. At the auspicious moment on Sunday they sailed away on the water, the realm of Naan̄ Chaan̄walaahog นางช้างวาลาหอก, the daughter of the spirit diety. And the daughter of the spirit diety even went with them. The two brothers only took with them their double-edged weapons and their bows. Both the god of the land and the god of the wind carried them on, and Naan̄ Meegkhalaa นางเมขลา, goddess of the sea, was pleased to protect them from danger.

They sailed for one month before they reached China. And the day they arrived a miracle occurred: a mist fell and the moon and the sun could not be seen and everywhere all the Chinese people's hair stood on end. They were greatly alarmed and shaken. The king of China then caused all his officials to assemble together in the Throne Hall and they consulted together. Later Keew Kaan Ciin ขุนแก้วการจีน was sent to observe the sea. He went to the north and to the south but was unable to detect any junks. He could only see a small boat with two Thai men in it. And Khun Naan̄ Keew Kaan Ciin, having seen this, returned to tell the King of China. And the latter knew in his heart by virtue of an ancient Buddhist prophecy in his country that there would be two Thai brothers who would sail across the seas in search of a wife, and one of them would become the ruler of the people of Chomphuu Thawiib ขอมพุทธวิป and he would change the era of the Buddha after which he would reach China. The prophecy had come true.

When the King of China understood this in his heart he sent Chinese soldiers to go and escort them to the Royal Palace, and they were seated on a throne of glass. The King of China then saluted them and spoke to them. And Phrajaa Ruang was facile in every way in the language. And the King of China brought his daughter and presented her to him as his wife, in virtue of the fact that this lady

had performed meritorious deeds with him in a previous existence by creating the three Tripitaka in the religion of the Kakuson กกุสันธ Buddha. And when Lord Buddha went and seated himself in the house of Pancamadchakhaam, ปญจมัทธคาม, a Naga นาค offered water to Lord Buddha and he foretold that when the Buddha Era reached the year 1000, this Naga would replace it. Phrajaa Ruanj was indeed this Naga.

And the King of China understood all, and he desired to please Phrajaa Ruanj in all ways and to spare him nothing and thus he presented the royal lady to him. The King of China then asked his officials to prepare a junk with many presents. He then divided a dragon-seal into two parts. He gave the tail portion to his daughter and if in the future they would correspond they would join one portion of the seal with the other and if they matched, it would indeed be a letter from his daughter.

Phracaw Ruanj then proceeded to the junk with the Lady Phasucatheewii พสุเทวี, Caw Ridthiraadchakumaan, and 500 Chinese servants. They sailed on the junk for one month before reaching their destination through the power of the gods. In arriving at the town of Sadchanaalaj สัจฉนาลัย, the sea at that time extending up until the town itself, they were able to proceed by junk.

The Sovereign then went up to his royal house and the nobles all saluted him. And the Chinese people set about making pottery for the Sovereign and from that time forward dated the practice of making royal pottery.<sup>58</sup>

## 2. From the "Culajudthakaarawonj":

58) This passage was translated from the Thai text in PP (1963), 11-13 by the present writer with the kind assistance of his wife, Chadin (Kanjavanant) Flood, to whom he is much indebted in matters of Thai language and literature. Quotation marks and paragraphing have been added. See Camille Notton, *Legendes sur le Siam et le Cambodge*, IV, 21-23 for a French translation of this passage, which differs from mine only in minor respects.

One day Phra Ruan went with his extensive retinue to the town of Sawankhaloog สวรรคโลก. There, in many temples, he noticed abodes for monks as well as sanctuaries in a condition of crumbling decay, and he wished to restore these buildings so that they would endure for a long time. He therefore consulted with his younger brother, saying, "I am going to the country of Makhod มคธ, that is, the country of China [sic] in order to ask the King of China (Phracaw Krun Ciin พระเจ้ากรุงจีน) for a number of artisans who specialise in making pottery to come and make pottery for dishes and for tiles so that the tiles might be used for making roofs for temples' sanctuaries and monks' abodes in our country".

Phrajaa Siithammaraachaa พระยาศรัทธามราชา, after listening to his brother, said to him, "Hail, you who possess great virtue, I ask to accompany you".

The two Kings thus agreed and entered into a small boat with seven pages. They asked all the officials, headed by the ministers who were to remain behind and take care of the country: "All of you stay and watch over the country".

After thus giving the command, the royal boat set sail. They reached the sea, and no danger came to them all the way to the country of Makhod, owing to their great power and previously-performed merit.

At that time the astrologers of the Court of the King of China presented a tablet foretelling the future of the country to the King: "Hail, you who possess great virtue. Enemies will be arriving at the capital tomorrow and they will certainly conquer our country".

The King of China, having thus heard, became alarmed and asked that the soldiers come together for a meeting on the terrace in front of the palace. He told them of the situation and asked that they guard the capital city at every gate and along the earthenworks that had

been thrown up as fortifications, and along the outward and inward walls of the city. It took well over 100,000 persons, equipped with various weapons, to guard the capital city and the palace in accordance with the King's command. They did this in a very able manner.

Phra Ruan and his royal younger brother, upon reaching the country of China, asked the seven royal pages to stay and guard the boat. The two then proceeded into the palace. Upon seeing the two kings, all the soldiers who were guarding the inner and outer gates became greatly alarmed and were unable to stop them or say anything to them. The soldiers all fled and no one detained the two brothers, who proceeded on to the residence of the King of China and seated themselves at a suitable place.

The King of China saw the two kings come and seat themselves close to him and he became very agitated and resolved to salute them.

Phra Ruan saw that the King of China was about to give salute and he forbade him from doing so, saying, "Hail, you who possess great virtue, do not be alarmed". I am from the country of Sukhothai and do not in the least wish to take away your throne and your wealth. I came here to ask for some pottery artisans to come and set up pottery kilns in the far away country of Sukhothai.

The King of Makhod, having thus heard, was greatly rejoiced. He scrutinised Phra Ruan carefully and he noticed that he was of great physical beauty and possessed of an incomparable bearing, befitting a King. He therefore bethought himself: "This great man who rules the country of Sukhothai possesses great supernatural power attained as a result of accumulated merit and he possesses a miraculous power in his speech. This I have heard in the rumors of merchants. It is fitting that I give my kingdom to this King."

Having thus contemplated, and being fearful of losing his own kingdom, the King of China presented his

kingdom and his daughter to Phra Ruan, saying, "Hail, you who possess great virtue, I beg to present all these to you. I myself ask to be your slave."

Phra Ruan, hearing this, replied with generosity, "Hail, you who are great, I do not covet your wealth and your kingdom, though you proffered your kingdom to me out of sincere respect." He walked over to a statue of a lion and made a vow: "May this lion-statue serve as a means for foretelling the future. I am going to cut off the head of this lion-statue. Over whichever country the head will fall, I will reside there and reign there as King."

After making this oath, he slashed the lion-statue with his double-edged sword. The statue was severed into two. Its head flew up into the air and, because of the supernatural powers that he [Phra Ruan] possessed in his words, it landed in the middle of the capital of Sukhothai.

When the King of Makhodtharaad and his officials and all the people saw the great supernatural powers of Phra Ruan their fear of him knew no bounds. The King of China therefore gave his daughter in marriage to Phra Ruan and invited him to reign in his country. Phra Ruan, upon hearing this, said, "Hail, you who are great. This kingdom is not a great kingdom. The lion's head fell within the capital city of Sukhothai. Therefore, Sukhothai is great. I will take leave of you and reign at Sukhothai.

Thus having spoken, he remained with the daughter of the King of China for three months, after which time he said to the King of China: "I am taking leave of you to return to Sukhothai".

The King of Makhodtharaad, having thus heard, asked: "Are you taking your wife with you, or do you desire to have her stay behind here?"



Phra Ruan, having thus heard, said, "The matter rests with her. If she wishes to go with me, I will take her. If she desires to stay with her royal father, she is free to do so."

The King of China asked his daughter: "Listen, you who are my beloved child, are you going to stay here or are you going to go with your husband?"

The lady answered her royal father: "I will take leave of my father in order to accompany my royal husband. It is very difficult for a woman to find a good husband who is loving and pleasing. It is difficult to serve a man, and also difficult to dress oneself up to attract a man's attention. Once a husband is acquired, to be separated from him would give rise to boundless pain and shame. I must take leave of my royal father and go with my royal husband."

Phra Ruan asked for 500 potters. The King of China granted his wish and also had 33 junks prepared and loaded with silver and gold, jewels, rings, silks and vestments and a great many tools and utensils. Then a great number of slaves and workers were assembled and bestowed on his daughter. The father then imparted his counsel to her. The lady's mother and relatives were all very sad because of their love and affection for her. Their loud lamentations could be heard within the palace for they loved the princess, and they, together with their servants, came to see her off at the boat. The princess took leave, saluted her royal mother and father and then boarded one of the junks.

At the auspicious moment the crews who manned the junks beat the gongs, weighed the anchors, shouted for victory, raised the sails, signalled by waving flags and sailed the junks away from the berths into the sea. No danger came to anyone. All the way to Sukhothai there was not one storm nor troubled sea because of the supernatural powers of Phra Ruan, owing to his merit.

After reaching the capital city, it was ordered that the princess be received and taken into the palace. Phra Ruan kindly arranged to have her stay in the royal residence. The daughter of the King of China was given the name of Lady (Naan) Khanthaararaadchatheewii นางคันทาเรศวร. She was well loved by Phra Ruan and lived happily with him for a very long time.

As for the persons who had loaded the articles on the junks and accompanied them all the way, they begged leave and returned to China after having unloaded the junks for the King.<sup>59</sup>

## V. Some Tentative Conclusions

Doubtless the first impression that comes to mind in comparing the above Chinese and Thai sources is the relatively accurate, matter-of-fact manner in which events are recounted in the former, and the quite fanciful and embroidered way in which they are presented in the latter. The exploits of Phra Ruan in China as we find them in the Thai sources are largely in the realm of folk-legends, with Phra Ruan as a kind of culture-hero, and can only inspire great reservations in the historian seeking hard facts on Sukhothai-Mongol relations. The picture depicted in the Chinese records, wherein Thai emissaries at the Court of China are refused a gift of horses for political reasons, is obviously a more balanced one than Phra Ruan's moral conquest of the Mongol kingdom.

It should be stressed, however, that the reservations concerning the Thai sources translated above extend only to the problem at hand—Sukhothai-Mongol relations. Both these sources surely have their uses, not only for Thai history but for other lines of inquiry as well. But the immediate purpose here is to minimize conjecture on a subject that has hitherto been fraught with it, and to bring out the most tangible facts about Sukhothai-Mongol relations. To this end the present paper will refrain from further speculations on what pos-

59) This passage was translated entirely by Chadin (Kanjavanit) Flood. Quotation marks and paragraphing added.

sible historical events these Thai sources might, however obscurely, reflect. It will instead focus on the detailed Chinese records and what they have to tell us, in an effort to make clear the folly of perpetuating as fact such legends as Raamkamheen งามกำแหง colorful visits to China, his friendly hand-shaking relationship with the Mongol Khans, and his return with a horde of Chinese potters, as W.A.R. Wood and others have pictured it in the past.<sup>60</sup>

Like many other events recounted in the biographies in the "Chuan" section of the *Yuan Shih*, the first passage from this source translated above (No. 1) is undated. To this writer's knowledge only two scholars have given this citation any attention: Prof. G.H. Luce, in 1959, and Prof. T. Yamamoto in 1950 in his monumental *Annan-shi Kenkyū* 安南史研究 where the Chinese text was reproduced. Both scholars agreed that it should be dated before 1287, and this seems beyond doubt, since the next date after this passage in that particular section is 1287. It is not as easy to assign an early limit to it. Luce holds for sometime soon after Shih Tsu (i.e., Khubilai Khan) completed the conquest of China in 1279. Yamamoto also holds for either 1281 or 1282 on the grounds that Shih Tsu's plans for subduing South and Southeast Asia were closely related to and in fact contingent upon his attempts in 1281 and 1282 to set up in Champa a "base of operations", as it were, that would put him in a position to effect further economic and political expansion in those regions. The deliberations reflected in passage No. 1 must, he thinks, have been roughly coincident with the Champa operation.<sup>61</sup>

Behind the aggressive designs reflected in passage No. 1 was the desire on the part of Shih Tsu (Khubilai) to control the lucrative

60) Wood, (1933), 55 ff; Hoontrakul, (1953), 103. With all its shortcomings, Wood's work was a serious piece of scholarship. Hoontrakul's book, on the other hand, is so filled with fancy and fable as to be underserving of scholarly attention. It is only mentioned in this paper because it has seduced certain unwary Western text-book writers, e.g., John Cady, in his *Southeast Asia, Its Historical Development*, 145, in regard to descriptions of Sukhothaj-Chinese relations. Steiger, (1936), 320, repeated Wood's errors.

61) See the citation to the *Yuan Shih*, note 38 above; Luce, (1959), 61; Yamamoto, (1950), 109-110.

sea trade out of South China. In 1277, before his elimination of the Southern Sung (1279) he had already set up government-controlled Maritime Trade Offices (*shih-po-ssu*) in several South China ports. In 1278 he began the policy of "summoning and persuading" (*chao-yu* 招諭) the various chiefs of the southern countries.<sup>62</sup>

As Prof. Yamamoto notes, up until around 1280 Mongol policy vis-à-vis the region of Southeast Asia consisted merely of "summoning and persuading". In 1280 or 1281 this policy begins to change. In 1281 the Mongols ignored the independence and the indigenous traditions of Champa and began to set up a typically Mongol-Chinese bureaucratic structure there, in preparation for the forceful submission of the entire Southeast Asian region. It seems most probable, then, that, as Yamamoto argues, the Yuan Court's deliberations regarding military moves against Sukhothai (Hsien) and other Southeast Asian countries took place around 1280 or 1281.<sup>63</sup>

Oddly enough, in view of the Mongol record of military conquest, the pacific arguments of the Uighur scholar Chia-lu-na-ta-ssu at least temporarily won the day and it was decided to forego military moves and attempt to "summon and persuade" these countries to submit.<sup>64</sup> In any case, it is against this background of an increasingly aggressive Mongol foreign policy that the dispatch of the Ho Tzu-chi mission to Sukhothai should be viewed.

Passage No. 2 above, relating to the order for Ho Tzu-chi to proceed to Sukhothai merely states that he was ordered on July 17, 1282, to proceed there. It certainly does not state that he reached there in 1282 or any other time and, *a fortiori*, it does not state that he engaged in any diplomatic negotiations with the ruler of Sukhothai after arriving there. What then could be the source for the persistent Thai and Western accounts that assert or imply that he did arrive there in 1282 and even negotiated treaties?

62) 元史列傳卷 97 (元史 210) 馬八兒等國 (dating from context), folios 16-18 (28931-32) [the *Yuan Shih* account of *Ma-pa-erh*, etc.]; Yamamoto, (1950), 99-100; Ichimura, (1939-50), III, 143-58; Maspero, (1928), 174 ff.

63) Following Yamamoto's argument developed in (1950), Chapter III, "Sei-sō no Sen-jō Shuppei"; see also Maspero, (1928), 175-76.

64) Luce, (1959), 62, and *Yuan Shih* citation, note 38 above.

The most influential progenitor of this myth among Western writers was W.A.R. Wood, in his well known *History of Siam*.<sup>65</sup> Wood's account, in turn, was based on the work of Prince Damrong originally published in Thai in 1914.<sup>66</sup> Damrong's 1914 treatise, which dealt with events prior to the founding of Ayuthia, was translated into English in 1919 by Sir Josiah Crosby in the *Journal of the Siam Society*. It is evident that Wood did not rely on the English translation, however, because the latter, for unknown reasons, omits the very portions concerning Sukhothai-Mongol relations that led Wood astray. These portions appear only in the Thai version of Damrong's work.<sup>67</sup>

The 1914 Thai version of Damrong's study indicates that he had for long been loathe to credit the legends in the "Phonsaawadaan Nya" about Phra Ruan's visits to China. His doubts were dissipated and he was forced to accept the veracity of the latter work when, as he notes, he was confronted with "Chinese documentation".<sup>68</sup>

As the reader will no doubt have guessed, the "documentation" referred to by Damrong was none other than the translation into Thai of relevant passages from certain 18th century Chinese works by Phra Ceenciin, as described earlier in this paper.<sup>69</sup> This translation, done in 1909 at the behest of Prince Damrong, appears indeed to have been the ultimate source for many of the errors that have plagued the problem of Sukhothai-Mongol relations since that time. This work misled Prince Damrong on many points, and the latter, reluctantly changing his opinion, became the source for W.A.R. Wood's errors on Sukhothai-Mongol relations which have in turn been perpetuated

---

65) Wood, (1933), 55.

66) PPCPH (1952), 51-168. Cf. note 24 above on this work. It carries a discussion of Sukhothai-Mongol relations (pp. 141-43) which Wood obviously drew on.

67) "Siamese History Prior to the Founding of Ayudhya", JSS, XIII, Part 2 (1919), reprinted in *The Siam Society: Selected Articles*, III, (1959), 36-100. The portions of Damrong's Thai text omitted would have appeared on Pp. 84-85.

68) PPCPH, (1952), 142-23.

69) That is, the work cited in this paper as CRPSC, (1964). See Section II, C, above for a discussion of this work.

by a variety of Western and, ironically enough, even Chinese writers.<sup>70</sup>

In regard to the events related in passage No. 2 above, Phra Ceenciin's translation in 1909 was taken from one section of the 18th century *Hsu-t'ung-chih*, as we saw earlier. The passage in the latter work was simply taken from the *Yuan Shih* passage translated as passage No. 2 above, but Phra Ceenciin's translation states that Ho Tzu-chi was ordered to proceed as an "ambassador" (raadchathuud ราชทูต) to "persuade" Hsien.<sup>71</sup> Although the term *ta-shih* 大使 in modern Chinese, or *taishi* in Japanese does mean "ambassador", the term *shi* 使 as it occurs so often in Chinese dynastic histories and particularly in the Mongol period meant simply "messenger" or "emissary". The translation of this term as "pen raadchathuud" เป็นราชทูต (Phra Ceenciin), or even as "se rendre en ambassade" (Pelliot) is apt to lead to further anachronistic errors. A classic example of this was when Prince Damrong, using Phra Ceenciin's translation, made some inferences of his own from Phra Ceenciin's translation: "The King of China therefore caused his ambassador to come [to Sukhothai] in 1282 and discuss friendship..."<sup>72</sup>

By the time the matter appears in Wood's *History of Siam* the anachronisms about the arrival of ambassadors, discussions of friendship, etc., have blossomed even more: "In 1282 a Chinese mandarin named Haw Chow Chi [i.e., Ho Tzu-chi] arrived at the Court of Suk'ot'ai to negotiate a treaty of amity between China and Siam".<sup>73</sup>

Finally, a later writer, Hoontrakul, apparently concerned that the outcome of the "negotiations" not be left up in the air, further embellished in 1953: "In A.D. 1282 a Chinese envoy, named Ho-

70) Some works that misdate the first Sukhothaj-Mongol contacts: Coedès, (1968), 206; Skinner, (1962), 2; Spinks, *The Ceramic Wares of Thailand*, 10. Among recent Chinese works that betray the same error are Ling Ch'un-sheng, (1958), 73 and Hsieh, (1949), 45 and 175. The latter corrected himself in the revised edition to this work after reference to the "Chuan" section of the *Yuan Shih*. Cf. Hsieh, (1953), 61, note 10.

71) CRPSC, (1964), 11.

72) PPCPH, (1952), 142.

73) Wood, (1933), 55.

Tse-Chi . . . was sent from China to Sukhothai and a *Treaty of Amity* [italics per original] was reached between King Khun Ram Kamheng and Emperor Shi-tsu . . ."<sup>74</sup>

Far from discussions of friendship and negotiations of treaties of amity, which in the Mongol scheme of things are sheer anachronisms, it is evident that the mission of Ho Tzu-chi was entirely in accord with the overall foreign policy of the then-reigning Shih Tsu, or Khubilai Khan. It had no other purpose than to "summon and persuade", as the term "chao-yu" should be strictly rendered. It was not for the purpose of "conciliating" (Wood) Sukhothai, nor of establishing amical relations on a basis of equality as in present-day international relations. Such terms as "treaty of amity" as applied to the alleged "results" of Ho Tzu-chi's mission are simply uncritical misconstructions of the basically unequal and coercive relationship that obtained between the Mongols and neighboring states.<sup>76</sup>

Passages Nos. 3,4, and 5 above, originally from the "Ching-shih ta-tien" and reproduced in the *Yuan Shih*, occur somewhat unexpectedly in the account of Mongol relations with Champa as found in the "Chan-ch'eng [i.e., Champa] Chuan" of the latter work. The beginnings of Sukhothai-Mongol relations have often been misdated because these passages were sometimes overlooked by those perusing the *Yuan Shih*.<sup>77</sup>

---

74) Hoontrakul, (1953), 103.

75) Sugimoto, (1959), 9; Luce, (1958), 139.

76) Such terms can be found in Wood, (1933), 55; Hoontrakul, (1953), 103; and in Damroß's work, PPCPH, (1952), 138 and 142.

77) Pelliot, (1904), 241 was the first Western scholar to note that Ho Tzu-chih and his party never arrived in Sukhothaj. With his marvelous thoroughness, even at this early date he had researched the notices on Sukhothaj in the "Champa Chuan", as well as in the "Hsien Chuan" and in the "Annals" ("Annales principales" as he termed them). Subsequently Maspero, (1928). 177 and Luce, (1958), 139-40 retraced Pelliot's steps in the *Yuan Shih* but even their works were overlooked by some later writers (e.g., Cady, *Southeast Asia, Its Historical Perspective*). L.P. Briggs, (1949), 62, among other inaccuracies, erroneously cited Pelliot (1904) as his authority for the assertion that "envoys from Sien (Hsien) appeared at the Chinese court in 1282 . . ." In his next sentence Briggs also erred: "About the same time,

The account in the Champa section of the "Chuan" indicates first of all that Ho Tzu-chi was not the only official dispatched to Sukhothai. In fact he travelled with a lesser official, Huang-fu Chieh and others who were also bound for that country. In addition their party was accompanied by the two Pacification Commissioners Yu Yung-hsien and Ya Lan (the latter, at least, a Mongol name) who were bound with a party to "summon and persuade" the country of Ma-pa-erh (according to Hirth and Rockhill, an area on the Coramandel coast of India called "Ma'bar").<sup>78</sup>

The harbor from which the party departed was no doubt in the vicinity of Ch'uan-chou, at that time a flourishing trade port in the southeastern part of present-day Fukien province.<sup>79</sup> The precise date of their departure is not clear but it was probably in October or early November to allow them to pick up the northeast monsoon. In any case, when the party sailed past Champa, sometime in November, 1282, they were all taken prisoner by the Chams (passage No. 3).

This turn of events would not be surprising, for the assertive policy of the Mongols in Champa in 1281 had already aroused the hostility of that state, and even before the Chams captured Ho Tzu-chi and his party the Mongol Court had decided to dispatch forces to control dissidents in Champa. On July 16, 1282, just one day before Ho Tzu-chi was ordered to proceed to Sukhothai, we note in the "Annals of Shih Tsu" in the *Yuan Shih* that "Champa, previously

---

the name Sien-lo (Hsien-lo) was also applied by the Chinese to these [Sukhothaj] people". The point is too involved to deal with here, but it will suffice to note that the term "Hsien-lo" resulted from a fusion of the kingdoms of Sukhothaj and Lo-hu 羅斛 around 1349. The term does not occur in the history of the Mongol dynasty, the *Yuan Shih*. Briggs, in a later work, (1951), 241, discussed Sukhothaj-Mongol relations, apparently basing himself on either Maspero or Pelliot, but in any case he confused the events of 1282-83 in asserting that envoys coming from Hsien were captured by the Chams. He apparently misread the French of one or the other of the above authors.

78) F. Hirth and W.W. Rockhill, *Chau Ju-Kua* (New York, 1966), 277. I have intentionally refrained from further complicating this brief review with conjectures on place names and their locations.

79) Sugimoto, (1959), 7-8.



submitted, has revolted . . ." On that same day Shih Tsu ordered an expedition against the Chams.<sup>80</sup>

Thus, by the time Ho Tzu-chi's party sailed past Champa, the latter was already in a state of virtual war with the Mongols and for this reason the Chinese emissaries were taken prisoner and used as hostages or pawns in the struggle with the Mongol army, which departed for Champa in December, 1282.

As Maspero noted in 1928, the capture of Ho Tzu-chi's party was merely another reason for the Mongol dispatch of troops; it was not the basic cause (despite a passage in the *Yuan Shih* suggesting this). In any case, the dispatch of Mongol forces and the initial Mongol victories over the Chams proved fatal to the innocent emissaries. They were sacrificed one by one as the battle went against the Chams in February, 1283.<sup>81</sup>

Thus the Mongol-initiated attempt to make contact with Sukhothai in 1282 ended in failure owing to the intervention of the Chams.

If Mongol-Sukhothai relations do not go back to 1282, as so often asserted, then to what date are we to ascribe the opening of relations between the two countries? Passage No. 6 above from the *Yuan Shih* would seem to provide the answer. From this notice we learn that a person dispatched by the Kwangtung Circuit's Pacification Office (*hsuan-wei-ssu* 宣慰司) arrived in the capital city of the Mongols (Khanbaliq or Tai-tu 大都) bearing the golden missive proffered by the Chief of the kingdom of Hsien, or Sukhothai.<sup>82</sup>

80) 元史本紀世祖卷 12, (至元 19 年 6 月戊戌), folio 6, verso (26785).

81) For the basic account of these events, see the citations to the "Ching-shih ta-tien" and the *Yuan Shih* in note 40 above.

82) Although there are some problems remaining in the unswerving identification of the Chinese place name "Hsien" 暹 with the Thai state of Sukhothaj, the present paper is of course premised on the validity of that identification as made by, *inter alia*, Pelliot, (1904), 235, ff, accepted by Maspero, (1928), loc. cit., and by Luce, (1958), loc. cit., and confirmed by the independent research of Sugimoto, (1955) and (1957) on the basis of Chinese sources not used by the above writers.

According to this entry, the person who reached the Mongol capital on November 26, 1292, was not the Sukhothai emissary who (presumably) brought the golden missive to China. It was, rather, a Chinese person dispatched from the Pacification Office in Kwangtung Circuit. Yet it seems safe to assume that the Sukhothai emissary, who only went as far as Kwangtung, also arrived there sometime in the year 1292 since the Chinese messenger forwarding his missive arrived in the capital city in November of that year.<sup>83</sup> The first documented contact between the two states, therefore, must be ascribed to the year 1292, when an emissary from Sukhothai brought a "golden missive" as far as Kwangtung.

It seems safe to infer that the Sukhothai contact made with Mongol China on this occasion did not constitute a formal act of submission. First of all, the Chinese term used to describe the 1292 communication was "ts'e" meaning simply "book" or "missive" (in this case it was a "golden missive").<sup>84</sup> It was not a "piao" 表 which was the more usual form of communication between a tributary state and the Emperor of China. The former term carries no special connotations of vassalage or submission; the latter term is constantly used in the dynastic histories to describe written documents from foreign countries indicating their "submission" to the Celestial Court, or to enumerate their tribute goods.

The fact that Sukhothai's missive was sent up to the Mongol capital via a bearer from the Kwangtung Circuit rather than being

83) Luce, (1958), 140; Sugimoto, (1959), 8-9. The latter notes that the Chinese record of this event (cf. passage No. 6 above) was originally made in the central offices of the Mongol capital (Tai-tu) and thus almost certainly the date November 26, 1292, represents the date on which the Chinese messenger from the Kwangtung Pacification Office brought Sukhothaj's golden missive to the northern capital, and not the date on which the Sukhothaj emissary arrived at Kwangtung with it.

84) The fact that missives from Sukhothaj and other Thai states addressed to the Court of China were often in what the Chinese called "goldlettering" calls to mind the Thai use of the yellow resin, gamboge, (Thai : roṅ ๓๓) for writing on locally-made books of black paper in former times. The physical appearance and actual contents of these missives (*piao*) should be further researched. Some possibilities in this respect are suggested by Paul Pelliot, (1904), 241, note 5, and 262, note 1.

taken there personally by a Sukhothai emissary also suggests that this was perhaps more in the nature of a preliminary communication than a formal act of submission in accordance with Chinese protocol.

The most convincing piece of evidence for the fact that Sukhothai had not yet in 1292 made the formal act of submission comes in passage No. 7 translated above, where it is stated that a Chinese emissary was ordered to proceed to "summon and persuade" Sukhothai on June 4, 1293. This too implies that the "golden missive" of 1292 did not yet carry a formal act of submission.

It is tempting to speculate on the contents of the communication of 1292—the first documented one between the state of Sukhothai and the Mongol Empire. It should be stressed, however, that the Chinese records we now possess do not afford us sufficient data to make very meaningful conjectures about this or about the issues that might have prompted it. There are no grounds in the Chinese sources, for example, for the suggestion made by L.P. Briggs that the ruler of Sukhothai was hostile to the idea of submitting to China.<sup>85</sup>

The only issue that might have been outstanding between the two states prior to the actual submission of Sukhothai, and about which we have some evidence, was the presence in Sukhothai around 1283 of a Sung Dynasty loyalist, one Ch'en I-chung 陳宜中. The standard dynastic history of the Sung, the *Sung Shih* 宋史 (completed in 1345) carries a biography of Ch'en which recounts his flight from the Kwangtung region to avoid the victorious Mongol armies (1277). Subsequently, the dispatch of Mongol forces to Champa in 1282-83 impelled Ch'en, an ex-prime minister under the Sung, to flee again, this time to Sukhothai (*Hsien*), probably in the company of a few other Sung loyalists. His biography notes that he later died in Sukhothai but it gives no date for this.

The details on Ch'en's flight to Champa and then to Sukhothai around 1283 as carried in the *Sung Shih* (compiled by Mongol scholars

---

85) Briggs, (1951), 242, implies such hostility in asserting that "Rama Khamheng refused to accept" the advice of Chinese emissaries sent to him in 1293. He cites no authority for this statement. There are no grounds in Chinese or Thai records for it.

under the last of the Mongol Emperors) indicate that the Mongols were aware of this Sung loyalist's presence in Sukhothai. The Mongols may have been especially interested in Sukhothai for this reason.<sup>86</sup>

Turning now to passage No. 9 above, it should be noted that the repetition of the order to "summon and persuade" Sukhothai (i.e., its "Kamaraten") does not imply that the latter state had rejected or refused the earlier summons of 1293 (passage No. 7 above). For any one of a number of reasons Sukhothai may not yet have been able to respond to the 1293 order—if it ever reached her, which, given the communications problems of the day is problematical. It may well be too that the order to "summon and persuade" was reiterated because of the death of Shih Tsu (February 18, 1294) and the accession of the new Emperor, Ch'eng Tsung (May 10, 1294).<sup>87</sup> Ch'eng Tsung may simply have been affirming his own intent to carry on the forceful policies of his predecessor in regard to the regions of South-east Asia.

---

86) For Ch'en I-chung's biography, including an account of the events noted in the text, see 宋史列傳卷418, 陳宜中傳 folio 19, recto and verso. Ch'en's flight to Sukhothaj (Hsien) and his death there are also noted in another Yuan Dynasty work of unknown date and authorship, the "San-ch'ao yeh-shih" 三朝野史. See 說庫, 28冊, 三朝野史 folio 3, verso. There are a number of interesting problems connected with this source which cannot be dealt with here but two points should be mentioned. Firstly, the compound "Hsien-lo" 暹羅 which occurs in this source is obviously an anachronism, rendered by a later copyist. Secondly, since it is an anachronism, it should not be used to establish the date of this source. The most suggestive point in this respect is the fact that the last date that occurs in this very short work is 1282 (and not 1279 as per Herbert Franke in Beasley and Pulleyblank, 1961, 125). It was probably compiled shortly thereafter. If this is true, the reference to Sukhothaj in this work would be the earliest mention of that state in Chinese records that we now possess, possibly antedating the *Chen-la feng-t'u-chi* 真臘風土記 of Chou Ta-kuan.

87) On the death of Shih Tsu, see 元史本紀世祖卷17, (至元31年正月癸酉), folio 23, verso (26859). Wood, (1933), 55, misdates his death; Hoontrakul (1953), 103, incorrectly has Wu Tsung succeeding Shih Tsu.

Passing to a further point concerning passage No. 9, Professor Sugimoto has suggested that the order of August 18, 1294, concerning the necessity for the ruler or other key hostages from Sukhothai to come to court, may have been entrusted to the emissary of the "Kamarateṅ" of Petchaburi (Pi-ch'a-pu-li) who had arrived at the court on a tribute mission the previous month (passage No. 8). In so theorising, Sugimoto implies, of course, that the "Kamarateṅ" of Petchaburi was not the same person as that of Sukhothai, and also that the Mongols knew that Petchaburi was a vassal state of Sukhothai and in a position to transmit the Imperial orders to the latter.<sup>88</sup>

Sugimoto further suggests that the Mongol Court, having had as yet no response to the summons of August 18, 1294 (sent via the the Petchaburi envoy), thereupon in early 1295 dispatched another emissary to Sukhothai (as suggested by passage No. 11). Then shortly after the latter mission left for Sukhothai, the latter country, unaware that a mission was on its way from China, sent an envoy in response to the summons of August, 1294 (sent via Petchaburi). Sometime in the year 1295 this Sukhothai envoy presented to the Mongol Court Sukhothai's gold-lettered tributary missive, symbolising the latter state's submission as a formal tribute state (passage No. 10).

From the point of view of present documentation, the gold-lettered tributary missive (*chin-tzu-piao*) of 1295 figures as the first formal indication of Sukhothai's submission to China as a vassal state (if the "chin-ts'e" of 1292 is excluded as formal evidence of submission). The great gaps in the documentation, however, and the utter absence of reliable evidence from the Thai side preclude any definite determination in these matters.

According to passage No. 10 above, the Sukhothai emissary who presented the gold-lettered tributary missive of 1295 also asked that the Mongols send an emissary to Sukhothai. Professor Sugimoto

88) Sugimoto, (1959), 11-12. Coedès, (1968), 205 takes passage No. 8 as evidence that the Kamarateṅ of Petchaburi is identical with Raamkam-heeṅ, the Kamarateṅ of Sukhothaj. See the argument in Sugimoto, (1955), 563 ff, against this.

has explained this in connection with passage No. 8, and the possibility that the August 18, 1294 summons to Sukhothai may have been entrusted to the envoy from Petchaburi. He speculates that the Sukhothai request for a Chinese emissary might have indicated a desire on the part of Sukhothai that its affairs with the Mongol court not be handled through or entrusted to emissaries from the vassal state of Petchaburi but rather should be handled directly by Chinese representatives sent to Sukhothai.<sup>89</sup>

Whatever the validity of this, it is clear that the Sukhothai envoy who bore the gold-lettered tributary missive of 1295 was unaware the Mongols had just sent an emissary to his country. He was therefore given a present and hastily sent back in order to overtake the Mongol mission then on its way to Sukhothai, and another party of Chinese was ordered to accompany him.

This seems to be the best explanation for the rather confusing series of events recounted in this passage.

Professor Sugimoto also conjectures that the state of Sukhothai was anxious to have a Mongol mission sent to its country because it desired to use the authority of the Mongols in settling the long-standing unrest between their country and Ma-li-yu-erh. We learn from the Sukhothai section ("Hsien-chuan") of the *Yuan Shih* (passage No. 12) that by 1295 both these countries had submitted and that the Mongols thus ordered Sukhothai not to harm the Ma-li-yu-erh and to "keep to their promise". Whatever the precise nature of the undertaking Sukhothai had given the Mongols, it must have been given sometime between 1292 and 1295. Judging from the fact that four years later, in 1299, emissaries from both Sukhothai and Mo-la-yu (variant orthography for Ma-li-yu-erh) arrived at the Mongol Court together, we may conclude that China's authority in the affair was to some extent effective (cf. passage No. 14).<sup>90</sup>

Passages Nos. 8 and 9 above cover the year 1294, and obviously make no mention nor do they imply that the ruler of Sukhothai visited the Mongol Court in that year, as W.A.R. Wood and others

---

89) Cf. Sugimoto, (1959) 12.

90) *Ibid.*

have asserted.<sup>91</sup> In seeking the source for Wood's assertions the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya" must be absolved, for as the translation above shows, it gives no specific dates for the visit to China of "Phra Ruaṅ". On the contrary, Wood's source was, as his citation shows, Damron's 1914 study alluded to earlier.<sup>92</sup> The latter, in turn, used as the basis for his discussion of the events of 1294 Phra Ceenciin's translations from the Chinese, and it is the latter's work that again lies at the root of much subsequent confusion on the problem.

Phra Ceenciin's 1909 translation attempted to render a passage from the *Hsu-t'ung-chih* of 1767 (cf. Section II above) which in turn exactly reproduced a notice in the *Yuan Shih* translated herein as passage No. 9.<sup>93</sup> But according to Phra Ceenciin's translation, the King of Hsien, the "Kamaratenṅ", visited the Court of the Mongols in 1294 and was told by the Emperor Ch'eng Tsung: "If you consider that we enjoy friendly relations, send your sons or officials here as hostages."<sup>94</sup>

91) Wood, (1933), 55; Hoontrakul, (1953), 103; Hsieh, (1949), 45. The latter quotes extensively from the *Yuan Shih* on Sukhoothaj-Mongol relations but still makes the categorical statement that Raamkamhēṅ had an audience at the Yuan Court in 1294 (ibid., 45). He qualifies this somewhat in note 3, P. 56, however: "Some say that Raamkamhēṅ twice went as far as Kwangtung but did not obtain audience in Peking . . ." He does not further identify the source of this statement, but on P. 175 Hsieh again states that Raamkamhēṅ twice had an audience at the Mongol Court. He repeated these assertions in the revised edition of his work, (1953), 48, 61 and 205.

92) That is, his introduction to the PPCPH, (1952). Cf. note 24 above. Landon, (1941), 4, and Skinner, (1962), 383, erroneously attribute to the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya" (which neither apparently saw) the assertion that "Phra Ruaṅ" (i.e., Raamkamhēṅ) went to China specifically in 1294 and again in 1300. In fact, as our translation of the pertinent passage shows, the "Phonṣaawadaan Nya" provides no specific dates for the legendary visit of Phra Ruaṅ to China.

93) The passage in the *Hsu-t'ung-chih* which Phra Ceenciin attempted to render into Thai is located in 欽定續通志第1冊卷62, 元紀6, 成宗1, 志3631 (for edition cited here cf. the bibliography).

94) CRPSC (1964), 12. A footnote added by the Krom Sinlapaakkoon กรมศิลปากร to this 1964 edition of Phra Ceenciin's work recognised the latter's mistranslation and provided a new one which agrees with mine (passage No. 9).

Prince Damron's study, based on this erroneous translation, also flatly stated that the King of Siam went to China in 1294.<sup>95</sup> W.A.R. Wood accepted this and added wistfully that he wished the King (Raamkamheeng, according to him) had kept a diary.<sup>96</sup>

If there is no evidence in the Chinese chronicles for a royal visit to China in 1294, what then of an alleged visit—a "second visit", which Wood specifically dated in 1300? Again we know that the Thai legends provide no such specific dates. On the Chinese side, the *Yuan Shih's* only notice for 1300 on Sukhothai is passage No. 17 above, wherein it is stated that persons from Sukhothai, Java, Champa and other places, totalling 22 in all, arrived at the court, were given presents and sent back. If the King of Sukhothai did arrive in that year he would have had to have an embarrassingly small retinue, and did not even merit mention by the Chinese chroniclers.<sup>97</sup> This would be all the more curious in that these chroniclers did record the presence at court in 1299 of the Heir Apparent of that very King: perhaps the best evidence that the latter was never there.

The *Yuan Shih's* passage No. 14 above is very clear on the presence of the Heir Apparent, that is, the eldest son of the ruler of Sukhothai at court in 1299, for it is noted that Emperor Ch'eng Tsung presented him with a Tiger Talisman in that year. This in itself is of interest to historians and has not been widely noted, but there is certainly no mention that the King of Sukhothai himself was at the Mongol Court with his son. The presence of his son there was no

95) PPCPH, (1952), 142-43. Prince Damrong added that the evidence of the "Phongsawadaan Nya" regarding the Sukhothai King's visit to China must therefore be credited. In 1939 correspondence with Prince Narid, Damrong still maintained this on the basis of Phra Ceenciin's work. See *Saan Somded*, สำนัสมเด็จ, เล่ม 16 (Bangkok, 1962), 199 ff, esp. 202-203. In other respects his discussion here was very instructive on the subject of Siam's tribute relations with China.

96) Wood, (1933), 55; see also Hoontrakul, (1953), 103; Hsieh, (1949), 45; Buss, (1966), 535, et al.

97) *Contra* Wood, (1933), 55. Hsieh, (1949), 275, declares that Raamkamheeng went to China in 1299 and brought back pottery-makers. His source for this is apparently Wood's work. There are no grounds in the Chinese sources for such assertions.



doubt in response to the Imperial summons of 1294 or a similar one later calling for important hostages from Sukhothai.<sup>98</sup>

There is, in the *Yuan Shih*, one passage that might lead an over-zealous researcher to conclude that the King of Sukhothai was at the Mongol Court. This is passage No. 15, which relates, however, to 1299 rather than 1300, and indicates that sometime in 1299 the sovereign of Sukhothai presented a petition to the Mongol Court. The question is, did he present the petition there in person?

There is nothing in the wording of passage No. 15 which necessarily implies that the King himself was present at the Mongol Court. The evidence, on the contrary, indicates that he was surely not. In view of the fairly detailed records on the Chinese side concerning Sukhothai-Mongol relations in these years, including notices on the presence of the King's son at Khanbaliq, it is significant that there is no mention of the presence there of the King, either in the "Chuan" or the "Annals" sections of the *Yuan Shih*.

How then are we to interpret passage No. 15, which begins, "The Chief of the country of Hsien presented a petition..."? The interpretation of Professor Sugimoto seems as plausible as any: the King of Sukhothai's petition for horses, etc., was probably conveyed to the Mongol Court by his son. We know that the latter was there in February, 1299, and since the notice concerning the petition does not indicate when during the year 1299 it was presented, it could very well have been, and in fact most probably was presented by the Heir Apparent.<sup>99</sup>

Returning now to the question of Wood's source for the assertion of a royal visit to China in 1300, we discover that, as in previous cases, the ultimate root of the confusion was Phra Ceenciin's 1909

98) If we accept the standard chronology of reigns for Sukhothaj kings, as found, for example in Hall, (1964), 886, this Heir Apparent must have been the person who later became King Læthaj, believed to have succeeded Raamkamhæŋ. See also the discussion below on the date of Raamkamhæŋ's death and the identity of his successor.

99) Sugimoto, (1959), 12-13. Hsieh, (1949), 56, note 3 notes correctly that passage No. 15 (above) does not necessarily imply that the King of Sukhothaj was present at the Mongol Court in that year.

translations, as accepted in 1914 by Prince Damrong and then taken up and embellished slightly by Wood himself. In Phra Ceenciin's translation it is asserted that in 1300 the King of Hsien went to the Mongol Court and had an audience with the Emperor.<sup>100</sup> This was apparently an unsuccessful attempt to render a passage in the *Hsu-t'ung-chih* which partially reproduced an earlier passage from the *Yuan Shih* (passage No. 17 above). As the reader can see it makes no reference to the King of Sukhothai.<sup>101</sup>

Passage No. 15, dated 1299, is important in another respect. It may throw new light on the death of the ruler of Sukhothai, Raamkamheen, and on the identity of his successor. The problem of dating Raamkamheen's demise has stirred some controversy among Thai and Western scholars in recent years and deserves, therefore, brief mention here.<sup>102</sup>

According to the long-accepted chronology of Sukhothai reigns, King Raamkamheen died around the year 1317, having been on the throne since about 1277 or 1278: a reign of some forty years.<sup>103</sup> If we were to accept this standard chronology (as Coedès has done as late as 1968), we would have to conclude that the words "Chief of the country of Hsien..." in passage No. 15 above refer to King Raamkamheen, who would have been on the throne at that time (1299). Assuming that this was so, then the words of the petition described

100) Phra Ceenciin: CRPSC, (1964), 13; Damrong: PPCPH, (1952), 143; Wood: (1933), 55. Sugimoto, (1959) 14-15, gives an erroneous view of Wood's sources in his critique of the latter's book. Sugimoto was unaware of the Thai literature (including Phra Ceenciin's work) discussed herein.

101) The passage mistranslated by Phra Ceenciin is in 欽定續通志第1冊, 卷62, 元紀6, 成宗, 志3634. It omitted the last four characters 賜衣遺之 of the original *Yuan Shih* passage (No. 17 herein).

102) For this controversy among Thai scholars see SBSS, (1964), esp. 176-90. This work is indispensable for the study of Sukhothai history. See also Coedès, (1968), 218-19 and notes.

103) The standard authority for this dating was apparently Prince Damrong, PPCPH, (1952), 143 ff (his 1919 essay on pre-Ajudthajaa history). Coedès, (1968), 219 accepted it and cited Damrong's work. See also the dynastic lists in Hall, (1964), 886, and Hsieh, (1949), 31, both of which reflect this dating.

in this passage must be attributed to him as the ruler of Sukhothai. Therefore the allusion "... when his father reigned ..." would refer to the father of Raamkamheey. The language of the *Yuan Shih* is quite straightforward in this regard: assuming Raamkamheey as the ruler of Sukhothai at this point, there can be no other interpretation.

The established facts concerning Sukhothai-Mongol relations are, however, utterly at odds with this interpretation.<sup>104</sup>

We know from the famous Raamkamheey inscription (Krom Sinlapaakon Inscription No. I) that Raamkamheey's father was Khun Sii Intharaathid ขุนศรีอินทราทิตย์. The dates of his reign are uncertain but there is no doubt that it began in the first half of the 13th century. He was succeeded by another son (according to the same inscription) named Baan Myan บานเมือง, an elder brother of Raamkamheey. We lack specific dates for Baan Myan's reign as well but in any case we learn from the same inscription that he was then succeeded by Raamkamheey.<sup>105</sup> As noted above, this was probably in the late 1270's.

The point of all this is that the words ... "when his father reigned ..." in passage No. 15 above could not possibly refer to the father of Raamkamheey for in the early 13th century in the reign of Intharaathid China was not yet in contact with Sukhothai. The Mongols had not yet entrenched themselves in China and their Court was certainly not, at that time, bestowing white horses and other marks of favor on any ruler of Sukhothai.

We have the option, therefore, of either rejecting the evidence of the *Yuan Shih* as unreliable or of accepting it and its implications. Considerable effort has already been expended in this paper in esta-

<sup>104</sup>) I first became aware of the ramifications of passage No. 15 for the dating of Raamkamheey's demise through the reading some years ago of Professor Sugimoto's work, (1959), esp. 12-13. The arguments and conclusions that follow, however, differ from his in that he ultimately rejected the evidence of the 1299 entry on the grounds that it was a scribe's or copyist's error. This was pure conjecture, however, and had he been aware of the evidence from the Thai side discussed below Professor Sugimoto would no doubt have credited the 1299 entry.

<sup>105</sup>) See Krom Sinlapaakon (compiler), *Prachum Silaacaaryg paag thii nyi*, (3rd Edition, 1957), ก-ข (details on site and description of Inscription No. I); 1-12 (text and commentary on it).

blishing that the *Yuan Shih* is in fact a very reliable source of historical information and the point need not be labored any further. Clearly the only sensible option is to accept the passage and what it says at face value.

In recognising the *prima facie* implications of this passage we thereby admit that (1) Sukhothai-Mongol relations began in the reign of Raamkamheen, probably around 1292, as discussed earlier; (2) Raamkamheen had subsequently received white horses, etc., from the Mongol Court; (3) Raamkamheen had died or otherwise relinquished the throne of Sukhothai by the time the petition in question was presented—1299; (4) a son of Raamkamheen had succeeded him to the throne by the time the petition was presented and this son was in fact the author of it; (5) it was the Heir Apparent to this latter ruler who was present in the Mongol capital of Tai-tu in 1299, as recounted in passage 14 above. All of this is implicit in passage No. 15 if it is taken at face value, and there would appear to be no other way to construe it.

This interpretation implies, of course, a revision in the date of Raamkamheen's demise, or at least the date at which his reign ended. It also carries certain other ramifications which have made it a subject of some controversy in recent years and have caused it to be rejected by some who prefer the more traditional chronology for Sukhothai reigns.

George Coedès recently opposed this interpretation, as did several Thai scholars.<sup>106</sup> Their grounds for so doing were diverse. Some of the Thai scholars argued against it on the grounds that Phra Ceenciin's information relative to a 1300 visit of Raamkamheen to the Mongol capital was historically accurate: a confusion that has already been dealt with earlier in this paper.<sup>107</sup> Another objection shared by both the Thai scholars and Coedès was, however, that if Raam-

106) See Coedès, (1968), 218-19 and notes 2 and 3, in which he cites Damroy's old essay on events prior to the founding of Ajudthajaa as authority for his position. For the objections of some Thai scholars, see the report by M.R.W. Sumonnachaad Sawaddikun ม.ร.ว. สุนันทาธิ์ สวัสดิ์กุล in SBSS, (1964), 183 ff, esp. the exchanges beginning on 189.

107) SBSS, (1964), 184-85, *inter al.*

kamh   's son, L   haj       , succeeded him in 1298 or 1299, his reign would have spanned an excessively long period of time—48 or 49 years—since the beginning of the next reign, that of Lithaj       is fairly well established at 1348. We possess no epigraphic or other evidence to justify acceptance of such a long reign.<sup>108</sup>

This reasoning, which apparently derives ultimately from Prince Damrong, is obviously premised on the validity of the accepted chronology which makes L   haj the only ruler between Raamkamh    and Lithaj.<sup>109</sup> Were this indeed the case, then L   haj's reign would assuredly appear to be excessively long (though not, it should be recalled, impossibly so), particularly since we have no traces of it. The *Yuan Shih* passage (No. 15) discussed above would then appear to be of doubtful reliability.

A recent epigraphic find in the area of old Sukhothai appears to confirm the evidence of the *Yuan Shih* in an indirect, but nonetheless significant manner.

In 1952 an inscription (Krom Sinlapaakoon No. VIII,B) was discovered near the Phra Mahaathaad Temple             in old Sukhothai. Written in the Thai language and apparently dated 1392, it carried a list of some of the kings of Sukhothai and it provided the names of sovereigns not carried on hitherto-accepted lists. In addition to the name of L   haj, which was already known, it listed two other names, apparently of kings (the point is disputed) who came after Raamkamh    and before Lithaj.<sup>110</sup>

108) Coed  s, (1968), 218-19; SBSS, (1964), 186. These were not the only arguments offered against the earlier date for Raamkamh   's death but seem to me to be the principal ones.

109) Cf. references in note 103 above.

110) Krom Sinlapaakoon (compiler), *Prachum Silaacaaryg paag thii ny  *, 91-3 (for details on the location and description of Inscription No. VIII, B) and 127 (for the portion of the original text carrying names of the rulers in question). One of the objections to including some of the newcomers (including Sajsongkhraam) to the dynastic lists was that the term "phrajaa" which preceded all the known kings listed in the inscription, was not affixed to the names of some of them, thus suggesting that they were perhaps not kings. Although Sajsongkhraam's name on the inscription was not preceded by the honorific "Puu Phrajaa", this designation did precede the name of   uanamthom. Thus even if Sajsongkhraam were ruled out for this reason, two rulers, L   haj and   uanamthom still remain to fill the gap between the 1298 death of Raamkamh    and 1348, thus rendering the evidence in the *Yuan Shih* still plausible. Cf. SBSS, (1964), 194-95

Again in 1960, in an important seminar on Sukhothai history held in Thailand, Nai Tri Amatayakul นายตรี อมาตย์กุล, one of his country's leading authorities on early Thai history, indicated that he was aware of the purport and ramifications of the *Yuan Shih* evidence translated above as passage No. 15 (though he misdated it 1300 rather than 1299). He also argued that it demonstrated that Raamkamheen died long before the traditionally accepted 1317 or 1318. In so doing he suggested that the 1952 inscription (No. VII, B) of Phra Mahaa-thad Temple corroborated the Chinese evidence and necessitated a change in the accepted chronology and the insertion of two additional rulers after Raamkamheen's demise in 1299 and before the reign of Lithaj in 1348: Sajsonkhraam, then Læthaj (already accepted), and then another newcomer, quanamthom. This would provide a total of three rather than one ruler for this long span of time between 1299 and 1348.<sup>112</sup>

111) See his "Thai Beach-head States in the 11th-12th Centuries", reprinted from *Silapkon Journal*, I, Nos. 3 (September, 1957) and 4 (November, 1957), esp. 8 and 15. This scholar also took part in the seminar on Sukhothaj history in 1960 of which SBSS, (1964) is the report, and he generally supported the point of view expressed in the present paper.

- 112) SBSS, (1964), 172-82 (for Nai Tri Amatayakul's paper delivered at the 1960 Seminar held at the site of old Sukhothaj), esp. 176-78 (on the dating of Raamkamhæŋ's reign and the implications of our passage No. 15 for Sukhothaj history). In *ibid.*, 182 appears his revised list of Sukhothaj kings, including the following relevant to the present paper: (3) Raamkamhæŋ : r. 1279-1300; (4) Sajsonkhraam : r. 1300-?; (5) Læøthaj : r. ?-?; (6) ŋuanamthom : r. ?-1348. As noted in the text, the passage (No. 15) in the *Yuan Shih* necessitates changing Raamkamhæŋ's death to 1298, and accordingly Sajsonkhraam's accession to that year or early 1299.

definitive judgment of the chronology in question. It would appear, however, that, when the *Yuan Shih* evidence is properly understood, and when the evidence from the Thai side is integrated with it, Mssrs. Sukhabanij and Tri Amatayakul have a fairly firm case for revising the accepted dynastic lists.

One final possible implication from the *Yuan Shih* should be pointed out in this regard. It is not impossible that it was one of the changes of reign, perhaps the death of Sajsonkhraam and the accession of Læthaj, that occasioned the dispatch of a tributary missive (*piao* 表) to the Mongol Court in 1319 from Sukhothai. This could have been a typical reaffirmation of tributary status occasioned by the accession of a new vassal ruler. This is, it should be emphasised, pure speculation, of course.

The remaining passages in the *Yuan Shih* do not require any further comment in a bibliographic review of this kind. The remarks that have been offered have by no means dealt with all the historical implications of the materials discussed herein. Such was not the aim of this paper. It is hoped that the foregoing will merely serve to remove some of the many misconceptions regarding Sukhothai-Mongol relations that still abound in textbooks and diverse studies on medieval Southeast Asian history.

## KEY TO ABBREVIATED CITATIONS\*

- ARJ, (1959): 平凡社, アジア歴史事典 (Tokyo, 1959).
- Beasley and Pulleyblank, (1961): W.G. Beasley and E.G. Pulleyblank (ed.), *Historians of China and Japan* (London, 1961).
- BEFEO : *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* (Hanoi).
- Bowring, (1857): Sir John Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam*, (London, 1857), 2 vols.
- Briggs, (1949): L.P. Briggs, "The Appearance and Historical Usage of the Terms Tai, Thai, Siamese and Laos", *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXIX, No. 2 (1949), 60-73.
- Briggs, (1951): *The Ancient Khmer Empire*, (Philadelphia, 1951).
- Buss, (1966): Claude Buss, *sub verbo* "Sukhothai" in *Encyclopedia Britannica*, XXI, (1966).
- Coedès, (1920): George Coedès, "Les Origines de la dynastie de Sukhodaya", *Journal Asiatique*, XV, (April-June, 1920), 233-45.
- Coedès, (1968): *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, (Honolulu, 1968).
- CRPSC, (1964): จดหมายเหตุ เรื่องพระราชาไมตรีระหว่างกรุงสยามกับกรุงจีน และนิราศพระยามหาเทพไปเมืองจีน (Bangkok, 1964).
- CRPT, (1920): จุลยุทธการวงศ์ ผูก ๒ เรื่องพงษาวดารไทยของสมเด็จพระวันรัตน์วัดพระเชตุพนในรัชกาลที่ ๑ ทั้งอรรถและแปล (Bangkok, 1920).
- Dubs, (1946): H.H. Dubs, "The Reliability of Chinese Histories", *Far Eastern Quarterly*, VI, No. 1 (1946), 23-43.
- Gunji, (1942): 郡司喜一, 十七世紀に於ける日泰關係 (Tokyo, 1942).
- Hall, (1964): D.G.E. Hall, *A History of Southeast Asia*, Second Edition, (London, 1964).
- Hoontrakul, (1953): L. Hoontrakul, *The Historical Records of the Siamese-Chinese Relations* [sic] (Bangkok, 1953).
- Hsieh, (1949): 謝猶榮, 暹羅國志 (Bangkok, 1949).
- Hsieh, (1953): 新編暹羅國志 (Bangkok, 1953).
- Hsu-t'ung-chih: 欽定續通志 (商務印書館 edition, Shanghai, 1937).
- Ichimura, (1943): 市村瓚次郎, 支那史研究 (Tokyo, 1943).
- Ichimura, (1939-50): 東洋史統 4 vols., (Tokyo, 1939-50).
- Ishida, (1945): 石田幹之助, 南海に關する支那史料 (Tokyo, 1945).
- Landon, (1941): K.P. Landon, *The Chinese in Thailand* (New York, 1941).
- Ling Ch'un-sheng, (1958): 凌純聲等著, 中泰文化論集 (Taipei, 1958).
- Luce, (1958): G.H. Luce, "The early Syam in Burma's History", *JSS*, XLVI, Part 2, (November, 1958), 123-214.

---

\* This list does not include works already cited in full in the notes.



- Luce, (1959): "The Early Syam in Burma's History-A Supplement", JSS, XLVII, Part 1, (June, 1959), 59-101.
- Maspero, (1928): Georges Maspero, *Le Royaume de Champa*, (Paris et Bruxelles, 1928).
- Naito, (1949): 内藤虎次郎, 支那史學史 (Tokyo, 1949).
- Pallegoix, (1854): Monsignor Pallegoix, *Description du Royaume Thai ou Siam*, (Paris, 1854).
- Pelliot, (1904): P. Pelliot, "Deux Itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle", BEFEO, IV, (1904), 131-385.
- Pelliot, (1951): *Mémoires sur les Coûtures du Cambodge de Tcheou Ta-Kouan*, Version nouvelle suivie d'un commentaire inachevé, (Paris, 1951).
- PP, (1963): ประชุมพงศาวดารเล่ม ๑ (ประชุมพงศาวดารภาค ๑ ตอนต้น) (Bangkok, 1963).
- PPCPH, (1952): พระราชพงศาวดารฉบับพระราชหัตถเลขาเล่ม ๑ ตอน ๑ (Bangkok, 1952).
- SBSS, (1964): คำบรรยายสำเนาโบราณคดีสมัยกรุงสุโขทัย พ.ศ. ๒๕๐๓ (Bangkok, 1964).
- Schweigsuth, (1951): P. Schweigsuth, *Étude sur la Littérature Siamoise*, (Paris, 1951).
- "San-ch'ao yeh-shih": "三朝野史", 吳興玉編輯, 說庫, 第二十八冊 (Shanghai, 1915).
- Skinner, (1962): G.W. Skinner, *Chinese Society in Thailand: An Analytical History*, (Ithaca, 1962).
- Sugimoto, (1955): 杉本直次郎, "シアムの建國にかゝる問題點," 廣島大學文學部紀要, VII, No. 3 (1955).
- Sugimoto, (1957): "暹の位置問題の再吟味東方學 No. 14, (July, 1957).
- Sugimoto, (1959): "暹國と中國との交渉," 南方史研究, No. 1, (1959).
- Sung Shih: 百衲本二十四史宋史, 商務印書館, (Shanghai, 1927-37).
- TRD: 平凡社, 東洋歴史大典 (Tokyo, 1938).
- Wenk, (1962): Klaus Wenk, "Prächum Phongsāwadān: Ein Beitrag zur Bibliographie der thailändischen historischen Quellen," *Oriens Extremus*, Year 9, Part 2 (December 1962), 232-57.
- Wood, (1933): W.A.R. Wood, *A History of Siam*, Revised Edition, (Bangkok, 1933).
- Yuan Shih: 百衲本二十四史元史商務印書館 (Shanghai, 1927-1937).
- Yuan-wen-lei: 蘇天爵編, 元文類, 商務印書館 (Shanghai, 1936).

