

Robert B. Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks Including a Translation of Traditions of Royal Lineage in Siam by King Chulalongkorn* (Data Paper: Number 81, Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, June 1971), ix, 147 pp.

The title of the present Data Paper is certain to excite the interest of historians of Southeast Asia, for, as Prof. Jones remarks in his Introduction, "A thorough description of the elite hierarchies would seem to be a necessity for any comprehensive understanding of the social and political institutions of a nation . . . but as yet no very complete understanding . . . has been forthcoming . . ." (p. 1). As part of the reason for this lack of knowledge, Prof. Jones mentions that "Thai sources of information have not been easy to find" (p. 1).

Now the problems posed in Southeast Asian studies by the lack of sources are well known, but it seems to me that before definitely attributing gaps in our knowledge to such lack, scholars should first do everything possible to extract information from the sources which are known. In the case of Thai ranks and titles we have a voluminous raw source in the 1805 compilation of Thai laws for which, unfortunately, "The best discussion has been that of Wales" (p. 1), who too often resorted to speculation and *a priori* assumptions rather than clear analysis of his sources.

As it is presented, the work under consideration here could lead one to expect something going beyond the work of Wales and providing at least a preliminary treatment of the problems involved in study of the titles contained in the laws, chronicles and inscriptions; and readers are therefore warned not to expect a new study of Thai ranks and titles complementing and improving on Wales' *Ancient Siamese Government and Administration*. What Prof. Jones' book provides, and what would have been a better title is, "Text and Translation of 'Traditions of Royal Lineage in Siam by King Chulalongkorn' Including Some Comments on Thai Titles and Ranks". It touches only lightly on some of the stickier problems in the history of Thai titles and administration, such as the idea that, "the Palatine Law of King Trailokkanat was derived largely from the Khmer system" (p. 2), and that "most of the Khmer titles for the mandarinat had been borrowed and adjusted until they were

operating in the same relative hierarchy in Thailand as they did in Cambodia" (p. 3).

This question of Khmer influence is a subject which I particularly wish to discuss, but first a few remarks need to be made about King Chulalongkorn's essay, composed in 1878.

The essay, which forms the major portion of Prof. Jones' book, is concerned with Thai royal titles as they were used in the 19th century, and its purpose, as Prof. Jones suggests (p. 5) was clearly, it seems to me, related to the shift of power from nobility to royalty and the Front Palace Incident of 1874. It should perhaps also be related to the birth in 1878 of King Chulalongkorn's first *câwfââ* son, Vajirunhis, whom according to Prince Chula Chakrabongse, he intended to make his heir in spite of the existence of an *uparâja*¹ (Jones' ?*upârââd*).

As the reader will observe, most of the essay is devoted to the exaltation of *câwfââ* princes and the setting up of hierarchies among them and other royal relatives which are nowhere justified in the traditional law texts and in many cases are specifically tailored for the living relatives of King Chulalongkorn. As a result King Chulalongkorn's cousin and *uparâja*, by birth belonged in a category far down the list, obviously too low to be entitled to the position into which he had been thrust at the insistence of King Chulalongkorn's regent.

Although the 19th-century system had been much modified, King Chulalongkorn referred nevertheless to the *Palatine Law* as authority, but treated its provisions in an interesting way, by saying that "In that law *câw* (royalty) are divided into four ranks" (p. 11). As Prof. Jones' note 3 makes clear, the law lists five ranks, and the one King Chulalongkorn omitted was the second, that of *uparâja*, reflecting, I should say, his preoccupations with contemporary conflicts among members of the royal family.

Transcription: Unless otherwise specified I shall follow, as nearly as the limitations of typesetting permit, the transcriptions used by Prof. Jones, except for well-known names.

- 1) This is based on Prince Chula Chakrabongse's statement that Vajirunhis "was created Crown Prince . . . an entirely new position and an unprecedented step seeing that the Uparaja was still alive . . ." (*Lords of Life*, p. 221-2), although the official proclamation to this effect only came in 1886 after the Uparaja's death.

King Chulalongkorn cited the *Palatine Law* further as "Evidence of the antiquity of the ranks of the royal family" (p. 11), but, with the exception of *uparāja* which he chose to ignore, none of the four royal titles in question are found anywhere else in the laws or chronicles and thus were probably not commonly used by Thai royalty. King Chulalongkorn was of course aware of this and offered a partial explanation in noting that "In time the rank of *sōmdèd nò phráphúthácáw* completely disappeared" because "kings seldom had a supreme queen with rank higher than the others" (p. 17).

An alternative explanation is that the *Palatine Law*, at whatever date it was first composed,² represented, like King Chulalongkorn's own essay, the situation of one particular royal family rather than a general statement about the ranking of royal children.

Another example of King Chulalongkorn's attempt to reconcile contemporary practice with confusing statements in the laws is his discussion of *cāwfáá*. The statement that, "According to the *Palatine Law* there were only two kinds of *cāwfáá*" (p. 15) is not quite accurate, for nowhere in the *Palatine Law* is the term *cāwfáá* mentioned. In fact, in the whole corpus of laws dated before the reign of King Rama I, I have found *cāwfáá* only once, used for King Naresuon in the *Law on Treason*, article 68, IV, p. 156.

As Prof. Jones states in his Introduction (p. 3), it is generally believed that *cāwfáá* was brought into Siam from Burma, or at least from the Burmese Shan states, since the term itself is Thai rather than Burmese; but King Chulalongkorn's remarks on the shift in meaning of the title (p. 15), and Prof. Jones' comment on the same subject (p. 3), are speculation, there being no precise evidence on the matter. King Chulalongkorn's problem was to reconcile the contemporary fact of

2) References to the law texts are from the 5-volume set published by *khuru saphū*, copied from the *Lingat* edition, and thus preserving the original orthography. The citations will be by volume (roman numerals) and page. The *Palatine Law*, I, 69-159, is dated 720, which if *cula* era, would mean 1358 A.D. Quaritch Wales, *Ancient Siamese Government and Administration*, pp. 19, 22, following Prince Damrong, said the date should be 1458, or 820 *cula*. David Wyatt, "The Thai 'Kaṭa Maṅḍiarapala' and Malacca", *JSS* LV (2), July 1967, pp. 279-286, identifies this date as *culāmaṅḍi* era which would make it equivalent to 1468 A.D.

câwfâá being the highest rank for royal children, a belief that the title had originally meant a ruler or at least a provincial viceroy, and the statement of the *Palatine Law* implying that only princes of the third and fourth ranks were sent out to govern provinces and were thereby *câwfâá*. The reader should be aware that His Majesty's remarks are of unquestionable accuracy only in so far as they concern the 19th century situation and that the historical parts of sections 9-12 are speculative and may or may not be true.

In section 20 (p. 23) the details on *krom* ranks and dignity of *câwfâá* are taken from the *Law of the Civil Hierarchy* which, we should note, although dating, in the conventional view, from the same reign as the *Palatine Law*,³ gives quite a different picture of royal ranks, and again King Chulalongkorn has interpolated details from 19th-century actuality. Thus, for example, the law says nothing about *câwfâá* or *phrá ? oŋcâw*. but rather calls the king's highest ranking younger brother *phrá ? anuchathirat* instead of *phrácâw nŋŋjaathæcâwfâá*, and does not indicate that the differences in rank among brothers, sons and grandsons corresponded to the 19th-century use of *câwfâá* and *phrá ? oŋcâw*.

The intention of the text as a description of the royal family at a specific time comes through clearly in the remaining sections devoted to the ranking of its members (up to p. 67), particularly with respect to some of the lower ranks, apparently devised for the children of specific individuals. We may note with interest that King Chulalongkorn's Prince of the Front Palace, in this system, would have been merely a *worawoŋthæ*, fourth class (section 58, p. 57), and thus only in the 14th rank of all *phrá ? oŋcâw*, far below the seven levels of *câwfâá*.

In the remainder of the essay devoted to the *krom* ranks of princes, order of precedence, and ranks of women, the reader should still be aware that its value is as a description of 19th century practice, and

3) The date in the preamble of this law is 1298, which would normally be construed as *śaka* era, equivalent to 1376 A.D. However, there is certainly an error, for the animal year is off by 6 years. Quaritch Wales, op. cit., pp. 22, 34, followed Prince Damrong in assuming the date should be one equal to A.D. 1454 in the reign of King Trailokkanat. Phipat Sukhatit, in "sakaraat culāmaŋī", *Silpākron* 6 (5), Jan. 1963, pp. 47-57, p. 56, said the date intended must have been 1278, which he assumed to be in the *culāmaŋī* era, thus equivalent to 1466 A.D.

that the historical details are largely speculative and need to be checked against the laws and chronicles. The system of *krom* ranks, for example, is nowhere set out in the old laws and the history of its development is not at all clear.

In addition to text and translation of King Chulalongkorn's essay, Prof. Jones' volume also includes a section on "Development of Royal Titles" and sections on other types of titles, such as "nobility", which contain historical remarks and comments on the relationships between Thai titles and those of neighboring countries, chiefly Cambodia. It is on these sections that I wish to introduce several observations.

For the history of the titles Prof. Jones notes his indebtedness to Prince Damrong who consecrated "a few all too brief statements" to the subject (p. 115). In fact the brief statements are largely speculative and do not always fit the evidence of available documents. For instance, that "the first use of *câwfaû* in Thailand comes in the middle of the sixteenth century when... King Bayinnaung of Burma established Thammaraja as King of Siam with the Shan title of *câwfáá*" (pp. 115-116), is not borne out by the chronicles, in which Thammaraja is given titles of traditional Thai type. Neither are there any laws of his reign in which the title *câwfáá* might be found, and the first use seems to be that which I cited above, for King Naresuon. Perhaps Prince Damrong was influenced by a Burmese source, but that would merely reflect Burmese usage rather than titles actually used in Ayutthaya. Of course, the reigns of Thammaraja and Naresuon are the most likely periods to look for Burmese influences, but since *câwfáá* is a Shan, that is Thai, title, it seems more likely that it had always been known to the Thai of Siam even if it has not been preserved in extant texts and inscriptions.

One would also like to see some specific references for the statements that King Thaisa "established that children of *câwfáá* princesses should also bear that same title by virtue of their mother's rank", thereby setting aside the rule of declining descent (p. 116), and that the title of *phrá ? oycâw* was established by King Petracha (p. 116), since such information is not to be found in the chronicles.

As for *mðmcâw* being introduced by King Barommokot and *mðmrâad-châwoŋ* by King Mongkut, both are listed in the *Law of the Civil Hierarchy*

dated 1298 (1376), but currently attributed to King Trailokkanat (1448-1488)⁴. Of course, since the extant edition of the laws dates only from 1805, *mōmcāw* could still have been introduced by King Barommokot, in which case we have evidence for a late interpolation into the law; and since in the law *māmra'adchāwoŋ* is mixed in with the *mahātēk*, it may have been an old title to which King Mongkut gave a new function.

Concerning the relationship with Khmer titles and practices, which is the subject of my remaining remarks, some introductory comment is necessary.

The conventional view for some time has been that the massive Khmer borrowings in Thai administrative and royal vocabulary result from an influx of Cambodian scholars and brahmans to Ayutthaya following the final conquest of Angkor by the Thai in 1431, the date given in the *hlvañ prasō'th* (*Luang Prasō't*) chronicle. The Khmer influences reaching Ayutthaya at that time were then formalized a score or so of years later in the administrative reforms of King Trailokkanat.

In the days when Prince Damrong was devoting his attention to the chronicles this explanation seemed to account for most of the facts, but such is no longer the case. Attention has been drawn in recent years to certain pieces of evidence showing that from pre-Angkorean times there were localities on territory which later formed the core of the Ayutthayan kingdom, using Khmer, and apparently independent of any polity in what was to be the Angkor Empire.⁵

This situation continued in certain places into Angkorean times as is proven by the inscription on the Buddha of Grahi and the 1167 inscription from Nakhon Sawan.⁶

Together with this long tradition of the local use of Khmer, parts of the Menam basin came under the direct control of Angkor—Lophburi under Suryavarman I (1006-1050), and probably the lower Menam basin and contiguous territory under Jayavarman VII (1181-1220).⁷

4) See note 3 above

5) G. Coedès, "Nouvelles Données Epigraphiques sur l'Histoire de l'Indochine Centrale", *Journal Asiatique* 246 (2) 1958, pp. 125-142, see 127-128.

6) Ibid; and *Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam*, deuxième partie, pp. 29-31.

7) Coedès, *Etats Hindouïsés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie*, 1964, pp. 252-3, 314, 320-321; and *Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam*, deuxième partie, pp. 21-31.

Even more interesting is that the early kingdom of Ayutthaya reserved an important place for the Khmer language which appears in the majority of original Ayutthayan documents preserved from before the 17th century.⁸

The logic imposed by these pieces of evidence is that Khmer influence in Ayutthayan language and administration does not have to be accounted for by borrowing from Angkor or the pre-Angkorean states of Cambodia proper, but may be due to a long, independent, local Khmer tradition; and that even if due to direct Angkorean influence the process was not necessarily contingent on a Thai conquest of Angkor in 1431 or at any other date, but could have resulted rather from the extension of Angkorean power into the Menam basin in the 11-13th centuries (It is interesting to note that recent writers on the subject who accept that King Trailokkanat instituted important reforms in the 1450's-1460's, and that these reforms were Khmer inspired, also accept Prof. O.W. Wolters' new reconstructions which place the final conquest of Angkor in 1389, nearly a half-century earlier than the hitherto accepted date, and yet fail to discuss whether the longer period between presumed initial cultural impact and resultant reforms is consonant with received views on King Trailokkanat's reforms or should force revision of our ideas about them. This is the sort of thing I had in mind when I introduced the term "scholastic involution" into an earlier review).⁹

-
- 8) Michael Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim : a Reinterpretation", *JSS* 61 (1), Jan. 1973. Ayutthayan inscriptions of this period are extremely rare. One which seems to have gone unnoticed is on the pedestal of a bodhisatva image currently believed to be one of a set cast by King Trailokkanat in 1458. See *sinlapakam samaay ayuthayaa*, published for National Children's Day, 2514, p. 65 and fig. 25. The inscription, which is not visible in the photograph, reads, in graphic transliteration, *anak jã brahm r̥si*, "he/the one/a person, as/who is a brahma rishi".
- 9) O. Wolters, "The Khmer King at Basan (1371-3) and the Restoration of the Cambodian Chronology During the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries", *Asia Major* 12, 1 (1966), pp. 44-89.
 Akin Rabibhadana, *The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period 1782-1873*, Data Paper 74, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, July 1969, see pp. 21, 27, n. 60, 190.
 David K. Wyatt, "The Abridged Royal Chronicle of Ayudhya of Prince Paramanuchitchinorot", *JSS* 61 (1), Jan. 1973, pp. 25-50. See pp. 33, n. 10; 34, n. 17; and Wyatt, *op. cit.*, note 2, above.
 Jones, n. 2.
 Hall, *A History of Southeast Asia*, pp. 130, 178-80, seems both to accept Wolters' view and yet maintain the date 1431, but does not repeat the suggestion that the reforms of Trailokkanat were a result.

In addition to the foregoing theoretical considerations of Khmer influence in Ayutthaya, a few pertinent facts relating to the possible connection between the Ayutthayan and Angkorean administrative systems require emphasis. As Prof. Jones noted (p. 115), the Angkorean administration and its titles have been insufficiently studied. In fact, we know next to nothing about Angkorean administration, not even having lists of titles comparable to the Thai laws of civil, military and provincial hierarchies.^{9a}

However, any student reasonably familiar with Ayutthayan titles and who has even casually leafed through the several volumes of *Inscriptions du Cambodge* and Coedès' other epigraphic studies should have been struck by the almost complete absence of similar titles in the two areas. Certain Angkorean royal titles were apparently adopted in Ayutthaya, but scholars have generally ignored them and they have not figured in any treatment of the subject.¹⁰ Mention of *vrah kralāhom* is found in Angkorean inscriptions, but its meaning is not certain.¹¹ The famous oath inscriptions of Suryavarman I contain long lists of *tamrvāc* (Thai *damruot*), whose function, aside from being somehow territorial, has not been determined.¹² Some Sanskrit titles such as *purohita*, *guru*, and *senāpati*, are found both at Angkor and Ayutthaya, but Sanskrit titles occur all over Southeast Asia as well as in India, and a case may be made for borrowing from one specific place to another only if the title is both identical and applied to the same function. The Khmer royal and sacred title, *kamraten*, which is hidden away in an odd place in the Ayutthayan laws,¹³ is also found in Sukhothai inscription no. 4, in the Grahī inscription, and in the 1167 inscription from Nakhon Sawan, and

9a) At the present time the best compilation of information, from inscriptions and secondary sources, relating to Angkorean administration and titles is, Sachchidanand Sahai, *Les Institutions Politiques et l'Organisation Administrative du Cambodge Ancien (VI-XIII siècles)*, where the reader familiar with Thai titles can easily see the great difference between the latter and Angkorean terminology.

10) These titles are *śrī śrīndra* and *jayavarmanadeva*. See Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim . . .", p. 69 and p. 57, n. 25.

11) Coedès variously treats the term as "l'aire du *homa*", "salle de l'oblation", "l'aire des oblations", and "nom de fonction". G. Coedès et P. Dupont, "Les Stèles de Sdok Kāk Thom, Phnom Sandak et Prāh Vihār", BEFEO 43 (1943-46) pp. 56-154, see pp. 107, n. 1; 118, n. 4; 144, n. 1; G. Coedès, "Stèle du Vāt Prāh Thāt de Tū'k Čha", *Inscriptions du Cambodge* V, pp. 222-228, see pp. 225, 228; and G. Coedès, "Stèle de Samrōh", IC IV, pp. 175-205. see p. 197.

12) George Coedès, "Études Cambodgiennes IX Le Serment des Fonctionnaires de Suryavarman I. BEFEO 13 (6), 1913, pp. 11-17; and Coedès, "Inscription du Gopura Oriental du Phimeānakas", *Inscriptions du Cambodge* III, pp. 205-214.

13) Laws I. 249. Six relatively low-ranking (*śakdiṇā* 600) officials in the Registrar's Department had the title *kuṃṛtaeṇ* (graphic) < *kamraten*.

is thus evidence for my contention that Khmer influence in Ayutthaya was independent of any presumed invasion and conquest of Angkor.

Apart from these few examples and possibly others which may appear when a list of Angkorean titles is eventually compiled, the great mass of the latter consists of terms which have no counterpart at all in Ayutthaya.

As a provisional conclusion we must admit that at the present time nothing may be said about Angkorean influence on the Ayutthayan administrative system at any time, pre- or post-Trailokkanat, but that preliminary observation of the material tends to indicate that very few titles were borrowed and that it is certainly mistaken to state that, "By this time [Trailokkanat] most of the titles of the Khmer mandarinat were in use in Thailand . . ." (p. 115).

It is likewise very risky to use post-Angkorean Cambodian evidence, as Prof. Jones did, to show Cambodian influence at Ayutthaya on the grounds that in "the latter part of the nineteenth century the Thai and Cambodian systems are very similar" and "Khmer influence on the Thai system thus seems clear". (pp. 2-3).

In fact, there is a nearly complete break in contemporary Cambodian source material between mid-14th century, the time of the last Angkorean inscriptions, and the 16th century when the so-called Modern Inscriptions of Angkor and a few other scattered texts begin to appear. These consist of short inscriptions at Angkor Vat in 1546 and 1564, then inscriptions at Angkor Vat and in Kompong Cham in 1566, some 30-odd inscriptions, a few of considerable length, at Angkor Vat dated from the end of the 16th century to 1747, plus a dozen or so inscriptions in other parts of the country.¹⁴ Other documents relevant for the study of Cambodian titles and administration are law texts, some apparently dating from the 17th century, and chronicles written in the 18th and 19th centuries.

14) G. Coedès, "Deux bas-reliefs tardifs d'Angkor Vat", *Journal Asiatique* 1962, pp. 235-243.

Jean Filliozat, "Une inscription Cambodgienne en Pāli et en Khmer de 1566 (K 82 Vatt Nagar)", *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Comptes Rendus des séances de l'année 1969 janvier-mars*, pp. 93-106.

silā carik nagar vatt (Inscriptions Modernes d'Angkor) 2^{ème} édition, Phnom Penh, Institut Bouddhique 1958.

As one would expect, the Khmer language changed significantly between Angkorean times and the 16th-17th centuries.¹⁵ What is less expected is evidence of an almost complete break in administrative traditions and even of toponymy. There is as much difference between the titles found in post-Angkorean material and those of Angkor as between the titles of Angkor and Ayutthaya, and the place-names found in post-Angkorean inscriptions are nearly all readily identifiable, while most of those from the Angkor period are still a mystery.

However, there is much similarity between post-Angkorean Cambodian titles and those of Ayutthaya, which together with clear linguistic borrowings from Thai to Khmer, seems to indicate that the similarities are due to Ayutthayan influence in post-16th century Cambodia rather than the other way around.

Specifically, with respect to Prof. Jones' remarks, the institution of *krom* was indeed known in Cambodia, and the word itself is Khmer, meaning "department, group, etc.", but in Prof. Jones' explanation (p. 117) information for Ayutthaya, Angkor and post-Angkorean Cambodia has been garbled. Part of the confusion is due to Prof. Jones' use of a phonemic transcription in which *krom* bears a superficial resemblance to Sanskrit *grāma*, "village". Graphic transliteration would have shown that Khmer *krom*, written form of the word pronounced *krom*, could not have derived from Sanskrit *grāma*, which, if it had been maintained in Khmer, would be pronounced today as *kream*. The Pali form, *gāma*, is however known in Khmer with the expected pronunciation, *keam*, although still written *gāma*, and is also found in Sukhothai inscriptions. Thus, Punnāgavarman, in his A.D. 1019 Sanskrit (not Khmer) inscription, founded a village (*grāma*), not a *krom*, and if *krom* in Ayutthaya really "functioned as villages" (p. 117), it is not because they had at one time been such. The relationship between Thai and Cambodian *krom*, like the whole subject of the administrative history of the area, must await detailed exploitation of the Angkorean inscriptions to this end.

15) Saveros Lewitz, "Textes en Khmer Moyen" BEFEO 57 (1970), see p. 102. For a description of some of the processes of change see Saveros Lewitz, "La Toponymie Khmer", BEFEO LIII (2), 377-450; see pp. 384-390; and for the post-Angkorean absorption of Thai influences Saveros Lewitz, "Recherches sur le Vocabulaire Cambodgien (III)", *Journal Asiatique* 1967, pp. 285-304; see 286-7.

Prof. Jones is also in error in attributing a Khmer origin to some of the Ayutthayan titles of nobility (p. 128). I shall comment on *phájaa* below. As for the rest, only *phra*?, old Khmer *vrah*, is of fairly certain Mon-Khmer origin. The titles *mỳyn* and *phan* are numerical terms belonging to several Thai languages. *Khũn* and *luan* are not known in Khmer titles until after Ayutthayan influence had permeated Cambodia, and although I have never seen any discussion of their origin, the latter seems always to have been treated by linguists as a Thai term, and the use of the former in Thai traditional histories as far afield as the Luang Prabang and Ahom chronicles seems to be fairly good evidence for it too being an old Thai term. The Luang Prabang chronicles, we will remember, place a long list of rulers entitled *khũn* in a more or less legendary period before the 14th century. The late date of the extant versions of these texts of course makes it impossible to completely exclude Khmer influence, but the use of *khũn* in the Ahom chronicles as the title of the two ancestors who first descended from heaven to become kings on earth shows conclusively, I think, that no Khmer borrowing is involved.¹⁶

The prefix *ṛḍḍg*, like *khũn* and *luan*, is only found in Cambodia in post-Angkorean times and is thus probably a borrowing from Ayutthaya. As for its origin, if it is not Thai, the logical place to look would be Burma, where the term, generally written *ok*, is used in official titles. For the sake of completeness we should note that one of the *ṛḍḍg* titles, *ṛḍḍg phájaa* (graphic *òk bañā*), has been omitted by Prof. Jones. It was given to the ministers of *khlan* and *van* in the *Law of the Civil Hierarchy* (I, 233, 237), and may thus have been at one time equivalent to *cāw phájaa*.

A certain amount of confusion occurs in Prof. Jones' treatment of *phájaa* and *phrájaa* and their compounds with *cāw* and *sōmdèd*. He considers *phájaa* to be a Khmer borrowing which replaced *khũn* as a title for Sukhothai kings (p. 3) and later became a title of nobility (p. 128). He also seems to think that *phájaa* is different from *phrájaa*, although his remarks on that point are not entirely clear to me (p. 128),

16) *Ahom Buranji*, translated and edited by Rai Sahib Golap Chandra Barua, Calcutta 1930, pp. 3-12.

and that the titles *câw phrájaa* and *sǝmdǝd câw phrájaa* came into existence in the late Ayutthaya period and the reign of King Taksin respectively (p. 127).

As I read the evidence *phájaa* and *phrájaa*, which are not found in Cambodia until the post-Angkor period and are thus probably due to Thai influence, represent two forms of a single title which has a long history, including the forms with *câw* and *sǝmdǝd*, in the Thai-Mon area. The evidence, which I cite in graphic form for clarity, is (1) the inscription of *văt braḥ yū'n*, no. 62 of the Thai corpus, which shows *brañā* as the title of three rulers of Chiang Mai; (2) Sukhothai inscriptions nos. 1,2,3,5,7,8,11,14,40,45, and perhaps others, using *brañā* as a king's title; (3) The use of *bañā* as a royal or noble title in a number of Mon inscriptions;¹⁷ (4) the law texts of 1805 which consistently show *cau bañā*, *bañā*, *ǝk bañā* (I. 224,229,237, for examples), and even contain a list like those of Jones (pp. 127-8) showing the titles without *ǝk* (?ǝg) and reading, *bañā*, *braḥ*, *hlvañ*, *khun*, *hmū'n*, *bǎn* (I. 314); (5) chronicle manuscripts of the 19th century which consistently use *bañā* for titles which in updated spelling, such as found in published editions of the Royal Autograph chronicle, are written with *brahyā* (Jones' *phrájaa*). I would thus suggest that we are faced with a single title generally written *bañā* by the Mon and in Ayutthaya, *brañā* in the north and at Sukhothai, and that in the later 19th century the unusual spelling *brahyā* (*phrájaa*) was officially adopted due to its conformity with contemporary pronunciation and perhaps also through a false etymology linking it with *braḥ* (*pra?*), old Khmer *vraḥ*. Two early exceptions to this pattern of regularity are inscription no. 9 with *braḥñā*, which in this case may be due to spelling conventions associated with the use of Khmer script, and no. 49 which has the modern form *brahyā* (*phrájaa*) and which is in other respects linguistically anomalous (see review of Sukhothai glossary in this issue).

As for the combined titles with *cau* and *samtec* (*câw*, *sǝmdǝd*), they are also attested as early as the 14th century. Specifically, but not

17) For the use of *bañā* in Mon see H.L. Shorto, *A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions*, "bañā"; "The Kyaikmaraw Inscription", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 21 (2) 1958, pp. 361-367; "The Dewatau Sotapan: A Mon Prototype of the 37 Nats" BSOAS 30 (1), 1967, pp. 127-141; "The 32 *Myos* in the Medieval Mon Kingdom", BSOAS 26 (3), 1963, pp. 572-591.

exclusively, *cau brañā* is found in inscription 8, dated between 1359 and 1370, referring to the ruling prince of a *mo'añ*; inscriptions 45 and 49 have *cau brañā/brahyā* "the grandson"; and in nos. 13 and 14 we find *cau brañā srīdharmāsokarāja*, possibly a local ruler. The Vat Pamok inscription, the "earliest documentation" for such a title of nobility (p. 127) has, in fact, *cau bañā*, not *cāw phrājaa*, and the Dutch record of 1622 (?) also shows this title in its transcribed form "Chaw peea" (Jones, p. 127). Prof. Jones has apparently misunderstood this last document. The title "Chaw peea" is not what "the editors have suggested", but is the title of the original text. The editors' suggestion, in a footnote, is that this individual was the same as the *braḥ glañ* designated in the laws as *òk bañā* (not *ʔògjaa*) [Laws I, p. 233], and the close correspondence of the remaining elements of the title in the laws and the letter shows that the identification is certain. The interesting feature about this letter is the evidence that *cau bañā* was in use as an official title before the time of Van Vliet and Loubère, who both mention *òk* titles, and that both types of title were used concurrently for a time before the latter became obsolete.

The higher-ranking title, *samtec cau brañā*, is given in inscription no. 40 to a person whom Griswold and Prasert believe to be King of Ayutthaya, and in a short inscription from Nan published by G. and P. the ruler of Nan in 1426 is also accorded this title.¹⁸

What may then have been the innovations of the Ayutthaya and Thonburi periods was to use these formerly royal titles, attested from the very beginning of recorded Thai history, as titles of nobility, thus illustrating very clearly the phenomenon to which Prof. Jones alluded in his remarks about the declining value of titles over time (pp. 3, 115).

18) Vat Pamok: A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Devices and Expedients Vat Pa Mok 1727 A.D.", *In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon*, pp. 147-220; see pp. 182, 185; and *prachum cotmai het samay ayuthaya phak 1*, p. 56.

The Dutch document: *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries* Vol. I, p. 131.

Inscription 40: "Epigraphic and Historical Studies no. 5", JSS 58 (1), Jan. 1970, pp. 89-114; see p. 92.

Nan inscription: "Epigraphic and Historical Studies no. 3", JSS 57 (1) Jan. 1969, pp. 57-108; see p. 105.

Along with his analysis of the development of titles Prof. Jones includes a description of the Thai and Cambodian rules for declining descent which is generally very clear and should prove very valuable for students in their first contacts with the subject. In the search for parallels in neighboring countries it would be useful to note, "Les titres et Grades Héréditaires à la Cour d'Annam", by A. Laborde, *Bulletin des Amis du Vieux Hué*, 7 (4), oct-nov 1920, pp. 385-405, which depicts a declining descent system almost exactly like that of the Thai court.

However, the comparison with the Cambodian royal family structure as set up by the edict of King Ang Duong may not be very meaningful, for the latter was very likely modelled on the Thai system, even including some Thai titles such as *cāw cōm*, and is even more theoretical, since between King Ang Eng (1779-1796), when the chronicles begin to provide rather full information on royal family unions, and King Sihanouk, no reigning king, with a single exception, took a wife who was already a princess by birth, and the highest rank for princes and princesses was in fact *prěah-qōη-mcah*, which, according to Bitard's article on the Ang Duong edict, would only have been given to children of wives lower than fourth rank. The sole recorded exception was King Norodom's union with Princess Snguon, daughter of Norodom's uncle, King Ang Chan, but no children of this princess, if any, were significant enough to have found a place in extant records. Norodom's brother Sisowath, long before he was king, married a half-sister, Princess Chongkolani, but both being of commoner mothers their own rank at the time was *prěah-qōη-mcah*, and their son Essarvong, direct ancestor of Sirik Matak, was therefore also only a *prěah-qōη-mcah*.

The case of Sihanouk's parents is not an exception either, for Suramarit at the time of his marriage was a *prěah-qōη-mcah* prince whose parents, half-siblings, were both *prěah-qōη-mcah* children of Norodom; and Princess Kossamak, although daughter of King Monivong, was still only a *prěah-qōη-mcah*. Sihanouk himself had at least three royal wives,

but all were of *prĕah-qəŋ-mcah* rank and his children have always been referred to as *prĕah-qəŋ-mcah*.¹⁹

As for the supposedly higher ranks for children of royal wives, they appear to have been given indiscriminately according to royal favor. In 1845, for example, Ang Duong gave two of his daughters, both of commoner mothers, the ranks, *səmdac-prĕah-rĕec-thiidaa prĕah mahaa ksatrei* and *səmdac-prĕah-rĕec-thiidaa prĕah srey vo ksatrei* respectively.²⁰

Thus, concerning the table on p. 124, there is really nothing in Cambodian practice which corresponds to Thai *cāwfāa*, and the title *səmdac* is not a separate rank, but an honorific title which may be granted to any *prĕah-qəŋ-mcah* as well as to commoners.

After the foregoing remarks it is only fair to note that the weak points of this data paper may be due to its presentation in a form differing considerably from the author's original intention. Judging from Prof. Wyatt's Foreword it was compiled first of all as a first-year study aid, and as such it is very good. I wish I had had something like it several years ago to facilitate the transition from Mary Haas' *Reader* to the *Phongsawadan Krung Ratanakosin*. Of undoubted value for this purpose, in addition to the main essay and its translation, are the very last sections (pp. 131-143) on "The Corps of Royal Pages", "The Ministries", "Military and Police Titles", "Rank Correlation of Titles", "Titles for Women", "The Inner Palace", and "Appendix: Royal Kin Terminology", some of which of course are pertinent only to the 20th century. If the data paper had been limited to this there would be no grounds for criticism.

19) This information comes from a variety of sources: J. Moura, *Le Royaume du Cambodge*; Eng Sot *ekasār mahā puras khmaer*, copied from the most recently compiled Cambodian Chronicle; the various Cambodian chronicle manuscripts in the Buddhist Institute, Phnom Penh; numerous published accounts of royal family activities in Cambodian language newspapers for the years 1945-1970; and Princesse P.P. Yukanthor, "Généalogies des Familles Princières du Cambodge", *France-Asie* no. 113, octobre 1955, pp. 248-258.

20) Eng Sot, *op. cit.*, p. 1074.

It is of less value, however, for the community of scholars working in Thai history, and I assume that this is the level for which data papers are intended. The late 19th century is a period for which there is relatively little mystery regarding titles and administration, and the remarks on historical explanation and relationships with neighboring countries, fields for which the current published material is woefully inadequate, nearly all require modification.

Of course Prof. Jones cannot be faulted for repeating the conventional wisdom in fields not his own, such as Angkorean administration, Cambodian titles, and their relationships to Thai systems, but colleagues on the Cornell faculty should have been able to warn him about the shaky foundations underlying some of the current assumptions. The Cornell Southeast Asia Program has also missed a chance to use its considerable resources of linguistic and historical talent in a collective effort toward a historical study of Thai titles and "elite hierarchies" for the whole Ayutthaya period. There is a serious need for this type of study, and a valuable beginning would be an index of all the occurrences of all titles in the laws, chronicles and inscriptions, something that would fill several data papers and would be of immense value to all students of Ayutthayan history.

Michael Vickery

School of Humanities,
Universiti Sains Malaysia,
Penang