

REVIEW ARTICLES

Jeremias van Vliet, *The Short History of the Kings of Siam*, translated by Leonard Andaya from a transcription by Miriam J. Verkuijl-van den Berg, edited by David K. Wyatt. Bangkok, The Siam Society, 1975 iv, 97 pp.

For a number of years historians concerned with early Ayutthaya have been aware that a chronicle version older than anything else extant had been compiled in Dutch by the early 17th-century V.O.C. representative in Ayutthaya, Jeremias van Vliet, and its publication has been eagerly awaited for light it might shed on points which remain obscure in other texts.

Now The Siam Society has provided in very attractive format a transcription of van Vliet's original text with an English translation and a certain number of notes on the historiographic problems of the text and its relationship to other sources.¹

Van Vliet's chronicle begins with a very interesting version of the history of the peninsula and lower Menam basin before the founding of Ayutthaya. Here van Vliet relates several stories which were current concerning the first king of Siam in ancient times—that he was a son of a Chinese emperor and had come to the peninsula about 2000 years before, that he was a brahman named Phrommathep, and that Siam was founded by the Buddha himself. A long time later, about 300 years before van Vliet's day, another son of a Chinese ruler, Chao Ui, arrived on the peninsula and became the Thao U Thong who founded Ayutthaya. His acts in accomplishing this are described in some detail. No absolute

1) In what follows I shall use "van Vliet" for the author and vV for the text. Proper names and royal titles will follow Wyatt's system of transcription except where etymology is to be emphasized, and there, as in quotations from Thai texts, the graphic system of transliteration will be used.

year dates are given, but tiger year, which may be assumed to represent the 1350-51 of other texts, is specified for the founding of the city. Thereafter the chronicle runs through the reigns of kings who may generally be recognized as those of the standard Ayutthayan chronicles² and ends in the period of Prasat Thong, in 1640. The text is generally very summarized and there are few political or military details before the time of King Maha Chakrapaththirat. Thereafter relations with Burma and Cambodia are reported quite fully, but with the details often confused. For the 17th century, the period which van Vliet knew from personal experience, there is a good deal of information which must represent his own research and which is also included in his other works.

Although the kings are the same as in the other chronicles, their reign periods are usually quite different from both of the major chronicle traditions. The textual material is also different, and this, together with its brevity for the first two hundred years, leads one to wonder whether van Vliet translated a Thai text or put together a history from disparate information he had collected from various informants.

Although the editor, Wyatt, felt that, "it is much too early to begin to assess the full value" of vV (p. 9), material is readily at hand to go much farther in this direction than he chose to do, and in fact should have done, in the present publication. I intend therefore, to use this occasion to compare "his [van Vliet's] version with that of the several versions of the Royal Chronicles of Ayudhya and other documents," (p. 9), in order to situate it much more firmly within the picture of Ayutthayan history such sources have provided.

-
- 2) These are the *Hlwañ praso'ñh/Luang Prasot* (LP) chronicle and a group which I shall refer to as the 1157 tradition (1157), consisting of a chronicle composed at that date, equivalent to A.D. 1795, and represented today by *Bāncādanumās* (P), and its direct descendents: the version of *Samtec brah bānrātn* (Wyatt's Phonnarat), the so-called British Museum version, the Bradley version, and The Royal Autograph Chronicle (RA), of which the edition to be cited here is the sixth, Chonburi, 2511 [1968].

Since Wyatt cites me as one of several persons who provided "assistance and advice" (p. i), the reader might legitimately feel that my comments should have been offered to the editor for inclusion rather than saved for a review, and therefore I must note briefly the extent to which I was involved.

In 1972 I found out that Wyatt was working on vV and I wrote to him for a copy of the translation in order to check it for information useful in my dissertation research. He very kindly sent me a copy of the typescript of the English translation, for which I am very grateful. At the time I was mainly interested in what vV had to say about Thai invasions of Cambodia, and finding that it provided no information about such before the time of Naresuan, I put it aside. My only suggestions to Wyatt at the time, as far as I remember, were that vV provided clinching evidence that the true title of the king known as Ekathotsarot had been Ramesuan and that vV's transcription of proper names and titles should be clearly indicated in the final publication. The typescript I received did not contain any of the Dutch text, or its version of titles, nor any editorial comment, none of which I saw until receiving a copy of the publication a couple of months ago. Neither did I study the whole of vV very closely until recently, when I saw some of its more obvious relationships with other texts, and in the meantime Wyatt had had access to a partial draft of my dissertation in which, although not discussing vV, I had treated the "invasion" of 1369 with respect to other sources and had described clearly the chronology of *Sāṅgītiyavaṇṣ*.³ Certain other of the comments I shall make below are based on material I have already published and which presumably would have come to Wyatt's attention.

The first comment required is a question of bibliography. In his "Abbreviations" on p. iv Wyatt has a note on LP in which he says that

- 3) *Sāṅgītiyavaṇṣ samtec brah vānarāṭṭn vāt brah jetuban nai rājakāl dī 1*, Bangkok 2466 (1923). This volume provides the original Pali text and a Thai translation in parallel columns. Coedès translated the Ayutthaya chronicle from another manuscript of *Sāṅgītiyavaṇṣ* in his "Une recension palie des annales d'Ayuthya," BEFEO Vol. XIV (3), 1914, pp. 1-31. There are some minor, but interesting differences in the two versions. *Sāṅgītiyavaṇṣ* proper will here be cited as S and Coedès' translation Sc.

the text published in PCSA⁴ is in the original spelling. As I pointed out in a review of that volume, not only does the text of PCSA not have the original spelling, but it is not even the original LP.⁵ It is another two-volume copy, probably that of King Taksin's reign which had already been identified by Prince Damrong.⁶ As far as I know, no published edition of LP preserves the original spelling, and curious readers may check out any copy to which they have access by comparing it with the plates of PCSA, which have been taken from the original.

Contrary to what Wyatt felt (pp. 6-10), the single major source for vV is very clear. It is the version of Ayutthayan history preserved today in S. The relationship is clearest in the chronological framework, which I present below in tabular form beginning with the foundation of Ayutthaya in the reign of U Thong, Ramathibodi I (vV's pre-Ayutthayan section belongs to other traditions and must be treated separately). The reign periods are totalled both by modern and traditional arithmetic, which I have explained earlier in a review of *Sinhanavajikumār*.⁷ Brackets indicate details for which vV, S, and Sc differ among themselves. Note that the first date of S, 1892 Buddhist Era, is incorrect, for tiger year *cula* era 712, equivalent to A.D. 1350-51, should be B.E. 1893 or 1894. For convenience the calculation of year dates is in A.D. beginning with 1351, which, since the date is near the end of the year, is the correct synchronism in this case for 712 tiger.⁸ The corresponding LP dates and periods are also provided for contrast.

4) *Parhjum cathmāyhetu sūmāy ayudhayā bhāg 1* [Collected documents of the Ayutthaya period part 1], Commission for the Publication of Historical, Cultural and Archeological Documents, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, 2510 [1967]. The LP text is on pp. 93-103.

5) In JSS Vol. LX (2), July 1972, pp. 319-329. See p. 325.

6) See Prince Damrong's introduction to LP in the various editions of *Prahjūm banśāvatār/Prachum Phongsawadan*, part 1.

7) "The Lion Prince and Related Remarks on Northern History," JSS, LXIV, 1 (Jan., 1976), p. 352, n. 64.

8) See Wyatt's comment, vV p. 58, n. 23, and his review of Prasert na Nagara, ผลงานค้นคว้าประวัติศาสตร์ไทย [Researches in Thai History], JSS Vol. LXIII (2), July 1975, p. 414.

<i>LP</i>	<i>Sāṅgīṭi/vV</i>	<i>modern/traditional</i>
712 tiger/1350-1	1892 tiger	1351
Rāmādhīpatī	Ramathibodi	
	19 years	1370/1369
731 cock/1369		
Rāmeṣuor	Rāmessaro/Ramesuan	
	3 years	1373/1371
732 dog/1370		
Param rājādhīrāj	gunlum baṅu/Khunluang	
	18 years Pha-ngua	1391/1388
750 dragon/1388		
Dòh lān	Suvāṇṇacāndolo/Thong Čhan	1391/1388
	7 days	
750 dragon/1388		
Rāmeṣuor	Rāmessaro/Ramesuan	+9 +6 [vV, mod.]
	9 years/6 years [vV, Sc]	1400/1396 1397
757 pig/1395		
Baṇā rām	Son of above/Phra Ram [vV]	
	3 years	1403/1398 1400
771 bull/1409		
Indarāja	Nagarindo/Nakhon In	
	20 years	1423/1417 1420
786 dragon/1424		
Param rājādhīrāj [II]	Paramarājā/Borommaracha	
	20 years Thibodi	1443/1436 1440
810 dragon/1448		
Param Trailok cau	Tilokanātho/Boromma-	
	20 years trailokanat	1463/1455 1460
825 goat/1463		
Trailok to Phitsanulok		
Param rāja in Ayutthaya		
850 monkey/1488	Indarāja/Intharacha	
Trailok died	37 years	1500/1491 1497

853 pig/1491

Param rājādhirāj died

Rāmādhīpati reigned Rāmādhīpati/Ramathibodi

38 years

1538/1528 1535

891 bull/1529

2072 bull [S, Sc]

Hnò buddhāṅkūr

Buddhāṅkūr/No Phutthangkun

5 years

1543/1532 1540

895 snake/1533

Son of above

Aṭṭhādhirāj-kumār/Wora-
ratsadathirat

5 months

1543/1532 1540

896 horse/1534

Jaiyarājādhirāj

Jayarājasi/Chaiyaracha

13 years

1556/1544 1553

908 horse/1546

Yòt fā

Yotta/Yot Chao

3 years

1559/1546 1556

910 monkey/1548

Khun jinarāj

Guṇ Jinarāj/Chinnarat

40 years/40 days

1559/1546 1556⁹

910 monkey/1548

Dhiarrāja, Mahā

cākrabarrtirāj

Dehrāj/Thianracha

16 years

1575/1561 1572

930 dragon/1568

Mahindrādhirāj

Mahind/Mahin

6 years/7 years [vV, Sc]

+6 +7

1581/1566 1579

931 snake/1569

Mahādharrmarājā-

dhirāj

Dharrmarājā/Mahathammaracha

22 years

1603/1587 1601

9) The "40 years" of S is an obvious scribal error due to the structure of the Pali phrase, thus:

Sc *cattāṭṭisa divasāni*, "forty days"

S *cattāṭṭisa vassāni*, "forty years."

952 tiger/1590	2134 tiger [S, Sc]	
Narāyṇ ¹⁰	Narissa/Naret Rachathirat	+20
	"a few years" + "a few years"	1623/1606 1621
	+15/28, 20 [vV], 15 [Sc]	
966 dragon/1604		
End of LP		
<i>Reconstructed¹¹</i>		
<i>true dates</i>		<i>traditional</i>
967 snake/1605	snake [S, Sc]	1606,
Ekādasāratha/	Rāmessaro/Ramesuan	+6 +7
Ekathotsarot	6 years/7 [Sc]	1611, 1612
[dog] 1610-11	dog [S, Sc]	
Drañ Dharrm/	Indarājā/Intharacha	
Song Tham	19 years	1629, 1630
[dragon] 1628-29	dragon [S, Sc]	
Jeṣṭharāja	Chettharacha	
	8 months	1629, 1630
[snake] 1629	snake [S, Sc]	
Adityasuravariś	Athit Surawong	
	38 days	1629, 1630
[snake] 1629	horse [1630 S, Sc]	
Prasat Thong	Sri Thammarachathirat	1629, 1630
Prāsād Dōñ	11 years at end of vV	

10) LP gives the name "Naray" to the king known in the other chronicles as *Naresuan*/Naresuan. In this case LP is probably in error, since Europeans less than a half century later were familiar with the name "Naret", which can derive from Naresuan, but not from Naray.

11) These dates have been reconstructed through the evidence supplied by 17th-century European writers, including van Vliet. See Wyatt's notes 113, 118, 119, 124, 128, 129. See also W.A.R. Wood, *A History of Siam*, pp. 160, nn. 1-3, 171.

It is quite clear now that vV, in its chronology, belongs to the tradition embodied in *Sāṅgītiyavaṇṣ*. With the exception of the reign of Naresuan its periodization always agrees with either S or Sc. This shows further that the 1789 *Sāṅgītiyavaṇṣ* is not an entirely original composition, but is based on a tradition already written down at least as early as the first half of the 17th century. Even in the case of Naresuan, vV's 28 years, which Wyatt seems to have treated as a typographical error, can be shown to fit the S pattern. This figure of 28 years appears in vV's heading for the section dealing with Naresuan's reign (p. 38), but in the English translation (p. 82) it has been "corrected" to 20, apparently to agree with vV's later statement that "he was king for twenty years" (p. 87). The passage in S has no definite statement about the length of this reign, but twice mentions periods of "only a few years," [ใน ๓ ปี] and then a further period of 15 years.¹² Since the next reign began in a snake year, and the correct snake year, 1605, is just 15 years from 2134/1590, the additional periods of "a few years" imply that the following snake year, 1617, is meant, and this is exactly 28 years, by traditional arithmetic, from 1590. These details show that the 28 years of vV is not a scribal error and that in this passage the text of S as we find it today existed essentially in the same form in van Vliet's time. The original writer probably did not intend his passage to be interpreted as 28 years, but rather envisaged the two periods of "only a few years" as included within the 15, which was the true length of Naresuan's reign, and is the interpretation adopted by Coedès.¹³ The contradictory statement about 20 years, which is also incorrect, was probably added by the compiler of S from another tradition.

A notable feature of the above chronologies is the multiple possibilities for calculation which they provide. There is the result provided by modern arithmetic, which was not used by the Thai, and is only of interest for the clues it gives concerning van Vliet's own calculations. Then there is the traditional calculation from the inserted BE date for Naresuan's reign, which, taking the true 15 years of Sc, results in the true date for the end of Song Tham's reign. The alternative

12) See S, pp. 385-386.

13) Coedès, Sc, pp. 21-22.

20-year reign period for Naresuan found in vV, if added to the previous reigns as given, also provides very nearly the correct date for the reign of Song Tham, depending on the choice made at those points where S and Sc offer different possibilities. The same results will be obtained by using the maximum reign lengths from the erroneous BE date at the beginning of S. Thus the one thing which all of these schemes have in common is the goal of making the cumulative reigns reach the true dates for the Song Tham-Prasat Thong period. This would seem to be proof that S and vV as we have them represent a written tradition compiled at that time and including older traditional dates and periods which had to be in error since they did not add up to known contemporary dates.

It is also worthwhile to note that in spite of the different reign periods, and in mid-15th century of different kings, the dates of S on the whole are very close to those of LP, much closer than the chronology of the *1157-RA* tradition. For the first five reigns S and LP are always within one year of each other. Then there is serious divergence, due partly to the unlikely circumstance that in S three kings in a row have reigns of precisely 20 years. However, Intharacha's 37 years in S brings the chronologies back together for the reign of Ramathibodi II and they remain no more than two years apart for several more reigns.

Wyatt did not notice these details, due to his use of modern arithmetic, which led him to calculate that the total of all the reigns from 1351 to 1640 came to 307 years, thereby pushing the terminal date logically up to an impossible 1658 and placing the Burmese conquest of Ayutthaya in 1579 rather than 1569 (p.8).

It would seem that van Vliet also worked with modern arithmetic, which may be the cause of some of the chronological confusion in the later reigns. The clearest evidence of this is in his statement about the first Siamese mission to Holland (p. 84). Van Vliet of course knew the correct date, 1607, but his modern arithmetic put that date in the reign of Naresuan, rather than that of Ekathotsarot-Ramesuan, where it belonged. From the reign of Song Tham-Intaracha van Vliet must have known the true dates and although he would have seen that the reign periods of his source eventually added up to an impossible total, he had no way to check them, and left them as they were.

Other examples of chronological confusion of events, the true dates of which are fairly certain, begin in the reign of Phra Thianracha, or King Maha Chakrapatthirat, and not all are due to van Vliet. For example (p. 74), it is implied that an attack on Ayutthaya by Patani (1563), the death of Thianracha (1568-9), and the death of the Burmese king (presumably Bayinnaung, 1581) all occurred within the same year. In this case the fault is probably not van Vliet's addition but confusion in the text from which he worked, and perhaps due to the circumstance that the Patani attack came in the same year as another Burmese invasion, and the deaths of the two kings, depending on the way the Thai records are read, could be interpreted as both having occurred in snake years, something which has more than once led to difficulties in the composition of chronicles.¹⁴

The next instance of such confusion may more easily be analyzed with reference to van Vliet's addition. Thus two Burmese attacks which seem to correspond to events dated elsewhere in about 1584¹⁵ bracket the death of the Burmese king (1581). For van Vliet, however, 1581 was only two years after the beginning of the reign of Maha Thammaracha, rather than twelve, and van Vliet has confused a Burmese pursuit of Naresuan after his incursion into Burma in 1584¹⁶ with one which may have occurred about one cycle earlier following Naresuan's escape from captivity in Burma, just over two years after the true date of the beginning of Maha Thammaracha's reign. But on this point see below, p. 113. In the Burmese attack of 1584 one of the leaders, according to vV, was Sarrathij, whom Wyatt hesitantly identified as Prince of Tharawaddy (pp. 78-9). There is no need for hesitation. In LP he is

14) See the LP entries for the years 925, 930 and 943. It is not clear from LP whether Maha Chakrapatthirat died at the end of 930 or the beginning of 931. The Burmese chronicle says it was 931, which, like 943, when Bayinnaung died, was a snake year. See *Relationship With Burma-Part I*, The Siam Society, 1959, p. 59.

15) The LP entry for 946, and *Relationship*, pp. 126-128. The dates differ by one year in the two accounts,

16) *Ibid.*

called Savatti and leads the same attack, and the Burmese chronicle relates that he had been made ruler of Chiang Mai in 1578.¹⁷ LP, like vV, also mentions *bañā* Bassein as another leader in one of the same campaigns.

Van Vliet's responsibility for the next set of chronological errors, concerning Cambodia, is even clearer, and shows he was mixing information from some other source into his basic framework. Still in the reign of Maha Thammaracha, which for van Vliet ended in 1601, but for which the true date was 1590, vV mentions a Cambodian attack on Nakhon Ratchasima and yearly raids on the Siamese rivers. LP and the best Cambodian tradition seem to confirm that the former occurred in 1580 and the latter between 1575 and 1581.¹⁸ Then a punitive expedition was sent by the Thai, but it had to be called off due to the famous Burmese attack in which the Burmese Maha Uparacha was killed. The true date for this event was 1592.

Following this the great Thai invasion of Lovek of 1593-4 is described, although vV is in error in stating that the Cambodian king was captured, rather than his brother. Still in the reign of Maha Thammaracha vV includes the return of the Cambodian king (read his brother) to his throne, an event of 1601.

Due to this chronological squeezing in the text of vV the only clear political events of Naresuan's own reign are his campaigns in Burma between 1596 and 1605, plus a possible reference to a campaign in the second year of his reign, really 1592-93. There is also one more campaign into Cambodia which appears to correspond to events dated elsewhere to 1603,¹⁹ but which were not a revolt by the new Cambodian

17) *Relationship* p. 112.

18) A Cambodian attack overland is placed in 1580 by the *Nong* chronicle, for which the best published version is the Thai translation in *Prañjūm bāñśāvātār* [*Prachum Phongsawadan* (PP), part 1. See p. 200 of the Guru Sabbhā edition. Naval attacks are recorded in LP between 937 and 943.

19) These events are not absolutely clear in any source. They seem to be reflected in different ways in LP, date 965, *Nong* at the same date, p. 205, RA, pp. 208-209, where the date is one cycle too early, and in the fragmentary, but detailed, *Bāñśāvātār Lahvaek* [Chronicle of Lovek], PP, Guru Sabbhā edition, Vol. 44, pp. 274-275, where the date is 1605.

king as vV writes, but a conflict among Cambodian princes in which the Thai aided the one whom they had restored to the throne. Unexplainable though, as Wyatt remarks, is that Naresuan is said to have gone from Cambodia to conquer Champa, something which finds no support in any other source. Could it be that there is here confusion of events of the 1590's when the Cambodian prince Ream Choeung Prey, who ultimately drove the Thai forces out after the invasion of 1593-4, then sent a Cambodian army to conquer Champa?

As I remarked before, and as Wyatt also noted (p. 8), the chronological confusion shows that van Vliet had some other source for the true dates of many events. It should not be thought that vV may possibly preserve a more accurate account than the standard chronicles or that it will "assist in opening, and hopefully settling, the question of [the] validity" of the chronology in "the period immediately following the Burmese sack of Ayudhya in 1569" (p. 10). The true dates for wars with Burma and Cambodia in the latter half of the 16th century are fairly certain from the combined evidence of the Burmese, Cambodian and LP chronicles plus contemporary European writings,²⁰ and van Vliet must have tried to insert these events in a framework which his ignorance of traditional arithmetic, and perhaps also the basic text he used, had distorted. Another bit of evidence for his use of different sources is the double mention of Chiang Mai as "Jangoma" and "Tsieengh Maeij" (p. 86), the first the common term used by Europeans of the time, and the second which van Vliet would have taken from his written Thai source, perhaps not realizing they were the same place.

As to textual content, there is somewhat more difficulty in identifying van Vliet's sources than in the case of his chronology. Since the latter is the framework of S one could legitimately expect its textual

20) The chronicles are *Relationship*, LP, and *Nong*, cited above. The European evidence is *Les Voyages Advantureux de Fernand Mendez Pinto*, trans. by Bernard Figuier, Paris 1628; Reports from Europeans who were in Burma between 1569 and 1600 in *Publications of the Hakluyt Society*, Extra Series, Vol. X, pp. 110-217; letters of Diego Beloso and Blas Ruiz de Hernan Gonzalez, who participated in the Cambodian events of the 1590's, in Blair and Robertson, *The Phillipine Islands*, Vols. IX and XV,

matter to have influenced him, but in the last few reigns van Vliet clearly added much material in his own words and deriving from what he knew of recent events. In the early reigns, however, Wyatt's characterization (pp. 8-9) of vV's style is exactly that of S, although the latter is even more succinct. Thus, rarely does vV appear to be an exact translation of the extant S, and the text from which van Vliet worked must have been fuller. It is possible, however, to show that the model for vV was the S tradition, for both contain certain important textual diagnostic features which differentiate them from the other Ayutthayan chronicles, and vV's entries often include a nearly verbatim translation of the opening sentence of each S reign concerning the succession of the king and the length of his reign.

These features begin in the reign of Ramesuan, the second king, both the reign of U Thong and the pre-U Thong details of vV being quite different from S and probably deriving, as Wyatt remarks (p. 9,) from oral tradition. vV's first two sentences on Ramesuan, "The son of the dead king succeeded his father in the kingdom peacefully when he was thirty years old. He was called Phra Ramesuan," are almost verbatim for the corresponding passage in S. Wyatt remarks that, "no other source gives his age at accession," evidently having neglected to check S.²¹ vV in this way supplies the ages of all the kings, something which occurs only irregularly in S, but where they are to be found they agree with vV. This is more evidence that van Vliet probably worked from a more complete text of the S type.

Next is the name of the third king, *gun lum bahu* in S and *tJaeu Couloangh Phongh Wo-ae* (Čhao Khunluang Pha-ngua) in vV, a name not found in the two major Ayutthayan chronicle traditions.²²

Another correspondence is the name of the fourth king, Thong Čhan in vV, *Suvāṇṇacāṇḍ*, in S, whereas, as Wyatt notes, "The usual form of his name is Thong Lan."²³

21) vV, p. 60, n. 34; S, p. 374.

22) Readers familiar with RA hold your fire. I shall get back to this point later.

23) vV, p. 61, n. 38. Again RA is an exception.

The name of the seventh king is also common to vV and S. This is Nakhon In of Suphanburi who seized power in Ayutthaya. LP, as Wyatt remarks (n. 42), calls him Intharacha, as does the 1157 tradition, while the name "Nakhon In" is reserved in those texts for the Thai prince left to govern Angkor in the next reign. In this connection it should be noted that both vV and S ignore the invasion of Cambodia between 1384 and 1388 found in 1157 and RA and the conquest of Angkor recorded in 1431 by LP and 1421 by the long Ayutthayan chronicles.

For the following king the opening sentences of vV and S are nearly the same and both mention his personal name, Phrachao Sam (vV) or *samtec brah sām* (S) without referring to Chao Ai and Chao Yi and their duel.

The next diagnostic feature is the successor of Trailokanat, Intharacha, who does not figure as king in the LP and 1157 traditions. As Wyatt notes, the dating of this period "is confused and complex" (n. 47), and it is clear that vV and S are partners in one particular tradition.

After this vV includes more and more detail not found in S and which may come from quite different sources. S also has details, such as a summary after the first ten reigns, which may not have been in its own 17th-century ancestor. Nevertheless, there are still small clues showing the relationship between the two texts.

Thus the officials who killed the usurper, Khun Chinnarat, are called in vV *Okphra Thainam* and *Okluang Ratchayut*. In 1157 and RA the titles of these men are quite different, the two leaders being *Khun birendardeb* and *Khun indardeb*, but in S the first is called *vara udakahethaca*, which the Thai translator rendered as *brah dāy nām*.²⁴

In the reign of the king known as Thianracha or Maha Chakrapat, the text of S, which calls him *Dehasin* or *Deharājā*, may have contributed to some of the confusion which we have already noticed in vV. Thus

24) S, p. 380, line 12. Sc, p. 20, agrees with 1157 on these details. LP does not name these men at all.

his reign is said there to have begun in a monkey year, which is the LP date 910/1548, in disagreement with S's own chronology. Then the first event mentioned is in a pig year (LP 925/1563) when Burma invaded, and with this invasion the king's reign ends, as in vV, but with abdication, not death. There is no mention in S of the Patani attack or a Burmese king's death. Thus van Vliet could easily have been following a textual framework like the extant S, and the insertion of the Patani detail, which he probably obtained from elsewhere, could only fall at the end of the reign.

Although S has Maha Chakrapat become a monk, it does not bring him back, like the long chronicles, to replace his son Mahin for a second reign. S and vV thus agree with LP in giving Chakrapat and Mahin one reign apiece, although LP's periods are different.

In the next reign, of Mahathammaracha, there are more interesting correspondences. vV gives him the titles Phra Mahathammaracha Phrachao Song Queen, of which Wyatt seems not to have understood the last two terms (p. 77, n. 90). However, Song Queen should undoubtedly represent Song Khvae, "two river branches," the ancient name of Phitsanulok, Mahathammaracha's own principality.²⁵ Here S is extremely interesting, calling this king *dviratnonāma*, "named 'two jewels'", which the Thai translator rendered as "Brah Mahadharrmaraja received a name meaning, 'the king has two jewels'" (พระมหาธรรมราชาได้รับชื่อว่า พระองค์มีรัตนอยู่ ๒). This shows not only that vV's unusual features still belong to the S tradition, but that the extant S, in its chronicle, is not an original Pali composition, but a translation from an older Thai text. Thus its author misunderstood the old name for Phitsanulok, สอง แคว, "two river branches," as a scribal error for สอง แก้ว, "two jewels," and translated it that way in his Pali version, a circumstance which probably indicates that the old name was still current in the early 17th century,

25) For the relationship of Mahathammaracha to Phitsanulok see RA, pp. 75-76, 83, and A.B. Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 56. For Song Khvae, see Griswold, *Towards*, pp. 6, 37, 40, 56. And see S, p. 382.

but had been forgotten in the late 18th, to be rediscovered by modern research into the Sukhothai inscriptions.²⁶

Further comparison with the S treatment of Mahathammaracha's reign shows that vV's confusion in this period is at least partly due to the framework he took over from his model. First, vV devotes much attention to the story of Naresuan being held hostage for a time in Pegu following the war of 1569, a story not part of the two main Ayutthayan chronicles, or of the Burmese chronicle, although it is solidly rooted in Thai tradition.²⁷ This story is also found in S, where the famous duel with the Burmese Maha Uparacha comes immediately after Naresuan's escape when the Maha Uparacha leads a force to pursue him. This occurs, apparently, during the reign of Mahathammaracha. What is more likely to be the true story, since the better Ayutthayan chronicles, the Burmese chronicles, and European sources agree on it, is that the duel with the Maha Uparacha took place in 1592, in the beginning of Naresuan's own reign, but, according to the chronicles, the Maha Uparacha had led earlier campaigns into Siam in about 1584, 1585, and 1590.²⁸ Naresuan also, whether ever a hostage or not, in the major Ayutthayan chronicles led a campaign into Burma, up to a place called *graen*/Khraeng, and retreated under pursuit in 1584,²⁹ and it seems that these different campaigns have been confused in the tradition represented by S and vV. This confusion is also found in the two collections of "testimony" from the end of the Ayutthaya period,³⁰ where there is only one campaign led by the Maha Uparacha, and it is in order to pursue Naresuan after his escape.

26) The misunderstanding was especially easy when reading old-style mss., in which tone marks are often lacking and the letters *n* and *ṇ* may be very hard to distinguish.

27) See the two collections of "testimony" from the end of the Ayutthaya period, *Gāṃ hai kār jāw kruṇ kau* and *Gāṃ hai kār khun hwaṇ hā vāt*, Glāṇ vidayā, Bangkok, 2510, pp. 89-91, 299-304; Prince Damrong's commentary in RA, p. 365; W.A.R. Wood, *A History of Siam*, p. 128.

28) LP dates 946, 947, 952. *Relationship*, pp. 126-7, 135-6.

29) LP date 946. The Burmese chronicle says he tried to take Pegu, *Relationship*, p. 126.

30) *Gāṃ hai kār*, etc., op. cit., n. 27, above, pp. 89-94, 300-309.

vV also has only one campaign led by the Maha Uparacha, but, correctly, does not make the duel a result of Naresuan's escape and places it after several other Burmese campaigns. Where vV seems to confuse two campaigns is in the mention of Creng, probably the *graeñ* which Naresuan invaded in 1584, in connection with Nong Sarai and the battle with the Maha Uparacha.³¹

The campaigns in which the Prince of Tharawaddy figures are not found in S, but the paragraph of vV relating Naresuan's attacks on Pegu, its surroundings, and Müang Hang near the end of his reign is very close to the wording of S, even though vV has no mention of Toungoo.³²

The S account of Naresuan's major invasion of Cambodia is different from vV, and even more in error, relating that Naresuan killed the Cambodian king after defeating him in a naval battle.³³ The well-known true account is that the Cambodian king escaped to Laos while his brother was captured and taken to Ayutthaya.³⁴

For the remaining reigns, in which vV has much extra material, the significant details to compare with S are the royal titles, Ramesuan for Ekathotsarot, Intharacha for Song Tham, and Sri Thammarachathirat for Prasat Thong (in S *braḥ sṛī sudharmarāj*), all of which are missing from the standard chronicles.

It is safe to conclude, then, that vV belongs first of all to the same tradition as S, textually as well as chronologically, even though much other material has been added.

Although the chronology generally gives an impression of less reliability than the later LP, and the textual matter where it can be checked is frequently garbled, vV's sources nevertheless preserved certain genuine details of royal titles absent from later chronicles. The first example is in the titles attributed to U Thong after his founding of

31) Kreng, mentioned among Naresuan's conquests on pp. 86-87, is probably the same place. Modern maps show a River Gyaing, graphic *graiñ*, at the same approximate location.

32) vV, p. 86; S, p. 385.

33) S, pp. 384-385,

Ayutthaya. To illustrate the discussion I present them below (1) as they are given by vV, (2) as transcribed by Wyatt, (3) in my own version using Wyatt's phonetics, and (4) in a graphic transliteration of my reading as it would be in standard spelling and Thai script. For (1) and (2) see pp. 18 and 59.

- | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| (1) Somdit Pra | Raetsja | Rama tijbodij | srisoerin Thae borom |
| (2) Somdet Phra | Racha | Ramathibōdi | Sisurintha B̄romma |
| (3) Somdet Phra | Racha | Ramathibōdi | Srisurintha B̄romma |
| (4) samtec braḥ | rāja | rāmādhīpatī | śrīsrindra parama |
| (1) t'Jaccerae phad Thieraeija | ramisoon | d'harmamij Craij | dij t'siou |
| (2) čhakkaphat | Thianracha | Ramesuan | Thammikarat (thi) Čhao |
| (3) | chakraphatthiracha | Ramesuan | Tharmmikarat decho |
| (4) | cākṛabarttirāja | rāmeśvara | dharmmīkarāja tejo |
| (1) siaeij | baramma Thip | Thrij phova nadṭ thij Bis | Borroma Bophit |
| (2) Si Aiya | b̄rommathip | Siphuwanatthibet | B̄rommathibet |
| (3) chaya | barmmathip | Triphuvanathibet | B̄rommathibet |
| (4) | jayabarmmadeb | tribhūvanādhipeśa | paramapabitra |

Following this there is "Prae Thaeu Outongh" (Phra Thao U Thong), about which there is no controversy.

Wyatt's rendering seems to contain several anomalous, even improbable elements. All genuine titles of the 14th or 15th centuries consisted of elements which were meaningful in Sanskrit, Pali or one of the local languages, most often Khmer, and they fell into rather regular, recognizable patterns. Thus it is immediately clear that "Thian", "(thi)", "Si Aiya", and "Si" before "phuwanatthibet" are impossible, and if, in fact, van Vliet had intended them as such, it would have been because he misunderstood titles he had heard from an informant.

In the transcription I have proposed all the elements are meaningful and traditional. Among those subject to controversy, proof that van Vliet intended "Thier" in the way I have rendered it is to be found in the titles, among others, Woo-Rhae Rassae Thae Thieraya (p. 27), Prae Anoet Tsiae Thieraij (p. 43), and d'Harmae Raatsiae Thieraija (p. 49), which Wyatt respectively transcribed, just as I have proposed, W̄raratsadathirat (p. 70), Phra Anuchathirat (p. 87),

and Thammarachathirat (p. 94), and where "Thianracha" is certainly correct, as the personal name of the king more formally known as Maha Chakrapat, vV has uniquely Prae theen Nae Rhae Tsiae (pp. 29, 72). As for dij t'siou = tejo/decho, t's/ts is vV's usual way of rendering syllable initial ʂ, as in Tsieng May (เชียงใหม่), on p. 43, tsiaej for ໄຍ in Pratu Čhai (pp. 24, 66), and Prae Tsiĵ Tsieeugh for พระขี้เหล็ก (pp. 28, 71). There are also several other such examples. Where van Vliet clearly intended "Thi Čhao", as in the expression *braḥ buddhi cau* (พระพุทธเจ้า), he wrote Pra Probij dij t'Jacu, with t'J as his usual rendering of syllable initial ɰ (pp. 15, 55). For other examples see t'Jan for Čhan (จน) in the titles Phra Thong Čhan (p. 61) and t'Jacu for Čhao (เจ้า) in the title Čhao Ui (p. 55). He was not, however, perfectly consistent, and examples of the opposite usage can be found. As for siaej = *jaya* (ชัย), there is no other example of van Vliet transcribing ʂ by s, but since these titles as a whole are known from epigraphy, and only *jaya* is meaningful in this position, my proposal is still acceptable.

For what is particularly interesting about these titles is that they are found in inscriptions from the reigns of kings Trailokanat and Naray, but are entirely absent from extant chronicles, and have only recently been recognized as Ayutthayan.³⁵ Minor differences in the epigraphic examples are absence of *rāja* after *samtec braḥ*, addition of *adhīrāja* after *cākrabarttirāja*, and *āideba* affixed to *jayabarrmadeb*.

Wyatt's assertion to the contrary (p. 59, n. 28), if the written documents of van Vliet's day were in the same state as the chronicles extant today, he was perfectly justified in saying, "they were never assumed by any other Siamese kings" (p. 59). Some of the elements do, as Wyatt remarked, occur in various combinations in very many titles, but comparison is only meaningful when the same elements are found in the same order. Wyatt's citation of other examples from the laws is also curious. He refers to a new edition of the somewhat exotic

34) See the accounts of Beloso and Ruiz cited in n. 20, above, and B.P. Groslier, *Angkor et le Cambodge au XV^e siècle*, Chap. II.

35) Michael Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: A Reinterpretation." JSS LXI (1), January 1973, pp. 51-70.

Prince Ratburi edition,³⁶ rather than the more accurate Lingat edition reproduced by Guru Sabha,³⁷ and, in the examples he gives, the titles of Rama I (Chakri) and those of King Borommaracha II, do, in fact, bear formal resemblance to the vV, and Tenasserim, titles, but his choice of "Ekathotsarot's" titles as another example is inexplicable. The actual title of the passage he cites is *ekādadharaṭha*, which may not *a priori* be assumed a corruption of Ekathotsarot, and the date 1565/1643 shows that it is certainly not Ekathotsarot in the commonly accepted sense of that term.³⁸ Moreover, the only expressions identical to the vV titles are *samtec* and *paramapabitr*. The evidence of the laws is important though, for they do contain one nearly perfect, and other partial examples of the vV and Tenasserim titles, which help support, as I indicated elsewhere, the interpretation of these titles as Ayutthayan;³⁹ and the vV evidence is final proof, if any doubt still remained, that they were an old, eventually forgotten, Ayutthayan tradition. It is tempting to speculate that vV here preserves a contemporary datum and that these were the true titles of Ramathibodi I.

36) *Kaṭhmāy lem 1*, Brah cau paramvañśdhoe kram hlvañ rājpuri tirekḍdhi, Commemoration volume for the cremation of Baldo Ambar Śrījaiyyānt, 2513/1970, reprint of the second edition of 1902.

37) *Kaṭhmāy trā sām dvāñ*, Guru Sabhā 5 vols., numbered 1602-1606.

38) The only contemporary documents containing this type of title show that "Ekathotsarot" may be a corrupt form and the genuine title *Ekādaśaruda*. See A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Devices and Expedients Vat Pa Mok, 1727 A.D.," *In Memoriam to Phya Anuman Rajadhon*, Siam Society, 1970, pp. 149-150, and Prasarn Bunprakong, "The Royal Letters in Thai Language, Ayudhya Period," [in Thai], *Silpākḥon* IV (3), September 1960, pp. 43-54. In the laws *ekādadharaṭha* is the common form, being found eleven times against one for *ekādaśaratha*/Ekathotsarot. Furthermore, the law to which Wyatt refers is one of those with a *culāmaṇi* date (See Wyatt's "The Thai 'Kaṭa Maṇḍiarapāla' and Malacca," JSS LV (2), July 1967, 279-286), which, if the *culāmaṇi* hypothesis is correct, means that its date 1565 is equivalent to A.D. 1753 in the reign of King Borommakot. These points cannot be discussed here, and I only wish the reader to be aware that the Eka-type titles are a very complex problem on which practically no work has been done,

39) Vickery, "Tenasserim," p. 57, n. 25,

Another genuine old title preserved in vV is Phra Borommaracha Thibōdi/*brah parama rājādhipatī* (p. 63), also missing from other chronicles, but found in at least two Ayutthayan inscriptions. In vV it is given to the king who corresponds to Borom Rachathirat II of other texts and whose LP dates are 1424-1448. The inscriptions in question are no. 49, dated 1418, which Griswold and Prasert have interpreted as belonging to Intharacha (vV's Nakhon In),⁴⁰ and a gold plate found in Suphanburi and dated 175?. This date has been restored by Maha Cham Thongkhamwan as *śaka* 1357/1435 AD on the grounds that inscription no. 49 proves *rājādhipatī* to have been a title of Borom Rachathirat II, within whose reign this date would fall, which is not a sufficient reason, nor is it even accurate, since no. 49 belongs to the reign of Intharacha, not Borom Rachathirat.⁴¹ However, the restoration itself is not arguable, since the only other plausible hare years with "5" in the tens position are 1153/1231 and 1453/1531, the first of which is too early for this type of Ayutthayan inscription and the second of which falls at a time when it is believed the ruling king had quite different titles.⁴² The contents of the latter inscription also helps to date it. In addition to the king it includes a second person, *brah rāmeśvara*/Ramesuan, in the act which it records, and according to LP the king at that date had a son, Ramesuan, who later became King Trailokanat.

One more epigraphic occurrence of this title is worth a brief note. It is found in a 14th-15th century Khmer inscription of Angkor which is totally illegible except for two royal titles, *rājādhipatirāja* and *dharmmikaṛājādhirāja*.⁴³ According to LP *parama rājādhirāja* II, whose

40) A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 1," JSS LVI (2), July 1968, pp. 230-247.

41) PCSA, p. 28. See also Vickery, "Tenasserim," pp. 61-63. By any of the known Ayutthayan chronologies these two inscriptions would belong to different consecutive reigns, but it is well-nigh impossible that the two kings had exactly identical titles, (*brah parama rājādhipatī śrī mahā cākṛabartirāja*, and these inscriptions are probably evidence that the Ayutthayan reign sequence at this point is wrong in all the chronicles.

42) Nq Phutthangkun. However, there are no contemporary documents from his reign.

43) Inscription K. 489 of the Cambodian corpus. See Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* [textes] III, p. 229.

real title it now appears included *rājādhipati*, was the conqueror of Angkor in 1431, and it is tempting, even if illegitimately speculative, to suggest that the inscription included a record of that conquest.

We may now devote some attention to the ways in which vV contributes, and does not contribute, to certain problems of early Ayutthayan history. One of the most important of these is the question of relations between Ayutthaya and Cambodia. There is a good deal of reference to Cambodia in the reigns of Mahathammaracha and Naresuan, but both the details and the chronology are confused and it is only possible to disentangle them by reference to the better information of LP and contemporary European reports.

Moving back in time, in the reign of Chaiyaracha, vV mentions that the king, "waged war often with Cambodia," and, "toward the end of his life . . . went . . . to the borders of Cambodia and captured the city of Lamphun." Wyatt understandably exclaims that this is "an apparent contradiction . . . Lamphun is hardly near the borders of Cambodia! LP . . . makes no reference to warfare in the east" (pp. 70-71, n. 71). Actually, the passage provides proof for the solution of a very interesting historiographic problem which I discuss thoroughly elsewhere.⁴⁴ This is the existence of two quite different terms, *Kamboja* and *Kambujā*, the latter meaning since early Angkorean times the kingdom of Cambodia and based on the etymology *kambu-ja*, "born of Kambu", and the former the name of one of the sixteen great divisions of classical India, later transferred to Southeast Asia as part of a geographical system and localized in the Burmese Shan States, and in northern and central Siam.⁴⁵ Eventually the two terms became

44) In my dissertation on Cambodian and Thai chronicles which is due to be presented to Yale University within the next few months. I realize how maddening it is to be directed to a reference which is not yet available, and which in some cases seems to avoid publication for a number of years. There is nothing else to do, though, for the full argument is much too long to include here. I can say, however, that it is all down on paper, and I am prepared to send copies of relevant sections to any reader who will pay the cost of xeroxing and postage from Penang.

45) See *Sāsanavaṃśa*, edited by Mabel Bode, Pali Text Society, p. 15; G.P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, I, pp. 526-7; Dr. Than Tun, "Administration Under King Thalun," *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, LI (2), December 1968, pp. 173-188.

conflated, leading to all sorts of confusion. This is clearest in Tome Pires, who describes Cambodia encircling Siam from the east and around the north to the borders of Pegu;⁴⁶ Pinto who makes the King of Cambodia (probably either Mahathammaracha of Phitsnulok or Phraya Sawankhalok) one of the leaders of the group who placed Thianracha on the throne;⁴⁷ and the present passage of vV, which is conclusive evidence. In all of the other chronicles, Chaiyaracha warred more than once in the north, but never with Cambodia, and his contemporary, Pinto, had heard of the campaigns.⁴⁸ Van Vliet had obviously heard "Kamboja" applied to the north, or his written source used the term, and he considered it to be the same as the name of the country to the east.

The most serious result of the *Kamboja/Kambujā* confusion is the conquest of Cambodia placed by 1157 in approximately 1351-52 and borrowed from that source by the Cambodian chronicles. It is most probably due to the *Jinakālamālī* description of conflict in *Kamboja*, meaning central Siam, in the reign of Ramathibodi I,⁴⁹ but 18th-19th century writers no longer understood it correctly. This is not as radical a revision of history as some might think. Wolters, in his attempt to find solid support for a Thai invasion of Angkor in the reign of Ramathibodi, recognized that the *Jinakālamālī* story and the entry in the 1157 chronicles were referring to the same event, and in the last few years scholars conversant with the Thai texts have recognized that the "Kamboja" of the *Jinakālamālī* refers to Siam.⁵⁰ None of them, however,

46) A. Cortesão, ed., *The Suma Oriental of Tome Pires*, pp. 108-109, 111-112, 388.

47) Pinto, op. cit., p. 943.

48) *Ibid.*

49) G. Coedès, "Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental," BEFEO XXV, 1925, pp. 1-201, see pp. 99-100.

50) O.W. Wolters, "The Khmer King at Basan (1371-3), and the Restoration of the Cambodian Chronology During the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," *Asia Major* XII (1), 1966, see pp. 80-81; O.W. Wolters, "A Western Teacher and the History of Early Ayudhya," *Saṅgamśāstr paridāśn, The Social Sciences Review*, Special Number 3, June 2509 (1966), p. 97; A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies no. 11 (2)," JSS LXI (2), July 1973, pp. 107-108; Charnvit Kasetsiri, "The Rise of Ayudhya: A History of Siam in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries," unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, 1973, pp. 95-97. This work will soon be published by Oxford in Asia, but all citations here are from the thesis.

saw the final implication of this for the first "invasion of Cambodia" in the long Ayutthayan chronicles, a story which may now be replaced in its proper context.

In fact, the most important problem in the history of early Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations is the date of one or more conquests of Angkor supposedly carried out in the 14th-15th centuries. All Cambodian chronicles mention a pair of invasions dated variously 1352/1372, 1388/1408, 1369/1389, 1352/1457, 1472/1492, etc. (the list is not complete), the late Thai chronicles have three conquests, 1351-52, 1384-88, and 1421, but LP, generally considered most accurate, has only one such conquest, in 1431. The latest published work on the subject seeks to prove that the true dates were 1369 and 1389.⁵¹ The vV chronicle records none of these at all, and does not even mention Cambodia from the end of the reign of U Thong to that of Chaiyaracha, where, as we have seen, it is used inaccurately. The first reaction is thus that vV provides no evidence for any invasion theory, even though, because of its extremely succinct text, its silence is not evidence against any invasion either.

There is, however, a curious story from the reign of U Thong (pp. 59-60). According to this, after ruling about ten years, thus in about 1360, U Thong left Ayutthaya on the advice of astrologers, and moved to Cambodia where he built Nakhon Luang (Angkor). After nine more years, or in about 1369, he left his son in Nakhon Luang and returned to Ayutthaya where he died. Both Wyatt and Charnvit Kasetsiri have taken this story as support for Wolters' thesis of an invasion in 1369, Wyatt believing that "van Vliet reinforces the Royal Autograph Version's dating of the first Thai attack on Angkor, as against the later date of LP."⁵²

This is a very doubtful conclusion. An alternative explanation for the RA entry has been proposed above. As for Wolters, through a very fastidious analysis of Chinese sources and, frequently erroneous, French translations of Khmer chronicles, he sought to prove there was

51) O.W. Wolters, "The Khmer King at Basan."

52) vV, p. 10, p. 60, n. 33; Charnvit, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

an invasion, not sometime in the 1360's or sometime in the reign of Ramathibodi, but precisely in 1368-1369. If vV has a disguised account of an invasion, it was in 1360, something which would quite contradict Wolters' calculations.

There is, in any case, a better explanation for vV's story. Its chronological schemes have shown that it was probably composed about the time van Vliet worked on it, and it is known that both Song Tham and Prasat Thong were frequently preoccupied with Cambodia, attempting to assert suzerainty which the Cambodians denied and were strong enough to resist.⁵³ Prasat Thong, moreover, seems to have had a deeper interest in his neighbor, for he copied the plan of Angkor Wat, built two temples modelled on it, and at one point planned to give the classical name for Angkor, Yaśodhara, to one of his palaces.⁵⁴ The vV text makes U Thong the founder of most of the important towns of south central and peninsular Siam, the absurdity of which Wyatt correctly indicates,⁵⁵ and what is more natural than to make him, in such a text, the founder of Angkor as well? This would have provided an ancient justification for the ardently desired suzerainty. The date 1369 is, I repeat, not the time when vV makes U Thong go to Cambodia, but the year in which he returned, and return was made necessary by an even older tradition, perhaps true, that U Thong/Ramathibodi had died that year in Ayutthaya. We must finally conclude, I think, that vV contributes nothing to an understanding of Ayutthayan conquests of Angkor.

Another historiographic problem is "the bi-polar interpretation of Thai politics in this period [14th century] that has featured in the recent work of A.B. Griswold, O.W. Wolters, and others" (p. 63, n. 44).

53) vV, p. 90; and see van Vliet's other works, "Description of the Kingdom of Siam," trans. Ravenswaay, JSS 7 (1), 1910, p. 36; and *Historiael Verhael, etc.*, ed. Seiichi Iwao, Toyo Bunko, Tokyo, 1958, p. 200.

54) RA, pp. 428-429; Tri Amatyakul, *Silpa sāmāy ayudhayā* [Art of the Ayutthaya Period], Kram Silpakar, 2510, p. 52; Hiram W. Woodward, Jr., "The Art and Architecture of the Ayudhya Period," *Silpakarrm sāmāy ayudhayā* [Art of the Ayutthaya Period], Kram silpakar 2514, p. 64.

55) vV, pp. 56, 57, 59, nn. 10, 12, 16, 30.

Wyatt feels vV's remark that during the reign of Phra Nakhon In "the land was burdened with internal wars, but he conciliated the two parties," is confirmation of this bi-polar interpretation.

I think it is time to subject this bi-polar theory to critique before it takes on too much of a life of its own and becomes a basic fact on which to build further hypotheses. The "bi-polarity" refers first of all to rivalry between Ayutthaya and Suphanburi, something about which there can be no doubt if we accept any version of the Ayutthayan chronicles as at all factual. Wolters, who originated the "bi-polar interpretation of Thai politics," went much further, though, and claimed that the Suphanburi house, which was ethnically Thai, followed a policy of conquering Sukhothai and other northern neighbors, while the house of Ramathibodi, perhaps Mon, and originally from Lopburi, was interested in conquering Angkor, and that the foreign policy of early Ayutthaya shifted as kings of these two houses alternated in the 14th century.⁵⁶ His views on this fall into line with his conviction that the two conquests of Angkor occurred in 1369 and 1389 in the reigns of Ramathibodi and his son Ramesuan. Griswold accepted the bi-polar theory, but for him Ramathibodi was definitely Thai while the Suphanburi house "was perhaps more Mon or Khmer," and his position is puzzling since he also emphatically accepts the LP chronology which places the sole invasion in 1431, in the reign of Borommarachathirat of the Suphanburi house.⁵⁷

Wolters also based his interpretation on the existence of the two major Thai chronicle traditions, LP, which ignores Cambodia before 1431, and which he therefore attributed to the Suphanburi house, and the 1157 group which has three invasions at earlier dates, and which would have been a chronicle drawn up by the Ramathibodi faction. This is

56) Wolters, "The Khmer King at Basan," pp. 82-84; "A Western Teacher," pp. 96-97.

57) A.B. Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 31; A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies no. 1" p. 209, and EHS no. 3, JSS LVII (1), January 1969, p. 62,

extremely unlikely, since LP only dates from 1680, long after both houses had died out, and 1157, both in its textual framework and chronology, derives from LP and probably did not exist in its present form before the end of the 18th century.⁵⁸ As for its accounts of war with Cambodia, the first, in the 1350's has been explained, the second, in the 1380's, is filled with anachronistic details and must have been borrowed from a story belonging at a later date, and the last, in 1421, is the story which LP places in 1431. Thus in both traditions there is only one possibly genuine record of an invasion of Cambodia, for which the best date so far is LP's 1431.

What vV seems to be noting is the conflict between Suphanburi and Ayutthaya for domination of the Menam basin, something which is adequately documented, but there are no grounds for extending this to a bi-polarity of policy, which may, of course, have existed, but about which there is no information in the extant texts.

It is perhaps time now to say a little more about vV's treatment of the pre-Ayutthaya period, something which does not appear to derive from the S tradition. As mentioned above, van Vliet listed three different legends concerning a first founding of Siam about 2000 years before, and these are of course folklore. Of more interest is his story of the background of U Thong, a Chinese prince exiled from China. Thus we have one more version of the U Thong story, and a new etymology for the name U Thong, as due to his marriage with a Chinese princess named Pačham Thong (p. 57).

U Thong is also said to have built the cities of Langkasuka, Ligor, Kui, Phetburi, Chongh [?], Cout-Thiam [?], Bangkok, Nakhon Chaisri, Phitsanulok, Sukhothai, Kamphaengphet, and Angkor in addition to Ayutthaya. As Wyatt notes, most of these claims are fantastic,⁵⁹ and it is therefore strange that he wishes to take seriously the account of U Thong's sojourn at Angkor, which, in vV, is intimately connected with the story that he built that city. When a source is full of details known

58) The proof of this is too long to even summarize here. See note 44 above.

59) vV, notes 10, 12, 16, 30.

to be in error, it is hardly legitimate to simply pick out other details and declare them to be important new discoveries.

Neither is vV's mention of Langkasuka as surprising as Wyatt seems to feel.⁶⁰ Although "no other Thai historical source" mentions it (p. 10), and it required Wheatley's work on Chinese sources to locate it to the satisfaction of western scholars, Langkasuka is a part of Malay tradition, and many Malays, at least in the northern states, 'know' where it was even if they have never heard of Wheatley or the scholarly discussion concerning the place. Given the extent of Dutch activity in Patani, they could easily have picked up local traditions. Of course, this tradition could also have still been current in Ayutthaya and, together with U Thong's other activities in the peninsula would reflect current preoccupation with that area in the reigns of Song Tham and Prasat Thong. As I see it, none of the U Thong stories may yet be accepted as true, but each is due to particular interests of the Ayutthayan court at the time it was written down.⁶¹ This is also something that should be noted by proponents of n-polar theories of early Ayutthayan politics. Early reports make quite clear that in the 14th and 15th centuries Ayutthaya asserted strong claims to the peninsula all the way down to Malacca, yet there is little sign of this in any Ayutthayan chronicle except vV, where it comes through in legendary fashion.⁶² This "pole" was thus important during reigns of both the early royal houses, and if it is not given sufficient attention in the standard chronicles it is probably because they were written at times when the capital's attention was directed chiefly to other regions and the peninsula was no longer a major problem.

60) vV, pp. 10, 56, and n. 10.

61) A number of these stories have been collected and discussed by Charnvit Kasetsiri, *op. cit.*, whose interpretation differs from mine.

62) For comment and further references see O.W. Wolters, *The Fall of Srivijaya in Malay History*, pp. 108-9, 154-5, 169. The standard chronicles mention one attack on Malacca in 1455 (LP) or 1441 (RA).

Above, p. 111, I made a statement about the concurrence of vV and S in certain details not found in other chronicles. In fact, some of these details appear in RA, although not in its direct ancestors of the 1157 tradition, nor in LP. The circumstance that RA, just because it is the *Royal Autograph Chronicle*, has become a sort of official version, has obscured the fact that it is the final link in a long chain of transmission, and as a source of history is much less valuable than its several extant ancestors. The chain of transmission that led to RA's incorporation of details from the vV-S tradition is rather easy to determine.

Sāṅgītiyavaṇṣ was compiled by Somdet Phra Phonnarat⁶³, who, together with his pupil, Prince Paramanuchit Chinorot, prepared in 1807 a version of the 1157 chronicle.⁶⁴ Later on, in 1850, Prince Paramanuchit wrote a short chronicle (*Saṅkhep*), which was an abridgement of the 1157 tradition, but included some of the diagnostic features of the S-vV tradition, such as the names of the Suphanburi princes and the reign of Intharacha following Trailokanat. At the time these details must have been taken over from S, the work of Prince Paramanuchit's teacher, since the earlier versions of the 1157 tradition did not contain them. Then when RA was prepared in the reign of King Mongkut these features, for unknown reasons, were adopted, probably from *Saṅkhep*, in preference to the pure 1157 tradition. This is the reason for my statement that these details are not part of either major tradition.

The evidence on the filiation of these texts and the role of Somdet Phra Phonnarat in their preparation provides material for some interesting speculation about his view of the historian's task and his beliefs concerning the true history of Ayutthaya, for the works in which he had a hand comprise three different chronologies and for certain events and periods two differing textual traditions. There is S, which

63) His title has been variously transcribed elsewhere as Phonrat, Wannarat, Wanratna, Banaratn, Vanaratn.

64) For more details and further references see David K. Wyatt, "The Abridged Royal Chronicle of Ayudhya of Prince Paramānuchitchinōrot," JSS LXI (1), January 1973, pp. 25-50, see pp. 26-27.

he continued beyond the vV period right up to the destruction of Ayutthaya in 1767 and the ensuing disintegration of the kingdom. Besides its own unique chronology, which is found in vV, both S and Sc contain a number of inserted dates, probably from the hand of Somdet Phra Phonnarat, and which agree with the tradition of LP, not rediscovered by later historians until the 20th century. The third chronology he used is that of 1157, one version of which he prepared. Certain questions thus come to mind. Did he favor any one version as being most accurate? Was he concerned only with preserving all old traditions? Did such considerations trouble him at all?

At least we now know that what had hitherto appeared as his own, chronologically peculiar, composition was a much older history which he preserved and prolonged. One can certainly agree with Wyatt (p.10) on the importance of the publication of van Vliet's version of this older history, but its importance, I feel, lies in its evidence for the analysis of Ayutthayan historiography rather than for any startling contribution to our knowledge of the facts of early Ayutthayan history.

Michael Vickery

*School of Humanities
Universiti Sains Malaysia.
Penang.*