

## THE 2/K.125 FRAGMENT, A LOST CHRONICLE OF AYUTTHAYA

by  
Michael Vickery

After the accomplishments of Prince Damrong and George Coedès<sup>1</sup>, it seemed that no more significant Thai or Cambodian chronicles were likely to be discovered, and that in spite of the mysteries left in certain periods of the history of that area, there was little chance of new records being discovered to clear them up. The only major chronicle discovered in recent years is that of the British Museum<sup>2</sup>, which has proved to be little more than a copy of a version already known. Indeed, almost all of the Ayutthayan and Cambodian chronicles are closely related variants of a small number of cognate traditions.

One text outside the major traditions is the *Ang Eng Fragment*, which O.W. Wolters has used in an effort to effect major revisions in the accepted story<sup>3</sup>. In the following pages I present another fragment, which, like *Ang Eng*, is very different from the standard histories, and which appears to have made use of some of the same material in ways providing links between *Ang Eng* and the Thai *Hluon Prasro'ih* chronicle<sup>4</sup>.

I discovered this text, which I shall call the *2/k.125 Fragment*, after its catalogue number, in the National Library at Bangkok in 1971<sup>5</sup>. So far as I have been able to determine, it has never been noticed by other students or historians.

- 1) See the commentary of Prince Damrong Rajanubhab to the *Royal Autograph Chronicle (RA)*: *Braḥ rājabaṅśāvatār chap̣p braḥ rāja hātthalekhū*, sixth printing, Chon Buri, 2511 [1968], pp. 1-62, 222-418; a translation of part of the above by O. Frankfurter, "The story of the records of Siamese history", *JSS*, XI, 2 (1914), pp. 1-20; G. Coedès, "Essai de classification des documents historiques conservés à la bibliothèque de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient", *BEFEO*, XVIII, 9 (1918), pp. 15-28.
- 2) *Braḥ rājabaṅśāvatār kruṅ sayām cāk tan chap̣p di pen sampati khōn pritiṃ miosiyam kruṅ lōnōn*, Bangkok, 2507 [1964].
- 3) 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), pp. 44-89.
- 4) *Braḥ rājabaṅśāvatār kruṅ śrī ayudhayā chap̣p hluon pra: sro'ih* (cited further as *LP*), several editions; the one used here is in *Pra: jum baṅśāvatār* (Guru sabhā edition—cited further as *PP*), vol. I.
- 5) The full title is *Baṅśāvatār kruṅ śrī ayudhayā*, No. 2/ก. 125. It is further classified at the Library as No. 223, cupboard (ตู้) 108, bunch (มัด) 27; and its provenance is given as "original holdings of the Library". My research at the time was made possible by a grant from the Foreign Area Fellowship Foundation, to which I wish to express my gratitude.

Physically the *2/k.125 Fragment* is a single *phuk* of *samut dai tām* ("folding black book") torn out of its context with no beginning or end and no indication of date of composition or provenance, except that it formed part of the Library's original holdings. It consists of 37 folded leaves. The side which the Library labels as the obverse consists of 36 leaves, with a text beginning in mid-sentence. The reverse continues with 32 more written leaves, of which the first is almost entirely illegible. The obverse is written in white chalk in *หัตถ์แบบบรรจง* script, rather difficult to read. The reverse is in *หัตถ์* script<sup>6</sup>, very clearly written; the first 17½ lines are in yellow ink, with the remainder in white.

From the train of events and two explicit dates, one in each half, it is easy to see that the story really begins on the 'reverse', and that what is on the obverse continues afterward with a gap of perhaps several pages, which appear to have been torn off. It is clear that this is a copy from an older manuscript, almost certainly done by two different hands.

In terms of modern usage, much of the spelling appears quite peculiar. It is not even internally consistent, a not infrequent phenomenon in old manuscripts. Most of the 'incorrect' spellings are immediately comprehensible, and there is no need to correct them in footnotes. For example, the context shows clearly that *พ้ง* and *พช* of p. [1] of the text must be understood as *พ้ง* and *พช*; and the frequent use of short *i* for long *ī*, as *พฉ* instead of *พฉ*, also requires no comment. Neither is it necessary to note all of the instances in which consonants of the *k*, *c*, *p* and *t* series are found in a manner opposite to their modern usage, i.e. the frequent confusion between *ช/ค*, *ฉ/ช*, *พ/ผ*, *ภ*, and among *ต/ถ/ท*.

6) The information on script was provided by Khun Bunnag Phayakhadet at the Manuscript Section of the National Library, whose help in reading difficult passages is gratefully acknowledged and is indicated further in the footnotes below. The Thai transcription of the manuscript was done by Khun Vipachaloeum Watana and Khun Vachira Tamethin, also of manuscript staff of the Library. Khun Champa Yoeungcharoeun of the Library and Khun Euayporn Kerdchouay of the Siam Society also provided suggestions for reading difficult passages.



One feature which might cause the reader difficulty at first is the almost universal replacement of medial ʋ by ɔ in words such as ดวย, ขวน, หลวง, which are written ดอน, ขอน, หลอง. In the Thai text those words, like everything else, appear as in the original, and I believe there is no case in which a real conflict of meaning occurs.

Tonal marks, which have not been included in transliterated words but which appear in the reproduction of the Thai text, were used erratically. Some of the usage resembles that which David K. Wyatt found in the chronicles of Nakhon Si Thammarat; but again, and contrary to the latter, there is lack of internal consistency<sup>7</sup>.

I intend to go no further with the question of the writing itself, since that would require special study and lengthy comparison with other old texts. Also, my main interest is in the relationship of the story to other extant chronicles, and the value of its evidence for a reconstruction of fifteenth century history, particularly with regard to the conflict between Ayutthaya and Cambodia.

Brief explanations are included in footnotes directly below the translation. Points which require lengthy discussion are referred to the commentary which follows. The translation is intended to be as literal as possible, yet remain comprehensible. Thus, there has been no attempt to write elegant English. In fact, the English has at times been deliberately distorted to facilitate comparison with the Thai.

The text is arranged with the reverse of the manuscript first, in order to preserve the continuity of the story. Page numbers have been supplied in Arabic numerals for the reverse, and in small Roman numerals for the obverse; the *fōnmān* symbols (๐) of the original have been retained in the text and translation. In footnotes or cross-references, the relevant page numbers are enclosed in brackets. Transliteration accords with the graphic system, which preserves the original spelling; but modern place-names are written according to current usage, and terms discussed in the commentary have been standardized. One innovation in the transliteration used here is the rendering of *visarjanīy* by : rather than *ḥ*, except where it corresponds to the Khmer *visarga*. Thus I write *pra:jum* (ประจุม), but *braḥ* (พระ).

7) David K. Wyatt, trans., *The Crystal Sands, The Chronicles of Nagara Śrī Dharmarāja*, Data Paper No. 98, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University, April 1975, pp. 14-17.

## TEXT

[๐] .....ประทับท้าว.....(สมุทลบลี้น ๑ หน้า)  
 .....ผู้เป็นเจ้าเสด็จไปเอาเมืองหงสาวดี ครั้งนั้น เข้ากจำ  
 มาให้ย . . .

[๑] ดูทวย กรันคำมมาจไกลถึงพัง แลหมินสมรรไชย กยายลูกเกล้า: แล  
 งามกทงเรือโล่ ทิชาวทายทงผู้ทิกกรเซียงนั้น วิ่งลงนำหนีสั้น แต่ผู้ถือทาย  
 เอาภายสู้ ทิหมินสมรรไชยๆ กติผู้ถือทายทกน้ำ แล้วหมินสมรรไชย เอาเรือ  
 เข้ามายังขุนนครไชยๆ กไทคนแจ้ว หัซข้างตัวหนึ่งแล้ว ท้าวพรญา เสดนา  
 แต่บรรดานายทับนายกองทงปองกลาตอยทบัแลสงวา ถ้าเมื่อได้ไ้ไ้ญนเสียง  
 ฆ้องเราใส จิงไหยอฆ่าศึก ถา

## Translation

[0] [This page, written in yellow ink, has been almost entirely effaced. The last line is] . . . The king went to take *mo'añ* Hansavati [? doubtful reading] At that time they waited to come give . . .

[1] . . . see, for when [we, they?] cross over will be near to the shore, and Hmu'n Samarrjaiy<sup>8</sup> moved *luk klauh*<sup>9</sup> and pulled up the thwarts of the boats to attack the people of *Tāy Dōñ*<sup>10</sup>. The one who held the main oar lowered himself quickly into the water and fled away. But the one who held the stern took a paddle and resisted. He struck Hmu'n Samarrjaiy who then struck the one who held the stern. He fell into the water and then Hmu'n Samarrjaiy took the boat and then came on up to Khun Nagar Jaiy<sup>11</sup>, who had the oarsmen . . . get on an elephant, and gave [them to]<sup>12</sup> the *dāv bañā*<sup>13</sup> of the army. But all

- 8) *Hmu'n samarraijj* is an unidentified title. Throughout this study, titles are classed as unidentified, and will not be footnoted, if they are not included in (a) Yoneo Ishii, Osamu Akagi and Shigeharu Tanabe, *An Index of Officials in Traditional Thai Governments*, vol. I part I, *The Law of Civil Hierarchy and The Law of Military and Provincial Hierarchies* (Discussion Paper No. 76, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, 1974), (b) Foures, "Le royaume du Cambodge, son organisation politique", *Excursions et Reconnaissances*, V, 13 (1882); I have not come across them in other sources. Some of the unidentified titles will probably be found when a systematic search is made through the other law texts and inscriptions.
- 9) *Luk klauh*: a term which has defied explanation. Khun Bunnag suggested that the immediately preceding expression, *ka yāy*, should be emended to *khayāy*, "enlarge", "spread", but that does not aid an understanding of the whole phrase.
- 10) *Tāy dōñ*, a toponym which also occurs as *tai dōñ* in the Palatine Law, in *Kāthmāy trā sām tuōñ* ("Laws of the Three Seals"), Guru Sabhā edition, vol. I, p. 70. Those laws will be cited as *Laws* plus volume number. On *tāy dōñ*, see below under "Miscellaneous toponyms".
- 11) *Nagar jaiy* may possibly be the same as the *khun lagòr jaiy* in the department of *tāmruoc hñāi sāy*, *Laws* I, 288.
- 12) The phrase from "the oarsmen" to "gave [them to]" is highly conjectural, and assumes that "elephant" (*jāñ*/ช้าง) was miscopied as *khāñ*/ช้าง, the word actually appearing in the text. The ellipsis indicates one or two illegible characters followed by *ñ/ha*.
- 13) *Dāv b(r)añā*, "officials", a more precise meaning being difficult to establish. This and other such terms indicating officials will generally be left untranslated. In the manuscript the forms *bañā* and *brañā* have been used



[๒] ผู้ได้ทำตามสั่งใส่ จให้ลงโทษจันทน์ แลขุนนครไชย กลาตอย มาเข้าทราบอยู่ชายป่า จึงเจ้าเมืองตาทองแลกอรสหนึ่งผู้เป็นนายทัพนายกอง ทั้งหลายกถาม

[๓] ช้างม้ารพลขึ้นยั้งฝั่งคางนี้ได้แล้วเอาเรือเทียบเข้ารพลขึ้นใส่ ขุนนครไชย แลท้าวพรญาทั้งหลายมา ขุนนครไชยท้าวพรญาทั้งหลายกลาตอยมา เข้าศึกเกรงได้ใจกว้างใหญ่มา พรญาขเลียงขุนศรีบาทมิได้ ถาพ้องร้องสำคัญ กษอนกันยอฆ่าศึก ๆ

[๔] ภายลงน้ำโยธาทหารกลไ้ฆ่าฟันเมงตาทปรมารสองรอย

๑ ขุน เจ้าเมืองตาทองแลกอรสหนึ่งทั้งปวงไปยังมีทันขึ้นช้างขึ้น มักเอาช้างม้าคินลงน้ำแลเรือหอมลอมคามหนี ครั้นพ้นหงษเห็นวนวายกหัก ลายจำคงเสีย แลวงน้ำมาหาโยธาทหารชั่ว

[2] the officers all pulled back the troops and ordered, "whenever the sound of our gong is heard, then resist the enemy. If anyone does [not]<sup>14</sup> follow orders, we shall have him punished severely"; and Khun Nagar Jaiy came on back and slipped into<sup>15</sup> the edge of the forest. Then the ruler of Tāy Dôn and the princes<sup>16</sup>, who were all the officers in the army, crossed over with

[3] the elephants, horses and troops up to the shore on this side; and they took boat(s) up very close to the troops to pursue Khun Nagar Jaiy and all the *dāv bañā*. Khun Nagar Jaiy and all the *dāv bañā* retreated. The enemy was encouraged and came on strongly<sup>17</sup>. Bañā Jaliañ<sup>18</sup> and Khun Śripād did not wait to hear the important gong. They rallied to resist the enemy

[4] who were defeated and fell into the water. The soldiers pursued and killed the *meñ*<sup>19</sup>, about two hundred of whom died. The ruler of Tāy Dôn and all the princes went without having time to mount elephants or horses, so they took the elephants and horses back into the water and the boats surrounded and fled after them. When Bān Hañṣ<sup>20</sup> saw the disorder, he broke his bonds<sup>21</sup> and hurried along the river to find the soldiers, our people.

---

interchangeably, but in the translation and commentary I have rendered all occurrences as *bañā*. See my comments on this term in Michael Vickery, review of Robert B. Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks, etc.*, *JSS*, LXII, 1 (January 1974), pp. 170-71.

14) The emendation is required by the context.

15) *Khau drāp* < Khmer *jrāp cūl*. For the identity of Thai *drāp* and Khmer *jrāp* see Karnchana Nacaskul, "A study of cognate words in Thai and Cambodian", unpublished Master's thesis, University of London, 1962.

16) *Smiñ*: a Mon term for "king" and "prince", inferior in classical Mon usage to *bañā*. See H. L. Shorto, "The 32 *myos* in the medieval Mon Kingdom", *BSOAS*, XXVI 3 (1963), pp. 578-9. *Kōn smiñ* is Mon for "prince". See R. Halliday, *A Mon-English Dictionary*, p. 55; and H. L. Shorto, *A Dictionary of Modern Spoken Mon*, pp. 172, 272, and note the equivalence of *hmoij/smiñ*, *smiñ*.

17) Khun Bunnag offered that reading.

18) *Bañā Jaliañ*, the Lord of Jaliañ (Chalieng), north of Sukhothai.

19) *Meñ* is a term which usually designated Mon or Burmese.

20) Apparently some sort of title. His role in the action is not clear.

21) Khun Bunnag offered that reading.

[๕] เราๆก็เอาพันธะมาถึงขุนนครไฉ่ๆก็ให้เสียพา แลให้ช้างตัวหนึ่ง  
 เล่า ขุนนครไฉ่ ท้าวพรญาทั้งหลายยกทัพกลับคืนมาถวายบังคมพบบาทผู้  
 เป็นเจ้า แลทูลแถลงการศึกทั้งปวงแก่ท้าวๆก็ให้หมื่นสมรรไฉ่ เป็นหัวหมื่น  
 ช้างสอนพันธะไฉ่ให้เป็นหัวหมื่นเรือในหุ้มเกล้าแลให้พระราชทานรวงวัน  
 เปนยศ-

[๖] ถาศักดิ์บำเหน็จบำนาญนั้น

๑ อยู่ปรมารเถินหนึ่ง สมเด็จพระบรมราชาธิราชเจ้า กเสด็จไป  
 ปรภาษ กรันสุริยาชายันทหารก็ให้เอาพลายทรงบุณเป็นพรทิ่ง แลเอามหา  
 ธรรมราชาธิราช พรญาขเลียง พรญารามราชคิตอยขับนายทิตนายช้างนั้นลง  
 แลนายทิตมิไคลงถดลงไป ปชิตขวานอยู่ผู้เป็นเจ้ากเสด็จ

[๗] ขึ้นมาพลับพลาไฉ่

๑ อยู่มาปรมารหาทวัน ท้าวพรญาทั้งหลายถวายบังคมลาพบบาท  
 ผู้เป็นเจ้าคืนไปเมือง สอนผู้เป็นเจ้ากเสด็จเข้ามายังกรุงศรีอยุธยา

๑ สอนให้เมืองหงสาวดีนั้นพรญารามสวรรคต กได้ราชสมบัติ  
 แก่พรญาโพ

๑ อยู่จาเนยรรมา พรราชบุตรท้าวเจ้าพรญาพรณครอินทอรันอยู่เสวย  
 ราชไฉ่



[5] Our men took Bǎn Hañṣ to Khun Nagar Jaiy, who gave him clothes and let him ride on an elephant. Khun Nagar Jaiy and all the *dāv bañā* took the troops and returned for an audience with H.M. the King, and they reported all about the war to him. He made Hmu'n Samarrjaiy chief *hmu'n* of elephants. As for Bǎn Hañṣ, he made him chief *hmu'n* of boats in their group<sup>22</sup>; and he gave royal rewards of rank

[6] and various gifts. ☉ After about a month, Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau<sup>23</sup> went on a tour at the time of the solar eclipse. He had them take the female elephant "Drañ Pun" as his transport; and he took Mahādharrmarājādhirāj, Bañā Jaliañ, and Bañā Rāmarāj<sup>24</sup> to ride with him. [They] chased Nāy Dit, the elephant master, down, but Nāy Dit didn't get down; he moved down near to the driver<sup>25</sup> and stayed there. The King went

[7] up to the pavilion. After about five or six days all the *dāv bañā* took leave of H.M. the King and went back to their towns. As for the King, he entered the city of Ayutthaya. ☉ Whereas in *mo'an* Hañsāvati Bañā Rām died and the throne went to Bañā Baro<sup>26</sup>. ☉ After some time the King's son, Cau Bañā Braḥ Nagar Indr, who was ruling in

22) ๒๒ เล้า.

23) It will be seen from the context that he was the second Ayutthayan king of that title, who reigned from 1424 to 1448 according to *LP*.

24) Apparently the rulers, respectively, of Phitsanulok, Chalieng, and Sawankhalok. See comment below, under "Ayutthayan relations with the north".

25) *Khvān* (ขวาน) written for *gvān* (กวน), "driver".

26) *Bañā Rām* and *bañā baro* are Mon rulers found in the standard histories. See below, under "The date of the story".

[๘] พรณครหลวงนั้น ขุนไสรทรงพรอินทรผู้เป็นพิเลียงถึงกรมกโหมาทูล  
 เสด็จมพระบรมราชาธิราชเจ้า ๆ กไหนดายพรผู้นองเป็นขุนไสรทรงพรอินทร์แทน

๑ อูยมาเจ้ายาค บุตรพรรามเจ้า อันผู้เป็นเจ้าให้ไปอยู่ จัตุรมุขนั้น  
 กชอนขเม้นทั้งหลาย แขงแกพรราชบุตรทวพรณครอินทร ๆ กไทดเขุนไสร  
 ทรงพรอินทรยกช้างม้ารีพลไป

[๙] รับท้าวพรณายังไปยไ้ราบคาบ จึงทวรกโหมาทูลเสด็จมเด็จพระบรมราชา  
 ธิราชเจ้า ๆ กไทดเขุนไสรให้เจ้าพรญาแพรก พรญาเทพมกค ขุนนครไชย  
 ขุนศรีบาท ขุนปราบถวิป ขุนศรีพิไชยสงคราม ขุนรามกำแหง ขุนกำแหง  
 พรอินทร ขุนเพชรราช ขุนไสยทวอว ขุนรัตน์ ขุนเพชรรัตน์ ขุน  
 เพชรสาร เอพล ๑๕๐๐๐๐

[๑๐] ช้าง ๑๐๐ ม้า ๑๐๐๐ ยกไปยังพรณครหลวง แลมิพรราชกำหนดผู้  
 เป็นเจ้าไปยแกพรราชกุมารทวว กรันทบทวพรญาทงหลายยกไปย ถึง  
 พรณครแล้วไสย ไสสมเด็จพรณครอินทรยกช้างม้ารีพลออกตั้งเป็นทบหนึ่ง  
 แล้วจึงยกไปยปราบพรคทงในจัตุรมุขนั้น กรันเจ้าพญาแพรกแลพรยา  
 พรหลวง ขุนหมินทง

[8] Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ, [had] a mentor (*bilian*), Khun Sai Drañ Braḥ Indr<sup>27</sup>, who died, and word was sent to Sam [tec] Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau. He appointed Nāy Bar/Bra, the younger brother, as Khun Sai Drañ Braḥ In[dr] in replacement. © Later on, Cau Yāt, son of Braḥ Rām Cau, whom the King had sent to reside in Caturmukh<sup>28</sup>, persuaded all the Khmer to rebel against the royal son, Braḥ Nagar Indr. [Braḥ Nagar Indr] ordered Khun Sai Drañ Braḥ Indr to move out elephants, horses, and troops to go

[9] to meet the *dāv bañā*. They could not yet go in proper fashion, so he had word sent to Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau. The King had them take elephants, horses, and troops. He had Cau Bañā Braek<sup>29</sup>, Bañā Deb Mañgal, Khun Nagar Jaiy, Khun Śrī Pād, Khun Prāp Thvip, Khun Śrī Bijaiy Saṅgrām<sup>30</sup>, Khun Rām Kāmphaeñ<sup>31</sup>, Khun Kāmphaeñ Braḥ Indr, Khun Bejrrāj, Khun Saiy Dāv Āv, Khun Rātñ, Khun Bejratñ, and Khun Bejrsār<sup>32</sup> take 150,000 troops,

[10] 100 elephants, and 1,000 horses, and move out to Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ. And there was a royal order of the King to his son saying, "when the army and all the *dāv bañā* have reached the capital, let Samtec Braḥ Nagar Indr move the elephants, horses, and troops out, set them up as an army, and then move to subdue all the *barrg*<sup>33</sup> in Caturmukh." When Cau Bañā Braek and the *braya*, *braḥ*, *hluoñ*, *khun*, *hmu'n*, all

27) *Nagar hluoñ* is Angkor. Braḥ Nagar Indr and Khun Sai Drañ Braḥ Indr are individuals found in the standard Cambodian accounts of those events. See below, "Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations".

28) Cau Yāt, or Bañā Yāt, is a hero-king of Cambodian history and legend, who drove the Thai out of Angkor following an invasion the date of which is controversial; but the story here is quite different from that in all other sources. See below, "Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations". *Caturmukh* is Phnom Penh.

29) Cau Bañā Braek would presumably be the governor of *mo'añ braek* in modern Chainat province.

30) Khun Srī Bijaiy Saṅgrām is found in the hierarchy law as military chief (*khun bal*) of the province of Phitsanulok, *Laws I*, p. 317.

31) Braḥ Rām Kāmphaeñ was one of the important generals under the *kalāhom*, see *Laws I*, p. 281.

32) Apparently the same title, written *beñāsār*, is given to the *cau mo'añ* of *kruñ jaiyasthan* in inscription No. 48, *Pra : jum Silā cāru'k*, III, pp. 75-81, dated *cula* era 770 (A.D. 1408), from Chainat.

33) *Barrg*, literally, "group", occurs frequently throughout the text as a designation for certain allies of Yāt. See below, "The *barrg*", for an explanation.



[๑๑] หลายยกไปถึงพรนครหลวงแล้ว สมเด็จพระนครอินทยกออกมาตั้ง  
 เบนทပ်หนึ่ง ตามพระราชกำหนด แล้วจึงยกไปปราบมหาพรรคทั้งหลาย จนถึง  
 จัตุรमुखนั้น แลพรรคทั้งหลายก็แตกฉารไตตัวเจ้ายศทั้งท้าวพรญาทั้งหลายคอย

๑ แลชนนนั้นพระราชกุมารทหารพรนครอิน ทรวงพรชอน ท้าวพรญา  
 เสดเมาตยพราหม

[๑๒] นาจารย์ทั้งหลายเตงบุษามหาเคราะห์ สารติ แล้วยกทัพทั้งปองคืนมา  
 ครั้นถึงพิเรนพรนครอินทยกพรชอนนั้นก็ถึงพรนครหลวงทาร์ก เสตจัสวรรคต

๑ จึงเมนางเทพรรณี แลเมนางคงคา กเขียนหนังสือใส่ไหใบพลูใส่  
 ไต้เข้าเตียบให้เอาไปยส่งแก่เจ้ายศ แลสั่งว่าให้เจ้าขันตู่ในเข้าเตียบนั้นก่อน

[๑๓] ครั้นสาวไชย เอาเข้าเตียบนั้นไปยส่งบอกเจ้ายศ ๒ ขันตู่กบ  
 หนังสือนั้นแลอานศุกรวามิกานฎผู้เปนเจ้า มาวาไหส่งเจ้ายศไปยยังอยุธยา

๑ จึงชนนกรไชยส่งเจ้ายศเข้ามาเต จัตุร मुखโดยทางเรือมิได้ให้  
 จำจง ครั้นมาถึงตำบลแสงเพลลา อยู่มาเพียงคิคนคนผู้รักษามานั้นนอน

[๑๓] ครั้นแล้วไซ้เยเธอเท้เตอีนนี้ไปยั้ง กบอกล้ำอวด๖ รั้น  
ถูกภบหนึ่งสื่อนั้น ผลฮานถูกภบมีกันอยู่เป็นเจ้า มาก  
ให้ส่งเจ้าอวดไปยั้งอยู่ชย ๑ จึงรูนครไซ้เยกส่งเจ้า  
อวดเท้มาผลจ้ตรมูรโดยทางเรือมิได้ให้จำจง ครั้นมา  
ก็ตำบลผลเพลาอูยมาเท้ถึงคีนคนผู้รักภมณนั้นนอน

[๑๔] หลบไปยั้งสินผลเจ้าอวดลงน้ลอยค้อไปย สรูนพลับพล  
ไซ้เย ๗ กทมมกไกรเจ้าอวดกบอวกทมิช้อเจ้าอวด บุตร  
พรภบ รูนพลไซ้เยกทมมกเป็นบุตรพรภบมารดาไซ้เย  
ไร เจ้าอวดกบอวกมารดาทมิช้อนางฮาบวเกษ รูนพลไซ้  
กมมกเป็นบุตรศทพเกษแล้ว แลรูนพลไซ้เยกทรูนมก





[11] of them, had reached Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ, Samtec Braḥ Nagar Indr moved out and set them up as an army in accordance with the royal order, and then moved to subdue all the *mahā barrg* right up to Caturmukh; and all the *barrg* were routed. They captured Cau Yāt along with all the *dāv bañā* as well. ☉ And at that time the royal prince, Braḥ Nagar Indr, became ill. The *dāv bañā*, the military officers, the Brahmans,

[12] all arranged an offering to the great planets<sup>34</sup>, and then started back with all the troops. When they reached *biren*<sup>35</sup>, Braḥ Nagar Indr became very ill. When they reached Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ he died. ☉ Then Mae Nāñ Debdharaṇī and Mae Nāñ Gaṅgā<sup>36</sup> wrote a letter, put it in a leaf of betel, put that under the rice in a basket, had it sent to Cau Yāt, and gave instructions for him to search<sup>37</sup> in the rice basket first.

[13] When the maid took the basket of rice to give [to him], she told Cau Yāt and he searched and found<sup>38</sup> the letter and read it and knew that an order of the King had come saying to send Cau Yāt to Ayutthaya. ☉ So Khun Nagar Jaiy sent Cau Yāt on from Caturmukh by boat without having him locked up and bound. When they reached the district of *saeñ blau*<sup>39</sup> [lacuna?] Later on, at midnight, the guards who had come all slept

34) *Grauh sārṭi*: probably the ceremony for "propitiation of the planets", in Sanskrit *graha śānti*. See Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p. 372.

35) An unidentified Cambodian toponym.

36) *Mae nāñ* is a title for one of the categories of palace women, but *debdharaṇī* is the earth goddess and *gaṅgā*, "Ganges", also appears more appropriate for a goddess than a mortal. However, *debdharaṇī* is also found in Inscription 93 of the Thai corpus as a title of a queen of Sukhothai.

37) *Khan* (ข) written in place of *gan* (ก).

38) *Bhap* (บ) written in place of *bap* (ป).

39) A toponym; for explanation see below, "Miscellaneous toponyms".



[๑๔] หลับไปยี่สิบ แลเจ้าอย่าตกลงนำลอยต่อไป สู่ขุนพลับพลายี่ๆ  
 กถามว่าใครเจ้าอย่าคบอกกว่าข้านี้ชื่อเจ้าอย่าต บุตรพราหม ขุนพลายี่ๆถาม-  
 วาเป็นบุตรพราหมมารดาเจ้าชื่อไร เจ้าอย่าคบอกวามารดาข้าชื่อนางอามพะษ  
 ขุนพลายี่ๆว่าเจ้าเป็นบุตรสหายเราจึงแล้ว แลขุนพลายี่ๆว่าขุนณะคร

[๑๕] ยี่ๆ กสงเจ้าอย่าตไปยังอยู่ทยา แลเราจปรกันเจ้าๆ อย่ากลัวเลย  
 เจ้าอย่าต กวาอันบิดาว่าตั้งณิ แหน่งว่าบิดาฆ่าข้าเสียในเรือน บิดานิเหต  
 จึงขุนพลายี่ๆแคงโพชนอาหารไหแก่เจ้าอย่าตกินแล้ว กสงเจ้าอย่าตไปไ้แก่  
 มหารังแกกเผ้าพรรค ขุนพลายี่ๆไนยเตริอญ ๑ ต่อ

[๑๖] รุกนทั้งนั้น จึงรู้วเจ้าอย่าต โยธาทั้งหลายกลนไปยี่ๆถามทั้ขุน  
 พลับพลายี่ๆ กวาเรมิปรากฏ ถ้าใครรู้จักใส่กให้ ไปตอยข้าเราไหชอย  
 กันหา

๑ อูนานมาจิงรู้วเจ้าอย่าตหนีออกไปกม้ง แลนายธรรมราชนายญี  
 ช้างทอง นายปรช้ำ นายทองเตรตสงสาร นายญีพกาย ยอมเขม้น หนี



[14] soundly, and Cau Yāt lowered himself into the water and swam away to Khun Blāpblājaiy<sup>40</sup>, who asked who he was. Cau Yāt answered, “I am named Cau Yāt, son of Braḥ Rām.” Khun Blājaiy asked, you are the son of Braḥ Rām; what is the name of your mother?” Cau Yāt said, “my mother is named Nān Āmbakeṣ.”<sup>41</sup> Khun Blājaiy then said, “you are really the son of our friend.” And then Khun Blājaiy said, “Khun Nagar

[15] Jaiy sent Cau Yāt to go to Ayutthaya and we shall protect you; don’t you be afraid at all.” And Cau Yāt said, “what you are saying now, I suspect that father will kill me in your house here.”<sup>42</sup> So Khun Blājaiy prepared food for Cau Yāt, and after he had eaten he sent Cau Yāt to *mahā rañ gaek*<sup>43</sup> of the *barrg* tribe of Khun Blājaiy in *tro’an*<sup>44</sup>.  
By

[16] dawn those people knew that it was Cau Yāt. All the soldiers rushed to ask the troops of Khun Blāpblājaiy. He said, “We are not certain. If anyone knows [him] let [him] go with our men. [They] will co-operate in looking for [him].” © Much later it was known that Cau Yāt had probably escaped, and Nāy Dharrmarāj<sup>45</sup>, Nāy Nī Jān Dōn<sup>46</sup>, Nāy Prajā<sup>47</sup>, Nāy Dōn Tret Sañsār, and Nāy Nībkāy agreed<sup>48</sup> to the Khmer fleeing

40) Khun Blapblājaiy is also found as the protector of Yāt in the *Ang Eng Fragment*, Coedès, “Essai . . .”, *op. cit.*, pp. 24-28. In the Thai hierarchy law the same title is given to an official, or a function, under the Palace (*vān*) Ministry (*Laws* I, p. 240). In addition see comment below, “Names of individuals”.

41) For an explanation of the name see below, “Names of individuals”.

42) The passage makes no sense, obviously, and the text must be corrupt.

43) An unidentified toponym; see also [15], [iv], [v] below.

44) An unidentifiable Cambodian toponym; see [15], [iv], [vi] below.

45) He is not the same person as Bañā Dharrmarāj of Phitsnulok, and appears to have been Cambodian. I am unable to offer a more precise identification.

46) *Nāy nī jān dōn* cannot be identified, but it should be noted that in the present text there are several titles beginning with *nī*, and inscription no. 48, face 2, line 3 (*Pra : jum śilā cāru’k*, III, 79), with the title *yi jān*, probably indicates that such titles are appropriate for the fifteenth century. One *nī*-type title preserved in the Hierarchy Laws is *ḍk braḥ nī sār sangrām* for governors of Singburi (*Laws*, I, 323), and other titles written *yi sār/sān* are recorded in *Laws*, I, pp. 229, 233, 237, 260, 271.

47) Under the *kalāhom* ministry there was a *khun pra : jā sebarāj* (*Laws*, I, 279), but no identity may be assumed.

48) *Yōm* (ຍອມ).



[๑๗] จากพรรณครหลวงไปอยู่สุเจ้าอย่าต ๆ กตั้งชายชวานาหลัง

๑ ศักราช ๘๔๕ ปีกุนเบญจศก เจ้าพรญาแก้วพรญาไท้ เป้ามหาพรค  
อันผู้เจ้าเข้ามาแต่พรรณครหลวงนั้น กเจรรจากตอยชัยปราชโหรจทำขบดแก-  
สมเทจี พระบรมราชาธิราชเจ้า แลสรรญาแกกันวาคุปราชหนา จให้ชัยปราช  
โหรจกินกรงอยู่ทยา แลจสง

[๑๘] พรญาแก้วพรญาไท้ แลเครื่องราชาปรโลกทิเออมานั้น คินไปยพร  
ณครหลวงคิน กรันรักันแล้ว ก เจรจาท้อยยอตเพชรรัต เพชรณร้าย เพชร  
สงครามพิไชยเพชรอันเปนทหารกงไน ไชศรีญจักรณี กฤดาตลศรีญชรชน  
หมากน้ายคำพรทาน นายงัวศรีนายนศรีหวิไชย นายศรีเทพศุค นายเจตหัว  
อีกหัวพันหัวปากนาย

[17] from Brah Nagar Hluoñ to go to stay with Cau Yāt. He organized them as left, right, forward, and rear. ◎ [Cula] era 845, Year of the Pig<sup>49</sup>, fifth of the decade, Cau Bañā Kaev and Bañā Dai<sup>50</sup>, of the tribe of *mahā barrg*, whom the King had brought from Brah Nagar Hluoñ, were discussing with<sup>51</sup> Jīy Prajā, the astrologer, about committing treason against Samtec Brah Paramarājādhirāj Cau, and promised one another that in accordance with his wish<sup>52</sup>, they would let Jīy Prajā, the astrologer, rule the kingdom of Ayutthaya, and would send

[18] Bañā Kaev and Bañā Dai, and the regalia<sup>53</sup> which had been taken, back to Brah Nagar Hluoñ. When they had made their plans, they also discussed with Yōt Bejrrat, Bejrrarāy, Bejrsangrām, and Bijaiybejr<sup>54</sup>, who were soldiers in *jaiśrī*<sup>55</sup>; with Ñi Cākṛ, Ñi Gṛtāl Śrī, Ñi Kharr Khānd Māk, Nāy Kāmbradān, Nāy Nūa Śrī, Nāy Śrī Hviyaiy, Nāy Śrī Debśuk, Nāt Cet, chief of [boats]<sup>56</sup>, and other chiefs of thousands (*bān*) and chiefs of sections (*pāk*), Nay

49) The date, equivalent to A.D. 1483, is incoherent; see below, "The date of the story".

50) Those two individuals are mentioned in *LP* at the date 793 (A.D. 1431), and in several Cambodian chronicles; see below, "Names of individuals".

51) The yellow script ends at that point in the manuscript.

52) *Prashnā* (ปราชณา) written for *prārthanā* (ปรารถนา).

53) *Rājaprabhog* (ราชปรโภค) written for *rājupabhog* (ราชูปโภค).

54) *Bejrrarāy* was a title given to a *khum* in the department of *tāmruc khāi khvā* (*Laws*, I, 286); *bejrsangrām* was a *khum* in a cavalry department (*Laws*, I, 258); and *bijaiybejr* might tentatively be identified with *bejbaiy*, chief of the palace guards (*Laws*, I, 260).

55) Could *jaiśrī* here mean "the palace"?

56) The emendation has been made here because the context below, p. [20], shows that his proper name was Nāy Cet, and his function *hua ro'a*, "chief of boats".

[๑๙] วังพระญบาล ทั้งปองแล้วกให้ผ้าพอร เงินทองไปแจกกันในภูมิจิย  
 ปรชาโหรจ แลคิตตอยกันวาทเจ้าให้เมื่อทาสต์จีไปยบางตนิมทหนึ่ง  
 เมื่อ ทาสต์จี ทรงบาทนันทหนึ่ง เมื่อทาสต์จีไปไสจันทรนัทหนึ่ง เมื่อ  
 ทาสต์จีไปปรภาตอยุทธญา นสหนามจรรนัทหนึ่ง เหตุว่าพระราชสมภาร  
 ทารจิงกรทำมิลุ จิงนัยเจต

[๒๐] หัวเรือกพททอง อนันันกันนมาบอกแกขุนราชอาษา กลางคิน  
 ขุนราชอาษากเอนายเจตหัวเรือมาค้อย แตกลางคินนั้น กเวยิกขุนมลเทียร  
 บาลๆกไผปรตุ พรราชวัง เอาขุนทั้งสองกเขาไปยกราบทูลแต่พรกัรรูนา  
 สมเด็จพระผู้เป็นเจ้าๆกให้หาพฤทธามาตราชอมาตยทั้งปอง แลขุนราชศักดิ์  
 แลขุนศรีมาชุมกันแล้วทาส์ไปปรยัคช้างม้า



[19] Vāñ<sup>57</sup>, and all the guards. And then they sent for a portion of the silver and gold to go and divide among themselves in the cell of Jiy Prajā, the astrologer; and they would discuss among themselves about taking the King when he went to Pāñ Tanim (1)<sup>58</sup>, when he *drañ pād* (2)<sup>59</sup>, when he went to offer food to the monks (3), when he went to visit Ayutthaya at *sanām candr* (4)<sup>60</sup>. Because of the King's accumulated merit it didn't succeed, for Nāy Cet,

[20] chief of boats, hid on his person the gold which had been divided and came to tell Khun Rāj Āṣā<sup>61</sup> in the middle of the night. Khun Rāj Āṣā took Nāy Cet, chief of boats, along with him in the middle of the night and called Khun Maldiarpāl<sup>62</sup>. The latter opened the door of the palace and took both of them in to go report to H.M. the King. The King sent for all the senior and royal councillors [*āmāty*]<sup>63</sup> and Khun Rājasakti<sup>64</sup> and Khun Śrī to come and assemble; and then he ordered [them] to prepare all the elephants, horses

57) *Nāy vāñ*, literally "a man of the palace".

58) Unidentified toponym.

59) Khun Bunnag has suggested that *pād* should be emended to *pāl*, and that the expression referred to the king offering food to the monks; but that seems unlikely since the same is repeated in the following phrase. Perhaps พระบาทสมเด็จพระ should be interpreted as the king himself carrying the alms bowl, having become a monk for a brief period.

60) A location in the old city of Ayutthaya; see Bra:yā porān rājadhānindr (Bar Teja:gupat), *Tūmnan kruñ kau* ("Story of the old capital"), PP, part 63, vol. 37, pp. 65, 154.

61) *Khun rāj āṣā* is also found in the Hierarchy Law in the department of *tūmruoc hñai khvā*, *Laws*, I, 286.

62) *Khun maldiarpāl* is not listed in the Hierarchy Law but the second term is part of the *rājadinnām/tāmnañ* of the Palace Minister (*Laws* I, p. 237). According to RA, p. 73, *khun* was the appropriate rank for officials of that level up to the time of Trailokanath.

63) The term *āmāty* occurs frequently throughout the text, and I have rendered it consistently as "councillor". Three types of *āmāty* mentioned in the story are *brādhā*- ("senior"), *rāja*- ("royal"), and *senā*- ("military"). Their precise function is of no relevance to the present discussion.

64) *Khun rājasak* is also found in the Hierarchy Law in the department of *tūmruoc hñai sāy*, *Laws*, I, p. 288.

[๒๑] ทเกล้าทหารทั้งปวง วารุณจึงไปเฝ้าพรราชาไทรหนั้น จึงพรญา  
แก้ว พรญาไทย คุรุหัตถ์นั้นจึงหนีไปซ่อนอยู่ ครั้นจกัลดุโรไทย โยธา  
ทหารทั้งหลายก็ไปกรเว้น เฝ้าหุ้มกรบทั้งปวงก็ได้สิน สอนพรญาแก้วพรญา  
ไทยใส่รอยสายงายแก่จึงได้นั้นหลังพรธาตุ ทารกไถถามเป็นสัจแล้ว กให้จำ  
หมั่นใส่เลาไว้แทบเสาทงไชนั้น จึงพรบรมรา -

[๒๒] ชาธิราชเจ้าก็ให้พรราชทานรางวัล แก่นายเจตหัวเรือ แลให้เป็นขุน  
อินทมลตรีข สอนเมณางพรญาเมณางเจ้าเมืองแลพระสหนมผู้ใหญ่ อีกท้าว  
พรญาเสณามาตยทั้งหลายก็ให้กลับเตาปูของพลกลองหมาก เป็นรางวัลแก่ขุน  
อินทมลตรีขไคปรมารกรเชอใหญ่หนึ่ง แล้วก็ให้ เอรังวันนั้นไปเฝ้าขอ

[๒๓] ทั้งปองตุ

๑ อยู่ปรมารศักสามวันทานกให้ ขุนไชยพญาแลศรีรังคัน เฝ้าพรญา  
แก้ว พรญาไทยแลชัยปรีชา แลราชโชนทั้งปอง เสียบปรจารไว้ให้ขุน  
ดเครไซ ทอยกันทั้งปองปรมารสามสมบัติ สอนบุตรพรญาแก้วผู้หนึ่ง ชื่อเจ้า  
แก้วฟ้า ไปอยู่ด้อยภรรยาให้พรปรสภ มิได้รู้ทอยบิดา ทานกมิได้ให้มาเสย

[21] and soldiers, saying "at dawn [you] shall go to get the royal astrologer."<sup>65</sup> But Bañā Kaev and Bañā Dai found out<sup>66</sup> the secret and fled and hid. When it was near sunrise<sup>67</sup> all the soldiers went to round up the traitors and got them all. As for Bañā Kaev and Bañā Dai, later in the day<sup>68</sup> they were caught behind the reliquary. The King had them interrogated, and then had them locked up in a pen placed beside the flagpole. Then Brah Paramarā—

[22] jādhirāj Cau gave royal rewards to Nāy Cet, chief of boats, and made him Khun Indmaltrīy<sup>69</sup>. As for the palace women and also all the *dāv bañā* and officers, he gave them cosmetic and lime boxes, and betel and areca containers as rewards. For Khun Indmaltrīy there was a large basket full, and he had [them] take these gifts and go to let all the traitors

[23] see. ☉ After about three days, the King had Khun Jaiy Bī/Bī and Śrī Rāṅgān take Bañā Kaev and Bañā Dai and Jīy Prajā and all the royal astrologers to impale and expose them on the moat [of] Khun Nagar Jaiy<sup>70</sup>, all together about thirty or more. As for one son of Bañā Kaev, named Cau Kaev Fā, he went to stay with his wife in Brah Prasabh<sup>71</sup>. He did not know about his father and the King did not have him killed.

65) The manuscript shows *draih* (ไธห); when compared with the contexts below, it seems to be a corruption of *hoh* (โห), p. [23], or *horh* (โหร), p. [24], both equivalent to *hor* (โหร), "astrologer".

66) *Ka rā* (กา ร), "found out", is an emendation, suggested by Khun Bunnag, of what appears written as *grū* (ครู), "teacher", making a phrase devoid of meaning.

67) *Aṇṇodāy* (อนโณทัย) written for *aṇṇodāy* (อนโณทัย), *arunoday* (อรุณโทัย).

68) That reading is by Khun Bunnag.

69) Possibly the same as *ḍk hlūoh inmantrī* of the department of *ṣā'a : bhākōr*, *Laws*, I, 248.

70) It is not certain what the reference is.

71) The only known place with that name at the present time is in Cambodia, between Phnom Penh and Kompong Cham, which in the context of the story is not impossible (see below, "Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations"). In this case, however, the "two or three days" of the next passage is an impossibly short time, and might be the mistaken entry of a later copyist who no longer understood the story.



[๒๔] อยู่ปรมารสองสามวัน เจ้าแก้วฟ้าก็ไกรบาทูล แต่สมเด็จพระบรมราชาธิราชเจ้าว่าตัวข้าพรพุทธิเจ้านี้ อยู่ไปวันฉะเข้าจวบตรราชโอรส แลจายทุกเมื่อ เพื่อ ดังนั้นข้าพรพุทธิเจ้าจขอตาย คอยกันเสียยังแล้วทีเดียวทอด จึงสมเด็จพระบรมราชาธิราชเจ้า ก็ให้ศรีรังคัน เอาเจ้าแก้วฟ้าไปมาเสีย ตามใจแล้วเอา

[๒๕] สมนั้นไท่กอบาตรพรญาแก้วผู้บิดาอยู่

๑ เหตุว่าผู้เป็นเจ้าทรงทศพิศราชธรรม มหาปรเสอดี แลข้าคนผู้เป็นกรบคนนั้น ที่มีไกรเห็นเป็นกรบคตอยนั้น ทารกไม่ให้ฆ่าเสีย แต่สักคน

๑ สอนให้เมืองน่านเสีย ท้าวแพงแลท้าวเหาะพี่น้อง ซอนกันทำขบถแพรญา

[๒๖] แคนท้าวจึงเอาเมืองน่านนั้นได้ แลได้ทั้งตัวพรญา แคนท้าว จำนั้นไว้ แลพรญาแพงก็ให้ท้าวเหาะไปกินเมืองลัม จึงพรญาลัมกวาแพรญาแพง ขอทหารให้ฆ่าพรญาแคนท้าวเสียใส่จึงจะชอบ พรญาไม่ช้าก็ให้จำพรญาแคนท้าวไว้ ครั้นสบายใจ ก็ให้ทอคมกีนโพชนาหารสุราบาล แล้วให้เอาไปจำไว้เถา อยู่มาพรญาแคนท้าวก็เจราจคอบรานธาตุ อนุมัติ

[24] After about two or three days Cau Kaev Fā sent word to Samtec Brah Paramarājādhīrāj, saying, "I, slave of Your Majesty, later on in the future will be called by people, 'son of the astrologer' and I will always be ashamed because of that; I, Your Majesty's slave, beg to die also; let's get it over with." So Samtec Brah Paramarājādhīrāj Cau had Śrī Rāṅgān take Cau Kaev Fā out and kill him as he wished and take

[25] the corpse to place it clasping the feet<sup>72</sup> of Bañā Kaev, who was his father. ☉ Because the King observed the ten principles of royal conduct excellently he killed people who were traitors. Those whom he did not also consider traitors, he did not have them killed, not a single one. ☉ As for *mo'an* Nan, Dāv Baeñ and Dāv Hau:, brothers, planned to commit treason against Bañā

[26] Kaen Dāv<sup>73</sup>. They seized *mo'an* Nan and got Bañā Kaen Dāv himself. [They] confined [him], and Bañā Baeñ let Dāv Hau: go to rule *mo'an* Lim<sup>74</sup>. Then Bañā Lim said to Bañā Baeñ, "please have Bañā Kaen Dāv killed, that will be proper." The *bañā* did not kill him, but had Bañā Kaen Dāv confined. When he was in a good mood, he had him brought out to eat food and drink liquor, and then had him locked up in the pen. Later on Bañā Kaev Dāv conversed with *Prān dhātu*<sup>75</sup>, who had

72) ปาตร (*pātr*), "almsbowl", written for ปาถ (*pād*), "foot"; correction suggested by Khun Bunnag.

73) An incident variously recorded in the northern chronicles; see below, "The date of the story".

74) Unidentified toponym.

75) *Prān dhātu* (ปราณธาตุ) has no clear meaning. The first term, when written ปราณ, commonly means "health", "life", "a living being", and the second "relic", "reliquary", "element", and also the fluids of the body, such as blood. I feel that the episode must have some connection with the Kaen Dāv story of the *Nan Chronicle*, in which Kaen Dāv smears his clothes with buffalo blood in order to feign dysentery and be released from prison. One then asks how an imprisoned man obtained fresh buffalo blood, and this may be what was sent by the *prān dhātu* in 2/k. 125. See *Baṅśāvatār mdañ nān*, in *PP*, part 10, vol. 9, p. 305; and *The Nan Chronicle*, trans. Prasert Churatama, ed. David K. Wyatt, Data Paper No. 59, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, p. 13. Those two texts are cited respectively as *NC* and *NCE*.

[๒๗] ความเสแสร้งเกาตमानนั้นก่อให้เกิดนายสามอนกเอาพรญาแกนท้าวไปซ่อนไว้ในเตาให้แห้งหนึ่ง ครั้นพรญาแพงรุกแต่งคนให้ไปหาทั่วทั้งเมืองกมิภพพรญาแพง กให้ยัศคารทางทุกตำบล ครั้นแล้วนายสามอนกเอาพรญาแกนท้าวหนีมาโดยทางสหวางหาโภชนาอาหารกินมิได้ย กกินแต่ไปมากเมาเปลยิกไม้รากไม้ ปรมารสิบวัน

[๒๘] กถึงเมืองสหลวง นายสามอนกเอาพรญาแกนท้าวเข้าไปยฝากไว้ในกุฎีพรหมหาเถนพรหมๆ กให้รักษาไว้

๑ จิงขุนพลพรญาชเลิงไปยวังข้างในตรอน ได้ช้างพังพลัยปรมาร หักสิบข้างจิงพรหมหาเถนพรหม กให้พ้าวมาบอกพรญาชเลิง ถึงคอกข้างนั้น วาบุตรทานพรญาแกนท้าว หนีมาคอยนายสามอน ถึงสหวางแล้ว

[๒๙] แลอยุธยาใส่ในกุฎีพรหมหาเถนพรหมๆ ให้เข้ามาบอกพ้าวเกทาร์ ครั้นพรญาชเลิงรู้ กยินลากยินดินนักหนา แลสั่งให้ผูกช้างผูกม้าไปรับพรญาแกนท้าว ครั้นพรญาแกนท้าวมาถึงกกราบไว้พรญาชเลิงผู้เป็นบิดา กแถลงการอันพรแพงพรญาลิม จิงเอาเมืองน่านนั้น แลพรแกนท้าวกหนีมาเลาไหพรญาชเลิงฟังทุกประการ

[๓๐] แล้ว พรญาชเลิงกเอาพรญาแกนท้าว ลองลงมาถวายบังคม แต่สมเด็จเจ้าพระบรมราชาธิราชเข้าถึงกรุงอยุธยา แล้วพรญาชเลิงกทูลแถลงการอันพรญาแพงพรญาลิม จิงเอาเมืองน่านนั้น แลตัวพรญาแกนท้าวกหนีมานั้น ทูลแก่ผู้เป็นเจ้าทุกประการ จิงสมเด็จเจ้าพระบรมราชาธิราชเจ้ากกล่าว กรรณาเกพรญาแกนท้าว แล้วไหพระราชทานรางวัล



[27] affection for him and had [?] sent [lacuna?] So Nāy Sām Òn took Bañā Kaen Dāv away and hid him in *tau hai* in a certain place<sup>76</sup>. When Bañā Baeñ found out, he organized people to go search all over the country, but didn't find [him]. Bañā Baeñ then had roadblocks set up in all the districts. After this Nāy Sām Òn took Bañā Kaen Dāv and fled via *sahvāñ*<sup>77</sup>. They couldn't find any food to eat and ate only leaves, *mau* fruit, tree bark, and tree roots for about ten days;

[28] and they reached *mo'añ sahuoñ*. Nāy Sām Òn took Bañā Kaen Dāv to go stay in the cell of Braḥ Mahā Thera Brahm, and the latter had him cared for. ☉ Then the officers of Bañā Jaliañ went to catch elephants in/at *tron/truon*<sup>78</sup>, and got about sixty elephants, both male and female. So Braḥ Mahā Thera Brahm had an ascetic (*bā khāv*) come to speak to Bañā Jaliañ at the elephant pen, saying, "your son Bañā Kaen Dāv has fled with Nāy Sām Òn to *sahvāñ*."

[29] and is staying in the cell of Braḥ Mahā Thera Brahm, who had me come give word to you." When Bañā Jaliañ found out, he was very happy and ordered the elephants and horses harnessed to go meet Bañā Kaen Dāv. When Bañā Kaen Dāv arrived he paid his respects to Bañā Jaliañ, who was his father, and reported how Braḥ Baeñ and Bañā Lim seized *mo'añ* Nan and Braḥ Kaen Dāv fled. He spoke so that Bañā Jaliañ could hear everything.

[30] Then Bañā Jaliañ took Bañā Kaen Dāv down the river to come to make obeisance to Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau in Ayutthaya. Then Bañā Jaliañ reported how Bañā Baeñ and Bañā Lim seized *mo'añ* Nan and Bañā Kaen Dāv had escaped. He related everything to the King. Then Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau expressed thanks to Bañā Kaen Dāv and gave rewards and gifts

76) Does *Tau hai* here mean a type of large jar (*hai*/ไห)? That would be more logical as a hiding place than a type of hearth (*Tau*/เตา). NC, p. 305, and NCE, p. 13, say "that night he escaped to Ban Tao Hai".

77) *Sahvāñ/sahuoñ* is probably the *sralvāñ* of Sukhothai inscriptions, which has been tentatively identified as in the Sukhothai-Phitsnulok region. For further discussion see below, "The date of the story".

78) Possibly modern Tron, an *ambhoe* (district) in Uttaradit Province.

[๓๑] แกพรญาทั้งสอง ๆ กลาพรบรมราชาธิราชเจ้ากินไปเมืองขลียง

๑ สอนในพรณครหลวงนั้นได้ หตุงขอมผู้หนึ่งได้ญินวามิกำนญผู้  
เป็นเจ้าไต้โฮงเจ้าอย่าตไต้ยั้งอยู่อยุธยา หตุงขอมกอนคุดตาเจ้าอย่าตกรว่า  
เจ้าอย่าตมิบุน

[i] .....วาเมื่อพราชมาร ทานพรณครอินทรวรรค  
แล้ว ตั้งนิจกอร์ใหญ่โตครองพิภพในพรณครหลวง จึงท้าวพญาพฤทธามาตย์  
ทั้งหลาย กวาเมืองพรณครหลวงไซ เป็นกรุงราชธานีใหญ่หลวง ไซ เมืองเล็ก  
เมืองน้อย แลเจ้าอำมาตมลตรี ไปกิน มิกว อันตู่ข้าพรพุทธิเจ้าทั้งหลายไซ  
ชอบไหพญาแพรก

[ii] อยู่เสวยราชเอง

๑ จึงพบรมราชาธิราชเจ้า กมิพราชโองการว่า พญาทั้งหลาย  
วานัก ชอบแต่เยียวพายหน้าเกอควิวาฯ จึงพญาทั้งหลาย ขอไหข้าพเจ้า  
ขุนศรีบาทเป็นขุนพลไหขุนทรงพรอินทเป็นพิเลียงคุดเตียว ขุนราชศักขุน  
ไกรนรายไซไหอยู่ตักเตอิน ข้าพเจ้าทั้งหลายเหนหาความกนิแห่งมิได้

[iii] เลอยจึงสมเด็จพระบรมราชาธิราชเจ้า กตรับบรรชาตามท้าวพญาทั้งหลาย  
แล้วทานไหตราพรครุทภาหไปไหท้าวพญาทั้งหลาย เอาเจ้าพญาแพรก ขึ้น  
เสวยราชในพรณครหลวง แลไหเจ้าแม่ท้าวอินทบุตริเป็นนางพญา

๑ อยู่มาพรเจ้ากรุงโสธรกไหขุนณครไชเป็นนายกอง ถือโยธาทหาร  
ทั้งหลายไปรับ เจ้ายาคแล



[31] to both the *bañā*, who took leave of Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau to return to *mo'an* Jaliañ. ☉ Whereas in Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ a certain *htuñ khòm*<sup>79</sup> had heard that there was an order of the King issued to have Cau Yāt sent to Ayutthaya. *Htuñ khòm* then examined the horoscope<sup>80</sup> of Cau Yāt and knew that Cau Yāt would have merit.

[32] [end of reverse of manuscript]

[i] [beginning of obverse of manuscript] . . . said, "since the royal son, Braḥ Nagar Indr, has died, now whom is it fitting to let rule in Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ?" Then all the *dāv bañā* and senior councillors said, "*mo'an* Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ is a very great capital city; it is not<sup>81</sup> a little place, and to let *āmāty* [and] *mantrī*<sup>82</sup> go to rule there is not proper; what all of us, slaves of Your Majesty, like, is to let Bañā Braek

[ii] stay and rule himself." ☉ So Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau issued an order saying that all the *bañā* had spoken thus, and that was good, but if in the future there is any conflict [lacuna?] Then all the *bañā* requested, "let your servant, Khun Śrī Pād, be Khun Bal<sup>83</sup>, let Khun Drañ Braḥ Indr be mentor just the same. [As for] Khun Rājaśāk and Khun Krainarāy<sup>84</sup>, let them remain to remind that all of us have no grounds for suspicion

[iii] at all."<sup>85</sup> Then Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau gave orders in accordance with all the *dāv bañā*; and then he gave the seal of the *braḥ* Garuda [*vāhana*]<sup>86</sup> to all the *dāv bañā* in order to take Cau Bañā Braek up to rule in Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ; and he let Cau Mae Dāv Indr Puñrī be consort. ☉ Later on the King of *sodhar*<sup>87</sup> let Khun Nagar Jaiy be commander and take all the troops to go to fight Cau Yāt and

79) *Htuñ khòm* cannot be positively identified as either a title or a name.

80) *Chaṭṭā* (ฉัตร) written for *ja : ṭṭā* (จตุร).

81) *jai*, more properly *jai* (ใจ), used as a negative, a usage attested in standard dictionaries.

82) It is not certain from the text whether *āmāty* and *mantrī*, "officers", should be separated or not.

83) *Khun bal* means "*khun* (chief?) of military forces", and since it appears in this context to be a central government function, might refer to that which under King Trailokanath is believed to have been changed to *kalāthom*. See below, "Date of the story".

84) *Khun krainarāy* is a title given in the Hierarchy Laws to the second in command of the military department of the *tejo*, *Laws*, I, p. 280.

85) That reading is by Khun Bunnag.

86) *Grud bhahā* in the manuscript. The garuda *vāhana* is the "vehicle" of Vishnu.

87) *Kruñ sodhar*, from *yaśodharapura*, the classical name for Angkor.



[iv] ปาวีเสศ ๒ กยฺกข้างมัวริพลไปอยู่ถึง เปรียงเพระะที่นั้นของแควบ จึงขุน  
นครไชย แต่งคนปรมารณ ๓๐๐ ให้ไป คุกน ๓๐๐ นั้น กยฺกไปกลางคืน  
ครันถึงหนทางหนาวหนัก กนออนหลับอยู่ ขุนนครไชยกแต่งหมู่หนึ่งไปดูเล่า  
ครนเห็นผู้ไปกอนนั้นนอนหลับอยู่ก็ให้เกบเอาเครื่องสาตราอาวุธมาสิ้น ครัน  
เขาคิน เขา ก กลับมา

[v] ยังทัพขุนนครไชยๆกไหลลงโทษแล้วให้ ลังเครื่องอาวุธให้แกเข้ากิน

๑ จึงขุนนครไชย กยฺกข้างมัวริพลไปรบเจ้ายาดถึงช่องแควบนั้นเจ้า  
ยาดไต่เตงเขมรของพรรณออกสก็ตยั้งซ้ายขวาหนาหลัง ขุนนครไชยกแตก  
พายมา แลขางภารุทไมตกกเสียขางสำพลิงไปแกเข้าศึก ข้าวกำพูชไล่ฆ่าฟัน  
พลตายชนนั้นมากนัก

[iv] *pā Viset*<sup>88</sup>. The latter took elephants, horses, and troops, and went to *priān broe*<sup>89</sup>. That was where the Chong *gaey*<sup>90</sup> were. Then Khun Nagar Jaiy organized about 300 men and had them go observe. The 300 men moved out in the middle of the night. When they got onto the road it was very cold and they went to sleep. Khun Nagar Jaiy designated a group to go and observe too. When he saw that those who had gone earlier were asleep, he had their weapons picked up and all brought back. When they woke up they came back

[v] to the army of Khun Nagar Jaiy. He had them punished and then had their weapons given back to them. © Then Khun Nagar Jaiy took elephants, horses, and troops to go fight Cau Yāt where the Chong *gaey* were. Cau Yāt had organized the Khmer, Chong and Pear<sup>91</sup> to go out and lie in ambush and shoot<sup>92</sup> from the left, right, front and rear. Khun Nagar Jaiy was routed, and the elephant rushed off with him without falling, and the elephant "Sām Bliñ"<sup>93</sup> was lost to the enemy. The Cambodians<sup>94</sup> pursued and killed the soldiers and very many died then. © Then

---

88) On *pā viset* see below, "Names of individuals".

89) An unidentified Cambodian toponym.

90) See n. 43, above, and comment on "The *barrg*" below. *Gaey* and *gaek* are possibly the same thing, one term, or both, being corrupt. The Chong/*jōn* are a Mon-Khmer ethnic group of western Cambodian and southeastern Thailand.

91) See comment on "The *barrg*" below. The Pear/*barrn* are a Mon-Khmer ethnic group of western Cambodia.

92) *Yu'n* (𑜋𑜨) written for *yīn* (𑜋𑜧).

93) Proper name of the elephant; apparently the same as on p. [xxv], below. One or the other must be corrupt.

94) The term occurs only here in the text, and seems to indicate the Khmer, Chong, and Pear collectively.

[vi] เจ้ายาตยกยักข้างม้ารืพลหนีไปอยู่ในตรอญอาจ ปรมารเตอินหนึ่ง กมา  
เข้าเอาบ้านสุนไปไค แลว กยักมาจงเกอีบ ชุนกำแหงเพชรอันกินเมืองนั้น  
กปองกันษามารต เจ้ายาตเอาเมืองมิไคกเพโทบาย ยกทัพคินไป จึงสมเตจ  
เจากรุงพรณครหลวง กแตงชุนไกรพลแสนไหไปช่วยชุนกำแหงเพชร กัน  
เมือง จงเกอีบนั้น ชาวเมือง

[vii] ทังปวงกไวใจ วาเจ้ายาคคินไปแล้ว ปรมารเจ็ดแปดวันเจ้ายาตยก  
เตคันเรวรุตมาปลดเอาเมืองนั้นไค แลชุนไกรพลแสนชุนกำแหงเพชร หนี  
รอกคินมายังพรณครหลวงแลเสียครว้อพยบชุนกำแหงเพชรสิน อยู่มาชุนไกร  
พลแสนกทูลเตสมเตจเจากรุงพรณครหลวง วาชุนกำแหงเพชรเป็นใจค้วย  
เจ้ายาต แลทรงบุตรภรรยา

[viii] ไป จึงผูกเปนจากไหถามชุนกำแหงเพชร ๒ กวา ถ้าเราเป็นใจค้วย  
เจ้ายาตคัจวานันจริง ชุนไกรพลแสนจหนี่รอดฤ

๑ อนึ่งข้าพเจ้าไครบพุงกันษามารตจิงรอด ผู้เปนเจ้ากไหพิจรณาตุ  
บาทเจบชุนกำแหงเพชรนั้นกเหนจริง ทานกสงภรรยาอินไห แลไหอยูกิน  
เมืองจงเกอีบคินเลา

๑ อยู่มาเจ้ายาตกโหมมา จรรจาปราไส

[ix] คอยชุนกำแหงเพชร วาบุตรภรรยา ชุนกำแหงเพชร ซึ่งเจ้ายาตไค  
เอาไปนั้น เจ้ายาตยังไหปรมนไว ขมิไหขจักขาย ถ้าชุนกำแหงเพชรไปเฝ้า  
เจ้ายาตไส กจเลยิงไหถึงความศุขช ชุนกำแหงเพชร กมิลงตวยเจ้ายาต ๒  
กยักข้างม้ารืพลมาเอาเมอึง จงเกอีบอีกเลา ครันถึงกไหเขาบายป็นปลดเอาไค  
เมืองนั้นแล แลไคทังทัวชุนกำแหงเพชร



[vii]

[vii] ...

[viii]

[illegible]



[vi] Cau Yāt moved the elephants, horses, and troops and fled away to stay in *troēñ āc*<sup>95</sup> for about a month; and [then] he was able to come in and take *pān sūn*<sup>96</sup>, and he moved on to *cañko'ap*<sup>97</sup>. Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr<sup>98</sup>, who governed that *mo'añ*, defended it fiercely. Cau Yāt couldn't take the *mo'añ*, so he employed a ruse and moved the troops back. Then the King of Brah Nagar Hluoñ appointed Khun Kraibal Saen<sup>99</sup> to go help Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr defend the *mo'añ* of *cañko'ep*. The inhabitants

[vii] all believed that Cau Yāt had gone back. After about seven or eight days Cau Yāt took only the fast ones, rushed in and sacked that town (*mo'añ*) and Khun Kraibal Saen and Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr fled quickly back to Brah Nagar Hluoñ and lost all the displaced family of Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr. Later on, Khun Kraibal Saen told H.M. the King of Brah Nagar Hluoñ that Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr was loyal to Cau Yāt, and he had sent<sup>100</sup> his son and wife

[viii] away [to Yāt]. So the King had Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr interrogated. He said, "if I am really loyal to Cau Yāt as [he] says, would Khun Kraibal Saen have gotten away? ◎ Furthermore, I fought fiercely and thus escaped." The King had Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr's wounds examined and saw that it was true. He sent him another wife and let him remain to govern *mo'añ cañko'ap* again. ◎ Later on Cau Yāt had someone come to have a discussion

[ix] with Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr to say that the son(s) and wife(ves) of Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr whom Cau Yāt had taken away were still being kept by Cau Yāt; he hadn't had them eliminated. If Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr went to submit to Cau Yāt, he would take care of him well. Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr did not go along with Cau Yāt, and the latter brought elephants, horses, and troops to take *mo'añ cañko'ap* one more time. When he arrived, he let [them] climb up into and sack that town and took Khun Kāmphaeñ Bejr himself

95) An unidentified Cambodian toponym.

96) An unidentified toponym which seems to be Thai.

97) An unidentified Cambodian toponym.

98) The title is given here to the governor of *cañko'ap*; later, p. [xxiii], he appears as governor of *trabañ blañ*.

99) *Kraibal saen, hluoñ* rather than *khun*, appears in the Hierarchy Laws as military chief of Nakhon Si Thammarat, *Laws*, I, p. 318.

100) *ᨾᩣ᩠ᨿ* (*drañ*) written for *ᨾᩣ᩠ᨿ* (*sañ*), "send"; correction suggested by Khun Bunnag.



[x] ไป เจ้าอย่าตลบตุกรรยาแลข้าคนขุนกำแหงเพชรอันได้ไปแตกอนัน  
ให้คืน<sup>๕</sup> แลเลี้ยงดูขุนกำแหงเพชรให้ถึงสุข

๑ อยู่มาเจ้าอย่าตกใตญ์ข้างทอง แลนางศรีพงษาไปจรรจาปราไสร  
ควมมหาพรกทั้งหลายอันอยู่ในปาสานตินัน มหาพรกทั้งหลายกมาออก  
แกเจายาค<sup>๕</sup>สน

๑ จึงสมเจพญาพรณกรหลวง กแตงขุนศรีมงคล

[xi] รัตน แลขุนทรงพรอินทร ขุนราชศักดิ์ยกช้างม้าวิปลไปเอา ญ์ข้างทอง  
มหาพรกทั้งหลายอันอยู่ในปาสานตินัน จึง ญ์ข้างทองแล มหาพรกทั้งหลาย  
ออกมารบขุนมงคลตณโยธาทั้งหลาย ๆ กพายมาถึงจัตุรมุข แลเสี้ยข้างม้าฮาร  
กายุทธ้องไชยแลเตรพาตสนญ์ข้างทอง แลมหาพรกทั้งหลายยกตามมาถึง  
จัตุรมุข ขุนศรี

[xii] มงคลรัตนชนราชศักดิ์กหนิตเตจัตุรมุขมายังพรณเคอรหลวง จึงเจายาค  
แตงทับเรือไหมสกับในลแวกทนกไลโตเรือชาผูกนมากจึงนายนอยเจาเรือ  
หัวเขนขุนทรงพรอินทรผูกดาขุนราชศักดิ์หนีรอด ชาวทัพเรือเจายาคโลก  
ขุนกำแหงบุตรภรรยาอีกบำไหราบาค-ไป ขุนราชศักดิ์ลูกขุนทั้งหลาย ผุรอด  
นั้นได้พายมาถึงพร

[x] away. Cau Yāt sent the son(s), wife(ves), and domestics of Khun Kāṃphaeñ Bejr whom he had taken away before, and gave them all back; and he took care of Khun Kāṃphaeñ Bejr and made him comfortable. Later on, Cau Yāt had Ñi Jāñ Dòn and Nāñ Śrī Bañṣā go negotiate with all the *mahā barrg* who lived in *pāsānti*<sup>101</sup>. All the *mahā barrg* came to join Cau Yāt. © Then Samtec Bañā Braḥ<sup>102</sup> Nagar Hluoñ appointed Khun Śrī Maṅgal—

[xi] rāṭṇ and Khun Drañ Braḥ Indr and Khun Rājaśākti to take elephants, horses, and troops and go take Ñi Jāñ Dòn and all the *mahā barrg* who lived in *pāsānti*. So Ñi Jāñ Dòn and all the *mahā barrg* came out and fought Khun Maṅgalrāṭṇ [and] all the troops. The latter were defeated and came to Caturmukh, and lost elephants, horses, weapons, victory gongs, and flutes. Ñi Jāñ Dòn and all the *mahā barrg* followed them to Caturmukh. Khun Śrī

[xii] Maṅgalrāṭṇ and Khun Rājaśākti fled from Caturmukh to come to Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ. So Cau Yāt organized a fleet and had it come to wait in ambush at Lovek<sup>103</sup>. He could then pursue and capture the slow boats and many people. Thus Nāy Nōy a boat master, held the arm of Khun Drañ Braḥ Indr, the father of Khun Rājaśākti, and he escaped. The sailors of Cau Yāt got Khun Kāṃphaeñ and his son(s) and wife(ves) and \_\_\_\_\_<sup>104</sup> Khun Rājaśākti and all the *lūk khun*<sup>105</sup> who escaped fled on to Braḥ

101) A Cambodian toponym which also appears in other sources; see below, "*pāsānti*".

102) The combination of titles *samtec bañā braḥ* is, I believe, unique; and it may be a corruption.

103) *Sakap*, an error for *sakat*, "ambush". Lovek was the sixteenth-century capital of Cambodia.

104) The term or phrase here has proven quite incomprehensible.

105) *Lūk Khun*, a type of official. No attempt will be made here to translate or define the term.



## [xiii] นครหลวง

๑ สวณขุนเทพราช อันผู้เป็นเจ้าให้ไปกินเมืองสลายนั้น ครนรู้เจา  
 อยากออกไปคบมหาพรรคทั้งหลายขมึงพริบเอาบาลเมืองทั้งปวงทั้งนั้น ขุน  
 เทพราช แลลูกขุนทั้งหลาย กแต่งบรรณาการมาถวายบังคมเตสมเตจพญา  
 ณครหลวง ครันมาถึงป่าสนที่ ต้องคอยเจ้าอย่าต ๒ กกุมเอาขุนเทพราช แล  
 ขุนหมื่นครว้อพ

[xiv] ขบ อันมาทั้งปวงนั้น กรือเมนางพระเมนางใส เมนางบุตรีเมนาง  
 สน เมนางอัครราช เมนางกงราช อนเปนบุตรภรรยาขุนหมื่นทั้งปวงนั้นก  
 ไตลีนกเอาไปถึงเจ้าอย่าต ๒ กเอาสัตว์ทั้งหลายนั้น เปนภรรยา แล้วกแจก  
 ทรัพย์เงินทอง อันไต่ไปนั้นแกกแกลัวทหารทั้งหลาย

๑ อยู่นอยหนึ่ง บาวีเสดกมาถึงเจ้าอย่าต ๒ กไห

[xv] เมนางกงราช แกบาวีเสด ๒ กกทำการอภิเศกเจาอย่าตไหเปนเจ้าพญา  
 อย่าตไนบาบุรรแล้ว บาวีเสดกตพงพลเอาหมื่นเตรตสงสารไปดวยเตพรายา  
 อย่าตไคเมืองทั้งปวง จัตุรมุข แลหมื่นธรรำเจ้าเมืองเพชรอินทรเมืองลเวก  
 เมืองกำพงไพศรี เมืองตรพังพล้ง เมืองบาบุรร เมืองเกอะ เมืองกตอก  
 ไหเตรตสงสารอยู่กินเมือง



[xiii] Nagar Hluon. ☉ As for Khun Debarāj, whom the King had led go to govern *mo'an slāy*<sup>106</sup>, when he knew Cau Yāt had probably gone off with all the *mahā barrg*, and could conquer all the country like that, Khun Debarāj and all the *luk khun* prepared gifts and came to offer obeisance to Samtec Bañā Nagar Hluon. When they reached *pāsānti* they met a patrol<sup>107</sup> of Cau Yāt. They captured Khun Debarāj and the officers (*khun hmin*)<sup>108</sup> and the families of refugees

[xiv] who came, all of them, that is, Mae Nān Braḥ, Mae Nān Sai, Mae Nān Putrī, Mae Nān San, Mae Nān Āgarāj, Mae Nān Gañrāj<sup>109</sup>, who were the children and wives of all the *khun hmin*; and they got all of them and all went to Cau Yāt. He took all the women as wives and then distributed the possessions and silver and gold which had been obtained to all the soldiers. ☉ A little later Pā Viset came to Cau Yāt and he gave

[xv] Mae Nān Gañrāj to Pā Viset, and the latter performed the consecration of Cau Yāt as Cau Bañā Yāt at Babaur<sup>110</sup>. After that Pā Viset *tabaṇ* [?] <sup>111</sup> the troops and took Hmu'n Tret Sañsār along with him. But Bañā Yāt got all the *mo'an*: Caturmukh and Hmu'n Nārā, governor of *bejrindr*, *mo'an* Lovek, *mo'an* Kompong baiśrī, *mo'an* Trapeang blaṇ<sup>112</sup>, *mo'an* Babaur, *mo'an* koe:, *mo'an* katò;<sup>113</sup> and he let Tret Sañsār rule *mo'an*

106) An unidentified toponym; see below, "Miscellaneous toponyms".

107) The translation was suggested by Khun Bunnag.

108) *Hmin*, an error for *hmu'n*.

109) Mae Nān Āgarāj and Mae Nān Gañrāj also appear in the *Ang Eng Fragment*; Coedès, "Essai", p. 27. See below, "Names of individuals".

110) *Papūrr*, modern romanization Babaur, is at the lower end of the Tonle Sap on the west side of the river.

111) The term has not been identified.

112) *Bejrindr* and *kambaṇ baiśrī* are unidentifiable Cambodian toponyms. Modern gazeteers list three places named *trabaṇ blaṇ* (Trapeang Phlong), in Siem Reap, Kampot, and Kompong Cham. The first two are clearly outside of the area concerned in the story. Even the third, right on what is today the border of Viet Nam, seems too far away. Of course the name, "pond of water chestnut", is the type of natural-feature toponym which could occur almost anywhere, only to disappear when the place was no longer important.

113) *Koe*: is unidentifiable, but I would suggest that *katò* is a scribal error for Krakor, slightly northwest of Babaur on the shore of the Tonle Sap. In the Thai history of the Bangkok Third Reign (*Brah rājabaṇśāvatār kruṇ rāṭanakosindī*, Glān Vitayā, Bangkok, 2506), p. 207, it is distorted in another way, as *ta: grò*; the letters for t, l, g, k may easily be confused in unfamiliar terms in both languages.

[xvi] กตอพญาอาศัยอยู่เชิงไพร พญาวิเสศอยู่พิเรนธร ญิฆางทองอยู่  
จตุรมุข ชนศพญาอยู่ลเวก ชนเทพราชอยู่บาบร ชนกำแหงเพชรอยู่ตังพังพลง  
นายธรรมราชอยู่จ้งเกียบ

๐ จึงสมเด็จพรเจ้ากรุงพนมเปญหลวง กไห่ นายลงพักแต่งกลไ้ลอบ  
มาทูล แดสมเด็จพรบรมราชาธิราชเจ้า คอยขุนณเฑียร

[xvii] ไช้พลอยเจาอาศัยเสีย แลเจาอาศัยออกไปชมมหาพรคทั้งหลายเป็นชบค  
ใหญ่หลวงดังนี้ ขอผู้เป็นเจ้าทรงพรกรุณา

๐ ครั้นคนไช้มาทูลคดีดังนั้น สมเด็จพรบรมราชาธิราชเจ้ากไห่พร  
ราชโองการไปแกพรราชโอรชทานสมเด็จพรเจ้ากรุงพนมเปญหลวง แลทาว  
พญาทั้งทั้งหลายวามีการพรราชสง

[xviii] ราชสงครามในอยุธยา แลไห้ขุนนครไชยนายลงพักมาจ้งจับปลับ  
สวนท้าวพญาเสนาทั้งหลาย ไ้ให้อยู่คอยเจาพญาครั้นพรราชโองการไปถึงสมเด็จ  
เจ้ากรุงพนมเปญหลวง กไห่ขุนณเฑียรไชย นายลงพักมายังอยุธยา

๐ ขุนนครไช้มาถึงสมเด็จพรบรมราชาธิราชเจ้า กไห่พฤทธามาตย  
ทั้งหลายพิจารณาเป็นสัถยทาน



[xvi] *katò*. Bañā Yāt stayed in Choeung Prey<sup>114</sup>, Bañā Viset stayed in *birendhar*<sup>115</sup>, Nī Jān Dòñ stayed in Caturmukh, Khun Śab ĩ<sup>116</sup> stayed in Lovek, Khun Debarāj<sup>117</sup> stayed in Babaur, Khun Kāṃphaeñ Bejr stayed in Trapeang *blañ*, Nāy Dharrmarāj stayed in *cañko'ap*. © So H.M. the King of Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ had Nāy Lañ Băt arrange a ruse, had him sneak off to report to Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau that Khun Nagar

[xvii] Jaiy had let Cau Yāt go, and Cau Yāt had gone out and joined with all the *mahā barrg* as a great traitor. "Thus I beg Your Majesty to have compassion." © When the servant had reported the situation, Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau had a royal order sent to his son, the King of the city of Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ, and all the *dāv bañā*, saying that there would be a war

[xviii] in Ayutthaya, and to have Khun Nagar Jaiy and Nāy Lañ Băt come very quickly<sup>118</sup>. As for all the *dāv bañā* and military, they were to stay with the *cau bañā*<sup>119</sup>. When the royal order arrived, H.M. the King of Braḥ Nagar Hluoñ had Khun Nagar Jaiy and Nāy Lañ Băt come to Ayutthaya. © [When] Khun Nagar Jaiy arrived, Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau had all the senior councillors confer, and [they found it] was true, and the King

114) *Jiañ brai*/Choeung Prey is a district (*sruk*) northeast of Phnom Penh and west of Kompong Cham.

115) Probably the same as *biren*; see above, n. 35.

116) The title *śab ĩ* occurs in three sections of the old laws, none of which show any relationship to its occurrence here. See *Laws*, III, pp. 114, 290, and *Laws*, IV, p. 89.

117) The title *debarāj* is found in several sections of the Thai laws, *Laws*, I, pp. 220, 233, 254, 265, 279, 280, but none of them shows any connection with the present context; and none of the extant lists of Cambodian officials gives such a title to governors of Babaur.

118) *Blap* (พลับ) written for *phlap* (พลับ) or *blan* (พลัน). See below, p. [xxxv].

119) *Cau bañā* here apparently refers to the Ayutthayan prince ruling at Angkor. \*



[xix] กโหมขุนนครไชเสีย แลนายสองถ้อน นายญั้ผู้เป็นบุตรขุนนครไชเสีย แล้วทันทังนายลงพักเป็นขุนพล เอาขุนกำแหงพรอินทรแทน นายลงพัก คู่ขุนรามษร สวณขุนผาวังปลลหัดขุนพรศรีใส อาทิกิ เมื่อขุนนครไชทูลขอชาวปลายเขยีนพลญลนเป็นจำนนัน วาเปนเจ้าศรควาไคแล

๑ ขนนันขุน

[xx] ผาวังทูลวาข้างอันฉนงตังนี้มีครไหไกลพรบาท จึงลุกขุนทั้งหลาย ถาผูอินไสมิชอบ ขาพรเจ้าขุนนครไชเป็นขุนพลเอง ผูเป็นเจ้ากเบอินพรภักตรหนี ขุนผาวังกมิไคทูลพรกรรมาไนรโถถาร อนึ่งมิไคบอกขุนพรศรีสงขางนันไป แกขุนนครไชเอง ผูเป็นเจ้ากโหมจาขุนผาวังไว้ในทลงพ้น แลตั้งไหยศรียุคขุน

[xxi] พรศรี เปนขุนศรีราชวงเมืองแทน

๑ ส่วนเจ้าพญาอยาตโสไกเอามหาพรรค ปรมารณ ๑๐๐๐๐ เปนชาย ขวาหนาหลัง แลไคพญาวิเสศเปนทัพนา ยักมาเตเมอึงนอกบาลพรรคทั้งหลาย กยกมาถึงโพธิสัตว จึงขุนทรงพรอินทรเจ้าเมืองนันออกกยกอพญาอยาตแล พญาวิเสศแตกพายไปถึงเชียงไพร

๑ อยุนอยหนึ่งพรยา

[xix] had Khun Nagar Jaiy killed, and Nāy Sòn Thòn and Nāy Nĩ Dũm, who were sons of Khun Nagar Jaiy, [were] killed [too]. Then the King appointed Nāy Lañ Băt as Khun Bal<sup>120</sup> and took Khun Kāmphañ Braḥ Indr in place of Nāy Lañ Băt, the friend of Khun Rāmaṣar<sup>121</sup>. As for Khun Phā Vǎn, the *balat*, [and] Khun Braḥ Śrī, when earlier Khun Nagar Jaiy asked [the King] for the male elephant, “Khian Bal,” as security<sup>122</sup>, saying, [lacuna?] the King said it was possible. ◎ At that time Khun

[xx] Phā Vǎn said [to the King] that an elephant with even tusks like this should not be allowed to go far from H M. So all the *luk khun* [lacuna?] “If others don’t like me, Khun Nagar Jaiy, to be Khun Bal myself, the King is disgraced”; and [he] fled<sup>123</sup>. Khun Phā Vǎn didn’t tell the King in private. Furthermore, he didn’t tell Khun Braḥ Śrī, but sent that elephant to Khun Nagar Jaiy himself. The King had Khun Phā Vǎn kept in a dungeon, and appointed Śrī, son of Khun

[xxi] Braḥ Śrī, as Khun Śrī Rājavǎn Mo’añ<sup>124</sup> instead. ◎ As for Cau Bañā Yāt, he took about 10,000 *mahā barrg* as left, right, forward and rear [troops], and let Bañā Viset be [commander] of the forward troops, and he moved in from the outer areas. All the *barrg* moved to Pursat, and Khun Drañ Braḥ Indr<sup>125</sup>, the governor there, went out and resisted Bañā Yāt and Bañā Viset [who] were routed and went to Choeung Prey. ◎ A little while later, Ba—

120) *Khun bal* in Ayutthaya. Above, n. 83, we saw that *Khun Śrī Pād* was *khun bal* in Nagar Hluoñ; it would appear that Khun Nagar Jaiy had been *khun bal* in Ayutthaya. See below, p. [xx].

121) Perhaps the same title as *khun ramaṣa*; *tej*, second in command of the department of *bijaiy sañgrām*, *Laws*, I, p. 280.

122) That interpretation is by Khun Bunnag.

123) The passage is admittedly anything but clear.

124) The titles are not found in the extant Hierarchy Laws; but the first could be interpreted as “*khun* of the royal betel”, which would be a palace functionary, and the second contains the term “royal palace”, *rājavǎn*.

125) Pursat (*bodhisātv*) is a town and province west/northwest of Babaur. Khun Drañ Braḥ Indr is apparently the same person mentioned above as *biliañ* of the Ayutthayan prince at Angkor.

[xxii] ยายคพญาวิเสศกยกขางม้ารืพลมาเอาโพธิสัตว์เลา

๑ ชนนันพญาวิเสศกยกทับบมา ทั้งในตำบลโพรงมิไคตังกาย สนวน  
พญาอยากไส มาตงไนโพธิสัตว์ ไหตั้งกายชุกคุ แลเขอินรารวราแพน อาม  
ราชวักหนานันมันคง แตะพรายายคมาลอมโพธิสัตว์อยู่ประมาณ ๕ วัน ชุน  
เทพสงครามจันทบรร กยกข้างม้ารืพลไป

[xxiii] ถึงโพธิสัตว์ ชุนทรงพรอินทรแลชุนเทพสงครามกตกแต่งข้างม้ารื  
พลออกยอพรายายค แลพรายวิเสศแตกฉาน แลโยธาทหารทั้งปวงกตามติ  
ไป ชนนัน ชุนเทพสงครามชีพลายญบาลกวางไล่มาคิกิเจตไปเตตั่วเดียว หมิน  
เตรตสงครามชีพลายรัตนบรล้ง นอย กวาพลายญบาลมากนัถ ครันเหนชุน  
เทพสง

[xxiv] ครามวาเตดไป แลหาผู้ไคจทันมิไค กเกยิวพลายรัตนบันล้งตรหลบ  
มา มุคออกไคกางพลายญบาล เทรตสงครามตีญมวกชุนเทพสงครามตก นาย  
จักรรัตอันเปนกลางข้าง เทรตสงครามกแหงญกตาชุนเทพสงคราม อยู่แลเตรต  
สงครามพันชุนเทพสงครามชาคไนค่อข้าง ชนนัน นายเตรตสงครามกตองป็น



[xxii] ñā Yāt and Bañā Viset took elephants, horses, and troops and came to take Pursat again. ☉ At that time Bañā Viset moved the troops to set them up in *tāmpal borāh*<sup>126</sup>, [but] did not set up a base. As for Bañā Yāt, he came to set them up in Pursat and had them make a base, dig ditches and ramparts around it and make a fence with spikes and thorns<sup>127</sup>, securely. And Bañā Yāt came to surround Pursat. After about five days, Khun Deb Saṅgrām of Chanthaburi<sup>128</sup> took elephants, horses and troops to go

[xxiii] to Pursat. Khun Drañ Braḥ Indr and Khun Deb Saṅgrām prepared the elephants, horses, and troops to go out and resist Bañā Yāt and Bañā Viset [who] were routed and all the soldiers pursued and attacked [them]. At that time Khun Deb Saṅgrām rode the male elephant “Bhūpāl” and blocked and pursued the enemy boldly all by himself. Hmu’n Treṭ Saṅsār rode the male elephant “Rātnaparllāñ,” which was much smaller than Bhūpāl. When he saw Khun Deb Saṅ-

[xxiv] grām was so bold and there was no one to resist him, he goaded the elephant Rātnaparllāñ and turned about to get out beside the elephant Bhūpāl<sup>129</sup>. Treṭ Saṅsār struck and hit the headgear of Khun Deb Saṅgrām and it fell. Nāy Cākrrāt<sup>130</sup>, who was on the back of Treṭ Saṅsār’s elephant, stabbed and hit the eye of Khun Deb Saṅgrām, and Treṭ Saṅsār slashed Khun Deb Saṅgrām, who died on the neck of his elephant. At that moment Nāy Treṭ Saṅsār was struck by arrows,

126) A location also apparently mentioned in the *Ang Eng Fragment*; see below, “Miscellaneous toponyms”.

127) According to Khun Bunnag the phrase has no clear meaning.

128) In the Hierarchy Law, the title does not figure as part of the titulature of governors of Chanthaburi.

129) Reading by Khun Bunnag.

130) The title *khun cakra: hrāt* occurs in the Hierarchy Laws in the department of *Tāmruoc hñai s̄āy*, *Laws*, I, p. 288.

[xxv] ๕ เหลม สนวนพญาตไสกตองปิ่นไนแซนนันปวตน์กัจยุมิไต ถอย  
ไปในถวนบาบรู

๑ อยู่มามีผู้มัลกัชารัตณสิงหาค แทโพธิสัตว์ไป ทองคอยนายเตรต  
สงสาร ๒ กว้างข้างนี้คอนแกเจาพญาต ๒ กรนรุเตรตสงสารโตข้างคั้งนั้น  
เจาพรายายากกขิซางสพลิง มาแต่เชียงไพรสู่พรวเสดทีตร

[xxvi] พังพล้ง ครันถึงกวาข้ามาจ ขอข้างพญาวิเสดกวาเจ้าจรรจาตอยเตรต  
สงสารเทอด พรายายากกไหาเตรตสงสารมาวา เทรตสงสารกวาข้างนี้ข้าพร  
เจาโตใสงไวชือษาทานเอง พรญาายากกวาเรามาใส เพรอะจแปลอินข้าง  
แลเมือทานมิแปลอินกตามใจเทอดพรายากกินไปเมอิง

๑ อยู่มาพรยา

[xxvii] อียากกไสกล ไหาเตรตสงสาร ๒ กไปบอกแกพญาวิเสด ๆ กหาม  
มิไหาเตรตสงสารไป อยู่มานอยหนึ่งพรายายากกไหาเอาเตรตสงสาร รุกไปบอก  
แกพญาวิเสด ๒ กหามเลาใสเรเตรตสงสารมิฟังก์เอาหัวพันสองคนและพล ๕๐๐  
ไปสู่พรายายาก ๒ กไหคุมเอาเตรตสงสาร แลหัวพันทั้งสองจำคงไว้ สนวนพล  
๕๐๐ นั้นใสไหาเอา

[xxv] five of them. As for Bañā Yāt, he was struck by an arrow in the arm, and it was very painful, and he could not remain. He withdrew into the *thuan*<sup>131</sup> Babaur. ☉ Later on someone came and stole the elephant “Rāṭnasinhāt”<sup>132</sup> from Pursat but was caught<sup>133</sup> by Nay Tret Saṅsār who had previously given that elephant to Cau Bañā Yāt. Yāt, when he knew Tret Saṅsār had gotten the elephant like that, mounted the elephant “Sablū’ñ”<sup>134</sup> and came from Choeung Prey to Bañā Viset in Tra—

[xxvi] peang *blañ*. When he arrived, he said, “I have come to ask for the elephant.” Bañā Viset said, “go ahead and talk with Tret Saṅsār.” Bañā Yāt had Tret Saṅsār brought to talk. Tret Saṅsār said, “I obtained this elephant to keep and mount in your service”. Bañā Yāt said, “we came in order to exchange<sup>135</sup> elephants, but if you do not exchange, so be it.” Bañā Yāt returned to his *mo’añ*. ☉ Later on Bañā

[xxvii] Yāt employed a ruse to send for Tret Saṅsār, who went to tell Bañā Viset. He forbade Tret Saṅsār to go. A little later Bañā Yāt sent for him again. Tret Saṅsār rushed to tell Bañā Viset. He forbade him again. Tret Saṅsār did not listen and took two *hūa bān*<sup>136</sup> and 500 troops and went to fight Bañā Yāt. He had Tret Saṅsār and the two *hūa bān* captured and confined. As for the 500 troops, he had them

131) *Thuan* seems inexplicable.

132) The name *ratnasinhāt* (< *ratnasinhāsana*), “jewelled lion throne”, is a near synonym with the name *ratnaparrlañ*, “jewelled throne”, above, p. [xxiii]; and perhaps the same elephant is meant.

133) Assuming the same expression, *ḡñ gòy* as on page [xiii], above; see note 107.

134) See n. 93, above.

135) *Plaein*, scribal error for *plian* (ပြုလုပ်).

136) *Hua ban*, “chief of thousand”, a level of military command.



[xxviii] ไสกลังไว แลเจ้าพรญาอยากเตงไหไปเอาพรญาวิเสตโตกไสจำ  
กงไวสามวัน เอาลงเรือไปถึงจัตุรมุกกษาเสีย สวเนตรตสงสารแลหัวพันทั้ง  
สองไสฆ่าเสียในเชิงไพร แล้วก็เข้าเอาครัวอพยบทั้งปวงเข้าในจัตุรมุกไปยัง  
ทวนบารปรสัน

๐ จึงเจ้าพรญาอยากไหนายธรรมราชเป็นหลวงเทพราชา สวณูชาง  
ทองไสให้ชื่อเจ้าขุนหลวง

๐ จึงสมเด็จพรบรมราชา

[xxix] ธีราชเจ้ากไหแมนางกองแพงบุตรีขุนเทพสงครามเจ้าเมืองจันทบูรแก  
ญไช ใหญ่ไชกินเมืองจันทบูรแทน

๐ อยู่มาพรญาเทพมงคลอันเป็นพฤธามาตยป่วยออกไปอยู่บาลจนถึง  
กถึงกรรม จึงสมเด็จพระบรมราชาธีราชเจ้ากไหเอาทองไนพรคลังขุนหนึ่งทำ  
โกฏสงสการศกนัน แลทานไหหาขุนศรีบาทผู้เป็นบุตรมาแต่พรน

[xxx] กอรหลวง เอามฤกสวนขุนปรชานนผุนองไส ทานไหรับราชการ  
เป็นพฤธามาตยแทน

๐ ศักราช ๘๔๖ ปีชวดนักษัตร เถินญี สมเด็จพรบรมราชาธีราชเจ้า  
กไหชินไปหาพรญาขเลียง แลมหาธรรมราชาพรญารามราช พญาแสนสอยทาว

๐ ขนนันพญาขเลียงไวเมืองสวรรคโลก เจาราชศรียศผู้เป็นบุตรแล  
พญาธรรมราชาไวเมืองพิศณุโลกแกพญาเหมพญา

[xxviii] put in fetters. Then Cau Bañā Yāt had Bañā Viset brought and had him confined for three days and then taken down in a boat to Caturmukh and killed. As for Treṭ Sañsār and the two *hūa bān*, he killed them in Choeung Prey and then went to get all the refugee families who had gone to Caturmukh, and they went to Babaur. ◎ Then Cau Bañā Yāt made Nāy Dharrmarāj Hluoñ Debarājā. As for Ñī Jāñ Dōñ, he gave him the name Cau Khun Hluoñ<sup>137</sup>. ◎ Then Samtec Brah Paramarājā—

[xxix] dhirāj Cau gave Mae Nāñ Kōñ Baeñ, daughter of Khun Deb Sañgrām, the governor of Chanthaburi, to Ñī Jai, and had Ñī Jai govern *mo'añ* Chanthaburi instead. ◎ Later on, Bañā Deb Mañgal, who was a senior councillor, became ill and went to stay in *pān chdīn*<sup>138</sup> and died. So Samtec Brah Paramarājādhirāj Cau had a *tul*<sup>139</sup> of gold taken from the treasury to make an urn for the funeral of the deceased. Then he had Khun Śrī Pād, who was the son, brought from Brah Na—

[xxx] gar Hluoñ to receive the inheritance. As for Khun Prajā, the younger son, he let him receive an official position as a senior councillor in his father's place. ◎ [*Cula*] era 846, Rat Year<sup>140</sup>, second month, Samtec Brah Paramarājādhirāj Cau sent up for Bañā Jaliañ, Mahā Dharrmarājā, Bañā Rāmarāj, and Bañā Saen Sòy Tāv<sup>141</sup>. ◎ At that time Bañā Jaliañ left *mo'añ* Savarrgalok [to] Cau Rāj Śrī Yaś, who was his son, and Bañā Dharrmarāj left *mo'añ* Phitsanulok to Bañā Hem; Bañā

137) A title which appears in several Ayutthayan documents, but in Cambodia only as the title of the early sixteenth-century rebel, Kan. See the traditional history of the period in J. Moura, *Le Royaume du Cambodge*, Adhémar Leclère, *L'Histoire du Cambodge*, or Francis Garnier, "Chronique royale du Cambodge", *JA*, octobre-novembre-décembre 1871, p. 347 (cited further as Garnier, "Chronique"). The best-known occurrence of *khun hluoñ* in Ayutthaya was in titles ascribed to Paramarājādhirāj before his reign. See *RA*, p. 67.

138) Literally "river village", and unidentifiable.

139) An ancient measure; see the Royal Institute dictionary.

140) The date 846 [A.D. 1484] is incoherent; see below, "The date of the story",

141) The title also occurs in the chronicles of Nakhon Si Thammarat (Wyatt, *Crystal Sands*, pp. 119-112); and in the hierarchy laws in the department of *tānruoc hñai khvā*, *Laws*, I, p. 287. But in both cases it is given to relatively low-ranking *hmu'n* who may not *a priori* be identified with the individual here.

[xxxi] งามราชไวมืองศุโขไทยแกพญาธรรมราช แลไตรศวรแลพญาแสน  
สอยดาวไวมือง กำแพงเพชร แกพญาศรีวิภักติ แล้วพญาทั้งหลาย กลอง  
มายังอยุธยา ครั้นถึงผู้เป็นเจ้าใหญ่ทั่วพญา เสนามาตย์ทั้งหลายในกลา  
บุเรียนพทรวาษ จึงบอกพญาทั้ง ๔ ถวายบังคมพรบาทแล้ว ทานกมิพรราช-  
โองการแกพญาทั้ง ๔ วาเยียนใด

[xxxii] เราให้พญาทานออกไปขึ้นทเสมาเราใด จึงพญาแสนสอยดาว แล  
พญารามราชกกุลแต่ผู้เป็นเจ้าว่า ข้า<sup>นี้</sup>ไสอยู่ตอดานเมืองขเลียงแล้วแลพญาแสน  
ทั่วมาอยู่ทวยในเมื่อนั้นเล่า ขอผู้เป็นเจ้าไวเป็นภานุรข้าพเจ้าพญาขเลียง  
ทีเดียวกเทอติ เมื่อใดจะมีการสงคราม ข้าพเจ้าทั้งหลายขอเอาช้างม้ารพล  
ไปชวย

๐ จึงสมเด็จพรบมราชธิราชเจ้ากตรัต

[xxxiii] พรบรราชตาม จึงพญาขเลียงกกุลแต่ผู้เป็นเจ้า วาธาเจ้าเอาทวย  
ไมตรีมิใดแล้วเอาทวยการสงคราม ผู้เป็นเจ้ายิ่งให้เอาดา จึงทานกมิพรบรทูล  
ว่าฉันใดใจใดไสกวาพญามิใดเลอย จึงพญาขเลียงกกุลเจ้าวกำลังข้าพเจ้าไส  
ยอนแล้วชาวแพรชว่น่านพลเข้าหญาบหมินช้างม้าเกอือบ คามถาจอไศกจใด  
ทวยเคชะพรรราชสมภารแล

๐ แล้วสม

[xxxiv] เ็จพรบมราชธิราชเจ้ากตรัตส่งแกพญาทั้งสาม วาธาพญาขเลียง  
จไปเอาเมืองนานไสให้ทั้งหลายแตงพล ๒๐๐๐ ช้างเกรือง ๒๐ ม้า ๒๐๐ แตง  
ให้ทันราชการไส คือทั้งหลายมิสวาพิภักแกเราเลอย

๐ แล้วทั่วพญาทั้งหลายกลาผู้เป็นเจ้าขึ้นไปเมือง แต่พญาแสนไสยัง  
อยู่บ่าเรอพรบาทในอยุธยา

๐ สอนพญาขเลียงไส ครั้นขึ้นไปถึง เมืองสวรรค



[xxx] Rāmarāj left *mo'añ* Sukhothai to Bañā Dharmarāj and *Trai suor*, and Bañā Saen Sōy Tāv left *mo'añ* Kamphaeng Phet to Bañā Śrīv Bhākti<sup>142</sup>. Then all the *bañā* came down to Ayutthaya. When they arrived, the King had all the *dāv bañā* and military councillors (*senāmāty*) assembled in a temple hall<sup>143</sup>. Then he allowed the four *bañā* to make obeisance, and then he addressed the four *bañā*, saying, "in what way

[xxxii] can we have you go out to our borders?" Then Bañā Saen Sōy Tāv and Bañā Rāmarāj said to the King that, "we are being used for the affairs of *mo'añ* Jaliañ already, and Bañā Kaen Dāv has come to stay too in that *mo'añ*. We request Your Majesty to leave it as the responsibility<sup>144</sup> of your servant, Bañā Jaliañ, alone; whenever there is a war, all of us, Your Majesty's servants, will ask to take elephants, horses, and troops to help." ◎ So Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau issued

[xxxiii] an order accordingly. Then Bañā Jaliañ said to the King, "if [we] cannot get [it/him] in a friendly manner, but take [it/him] through warfare, will Your Majesty still let us take [it]?" Then the King said, "any way you can do it is better than you not getting it at all." Then Bañā Jaliañ told him again that, "my forces are weak; the people of Phrae and Nan, their forces are twenty thousand, and the elephants and horses are almost *gām* [?] If I can get it, it will be due to Your Majesty's power." ◎ Then Sam—

[xxxiv] tec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau ordered the three *bañā*, "if Bañā Jaliañ goes to take *mo'añ* Nan, let all of you organize 2,000 troops, 20 war elephants, and 200 horses for him; if there is royal service, all of you be faithful to us." ◎ Then all the *dāv bañā* took leave of the King to return to their *mo'añ*. But Bañā Saen still remained to serve the King in Ayutthaya. ◎ As for Bañā Jaliañ, when he had reached *mo'añ* Savarrga—

142) The titles *cau raj śrī yas*, *bañā hmai*, *trai suor*, and *bañā sriv bhakti* do not occur in the Sukhothai-area inscriptions.

143) I follow here Khun Bunnag's suggestion that *purian* is for *เปรียญ* (*priāñ*), "monastic examination". He would also emend *kala* to *salā*, but I think the old Khmer term for "enclosed area", *kralā*, may have been intended. *Baddhāvās* is probably a scribal error for *buddhāvās*, "dwelling of Buddha".

144) *Bhandur*, written for *bhārdhura*: (ภารธุระ). Thanks are due to Khun Bunnag.

[xxxv] โลกกไวคตีทั้งปวง แก่หมิ่น หลวงพล ๒ กไหหนังสือไปสอง  
 พัน พารกองในเมองน่าน พัน พารกองกเป็นใจควย หมิ่นหลวงพลแลไห  
 หนังสือมาวาไหพญาเจ้าเรงยัก ช้างม้ารืพลไป จงจับพลันพรอมกันนักนิ  
 หมู้ลาวทั้งหลายมาบอกแก่ขุนหมื่นพองขวางไนไทรตริงษา

[xxxvi] พองขวางเคนพลรบไคพลปรมาร ๖๐๐๐ แลช้างม้าสพอยุแล้ว กไห  
 เอากรว้อบพยบทั้งปวงเขาไปในเมืองเชียงไหม

๑ กรันหนังสือมาถึงหมิ่นหลวง ๒ กเอาคตินันบอกแก่พญาชเลียง ๆ  
 กไหเทียบช้างม้ารืพลทั้งปวง แลไหหนังสือไปเรงเอาพลหัวเมืองใหญ่ทั้งสาม  
 เมืองอันจเข้าตาทัพควยนั้น

๑ ชนนี่ชาวคอยกมาบอกแก่สัวะ

[xxxv] lok, he left all affairs to Hmu'n Hluon Bal, who sent a letter to [sòh?] Băn Bārkhôn<sup>145</sup> in mo'an Nan. Băn Bārkhôn was loyal to Hmu'n Hluon Bal and sent a letter saying, "you hurry and bring elephants, horses, and troops and let's go quickly together now." All the Lao came and told Khun Hmu'n Bôn Khvān in *trai tru'nṣā*<sup>146</sup>.

[xxxvi] Bôn Khvān conscripted troops and got about 6000 together with elephants and horses. When all were there he had all the refugee families taken to *mo'an* Chiang Mai. © When the letter reached Hmu'n Hluon' he reported on the matter to Bañā Jalian, who prepared all the elephants, horses, and troops, and sent a letter to rush and take the forces of the large *mo'an*, all three *mo'an*, which would go as forward troops. © At that time the people of *gòy/gsay* came and spoke to *siva*.<sup>147</sup>

145) *Bārkhôn* is perhaps an error for *phākôn*, a name elsewhere associated with Nan, but not in the time period of 2/k.125. See NC, pp. 301-02; and A.B. Griswold and Prasert ға Nagara, "The pact between Sukhodaya and Nān, Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 3", JSS, LVII, 1 (January 1969), pp. 63-65, 81, n. 15.

146) *Trai Tru'nṣ* or *Traitrins'a*, according to A.B. Griswold and Prasert ға Nagara, "King Lōdaiya of Sukhodaya and his contemporaries, Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 10", JSS, LX, 1 (January 1972), p. 29, was located a few miles downstream from Kamphaeng Phet.

147) I have no explanation to offer for *gòy/gsay* or *siva*:. The text at that point is in poor condition.



### The age of the manuscript

The first critical task should be to investigate the age of the manuscript, but that seems impossible to determine beyond the probability that it is from the Ayutthaya period<sup>148</sup>. Lacunae at several points show that the contents did not originate with the manuscript at hand, which must in turn be a copy of an older one.

### The date of the story and its sources

The next question is what period the contents purport to cover. Two dates are found in the text: "*cula* era 845 [A.D. 1483], Pig Year, fifth of the decade (ms. [17])," and "[*cula*] era 846 [A.D. 1484], Rat Year". (ms [xxx]). Both are wrong. The year 845 was of the Hare, with the nearest Pig Years being 841 and 853, while 846 was of the Dragon and the nearest Rat Years were 842 and 854. Those dates must be emended before the contents of the text may be used in historical synthesis. Of the elements making up those dates, the "8" is virtually certain, since other sources have placed most of the events of the story in the fifteenth century A.D. Since the first date specifies, "fifth of the decade," it is also likely that "5" was the original unit figure in that date. It is therefore necessary to find a two-year sequence of dates in the ninth century of the *cula* era which ended in "5" and "6", and were respectively Pig and Rat Years. There are two such pairs: 805-806 and 865-866, of which the former seems initially to be preferable, since it falls within the reign of the Ayutthayan king known traditionally as Paramarājādhirāj (II), who died in 810/1448<sup>149</sup>.

Testing the period 805-806 against other details of the story reveals it to be preferable from all points of view. The first detail to use as a test is the statement, following the opening battle scene and preceding the first expressed date, that Bañā Rām died in Hansāvatī and was succeeded by Rañā Baro. In the Mon chronicle *Rājādhirāj*, King Sudodharmarājādhirāj is said to have died in 803 and to have been followed on the throne by Braḥ Cau Ba:ro. Shortly before that time

148) Conversation with Khun Prasarn Bunprakong, June 1975, which concurs with the opinion of Khun Bunnag. In a conversation Dr. Prasert na Nagara has said that the epigraphy of the Ayutthaya and Ratthanakosin periods has been too little studied to permit a definite statement about the date of the script.

149) Adopting the chronology of *LP*.

the brother of Sudo-, Bra:yā Rām, also died in Martāban<sup>150</sup>. Thus, although the two traditions do not seem to be exactly the same, we may conclude that they are variants of a single story which has generally been placed in 803, and the dates 805-806 for subsequent events are acceptable reconstructions.

The next episode which can easily be checked against other sources to verify dates is the incident in Nan that occurred between the two expressed dates which I have reconstructed as 805 and 806. The story is fairly complicated. According to the *Nan Chronicle (NC)*, Kaen Dāv (called *inta : kaen dāv*) succeeded to the throne in 795, but three months later his two younger brothers, Cau Paeñ and Hò Bam, overthrew him and left him in prison to die. He escaped, took refuge with Bra:yā Jaliañ, and in 797 returned with the aid of the latter's troops. Later on, in 812, Inta:kaen Dāv fled to Jaliañ a second time in the face of an attack by King Tiloka of Chiang Mai<sup>151</sup>.

The *Chiang Mai Chronicle (CMC)*, says, on the other hand, that in 805 Kaen Dāv of Nan tried to usurp the throne of Chiang Mai. Tiloka sent an army commanded by Mu'n P'eng of Phayao and Khun Xang, but Kaen Dāv deceived and killed them<sup>152</sup>.

So far the incidents of 2/k.125, *NC* and *CMC* involve the same principal personages, Kaen Dāv and *baeñ/paeñ*/P'eng, but their relationships are different and the outcome varies from one version to another. As to date, 2/k.125 and *CMC* agree against *NC*.

According to *CMC* Tiloka himself invades Nan after six years, in 810, and is victorious, whereupon Kaen Dāv flees to the south<sup>153</sup>, which seems to be the same event recorded in *NC* as the second flight of Kaen Dāv. If it were not for the date of the first event in *NC*, it could be assumed that all three sources agreed as to the events involving Kaen

150) *Rājādhirāj*, (Bangkok : Glān Vitayā, 2513), pp. 633-637.

151) *NC*, pp. 304-08, *NCE*, pp. 13-14.

152) See *Tāmñān bu'n mo'añ jiañ hmai* Bangkok, Commission for the Publication of Historical Documents. Office of the Prime Minister), p. 52; or Camille Notton, *Annales du Siam*, III, 110.

153) *Tāmñān*, p. 53; Notton, p. 111.



Dāv in Nan, even if the precise details differed from one tradition to the other. The dates of *NC*, however, are known to be in error. The error has been interpreted as one of two or three years<sup>154</sup>; thus 795 is called *ruaṇ kai*, in northern cyclical terms, but it was really a *ka pau* year, while the true *ruaṇ kai* year was 793. This date is just one 12-year cycle earlier than the 805 of *2/k.125* and *CMC*, and given the frequency of such cyclical errors in chronicle texts, it seems legitimate to prefer 805<sup>155</sup>.

The details of the (Inta :) Kaen Dāv episode also give some support for the idea that *2/k.125*, or the original behind it, was a very early composition. When Kaen Dāv escaped from confinement and fled from Nan, he was hidden in *tau hai*, then went to *sahvāṇ/sahluoṇ* (Sralvaṇ), and after that he was taken to Tron by his father, the Lord of Jaliaṇ. *NC* only says that Kaen Dāv fled from Nan to Ban *tau hai*, then to *mo'aṇ rām*, and then on to *mo'aṇ tai* (southern country), where he took refuge with the Lord of Jaliaṇ<sup>156</sup>.

The mention of Sralvaṇ is interesting, a place-name occurring in Sukhothai inscriptions, but the precise location of which is no longer

154) *NCe*, p. 16, n. b.

155) Another example of precisely such an error is the date *cula* 898, *po'k san*, given in *Baṇsavatar mo'aṇ nan*, p. 316, for the repair of a temple, *vāt hluoṇ klaṇ viaṇ*; but the true date, 910, *plo'k sa,n* is preserved in a contemporary inscription, no. 74, in *Pra : um sila caru'k* vol. III, pp. 202-206. This interpretation, that some if not all of the incoherent dates of *NC* are one cycle too early, differs from the evidence of the Chae Haeng Reliquary Chronicle, which Wyatt has recently used ("The chronology of Nan history, A.D. 1320-1598", *JSS*, LXIV, 2 [July 1976], pp. 202-06), and which often has dates one cycle, more or less, earlier than *NC*. The date of the construction of Vāt Hluoṇ, though, still agrees with the inscription. The complete consistency of the dates in the Chae Haeng Chronicle should not immediately lead to their acceptance. Such consistency is very easy to achieve, by 'correcting' either the absolute or cyclical year. The interesting feature of the *NC* dates is that the errors appear systematic, not random, and only discovery of the system will reveal the secrets of Nan chronology.

156) *NC*, pp. 305-06; *NCe*, p. 13.



known<sup>157</sup>. Thus, 2/*k*.125, or the records from which it ultimately devolved, would have been written when the name was still current; while at the time *NC* or its source was composed, the location (and perhaps the very name) was no longer known. In the two stories, Sralvañ and *mo'añ rām* have equivalent functions as the place where Kaen Dāv was given refuge by a monk or an ascetic; the logical location would be between Nan and Tron, i.e., probably in the present province of Uttaradit. This squares with Griswold and Prasert's assertion that Sralvañ cannot be in Picitr, as formerly believed, but does not support their idea that Sralvañ should be placed between Sukhothai and Phitsanulok<sup>158</sup>.

The dates suggested so far for the time of the story are also acceptable with respect to the *Hluoñ Prasro'th (LP)* date, 793/1431, for a conquest of Angkor by a king Paramarājādhirāj; but they are much too late for the dates of that event as given in the best-known Cambodian chronicles, and as proposed in the latest revision of the history of the period<sup>159</sup>. This is the main point on which I feel 2/*k*.125 presents important, hitherto unsuspected details, which are discussed below.

Although the story fits the evidence of a variety of other sources with respect to dates, one could still argue that its interesting and unusual details are not a more accurate rendition of events, but simply an imaginative composition which happened to be placed in the correct time period. Indeed, the numerous conversations it includes must be imaginative. The style of the narrative together with the conversations shows that it is not a chronicle based directly on archival extracts, as *LP* appears to be, but a story written at least one remove from them.

157) A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara, "The inscription of King Rāma Gāmhēn of Sukhodaya (1292 A.D.), Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 9," *JSS*, LIX, 2 (July 1971) p. 218, n. 129.

158) *Ibid.*

159) Most of the Cambodian chronicles place the event in the fourteenth century; and Wolters, "Basan", argues for 1389. See below, "Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations". As speculation on how the erroneous dates of 2/*k*. 125 came about, I would suggest that the original composition had *śaka* era dates, 1365-66, and an error was made by a later copyist who converted them to *cula* era.

Even if the story is one in which the writer's imagination were allowed some freedom, there is further internal evidence that the story as a whole dates from soon after the time period it purports to cover, which lends more credence to its details than if its origin had clearly been some hundred years later.

That evidence lies in the titles, especially the *yaś*, given to most of the characters in the story. It cannot have escaped the careful reader's attention that each grade of *yaś* in 2/k.125 seems to have a much higher status than in the nineteenth century, and also higher than in the 1805 *Laws*, some parts of which are believed to date from much earlier. Thus *khun* and *nāy* appear to be high-ranking officers; the only people entitled *bañā/brāñā* (modern *bra:yā*) are rulers of the Sukhothai-area *mo'añ*, recently independent; and the only two *cau bañā* besides Yāt, who appears to have assumed that title himself, are sons of the Ayutthayan King. Even officers who appear to be ministers of the central government are only entitled *khun*.

The declining value of titles over time, and their replacement by other, newly prestigious titles, is a well-attested phenomenon in many societies, so a time must be identified when the rank structure of 2/k.125 would have been appropriate. The most useful point of comparison is the very laconic entry of *RA* describing the so-called administrative reforms of King Trailokanath<sup>160</sup>. Those reforms raised the Minister of the Capital from *khun mo'añ* to *braḥ nagarpāl*, the Minister of the Palace from *khun vāñ* to *braḥ dharmādhikarṇ*, the Minister of Fields from *khun nā* to *braḥ kṣetrā*, and the Minister of the Treasury from *khun glāñ* to *braḥ koṣādhīpati*. Thus four of the principal ministers of the central government had *yaś* of *khun* before the reign of Trailokanath; that level was raised by two steps to *braḥ* sometime in the latter part of the fifteenth century. Later, as we all know, the *yaś* of those ministers was increased still more to *bañā*, *ḍkñā*, *ḍkbañā cau bañā* etc. In that respect, the rank structure of 2/k.125 belongs right where its ostensible date falls, just before Trailokanath's reign. Moreover, the official who opened the palace to the loyal personnel arriving to denounce the traitors, and who took

160) These reforms are not mentioned in *LP*.



them in to see the King, is called *khun maldiarpāl*, the latter term of which is still in the 1805 *Laws* a part of the *tāṃnaeñ-rājadinnām* of the Minister of the Palace<sup>161</sup>. It is unlikely that anyone intending subsequently to write a fictional account, when titles had been changed, would have so carefully documented, correct, early fifteenth-century titles.

#### Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations

The basic events related by 2/*k.125* are not unknown elsewhere. They are an Ayutthayan conquest of Angkor in the reign of one King Paramarājādhirāj, followed by resistance and eventual victory under a Cambodian prince, Bañā Yāt. The entire story, conquest and resistance, is only found in the Cambodian chronicles, and at various dates, such as A.D. 1372, 1388, 1408, 1420, 1457, 1492, but never at the date 1431 given by *LP*. The Cambodian chronicles also relate that a son of Paramarājādhirāj, called Indarājā, was given the throne at Angkor following the conquest, and they preserve the name, Bañā Braek, but as another title of Indarājā, not as a brother who succeeded the first Thai prince at Angkor. Furthermore, the period of Thai occupation of Angkor, ended by Bañā Yāt's resistance, is given as only one year, whereas 2/*k.125* taken together with the *LP* date implies a period of at least 12 years<sup>162</sup>.

The structure of the story in 2/*k.125*--conquest of Angkor by King Paramarājādhirāj, the placing of his son Nagar Indr on the Angkor-rean throne, the involvement of two individuals, Bañā Kaev and Bañā Day, the removal of valuable objects to Ayutthaya--shows that it is to

161) See my remarks on *yaś* in Vickery, review of Robert B. Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks*, etc., *JSS*, LXII, 1 (Jan 1974), pp. 169-71; and in Vickery, review of Yoneo Ishii et al., *An Index of Officials in Traditional Thai Government*, etc., *JSS*, LXIII, 2 (July 1975), p. 421, I give some attention to *tāṃnaeñ-rājadinnām*, and on pp. 426-30 I show that the *Hierarchy Laws* reveal an old structure in which the palace (*vāñ*) may have been the most important ministry—a situation which also seems to appear in 2/*k.125*.

162) See the standard accounts in Garnier, "Chronique"; Adhémar Leclère, *Histoire du Cambodge*; J. Moura, *Le royaume du Cambodge*.



that extent the same story as recorded in *LP* in A.D. 1431 and the long Ayutthayan chronicles in 1421. Subsequent events, however, including mention of Yāt and his reconquest, are missing from all Ayutthayan chronicles, which have nothing more about Cambodia for another century.

The *2/k.125 Fragment* amplifies that well-known story, and modifies it in some startling ways. Thus, when Angkor is first mentioned, sometime between 1441 and 1443, the Ayutthayan King's son, Brah Nagar Indr, had been ruling there for an unspecified period of time, which means that if the *LP* date for the conquest is true, and there is no evidence against it, Ayutthaya had occupied Angkor for 10 to 12 years when Yāt's resistance first began. Moreover, far from achieving the quick victory that the Cambodian chronicles indicate, Yāt is involved in a series of both defeats and victories extending over two years; and the struggle is still unresolved, with Ayutthaya still in control of Angkor, when our fragment ends in 1444.

Another difference from the familiar story is in the identity and fate of the Ayutthayan Princes at Angkor. Nagar Indr, whom the Cambodian chronicles call Indarājā, is not killed by Yāt, but dies of illness<sup>162a</sup>, to be succeeded by his brother Bañā Braek, which name the Cambodian chronicles give as a second title for Indarājā.

Perhaps the most startling detail of *2/k.125* is what it seems to say about the antecedents of Bañā Yāt. In the first passage where he is mentioned, he is called "son of Brah Rām Cau, whom the King had sent to reside in Caturmukh [Phnom Penh]". That unavoidably recalls the *LP* episode in which a King, Cau Bañā Rām, was sent away in 1409 by the father of Paramarājādhirāj, but to govern (กันเมือง) a location, *padāgūcām*, the identification of which has presented some difficulty<sup>163</sup>. Prince Damrong, who established the hitherto accepted identification, equated *padāgūcām* with *gū cām*, a canal just across the river from

162a) The death of Nagar Indr/Indarājā by illness is also mentioned by Rong Syamananda, *A History of Thailand*, p. 38, but no source for the information is given.

163) The date is from *LP*, and the identification is that of Prince Damrong in *RA*, p. 252.

Ayutthaya. But to explain the syllables “*padū-*”, he was forced to rely on a contrived etymology, which if for no other reason is not legitimate, since it is based on an entirely different language (Malay) by way of another, distant dialect of Thai, that of Songkhla. It also seems unlikely that rebellious generals, in the story of *LP*, could have escaped the royal authority merely by crossing to *gū cām*, and *padāgūcām*, as I propose to show, should probably be located much farther afield<sup>164</sup>.

In the two oldest full Cambodian chronicles, *Nong* and its Thai translation, the passage concerning the establishment of Phnom Penh as capital, which is attributed to Bañā Yāt, includes among the names of the place both *caturmukh*, “four faces”, and *crāp jhām*<sup>165</sup>, of which the second term means “blood”, but which as a whole has no coherent meaning and has long been unknown. Students of the chronicles are agreed that *crāp jhām* must be a very old title or toponym<sup>166</sup>, perhaps corrupt, which must have found its way into relatively modern chronicles probably through the recopying of older and longer texts. In a somewhat

164) The *gū cām* canal, which flows through a district formerly inhabited by “Cochinchinois” and Malays, begins at the river just 300 meters to the east of Vat Phutthaisawan, and flows southeast to meet the river again south of the old Portuguese town. Thus it is entirely within an area which must have been fully under control of the city even in the fifteenth century. See Sumet Jumsai, “The reconstruction of the city plan of Ayudhya”, *In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon*, p. 313 and figs. 11, 12, 24; and Bra:yā porān rājadhānindr, “Tāmnān kruñ kau,” in *Pra:jum bañsāvātār bhāg* 63 (Guru Sabbhā edition, vol. 36-37), pp. 148, 188. Prince Damrong said (R4, p. 252) *padāgūcām* derived from *pla:dābhūcām* (ปลาดุกจาน), and justified the first two syllables by reference to a Songkhla dialect term, *pla:dā*, used for districts near the sea. This can only be a southern Thai corruption of the local Malay *pata*, “beach”. See Thomas F. Fraser, Jr., *Rusembilan, A Malay Fishing Village in Southern Thailand*, p. 21 and appendix B, “The language of Rusembilan”. The syllable *bhū*, “territory”, of Prince Damrong’s reconstruction also contradicts the other etymology, “Cham canal”. Prince Damrong also said *LP* must be in error in stating that Cau Bañā Rām was sent “to eat *mo’añ padāgūcām*”, since there could have been no *mo’añ* there.

165) *PP*, vol. I, p. 193.

166) G. Coedès, “La fondation de Phnom Peñ au XV siècle, d’après la chronique cambodgienne”, *BEFEO*, XIII, 6 (1913), p. 8, n. 4.



later nineteenth-century chronicle, which however includes some apparently pre-*Nong* detail, this mysterious name is also written *prāp jhām*, which the close resemblance between Khmer *p* and *c* easily explains<sup>167</sup>. In fact, since the meaning of the term is quite obscure, *prāp* could be an older variant than *crāp*. The pronunciation of the variant with *p* is today/*prāp cheam*/; a few centuries ago it would have been/*prāp chām*/, in Thai script ปรำชาม. Since *prāp*/ปรำ has a common meaning, “to put down, to level”, it would be easy for a scribe to assume that the meaningless (in this context) *chām*/ชาม should be ฌม/*cām* or “Cham”, and that the name should mean “put down the Cham”; just as the name Siemreap/*siamrāp* is traditionally supposed to mean either “the Siamese put down [the Khmer]”, or “the Siamese were flattened”. Such a change could have been effected by a copyist working with either Thai or Khmer. It is perhaps also significant that the Mekong, on which Phnom Penh is situated, was known alternatively as late as the nineteenth century as the “Cham river”<sup>168</sup>, and the entire phrase might have been regarded, like *caturmukh*, as a reference to the geography of the site.

The reader is no doubt aware of the direction in which I am moving, and perhaps fears that I shall attempt to overwhelm him with a bit of legerdemain. But no, the next step, the identification of the initial syllables of both phrases, can be demonstrated on good linguistic grounds, and from two different angles. First, a flapped /r/, as /r/ when second member of a cluster is pronounced in both Thai and Khmer, in many languages alternates or is easily confused with a dental sound, such as /d/. In technical terms a “voiced apico-alveolar flap [r]” may be confused

167) That chronicle is the so-called Thiounn chronicle, named for the chief of its editorial commission, *Okhā vāṇṇ juon* (Thiounn). It has never been published in its entirety, but it was continued into the 1940s and acquired quasi-official status. The principal manuscript was, until 1975 at least, in the library of the Buddhist Institute, Phnom Penh, entitled *Braḥ rāj baṅsāvātā mahā ksatr khmaer*.

168) The detail is to be found in a typed manuscript in the National Library, Bangkok, catalogued as *Baṅsāvātūr khmer*, No. 102, with a notation that it was a work of King Mongkut, and entitled *Ro'añ rā tuoy phaen tin khamen baen òk pen sī bhūg* (“On the division of the Khmer realm into four parts”). The reference to “Cham river” is on p. 2.



with a "voiced apico-dental stop [d]". That occurs even in some varieties of English in which "/r/ is not a dorsal retroflex continuant, but . . . a tongue-tip flap (British English "veddy")"<sup>169</sup>. Plainly stated, it means that people hearing either /prā-/ or /pdā-/ in an unfamiliar word, could confuse one with the other. The second possibility concerns the Khmer script. There the second member of a consonant cluster, i.e. for our purposes the /r/ or /d/ following /p/, is written with a special subscript form, and among certain old styles of writing the two subscripts were sufficiently similar to be confused if the word itself was unfamiliar. Thus, we have the possible identity of:

prā	p	jhām
pdā	gū	cām <sup>170</sup>

The final step is where my explanation becomes much more speculative. In their present forms there is no systematic way to identify *p* of Khmer and *gū* of Thai, and so far as I know the two symbols could not have been confused in any script which might have been in use. One paleographic explanation would be that at some point in the descent of the Khmer manuscripts *prāp* was written *prāb*, the pronunciation of which is identical, and the Khmer symbol for *b* could conceivably be mistaken for *g* in an unfamiliar word. Then the vowel *ū* would have been added by an Ayutthayan scribe in an effort at comprehension since *gū cām*, "Cham moat", was a known toponym. Such confusion of final *p* and *b*, though rare, was not unknown. I have found one example, *jrābv* written for *jrāp*, or "understand," in a Khmer chronicle manuscript in the National Library at Bangkok<sup>171</sup>, and Guesdon's *Dictionnaire* also records the odd forms *jrāb*, *brāb*, "pigeon", *priab*, "compare", and *rāb*, "flat"<sup>172</sup>. Further evidence in favor of that explanation comes from another variant of the name in a Khmer historical manuscript<sup>173</sup>, *Tanleh prasabv muk puon*, in which *tanleh* is the common Khmer and Thai word

169) Robert A. Hall, *Introduction to Linguistics*, p. 50.

170) Note that *pdā* and *padā* are the same in Thai. The difference is merely a question of conventions in transliteration.

171) *Bansavatar Khamer*, No. 45 ๗, ๗ 111, p. 79.

172) Joseph Guesdon, *Dictionnaire Cambodgien-Francais*, pp. 561, 1260, 1269, 1495.

for a "large body of water", and *muk puon* is a translation of the Sanskrit *caturmukh*, or "four faces". The term *prasavy*, "to meet, to face", seems to have replaced *prāp/crāp* and possibly indicates that the original term, no longer understood, ended in *b*. Furthermore, the combination of final *bv*, as written in Khmer script with the *v* being a subscript, could even more easily be confused with *gū*. In any case, since *padāgucām*, *prāp jhām*, and *crāp jhām* are all corrupt, the original from which they derived was something quite different which could be misunderstood in several ways<sup>174</sup>.

I think therefore, that even if the original cannot yet be identified, there is sufficient evidence to show that 2/k.125 provides the means for identifying the *padāgucām* of *LP* with *caturmukh*, Phnom Penh; because of the age of *LP* it indicates that in the Cambodian chronicles the variant *prāp* may be older than *crāp*. The present interpretation also means that the term was already misunderstood when *LP* was composed, for the latter says the generals who first rebelled against Cau Bañā Rām fled, "across to stay in *padāgucām*", and from there conspired with Indarājā of Suphanburi, thus implying a location close to Ayutthaya and probably indicating that the compiler of *LP* indeed had *gū cām* in mind. The original records must have had *padāgucām*, or *prāpcām* (Phnom Penh) only as the place to which Cau Bañā Rām was sent, but a later scribe inserted it again earlier on in the story. Thus the phrase of *LP*, "govern *mo'ah padāgucām*", would be correct<sup>175</sup>.

- 173) Ms. No. g. 63, Buddhist Institute, Phnom Penh, entitled *Cpap' Kram cauhtvūy sruk* ("Law on Provincial Governors"), dated 1751 (A.D. 1829), p. 1.
- 174) Even Prince Damrong's *pla : dā/padū bhū cām* could be a possible ancestor linguistically and paleographically, even if it were a poor etymology in the way he used it. *Bhū* (Sanskrit "earth") could easily account for the *gū* through paleographic error. Phnom Penh was known from very early times as an ethnically mixed area which included Cham and Malay elements; depending on the local dialect the whole name could mean "shore of the territory of the Cham". This explanation is of course very speculative, and cannot be taken as more than a remote hypothesis.
- 175) Those who might cry sacrilege at the attempt to tamper with the text of *LP* should remember that Prince Damrong already considered the passage corrupt, although he thought the first mention of *padāgucām* correct and the second one in error. My explanation is the opposite, and is based on a document which has other close affinities with *LP*.



This new reading of the evidence has interesting implications for the political history of the period. If an usurping king of Ayutthaya sent his rival into exile as governor of Phnom Penh, that means that Ayutthaya had already conquered part of Cambodia, or that there had long been such close ties that the two polities did not yet consider themselves separate nations. I lean toward the second hypothesis, particularly since Ayutthaya's background and fifteenth-century culture were so strongly Khmer<sup>176</sup>.

Thus the 'conquest' of Angkor by Ayutthaya might well have been, as O.W. Wolters has already suggested<sup>177</sup>, not in the nature of an international war, but a conflict between rival dynasties for control of mutual borderlands, and I would add for control also of what both considered to be their old, traditional capital: *nagar hluoh* for the Thai, *brah nagar* for the Khmer of Cambodia.

#### The barrg

The toponym I have treated above is not the only instance in which 2/k.125 helps provide an explanation for a mysterious detail of LP.

Readers will have noticed that Yāt took refuge with, and was aided by, the *barrg* ("group") or *mahā barrg* ("great group"), who are mentioned frequently throughout the text. That term also occurs in LP, at the date 806/1444, in the sentence *satec pai prāp barrg*..., "the king went to put down the *barrg*", which has defied the efforts of all students of LP<sup>178</sup>. We find in 2/k.125 practically the same phrase when King

176) My opinion must not be taken as support for the fourteenth-century invasions of Cambodia found in the Thai RA and Cambodian Chronicles, and it does not conflict with what I intend to argue elsewhere—that all chronicular passages concerning invasions of Angkor before 1430 are fiction. I do not argue that no conflict between the two areas occurred, only that no true records have been preserved in extant chronicles. In addition, the passages I call fictitious speak of Thai conquests of Angkor, whereas the inference to draw from 2/k.125 is that earlier Ayutthayan interest in Cambodia had been in the southern part of the country.

177) Wolters, "Basan", p. 85.

178) Frankfurter, "Events in Ayuddhya from Chulaśakarāj 686-966", JSS, VI, 3 (1909), p. 48, date 806, where *prāp barrg* is rendered as "suppressed the contending factions"; W.A.R. Wood, "The 'Pongsawadan of Luang Prasöt'", JSS, XIX (1925), p. 155, where he confessed his inability to deal with the phrase, but suggested it was a corrupted place-name.



Paramarājādhirāj orders his son Nagar Indr to “go put down the *barrg*”, and also in the following sentence with Nagar Indr’s move to “go put down the great *barrg*”. The implied date is 805/1443, but since there were more battles with the *barrg*, there is no real discrepancy of date, and it is clear that both *LP* and *2/k.125* are based at this point on the same records.

What were the *barrg*? In addition to the numerous occurrences of the term in an unidentifiable collective sense, as above, a more precise clue is provided by two passages in which the *barrg* are called a race or ethnic group, *phau* (ផៅ). The first comes after the campaign against the *barrg* mentioned above, in which they were defeated and Yāt was captured. He then escaped and took refuge with Khun Blapblājaiy, who sent him to the *phau barrg*, “*barrg* tribe”, and who was of that *phau* himself. The next such passage is just a few lines later, after mention of the date 845 [805], when the scene shifts to Bañā Kaev and Bañā Dai, who were *phau mahā barrg*, “of the tribe of great *barrg*”.

The *barrg* were thus an ethnic group. Judging from Yāt’s itinerary when he first met them, on his way from Caturmukh to Ayutthaya, they must have been located somewhere in western Cambodia or the adjoining provinces of Thailand (to use the modern terms).

The *barrg* are not the only ethnic group associated with Yāt. In the second half of the story, between A.D. 1443 and 1444, the *jōn*/Chong, a group still living in the same area as that proposed above for the *barrg*, appear. A few lines later Yāt is said to have “organized the Khmer, Chong, and Pear (*barrn*)” as military forces; that is where the explanation of *barrg* lies. The name of the ethnic group, which is still in existence and whose name is conventionally romanized as Pear, is a homonym in Khmer with the word for “color”. Both are more or less pronounced /pəa/, although the word for “color” as in Thai preserves the Sanskrit etymology, *barṇ*, while the ethnic name is at present written *bār*<sup>179</sup>. It appears that a scribe had felt that a term understood by him as “color”

179) They are modern, ‘correct’ spellings. In earlier times the two homonyms might have been spelled identically, and for a Thai speaker *barrn*, *barṇ* and *bār* would all have the same pronunciation. Correct Sanskrit is *varṇa*.

was corrupt as the name for a group of people, and he 'corrected' it to the, for him, more logical *barrg*, or "group".

Some additional confirmation of the explanation comes from the entirely different source, *RA*, in a passage dealing with an early sixteenth-century incident between Ayutthaya and Cambodia<sup>180</sup>. There it says that another Cambodian rebel had gone off with the *joñ barrg*, which, when compared with the *joñ barrṇ* whom Yāt organized, shows that the intention in both cases was "Chong and Pear", two Mon-Khmer ethnic groups who still live fairly close together in western Cambodia and southeastern Thailand.

It is also worth noting that the Cambodian *Ang Eng* chronicle, in its relation of those events, states Khun Blājaiy led the *bāk* (= *barrg*) *buok*, or "group of supporters", to protect Yāt. In a later incident ethnic groups in the same region are called *mahā bñn ka:hriañ*, of which *mahā bñn* is a Thai phonetic rendering of *mahā barrṇ*<sup>181</sup>.

#### Basan

Another point on which *2/k.125* provides important evidence is the identification of the mysterious location of Basan, which is associated with Yāt in most of the Cambodian chronicles. Current doctrine holds that Basan was in the district of Srei Santhor, province of Kompong Cham, on the east side of the Mekong, although there has been no place which conserved that name up to modern times<sup>182</sup>. In Francis Garnier's time, Cambodian opinion placed Basan on the west side of the Bassac river in the province of Treang, in modern Takeo, and this identification is supported by a nineteenth-century oath text, which, in an enumeration of local deities, combines the toponyms *pāsūk pāsān sruk trāññ*

180) *RA*, p. 208, at the date 953, Hare Year, A.D. 1591.

181) The clarification is from the Thai text of *Ang Eng*, *PP*, III, pp. 180, 183, corrected by the original manuscript in the National Library, Bangkok. Coedès, who translated *Ang Eng* in "Essai," overlooked those details.

182) No such name is revealed in the 1962 Cambodian census, which listed all inhabited sites down to hamlet level. See *Royaume du Cambodge. Ministère du Plan, Resultats finals du recensement général de la population 1962*, Phnom Penh, 1966.



(Treang)<sup>183</sup>. O.W. Wolters has argued that Chinese mention of a *pa-shan* king in 1371 referred to the Basan of the chronicles, and proved that the Cambodian king had been driven from Angkor by the Thai shortly before that date<sup>184</sup>. I would say that since the Chinese characters for *pa-shan*, 巴山, translate precisely the Cambodian name Ba Phnom, or “*ba*-mountain”, the Chinese account refers to the latter place down the Mekong from Phnom Penh; and the pronunciation “basano”, as an alternative to “bapano”, was still recorded by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century<sup>185</sup>. That would be a different place from the Basan of the chronicles, and the seeming identity of Chinese *pa-shan* with Basan would be a coincidence.

In 2/k.125 much of Yāt’s activity unfolds around a place called *pāsānti*, which appears as the territory of the *barrg/barrn*, and would thus definitely be in western Cambodia, probably farther north than Treang.

The name *pāsānti* consists of two elements, *pā*, which in Thai might be translated as “forest”, but which in Khmer is a common initial component of place names and is considered to mean “male” or the “male principle”;<sup>186</sup> and *sānti*, or “peace”. The corresponding toponym of LP, i.e., the place where the king went to *prāp barrg*, is *pa : dāy khsem*, the second term of which has the same meaning as *sānti*. The first term looks very much like a corruption of the Khmer *pandāy*, or “fortress”, and a component of several other place names. It is likely that they

183) Garnier, “Chronique”, p. 344, n. 2; and *Kruṅ kambujādhīpatī* [Kingdom of Cambodia], “*Saccāpranidhān*” [oath], ms. No. MCC 56-036, Buddhist Institute, Phnom Penh. For providing me with a copy of the latter text I wish to thank David P. Chandler, whose “Royally sponsored human sacrifices in nineteenth century Cambodia: The cult of *nak ta Me Sa* (Mahisāsūramardīnī) at Ba Phnom”, *JSS*, LXII, 2 (July 1974), pp. 207-222, goes into some detail about the oath text and its subject matter.

184) Wolters, “Basan”, p. 48.

185) B. P. Groslier, *Angkor et le Cambodge au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, p. 157.

186) F. Martini, “De la signification de BA et ME affixés aux noms des monuments khmers”, *BEFEO*, XLIV, 1 (1947-50); Saveros Lewitz, “La toponymie khmère”, *BEFEO*, LII, 2 (1967), p. 425.



are two versions of a single place name, consisting of an element meaning "peace" preceded by one of two Khmer terms commonly found as the initial element of place names. The place itself still cannot be identified, but the context of 2/k.125 plus the oath text cited above shows that it must have been somewhere in western Cambodia, not at Srei Santhor or Ba Phnom.

#### The reign of Bañā Yāt

Although the story of Yāt is quite different from the Cambodian chronicles, some of the structure of 2/k.125 may be found, disguised, in the standard histories. In Cambodian history Yāt is said to have killed the Thai prince Indarājā [Nagar Indr]-Braek within one year of the invasion (A.D. 1431-32 with *LP* chronology), and he immediately leaves Angkor for Basan and Phnom Penh, but is crowned 12 years later. This detail fits almost precisely the story of 2/k.125, in which 12 years after 1431-32 Yāt is active in the *pāsānti*-Phnom Penh region, and is consecrated or crowned (*abhiṣeka*) in 1444, although apparently not as king of all Cambodia. The structure of the story in the various sources may be shown schematically as follows:

Cambodian chronicles					
		<i>Nong/Liste</i>		<i>LP/ 2/k.125</i>	
Invasion	-Rat Year	1372/1408	}	Pig year 1431	}
	Bull Year	1373/1409		[Rat year 1432]	
Yāt's resistance		1373/1409	}	Pig Year 1443	}
Yāt's victory	Bull Year	1373/1409			
Yāt's coronation	Rat Year	1384/1420		Rat Year 1444	
				[Bull Year 1445?]	

The major difference between the Cambodian chronicles and the *LP/2/k.125* scenario is in the absolute dates of those events. However, the differences among the various versions of the Cambodian chronicles themselves show that some, if not all, are artificial constructions, and until

their divergent structures and details are explained, they may not be used in argument against other sources<sup>187</sup>.

### Miscellaneous toponyms

In addition to the place names discussed above, 2/*k.125* contains a number of obsolete toponyms, only a few of which are found in other documents.

The first is *tāy dòn* (ตายนอน), which in the opening episode appears to be under attack by Ayutthayan forces, and which the scanty detail of the passage seems to place in the north. That name occurs in only one other text, I believe, the *Kaṭṭaṇḍiarpāl*/*Palatine Law*, in the form *tai dòn* (ไถนอน) and in a list of northern *mo'ān*, ... Phrae, Nan, *tai dòn*, *gotrapòn* ...<sup>188</sup> Wales ignored it in his description of that law. Griswold and Prasert, the most prolific writers on that area, have also neglected it. Wyatt, who devoted some attention to the list of place names, was unable to offer an identification<sup>189</sup>. Our fragment at least confirms that such a name was once in use, and that it was in the north, but does not permit any closer identification. Of special interest is that the men of *Tāy Dòn* seem to have been Mon.

Another interesting name is *saeñ blau*, where Yāt's captors stopped with him on the way from Phnom Penh to Ayutthaya by boat. It was there also that Yāt met Khun (Blap) blājaiy, who had been a friend of his father and an acquaintance of his mother. Since Yāt was quickly sent to take refuge with the Pear, it must have been somewhere in the

187) On the Cambodian chronicles see Coedès, "Essai"; L.P. Briggs, "Siamese attacks on Angkor before 1430", *FEQ*, VIII, 1 (1948) pp. 3-33; Wolters, "Basan", pp. 54 ff. The best published version of *Nong* is the Thai translation in *PP*, vol. I, neglected by these scholars, and the end of Yāt's reign according to the *Liste* manuscript is 1457, not 1433, as Wolters believed ("Basan", pp. 65, 67, 88). A full explanation of the Cambodian chronicles for this period will appear in my forthcoming dissertation.

188) *Laws*, I, 70.

189) H.G. Quaritch Wales, *Ancient Siamese Government and Administrations*; A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies", appearing in *JSS*, 1968 to present, *passim*.; and David K. Wyatt, "The Thai 'Kaṭṭa Maṇḍiarpāla' and Malacca", *JSS*, LV, 2 (July 1967), p. 285.



southeastern Thai—eastern Cambodia borderland. Khun Blājaiy is also found in *Ang Eng* as an ally of Yāt<sup>190</sup>, and there it says that Yāt's mother was daughter of the lord of *Pāñ Gāñ*, which, according to King Mongkut, was an old name of Prachinburi<sup>191</sup>.

In form the name *saeñ blau* irresistibly recalls the *saeñ jrau* (แสนจราว), which figures in *LP* at the date 734/1372 and in association with *mo'an nagar bāngā*<sup>192</sup>. Both have hitherto been placed in the north, while *bāngā* has been located at Nakhon Sawan<sup>193</sup>. In an effort to determine the origin of those names, we should first note that the Khmer symbols for *j* and *ph* (𑜏, 𑜑) have forms which in manuscript may easily be confused with each other and with Thai *ph* or *b* (ผ, บ). These Thai letters, as the spelling of 2/k.125 proves, were not always rigidly distinguished, and are phonetically identical. Thus I am arguing that both แสนจราว of *LP* and แสนพราว of 2/k.125 are corrupt derivations of a common original from the time when Khmer script was still frequently used at Ayutthaya<sup>194</sup>. The alteration of *l/r* would have been due to scribal 'correction' of a name which was no longer understood. The form of the second term which I would prefer to take as the original is *jrau* (จราว) of *LP*, "deep" in Khmer; and I would suggest further that the whole thing is a corruption of the name presently known as Chachoengsao/*cha: jo'n drau* (ฉะเชิงเทรา), which derives from Khmer *chdñ jrau*, or

190) Coedès, "Essai", p. 27.

191) *Op. cit.* in note 168, above.

192) See the passage dated 734 in any edition of *LP*. In *PP*, vol. I, p. 131.

193) A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "A declaration of independence and its consequences, Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 1", *JSS*, LVI, 2 (July 1968), p. 210, n. 7. The identification *pañgā* = Nakhon Sawan is, however, *ad hoc*, and not required by any of the evidence.

194) The evidence for the use of Khmer script in Ayutthaya has been outlined in Vickery, "The Khmer inscriptions of Tenasserim: A reinterpretation", *JSS*, LXI, 1 (January 1973); and in Vickery, review of Robert B. Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks*, pp. 164-65.



"deep river"<sup>195</sup>, and is within an area already identified as the scene of Yāt's movements.

Although it is difficult to propose a systematic explanation for a scribal error leading to the equivalence of *saen/chdiñ* (later pronunciation *stu'ñ*), there is one other example in which a very similar error seems to have occurred. In *RA*, page 208, in a section of which the dates are 10 to 12 years too early, there is a passage dated A.D. 1591 concerning the activities of a Cambodian rebel prince in *saen sdoñ* (ស្រែនស្ទឹង), of which the second term seems most likely to be Staung, in the region of modern Kompong Thom. That identification is supported by the most detailed Cambodian chronicle for the period, which also speaks of a rebellious prince who between 1596 and 1607 held out against central authority in Thma Kol (*kūl*), Kompong Svay, also in Kompong Thom; and the identity of this latter prince is confirmed by contemporary European accounts. Apparently the term *saen*, in this indubitably Cambodian context, can only be a corruption of *stu'ñ*, or "river," one of which--the Stung Staung--may still be seen on modern maps to flow into Kompong Svay. (There is no problem in the identity of *saen/saen*, since in Cambodian *mūl* or *khôm* script, used for pre-modern chronicles, the two final consonants could easily be confused.) As for *bañgā*, paired with *saen jrau* in *LP*, it is

195) Although I have found the derivation acceptable to competent linguists of my acquaintance, I do not know if it has ever been published. King Mongkut, *op. cit.*, recognized the name as Khmer, and if so, *chdiñ crau* is the only possibility. On the correspondence of Thai *dr* (ด) and Khmer *jr* (ជ) see Karchana Nacaskul, "A study of cognate words in Thai and Cambodian", M.A. thesis, University of London, 1962, p. 171. According to conversations I have had with David K. Wyatt and Hiram Woodward, Jr., there is some opinion that Chachoengsao is a new name and thus would not go back to a Khmer source. I should say that this is impossible. New names are comprehensible in the language of the population responsible, in this case Thai. "Cha choeung sao" is not Thai; it must derive from some other language, which in that area could only be Khmer, Mon, another Mon-Khmer language, or Sanskrit; one of its terms fits a recognized pattern of Khmer words borrowed by Thai, and the other may be shown on acceptable linguistic grounds to derive from Khmer.

probably the Banka of La Loubère's seventeenth-century map, a bit to the northeast of Petriou/Chachoengsao, and probably corresponds to modern Bangkhla/*paṅglā* (บางกล่ำ)<sup>196</sup>. Our text thus enables us to replace another difficult passage of *LP* in its proper context.

The explanation proposed here for this toponym has important implications for the route taken by Yāt and his captors. The first presumption might be that the journey by water from Phnom Penh to Ayutthaya entailed descending the Mekong and sailing around through the Gulf of Siam. In that case Chachoengsao, or any other place inhabited by the Pear, could hardly have been along the route, unless the boat made a detour up one of the rivers of the southeastern Gulf coast. I would propose rather that the route taken was up one of the rivers leading from the Tonle Sap through Battambang province to what is today the region of Aranyaprathet. Then there would be a short overland journey to the Bang Pakong River through Prachinburi and Chachoengsao to the sea. In the high-water season such a journey would be practicable for narrow river boats. It is also possible, that for reasons connected with tides or winds at the mouth of the Chao Phraya, the usual route from the mouth of the Mekong through the Gulf went up the Bang Pakong River and then through a system of *khlongs* to the Chao Phraya River near where Phra Pradaeng is today. In that case Chachoengsao would have been a convenient stopping place.

Most of the other strange toponyms--*caṅko'ap*, *kam̐baen̐ baisrī*, *koe*: or *teca*:, *katò*, *priaṅ broe*, *biren* (*dhar*), *bejrindr*, *trabāṅ blāṅ*, *tāṃpal borāṅ*, *pāl chdiṅ*--defy identification<sup>197</sup>. In the context of the text they all

196) The Cambodian chronicle is *Baṅśāvatār la'vaek* ("Chronicle of Lovek"), in *PP*, part 71, vol. XLIV, see pp. 260, 281-82; and the European evidence is in Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robinson, ed., *The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898*, XV, pp. 144-48. The name given to the prince in *RA* is On (ອ່ອນ), whereas the one in the chronicle and the European source is called Nōn (ນອນ); but given the extreme confusion of dates and names in this part of *RA*, that is not a serious objection. See Simon de La Loubère, *Siam*, Oxford in Asia edition, map between pp. 2-3.

197) I wish to thank David P. Chandler for checking those names in sources not available to me.



appear to be west or south of the Tonle Sap, and the first, second, and eighth sound unmistakably Khmer. I would also tentatively identify *katò* as a scribal error for Krakor, on the southwestern shore of the Tonle Sap, and *biren* is possibly *pāren*, mentioned in a Cambodian chronicle in 1662-3, but also difficult to locate<sup>198</sup>.

*Tāmpal borān* is very likely the *tāmpal bolāntān* of *Ang Eng*, which, although not helping much with the location, illustrates again the relationship between the two texts. In 2/*k.125* it appears to be near Pursat, and in *Ang Eng* somewhere between Rayong and Angkor, which might very well be near Pursat too<sup>199</sup>.

Another name which occurs in both texts is *mo'an slāy* (2/*k.125*)/*slai* (*AE*)<sup>200</sup>, and again the two passages show devolution from the same records. In 2/*k.125* Yāt acquires a number of women in a victory over the chief of *mo'an slāy*, and in *Ang Eng* the daughter of the chief of *mo'an slai* is mentioned in a list of Yāt's wives, of whom two have names found in the group of 2/*k.125* (see below). The place itself, though, defies pinpointing.

#### Names of individuals

Most individuals, wherever possible, have been identified in the footnotes accompanying the Thai text and translation. Here I wish only to discuss those which have a special significance owing to their appearance in other texts.

The first of these is *khun sai draṇ braḥ indr*, described as a mentor (*bilian*) of the Ayutthayan prince ruling at Angkor. It is clearly the title of a function, not a proper name, since after the first one died his brother was appointed to the same position with the same title (p. [8]). A title which may be assumed the same, *khun draṇ braḥ indr*, appears in all the chronicles of Cambodia in connection with Banā Yāt. In all but *Ang Eng* it is said that after Yāt's final victory over the Thai at Angkor he took a daughter of *khun draṇ braḥ indr* as wife and she gave birth to

198) See the Thai translation of the Nong chronicle, in *PP*, vol. I, p. 212.

199) Coedès, "Essai", p. 28.

200) *Ibid.*, p. 27.



Prince Dhammarājā, who eventually became king<sup>201</sup>. *Ang Eng* also makes her the mother of Dhammarājā, but as the wife of one of Yāt's sons rather than of Yāt himself<sup>202</sup>. Comparison of the full story with 2/k.125 is not possible, since when it breaks off Yāt has not yet achieved victory nor acquired a daughter of *khun sai drañ brañ indr*.

*Mae nāñ debdharanī*, who with *mae nāñ gaṅgā* aided Yāt during his imprisonment, also appears, but as the goddess, in *Ang Eng*, where she gave help to Yāt's father<sup>203</sup>. There may be a cryptic reference to this in 2/k.125 with its detail that Yāt's mother was named *āmbakeṣ*, the literal meaning of which seems to be "mango-hair", written *āmbakeṣ* (อัมเบศ) at the present time. Since that name has no traditional associations, we are entitled to suspect a corruption. The addition of only a subscript vowel sign turns the name into *āmbukeṣ*, (อัมเบศ) "water-hair", the most important characteristic of the goddess *dharanī*, who protected the Buddha from the assault of Mara's army by wringing a flood out of her hair<sup>204</sup>. The intention of the writer of 2/k.125 may thus have been to suggest that the *mae nāñ debdharanī* who aided Yāt was his own mother, and this would indicate a definitely mythical element in the story, since *debdharanī* and *gaṅgā* are much more likely to have been names of goddesses than of humans<sup>205</sup>.

*Khun blapblājaiy* or *blājaiy*, who helps Yāt escape his captors, plays the same role in *Ang Eng*<sup>206</sup>. There he is called the "chief of Pān Tān Hāk" (บ้านต้นหัก), which cannot be identified, but which appears to be a Thai name. Nothing more about him or his location may be inferred from *Ang Eng*, but in a comparative study the Thai name of *blājaiy's*

201) See Thai translation of Nong chronicle, *PP*, vol. I, p. 193.

202) Coedès, "Essai", p. 27.

203) *Ibid.*, p. 26.

204) That is one of the most common themes in Thai temple murals.

205) At Sukhothai, however, *debdharanī* figured as part of the titulature of queens. See Inscription No. 93 in *Pra:jum śilā cāruṅk*, IV; and A.B. Griswold and Prasert ๑ Nagara, "The Asokārām inscription of 1399 A.D., Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 2", *JSS*, LVII, 1 (January 1969), pp. 29-56.

206) Coedès, "Essai", p. 27; and *PP*, vol. III, p. 180.

village in *Ang Eng* and the apparent location found in 2/k.125 argue strongly against the stories of the other chronicles, which place Yāt's activities east of the Mekhong and Tonle Sap.

A similar geographical association may belong with *pā višet*, one of Yāt's main allies until their falling out and the former's execution. In *RA*, during Naresuan's campaign in Cambodia in 1593-94 (*LP* dates; *RA* has 1583) a certain *brah višet* of Chachoengsao was among Naresuan's commanders and was given the task of taking troops to hold Babaur<sup>207</sup>. If the two titles, at dates 150 years apart, indicate the same function, we have another bit of evidence linking Yāt with the Chachoengsao-Pra-chinburi region. It is also interesting in this connection to note that in the Hierarchy Laws the titles *khun višet* and *blapblājaiy* belong to the same *kram* under the Palace Ministry, indicating that whatever their duties, those two officials were closely associated from early times<sup>208</sup>.

*Bañā kaev* and *bañā daiy* are well known from *LP* and the long Cambodian chronicles, although the stories differ somewhat. In *LP* they appear as prisoners taken to Angkor along with a number of images<sup>209</sup>, a scenario which agrees with the details of 2/k.125, where they are also identified as ethnically Pear and seem to have been monks, astrologers, or magicians. The generally most accurate Cambodian chronicles do not mention them; and those which do include them, as officials who betray Angkor to the Thai, are late nineteenth-century compositions which could have borrowed the theme from Thai chronicles. The oldest Cambodian version, *Ang Eng*, does not have the names *kaev* and *daiy*, but relates that the Cambodian king, faced with the Thai invasion, sent two monks and two officials as a delegation to offer the city to the invader<sup>210</sup>; and the name of one of the officials, *khun manorath*, if we assume a corruption of *mano-ratn*, could be a disguised pun on the name *kaev*, "crystal".

One historian has tried to interpret those two names as referring to cult objects rather than human beings; but the title *bañā*, given only

207) *RA*, pp. 174, 178.

208) *Laws*, I, 240.

209) *LP* date *cula* 793.

210) Coedès, "Essai", p. 26.



to persons, precludes that solution<sup>211</sup>. In 2/k.125, which may represent the oldest record, they are definitely persons, whom the Ayutthayan king had brought involuntarily from Angkor, and who, rather than betraying Angkor, are portrayed as planning an insurrection in Ayutthaya.

#### Ayutthayan relations with the north

The evidence of northern relations with Ayutthaya in 2/k.125 is much less controversial, and its information generally fits the picture provided by the other sources and accepted by specialists of the area<sup>212</sup>. Some of this has already been discussed above in connection with the date of the story and the toponym *īāy dōñ*. Although neither the opening episode nor its locale may be identified from other sources, the terms *smiñ* and *meñ* used in connection with the enemy indicate that they were probably Mons from Burma, and that *īāy dōñ* may have been toward the west.

In spite of the general concordance with other sources, the administrative details of the Sukhothai-Phitsanulok area which may be inferred from 2/k.125 differ from the picture which has emerged from recent research. According to our text, the northern rulers who appear to have been in alliance with Ayutthaya were:

Mahā Dharrmarājā in Phitsanulok  
 Bañā Jaliañ in Jaliañ/Sawankhalok  
 Bañā Rāmarāj in Sukhothai  
 Bañā Saen Sōy Tāv in Kamphaeng Phet

211) Jean Boisselier, "Notes sur l'art du bronze dans l'ancien Cambodge", *Artibus Asiae*, XXIX, 4 (1967), pp. 317-18.

212) See the various "Epigraphic and Historical Studies" of A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara in *JSS* from 1968 to the present, and also their essay "On kingship and society at Sukhodaya", in G. William Skinner and A. Thomas Kirsch, *Change and Persistence in Thai Society, Essays in Honor of Lauriston Sharp*, pp. 29-92.



None of those agree with the Provincial Hierarchy Law, which is of uncertain date<sup>213</sup>. In particular, Phitsanulok, in the law, perhaps due to the changes in administration effected by King Trailok and periods of direct rule by Ayutthayan princes, appears to have lost all traditional titles.

*Mahā dharmarājā* is known from epigraphy as a traditional title of Sukhothai rulers, and was conserved by that dynasty when the center of power shifted to Phitsanulok; but according to Griswold and Prasert, the last of that line died in A.D. 1438. After that date Ayutthayan princes ruled there, presumably with distinct titles, and a *mahā dharmarājā* only appears again in 1549<sup>214</sup>. If Griswold and Prasert's explanation is correct, the ruler of Phitsanulok in the 2/k.125 period (1443-4) should have been Prince Rāmeśvara, who went there in 1438.

Bañā Jaliañ is identified here only by one of the names of his *mo'añ*, Sawankhalok. In the Hierarchy Law the Governor of Satchanalai-Sawankhalok is called *kra: setr sañgrām rāmarāj*, etc., the last term of which is expected since it is an old title of the entire Sukhothai area.

In 2/k.125 this last old title is given to the ruler of Sukhothai, which is quite plausible, although the title for Sukhothai governors in the Hierarchy Law is *srī dharmasokarāj*<sup>215</sup>, also traditional in that area, as attested by inscription 13 (found in Kamphaeng Phet and dated 1510), and inscription 14 from Sukhothai<sup>216</sup>.

The only one of the four titles above which is completely unexpected is *saen sōy iāv*, which I have found elsewhere only in the chronicles of Nakhon Si Thammarat, in a passage which is rather strange, and in the

213) See *Laws*, I, p. 320; and my review of Yoneo Ishii, et al., *An Index of Officials in Traditional Thai Governments*, in *JSS*, LXIII, 2 (July 1975), pp. 425, 430.

214) *RA*, pp. 82-83, with date interpolated from *LP*.

215) Written "... *śukarāj*"

216) See George Coedès, ed., *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam*, I, pp. 157-68.

Hierarchy Laws<sup>217</sup>. In the Laws, governors of Kamphaeng Phet are entitled *rām raṇaraṅg saṅgrām*, etc.

Some further evidence on old contemporary usage comes from inscription 86, found in Sukhothai, and which apparently refers to the edification of a temple there<sup>218</sup>. It dates from A.D. 1528, but includes information from 1506. It names three individuals who appear to be of *cau mo'añ* level in the order *bra:ñā sri saiyaṇaraṅg saṅgrām*, *cau mo'añ rāmarāj*, and *branā sri dhamm*. The last, in this context, could plausibly be understood as a short form of either *dharmarāj* or *dhammasokarāj*, and I am inclined to go along with the Hierarchy Law and place him in Sukhothai, and *cau mo'añ rāmarāj* in Sawankhalok. As for *sri saiyaṇaraṅg saṅgrām*, since the inscription indicates that he was the most important, I believe he should be identified as a high official of Phitsanulok. That question, although of considerable intrinsic interest, is not relevant to 2/k.125, and I pursue it no further here. The importance of inscription 86 now is to show that two of the Sukhothai area titles found in the Hierarchy Law and in 2/k.125 were in use at least as early as the first years of the sixteenth century.

The slight discrepancies in the location of the titles which are otherwise appropriate for the area pose no real problem, since the manuscript of 2/k.125 has admittedly gone through several stages of copying and probably contains a number of errors. The main problem is the title *saen sōy tāv*, which I find difficult to accept as genuine in both Kamphaeng Phet and Nakhon Si Thammarat. One or another of the chronicles must contain a spurious passage, but it is impossible, with the available evidence, to push the investigation any further.

Another problem requiring some attention is the extent to which 2/k.125 fits the Griswold and Prasert construction of Sukhothai-

217) Wyatt, *The Crystal Sands*, pp. 119-20; *Laws*, I, p. 287.

218) *Prajum śilā cāru'k*, IV, pp. 12-15.



Phitsanulok history of the fifteenth century. According to them, Mahā Dharrmarājā IV died in 1438; seven-year-old Prince Rāmeśvara, the future King Trailokanath, was sent to Phitsanulok as viceroy and presumably remained there until his coronation in 1448; the Buddha Jinarājā wept tears of blood; and Sukhothai was taken firmly into the Ayutthayan orbit. Our fragment does no violence to the last point. All the old Sukhothai area *mo'ah* seem clearly to be vassals at the beck and call of the King of Ayutthaya. Rāmeśvara as viceroy, however, could not have had the title *mahā dharrmarājā*<sup>219</sup>, and if 2/k.125 is accurate here, we must conclude that he had returned to Ayutthaya by this time, and a member of the old Sukhothai nobility had been installed as vassal ruler. It should also be emphasized that the Griswold-Prasert story has been built to some extent on a scaffolding of assumptions. There is no statement anywhere about the death of Mahā Dharrmarājā IV in 1438, and Rāmeśvara is only said to have gone to Phitsanulok, not to have been installed as viceroy. It would be equally legitimate to conclude that Mahā Dharrmarājā IV, having become a vassal of Ayutthaya, is the one mentioned in 2/k.125; or that the latter, if Mahā Dharrmarājā IV had really died, was Prince Yudhiṣṭhira<sup>220</sup>.

219) The statement is based on the observation that each polity had patterns of royal titles peculiar to it and distinct from others. An Ayutthayan viceroy would therefore most probably be given titles other than those which had been traditional for Sukhothai kings.

220) See A.B. Griswold, "Notes on the Art of Siam, No. 6 : Prince Yudhiṣṭhira", *Artibus Asiae*, XXVI, 3/4 (1963), pp. 215-229. The passage of the Chiang Mai Chronicle which Griswold ("Yudhiṣṭhira", p. 221) interprets as "the young Viceroy [Rāmeśvara] received him [Yudhiṣṭhira] cordially when he came to do obeisance . . .", in reality says only "[when they were] still children, Parammatrailok [Rāmeśvara] and Yutthisathieng [Yudhiṣṭhira] were friends", and the context indicates only that Rāmeśvara was not yet king. See Camille Notton, *Annales du Siam*, III, 112; *Tamnan*, p. 53.



Another interesting feature of *2/k.125* is the close connection between the royal families of Nan and the Sukhothai area, with Kaen Dāv of Nan portrayed as the son of Bañā Jaliañ; that detail, so far as I have been able to determine, occurs in no other source. Griswold and Prasert have called attention to the close connection between Sukhothai and Nan a half-century earlier<sup>221</sup>, and *2/k.125* may be evidence that the connection persisted much longer than the time of the inscriptions which first record it.

#### General conclusions

The history of the historiography of chronicle interpretation over the past several years has shown how dangerous it is to leap at every exotic fragment and declare it to be long-lost truth, and I do not wish to suggest that the reader should wholeheartedly embrace *2/k.125*, and my reading of it, without exercising his critical faculties.

Of course there is no guarantee that *2/k.125* is not simply an imaginative construction linking obscure events which appear in the histories of Ayutthaya and the surrounding regions, and conclusions must be based on probabilities; but the noteworthy feature of *2/k.125* in this respect is that the passages which link it to other texts are not explanatory, not conjectures, but are simple direct statements which seem to result from mutual incorporation of elements from similar records. Although much more detailed, the fragment follows the same general outline as *LP*. Thus, before the first datable passage in 803, there is a campaign in the north, and activities in the north are an important feature of *LP* throughout its first two centuries. For the years covered by *2/k.125*, however, *LP* is blank. It records two northern campaigns in 800 and 804, with no political activities inbetween, and

---

221) Griswold and Prasert, "The pact between Sukhodaya and Nan", cited above, n. 145.

none in 805; and *2/k.125* may well be supplying details for these blank periods. As for the reliability of the Chiang Mai chronicle with which I have compared *2/k.125* for those events, all of its entries which may be compared with the Ayutthayan chronicles, with one exception, agree with the chronology of *LP*.

In 805, *2/k.125* has a statement which is so close to the wording of *LP* that it can only be explained by the hypothesis that both derive from the same records. In neither case can the statement be considered an explanation, since the passages are corrupt, and probably neither the compiler of *LP* nor of *2/k.125* had any idea of what the *barrg* were, or the location of the campaign against them, any more than Frankfurter or Wood.

Following 806, *LP* has nothing more until 810. It may be presumed, however, on the basis of the otherwise good correspondence between *LP* and the Chiang Mai chronicle, that if the former had included the events of those years, it would have more accounts of northern campaigns in the manner of *2/k.125*.

The only passages of *2/k.125* which may be classed as conjectural or explanatory are the conversations among the participants, or considerations of their thoughts and motives, which do not themselves detract from the historical accuracy of the basic events.

I think it is safe, then, insofar as any conclusion in the study of early chronicles is safe, to accept *2.k/125* as representing an entirely unsuspected old Ayutthayan chronicle tradition, more detailed than but probably as old as *LP*, and based on the same records.

I would like to comment on the general inferences which may be drawn from *2/k.125* about the early development of Ayutthaya and the history of post-Angkorean Cambodia. Like the traditional history of the period, *2/k.125* shows conflict between Ayutthaya and Cambodia, but



not emphatically conflict between Thai and Khmer. Yāt still appears as hero of Cambodian and local Khmer resistance against Ayutthaya, but he himself is descended from Ayutthayan royalty, part of which may still have been more Mon and Khmer than Thai<sup>222</sup>.

Also like the traditional history, 2/k.125 shows Ayutthaya expanding against Cambodia, and even seems to hint at a bipolar policy, with the Suphanburi faction of Ayutthayan royalty particularly interested in Angkor, while the descendants of Ramathibodi were more concerned with the Caturmukh region around present-day Phnom Penh<sup>223</sup>.

Given the paucity of evidence I would not wish to argue very hard for such bipolarity, but it is quite likely that there were divergent ideas on policy both within Ayutthayan royalty and among the various factions within Cambodia. O. W. Wolters has hinted that the impetus for the growth of early Ayutthaya may have been the same increased trading opportunities resulting from changes in Chinese policies as were responsible for the growth of Malacca<sup>224</sup>. Just as in Malacca and the lower Chao Phraya basin in which Ayutthaya developed, the end of the fourteenth century saw a flurry of new economic activity in Cambodia. Between the 1370s and 1419 more missions were exchanged with China than during the entire Angkor period<sup>225</sup>, and it is difficult to resist the inference that changes in the Chinese trading patterns were producing the same effects as in the neighboring regions. The ultimate result was

222) Griswold and Prasert call attention to this in "On kingship and society at Sukhodaya", *loc. cit.*, p. 67.

223) For remarks on another bipolar theory, and further references, see Vickery, review of Jeremias van Vliet, *The Short History of the Kings of Siam*, in *JSS*, LXIV, 2 (July 1976), p. 232.

224) O.W. Wolters, *The Fall of Srivijaya in Malay History*, Oxford in Asia edition, p. 67.

225) Those missions are listed in Wolters, "Basan", pp. 47-54. For Angkorean relations with China, see L.P. Briggs, *The Ancient Khmer Empire*, pp. 91, 189, 223, 242.



an increasing importance of river ports near the junction of four river branches where Phnom Penh stands today, and a decrease in the wealth and power of Angkor. The activities of Yāt as described in *2/k.125* seem to show part of that process at work as he attracted people to his area and began to consolidate a new government.

The new Cambodian center would of course have been an economic rival of Ayutthaya, and the latter would naturally have tried to suppress or acquire control over it. The *2/k.125* text seems to allude to such an effort in the dispatching of a deposed Ayutthayan king to Caturmukh. The activities of Yāt, even though directed against Ayutthayan encroachment as in the traditional histories, seem in *2/k.125* to have been less inspired by a desire to regain Angkor than to establish himself solidly in the commercially more favorable region south of the Tonle Sap. The communications of the day did not permit prolonged Ayutthayan control over southern Cambodia; it was only much later, as a result of more rapid growth in a more favorable situation, that Ayutthaya was finally able to dominate its neighbor.