

# PROLEGOMENA TO METHODS FOR USING THE AYUTTHAYAN LAWS AS HISTORICAL SOURCE MATERIAL

MICHAEL VICKERY

Several years ago I wrote that "what the Sukhothai sources still require is the 'positivistic' type of analysis against which Collingwood so strongly argued."<sup>1</sup> Since that was in a review article discussing what others had written I was unable to demonstrate my suggestion beyond a few illustrative remarks.

In the present article I intend to show how such positivistic methods may resolve some of the difficulties of another corpus of Thai historical sources, the Ayutthayan laws, whose preambles, through comparison of the dates and titles contained therein, may be ordered chronologically in a much more accurate way than has so far been done.

By positivistic methods I mean simply the ordering, or counting, or dissecting of a body of data to demonstrate objective patterns concealed within it. As examples of such techniques we may note the procedures of stratigraphy and seriation in archeology, the comparison of written character forms in paleography or handwriting analysis, and in printed literature the analysis of word and phrase patterns which are peculiar to each writer and to some extent always involuntary.

In fact, the generally patterned information elicited through all such techniques was built into the material unconsciously, or through the random dispersal of countless small pieces. In the case of the Thai laws the concealed patterns which I shall elicit will reveal information which was in many instances, I believe, intended to remain concealed.

The law corpus under discussion is the *Kaṭhmāy trā sām duān* (กฎหมายตราสามดวง), promulgated in 1805 as a reconstruction of Ayutthayan laws by the first king of the present dynasty; and it was produced not as an essay in the preservation of historical sources, but as *his own law code* to be applied during his own reign. Thus any laws which appear to date from earlier reigns, as nearly all of them do, were supposed, in their final form, to nevertheless fit early 19th-century reality. If one should suspect *a priori* that certain modifications might have been introduced into the old law texts to

---

\* Visiting Research Fellow, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia.

1. Michael Vickery, "A Guide through some Recent Sukhothai Historiography," *JSS* Vol. 66, Part 2 (July 1978), p. 185, n. 9.

make them fit that reality, such suspicion is confirmed in the introduction to the laws themselves where we find that the impetus for the recodification was a provision of one of the old laws which offended the king's sense of propriety.<sup>2</sup>

The *Kaṭhmāy* consists of 29 purportedly Ayutthayan law texts of which 24 deal with specific matters, the remainder being collections of royal decisions and decrees on diverse subjects.<sup>3</sup> In format nearly all of them begin with a preamble including a date, the titles of a king responsible for the law, the subject of the law, and mention of the official to whom the king's communication on the subject was addressed. Besides the preamble dates, there are also other dated sections with titles within the texts of some laws. Most of the dates and royal titles, as well as some of the other material of the preambles, contain contradictions, both among themselves, and with the generally received notions of Ayutthayan history. In brutal terms, this means that either many of the law preambles are false, or part of the history of the 14th–17th centuries must be rewritten.

In what follows only two elements of the laws will be treated : the royal titles and the dates which accompany them in the preambles or other sections of the laws.

### Dates

Each date in the laws is expressed in one of three, or possibly four, different eras : Buddhist (A.D. + 543/544), *śaka* (A.D.–78), *cula* (A.D.–638), and '*culāmaṇi*' (A.D.–188). In terms of A.D., the law dates range from 1341 to 1804, and in terms of the first three eras just noted are distributed as shown in table 1.

Now there is sufficient contemporary epigraphic evidence to show that in all of the old kingdoms included in modern Thailand these three eras were popular in the order *śaka*, *cula*, Buddhist (B.E.), with *śaka* used exclusively in Ayutthaya up to some time in the 16th century, *cula* then replacing it as the official era up to the end of the 19th century, and the Buddhist era becoming popular and used in some official documents from the 17th and particularly the 18th century.<sup>4</sup> At Sukhothai, whose

2. References here are to the 5-volume *guru sabhā* edition of the laws. See Vol. I, pp. 1–3; and comment by Prince Dhani Nivat, "The Reconstruction of Rama I", JSS Vol. 43, Part 1 (1955), p. 27.

3. Since some laws contain more than one dated section with royal titles, there are over 40 dated contexts as shown in Table 1.

4. The change from *śaka* to *cula* at Ayutthaya toward the end of the 16th century is standard doctrine. See D.G.E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, 3rd ed., MacMillan and St. Martin's Press (1968), p. 268; W.A.R. Wood, *A History of Siam*, Bangkok (1933), p. 127; Prince Damrong Rajanubhap, ตำนานการเกณฑ์ทหารไทย, in *Prachum Phongsawadan (guru sabhā)*, Vol. 14, p. 118. On later use of the Buddhist era see พืพฒน์ สุขทิต (Phiphat Sukhathit), การนับปีแห่งพุทธศักราช, *Silpākṇ*, May 1963, 7 (1), pp. 48–58.

institutions may have influenced some of the Ayutthayan laws, the *cula* era was introduced earlier, in the 14th century, and it appears concurrently with *śaka* for some time thereafter.<sup>5</sup> Traditional Thai belief, however, held that the Buddhist era was earliest, to be followed by the *śaka* and *cula* eras, believed to have been introduced into Southeast Asia in A.D. 79 and 639 respectively.<sup>6</sup>

The points to note here are that genuine texts should be dated in an era appropriate to their age, that the wrong era probably indicates emendation by later generations who did not know the correct historical sequence, and that early 19th-century Thai would have seen no inconsistency in the use of any of these eras for any time in the Ayutthaya period.

Examining the laws from this point of view we see that the two earliest are dated *śaka*, and to that extent appear genuine; but then there follow six mid-14th century laws dated in the Buddhist era, which is anachronistic, then a *śaka* and *cula* date, and seven more 14th-century Buddhist era preambles. Two more Buddhist era dates occur for A.D. 1382 and 1432, and there is a final group of Buddhist era dates in 1611–1614. Only the last group fall in a period in which one might reasonably expect B.E. dates in official secular documents.

Our first preliminary conclusion, then, is that all of the law contexts containing B.E. dates were revised, if not composed out of whole cloth, in the 17th century, or later, that the earliest B.E. dates show a deliberate effort to provide a false aura of antiquity for certain pieces of legislation, and that nothing in those laws may be *a priori* assumed valid for any time before the 17th century.

The same objection of anachronism applies to two of the *cula* dates, 720 (1358) for the Palatine Law, and 796 (1434) for one clause of the Law on Treason. The latter, in addition to the question of era, is clearly false from another point of view, which I shall discuss below.

A different and somewhat more difficult problem is posed by the laws between 1622 and 1669 dated apparently in *śaka*, in a period when it is believed to have fallen out of use in Ayutthaya. If it was easy in other cases to postulate false claims to antiquity, it is more difficult to find a reason for apparent misuse of *śaka* after it had become obsolete. One plausible explanation is that these dates are indeed genuine and reflect a reaction by kings, one of whom (Prāsād Dòñ/Prasat Thong) is shown by other

- 
5. This has been determined by examining all of the published Sukhothai inscriptions.
  6. For comment on this see Michael Vickery, "The Lion Prince and Related Remarks on Northern History," JSS Vol. 64, Part 1 (January 1976), pp. 326–377; and "A Note on the Date of the Traibhūmikathā," JSS Vol. 62, Part 2 (July 1974), pp. 275–84.

evidence to have been a conscious archaizer, against the Burmese and Sukhothai-inspired *cula* era.<sup>7</sup>

The rest of the dates -- the *śaka* dates of the 14th and 15th centuries, the *cula* dates of the end of the 16th century and between 1690 and 1804 -- are all in appropriate time periods and cannot be faulted on this ground. These 20, out of a total of 43 dates, are all that survive the first test of validity.

The crude numerical date, however, is not the only decisive element in the dating of Thai documents. Each numerical year is also accompanied by the name of its place in the 12-year animal cycle; and if the animal mentioned is incorrect for the numerical date we know the document is in some way spurious, although the error may be no more than scribal carelessness in copying. In general scholars have assumed that animal years were maintained with greater care than numerical dates,<sup>8</sup> and where the error is believed to be of less than 12 years the numerical date is simply changed *ad hoc* to fit the animal cycle. This can be a risky procedure, since scribes could just as easily err in copying the figure for tens or hundreds, particularly in cases of 4 and 5, or 2, 3, 7, which are in Thai script often easy to confuse.

There are a number of law dates in which such discrepancies occur. For numbers 41 and 42, undoubtedly laws of Rama I Chakri,<sup>9</sup> we must attribute the errors to scribal carelessness; and a few others may also be corrected with this assumption. Thus, two contexts, number 20 of 1926/1382 and number 21 of 1976/1432 show the expressed animal date one year earlier than the true one. In the latter case the best explanation seems to be either a simple scribal error, or an error in converting a presumed original *śaka* date, 1353/1975, to Buddhist era. I would, however, interpret the

- 
7. 'Prasat Thong' copied the plan of Angkor Wat, built two temples modelled on it, and at one point planned to give the classical name for Angkor, 'Yaśodhara', to one of his palaces. See *Royal Autograph Chronicle*, พระราชพงศาวดารฉบับพระราชหัตถเลขา, 6th printing, Bangkok, 2511, pp. 428-29; any of the Annals of Ayutthaya at dates 992 and 993; and Hiram W. Woodward, "The Art and Architecture of the Ayudhya Period," in ศิลปกรรม สมัยอยุธยา (Bangkok 2514), p. 64.
  8. G. Coedès, "Essai de classification des documents historiques cambodgiens conservés à la Bibliothèque de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient," *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient*, XVIII, 9 (1918), p. 15, n. 3; David K. Wyatt, "The Thai 'Kaṭa Maṇḍiarapāla' and Malacca," *JSS*, Vol 55, Part 2 (July 1967), p. 282; Akin Rabibhadana, *The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period*, p. 189.
  9. Although Phiphat Sukhathit, "The *culāmaṇī* era," ศักราชจุฬามณี, in *Silpākṇ*, 6 (5), January 1963, p. 56, treated them as *culāmaṇī* era and belonging to the 16th and 15th centuries respectively.

other instance as scribal confusion in the Pali animal names, *kukkutha*/cock and *kukkura*/dog (ကုက္ကု/ကုက္ကု). In number 20 it would seem that the true *kukkura* was confused as *kukkutha* (misspelled in the text as *kukkuta* : (ကုက္ကုတု)).

Another anomaly for which there seems to be no systematic explanation is the four-year discordance in number 9 (1278/1355) and number 28 (955/1593). Aside from their true animal years being four years earlier than the ones expressed, they share no common diagnostic feature in the elements of their dates and titles. Possibly, however, they both suffered tampering during the recodification of Rama I, as I shall demonstrate below, and their animal synchronisms were misconceived in the manner of two of that king's own laws, numbers 41 and 42.

The most serious animal discrepancy problem is a whole group of laws which are apparently *śaka*, but which show a regular discrepancy of two years between the numerical and animal-year dates. The true animal year for the dates is in each case two years behind the one expressed. Two of them, considered as *saka*, would be in mid-14th century, five more in the 15th, and the remaining five in the 17th. Obviously, such consistency in 'error' cannot be due to random miscopying, the discrepancy must have been deliberate, and a systematic explanation for the entire group is required.

One explanation was already in existence in the 19th century, and it received further attention a few years ago.<sup>10</sup> This is the *culāmaṇi*-era hypothesis, which accounts for those dates by postulating a special era, beginning 110 years later than *śaka*, which had been in use for laws exclusively in the Ayutthaya period, and was then forgotten, with the result that its dates were misunderstood as *śaka*. The 110-year difference is just enough to make the year dates and the animal synchronisms of those laws coincide.

The most exhaustive essay to date on the '*culāmaṇi* era' is that by Khun Phiphat Sukhathit, which was the foundation for Wyatt's discussion. Khun Phiphat, however, did not set out to investigate whether or not such an era had existed, he accepted its existence and merely sought to determine the circumstances of its establishment. His reasoning is too lengthy to examine here, but it involves acceptance of the chronological data in the Nan Nabhamas story, which is unjustified,<sup>11</sup> various suppositions about King Lidaïy cutting *cula* or Buddhist eras, and finally the remark that the first *culāmaṇi* date (i.e., the first date in Table 1, above, calculated as *culāmaṇi*: 1263 + 188 = 1451)

10. Wyatt, "The Thai 'Kaṭa Maṇḍiarapāla'". See also Prince Damrong Rajanubhap, "Story of Thai Laws," ตำนานกฎหมายเมืองไทย in the commentary to the *Royal Autograph Chronicle* (above, n. 7), where he calls some '*culāmaṇi*' dates the 'Law Era', equivalent to *saka*+300.

11. See my "Note on the Date of the Traibhūmikathā",

falls in the reign of King Trailok- who, as a descendent of Sukhothai kings would have understood and favored it.<sup>12</sup>

None of Khun Phiphat's points show clearly that a *culāmaṇī* era existed and there is no discussion of the question of why Kings Lidaiy or Trailok-, in founding a new era, did not have it begin with its year 1, rather than back-dating it to begin in a year equivalent to A.D. 188, seemingly a date without significance. Moreover, in Sukhothai through the reign of Lidaiy neither the Buddhist nor the *cula* era was used for dating. The era in vogue was *śaka*; and the first recorded *cula* date in a Sukhothai inscription is 741 (A.D. 1379), placed after the principal date of *śaka* 1301.<sup>13</sup> Thus no explanation may involve an assumption that King Lidaiy or his predecessors based their calendrical reforms, if any, on the *cula* era. To be sure, the astrological documents cited by Khun Phiphat are in the *cula* era because they were composed later, at Ayutthaya, and were calculated back over several centuries.<sup>14</sup>

Khun Phiphat also assumed that all the law dates showing discrepancies between animal and year dates were *culāmaṇī*, and he arbitrarily altered the tens or hundreds figure to make them fit this supposition. I think it is preferable to assume that some of those discrepancies are random scribal errors; and as representatives of the *culāmaṇī* factor I shall accept only those apparent *śaka* dates showing the precise 2-year discrepancy.

A first, purely logical, objection to the *culāmaṇī* hypothesis is the unlikely circumstance of such a special era being used briefly in the 15th century, then abandoned for one hundred years, used again for a few law texts, neglected for 150 years more, and finally adopted again for a third time in the 18th century. If it was indeed the Ayutthayan Law Era, why was it not used for all laws? It is preferable to hypothesize that this aberrant system was devised once and for all at, or shortly before, the last date in the pattern, A.D. 1643 if we do not accept the *culāmaṇī* hypothesis or 1753 if we do. Furthermore, accepting it makes difficult the rest of the explanation, that it was then misunderstood as *śaka*, since in 1805 there must still have been court scholars who could have remembered the use of *culāmaṇī* era under the last Ayutthayan kings and who would have been able to cope with it correctly and consistently.

12. Since the laws and chronicles contain three different versions of the title, I shall use only their lowest common denominator, 'Trailok-'.  
 13. Inscription number 102 of the Sukhothai Corpus, published in Part 4 of the *Collected Inscriptions*, ประชุมศิลาจารึก.

14. Michael Vickery, "A New Tāmnān about Ayudhya," JSS Vol. 67, Part 2 (July 1979), pp. 140-41, 183-84.

If we accept that all *culāmaṇī* dates must have resulted from a decision made during a single codification of the laws, and that mid-18th century is too late for it to have been used and forgotten, then we must assume the numerical year dates to be intended as *śaka* and the last *culāmaṇī* laws to date from the reign of King Prasat Thong.

This is of particular interest in that there is other evidence to show that Prasat Thong tried to tinker with the calendrical system. According to all the standard chronicles, in 1638, or 1000 *cula*, Prasat Thong was anxious about a mystical significance of the year 1000, and he believed the nefast *kaliyuga* was about to begin.<sup>15</sup> In order to offset such bad luck he ordered that the proper tiger synchronism for 1000 *cula* be transformed into a pig year, which would be like the more auspicious *dvāparayuga*, and impressive ceremonies were carried out to effect the change.

The fate of his new calendrical arrangement is not known, for, with the possible exception of one law preamble, no extant document shows that system in which the true animal synchronism would be 3 years later than the one expressed.<sup>16</sup>

That reform of Prasat Thong is thus not the *culāmaṇī* factor, but the latter reflects similar considerations. That is, its animal years would be correct if the numerical dates were considered as Buddhist era, as that era was understood in 17th-century Ayutthaya—beginning in a snake year and equivalent to A.D. + 544.<sup>17</sup> They cannot be true Buddhist years, for that would put them long before the Ayutthaya period, and they must therefore be *śaka* years with pseudo-Buddhist animal synchronisms. The '*culāmaṇī* era' would then have been an attempt to give a mystically auspicious character to *śaka* dates by assigning them false Buddhist era synchronisms. The author of the reform was probably Prasat Thong, given the other evidence that he tried to initiate that type of calendar revision. In proposing this explanation it is worthwhile to take note of the abundant evidence that Prasat Thong was both an innovator and archaizer in many areas, and has always been considered an important legislator, something confirmed by his contemporary Van Vliet, but that if the traditional *culāmaṇī* hypothesis were accepted *none* of the extant laws would date from his reign.<sup>18</sup>

We may now draw another preliminary conclusion and say that all of the laws with B.E. dates, and all of the *culāmaṇī* group, in addition to interpolations which may have occurred in 1805, had also been revised, altered, and given false patents of anti-

15. See that date in any of the Annals of Ayutthaya.

16. This is the Law on Treason dated *cula* 955/A.D. 1593, number 29 in Table 1. A single example, however, is hardly sufficient to postulate a system, and random error is equally likely.

17. See Phiphat Sukhathit work cited in n. 4, above.

18. Jeremias van Vliet, *The Short History of the Kings of Siam*, The Siam Society, Bangkok, 1975.

quity during one or more recodifications in the 17th century. It seems most likely that all of the *cuḷāmaṇi* group were the work of Prasat Thong. As for the B.E. dated laws, the three latest are from the reign of King Indaraja, who was considered by his near contemporary, Van Vliet, to have been a great king, at a time when the Buddhist era was coming into vogue for secular use,<sup>19</sup> and whose better known popular name, Song Tham (*draṇi dharmā*), "upholder of the religion", indicates a solid tradition of his interest in a Buddhist ordering of society.

To sum up again, there are reasonable systematic hypotheses that nearly all law dates are spurious, concocted during later codifications and dressed up with false symbols of sanctity or antiquity. The only laws which do not so far appear spurious as to date are the *śaka*-dated law on Debts of 1278/1356, the two Hierarchy Laws of 1298/1376, three *cula*-dated laws in 1593 and 1599, the B.E.-dated laws of the Indarājā/Song Tham period, and the *cula*-dated laws from 1690 onward; or in other words all of the law dates of earlier than 1593, except the three mentioned above, have in some way been altered, if not entirely devised, between 1610 and 1805.

The Hierarchy Laws of 1298/1376, however, show complex problems of date, titles, and contents, and they require further examination. These two laws, which outline the structure of 'civilian' and 'military' official hierarchies, are the most valuable extant documents for study of the central government structure, or at least they would be if their own structure could be sorted out in a satisfactory manner. Their expressed dates place them in the reign of King Paramarājādhirāj, one of the most powerful, perhaps the most powerful, of early Ayutthayan rulers, thus in a reign in which one would not be surprised to find efforts at systematization of government structure.

The first difficulty is that the animal year and the numerical date do not correspond, the former being dog while the latter requires dragon, and the difference between them is 6 years counted forward or backward. If the numerical date were adjusted to the animal, as is often done, we would have two possibilities, 1370 or 1382, both still within the reign of the same king. If simple scribal error is assumed as the reason for the discrepancy, 1370 is the better choice, since in the original *śaka* numbering it (1292) differs by only one term from the expressed 1298, whereas 1382 (ś. 1304) differs by three; and the figures for 2 and 8 are among those whose elements may lead to confusion (๒, ๘).<sup>20</sup> So far this is a quite satisfactory explanation: Ayutthaya's most powerful early king, at the very beginning of his reign promulgated a law code which

19. *Ibid.*

20. See the extended discussion of such numerical errors in Michael Vickery, "Cambodia After Angkor, the Chronicular Evidence for the 14th to 16th Centuries," Ph.D. Thesis Yale University, 1977, chapter 1, and Annex 1.

included a sort of table of organization of the central government, which has been preserved, albeit with *ad hoc* modifications to fit changed circumstances, by later rulers up to the 19th century.

This apparently logical explanation, however, has always been rejected because of the titles given the reigning king—*braḥ param trailok nayak* . . . in the Civil Hierarchy law and *braḥ rāmādhīpati śrī param trailokanārth* in the Military and Provincial Hierarchy law, since *trailok*-type titles, in particular *trailokanāth/-nārth*, appear in all other chronicles or literary sources uniquely as the title of another powerful, presumably lawgiving, king who reigned between 1448 and 1488. Thus systematic explanation of the date has been rejected, and there have been at least two different *ad hoc* modern 'rectifications' to fit the Hierarchy laws into the traditional King Trailok's reign.<sup>21</sup>

The revision of date to fit the royal title is not at first thought a bad solution, for there is reasonably good evidence to suppose that 'Trailok-' was an administrative innovator, and the texts of these two laws contain many features which are difficult to accept before his time. Even the date could have been transposed to his time in a more systematic manner than has been done by supposing scribal error on two figures which changed an original 1388 dog year to 1298.

These laws will be given further attention in the discussion of royal titles, below.

I noted above that two laws, the Palatine, and a section of the Law on Treason, contain anachronistically early *cula* dates. The clue to the latter lies in the royal titles it contains and it will be discussed below.

The Palatine law, the other example of an anachronistically early *cula* date (720/1358) combined with a Trailok-type title shows still another serious anomaly. Its animal synchronism diverges from the true one by two years in exactly the same way as the *cuḷāmaṇī* factor. Traditionally, however, it was not treated as *cuḷāmaṇī*, since that category was held to comprise only those laws with apparent *śaka* dates and a two-year animal discrepancy. Even in the detailed treatment by Khun Phiphat the Palatine Law is ignored.

Wyatt, however, then hypothesized that the Palatine Law date, because of the animal year discordance, should be included in the *cuḷāmaṇī* group, which would fit it systematically into the reign of Trailok-, where earlier scholars had assumed it belonged,

21. H.G. Quaritch Wales, *Ancient Siamese Government and Administration*, pp. 22, 34, 173, suggested 1376/1454, while Phiphat Sukhathit, in "Cuḷāmaṇī era," offered 1278/1466. Wales followed Prince Damrong.

though at divergent dates and for unsystematic reasons.<sup>22</sup> The Palatine Law date, however, cannot belong to that group because its animal year, for the numerical date 720, does not fit the pseudo-Buddhist era pattern of the *cuḷāmaṇī* dates. To be sure, Wyatt postulated a conversion from an earlier pseudo-*śaka* date, but that is not legitimate without explaining why only that law, and not the others of the *cuḷāmaṇī* group, was converted to an apparent *cula* date. Any explanation for the '*cuḷāmaṇī era*' must account systematically for all such dates as well as the other anomalies of those laws.

The Palatine Law is most probably to be explained as imitation *cuḷāmaṇī*, devised at a time when no anomaly was seen in the use of *cula* era at any time in Ayutthaya, and when the *cuḷāmaṇī* factor was considered a special Ayutthayan law device. The first consideration indicates a time after 1569, and one might wish to assume that it was part of the recodification indicated in the reign of Prasat Thong. Since he, however, apparently devised the real *cuḷāmaṇī* system, it is difficult to attribute to him one law dated in a pseudo-*cuḷāmaṇī* era. It is more likely that the Palatine Law, of all the supposed old laws, is a construction of Rama I legists, even if older material was incorporated. Rama I did not order his code drawn up merely to preserve historical source material. It was intended as the laws of his own reign; and the Palatine Law, although dated in the early Ayutthaya period, was also *his own* Palace Law. He wished nevertheless to give that important text a patent of antiquity, and its early date, in the current early 19th-century *cula* style, was given an animal synchronism apparently resembling the imperfectly understood 'Law or *cuḷāmaṇī* Era'. It is thus the most anomalous, and most artificial, of all the anomalous law dates.

Finally, then, apart from the cases of presumed random scribal error, the only pre-Rama I law dates which do not appear quite spurious are number 9 (ś. 1278), the three 16th-century *cula*-dated laws, the three 17th-century Buddhist era dates, and numbers 39–40 from the late 17th century, or a total of only nine out of forty contexts. Of course, if my explanation of *cuḷāmaṇī* is accepted, then the numerical dates of numbers 34–38 would also be genuine.

### Titles

In Table 2 the 43 sets of royal titles in the laws are listed in order of date, assuming only three eras: *śaka*, *cula*, and Buddhist, and numbered in accordance with Table 1. The elements of the titles have been arranged to facilitate comparison, and in each case the original sequence of the title elements has been maintained. Due to length the final terms of each title, *ayū hūa*, are omitted.

22. Wyatt, "The Thai 'Kaṭa Maṇḍiarapala'". Prince Damrong's date was 820/1458, followed by Quaritch Wales.

This table indicates clearly the first important point to be made: there was a sequence of title elements which was felt to be 'normal'; titles were not concocted randomly; it is not true that "the same elements . . . are repeated again and again . . . in the same or different order; and any king might use a different combination at different times."<sup>23</sup> In only a very few cases is there deviation from the normal order, or an arrangement quite different from it; and where this occurs, as I shall demonstrate, it is a clue to rearrangement of the laws or recodification.

The second point to note is the pattern of occurrences of principal titles. With only six exceptions, all those pre-Rama I contexts which seem to contain a principal title fall into two mutually exclusive and well-defined groups - - the *rāmādhīpatī* group (19 cases) up to 1465 and the *ekā*-type group (12) encompassing all subsequent laws up to the reign of Rama I Chakri, who again used '*rāmādhīpatī*'. The temporal break between the last *rāmādhīpatī* law (1465) and the first of the coherent *ekā*-group (1593) is 128 years, far longer than any other space of time between law dates (the next longest is 50 years between 1382 and 1432). Two of the exceptions to this pattern are the Civil Hierarchy law (number 18) and a law on Treason (number 22), which have only *trailok*-as principal title, and a third is one *ekādadharaṭh* law (number 21) of 1432, within the *rāmādhīpatī* period. There are also three contexts which have *cākṛabartti* as major title. Two of them, number 20, with *cākṛabartti* + *rāmeśuor*, and number 17, appear to have been designed that way, but the third, number 25, seems originally to have been a *rāmādhīpatī* law from which '*rāmādhīpatī*' was subsequently dropped. Besides that, two of the *rāmādhīpatī* laws, numbers 9 and 26 of 1356 and 1452, exceptionally place *cākṛabartti* before *rāmādhīpatī*, rather than after the principal *rāmādhīpatī* title, as it occurs in the remaining 14 contexts.

None of these *cākṛabartti* laws fall in the reign of the king conventionally known by that title (1548-68); there is no systematic way to account for them; and for the present they must be treated as scribal anomalies.

It is interesting that the break in titulature between the *rāmādhīpatī* and *ekā*-groups, and a break on which laws, chronicles, and extant inscriptions all agree, corresponds to a real break in Ayutthayan history when the government of Ayutthaya was in 1569 assumed by Sukhothai princes after the Burmese invasion.

Within the *rāmādhīpatī* group, the regularity in arrangement of the elements is even more interesting in that it corresponds to the titles in a rare extant set of old documents, the 15th-century Tenasserim inscriptions of the reign of 'Trailok-'.<sup>24</sup>

23. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagra, "Devices and Expedients Vāt Pā Mok, 1727 A.D.," *In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon*, The Siam Society, Bangkok (1970), p. 151.

24. Michael Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: a Reinterpretation," *JSS* Vol. 61, Part 1 (January 1973), pp. 51-70.

There the royal titles are : *samtec brah rāmādhipatī śrī śrīndra param cākṛabartti rājādhirāj rāmeśuor dharmma [rāj] tejo jayabarmma debātideb tribhūbanādhipes...* Fourteen of the *rāmādhipati* law contexts contain a following *cākṛabartti* element; and in eleven cases *cākṛabartti* is followed directly by *rāj [ādhiraj]*. Moreover, seven examples of the *rāmādhipati* element are followed by *sundhar/surindr/sindhar*, probably here corruptions of the original *śrīndra*;<sup>25</sup> and in a handful of the laws there are still more elements of the old model following *cākṛabartti*, including one nearly perfect example of the old titles, number 5, the *rāp fōn* law dated 1899/1355.

The *rāmādhipati* law titulature is thus clearly based on a genuine old model dating from at least the 15th century.<sup>26</sup> In the course of time, and during successive recodifications, some elements were dropped from some laws and others added.

Since an authentic ancient model has been evoked, something more must be said about the question of 'true' titles before proceeding with the internal analysis of the law titulature.

In the conventional history of Ayutthaya, kings have been designated by the principal titles found in the chronicles, or Annals of Ayutthaya; but we are now faced with law titles which combine elements in ways unknown to the Annals. Examination of contemporary inscriptions, and recently studied old written works, such as the history of Van Vliet, shows that some of the titles in the Annals are inaccurate, and that some of those in the laws are more genuine.

Two inscriptions, and Van Vliet, show that the principal title of a king or kings reigning in 1418 and 1435, and who at the latter date was the ruler conventionally known as Paramarājādhirāj II, was really *paramarājādhipati*;<sup>27</sup> and the 15th-century Tenasserim inscriptions which I have just evoked, and whose titulature is reflected in some of the laws, demonstrate that 'King Trailok' was not known, at least not officially, by that title.

Those inscriptions must be accepted as incontrovertible evidence that 'trailok-' was not in contemporary official use for the king reigning between 1448 and 1488, and probably not for any other king either. The important elements of his true titles were *rāmādhipati...cākṛabartti rājādhirāj rāmeśuor dharmarājā...jayabarmmadebātideb tribhūvanādhipes* which begin with the name ascribed to the first king of Ayutthaya,

25. Although *sundhar* might be interpreted as *sundara*, "beautiful," that does not justify attributing an independent origin to this law title. Corruption in such contexts involves a misapprehension of meaning as well as change of orthography.

26. In van Vliet's *Short History* the same titles are given to Rāmādhipatī I, but that is not a reliable contemporary record.

27. See my review of van Vliet's *Short History* in JSS Vol. 64, Part 2 (July 1976), p. 227.

contain that of the next important ruler (*rājādhirāj* 1370–1388), a title obviously inherited from the greatest king of Angkor (*jayabarmadeba*-Jagavarman), and only at the end a doublet of ‘*trailokanāth*’ (‘protector of the three worlds’), *tribhūvanādhipéś* (‘lord ruler of the three worlds’).<sup>28</sup> What seems to have happened was that in popular usage the last, and usually least diagnostic, element of the royal titles was perpetuated, even in subsequent official chronicles and perhaps deliberately, to distinguish this king from the other *rāmādhipatī*, *rāmeśuor*, or *rājādhirāj*. This usage was consecrated at least by the early 17th century, since it is found in Van Vliet’s chronicle, and it may even have been common from soon after ‘Trailok’s’ reign. It must also not be forgotten that the ‘Trailok’ period in the Annals is extremely confused and there may be many undetected errors in the conventional picture.<sup>29</sup>

If confusion about ‘*trailok*’ was already current in Van Vliet’s time, his writings on the other hand enable us to resurrect genuine titles which have not been preserved in the Annals. Thus the true principal title of the Annals’ *ekādaśaraṭh* (Ekathotsarot), 1605–10, was *rāmeśuor* (Ramesuan), *drañ dharm* (Song Tham) was really *indarājā*, and *prāsād dòn* (Prasat Thong) should more properly be known as *dharmarājādhirāj*.<sup>30</sup>

In contrast to the correspondence between the *rāmādhipatī* group of laws and genuine old inscriptions, the 17th-century titles revealed by Van Vliet make the *eka*-group of law titles for that period seem anomalous; and the anomaly is compounded by the only extant contemporary document showing an *eka*-title, the 1727 Pā Mok inscription of the king popularly known as Thaisa (*dāy srah*), but there it is *ekādaśaruda*, followed by *prāsād dòn*. No extant laws date from his reign; and the condition of the sources does not permit conclusions as to when *eka*-titles were first used or what form they took. If we accept that those laws have a 17th-century origin, they and the Pā Mok inscription indicate that the conventional term *ekādaśaraṭh* may be spurious.

Let us return, though, to the *rāmādhipatī* titles and the variations from the 15th-century model. Some of the alterations and omissions seem due to scribal carelessness or misunderstanding, and are thus non-diagnostic. For example, the alternations *sundhar/surindr/sindhar*, and their omissions from some laws are probably of this type. Likewise the two occurrences of *cākṛabarrī* + *rāmādhipatī* must be considered idiosyncratic.

The additions to the old structure seem to be more informative, and their analysis can best be initiated with the Treason law of 1434 which I noted above as an

28. Vickery, “The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim.” Jayavarman’s own inscriptions always show *jayavarmmadeva*.

29. See Wyatt’s note in van Vliet, *Short History*, p. 63, n. 47.

30. Van Vliet, *Short History*, pp. 87, 89, 94; and my review of *Short History*.

anachronistically early example of *cula* date, 796. Its principal title is *trailok-*, but the date is 14 years before the beginning of 'Trailok's' reign; and since the year and animal synchronism agree it is not *culāmaṇi*, nor is there any other way to adjust the date to the true 'Trailok' regnal period. In fact it is the title which gives the game away. During the reigns of Taksin (1767–82) and Rama I (1782–1809) new chronicle versions were prepared in which all of the dates between 1346 and 1629 are inaccurate by 4–20 years and in which the reign of 'Trailok' indeed begins in 1434.<sup>31</sup> Thus that section of the law was composed at the end of the 18th century, probably after 1795 when the principal chronicle was written, and inserted among possibly older sections in order to give the new institutions of Rama I an air of Ayutthayan authority.

Rama I and his scholars believed 'Trailok' had begun his reign in 1434 and they calculated an entirely correct *cula* date. Since, however, there was no genuine contemporary *trailok-* title, all such are later concoctions; and we are entitled to attribute the one under discussion, *trailokanārth nāyak tilak*, to the legists of Rama I.

Among the elements of this new composition are *nāyak tilak*, found in only one other old law, the Civil Hierarchy text which shows serious anomalies of date as well. There *nāyak tilak* are followed by a long series of terms which are not part of recorded genuine old titles, and in that respect it resembles numbers 1, 10, 25, and 41, the last of which is a law of Rama I dated 1784. Thus we observe :

1.	visuddhi suriyavaṅṅ aṅg	purisotam
10.	mahā maṅkut debamanusa visuddhi suriyavaṅṅ aṅg	buddhāṅkūr
18.	klau bhuvamaṅḍal sakāl anacākr	agra purisotam
25.	mahā	surivaṅṅ aṅg purusotam
41.	siddhi visuddhi	purusotam

In general such extensions of titulature are characteristic of continuity and development within a polity; and the longest royal titles of all in the laws are those of Rama I in the introduction to the *Kaṭhmāy*, dated 1166/1804.<sup>32</sup> Those long introductory titles, moreover, include some of the controversial elements just noted: . . . . . *tribhūvaneśvaranārth nāyak tilak . . . visuddhi makuṅ . . . mahā buddhāṅkūr*.

Thus both the titular expansion and some of the anomalous (for the laws) terminology were characteristic of the usage of Rama I legists; and we may conclude that in addition to number 22, entirely a creation of Rama I legists, the *nāyak tilak* and following titles of number 18, as well as the extra terminology of numbers 1, 10, and 25 are due to Rama I legists, and these elements are evidence that the laws concerned, the 14th-century section of the Miscellaneous text, the Palatine and Hierarchy laws, and

31. See Vickery, "Cambodia After Angkor," chapter 9.

32. See *Ibid.*, chapter 7, and Annex 5; and for the long titles of Rama I, *Kaṭhmāy* Vol. I, p. 1.

one of the anomalous *cākṛabarrti* laws were all rewritten in some way in 1804–05 and their patents of antiquity modified or superimposed. We may not, however, conclude that ‘*trailok-*’ was an insertion by Rama I legists, since it was already attributed to the mid-15th-century king in Van Vliet’s day. A problem which remains is the evidence of number 22 that Rama I legists believed the reign of ‘Trailok’ to have been in mid-15th century, even if the precise dating was wrong; the dates of the other three ‘*trailok*’ laws fall in the 14th century; and no Thai tradition ascribes that title to more than one king. Thus laws 10, 18, and 19, the Palatine and Hierarchy texts should have been considered by Rama I, and perhaps by earlier kings and their legists, to belong to the 15th century. I shall return to this in a moment.

One more law whose title may be attributed to the post-1795 misapprehension about Ayutthayan regnal periods is number 28, the single *ekādaśarath* occurrence, dated 1593. The king conventionally known by that title reigned in 1605–10, and his principal title was *rāmeśuor*. Moreover the laws and a single inscription indicate that the genuine *eka-* titles were *ekādadharaṭh* and *ekādaśaruda*. During the reign of Rama I, and throughout the 19th century, however, it was believed that a king *ekādaśarath* began his reign in 1593;<sup>33</sup> and the number 28 law preamble thus dates from the period of Rama I and exhibits a false patent of antiquity. Interestingly, the text of this law, p. 198, contains the title *ekādadharaṭh*, probably indicating that the body of the law originally dated from one of the 17th-century reigns, but was then revised and a new preamble added by Rama I legists.

Above I noted two dates with a 4-year discrepancy in the animal synchronism. One of them is number 28, whose titles are a composition of the reign of Rama I; and the other is one of the *cākṛabarrti* + *rāmādhipatī* laws, which may perhaps also now be ascribed to Rama I. This is further evidence for my earlier tentative conclusion that the 4-year discrepancy was a fault in the writing of the 1805 code.

The main problems remaining now are the Palatine and Hierarchy laws, both because of their anomalous dates and the incorporation of the title *trailok*. Some of their anomalies are clearly the work of Rama I legists; and the pattern of the *trailok* elements suggests that they were also inserted during the codification of 1805. This cannot, however, be asserted definitively, since the title ‘*trailokanāth*’ was already current in the 17th century, and could have been inserted in the laws at that time. *A priori* they are the laws most likely to show corruption and inconsistencies in their composition, since they would be among the most essential texts of any law code, but they would need considerable revision with each new codification in order to correspond with changing government structures. In fact, I have demonstrated the existence of

33. See van Vliet’s *Short History*, Wyatt’s note, p. 87, n. 113.

inconsistent layers of composition reflecting changed administrative structures in the Hierarchy laws.<sup>34</sup> Moreover, if kings, as the action of Rama I seems to indicate, felt that their duty was to preserve in so far as possible old institutions, rather than openly innovate, the changes they introduced would be partially disguised among outmoded provisions of the laws, resulting in the confusion apparent in so many texts.

#### General conclusions on dates and titles

1. With the exception of the reign of 'Paramarājādhirāj' II, whose true major title was *rājādhīpati*, we have no evidence that '*rāmādhīpati*' is anachronistic for any other of the laws up to 1465; and all four laws whose dates fall in the reign of 'Paramarājādhirāj' II are anomalous in other ways. One is the misplaced *trailok* law on Treason, one is an *ekādadharath* law with Buddhist era date, and the other two are *cuḷāmani*.

2. The *rāmādhīpati* titles do not reveal definite evidence of more than two recensions, an 'original' with titles more or less in accordance with the 15th-century inscriptions, and that of Rama I in 1805. Given the similarity of all the old *rāmādhīpati* titles, the circumstance that Rāmādhīpati-Trailok probably was a reformer and innovator, and the inscriptions from his reign, it is probably better to attribute the earliest layer of titulature in the laws to a recension of his reign than to the founder of Ayutthaya. If Rāmādhīpati-Trailok had merely modified an old code we would expect more indications of tampering with the *rāmādhīpati* titles, such as occurred in 1805. There may of course be pre-'Trailok' sections in the laws to which he added his own titles, but they may only be revealed through detailed study of the texts. Another possibility is that, as the Van Vliet *Short History* shows, those same titles were used by Rāmādhīpati I, and copied by later kings, including 'Trailok', Naray, Phetracha, and with significant expansion, Rama I Chakri.<sup>35</sup>

3. The 15th-century inscriptions show emphatically that *rāmādhīpati* is appropriate for the 'Trailok' period; and that all *trailok* titles in the laws are probably later interpolations.

4. The Palatine Law shows anomalies of both date and title which are probably due to Rama I legists; and thus no provision of that law, in particular descriptions of royal family or state organization, may automatically be attributed to any date before 1805. Older sections no doubt survive, but only detailed study of the text in comparison with other texts will establish their identity.

34. Michael Vickery, Review of Yoneo Ishii, et. al., *An Index of Officials in Traditional Thai Governments*, JSS Vol. 63, Part 2 (July 1975), pp. 419-430.

35. See Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim," for discussion and further references. Rama I Chakri's use of these titles is in the Miscellaneous Law of 1146/1804, number 43 of Table 1.

5. The Palatine and Hierarchy laws exhibit complex difficulties which do not appear amenable to definitive resolution on the basis of date and titles alone. The true expressed date of the former is dog year, 720 *cula* = 1280 *śaka* (A.D. 1358); and the best reconstruction of the Hierarchy law date, as I indicated above, is dog year 1292 *śaka* (A.D. 1370), just one cycle later, and a circumstance in which copying errors have often occurred.<sup>36</sup> If it were not for the *trailok* titles which they all contain, we could leave it at that, saying they dated respectively from the reigns of Rāmādhīpatī I and Paramarājādhīrāj I, or all from the same date in one or the other of those reigns, with a subsequent cyclical error in recopying. The presence of *trailok*, however, means that they were at one time all dated in 'his' reign, or that because parts of the contents of those laws deal with administrativs structures which he is believed to have instituted, a post-15th century recension, most likely that of 1805, added the *trailok* titles arbitrarily in disregard of the date. As we have seen, all commentators on the laws have been willing to make quite arbitrary assumptions about dates in order to fit laws into slots in which they were *a priori* presumed to belong.

If we suppose that these laws really originated in the mid-15th century reign of 'Trailok', a plausible systematic restoration of the Hierarchy law date would be *śaka* 1388 (A.D. 1466), with two figures susceptible to a type of confusion which could lead to 1298. Then the *trailok* element could have been added either in one of the 17th-century recensions, or in that of 1805, at which time the error in copying the date would have occurred.

There is no way to systematically fit the Palatine date into the 'Trailok' period, but that date was most probably established arbitrarily by Rama I legists, and, as I said above, this law is the most anomalous of all.

6. The *ekādadharath* titles, when compared with other extant documents, seem quite anomalous, for that term is not found in any contemporary, or near contemporary, documents for any of the kings concerned; and the only confirmed *eka-* title is *ekāda-śaruda*, for a reign to which no laws are attributed. Application of the same method as used in my explanation of *cu!āmani* and the Buddhist era law dates would mean attribution of all occurrences of *ekādadharath* to a recension in the reign of King Naray, where it is found for the last time. Otherwise we would have to suppose that other kings also used it, but perhaps only for their laws. For the present the only permissible conclusion is that all *ekādadharath* titles belong to the reign of Nareśuor and in the 17th century.

36. See discussion of this problem in Vickery, "Cambodia After Angkor," chapter 4.

### Recensions of the Ayutthayan laws

The examination of dates and titles permits a few systematic hypotheses about the various recensions or recodifications through which the Ayutthayan laws passed before that of 1805.

1. A pre-1569 recension with true *śaka* dates. Although this may go back to Rāmādhipatī I there is no proof in the dates or titles of anything older than Rāmādhipatī- 'Trailok'.

2. Laws of Nareśuor's reign with true *cula* dates.

3. A recodification by Indarājā/Song Tham using Buddhist era dates, including the re-dating of old laws in the Buddhist era. The anomalous *ekādadharaṭh* title of 1432 (number 21) would have been part of either this recension or the one following.

4. A new code prepared for Dhammarājādhirāj/Prasat Thong. The *cuḷāmani* factor was probably devised at this time; and its occurrence at earlier dates would indicate either old laws revised for Dhammarājādhirāj or new compositions to which he wished to attribute patents of antiquity. It is also possible, because one *cuḷāmani* date belongs to the reign of Indarājā/Song Tham, that he was responsible for it and Dhammarājādhirāj continued its use.

5. New laws of Naray and Phetracha, although not full new recensions of the code.

6. The 1805 code of Rama I Chakri

It is now interesting to turn to the earliest European observer who wrote in some detail on the subjects of Thai historical literature and government structure, Jeremias van Vliet, who was on the scene in 1633-1641 during part of one of the reigns in which I have deduced a major law recension, and who made the following remarks about Thai laws - - probably based partly on his own observations, partly on Thai writings, and partly on oral tradition.

In his treatment of Rāmeśuor (Ekādaśaraṭh, 1605-10) van Vliet wrote that "he introduced the ordinances as established by . . . Rāmāthibodī to which the officers who served the foreigners . . . had to conform"; and for fiscal reasons "he introduced many oppressive laws . . . demanded that all subject lands and cities under the Siamese crown list their slaves."<sup>37</sup> Thus van Vliet, only 20-30 years afterward, had heard of major legal innovations in the beginning of the 17th century and also heard that they involved a renewal of earlier laws promulgated by a king Rāmādhipatī, although whether the first (1351-69), or the second (1491-1529), or Rāmādhipatī-Trailok is not clear.

37. Van Vliet, *Short History*, pp. 87-88.

Greater clarity emerges from his remarks on the reign of his contemporary King Dhammarājādhirāj who "improved, renewed, and corrected the ordinances introduced by the eleventh king [Rāmādhīpatī II] and continued by the twenty-first king [Rāmeśuor-Ekādaśarath]." <sup>38</sup> This information obtained by a near contemporary of the last two law revisions is very close to the picture deduced from the law preambles themselves, the important difference being that van Vliet emphasizes the work of Rāmeśuor, while the law preambles indicate a major recension under Indarājā. Also interesting, and puzzling, is that the earliest law code is attributed to Rāmādhīpatī II rather than to Rāmādhīpatī-Trailok, since no extant laws are dated between 1466 and 1593.

That difficulty, however, might be overcome by remembering that 'Trailok's true principal title was Rāmādhīpatī, but that by van Vliet's time this detail had been forgotten. Thus for men of the early 17th century all old laws with *rāmādhīpatī*-type titles would have been attributed either to the king of 1491-1529 or to the first of that name in 1351-69. Even if van Vliet believed all the *rāmādhīpatī* laws to have been the work of the second of that name, our examination of dates and titles indicates that apparently Dhammarājādhirāj/Prasat Thong and Rama I Chakri chose to redate some of them to the period of Rāmādhīpatī I.

---

38. *Ibid.*, p. 96.

Page locations in the *Guru sabhā* edition of the laws, and Thai subject titles of the laws. Numbering and dates are as in Table 1, and locations are by volume and page.

1.	1341	1263	Vol. III	p. 94	Miscellaneous - เบดเสวจ
2.	1345	1267	II	336	Slavery - ทาน
3.	1351	1894	II	68	Witnesses - ภฎาน
4.	1351	1895	IV	2	Crimes against the Government - อาชา หลวง
5.	1355	1899	II	27	Litigation - รับฟ้อง
6.	1355	1899	II	105	Ordeals - พิสูท
7.	1355	1899	III	1	Kidnapping - ลักพา
8.	1356	1900	II	130	Judges - ตระลาการ
9.	1356	1278	III	60	Debts - กู้หน้
10.	1358	720	I	69	Palatine - มณฑลเทศาภิบาล
11.	1358	1902	IV	106	Civil Offenses - อาชารวม
12.	1359	1903	III	114	Miscellaneous - เบดเสวจ
13.	1359	1903	III	210	Theft - โจร
14.	1360	1904	II	205	Husband and Wife - คู่เวียง
15.	1361	1905	II	244	Husband and Wife - คู่เวียง
16.	1362	1906	III	164	Miscellaneous - เบดเสวจ
17.	1364	1910	III	290	Theft - โจร
18.	1376	1298	I	219	Civil Hierarchy - ตำแหน่งนาพลเรือน
19.	1376	1298	I	316	Military, Provincial Hierarchies - ตำแหน่งนาทหารหัวเมือง
20.	1382	1926	II	50	Litigation - รับฟ้อง
21.	1432	1976	IV	17	Crimes against the Government - อาชาหลวง
22.	1434	796	IV	132	Treason - กระบดศึก
23.	1437	1359	II	287	Slavery - ทาน
24.	1447	1369	III	184	Quarrels - วิวาท คำคดี
25.	1451	1373	IV	123	Treason - กระบดศึก
26.	1452	1374	IV	149	Treason " "
27.	1465	1387	II	317	Slavery - ทาน
28.	1593	955	I	196	Fines - พรหมศักดิ์
29.	1593	955	IV	155	Treason - กระบดศึก
30.	1599	961	V	6	(Old) Royal Decrees - กำนันคดีเก่า

31.	1611	2155	III	21	Inheritance - มรดก
32.	1611	2155	III	46	Inheritance „
33.	1614	2158	III	53	Inheritance „
34.	1622	1544	I	160	Procedure - อรรถนุญ
35.	1633	1555	I	172	Procedure „
36.	1633	1555	II	185	Appeal - อฎฐ
37.	1635	1557	II	331	Slavery - ทบ
38.	1643	1565	III	132	Miscellaneous - เบดเสวจ
39.	1669	1591	II	38	Litigation - รับฟ้อง
40.	1690	1052	II	2	Division of <i>phrai</i> - บานแพนท
41.	1784	1146	III	173	Miscellaneous - เบดเสวจ
42.	1790	1152	II	202	Appeal - อฎฐ
43.	1804	1166	II	248	Husband and Wife - สัวเมีย

Table 1

Note: A.D. dates are calculated with the conventional 78 and 638 for *saka* and *cula*, and 544 for Buddhist, in accordance with 17th-century practice. With the exception of number 3, which clearly belongs in the reign of *Rāmādhīpati*, 1351, more refined calculation for dates falling near the change of year and requiring 79/639 would serve no purpose in the discussion. In column 3, *s.*, *c.*, and *B* indicate original *saka*, *cula* and Buddhist dates; column 4, +, indicates presence of *cujāmani* factor; column 5 indicates discrepancies between numerical year date and animal year other than *cujāmani* (+/- meaning true animal synchronism ahead or behind that expressed); translations of law subjects according to Akin Rabibhadana, *The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period 1782-1873*, Data Paper 74, *Southeast Asia Program*, Cornell University, July 1969.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	A.D.	orig.	<i>cula</i>			Principal title	Law subject
1	1341	1263	<i>s</i>	+		<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Miscellaneous
2	1345	1267	<i>s</i>	+			Slavery
<i>Rāmādhīpati</i> I							
3	1350	1894	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Witnesses
4	1351	1895	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Crimes against government
5	1355	1899	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Litigations
6	1355	1899	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Ordeals
7	1355	1899	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Kidnapping
8	1356	1900	B				Judges
9	1356	1278	<i>s</i>		-4	<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Debts
10	1358	720	<i>c</i>		-2	<i>rāmādhīpati</i> + <i>trailok-</i>	Palatine
11	1358	1902	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	
12	1359	1903	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Miscellaneous
13	1359	1903	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Theft
14	1360	1904	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Husband and wife
15	1361	1905	B			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Husband and wife
16	1362	1906	B		-7/+5	<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Miscellaneous
17	1364	1910	B				Theft
<i>Paramarājādhīraj</i> I							
18	1376	1298	<i>s</i>		+6	<i>trailok-</i>	Civil Hierarchy
19	1376	1298	<i>s</i>		+6	<i>rāmādhīpati</i> + <i>trailok-</i>	Military, Provincial Hierarchy
20	1382	1926	B		+1	<i>cākṛabarrti</i> + <i>rāmesuor</i>	Litigations
<i>Paramarājādhīraj</i> II							
21	1432	1976	B		+1	<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Crimes against government
22	1434	796	<i>c</i>			<i>trailok-</i>	Treason
23	1437	1359	<i>s</i>	+		<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Slavery
24	1447	1369	<i>s</i>	+		<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Quarrels
<i>Trailok-</i>							
25	1451	1373	<i>s</i>	+		<i>cākṛabarrti?</i>	Treason.
26	1452	1374	<i>s</i>	+		<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Treason.
27	1465	1387	<i>s</i>	+		<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Slavery
<i>Naresuor</i>							
28	1593	955	<i>c</i>		-4	<i>ekādasārath</i>	Fines
29	1593	955	<i>c</i>		+3	<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Treason
30	1599	961	<i>c</i>			<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	(Old) Royal decrees
<i>Indarājā/Draṅ dharm</i> (Song Thom)							
31	1611	2155	B			<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Inheritance
32	1611	2155	B			<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Inheritance
33	1614	2158	B			<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Inheritance
34	1622	1544	<i>s</i>	+		<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Procedure
<i>Dhammarājādhīraj/Prasād don</i> (Prasat Thong)							
35	1633	1555	<i>s</i>	+		<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Procedure
36	1633	1555	<i>s</i>	?		<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Appeal
37	1635	1557	<i>s</i>	+			Slavery
38	1643	1565	<i>s</i>	+		<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Miscellaneous
<i>Nārāy</i>							
39	1669	1591	<i>s</i>	no animal		<i>ekādadharaṭh</i>	Litigation
<i>Bedrājā</i> (Phetracha)							
40	1690	1052	<i>c</i>				Division of <i>phrai</i>
<i>Rām I Chakri</i>							
41	1784	1146	<i>c</i>		-3	<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Miscellaneous
42	1790	1152	<i>c</i>		+2	<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Appeal
43	1804	1166	<i>c</i>			<i>rāmādhīpati</i>	Husband and Wife

