

THE STORY OF THE RECORDS OF SIAMESE HISTORY.

[NOTE.—Subjoined is a translation of the first part of the introduction written by H. R. H. Prince Damrong for the History now being edited by him. It is published in the first volume.—O. FRANKFURTER.]

The history of Siam may properly be divided into three periods, namely, (1) the period when Sukhothai was the capital, (2) the period when Ayuddhya was the capital, and (3) the period since Bangkok (Ratanakosindr) has been the capital.

It is rather difficult to obtain definite, accurate knowledge about the Sukhothai period. But stone inscriptions and ancient manuscripts do exist in sufficient number to enable us to institute a comparison that affords us some knowledge. Of such stone inscriptions and ancient manuscripts I have found eleven examples having reference to that period. These are :—

1. The stone inscription of Khun Ram Khamhëng, who was the third King of Sukhothai in the dynasty founded by Phra Ruang. This inscription dates from the year B. E. 1835 (A. D. 1492), and was the first in which Siamese characters were employed. It relates the history of Sukhothai from the time King Khun Sri Indradit occupied the throne up to the reign of King Khun Ram Khamhëng.

2. A stone inscription of Phra Maha Dhammarajalithai, the fifth King of the dynasty of Phra Ruang. This inscription was made at Muang Nakhon Pu (near the present Kamphengphet) and is dated B. E. 1900 (A. D. 1557). It gives the story of certain relics brought from Ceylon.

3. Another stone inscription of Phra Maha Dhammarajalithai, on one side in Siamese characters and on the other in Cambodian. It is dated B. E. 1904 (A. D. 1561), and gives details of the history of Sukhothai in the reign of the royal author.

4. The Book of the Lady Nobhamat. This book was the work of the Lady Nobhamat, a daughter of Phra Sri Mahosot, who was of the Brahmin caste in Sukhothai. It relates how her father presented her to be a wife of King Phra Ruang, and how she became first wife with the title of Thao Sri Chulalaks. She lived in the royal palace, and became familiar with the royal customs and observances. These she noted down in her book, together with geographical details with regard to places, villages and towns and the surroundings of the palace. The whole is contained in three Siamese volumes, called variously the Book of the Lady Nobhamat, or the Tables of Thao Sri Chulalaks.

In reading this book I came to the conclusion that as regards language it is a modern work of the Bangkok period, the idiom being different from that used in the time when Sukhothai was the capital. Moreover there are certain things in it that cannot possibly be true, such as the statement to the effect that there were foreigners, English, French, Dutch, Spaniards, and even Americans, there. The truth is, as we now know, that no such foreigners, or indeed any *farangs* at all, had come to Siam at the time of the Lady Nobhamat. Furthermore in the time of Sukhothai there could not have been big guns weighing a hundred or a thousand piculs, as such guns had not then been made anywhere. For these reasons I came to suspect that it was a modern work, which some one else had written, using the name of the Lady Nobhamat. I once had an opportunity of putting the case before His late Majesty, who said that as far as language goes the book was certainly modern, and that there were certain things in it which could not be true. On the other hand scholars formerly—King Mongkut and Prince Wongsadirat-sanid in particular—admired the book very much. Now they must have observed the element of the marvellous in the book, the same as we do, and what other grounds they had for putting faith in it we do not know. But His Majesty King Chulalongkorn, as the result of the examination he made, was of opinion that an original version of the book once existed, that this original version became impaired, and that it had been restored during the Bangkok period, but that the person compiling the new version did not have sufficient intelligence or knowledge for the purpose, as can easily be seen.

5. The History of the Statue of the Buddha named "Phra Sihing." This work was written, in Pali, by a priest named Bodhi-

rangsi, between the years B. E. 2000 and 2070. It relates the history of this statue which was originally constructed in Ceylon. Then King Phra Ruang sent the Prince of Nakhon Sri Dhammaraj to beg permission to bring it to Sukhothai. The book, which has been translated into Siamese several times, further relates the wanderings of the image to different cities.

6. The History of Jinakalamalini. This manuscript was the work of a priest named Ratana Paññāñāña. It was composed in Pali, at Chieng Mai, in the year B. E. 2059, and gives the history of the spread of Buddhism in Siam. A translation into Siamese was made in the reign of King Phra Buddha Yotfa Chulalok.

7. The Chinese history known as Kintia Sektongchi. This work the Chinese Emperor Kian Long of the Ching dynasty ordered his officials to publish in the year B. E. 2310. It deals with the treaty relations between China and Siam, and was translated into Siamese by Khun Chen Chin Aksorn (Sutchai).

8. The Northern Annals, as appearing in the manuscript kept in the Vajirañāna National Library. King Phra Buddha Yotfa Chulalok directed his younger brother Prince Surasinghanada to collect all the documents. That was in B. E. 2350, and the Prince in turn ordered Phra Vichien Pricha, the chief of the royal pandits of the right side, to collate them. It appears that the method adopted by Phra Vichien Pricha was to collect all the old manuscripts he could find which he believed to relate events that happened before the building of Ayuddhya. And sometimes he simply noted down what he heard from old people in the North who remembered the old traditions. All this material he arranged in order just as he thought it would fit in, his purpose being to make it a consecutive whole like the history of Ayuddhya. The result is that in the Northern Annals we have a combination of many narrations, and sometimes one story is repeated twice. The chronology is thus entirely unreliable, and breaks down if any attempt is made to compare one date with another. None the less there is a solid substratum of fact to be obtained in the incidents narrated in this history; only one must not put credence in their sequence as set down by Phra Vichien Pricha.

9. The History of Yonaka. This is a history of the various principalities now included in Bayap Circle, and was written by Phya

Prajakich Korachakr (Jəm Bunnak). The author was at pains to collect and collate all the material available, and as he did so with perspicacity and a profound knowledge of antiquity, his book is a very good one. It is in fact one of the best works in the field of Siamese history, and it is much to be regretted that Phya Prajakich Korachakr died so young, as he gave promise of great things as a historian.

10. The Rajadhiraj. This is the history of Pegu, which His Majesty Phra Buddha Yotfa Chulalok ordered to be translated into Siamese in B. E. 2328. The first part has much to do with our history at the time when Sukhothai was the capital.

11. Chamadevivongs. This work was written in Pali by Phra Bodhirangsi, of Chieng Mai, and was translated as the History of Muang Haribhunjai. It also has to do with the Sukhothai period.

The history of the Ayuddhya period can be more easily examined than that of Sukhothai as we have documents to form a groundwork.

The most familiar version of this history is that printed by Dr. Bradley, in two volumes, in B. E. 2406, and by other printing offices on several occasions since. It is generally held that this History was the work of Krom Somdet Phra Paramanujit, and that in composing it he made use of the history of Somdet Phra Wanratna in Pali, one part of which was called Mahayuddhakar and the other Chulayuddhakar. The two volumes were thus ascribed to Krom Somdet Phra Paramanujit, and were generally considered the only books in existence relating to the history of the Ayuddhya period.

When, however, His Majesty King Chulalongkorn ordered the establishment of the National Library in B.E. 2448 and appointed His Majesty the present King President of the Council, and when afterwards the Royal Research Society was formed, of which His Majesty constituted himself President, in B. E. 2450, all the members endeavoured to collect historical documents. Many of them also helped in examining and comparing the many documents that were gradually placed in the Library. When any doubt arose the late King was approached, and His Majesty often gave his opinion on questions brought before him. Only two months before his lamented death the following letter was received from His Majesty:—

SUEN DUSIT,
The 8th August, R.S. 129.

TO PRINCE DAMRONG,

I have received your letter of the 5th inst. informing me that the National Library has obtained two other copies of the History, the one written in C. E. 1145 and other judged to date from C. E. 1157. The matter agrees with that given in the printed copy. But in the manuscript written in 1145, some words are missing and some are added, and in this respect it shows differences from the printed copy. I have examined one part and return herewith the two copies with the comparisons I have made. You do not express any opinion as to whether the manuscript dated 1145 comes from Ayuddhya or from Dhanaburi. I have made an examination, but am unable to establish the point definitely.

It appears to me that, in the composition of all these versions of our history, we have five different sources. The first is the yearly calendar (*Pum*). The second is the account dealing with the period from the reign of Somdet Phra Maha Chakrabarti to that of Prâsât Thong, and these documents are understood to have been written in the reign of Somdet Phra Narayana Maharaj. This part of the history is based on the war reports, just as was done afterwards in regard to the reign of Phra Chao Krung Dhanaburi, as I have shown in the *Phra Rajavichan*.

The third source is the story that takes our history from the reign of Phra Narayana to that of Boromakot. It is understood that this was composed in the reign of King Boromakot by his orders. For that period there were no war reports, so events were simply noted down, and may be fittingly compared with the way in which evidence was formerly taken in law cases. The evidence without any attempt at style or order was noted down as given, and the book in which it was noted down was bound up and provided with a seal of wet clay to which the person giving evidence had to affix his thumb mark.

Fourthly, from the time of Phra Boromakot up to the destruction of Ayuddhya the history may be said to have been written by order of Phra Chao Krung Dhanaburi. There are two versions.

The fifth source is the part which Krom Somdet Phra Paramanujit extracted from the war reports such as are still preserved to the present day, and a comparison between these and the actual History will serve to show how the compilation was made.

With regard to the two manuscripts believed to date from C.E. 1145 and 1157 I am of opinion that only words were corrected, and perhaps sentences, but no new matter was added.

(Signed) SAYAMINDR.

In order that the King's explanation may be understood, it will be necessary to give details of the different versions of the History preserved in the National Library.

The Council was able to collect five versions of the History during the fifth reign.

I:—The version of Luang Prasöt. It was found by Phra Bariyat Dhammatada when he still held the title of Luang, and it was decided by the Council to honour him by calling it after him.

The manuscript commences with the words: "May it be of good omen. In the year of the monkey, 1042, on Wednesday the 12th day of the waxing moon, 5th month, His Majesty was pleased to order to bring together the account of the events noted down by Phra Hora, and the account of the events which could be found in the Library and the events which were noted down in the Royal History, and to arrange all these according to date."

This history was ordered to be written by Somdet Phra Narayana Maharaj. It appears that the copy in the Library was written in Ayuddhya, but there is only one volume of it. The events are recorded, from the time the Statue of the Buddha known as Phra Chao Baneng Chón was erected in B. E. 1837 (C. E. 686). Ayuddhya was founded in the year of the Tiger, Chula Era 712, and the account given in this volume reaches up to C. E. 966, when Somdet Phra Naresuan raised an army to proceed to Muang Hang Luang. This history gives the events in very short form, but for the most part it agrees with the historical dates given elsewhere, and in looking over the years recorded in it, one finds that they are to a great extent correct. It is very probable this work formerly contained another volume,

II :—The copy of the History written in the year of the Chula Era 1145. The original was written at the time of the foundation of Bangkok. The contents are the same as in the printed copy in two volumes ; but it cannot be definitely stated when this History commenced, where it ended, or how many volumes it contained, because only two volumes can be found. Certainly the diction is different from that of the other versions.

III :—The copy of the History written in the year of the Chula Era 1157. In the commencement of this History it is stated : “ May it be of good men. In the Chula era 1157, year of the Rabbit, the 7th of the decade, when His Majesty Somdet Phra Boromadharmaruk Maharajadhiraj ascended the throne of Thep Thavaravadi Sri Ayuddhya, occupying the throne Dusit Maha Prasat, he ordered the Royal History to be collated.” This must be understood to mean that His Majesty Phra Buddha Yotfa Chulalok had collated the history in that year, and in the original copy it is stated that in some instances he has made some additions. Of this history, we have three books written in the first reign, and there are further four other volumes. The History commences with the foundation of Ayuddhya, but how far it went and how many more volumes it contained cannot as yet be ascertained.

IV :—The Petchaburi copy of the history (so called because the original was obtained from Petchaburi), and the copy of Phra Chakrabattibong (Chat) which is written on palm leaves. In comparing these two copies it appears that they agree with the version of Krom Somdet Phra Paramanujit, but they do not contain at the beginning the short version referring to Nai Sen Pom, or the abbreviated version. The short version appearing at the beginning of the two printed volumes contains in the copy kept at the Library the following : “ May it be of good omen. In the year 1202, year of the dog, on Saturday the 7th day of the 7th waxing moon, His Majesty the King entered the audience hall Amarindr Vinichai, and was graciously pleased to command His son Prince Annob to visit Prince Nujit Jinorot in Wat Phra Jetubon, requesting him to put in order in a short form the History of the things of Ayuddhya.”

This must be understood to refer to a separate version which the King Phra Nang Klao requested Somdet Phra Paramanujit

to arrange at a later date. Dr. Bradley received this version together with the extended version of the history, and he then printed the former at the commencement. As regards the abbreviated version, this was arranged by Krom Somdet Phra Paramanujit at the same time as the short version just mentioned.

I have compared the History of Luang Prasöt with the two printed volumes. In the beginning both are identical. It appears that the person who wrote the version in two volumes has copied the version published in the time of Phra Narayana, and has extended it up to the time of Somdet Phra Jairaja. It is curious that the dates agree in the two versions only up to the time of Phra Chao Udong; from that reign there is a difference between the two versions of between 4 and 20 years.

V :—The version of King Mongkut here printed and the version of Prince Mahisra, both of which agree. We know in regard to these versions that His Majesty King Mongkut ordered Prince Krom Luang Wongsadirat-Sanit to collate the old version, to correct it in many places and to give fuller details. I gather that when Krom Luang Wongsa had finished his work of collation, he presented his manuscript to His Majesty King Mongkut, and the King made further corrections. His Majesty's corrections made in his own handwriting are found in the copy kept in the Vajirañāna National Library; of which, however, only 22 books exist; but by a happy accident, the version of Prince Mahisra was also preserved. This is in 42 volumes and these give the history from the foundation of Ayudhya up to the First Reign in Bangkok, concluding with the year 1142 of the Chula era. From the various versions preserved in the Library, it is thus clear that there was a history of Siam before the time of Krom Somdet Phra Paramanujit, and that he did not compose the history. I approached His late Majesty on that question and his answer is shown in his royal autograph letter already given.

In the Reign of his present Majesty in B. E. 2454, Nai Sathien Raksa (Kong Këo) presented another copy to the Library which was written in Bangkok in C. E. 1136. The diction is older than the version of 1145, but the Library only possesses one book, and it cannot be ascertained when this History commenced, where it ended or how many volumes it contained.

Its existence nevertheless affords additional proof of the fact that the detailed version assuredly dates from Ayuddhya, and that the copy of the year C. E. 1145 was drawn up or edited at Dhanaburi; hence the differences in diction.

Moreover, the dates given in the copy of C. E. 1136 agree with those in the version of Luang Prasöt, and thus it appears that chronological errors only crept in at the time when new editions of the history were drawn up in Dhanaburi or in Bangkok.

It is greatly to be regretted that the copy of C. E. 1136 was not found during the life time of His late Majesty, for I am sure he would have been very pleased to state his opinion. It is very lucky, however, that in all the versions of the history now preserved in the Library, the story of how the King of Sri Sattana Kanahut returned Princess Phra Këo Fa to Somdet Phra Maha Chakrabat is contained. From the different versions of this history, it can easily be seen how they were arranged and how the versions were altered.

VERSION OF LUANG PRASÖT.

“In the year of the Rat, 926 C. E., Phra Chao Lan Chang invited the Princess Somdet Phra Keo Fa to return to Ayuddhya, stating that he desired the Princess Phra Thep Krasatr, and the latter was then bestowed on the King of Lan Chang.”

This is the oldest version which has been discovered.

THE HISTORY OF 1136, C. E.

“At that time Phra Keo Fa, the daughter of the King of the White Elephant Prasad Thong, was sent to Phya Lan Chang. When she arrived there, Phya Lan Chang said, ‘We have asked for Phra Thep Krasatr and we did not ask for Princess Keo Fa, and we shall therefore return Phra Keo Fa to Ayuddhya, and we ask for Phra Thep Krasatr as before.’ After the war regarding the White Elephant was finished, Phya Lan Chang commissioned Phya Sen, Phya Nakhorn, and Phya Thep Montri to accompany Phra Keo Fa, and he composed a royal letter saying, ‘We have asked for Phra Thep Krasatr.’ Then the King of the White Elephant acted according to this behest, and he arranged that Phra Thep Krasatr should be sent to Phya Lan Chang, in the

year of the Rat, 926. The King of the White Elephant ordered Phya Men to accompany his daughter to Phya Lan Chang by way of Samoh So."

This is a later version and only agrees as regards the date with that in the edition of Luang Prasöt.

VERSION OF 1145, C. E.

"When the Prince of Sri Sattana Kanahut found that it was not Phra Thep Krasatr (who had come) he was sorry and said, 'We asked for Phra Thep Krasatr, who is the daughter of Phra Suriyothai who died for her husband fighting on the elephant, and who is of excellent royal family,' and then he directed Phya Sen, Phya Nakhorn and Phya Thep Montri as ambassadors to return Phra Keo Fa to Ayuddhya and he sent royal presents to Somdet Phra Maha Chakrabat, Lord of the White Elephant. In the letter it is stated :

" 'Formerly you gave me Phra Thep Krasatr and her fame has spread everywhere throughout the Empire up to Sri Sattana Kanahut. Now you have sent me in exchange your daughter Phra Keo Fa ; and even if she were a hundred or a thousand times more beautiful than Phra Thep Krasatr, still if this fact were allowed to extinguish the glory of Phra Thep Krasatr it would be a dishonour for all time. I therefore return Phra Keo Fa and ask as a royal favour that Phra Thep Krasatr may be sent to me as was formerly agreed.'

"His Majesty Phra Maha Chakrabat after having read the letter was very grieved, and after Phra Thep Krasatr had recovered from her illness, he made arrangements for sending his Royal Daughter. She had a retinue of 500 male and female slaves, and in the 5th month, C. E. 913, in the year of the pig, he ordered Phya Men with a thousand men to escort her. Phya Men and his followers then invited Phra Thep Krasatr to ascend the Royal Palanquin and to proceed by way of Samoh So."

It appears that this version is based, with embellishments, on that of 1136. The date given should, however, be advanced by 13 years.

THE VERSION OF 1157.

This version agrees with the version of 1145, and there are only small differences in the diction.

THE PRINTED VERSION.

It is quite clear that Somdet Phra Paramanujit did not alter anything and that the few minor differences are due to printing.

THE VERSION OF KING MONGKUT.

This version has not been altered and agrees with that of 1157.

Any scholar who has read the versions placed in juxtaposition above will come to the conclusion that the original history was written in the Reign of Somdet Phra Narayana in the year C. E. 1042. After that this history was finally extended into the version of 1136, and from this all the other versions were made, up to the version of King Mongkut.

Two methods have been adopted in composing the various versions of the History, namely making a new version from the material already existing and making additions, and secondly by correcting and amending the existing history. With regard to the corrections and emendations of the history, we have, during the Bangkok period, one made in the first Reign and again one in the 4th reign, and perhaps there might have been one made in the 3rd Reign. There are no proofs that amendments were made in the time of Ayuddhya, before Bangkok was established as the capital.

The History was written, it appears, in Ayuddhya on two occasions, the first being in the Reign of Phra Narayana Maharaj, when the version of Luang Prasöt was composed.

This version extends from the casting of the statue of the Buddha named Baneng Chón, up to at the latest the end of the reign of Prasad Thong.

In the reign of Phra Chao Boromakot, another version was composed, because in that reign many books were written. The King just mentioned followed the example of King Phra

Narayana Maharaj and ordered a new and detailed history to be composed from the time of the foundation of Ayuddhya up to the reign of Phra Narayana at the most. This is clearly shown in the explanations given by His late Majesty. I may further add that I do not think that King Phra Boromakot brought the history down to any later period, because it must be understood that the reign of Phra Thep Raja and of Phra Chao Sūa, were not such that they can be considered glorious ancestors of King Phra Boromakot. Why then should he have included the history of their reigns? Had he done so, the narrative would assuredly have been different. There is an additional circumstance which lends colour to the view that the extended version composed in the reign of King Phra Boromakot did not even reach as far as the death of King Narayana Maharaj. In the history of that King's reign there are two mistakes.

1st. It is stated that Chao Fa Abhayathot is the son of Phra Narayana, whilst he really was his younger brother. Phra Narayana had no sons, as is proved by the books written by the French Amassadors, who came to Siam twice in the reign of Phra Narayana and gave many details about Siam. This is confirmed by the evidence of Khun Luang Ha Vat, who stated that Phra Narayana had no sons but only a daughter, and that that was the reason why Luang Sorasak was considered an illegitimate son.

2nd. In the history it is stated that Phra Narayana died in the year 1044 C. E., whilst all other books including the yearly calendar give the date as C. E. 1050, a difference of 6 years. This is a significant error since in the reign of King Phra Boromakot there were many persons alive from the time of Phra Narayana, and King Phra Boromakot himself was born in that reign. If that portion of the history was written in the time of Phra Boromakot, how could such mistakes have occurred?

I have carefully looked over the printed history in two volumes and the history corrected by the King Mongkat, and have come to the conclusion that the history written in the reign of King Phra Boromakot only went as far as the war in which Phya Kosa (Khun Lek) defeated the Burmese in Saiyok and then returned to the capital.

The succeeding sections which refer to Vichayen seem to have been added by another hand; the portions of the history dealing with the reign of King Narayana from that point onwards are disjointed, and dates are not given. It would appear as though the compiler had written down from hearsay incidents such as the story of Chao Phya Vichayen and that of Luang Sorasak up to the story of Chao Phya Kosa (Pan) going to France. Even our own knowledge of the facts to-day is more accurate than that displayed in the history. I am therefore of the opinion that the portions of the history above mentioned were written by someone who was born after the events narrated had occurred, and the error of six years in the date of Phra Narayana's death may thus be explained.

Now, if the portions of the history from the end of the reign of King Phra Narayana Maharaj onwards were not written in the time of King Phra Boromakot and if they were written in Ayuddhya at all, they must have been written in the reign of Phra Chao Suriyat Amarindr. But Phya Boran is of opinion that, since in that reign the Government was in a state of disturbance, there was no opportunity of writing history. In such a case, then, the portions in question could only have been written in the time of Dhanaburi, for even if there were many wars in that period, they were attended by victory. It has been further proved that Chao Krung Dhanaburi composed a version of the Ramayana, and if he had time for that, he could also have compiled a history.

If we examine the two printed volumes and see how Somdet Phra Chao Thai Sara is blamed, and Phra Boromakot exalted, we must agree with that opinion because the King of Dhanaburi and his followers were servants of Phra Boromakot.

Therefore we may state that the King of Krung Dhanaburi brought the history (the version of C. E. 1145) left uncompleted since the time of King Phra Boromakot, up to the latter's death and from then to the destruction of Ayuddhya by the Burmese.

This later compilation was probably made in the first Reign, in C. E. 1157, at the time when the history of the country was being revised. We know further that the history of Dhanaburi was written, by request of H. M. Phra Nang Klao, by Somdet Phra Paramanujit, and the style of the continuation is different.

In the 4th Reign the history was again corrected, and this version is the Royal autograph copy, which was only corrected up to C. E. 1152 (and there are 6 pages missing as compared with the printed volumes).

Now the question arises as to what can be ascertained about the version said to have been written by Somdet Phra Wanratna in Pali. I can only answer that Prince Sommot was told by the Phra Sangharaj of Wat Rajapradit that he had seen that version, and that he remembered how he altered Siamese names into Pali names, for example Chamün Dibsena into Chamino Dibbasena.

I myself asked Choa Fa Krom Phya Bamrab Parapaks whether the book existed, and he stated that he had seen it himself in the hands of Somdet Phra Paramanujit, and he believed that the book was still in Wat Jetubon. He then gave orders to enquire of Phra Mongkol Thep (Thieng), who was the personal servant of Phra Paramanujit, and who stated in my presence that, after the demise of Krom Somdet Phra Paramanujit, His Majesty King Mongkut gave orders to take all books kept by him to the Grand Palace, and none were left in the Temple.

When the books kept in the Mandira Dhamma were brought to the National Library, the Council looked for the Mahayuddhakar and the Chulayuddakar, but neither of these books nor other histories could be traced. However, the Mahayuddhakar and the Chulayuddhakar once existed, and if we enquire what their contents were we may even give the answer from the titles of the books.

The two Books relate the wars fought to the glory of the Kings. If such wars were not victorious they were not mentioned. The Mahayuddhakar speaks about a great war, the Chulayuddhakar about a smaller war. Such a great war was the war with Pegu from the time of Somdet Phra Maha Chakrabat up to the time when Somdet Phra Naresuan defeated the Peguans, and Pegu came under the jurisdiction of Siam.

The person who composed the former work composed it to the glory of Somdet Phra Naresuan, and for that there are proofs, namely, that the three versions of the history of E. C. 1136, 1145 and 1157 all deal with the events of the period of the Mahayuddhakar.

If we examine the printed copy and the royal autograph copy, we shall come to the same conclusion as His late Majesty, namely, that the History before Somdet Phra Maha Chakrabat is written in a short form, as if taken from the yearly Calendar. From the time of Somdet Phra Maha Chakrabat up to the time of King Phra Boromakot, the person composing it relied on the Mahayuddhakar.

With regard to the Chulayuddhakar, we have to consider what campaigns after the campaigns against Pegu are worthy of record. In the reign of Phra Narai, there were wars against Burma and Chiengmai, but these cannot be considered comparable to the great struggle in the course of which the King of Dhanaburi fought the Burmese and quelled disturbances, so that Dhanaburi rose to the same pinnacle of eminence which Ayuddhya had reached formerly. The resemblance between this war and that fought by King Naresuan was such as to invite the composition of a work in honour of the King of Dhanaburi which should liken him to the first-named monarch. The writing of such a work would cause no little satisfaction to the King of Dhanaburi. For this reason, the Chulayuddhakar may perhaps have been composed in Dhanaburi. And if that is so, I believe I am able to fix the author, namely Phra Dhammadhiraj Mahamuni of Wat Hong, or as he is also called Somdet Chao Chün. This person was known as a great scholar, who was esteemed by the King of Dhanaburi and finally was raised to the dignity of Phra Sangharaj. In the first reign of the present dynasty he was reduced in rank to that of Wanratna. It has already been stated that Phra Paramanujit, when compiling his version of the history, had recourse to the composition in Pali of Somdet Phra Wanratna. Perhaps it was the Chulayuddhakar itself, written by Somdet Chao Chün, to which he thus referred.

Now, I beg you to consider the style of Somdet Phra Paramanujit when he speaks about the reign of Chao Tak. He says : " When Ayuddhya had not yet been destroyed, the King had a proof that he could be considered as one destined to become a Buddha, and he knew that Ayuddhya was to be destroyed because the Chiefs and the people were unjust. Therefore he assisted, with all his power the Samanas, Brahmanas and the teachers, and as the

teaching of the Buddha was deteriorating, he assembled the people and soldiers in Wat Pichai, and thus it came about that the religion of the Buddha was preserved, and that was a good omen."

It is very likely, therefore, that Somdet Phra Paramanujit copied this from the Chulayuddhakar, but did not compose it. There was no reason why Somdet Phra Paramanujit should have exalted the King of Dhanaburi, as one "to become a Buddha;" but there is good reason why Somdet Chao Chün should have used that language. Compare the above passage with the following account (compiled in the first reign of the present dynasty) of the events which preceded the fall of Ayuddhya :—

"In the 12th month a naval force was prepared under Phya Tak (King of Dhanaburi), Phya Petchaburi and Luang Suraseni to wait at Wat Yai, for the coming of the Burmese war boats. Phya Petchaburi fought the Burmese at Wat Sangkawat and died fighting. Phya Tak and Luang Suraseni looked on, but did not assist, and established themselves at Wat Pichai."

I am assuredly only guessing, and I have no other evidence; but I have not yet given up the hope that we may find the Mahayuddhakar and Chulayuddhakar. In any event, however, these books are of value only as having been aids to the compilation of history, as can be seen from the version of Luang Prasöt.

We may divide the works which were used as aids to the compilation of history into four classes, namely, books written by priests, books written by Astrologers, official publications, and books written by private individuals.

BOOKS WRITTEN BY PRIESTS.

The first example we have is that by Maha Nama, who wrote the history of Buddhism in Ceylon in Pali. When our priests went for the purposes of study to Ceylon, and when priests from Ceylon came to this country, the latter were considered teachers as from the time of Sukhothai, and from the time when Chiangmai was still a sovereign State. The priests of Ceylon showed the way of writing history after the manner of the Mahawongse;

they composed religious histories and histories of religious monuments. This was done in Pali, and so Phra Bodhirangsi composed the Chama-devivongs, the history of Haribhunjai ; Phra Ratana Paññañāña wrote the history of Jinakalamlini ; and Phra Brahma Rajpañña wrote the Ratana Bimbawongs, the history of the Emerald Buddha.

Some of these histories were written in Siamese, like the history of the Mahadhat of Nakhon Sri Dharmaraj.

These histories, although having to do in part with foreign countries, are also the foundation of Siamese history.

BOOKS WRITTEN BY THE ASTROLOGERS.

If anything of importance happened, the astrologers noted down such events in the Calendar just as in a diary, and afterwards they combined these in the yearly Calendars, or sometimes they issued separate reports. Works of this nature are another good source of history ; they usually furnish dates with precision.

OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS.

The daily war reports are the principal of these. His Majesty the late King pointed out clearly how, in the printed version of the history, whenever there is a question of war, the dates are given very closely ; when there is no war the dates are given but rarely. This is noticeable from the time of Somdet Phra Naresuan's campaigns against the Peguans up to that of the King of Dhanaburi's campaigns against the Burmese. The reason for this circumstance is to be sought in the fact that the daily war reports were employed by the historian as a source of material.

In addition to the war reports, we also have the laws, which contained dates and other material both in the preamble and also in the body of the laws themselves. This greatly assists the historian, as also do the histories of neighbouring countries. I may enumerate the following six such histories:—

1:—The history of Burmah call the Maha Rajawongs ; formerly the book consisted of four " bundles " of palm leaves. Afterwards the

King of Ava Siri Bavora Maha Dhamaraja, called by the Burmese "Bagjido" (Royal Uncle), summoned on the first day of the 7th month C. E. 1197, the learned and the pandits to examine and extend the old history, and a new version was compiled called the Hamanan Maharajawongs, namely, the Maharajawongs of the Crystal Hall. It was called so, because the Assembly took place in the Crystal Hall of the Royal Palace at Ava.

Sir Arthur Phayre has used this for his history of Burmah in one volume. Khun Phraison Sararaks (Thien) has translated the portion commencing from the wars between the Peguans and Siamese into English, and I have instructed Maung Toh to translate those parts which have references to Siam.

II:—The history of Cambodia, which His Majesty King Mongkut ordered to be translated into Siamese in the year of the Rabbit in C. E. 1217.

III:—The history of the Peguans, which His Majesty King Mongkut ordered to be translated into Siamese in the year of the small dragon, C. E. 1219.

IV:—The history of Lan Chang, which was written in that city, and which was printed in the Vajirañāna Magazine.

V:—The history called "Yonok" written by Phya Prachakitch Korachakr (Jēm Bunnak), to which reference has already been made.

VI:—The history of the relations between Siam and China, translated by Khun Chen Chin Aksorn (Sutchai).

Besides the above books there are the records of judicial proceedings, and the reports of Siamese and foreigners employed on official business. According to an ancient custom with us, it is a duty of the Ho Satragom, under Nai Saneh and Nai Sutchinda Humpraeh, to note down "events of state interest" as they may occur. The reports thus compiled are known under the title of "Events in the national history."

It would appear that the history of Luang Prasöt is such a record of events compiled in the Ho Satragom.

BOOKS WRITTEN BY PRIVATE INDIVIDUALS.

These consist of works composed by various persons in the light of what they knew or saw or on the strength of evidence supplied to them, at a time when they were compiling a history or were investigating the past. In this way a record is sometimes made of the answers furnished to questions by old people who are familiar with any given subject.

Such a record was drawn up in the first reign when enquiries were made as to the customs in Ayuddhya regarding many royal festivals, including the Hair Cutting Ceremony. Chao Fa Bindavadi, the daughter of Somdet Phra Boromakot, who lived in Bangkok during the first reign, was consulted on these points.

The Recollections of Princess Narindr Devi, which His Majesty the late King has edited under the title of Royal Disquisitions, also belongs to the class of works here under discussion. I understand that the Princess submitted the material for this work to His Majesty, who wrote it down.

In the 3rd reign when the history of Siam was being compiled again, there were also works of this same class in poetical form, such as the "Defeat of the Annamites."

There are, moreover, books in European languages containing references to Siamese history. But most accounts furnished by Europeans commence only with the reign of Phra Chao Song Dharma. Few of them deal with an earlier period.

For the history of Siam, since Bangkok became the capital, we have the History of Somdet Phra Paramanujit for part of the first reign. H. M. King Chulalongkorn commanded Chao Phya Dibakarawongs (Kham Bunnak) to continue this account up to the end of the fourth reign. Further, there are the Royal Disquisitions which H. M. King Chulalongkorn composed. All these works offer us a ground-work,

In addition, we have also many other works which are of use for purposes of examination and comparison in compiling the history of Bangkok. The Council of the Royal Library is making a collection of them.

If we had many industrious helpers in our work of historical research, I believe we could produce a history which would compare not unfavourably with those of other countries.

[Note.—In the Evidences on Ayuddhya, lately published (p. 69) we find the following explanation given with regard to the history of Siam :—“After Khun Jinaraj (about C. E. 891) had ascended the throne, he ordered all the old histories and records to be thrown into the water or to be burned, and that is the reason why the history is in many parts defective”—O. F.]

