

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS  
OF  
VAN VLIET'S HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF SIAM IN THE 17TH CENTURY.

by

FRANCIS H. GILES.

INTRODUCTORY NOTE.

When I undertook the task of writing a note on van Vliet's *Historical Account of Siam in the 17th Century*, it was my intention to deal with some of the incidents related by van Vliet only. As my examination of van Vliet's *Historical Account* proceeded, I found that a short note would not be sufficient to cover the whole ground, which included events in the reigns of four Kings and impinged on events which occurred in the reigns of earlier Kings. Although van Vliet in his *Historical Account* makes no reference to the *Treatise* he submitted to Philippe Lucas, Director of the Dutch East India Company in A. D. 1638, which has already been published in the Journal of the Siam Society in A. D. 1910, I found it convenient to examine this *Treatise* to ascertain whether I could gain any information which would help me to a better understanding of his *Historical Account*. The *Treatise* supplies much of what is missing in the *Historical Account*, and has, therefore, been most useful.

This study of the *Historical Account* and the *Treatise* induced me to turn to other sources of information to obtain evidence to support van Vliet's statements. The more I read, the further afield I had to go in search of information. My original intention of preparing a short note or critical analysis could not be sustained, and the plan has developed along two paths, a critical analysis and an attempt to reconstruct Siamese history. This became necessary, because Siamese history is silent regarding most of the happenings recorded by van Vliet in his two works. With this explanation I

trust the reader will forgive me for retaining the title, *A Critical Analysis of van Vliet's Historical Account of Siam in the 17th Century*.

The works which I have examined in order to obtain data to enable me to present a fairly complete and accurate picture of events relating to the political and economic position of Siam during the period between A. D. 1590 and 1767 are :—

- 1) H. R. H. Prince Paramanuchit's version of the History of Siam.
- 2) The Royal or Autograph version of the History of Siam.
- 3) Luang Prasert's copy of Siamese History.
- 4) H. R. H. Prince Narathipraphanphong's History of Burma.
- 5) A History of Burma entitled *The Hmannan Yazawindawgi*, also known as *The Glass Palace Chronicle*.
- 6) Nai Thien (Phra Phraison Salarak), *Burmese Invasions of Siam*.
- 7) H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, *Wars between Siam and Burma*.
- 8) Part III of *A Collection of Historical Data* (ประชุมพงษาวดาร), entitled *A History of Patani*.
- 9) Mr. C. A. S. Sewell's *Notes on some old Siamese Guns* published in the J. S. S. Vol XV, Part 1 (1922).
- 10) Part V of *A Collection of Historical Data* entitled *An Explanation of the Ayudhyen Dynasties*.
- 11) Part XX of *A Collection of Historical Data* entitled *Inter-course between Japan and Siam in the 17th Century*.
- 12) Francis Caron and Joost Schouten, *A True Description of the Mighty Kingdoms of Japan and Siam*.
- 13) Sakae Miki, *The Exploits of Okya Senaphimocq* (Yamada Nagamasa), *the Japanese General in Siam in the Seventeenth Century*.
- 14) K. Gunji, *The correspondence between Tokugawa Shogunate and Siamese Kings at the beginning of the Tokugawa period*, J. S. S. Vol XXXIX, Part II 1937.
- 15) The Krom Sak Law (กรมศักดิ์) reputed to have been promulgated in the year L. E. 955 (A. D. 1593) by King Ekathosrot together with a list of titles.
- 16) David Murray, *Japan* (1919).
- 17) W. E. Griffis, *The Mikado's Empire* (1877).
- 18) Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century (National Library, Bangkok 1915).

19) Dutch Papers (National Library, Bangkok 1915).

My sincere thanks are due to my secretary, Nai Sin<sup>\*</sup> Chalermphao, who has not only helped me in writing the manuscript, but has given me valuable assistance in obtaining and examining many works of reference for me. Without this loyal service I would not have been able to bring this work to completion.

Francis H. Giles.

Bangkok, 30th November, 1937.

## PART ONE.

Concerning the period when van Vliet was in Ayudhya.

## (1) ABOUT VAN VLIET'S WORKS.

This paper is a critical analysis of a work written by Jeremie van Vliet in the year A.D. 1647, entitled *An Historical Account of Siam in the 17th Century*. This *Historical Account* was written in the Low Dutch language and published in Holland. It is generally believed that no copy of the original publication is extant, but I am told that there is a copy in the National Library at the Hague, and also that a photographic copy of this work was made and sent to the Taihok University in Formosa. However this may be, the English translation which is published in this Journal of the Siam Society was made by Mr. W. H. Mundie, a Vice-President of the Siam Society, in A. D. 1904 from a French translation of van Vliet's work, which was published as a Supplement to Herbert's *Relation du Voyage de Perse et des Indes Orientales*, published in Paris in A. D. 1663.

Before van Vliet wrote his *Historical Account of Siam in the 17th Century* in A. D. 1647, he had already written in A. D. 1638 at Batavia by order of the late Director Philippe Lucas, a *Treatise* giving an exact description of the position of this Kingdom, of the natives in this nation, of their religion, and of the state of their political government. This is what van Vliet tells us in his *Historical Account*. Philippe Lucas was a Director of the Dutch East India Company.

Mr. L. F. van Ravenswaay, a member of the Siam Society, translated a book written by van Vliet entitled *Description of the Kingdom of Siam, and the Account of the Origin, the political government, the distinctive characteristics, the religion, the manner of living of the nobles and common people, the commerce and other remarkable things concerning the Kingdom of Siam*. This translation was published in the Journal of the Siam Society, vol. VII, part I (1910). Ravenswaay admits that this book was published after the author's death. Is this book a copy of the *Treatise* written at the order of Philippe Lucas or not? I am inclined to think that it is the same work, for it deals with matters which occurred in Siam before A. D. 1638, and bears a title similar to that of the *Treatise*.

In writing my critical analysis or reviews of the *Historical Account*, I have had to rely on this other book written by van Vliet in order to elucidate certain obscure points; and when I have to refer to this book in my critical analysis, I shall for the sake of brevity call it the *Treatise*.

(2) WHEN WAS VAN VLIET IN AYUDHYA AND WHAT  
WAS HIS POSITION THERE?

We learn from Ravenswaay's translation of the *Treatise* that the Dutch East India Company established a depôt in A. D. 1602 at Patani, and the next year Daniel van der Leek, the chief of that station, paid a visit to Siam with the result that in A. D. 1604 he sent Cornelius Speex to establish a depôt at Ayudhya. Several managers succeeded each other. Ravenswaay tells us that van Vliet's immediate predecessor was Joost Schouten, who was manager from A. D. 1624 to 1629, and that van Vliet had charge of the Dutch East India Company's interests in Siam from A. D. 1629 to 1634. Sir Ernest Satow in his *Notes on the Intercourse between Japan and Siam in the 17th Century* says that van Vliet succeeded Joost Schouten as manager in A. D. 1636, but does not tell us when he left Siam. Joost Schouten, sometimes referred to in official documents as Joosten van Schouten, is an important link in the question as to when van Vliet was really in Siam. Joost Schouten wrote a book in A. D. 1636 entitled *A Description of the Government, Might, Religion, Customs, Traffick, and other remarkable Affairs in the Kingdom of Siam*. I have examined this work and find that he says he was in charge of the Dutch trading interests in Ayudhya for four years, and resided in the chief city for eight years; but, unfortunately, he does not give us any dates. I find in the *Treatise*, van Vliet mentions that Joost Schouten was the first representative of the Dutch East India Company in Siam, from A. D. 1624 to 1629, and that he himself (van Vliet) spent five years in Siam. This statement that Joost Schouten was the first representative of the Dutch East India Company in Siam is obviously wrong. The first representative, according to Ravenswaay, was Cornelius Speex. Van Vliet, who must have been in the employ of the Dutch East India Company for many years, could not possibly have made the mistake of saying that Schouten was the first representative in Siam in the sense of being the first manager. These Dutch representatives were not only merchants or traders looking after the commercial interests of their

employer, but were political envoys and delegates, for we find that when the Dutch East India Company was in high favour with King Prasat Thong, Schouten took his place amongst the noblemen at the King's audiences. Van Vliet meant to impress on the reader that Joost Schouten was the first or chief representative of the Company in Ayudhya from A. D. 1624 to 1629, or it is possible that he meant that Joost Schouten's first period of service as representative extended from A. D. 1624 to 1629, that is, five years. I find in *Corpus Diplomaticum Neerlando Indicum* vol I no. CXVIII pp. 284-285, (published by the National Library, Bangkok, 1907, in *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century*) the following statement: "Our first dealings with Siam date already from 1604, when Admiral Wigbrand van Waerwijck, during his stay at Patani, sent Cornelis Speex as envoy to the ruler of the said Kingdom." It will be noticed that the word "envoy" is used. It therefore seems probable that Cornelius Speex, after negotiating a trading arrangement with the King of Siam, opened the Dutch depôt in Ayudhya. It also appears from the same document that the depôt or factory was given up in A. D. 1622, but trade relations were maintained and courtesies exchanged. We also learn that Schouten was appointed director of Dutch trading interests in Siam in A. D. 1633 and held that dignity till A. D. 1636. The *Dagh Register*, called the *Dutch Papers* by the National Library, Bangkok, records that Schouten arrived in Batavia on the 27th April 1636, having travelled from Siam on board the *Dämon*. Schouten submitted a Report in writing which was handed to the Governor General and his Council in which he stated that he had handed over all the Company's means to van Vliet. It is now clear that van Vliet took over charge early in A. D. 1636 and not 1629 as stated by Ravenswaay. The depôt was given up in A. D. 1622, and as Schouten was the representative of the Company from A. D. 1624 to 1629, it is but reasonable to assume that the depôt was reopened in A. D. 1624. It is a curious fact that neither the *Record of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century* nor the *Dutch Papers* make any reference to matters between A. D. 1628 and 1631. We know from many sources that great disorders prevailed during this period, so it may be that Schouten closed the depôt down early in A. D. 1629. In the *Dagh Register*, page 97, we find an entry dated 29th November 1641 recording the

fact that van Vliet had left Ayudhya in March of that year, and that the merchant, Reynier van Tzum, had carried on the Company's business and negotiations with some success.

The question as to when Joost van Schouten and Ieremias van Vliet were in charge of Dutch interests in Ayudhya is now clear. Schouten was in charge from A. D. 1624 to 1629 and again from A. D. 1633 to the beginning of 1636, altogether a period of eight years. Van Vliet was in charge from about February 1636 to March 1641, a period of five years. Van Vliet's connection with Siam, however, had not ceased in March 1641. He returned to Ayudhya in September 1641 as a delegate or ambassador from the Prince of Orange and the Governor General of the Dutch East Indies. He carried letters and gifts from the Prince and the Governor General to King Prasat Thong. Van Vliet arrived in the Menam river on the 23rd September 1641 and immediately proceeded to Ayudhya. He had several audiences with the King, but could not obtain letters from the King in reply to those which he had brought. Van Vliet had a farewell audience of the King on the 20th December, bade farewell to the noblemen and gave final instructions to the then chief merchant, van Tzum, on the 28th, leaving Ayudhya on that day on board the warship *Heemskerck*. This vessel left the anchorage on the last day of December and sailed for ports in the gulf of Siam, where van Vliet had some business to execute. Van Vliet returned to Batavia on the 28th of May 1642 on board this ship.

Van Vliet henceforth rose to high position in the service of the Company. He became Governor of Malacca and eventually was given a seat on the Council of the Governor General of the Dutch East Indies. He was in Malacca on the 13th October 1644, when he gave certain information regarding the quarrel between the King of Queda and the King of Siam to Governor Arnold Heussen. This is the last reference to van Vliet in the *Record of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries* etc. and the *Dagh Register*.

In van Vliet's *Historical Account* is found the following passage :

"The King made peace and alliances with all the Indian Princes and with all the Kings and States that are known in the Indies. And although he had expelled and maltreated the Japanese, he did not fail to make them come back some time after, or to send his ambassadors to Japan, in order to make a treaty with that powerful Emperor of a very considerable part of the Orient. That ambassa-

dor was the bearer of a letter written in characters of gold, and of several splendid presents. But in as much as he had not yet come back when I left Iudia two years ago, I can say nothing as to the success of his negotiations."

This *Historical Account* was written in the year A. D. 1647. The only interpretation that can be put on the wording of this sentence is that van Vliet was in Ayudhya in A. D. 1645. Van Vliet is so accurate regarding what he says that I think he must have been sent to Ayudhya on some special mission by the Governor General in the same way as he was employed in A. D. 1642. It is unfortunate that the *Dagh Register* only records events up to A. D. 1642, and the *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries*, etc. is silent regarding the affairs of the Company between A. D. 1645 and 1648; in fact, there is only one reference to Siam between the years A. D. 1645 and 1653.

It has now been established beyond doubt that van Vliet assumed charge of Dutch interests in Ayudhya about February 1636, and as he referred to many events in his *Historical Account* which happened prior to that year, one is caused to think that he had some connection with Siam before he took up residence in the Capital. Van Vliet is referred to as Captain van Vliet which proves that he was in command of one of the ships of the Dutch fleet. Schouten reported to the Dutch East India Company that when he was in the Menam on the *Wapen van Delft* on the 13th June (1634) he met the flyboat *van Velsen* which had arrived on the 3rd, and on her way captured two vessels with a cargo of pepper, pitch and cotton. The *Velsen* had called at Sengorah where she found the Siamese army and fleet, which Captain van Vliet had understood to be in Patani. This statement shows that van Vliet was in Ayudhya in A. D. 1634, and as the Dutch ships voyaged extensively in the Eastern seas, it seems probable that van Vliet as an officer of one of these ships visited Siam many times prior to A. D. 1634. However this may be, van Vliet was a friend of Schouten, who had been in the country for many years and could therefore learn from him about the happenings in that country. Furthermore, it is clear that a Daily Journal recording all events was kept in all the offices of the Dutch East India Company, and van Vliet, who rose to high position, had ready access to all these journals or diaries. I myself have made use of the same papers.



## PART TWO.

*Concerning the birth of Phra Ong Lai (King Prasat Thong).*

As van Vliet's *Historical Account* is to some extent a biography of King Prasat Thong, it seems well to state the family history of this remarkable man. Van Vliet tells us that he was known as Phra Ong Lai, and was a son of Okya Sri Thamathirat, who was a scion of the Royal House, and the elder brother of the mother of Prince Intha Racha, who afterwards became King Song Tham. This lady was a wife of King Ekathosrot. Some historians give the name of Prince Intha Racha as Intrathit (อินทรพิทักษ์). I think that Intha Racha is correct. Some writers hold that Phra Ong Lai was born in A. D. 1600, i. e. in the year of the Rat B. E. 2143. H. R. H. Prince Damrong, in his record of the Wars between Siam and Burma, says that there is a tradition extant about the birth of Phra Ong Lai. The story is that Prince Ekathosrot, a brother of the Great King Naresuan, when holding the office of Crown Prince, happened to go down the river towards Bang-pa-in. A storm arose, and the Prince's boat capsized. He swam ashore, and took refuge from the inclemency of the weather in a house of one of the villagers. A maiden of the village was given to him, and this young woman in due course gave birth to a son. This boy was Phra Ong Lai. When Phra Ong Lai became King, he did honour to his mother by building a temple known as Wat Chumphon Nikayaram (วัดชุมพลนิกายาราม) on the site of his mother's house. He also caused a pavilion to be erected on the island as a place of temporary residence.

In Siamese history we are told that King Prasat Thong built, on the site of his mother's house, a grand pagoda, having a terrace or gallery round its base, and that at each of the four corners he caused to be erected four votive chambers together with a preaching hall, a library and houses for the priests. This temple was given the name of Chai Watanaram (วัดไชยวัฒนาราม). One is led to believe that this building was erected in Ayudhya. It is possible that King Prasat Thong built two temples, one at Bang-pa-in in memory of his real mother, and the other at Ayudhya in memory of his foster mother, the wife of Okya Sri Thamathirat, who was a brother of one of King Ekathosrot's concubines and mother of King Song Tham.

The Bang-pa-in story, if correct, would prove that Phra Ong Lai was born during the reign of King Naresuan. The story related by

van Vliet may be true, but knowing the casual way in which the Thai people speak of relationship, I am inclined to think that the Bang-pa-in tradition is worthy of credence. Prince Ekathosrot, wishing to hide his connection with the country girl, would naturally place his son under the care of the brother of his wife. Phra Ong Lai would therefore be the foster and not the real son of Okya Sri Thamathirat.

A similar instance arose during the reign of King Narayana. This King, when waging war on Chiengmai, sacked the town. All the daughters of the King, the Princes and the noblemen, became the booty of the victorious monarch. These girls were distributed among the officers of the army, the King taking as his share a daughter of the King of Chiengmai. This young woman in due course became pregnant. The King, being ashamed of what he had done and fearing the taunts and jeers of the ladies of his palace, handed the young woman while still pregnant over to the care of a powerful nobleman, Phra Phet Racha, holding office in Suphanburi. Some time later the King made a Royal progress to Phitsnulok. Phra Phet Racha and the Chiengmai Princess were in his retinue. At a place near Pichitr called Ban Pho Pratab-chang (บ้านโพธิ์ประทับช้าง) the Princess gave birth to a son, who was named Dūa (เดื่อ). Some years later the King admitted his parentage to the boy, who, after knowing that the King was his father, became proud and overbearing. He was raised to the rank of Luang Sorasak, and rendered personal service to the King. It was he who headed the revolution when his father was dying, and put to death some members of the royal House and many noblemen, including Constantine Phaulkon (Chao Phya Wichayen). He placed his foster father, Phra Phet Racha, on the throne and, eventually, succeeded him as King under the style and title of Phra Chao Sūa (พระเจ้าเสือ). He was indeed a tiger, for he was a man of the most cruel nature. Many acts of diabolical cruelty stand to his credit. This King also built a temple on the spot where he was born, which to-day is still known as Wat Pho Pratabchang (วัดโพธิ์ประทับช้าง).

Having digressed from the main theme, I will now return to the story of Phra Ong Lai. This boy was high spirited, courageous and ambitious. He always took the leading part in games with his friends and in dissolute frolics. He was educated in Wat Ra-Khang, a monastery in which members of the royal House were apt to take

on the yellow robe in order to escape violence at the hands of the King owing to suspicion of their loyalty. Prince Intha Racha was a Buddhist priest in this temple during the reign of his brother, Sri Saowaphak. With Phra Ong Lai, then Cha-mün Sri Sorarak, and some other noblemen who were dissatisfied with the conduct of that King he conspired in a plot to depose him. The plot succeeded, and the King was put to death. Phra Ong Lai, a young man of twenty years of age, played a leading part in this drama, and it was, probably, his first appearance in the political arena, where he remained for the next thirty six years. Phra Ong Lai, when thirteen years of age, was given the rank of Hum Phrae (หุ้มแพร) and put in charge of a section of the Corps of Pages, and when sixteen, promoted to be Cha-mün Sri Sorarak, head of that Corps. He was always in trouble arising from his bad conduct, and frequently imprisoned. The punishment meted out to him undoubtedly planted in his mind the need of a desire for revenge against the royal House. Phra Ong Lai suffered severe punishment on three occasions for offences committed by him against the prestige of the King, and the honour and life of Prince Sri Sin (พระศรีศิลป์). The first offence was, probably committed during the lifetime of his father, Ekathosrot, when he, with some companions in a drunken frolic, assaulted the nobleman appointed by the King to perform the ceremony of the First Ploughing. His second offence, committed in the reign of King Song Tham, was against the honour of Prince Sri Sin, for we know from van Vliet that he debauched the wives of this Prince, and not content with this dishonourable act, he went so far as to enter into a plot with four or five noblemen, his bosom friends, to murder Prince Sri Sin. It is probable that the punishment he suffered brought his desire for revenge against the royal House to a head, and this was the propelling impulse or animus which actuated every act of his life. When King Song Tham was dying, Cha-mün Sri Sorarak, who had then become Okya Sri Worawong, gladly acquiesced in the King's desire to place his son on the throne, because he knew that, if Prince Sri Sin succeeded, his life would be forfeit. There is a possibility that Okya Sri Worawong poisoned King Song Tham. The King's illness entered on a state of collapse or exhaustion just before his death. The action of Okya Sri Worawong, in taking steps to prevent any one approaching the King and holding the palace with soldiers,

gives colour to this suspicion. When King Chetthathirat was about to be executed, according to van Vliet, he upbraided Okya Kalahom in these words: "You have come into the world in order to be the ruin of this Kingdom, for you put my father to death by poison, and, by your intrigues, you caused the Prince, (Phra Sri Sin) my uncle, to perish lamentably".

H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab apparently accepted van Vliet's statement that Phra Ong Lai was a son of Okya Sri Thamathirat, for he discusses this point in his work *The Wars between Siam and Burma*. Prince Damrong goes a step further, and is inclined to think that King Song Tham was the son of the Bang-pa-in village maiden, whom the King took into the palace as a concubine, and on whose relations he showered favours. Van Vliet, however, makes it clear that the mother of King Song Tham was a sister of Okya Sri Thamathirat, and not the Bang-pa-in maiden. It is difficult for me to accept the Prince's reasoning, for the Bang-pa-in tradition relates specifically to the birth of Phra Ong Lai, and not the birth of Song Tham. It would be impossible for Okya Sri Thamathirat to be a brother of the Bang-pa-in girl, for we know that he was a member of the royal House, and therefore of the blood royal. I have given my understanding of this question in the beginning of this part. Van Vliet tells us what happened in the subsequent career of Phra Ong Lai.

## PART THREE.

*Concerning the dates of accession and death of certain Kings.*

(1) DATES OF ACCESSION AND DEATH OF KINGS IN TABULATED  
FORM ACCORDING TO DIFFERENT AUTHORITIES.

Siamese history, regarding the events which took place from the reign of Ekathosrot to that of Prasat Thong, is practically a blank. It is sterile; it is silent. The dates of accession and death of the Kings are wrong and therefore misleading. H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab has attempted to put these dates right, relying on data collected from Luang Prasert's copy of Siamese history. (This official, in later years, became Phya Pariyat Thamathada, a noted scholar). The Prince also gained much valuable information on this subject from the works and letters of foreigners who had lived in Siam. As I am only concerned with the period from the reign of King Naresuan to that of King Prasat Thong, I will give the dates as recorded in the Paramanuchit and Royal Version of the history of Siam, and the corrected dates as given by H. R. H. Prince Damrong in a note entitled *An Explanation of the Ayudhyan Dynasties* published in Part V of *A Collection of Historical Data*, as well as the dates which I believe to be correct.

TABLE I.

Name of King	Date Paramanuchit Version		Date Royal Version		Corrected Date H. R. H. Prince Damrong		Author's suggested Date	
	Acces- sion	Death	Acces- sion	Death	Acces- sion	Death	Acces- sion	Death
Naresuan ..	1578	1593	1578	1593	1590	1605	1590	1605
Ekathosrot ..	1593	1601	1593	1601	1605	1620	1605	1620
Sri Saowaphak ..	1601	1602	1601	1602	1620	1620	1620	1620
Song Tham ..	1602	1627	1602	1627	1620	1628	1620	1628
Chetthathirat ..	1627	1629	1627	1629	1630	1631	1628	1629
Athityawong ..	1629	1637	1629	1637	1630	1630	1629	1629
Prasat Thong ..	1630	1655	1630	1655	1630	1655	1629	1656

This table shows certain differences regarding the dates of accession and death of these monarchs as well as the length of their reigns. The corrected dates given by Prince Damrong for the reign of Chethathirat are undoubtedly wrong, and this error may be due to careless compilation. The date of the accession of Chethathirat should be A. D. 1628, for his father died in April of that year, and he was executed about September 1629. The reigns of Athityawong and Prasat Thong should be put back to A. D. 1629 for all the data at our disposal goes to prove that Athityawong was dethroned in November 1629. My amendments to Prince Damrong's dates probably make the table correct, for they are based on evidence derived from the works of contemporaneous writers.

According to Prince Paramanuchit, these reigns covered a period of seventy-seven years, which agrees with the Royal Version. The corrected dates as published in Part V of *A Collection of Historical Data* only covers a period of 65 years. This means that if we accept the corrected dates, the accessions of King Naresuan and Ekathosrot will have to be put forward twelve years, i. e. one cycle of the zodiacal year, and that of King Sri Saowaphak, eighteen years. This advance in dates, naturally, requires a revision of the length of each reign. In order to see where the difference in the length of each reign occurs, I place the following figures before the readers.

TABLE II.

Name of King	Length of the reigns			
	Paramanuchit Version	Royal Version	Prince Damrong's Corrected Version	Author's Version
Naresuan .. ..	15	15	15	15
Ekathosrot ..	8	8	15	15
Sri Saowaphak ..	1	1	1	1
Song Tham ..	25	25	9	9
Chetthathirat ..	1 year and 7 months	1 year and 7 months	1	1 year and 6 months
Athityawong ..	6 months	6 months	36 days	36 days
Prasat Thong ..	26	26	25	26

As the first table shows that a revision of Siamese history demands an advance in the dates of the accession of some of the Kings, so the second table shows a difference in the number of years reigned,—notably in the case of Ekathosrot, the length of whose reign must be increased from eight to fifteen years, and that of Song Tham which must be reduced from twenty-five years to nine. A careful reader of these tables may enquire why the death of King Athityawong in the first table is given as having occurred in A. D. 1637, some eight years after his accession, whereas he is supposed to have reigned for only six months. Siamese history, both in the Paramanuchit and the Royal Version, place on record that Prince Athityawong ascended the throne in the year of the Little Era 992 (A. D. 1630) and, having reigned for six months, it was found that being a child, he could not bear the responsibility of a crown, and he was dethroned by the Council of Ministers, and Okya Kalahom crowned King under the title of Prasat Thong in his place. The young Prince was kept in the palace to be educated. In the year A. D. 1633, when the King was engaged in inspecting some new structural work, he noticed Prince Athityawong sitting on a wall with his legs dangling down high above the King's head. No one must be above the King's head, and this act of the young Prince so enraged the King that he commanded the young Prince should be removed from the palace and made to take up his residence in a small bamboo hut with two servants outside the palace. The boy lived in this mean state for four years; then having gathered around himself a number of dissatisfied nobles, he, with a force of three hundred men, attacked the palace. King Prasat Thong was taken unawares, but managed to escape. He commanded his ministers and troops to seize the Prince. A fight took place in which many were killed and the Prince made prisoner. He was then executed (Little Era 999: A. D. 1637). Van Vliet tells us nothing of this, but says that the Prince sat on the throne for thirty-six days, and was taken from the college in which he was wearing the Buddhist robes and executed. This statement of van Vliet may mean that King Athityawong, having been on the throne for thirty-six days, was found to be so childish that he was dethroned and placed in a Wat for his education, from whence he was taken some time later and executed. If my understanding of van Vliet's statements is correct, it would agree in some small measure with Siamese history, but the period between the vacation of the throne

and the execution could not have been seven years, but may have been a few months.

As van Vliet was in Ayudhya a few years after the time in which these events occurred, and had the advantage of discussing the matter with Siamese noblemen and servants of the Dutch East India Company, it is probable that his story is the more correct version of what took place.

(2) SOME EVIDENCE REGARDING THE DATES OF ACCESSION  
AND DEATH OF THESE SEVEN KINGS.

1. *An explanation of Siamese Chronology.*

Siamese calculations of time were based on the zodiacal *nak-satr* (นักษัตร) year, and it was the use of this method which makes it difficult to state accurately the year in which any event occurred. Even to-day one finds the greatest difficulty in ascertaining the age of any elderly person. Such a person will tell you that he was born in, say, *pi chaloo* (ปีฉลู), the year of the Ox, but unless one knows the denary number of the year in the Little Era or *Chula-sakara-j* (จุลศักราช) one cannot fix the year of his birth. The present year is the year of the Ox, so this man may have completed his seventy-second or sixtieth year, but when one knows the denary number as expressed in the Little Era, then his age can be fixed definitely. It is due to this system that Siamese historians have made many mistakes when attempting to fix a particular date for a particular event. They may know the zodiacal year but not the year of the Little Era, and this leads to mistakes. King Naresuan, according to Siamese history is stated to have ascended the throne on the death of his father, Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha, on Tuesday, the 2nd waning of the twelfth month of the L. E. 940, the year of the Tiger (A.D. 1578). Now the year L. E. 940 was the year of the Tiger and the tenth year of the denary cycle, but we know from other reliable evidence that King Naresuan really ascended the throne in the year of the Little Era 952, also the year of the Tiger, but the second year of the denary. It would therefore seem that one of those mistakes in calculation, referred to by me, has been made. Siamese historians knew that he became King in the year of the Tiger, but nothing else.



We have another example of the inaccuracy of Siamese dates. According to Siamese history King Narayana died on Thursday, the third waning of the fifth month of the year of the Little Era 1044, being the fourth year of the denary in the year of the Dog. Now the year L. E. 1044 agrees with A. D. 1682. We know, however, from the writings of Europeans that the King died in A. D. 1688. Thus there is an error of six years.

2. *The fall of Ayudhya taken as a basic point from which to fix the date of accession of King Naresuan.*

It is necessary, for the purpose of fixing a date on which any particular event occurred about which there is some doubt, to have a basic point to start from. The first fall of Ayudhya was an important event. I will, therefore, take this event as the basic point for fixing the date of the accession and death of King Naresuan and his successors.

Siamese history tells us that Ayudhya fell into the hands of Bureng Nong Kyawdin Nawratha on Saturday the eleventh waning of the ninth month of the year of the Little Era 918 (A. D. 1556) and that the Burmese conqueror crowned his ally, Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha, as King Regent to govern Siam in his name on Friday, the sixth waxing of the first month of the same Siamese year which would synchronise with January 1557. The year of the Little Era 918 was the year of the Great Serpent. Siamese history tells us that this King Regent reigned for twenty-two years, and that he was succeeded by his son, Naresuan, in the year of the Little Era 940, being the year of the Tiger.

H. R. H. Prince Narathipraphanphong, in his work entitled *History of Burma*, places on record that Ayudhya was captured on Tuesday, the fourth waning of the ninth month of the Little Era 937 (A. D. 1575). This is obviously wrong, for it is not supported by Burmese History.

A Burmese history, known as the *Glass Palace Chronicle* or *Hmannan Yazawin Dawgyi* compiled by a select committee composed of learned monks, scholars and historians appointed by King Bagyidaw of Burma in A. D. 1829, gives us another date. This Committee, which examined and studied all existing histories, including the Yazawin Dawgyi Chronicles, local traditions and inscriptions, came to the conclusion that Ayudhya was captured by the

Burmese forces on Tuesday, the fourth waning of the month Wagaung of the year of the Little Era 931 (A. D. 1569). This date in the month of Wagaung may synchronise with the latter portion of August or the beginning of September. This same history records that Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha, the Prince of Song Khwae, (Phitsnulok) was crowned King of Siam on Wednesday, the fifth waning of the month Thadingyut L. E. 931 (A. D. 1569). This month is the one which denotes the completion of the period of Lent, and is the one in which the Kathin (กฐิน) gifts are presented to the monks (October). The Burmese word Thadingyut is the equivalent of Thot-Kathin (ທອດဂັၚ်) in Siamese. The King of Burma left Ayudhya sixteen days after the coronation of the new King, his vassal. This history does not tell us when King Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha died. It is evident, however, that this King reigned at peace with his suzerain till A. D. 1584. In that year Prince Naresuan, whom Burmese history already called the King of Siam, was commanded by the King of Burma to bring an army to Hongsawadi to assist in the war with Ava. King Naresuan adopted dilatory tactics, arriving outside the city of Hongsawadi (Pegu) some time after his overlord had left to attack Ava. King Naresuan is stated to have behaved as though he had the intention of attacking Hongsawadi, which was hastily put in a state of defence by the Crown Prince of Burma. King Naresuan, hearing that the King of Burma had been successful in the war against Ava and was returning to his capital, withdrew his troops from Hongsawadi and returned to Siam by the Mautama route. On the way he collected together as many of the Siamese families as had been made captives of war in A. D. 1564 and 1569, as well as a large number of Mon families, and took them to Ayudhya. He was followed in his retreat by a Burmese army. When he came to the frontier he is supposed to have declared the independence of Siam with the customary ceremony of pouring lustral water on the earth. Siam was not left in peace, for the Burmese sent several armies to crush the rebellious vassal, but without success. One of these armies was led by the King of Burma himself. The last attack was made in A. D. 1587. During this period of war, Burmese history gives Prince Naresuan the title of King of Siam. It was not till A. D. 1593 that Burma made a last attempt to crush Siam. In that year the Crown Prince of Burma led a vast army to Ayudhya, outside the walls of which city he was attacked by King Naresuan and defeated. The

Crown Prince lost his life in this battle, and the Burmese army retreated, suffering severe losses.

It is curious that this history should record the coronation of the Prince of Song Khwae, but make no reference to his death. Reading this history, one is led to believe that Prince Naresuan was already King in A. D. 1584. We know, however, that he did not become King till A. D. 1590, so it may be that King Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha had, owing to his great age, entrusted the affairs of state to his active and brave son or it may be that Prince Naresuan, who was the Maha Uparacha, was known to the Burmese as the Second King and, therefore, called King by them.

H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, in Part V. of *A Collection of Historical Data*, in a note called *An Explanation of the Ayudhya Dynasties*, states that Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha was crowned King in the year of the Little Era 931 (A. D. 1569), the year of the Little Serpent, and that he reigned for twenty-one years, dying on Sunday) the thirteenth waning of the eighth month of the year of the Little Era 952, the year of the Tiger (A. D. 1590). He was succeeded by his son, Naresuan, in that year. Prince Damrong supplements this information in his work, *Wars between Siam and Burma*, in which he tells us that King Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha was crowned on Friday, the sixth waxing of the twelve month B. E. 2112 (November 1569) of the year of the Little Serpent, and that he died on Sunday, thirteenth waning of the eighth month B. E. 2133, (A. D. 1590,) the year of the Tiger. Prince Damrong does not give us any data to support these specific dates; but I think he must have obtained them from Phra Phraison Sararak's works, translated from the *Glass Palace Chronicle* entitled *Burmese Invasions of Siam*, which was published in the Journal of the Siam Society.

A close examination of the dates given in Burmese history and by Prince Damrong proves that King Naresuan ascended the throne in A. D. 1590. Now how can we bring Siamese history into accord with this evidence? Siamese history states that Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha was crowned in January 1557 and that he reigned for twenty-two years, which will bring us to A. D. 1578, i. e. L. E. 940, the year of the Tiger. We are thus short by twelve years, a cycle of the zodiacal year. As I have pointed out, Siamese calculations of time are apt to be wrong by a cycle, and I think the mistake in the year as given in Siamese history is due to this cause. If we take twenty-

two years as the length of the reign, about which there can be little doubt, and add on twelve years for the missing cycle we obtain thirty-four years, which, added to the year of accession (January) 1557, brings us to 1590, for it should be remembered that the number of years of a reign are calculated according to the dates of the years reached, and not according to a year of twelve months. Thus if a King ascended the throne in December 1800 and died in January 1820 he would have reigned for twenty-one years. For this reason I think Prince Damrong is in error when he says that Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha reigned for twenty-one years, for as we are using Siamese chronology and methods it would be twenty-two years in agreement with Siamese history. Ayudhya surrendered to the same King, Bureng Kyawdin Nawrata, in March 1564, and Siam became a vassal state of Burma from that date. Siam rebelled against Burma some time later, and this led to the war which ended in the removal of the then reigning royal House and the appointment of the King Regent Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha, which reign I take as a basic point for establishing the year of the accession of King Naresuan. That year was A. D. 1590.

Siamese history records that King Naresuan reigned for fifteen years and that he died at Muang Hang Luang (เมืองห้างหลวง), when leading a military expedition to attack Ava, and that he died at this place in the year of the Little Era 955, still short by a cycle of the zodiacal year, for he really died in the year L. E. 967. Burmese history corroborates this date L. E. 967 (A. D. 1605), and it gives the place at which he died, namely, Hin Myo. Now Hin Myo is no other place than Muang Hang. The word Myo in Burmese is Muang in Siamese, and the word Hin in Burmese is Hang in Siamese. The Burmese write the word Hang correctly, but they pronounce the word Hin quite differently from the written character. Prince Damrong accepts L. E. 967 (A. D. 1605) as the year in which King Naresuan died, and there can be but little doubt that this is right. This date is supported by a Report to the English East India Company of which an extract is given in Paragraph 3.

### 3. *Dates of accession of succeeding Kings.*

King Naresuan, having died in A. D. 1605, was succeeded by his brother Ekathosrot. There is much evidence to prove the years during which King Ekathosrot was on the throne. We know that

he commenced his reign in A. D. 1605 and that the Shogun of Japan sent a personal letter to him through the agency of two foreign officials in A. D. 1606. Diplomatic letters continued to come from Japan till A. D. 1610, and King Ekathosrot sent a Siamese embassy to Japan in A. D. 1616. We find in the *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century*, many entries of considerable value relating to the foreign relations of Siam. In A. D. 1607 King Ekathosrot despatched an embassy to Holland not only for the purpose of cementing friendly relations with that country and developing commerce, but also to study the technique of building foundries and to obtain handicraftsmen. Some difficulties arose at Bantam about conveying the members of the embassy to Holland, but we learn from a letter of the King of Portugal to his Viceroy in Goa that this mission was taken to Holland by the Dutch.

In A. D. 1612 the King of England sent a friendly letter to the King of Siam asking for the right of free trade, which was granted. This letter was brought by the captain of an English ship and a merchant Mr. Adam, both of whom had an audience of the King Ekathosrot on the 29th September 1612. It is evident from the *Records etc.* that King Ekathosrot was in communication with the Viceroy of Goa in A. D. 1607 regarding the Portuguese request to be allowed to fortify Martaban. These negotiations were protracted. In January 1618, the King of Portugal wrote to his Viceroy about this matter. In A. D. 1618 the King sent an embassy to the King of Portugal, but for certain reasons did not get beyond Goa. The members of this mission were sent back to Siam under the care of Joas de Silva.

Regarding the date of the death of King Ekathosrot, I find a reference to this in a letter dated 4th October 1620, written at Singora by Jan van Hasell. It refers to the attempts of the English to negotiate a commercial treaty with Siam and the manœuvres of the Dutch to frustrate the attempt. In this letter the writer speaks of the illness of the old King (undoubtedly King Ekathosrot) and the incapacity of the young one (Sri Saowaphak) to rule the noblemen and mandarins as being the cause of the deterioration of the Chinese trade. The statement in this letter about the illness of the old King causes one to understand that King Ekathosrot died early in A. D. 1620. This date can now be accepted as correct, because a report, making

a survey of the trading prospects in Siam, submitted to the English East India Company, gives us A. D. 1605 as the year in which King Naresuan died, and A. D. 1620 as the year in which the White King died. It is fortunate for historians that this document, though much damaged, is still in existence, and that the writer refers to the King who died in A. D. 1620 as the White King. King Naresuan was known as the Black King on account of his swarthy complexion, and his brother, Ekathosrot, as the White King because of his fair skin. I see from a note, printed at the end of this document, that it is believed to have been written in A. D. 1622, because it makes a reference to the troubles with Cambodia. The year in which this report was written is of some importance, because the writer uses the words "his second son inherits, who now lives." The second son referred to here may be either Sri Saowaphak or Intha Racha. The White King's first son, Prince Suthat, died in A. D. 1612, and the writer may have been ignorant of this fact, and if this was the case Prince Intha Racha would be the second son, and thus the King living, when this report was written, alleged to be A. D. 1622, would be Song Tham.

The following is the extract from this report :

"The Description of Siam.

Siam many years ago, it seems, hath been a famous Kingdom, bearing rule over others, ever being in good credit with the King of China, which Kingdom received their Laws and religion from Siam ; so confessed by their mutual sending of presents every three years each to the other. The King of Siam Raja Api (or the Fire King) died 1605, whom his brother (called the White King) did succeed. He died also 1620, and his second son inherits, who now lives, and upon whom many Kings do make wars and do hope to put him out of his Throne. Hereby we may see the dangerous state whereunto Siam is now brought, and the hazard which we do bear in those places." (*Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century*, Vol. I, page 139).

King Ekathosrot was succeeded by his son Sri Saowaphak. Siamese history records that he reigned for one year and two months, but there is some reason to doubt this. As King Ekathosrot died in A. D. 1620, then it is probable that King Sri Saowaphak was executed in the latter half of that year.

King Sri Saowaphak was succeeded by King Song Tham. The date of his accession and the length of his reign as given in Siamese history is at variance with van Vliet's statement in his *Historical Account*, though the years of his death as given in the two records practically agree. Siamese history states that King Song Tham took over the reins of government in the year L. E. 964 (A. D. 1602), and that he reigned for twenty-six years, dying in the year of the Rabbit, L. E. 990. Van Vliet tells us that this King reigned for about nine years, which, according to European computation, would be a little more than eight full years. As this King died in April A. D. 1628, it is certain that he ascended the throne in A. D. 1620. There is an error in Siamese history of eighteen years, and this is due to a miscalculation of twelve years, one cycle of the zodiacal year as already explained, and to King Ekathosrot's reign being shortened by six years. The correspondence between this King and the Shogun of Japan affords ample evidence that he reigned from A. D. 1620 to 1628.

There can be no doubt about the date A. D. 1628 being the year in which King Song Tham died, for both Siamese history and van Vliet are in agreement on this point.

King Chetthathirat ascended the throne in April 1628. Siamese history records that he reigned for one year and seven months, whereas van Vliet says that he reigned for eight months. I feel that a mistake in writing crept in here, and that van Vliet meant eighteen months. We know that King Chetthathirat was still alive in April 1629, for in that month and year he wrote a letter to the Shogun of Japan. If we accept eighteen months as the length of his reign, that brings us to September 1629, and this would be about the date of his execution.

King Chetthathirat was succeeded by his brother, Prince Athityawong who, Siamese history says, reigned for six months, whereas van Vliet gives thirty-six days as the length of the reign. Van Vliet was in Ayudhya a short time after this event, so I think we can accept his statement as correct. If we accept this, then King Athityawong was deposed in November 1629, and this is supported by the fact that a Siamese embassy was received in November 1629 by the Shogun of Japan, sent to announce the accession. The actual date of the execution of King Athityawong is uncertain and obscure. King Prasat Thong succeeded him and reigned till A. D. 1656, a

year later than the date given in Siamese history. There is a report from the Council at Batavia to the Dutch East India Company dated 31st January 1657 which gives the following information:—

“Dated 21 Jan. O. S. (31 Jan. N. S.) 1657.

The Kingdom of Siam has this year had a great revolution, the King having died on the 8th August (1656) (18 August, N.S.) and the eldest son having, with armed men seized the court, and ascended the throne. But this only lasted until the second son drove him off it and made the brother of the late sovereign king, he being according to the Siamese laws the next of kin. And a few days later he had the eldest son killed. But this king did not occupy the throne two months; the aforesaid second son, being named Promarit (Narayana), took up arms again and deprived his uncle first of his throne, and then, a few days later, of his life, and set himself up as king under whom the kingdom has remained quiet.”

The eldest son referred to is, undoubtedly, Chao Fa Chai (เจ้าฟ้าไชย) who became King under the title of Phra Sanphet VI (พระสมเพ็ชรที่ ๖). The second son is Prince Narayana, and the uncle is King Sri Suthamaracha, a brother of King Prasat Thong.

In addition to the evidence recorded above much proof can be found in the writings of foreigners, Portuguese, Dutch and English, to substantiate these dates.



## PART FOUR.

*Concerning some events in Siamese History.*(1) THE PROBABLE REASON FOR THE SUICIDE OF PRINCE SUTHAT,  
SON AND CROWN PRINCE OF KING EKATHOSROT.

Although what I am about to relate and discuss does not fall within the scope of this critical analysis, because van Vliet does not touch on the subject in either his *Historical Account* or the *Treatise*, I deem it convenient to deal with the occurrence in this Part as it concerns an important event in Siamese history.

Siamese history places on record that in the reign of King Ekathosrot, his son, Prince Suthat, the Maha Uparaj or Crown Prince, committed suicide by taking poison in the third year of the reign.

The actual statement in Siamese history is as follows :---

In the third year of the reign the King appointed his eldest son, Prince Suthat, to be Maha Uparaj or Crown Prince. Four months later the Crown Prince sought an audience with his father, and asked to be allowed to examine *khon ok* (คนออก). The King turned on his son and enquired whether it was his intention to rebel. The Crown Prince was so overcome by fear of his father's suspicion that he retired from the royal presence, returned to his own palace, and in the evening committed suicide by taking poison.

This bald statement of what took place does not convey much information to the reader of the real reason for the suicide. The word *khon ok* is the pivot round which this story turns. I have not met any Siamese authority who could explain the meaning of this word, so I have had to form my own judgment.

*Khon ok* may have three different meanings: firstly, persons leaving or going out; but as the history does not say what place they were leaving, it is difficult to accept this rendering. If the history meant that the object was to examine persons leaving some place, such as the palace or the city, then it would have said so. For this reason the word cannot have the meaning of persons leaving. Secondly, the words *khon ok* may have the meaning of a person or persons of high rank, or possibly, a person or persons of elderly age. If we accept this connotation, the object of the Crown Prince would be to some extent clear and might account for his father's suspicion and anger. In Siamese we have the terms *pho ok* and

*mae ok* (พ่อเอก แม่เอก), which mean respectively the father who is greater and higher and the mother who is greater and higher than the person speaking to them. Thirdly, the words *khon ok* may mean a person or persons, a subject or subjects, of a vassal state. A vassal state in the Siamese language is *muang ok*, (เมืองเอก) and on this analogy *khon ok* should be the subject or subjects of a vassal state.

During the reign of King Ekathosrot many states were the vassals of Siam. Ayudhya, the great and glorious city, attracted people from all over the world, and it is certain that many of the subjects of the vassal states both visited and resided in the city. Envoys with their retinues from foreign and vassal states were frequently in Ayudhya.

I accept my third definition of the word *khon ok*, and in accepting this the whole matter becomes clear. The King suspected that his son was in touch or communication with foreigners or his vassals and, therefore, feared that his son contemplated rebellion.

I am not satisfied with leaving the matter at this point, and have endeavoured to find some evidence to support my theory. I find this evidence in a letter, dated 3rd May 1612, from Cornelius van Nyenrode at Ayudhya to H. Janssen at Patani, published in *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century* Vol. I. I quote this letter in full:

"Dated Judea, 3d May 1612. (N. S.)

(24 April 1612 O. S.)

"On the same date the Japanese were driven out of Pepry (Bejrapuri), some being killed, and that because they had committed excesses there, so they remained altogether at Bangkok, where he has been a little king till now.

"Moreover during this revolt of the Japanese a great lord of this place named Chao Fa Tana had gone over to the Langesander (Lanchang) and told the King that the King of this place had been killed by the Japanese and that they were ruling the country, also that most of the people had fled. The King of the Lanchang, one of the mightiest kings except this one here, has ordered his people to march hither and to try to chase the Japanese away and take the kingdom into their own possession. While marching against this town he found little resistance, so he has been keeping his camp about one day's journey hence during already four months, at a place called

Lemvo (Lavo), and has often sent Ambassadors (saying) that he had come to assist the king to turn the Japanese out of his country. However, His Majesty did not believe it, as the Lanchang people had brought many wives and children with them: and the latter made their intention so clear that the King assembled his people from everywhere and has left the town on the 12th March with all his power against the Lanchang people. He made his camp about five miles from his enemy, ordering his officers to make one nearer to the enemy.

"On the 22nd March he sent some messengers to invite the Dutch to visit him, which they did on the 24th. Then the King was only three miles off the enemy. The reason of the invitation soon appeared, when the King asked them to handle the cannons, given to His Majesty by His Excellency the Prince either in the battle or when the King would order them. By the 30th March the King's army approached the enemy so closely that on the 5th April the battle was fixed on. However, on that day there was no enemy, the Lanchangs having sent their wives and children already four days before, the King and all his elephants and horses following the night of the 4th April. His power had consisted of one hundred thousand men, five thousand horses, but only a few elephants; the Army of the King of Siam having been two hundred thousand men, three thousand elephants (five hundred being equipped for war). The enemy was pursued by some mandarins with their people, many being killed, and the King having only narrow escape. He had to leave his elephant and fly on a horse. The elephant with all that belonged to it was taken by those mandarins. The King of Siam returned thus triumphantly to his capital of Judea on the 12th April. Then he ordered the Japanese to leave his country, which they were willing to do. So within three or four days all Japanese will have left Siam.

"Writers do not think the Japanese will soon return, which they consider to be a profit to the Company, as all deer-skins will now be bought by them."

H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab would seem to have used this letter in connection with his work *Wars between Siam and Burma*. On page 186, he refers to this matter, but for some reason which is not clear, has altered the substance of the story. In the letter the Prince is called Chao Fa Tana. This is, undoubtedly, a

misprint, and should be Chao Fa Fana. The word Fana is Faina. The Dutch always spoke of the Maha Uparaj or Crown Prince as Chao Fa Faina or Faina. This letter gives us the clue to the suicide of Prince Suthat. This Prince went over to the King of Lanchang and told him that the King of Siam (his father) had been killed by the Japanese, who had pillaged Petburi and occupied Bangkok and were ruling Siam. The King of Lanchang conceived the plan of driving out the Japanese, and placing himself on the throne of Ayudhya. A large army led by the King in person, accompanied by women and children, marched on and occupied Lavo. This letter gives full details of what took place, so I will not repeat them.

If I am right in assuming that the Chao Fa Faina was Prince Suthat, and there is little reason to doubt this, for King Ekathosrot did not appoint a new Crown Prince on the suicide of his son, then it is easy to understand why King Ekathosrot suspected the loyalty of his son, and why Prince Suthat committed suicide. The Prince did not commit suicide in the third year of the reign of King Ekathosrot, but in A. D. 1612, the eighth year of the reign.

However, I doubt the accuracy of the statement that Prince Suthat committed suicide. It seems more likely that he was executed by the command of his father, for the offence was rebellion, a heinous crime for which death was the only punishment.

(2) WHO WAS PRINCE SRI SIN, WHO REBELLED AGAINST  
KING CHETTHATHIRAT?

In the Paramanuchit version of Siamese history it is stated that King Song Tham was Prince Sri Sin, (พระศรีศิลป์) a son of King Ekathosrot by a concubine. We know now from van Vliet that his mother was a younger sister of Okya Sri Thamathirat, whose family was closely related to the royal House. This lady was a concubine of King Ekathosrot. Van Vliet gives the original name of King Song Tham as Intha Racha, and not Sri Sin. He also tells us that King Song Tham had two brothers, Prince Sri Sin and Prince Thong (พระองค์ทอง) whom he loved beyond all others. We do not know when Prince Thong died, but Prince Sri Sin was alive when his brother came to the throne, and like so many Princes, had become a Buddhist priest. It is believed he was residing in Wat Rakhang (วัดระฆัง) when his brother King Song Tham died in A. D. 1628. According to van Vliet, the line of succession should have descended to

this Prince Sri Sin and not to the King's son, Chetthathirat. King Song Tham, before his death, secretly commanded Okya Sriworawong to place Prince Chetthathirat on the throne. This caused much dissatisfaction among the ministers and noblemen, who became divided into two factions, one faction favouring Prince Sri Sin and the other, Prince Chetthathirat. Okya Sriworawong, who afterwards became Okya Kalahom and, eventually, ascended the throne as King Prasat Thong, had, according to van Vliet, in his younger days debauched some of the wives of Prince Sri Sin and later attempted to assassinate the Prince and his brother Thong, which offences led to his being imprisoned. Okya Sriworawong fell in with the King's wish to place his son on the throne as he knew that if Prince Sri Sin became King, his life would be forfeit. Immediately after the coronation of King Chetthathirat, Okya Sriworawong took steps to rid himself of this potential danger. Prince Sri Sin had been frequently commanded to attend the court, but had neglected to obey the command. Okya Sriworawong arranged with Yamada (Okya Senaphimuk) to persuade the Prince to come to Court, promising to support his claim to the throne and to make him King. Van Vliet tells us that Prince Sri Sin, trusting in the honesty of purpose of Yamada, agreed to come to the palace in his priestly robes, where he would cast them off and, arraying himself as a Prince of the blood, enter the palace and be proclaimed King. The unfortunate Prince acted according to this deceitful plan. On arrival at the palace and having changed his dress, he was seized by Yamada's soldiers, taken before the King and accused of rebellion. The partisans of Okya Sriworawong clamoured for his death, but the King refused to be a party to the shedding of his uncle's blood. The Prince was exiled to Petburi, where he was kept in a well. Instructions were given to bring about his death by gradual starvation. Okluang Mongkol, (ออกหลวงมงคล) a relative of the Prince, succeeded in rescuing the Prince from his terrible plight. The Prince and Okluang Mongkol did now rebel, for they raised an army to attack Ayudhya. Prince Sri Sin was defeated, captured and executed. Van Vliet gives full details of these events. By the removal of Prince Sri Sin, Okya Kalahom advanced many steps in his ambitions to place himself on the throne, which he did before the year 1629 was out.

Siamese history places on record that the second brother of King Chetthathirat, called Prince Phra Phan Pi Sri Sin, (พระพันปีศรีสิน) who could not have been more than thirteen years of age, rebelled against his brother King Chetthathirat, a boy of about fifteen, because he had not been selected to ascend the throne in succession to his father King Song Tham. It does not seem likely that a boy of thirteen years of age would take up arms against his brother, who had a greater right than himself to the throne. The fact that the boy is given in Siamese history the name of Phra Phan Pi Sri Sin may also be taken as evidence that this Prince Sri Sin was grown up and it is certainly more likely that van Vliet is right when he says that the Prince Sri Sin, who rebelled, was a younger brother of King Song Tham, and therefore an uncle of King Chetthathirat. I believe that it is almost unknown in the social life of the people of this country for a father to give his own name to his son. This custom would also support my theory that King Song Tham was not Prince Sri Sin.

(3) WAS KING SONG THAM PRINCE SRI SIN, AND WAS HE IN THE PRIESTHOOD FOR MANY YEARS PRIOR TO HIS ASCENDING THE THRONE?

It is generally believed that King Song Tham was in the priesthood for many years. Some historians say eight years before he became King, and that his ecclesiastical title was Phra Phimonthan Anantapricha (พระพิมลธรรมอนันตปรีชา), which rendered into English means "Fully conversant with the excellent law." Some scholars think that he took his royal title, Song Tham, from his monastic name. It is certain that he left the priesthood when he rebelled and dethroned his brother Sri Saowaphak. If his son, King Athityawong, was only ten years of age when he was executed in A. D. 1629, King Song Tham could only have been in the priesthood for a comparatively short time, certainly not eight years, for he ascended the throne in A. D. 1620. Furthermore, Prince Chetthathirat, his eldest son, must have been born in A. D. 1614, which is additional proof of this. It does not seem probable that Prince Intha Racha (King Song Tham) had anything to fear at the hands of his father, but a great deal to fear at the hands of his brother, Prince Sri Saowaphak. Therefore it is likely that he entered the priesthood immediately after the death of his father in A. D. 1619. Princes Chetthathirat and Athityawong must have been born, while he was

still a layman. As both the Paramanuchit and Royal Versions of Siamese history insist that Prince Sri Sin was a priest in Wat Rakhang, and held the ecclesiastical title of Phra Phimontham Anantapricha, and that he ascended the throne as King Song Tham, a point of some historical importance is raised for solution. Van Vliet tells us a story at complete variance with Siamese history, for he says that King Song Tham was Prince Intha Racha, and his brother was Prince Sri Sin. Can it be that Prince Sri Sin was the priest, Phra Phimontham Anantapricha? As I have shown, King Song Tham could not have been in the priesthood for many years before he became King at the age of twenty-nine, although he may have been prior to the year A. D. 1614. I am therefore inclined to doubt the accuracy of Siamese history in this matter, although I accept the statement that Prince Sri Sin was the priest Phra Phimontham Anantapricha.

(4) WHO WAS CHAMÜN SRI SORARAK (จันศรีวรราช), STATED IN  
SIAMESE HISTORY TO HAVE BEEN APPOINTED MAHA UPARAJ  
ON THE ACCESSION OF KING SONG THAM?

In both the Paramanuchit and Royal Versions of Siamese history we are told that Chamün Sri Sorarak had joined Prince Sri Sin in the plot to dethrone King Sri Saowaphak, and, that as a reward for his services, he was elevated to the rank of Maha Uparaj, the highest position next to the King in the Kingdom, which position he only held for ten days, as he died of a sudden illness. I have dealt in my two foregoing notes with the fallacy of the statement that King Song Tham was Prince Sri Sin. As Siamese history is certainly wrong in this matter it may be equally in error about the appointment of Chamün Sri Sorarak to be Maha Uparaj. Chamün Sri Sorarak was the head of the Corps of Pages in the reign of King Ekathosrot. In fact we are led to believe by a tradition extant that he was a son of this King himself by a Bang-pa-in village girl. I have recorded this tradition in Part II of this paper. Chamün Sri Sorarak was given this title when about sixteen years of age, during the reign of King Ekathosrot. He had attained to great notoriety in Ayudhya by his actions. The boy was undisciplined, ambitious and headstrong and always committing offences against social and official convention, for which he was frequently punished. Van Vliet tells us that Chamün Sri Sorarak was Phra Ong Lai and he was a

son of Okya Sri Thamathirat, a scion of the royal House, which might account for being known as a Prince. Then, there is another story which says that he was a son of King Ekathosrot, and would, therefore, be entitled to the rank of Phra Ong. However this may be, the fact remains that the reputation of this young man was notorious, and it was he who joined in the conspiracy with Prince Intha Racha, which led to that Prince deposing and executing King Sri Saowaphak, and placing himself on the throne. Chamün Sri Sorarak was the leading spirit in this conspiracy. Van Vliet, who knew this official well, tells us that he moved from the position of head of the Pages to that of Chamberlain of the Household with the rank of Okya Sri Worawong during the reign of King Song Tham, and that in the succeeding reign he became Okya Kalahom and, eventually, seized the supreme power himself, being known in history as King Prasat Thong. Van Vliet gives us a sketch of the life of King Prasat Thong from the days when he was known as Phra Ong Lai, and there is no suggestion that he ever became Maha Uparaj. Is it likely that there were two officials holding the same title Chamün Sri Sorarak? The answer must be in the negative. As our Chamün Sri Sorarak (Phra Ong Lai) only became Okya Sri Worawong during the reign of King Song Tham, it would seem to be certain that he did not die. If we accept van Vliet's statement about the career of this man, one is forced to the conclusion that Siamese history is in error on this point, in the same way as it is in error about Prince Sri Sin having ascended the throne as King Song Tham. Chamün Sri Sorarak was so well known in Ayudhya as to be surrounded by a halo of notoriety, and as he became King it may be that Siamese historians have become confused by the extraordinary events, which happened between A. D. 1620 and 1629, in which Chamün Sri Sorarak occupied the central position.

(5) IN WHAT YEAR DID KING SONG THAM ACTUALLY DIE?

Siamese history places on record that King Song Tham was taken ill on Thursday, the sixth waxing of the second month of the year of the Little Era 989, the year of the Rabbit (ปีเถาะ), and that he died of this illness one month and sixteen days later. A calculation proves that both the year of the Little Era 989 and the year of the Rabbit synchronise with the year A. D. 1627. It is more difficult to fix the exact month according to the European calendar, as the



Siamese calendar of that time was based on the lunar system. The second month might be either February or January and, therefore, the King's death may have taken place in the beginning or the end of March 1628, for, it should be remembered, both the zodiacal and the Little Era cover approximately nine months of one year and three months of another year of the European calendar. Siamese history says the King reigned for twenty-five years. This cannot be correct, for we have many foreign records, Portuguese and Dutch, to prove that King Ekathosrot was on the throne in A. D. 1618 and died in A. D. 1619 or 1620. (vide Part III.)

Van Vliet, in his Historical Account speaks of the illness of King Song Tham, and gives dates very similar to those recorded in Siamese history. Van Vliet says: "His (the King's) disposition became, towards the end of the year of the rabbits, in the waning of the eleventh moon, unbearably peevish, so much so that the Mandarins and other grandees of the Court did not dare any longer to approach him in order to speak to him of the important and necessary affairs of his Kingdom. At the beginning of the twelfth and last moon of the year the King fell all at once into a state of exhaustion, and it was very soon evident from the course of his sickness that there was no hope of his recovering". A few sentences further on van Vliet states that the King died "on the 22nd day of the first moon of the great year of the serpents. . . . . At the time of his decease he was only thirty-eight years old so that he died in the flower of his age, after having reigned about nine years, almost the whole time in peace."

In attempting to come to a decision as to when King Song Tham actually died, it is noteworthy that van Vliet states that the King was taken ill in the eleventh moon of the year of the Rabbit, and that his illness became so serious at the beginning of the twelfth and last moon of the year as to be the cause of grave anxiety, and that he died on the twenty-second day of the first moon of the great year of the Serpent. It is clear from what van Vliet says that he was speaking of the numerical position of the month of the year of the Rabbit, and that of the Serpent, for he conditions the twelfth month as the last month in the year of the Rabbit. He was not using the ordinary terminology applicable to the months, which would place the eleventh and twelfth months between October and December. Furthermore, after speaking of the twelfth or last month of the year

of the Rabbit he continues with the first month of the new year of the Serpent (ปีมะโรง). If he were speaking in the usual terminology then there would be an hiatus, for the change to the new year under the zodiacal system does not take place till the very end of March or the beginning of April. To make this point clear I would like to explain that the year of the Rabbit commenced at the very end of March or the beginning of April 1627, and closed on or about the same date in A. D. 1628. The year of the Rabbit is followed by the year of the Great Serpent (ปีมะเส็ง).

If my understanding of Van Vliet's statement is correct, then the second month (เดือนกุมภาพันธ์) of the year of the Rabbit mentioned in Siamese history as the date of the commencement of the King's illness would almost exactly agree with the eleventh month given by van Vliet. Siamese history says the King was ill for one month and sixteen days and then died. This statement also closely approximates with van Vliet's statement that the King died on the twenty-second day of the first month of the year of the Serpent which would be about the 20th of April 1628. The use of the words "the great year of the Serpent" may imply that the Maha Sakarat was in common use when van Vliet lived in Ayudhya, but I am inclined to think that van Vliet really meant the year of the Great Serpent, for there are two years of the Serpent, namely, the Great Serpent and the Little Serpent (ปีมะเส็ง). Van Vliet says that King Song Tham reigned for about nine years. This statement appears to be correct though opposed to the twenty-five years given in Siamese history. If, as I understand, King Song Tham ascended the throne in the latter part of A. D. 1620 and reigned till April 1628, this would cover the period of about nine years mentioned by van Vliet. According to Siamese methods of calculation, if a King ascended the throne on the last day of any given year and died in the first week of any given year, that would be calculated as two years.

We know that King Song Tham was succeeded on the throne by his son, Prince Chetthathirat. The proclamation of the accession, according to van Vliet, was made immediately after the death of the King in order to prevent Prince Sri Sin, the King's brother, attempting to seize power. Siamese history records that King Chetthathirat reigned for one year and seven months. Van Vliet says that he reigned for eight months. I think that eight months

is a clerical error for eighteen months. If, as I assume, King Song Tham died in April 1628, then King Chetthathirat was executed in September 1629.

Is there any evidence to help us to solve this difficulty? Fortunately we have a letter from King Chetthathirat to the Shogun of Japan. This letter is dated ๓๓๓๓ ๔ ค่ำ ปีมะเส็ง จุลศักราช ๙๙๑. This date tells us that the letter was written on the fourth waxing (month not mentioned) of the year of the Little Serpent, synchronising with the year 991 of the Little Era. The year of the Little Serpent and the year 991 of the Little Era both agree with the year A. D. 1629. It is unfortunate that we do not know the Siamese month in which this letter was written, but in Part XX of *A Collection of Historical Data*, published by the Royal Institute, the date is said to be the 23rd of April 1629. Part XX is, I believe, a translation of Sir Ernest Satow's *Notes on Intercourse between Siam and Japan in the 17th Century*. Whether this date, the 23rd of April, was given by Sir Ernest Satow or by the translator, I am not in the position to say, as I have been unable to obtain a copy of this work in the original. However, I think that I will be correct when I say that the fourth waxing could not possibly be the 23rd of April. However this may be, we cannot escape from the fact that the year of the Little Serpent and the year 991 of the Little Era synchronise with A. D. 1629. This evidence goes to prove that King Chetthathirat was alive in A. D. 1629. If van Vliet is correct when he says that King Song Tham died in the first month of the new year of the Serpent, and I can see no reason for controverting this statement which almost exactly agrees with Siamese history, then King Chetthathirat must have reigned for more than eight months. It is, therefore, probable that the length of the reign, one year and seven months as given in Siamese history, approximates to the truth, but I accept eighteen months as the length of the reign.

(6) THE CREMATION WHICH LED TO THE REBELLION OF OKYA  
KALAHOM AGAINST KING CHETTHATHIRAT.

The events, which led up to the execution of King Chetthathirat as recorded in Siamese history, are similar to those mentioned by van Vliet. Both records agree that Okya Kalahom was engaged in cremating the body of a relative. Noblemen attended this ceremony for several days and did not appear before the King at the daily

audiences. This negligence on the part of the nobles enraged the King, and gave rise to a suspicion in his mind that they were conspiring to rebel against him. The King determined to arrest Okya Kalahom, but was himself forced to flee from the palace. He was later taken prisoner and executed on the ground that by fleeing from the palace he had deserted from his high office. Siamese history relates that Okya Kalahom was cremating the body of his mother. Van Vliet, who was in Ayudhya a short time after this event, says that Okya Kalahom was cremating the body of his brother, and, taking advantage of this opportunity, re-cremated the bones of his father, who had died some time before. These cremations were on a grand scale approximating in grandeur to the honours paid to the royal dead.

(7) EXPLAINING THAT THE OKYA KALAHOM OF THE REIGNS OF  
KING SONG THAM AND KING CHETTHATHIRAT  
WERE DIFFERENT PERSONS.

If one reads Siamese history of the reign of King Song Tham, one learns that a body of some five hundred Japanese marched through Ayudhya, and, entering the precincts of the Palace, made a threatening demonstration against the King, whom they accused of having murdered their patron, King Sri Saowaphak. These Japanese had the intention of seizing the person of the King, but they seem to have been lacking in unity of purpose and a leader. A nobleman, Phra Maha Amatayathibodi (พระมหาอำมาตย์ธิบดี), probably saved the King's life, for he, having gathered together a force of Siamese soldiers, attacked and defeated the Japanese, who were driven out of Ayudhya. King Song Tham rewarded this nobleman by promoting him to the rank of Chao Phya Kalahom Suriwong. As an official of this title continues to take a leading part in the events of the succeeding reigns, one would suppose that the same man continues to render service to both these Kings, but this was not the case. Van Vliet tells us that the Okya Kalahom (Chao Phya Kalahom) of the reign of King Song Tham, was executed in the reign of King Chetthathirat, under the compelling advice of Okya Sri Worawong, a powerful nobleman, who had served King Song Tham in the Royal Household. Okya Sri Worawong, having got rid of Okya Kalahom on the ground that he favoured the claim of Prince Sri Sin to the throne against the expressed wish of the King that his son Chettha

thirat should succeed, forced King Chettathirat to promote him to the vacant title, from which he ascended the throne as King Prasat Thong. Siamese history is silent about these happenings, and leads one to believe that Phra Maha Amatayathibodi was the Okya Kalahom of the reign of King Chetthathirat and, therefore, the nobleman who placed himself on the throne under the title of King Prasat Thong. This Okya Sri Worawong is none other than Chamün Sri Sorarak (จันทน์ศรีสุรารักษ์) born as Phra Ong Lai, whose birth story I have related in full in Part two, and spoken of in Paragraph four of this part.

#### (8) WAR WITH CAMBODIA.

Van Vliet places on record an event of some importance regarding which Siamese history is silent. He says that the King (Song Tham) was organizing a military expedition by land and sea against Cambodia and that Chamün Sri Sorarak, of whom we have already spoken, who was in prison at the time, petitioned the King to be allowed to take part in the campaign. The petition was granted and Chamün Sri Sorarak accompanied the army, and on his return was taken back into the favour of the King. Van Vliet, in his Treatise submitted to the Director Philippe Lucas of which I give an extract below, amplifies his statement in his *Historical Account*, and tells us that the King accompanied the army himself. I doubt the accuracy of this statement, for there is not the slightest indication in the letters of the King to the Shogun of Japan to support it. Is there any evidence to support this statement of Van Vliet, that Siam was engaged in war with Cambodia during King Song Tham's reign? There is no evidence in Siam, and we have to go to Japan to find it. The correspondence, which was carried on between the Kings of Siam and the Shoguns of Japan, as well as the letters passing between the Ministers of the two countries, which fortunately for us have been preserved in the Japanese archives, provide us with evidence on this point. Early in the year A. D. 1623, King Song Tham sent a letter to the Shogun of Japan in which he says that he had the intention of sending greetings to the Shogun in the previous year, but was prevented from doing so by trouble which had arisen in Cambodia. The King says in this letter that King Sri Suphanarat of Cambodia, a loyal vassal of Siam, had died and been succeeded on the throne by his son Chettha. The new King failed to follow in the

footsteps of his father and refused to acknowledge the suzerainty of Siam. It was resolved at a meeting of the Ministers of State to send an ambassador to Cambodia to attempt by kindly words to bring Chettha back to his allegiance. The embassy failed in its mission, and Chettha openly rebelled. The King then went on to tell the Shogun, that he was organizing a military expedition to go by land and sea to suppress the rebellion. He pointed out to the Shogun that there were many Japanese in Cambodia, and he feared that when fighting commenced between the Siamese and the Cambodians, some of these Japanese might fight on the side of the Cambodians and be killed, and that this might lead to a rupture of the existing friendly relationship between the two countries. The King asked the Shogun to prohibit the entry of Japanese into Cambodia during the period of the war. The Shogun of Japan replied to the King of Siam by a letter dated September 1623, in which he said he was sorry to hear of the rebellion on the frontier of Siam. He then pointed out that traders were traders and should not mix in politics, and should any Japanese subjects take part in the war, they should not be exempt from punishment. He advised the King to suppress the rebellion with vigour, and without any fear of resentment on his part.

Van Vliet, in his *Historical Account*, states that the Cambodian expedition was not the success anticipated. As I have already mentioned, Siamese history is silent about this war; therefore, in order to ascertain what happened, I again turn to Japan for information. In the correspondence which passed between King Song Tham and the Shogun of Japan, there are letters to show that the war was a long one, and that even in A. D. 1626 the rebellion had not been suppressed. There is a letter dated March 1626 from the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, Okya Phra Khlang, to Sakai Tadayo, a Minister in Japan. This letter was written in the name of the King and, as in such cases, the permanent title of the Minister was used. In this case, as the Minister for Foreign Affairs was writing in the name of the King, the letter emanated from Okya Sri Thamarat, although signed by Phra Khlang. The same system was in force a few years back in the Ministry of the Interior. When this Minister received any commands or instructions from the King, such commands or instructions were issued in the name of Chao Phya Chakri, whereas an ordinary order or letter from the Minister of Interior would be in his own name. In this letter the King, through his Foreign

Minister, informed the Shogun of Japan among other things that the rebellion in Cambodia had not been completely quelled, and that he was sending reinforcements to the seat of war. This letter was conveyed to Japan by an Ambassador, Khun Raksa Sittiphol, who was accompanied by an interpreter. The Japanese Minister replied to this letter later in the same year, saying that his master, the Shogun, was grieved to hear of the continuance of the war, and that he felt the King's army would be successful; the weak could not resist the strong. This rebellion was not crushed till the reign of King Prasat Thong.

The letters I have quoted here show that van Vliet places on record an actual happening and thereby adds to our knowledge of history. In order to amplify our understanding of what occurred during this war with Cambodia, I reprint the remarks of van Vliet recorded in the *Treatise* he submitted to the Director, Philippe Lucas, in Batavia in A. D. 1638, which was published in the Journal of the Siam Society Vol. VII, Part 1.

"The kings of Cambodia are from olden times vassals and subjects of the Siamese kings, but on several occasions they have revolted.

Although brave kings and powerful princes of Siam several times subdued the vassal and with arms forced him to pay obeisance, the Cambodians did not remain in proper subjection. They made themselves ready for war and plundered the towns situated on the Siamese rivers. To prevent such to happen again and to tie Cambodia to Siam, the predecessor of the present King has sent two very large armies to Cambodia in 1622. One of the armies went by water and the other one by land, and the king himself accompanied the army to Cambodia. After the Armada (consisting of many large armed galleys and ships of less importance) had been lying for a long time on the river of Cambodia (without going into action or doing anything), it returned again. The Cambodians, encouraged by the departure of the Siamese boats, went to meet the army which came by land. They united in the valleys and the low fields and by false guides brought the Siamese from the good roads. They attacked the Siamese and many thousands of men were slain. Many great men, elephants and horses were killed in that unfortunate battle. The Cambodians took about 250 living elephants. After this victorious defence the one party has left the other in peace. Several times afterwards the Siamese have made preparations for war and the news spread that they wanted to

attack Cambodia, but all this never had any result. I believe that the proud and thoughtless Siamese have spoiled a double chance by treating the foreign merchants and Dutch so badly a few years ago. For now not only can no war vessels for the conquest of Cambodia be expected from the Governor General at Batavia (as was promised by letter in 1637), but also the Governor General has established a Comptoir in Cambodia, where his factors reside so that the Siamese, certainly, will leave Cambodia in peace in future."

#### (9) THE REBELLION OF THE QUEEN OF PATANI.

It is apparent from what van Vliet says in his *Historical Account* that the Kingdom of Patani then ruled over by a Queen had broken away from its allegiance to Siam, probably about A. D. 1630. This rebellion was ushered in by an attack on Patalung and Nakhon Sri Thamarat, in resisting which Yamada was wounded and thereby lost his life. The military expedition organised and despatched from Ayudhya did not arrive on the scene of the rebellion till A. D. 1632. This army, which was composed of some sixty thousand men with war elephants, horses and artillery would seem to have been more than sufficient to have crushed a small state like Patani, the more so as a fleet of war ships went by sea to give support to the land forces. Van Vliet tells us that the expedition was not successful, owing to the Generals in command not co-operating together. He places on record, in his *Treatise*, the punishment meted out to these officers which was typical of the time. Okphra Rabasit, one of the generals mentioned by van Vliet, was Okphra Ramasitthi, for he spells the name wrongly. King Prasat Thong, wily and astute statesman that he was, deemed it necessary to be on terms of friendship with the Kings of Acheen and Arakan before taking steps to punish Patani. This act of diplomacy was necessary to protect the Siamese seaboard, which lay on the Bay of Bengal, for at that time the provinces of Mergui and Tanao Sri (Tenassarim) formed a part of the kingdom. The King feared that these two potentates might take advantage of his embroilment with Patani, and attempt to seize these two provinces. In fact it would seem from what van Vliet tells us in his *Treatise* that the King of Arakan did have this plan in his mind. Van Vliet in his *Historical Account* mentions the preparations for the war against Patani, but for details of what really happened we must turn again to



the *Treatise*. I reprint below that portion of the *Treatise* which deals with this subject. It is curious that an event of such importance in the reign of King Prasat Thong was not known to Siamese historians; or if they knew it they ignored it, for nothing at all is said about this war in Siamese history. In a history of Patani, Part III of *A Collection of Historical Data* we are told that a Queen ruled over Patani and that three cannon were cast by a Chinese during her reign, but not a word about rebellion. I will digress a little and say that one of these cannons is in Bangkok to-day, brought here in the third year of the reign of King Phra Phuttha Yot Fa (A. D. 1784). This Queen of Patani could only be the Queen who rebelled against Siam during the reign of King Prasat Thong. I do not guarantee that these cannon were cast during her reign. This woman holds a remarkable position in Malay History, and the casting of these cannons was also a remarkable event, so it may be that tradition has brought the two events together. The following are the extracts from van Vliet's *Treatise*:

"The kingdom of Patany has been subjected to Siam since olden times but was only bound to bring, every year, homage to his Majesty the king of Siam with the golden and silver flowers, and in times of war to send in assistance a few thousand soldiers. The princes and princesses of Patany received titles from the Siamese king. They received titles of Pra Chao. From that may be concluded the good right of the Siamese king over the government of Patany. But by the ambition of the late Princess to obtain the highest power and by the great authority of some mandarins, especially Dato Bestaar, (who were not loved by most of the Orangh Cayos,) the people of Patany became rebellious against Siam during the change of succession in that country.

"The ambitious Princess and mandarins, already mentioned, made known in public that the King of Siam did not have the right to wear the crown and that he had killed the true kings and their heirs. For this reason the Patanese regents could not recognise him as a legal king but as a tyrannic conqueror to whom the kingdom did not need to pay homage. To show their intention the Patanese have attacked the provinces of Bordelongh and Lygoor during the first year of the rule of the present king, and afterwards they have taken two of His Majesty's vessels which were going to Batavia and which traded with the East-India Company's factors. At last they

have treated His Majesty's ambassador very unworthily and refused to negotiate with governor Caan who, in 1632, was sent to Patany to promote peace. The Batavian community (burghers) could not expect any restitution and the King of Siam had given up all hope that the Patanese would be obedient to him or make friendship with him. After having conquered the provinces of Lycoon and Lygoor and after having made peace with Queda and Sangora, the King of Siam therefore wanted to force Patany to pay obeisance and to give Siam again the same power as before. To do this His Majesty called to arms in Lygoor an army of 60,000 men with plenty of elephants, horses, artillery and ammunition, and placed over this army four generals named Oyas: Lygoor, Calahom, Berckelagh and Rabisit. Moreover an armada of forty junks and galleys with ammunition and the necessary provisions were sent there. The four chiefs got the order to attack the town of Patany at the end of April or to besiege and take the town by starving it. But in order to carry on the war with more glory and to frighten the Patanese and their neighbours more, the King and the mandarins of Siam asked for assistance of a few ships of the Governor General and Council of India. This request was founded on various motives, namely:— 1—the friendship with the Netherlands nation, which His Majesty had kept up for a long time, 2—the assistance of which His Kingly Grace, the Prince of Orange has assured the King by various missions, 3—the assistance which the late noble general Koen gave the late King many years ago by sending two ships to fight Cambodia, 4—the assistance which the noble general Speck gave in the year 1632, without any requisition, by sending five well armed ships under the command of Anthonio Caan, to fight against the Castilians, 5—that all relations with the Castilians and Portuguese were trade relations, but that there was great friendship with the Netherlands nation. This was proved by several actions of the Siamese government as:— 1—the punishment of Don Fernando de Silva by the late king for taking the yacht *Seeland* and the goods of Caspir Swaris who in 1630 came from Maccouw to Siam with Chinese products, 2—the pursuit of the Maccau prisoners in 1633 by many mandarins.

“For which reasons the King and the mandarins firmly believed that the requested assistance could not be refused by the Governor General. By this assistance Patany should be forced to pay obeisance to Siam. The noble Governor General and the Council of India have

taken the claim on Patany and the urgent requests into consideration, and sent to Patany the ship *Velsen* ahead, and afterwards six well armed boats with a junk under the flag of Commander Claas Bruyn to assist the king of Siam. But these ships came too late as the Siamese army had already returned. The Siamese had besieged the town for about one month, had fought many skirmishes and even had been in the fortress of Patany. Oya Lygoor, who thought that the Siamese had already conquered the town, ordered that the whole town should be kept for the King and that nobody be allowed to take anything of the booty. The soldiers then retired from the town and went back to their camp. Now the Patanese regained courage, defeated the Siamese and made them flee away. After many defeats the Siamese lost all hope of conquering Patany and returned to their fleet at Sangora. But when the chiefs of the army afterwards started to regret the mistakes which they had made, they tried to give the blame to our nation. They sent their false information to the King and made him believe that the Netherlanders, by keeping back their warships (which, as they said, were promised to them for certain), were the cause of the defeat. Without any consideration the credulous King believed all this. An immediate result of this was that we became in trouble; we were quite isolated from the outside world, lived as prisoners in the Company's house and expected still worse things for the future. But when the King afterwards heard of the good-will which the Governor General had shown, His Majesty's disgrace turned from us. After the army, with a loss of many thousands, returned in parts to Siam, the principal officers (among whom were those who had falsely accused us) were not allowed to appear before the King to pay the usual reverence and to report of their doings. They were sharply examined about their conduct by a commission. After information had been gathered it was found that many hundreds of Siamese had been inside the fortress of Patany, but that they had the order from Oya Lygoor, general of the army, to retire, as he feared that his soldiers would plunder and destroy the town. Having received this information the King concluded that Patany had not been conquered on account of two mistakes of his officers; firstly, they had left the town too early and, secondly, they had not waited for the assistance of the Dutch. In his rage the king said that they all (although some had shown much ambition) deserved the severest punishment. One of the Captains

was beheaded and his head was put on a post, and His Majesty ordered the others to sit around the post for three days under the open sky in order that they might consider whether their Captain had been punished in the right way. Also His Majesty made known to them that this punishment was the best compensation for their brave deeds. In such condition the officers had to sit for two days in public as an example for everybody, though it was dangerous for their health. At last they were thrown into prison by Oya Poucelouk and Oya Sycry, but were released again with the fearful understanding that, if they should be sent for a second time to Patany and if they should return without having gained success, the King would put to death not only them but also all their relatives. The King showed thankfulness for the Dutch assistance although it came too late, and as recompense he discharged the Company for about half a year of the usual taxes. If Patany had been conquered by the assistance from Batavia, the Company would have enjoyed many more advantages."

Van Vliet, in another part of the *Treatise*, tells us of the great preparations for a second campaign, but by the intervention of the King of Queda, peace was made between Siam and Patany. He says: "After the first war great numbers of new soldiers were called to arms for the second campaign which had been postponed for one year on account of the bad harvest of rice. In the meantime more than one hundred new vessels had been built in Siam and the neighbouring countries, and the old vessels had been repaired. All these vessels were to take part in a second war with Patany, so that according to all appearances Patany would have had a hard time in 1636. But by intervention of the King of Queda, and from the predictions of the Siamese priests, the King changed his mind. By order of the King, Berkelangh sent ambassadors to Patany in order to offer for the last time peace to the Queen and the mandarins (as a warning and under pretence of having pity for the Patanese). The ambassadors had also to tell the Patanese that the war had been prevented by the King of Queda and the Siamese priests, and if the Patanese would send legates to Siam to ask mercy, His Majesty without any hesitation would be very glad to grant such. In March 1636 appeared thereupon some ambassadors, who were received by Berkelangh. There were as much humble as the Siamese showed pride. The result of the preliminary negotiation was that in August next a distinguished person appeared as a legate. He presented the golden and the silver flowers to the

King as a sign of subjection. This was accepted by His Majesty with great pleasure, and herewith peace was made between the two kingdoms. No claims were made from either side for insults suffered or for damages."

Van Vliet, in the *Treatise* submitted to his Director, Philippe Lucas, gives us a graphic picture of the political relations between Siam and Arracan. It would seem that the King of Arracan did not wish to be on friendly terms with King Prasat Thong, whom he felt to be an usurper. This King of Siam did all in his power to placate the King of Arracan, because he was embroiled with Patani. I cannot do better than insert here the statement of van Vliet:—

"The kings of the Arracan and Siam have lived in peace and in alliance for a very long time without either of them being a vassal or tributary to the other. To maintain this alliance they sent each other ambassadors every year. This was done, not only to promote commerce, but also for reasons of policy. The alliance lasted until the death of the great King (Song Tham). But as soon as this king had passed away the friendship was finished, between the two kingdoms, for the present King having been crowned and having reached the supreme power sent his ambassadors to Arracan as before, although no ambassadors had come from Arracan. The king of Arracan did not receive the legation, saying that he could not recognise an illegal usurper as king of Siam, and he therefore refused to give audience to the ambassadors or to pay any honour to them. The King of Arracan did not allow the ambassadors to return, but did send a boat with some of his subjects to Tannassary to trade as usual. The governors out there reported this to the Siamese King, and asked the King's advice what to do with these people from Arracan. His Majesty commanded that their boats and their goods should be seized and the men taken prisoners and brought to Judia. For more than two years these people from Arracan have been kept prisoners, and during all this time no negotiations about these men have taken place, nor has any hostility been shown by either side, both parties keeping quiet until November last year. At that time some galleys and other small ships were sent from Arracan to the island of Mirghy and to Tannassary with a view to plunder, but as many Moors had left for Masilipatham, and as those who had not left were on their guard, the Arracans could do very little.

"At last the people of Tannassary have seized some Arracans and sent them to Judia. These prisoners after a sharp investigation confessed that the King of Arracan intended to conquer Mirghy and Tannassary, but from want of a sufficient army had postponed the expedition until he might have a better chance. In the meanwhile he wanted to make the rivers in the neighbourhood unsafe in order to prevent the Moors from the coast of Choromandel from coming to Tannassary. The King had moreover asked the assistance of the Dutch and the Portuguese. The Dutch resident had refused such assistance, but the Portuguese had promised to help as much as they were able to. The Siamese King then released the prisoners and sent them over Tannassary, to their own country. They were given a *Traak' hausa Ty-bydy*, or missive, from Berkelangh, in which was mentioned the friendship which for so long time had been maintained between the two kingdoms.

"If the King of Arracan wished to continue this friendship, the King of Siam would be very much pleased, but in case the King of Arracan did not wish to act like this, a strong Siamese army would be sent to his country. As no answer has yet been received from Arracan, it cannot be stated for certain whether the two Kings remain enemies or will become friends."

#### (10) WAR AGAINST CHIENGMAI.

Van Vliet, in his *Historical Account*, mentions a military expedition sent by King Prasat Thong to attack the King of Chiengmai, who he feared might, with the aid of Ava, wage war on him. According to van Vliet, the Princes of Chiengmai and Nan were brothers, but were on bad terms. Owing to the friction between the two principalities, a number of Laos had migrated into Siam and established themselves in the Province of Lavo (Lop-buri). These people, being dissatisfied with their lot, and probably, at the instigation of Chiengmai, left Lavo and went to that town. It was, perhaps, this incident which caused Siam to send an army to punish Chiengmai. As the Prince of Chiengmai had fled before the arrival of the Siamese Army, and as that army therefore had nothing to do, the general in command decided to attack Lycon Lawa (also written *Lauwa* by van Vliet) because the Prince of that Province was a tributary of Chiengmai. Van Vliet, in the *Treatise* speaks of an expedition sent to the North in which the town of Lycoon was destroyed, and then

goes on to record the relations existing between Siam and the kingdom of Lanchang, which he says was not frightened by the fate of Lycoon. This Lycoon is probably Nakhon Lampang. In the *Historical Account* he gives us some information about a war with the North and says that Lycon Lawa was attacked and sacked. Now, is this Lycon Lawa the city of Nakhon Lampang or not? The word Lawa can hardly be transformed into Lampang, and as there was in those days a state near the present day Chiengkham, known as Nakhon Law or Muang Law, van Vliet's Lycon Lawa may be this place. Muang Law was a fortified place, being surrounded by a wall, the remains of which may still be seen to-day hidden in the forest. It may be helpful to the reader, if I reprint what van Vliet said about the relation between Siam and the Northern principalities in the Treatise. So I give an extract as follows, because Siamese History is silent regarding these happenings:

"For various reasons the Siamese kings have often attacked the neighbouring countries like Jangoma, Taiyou, Langsiangh and others. There was peace during a long period until the King of Siam, in 1632, took Lycoon by stratagem, destroyed the town and took the inhabitants as prisoners to Judia. These people came under the government of five mandarins who treated them so badly that many tried to flee away in 1633. But their intention became known before they could go. The chief conspirators were thrown into prison, some were killed by elephants, others thrown into the river and their bodies cut in two, etc.

"The reason for this war was an old claim which the Siamese Kings had on the province and the town. But as the chiefs and the population at the commencement of the rule of the present king refused to pay homage and the yearly taxes, His Majesty decided to force them to do so, and in order to frighten the Patanese (who were rebellious at that time) the King accompanied the army. On leaving his palace the King swore that the four women whom he should meet first would be made an offering to the gods and that his vessels would be besmeared with the women's flesh and blood. This was done; before His Majesty was out of the town he met four young girls sitting in a boat, and on these girls he fulfilled his oath.

"Satisfied he now continued his journey and imagined that victory would be his. I wanted to describe this cruelty in order to show

what great authority the Siamese kings possess and how little their subjects are cared for."

In another part of the Treatise he says :

"The Princes of Jangoma and their neighbours were not at all frightened by the war with Lycoon. But the Princes of Langsiangh sent an ambassador to the Siamese Court with presents in 1633. These presents were made more or less with selfish reasons. For the ambassador brought with him many products from the highlands, such as gold, benjamin and malacca gum with a view to exchanging these for cloth, for which there was great want in Langsiangh at that time. Many private merchants accompanied the ambassador in order to be able to sell their goods with less trouble in the name of the ambassador. But the ambassador and all the people with him had to stop about two miles above the town, and he was not allowed to enter the town before the day that His Majesty gave audience to him and that day the ambassador took leave. They were also so annoyed in their trade by all kinds of monopolies and ill treatment by the Kings, factors that they never came back to Siam again. The Siamese king's seeing afterwards that the absence of the highlanders was a drawback for him and his country, ordered Oya Poucelouck and Berckelangh to send several ambassadors to Langsiangh to invite the people to come back, promising them better treatment and more freedom than on their last visit. But no highlanders appeared in Judia (apparently kept away by distrust); some of them went as far as Poucelouck with their goods. In December last the King sent an ambassador to Langsiangh to remove any objections and to ask the King of Langsiangh to send his subjects again to Siam as in former days promising his people many privileges and much freedom.

"Up to now it is uncertain what has been the result of this mission."

(11) WHERE IS TAPHANG TRU (ตะพั้งตรู), THE PLACE AT WHICH SIAMESE HISTORY STATES THAT KING NARESUAN DEFEATED AND SLEW THE CROWN PRINCE OF BURMA IN A. D. 1593?

Burmese and Siamese histories do not agree as to the exact spot, where the battle between King Naresuan and the Crown Prince of Burma was fought, in which the latter was slain. Burmese history insists that this battle was fought just outside the walls of Ayudhya,



whereas Siamese history says it took place at Taphang Tru (ตะพานตรู), in the district of Suphan, which is many miles distant from Ayudhya. Van Vliet, who was in Ayudhya thirty-nine years after the event, says in the report that the battle was fought half a mile above the town near a ruined temple. Van Vliet's statement is in accord with Burmese history. The description of the battle given in Burmese history differs from the Siamese account. Burmese history says that the Crown Prince was killed by a stray bullet, and after his death the Burmese army retreated to a place two miles from Ayudhya where they performed the funeral obsequies by embalming the dead body with quick-silver. Van Vliet in his account of the battle states, "The Siamese prince ran his adversary with his lance through the body and took the other's elephant. His slaves, who followed him very close by, killed a Portuguese who sat behind the Pegu prince to guide the elephant."

H. M. the late King Rama VI states that the battle was fought at a place called Don Chedi, West of Suphan and not at Taphang Kru. This Taphang Kru of the King and Taphang Tru of Siamese history must be the same place, the difference being only in the spelling of the word. According to the present administrative division of the country, Taphang Tru is in Amphur Ban Thuan, Province of Kan-cha-naburi, but we do not know how the country was divided in A. D. 1593. Historians must decide the exact spot, on which this famous battle was fought, a battle which liberated Siam from the foreign yoke.

(12) THE MANNER OF EXECUTING PRINCES OF THE BLOOD ROYAL.

Van Vliet, in his *Historical Account*, describes the method or manner in which Princes of the Blood Royal were executed. One does not like to say that van Vliet was mistaken regarding this matter, for it is apparent after profound study of the happenings related by him that he was a man of keen perception, a close observer and must have been in touch with the court and knew a great deal about the lives of the noblemen and what was taking place. He says that when a Prince was to be executed, the executioners laid him down on a scarlet carpet, and thrust him through the stomach with a sandalwood stake, and threw his body into a well. I have always understood that a Prince condemned to death was placed in a red sack which was tied up at the mouth. The executioner would then strike blows at the body of the condemned

man with a cudgel or club made of sandal or scented wood until death ensued, and the body buried. On making enquiries from a high personage fully conversant with the life of the palace and all matters pertaining to the Royal Family, I was given an extract from the ancient *Kot Monthienban* (กฎมณเฑียรบาล) of the Ayudhyan period the Code providing for the Control of the Royal Household. I learn from this Code:—"Should a child of the King be guilty of an offence punishable by death he shall be handed over to two officials referred to as *Thaluang Fan Lang* (ทลวงฟันหลวง) and *Nai Waeng Lang* (นายแวงหลวง) to be executed at *Kok Phya*." The Code then goes on to say นายแวงนั้นทักตัก ขุนดาบขุนใหญ่ไปนั่งดู หมั้นทลวงฟันกรบสามคาบ ติดไว้ก่อนจันทร์ แล้วเอาลงขุม นายแวงทลวงฟันผู้ใด เอาผ้าทรมแลหวนทองโทษถึงตาย เมื่อตั้นนั้นลือชลือชบะระอ. The two officials *Mün Thaluang Fan Lang* and *Nai Waeng Lang* are, undoubtedly, the executioner and the flogger. It would seem that the condemned Prince sits in a posture known to the Siamese as *Khatsmat* (ขัดสมาธิ) on a cushioned mat the edges of which are bordered with cloth. This position is one in which the Buddha is represented as sitting when in a state of meditation.

If I understand the Code rightly, the *Nai Waeng* sits on the lap of the condemned Prince facing him, and the executioner strikes a blow on his neck with a club of scented wood causing death. The code is not explicit as to why the *Nai Waeng Lang* should sit on the lap of the Prince, but it seems, probable, that this position is taken up in order to prevent the Prince from moving to avoid the blow or from rising and attempting to escape. Officials known as *Khun Dab* and *Khun Yai* have to be present at the execution, and the executioner *Mün Thaluang Fan Lang* has to perform the act of obeisance three times before the condemned Prince prior to striking the fatal blow. The body was always buried. The word *Thaluang Fan* has a peculiar significance. All executioners before delivering the fatal blow or cut have to approach their victim with a ceremonial dance, and at the conclusion of this dance, turn and make a sudden dash to deliver the blow. Hence the use of the word *Thaluang Fan*. Should any *Nai Waeng* or *Thaluang Fan* appropriate to his own use the clothes or gold ornaments of an executed Prince, death was the punishment. *Kok Phya* is the place at which all Royal executions

took place, and is generally referred to, in Siamese history as Wat Kok Phya.

This high personage said that during the Bangkok Dynasty he believed that executions were carried out in the following manner but was not quite certain as to the exact method, as executions were not carried out in an open manner.—The condemned Prince was placed on a cushioned mat red in colour, lying face downwards with the knees drawn up under his body. A block of sandal or scented wood was so placed that the throat was lying on it. The executioner then with a club of scented wood struck a blow at the back of the neck to break it. The execution was carried out in this manner in order to avoid an effusion of blood, because it was deemed improper that the blood of a Prince should stain Mother Earth. The body was then placed in a weighted sack and thrown into the river.

## PART FIVE.

*Concerning the Japanese in Siam, in the 16th and 17th Centuries.*(1) A FEW REMARKS ON THE CONDITIONS  
PREVAILING IN THE EAST.

During the 16th and 17th centuries of the Christian Era, the Eastern seas were infested with foreign adventurers. These adventurers were of many nationalities, including Spaniards, Portuguese, Dutch, English and Japanese. Piracy was a gentleman's profession, and many of these adventurers would commit an act of piracy on sea or land if a favourable opportunity occurred. The legitimate business (if one may call it so) was commerce and seizing another man's territory. If we read the letters which passed between the Kings of Siam and the Shoguns of Japan and their Ministers, we find that in the year A. D. 1629, communication with Japan was interrupted owing to the activities of Portuguese pirates. (*vide* letter dated 27th March 1629 from Yamada to Sakai Chikara-no-suke). There is documentary evidence to show that these acts of piracy were not confined to the Portuguese or other European nationals only, for a Japanese pirate vessel also attacked a British ship off Patani in A. D. 1605 and killed the captain, John Davis. In A. D. 1610 Japanese pirates were so active on the coast of Cambodia, that the King of that country had to make an official representation to the Shogun of Japan. The acts complained of were attacks on Cham territory and the murder of the inhabitants. The Japanese also attacked shipping on the coast, and even dared to commit their depredations at the port of the Capital. The Shogun advised the King of Cambodia to deal with these men according to the laws of his country. About the same time Japanese pirates are alleged to have murdered an Englishman named Temple Peacock on Cham territory.

In the diplomatic correspondence which passed between Siam and Japan between the year A. D. 1606 and 1629, it is apparent that there was great commercial activity between the two countries, and that there were Japanese settlements in Siam, notably at Ayudhya. The Japanese, who came to Siam, were of three classes: first, men who entered the military service of the Kings of Siam, probably, as early as the reign of King Naresuan; second, traders who settled permanently in the country and established business firms, as well as traders

who came to the country periodically with their ships; and third, Japanese seamen employed as crews on the trading vessels of various nationalities including Japanese. These Japanese were inclined to be troublesome, getting out of hand if they felt that proper consideration had not been shown them, and the more turbulent element would go so far as to commit acts of violence. There is no evidence to show that these men were accompanied by their women, so it is probable that they married Siamese wives, and that their offspring have been absorbed in the race. On the other hand there is evidence to show that in A. D. 1621 Mr. Cocks was informed by the Prince of Hirado that there was an edict in force prohibiting foreigners from purchasing servants, both male and female, of Japanese nationality for removal from Japan, and from possessing armour, spears, swords, guns and ammunition, and also that Japanese should not accept hire as seamen on foreign vessels. This last prohibition would appear to have been a dead letter, for Japanese crews often manned foreign ships. These men may have been Japanese who had left their country prior to the promulgation of this law.

## (2) JAPANESE CONNECTION WITH POLITICAL EVENTS.

The first reference to the Japanese in Siamese history occurs in the reign of King Naresuan. We are told that a body of five hundred Japanese soldiers, under the command of Okphra Senaphimuk, accompanied the King and fought in the battle in which the Crown Prince of Burma was killed (A. D. 1593). The Japanese commander rode a male war-elephant named Fūang Phop Trai (เฟื่องพ้อไตร).

The Siamese record of the reign of King Ekathosrot makes no mention of the Japanese, and does not tell us anything of importance beyond the fact that his son, Prince Suthat, the Maha Uparaj or Crown Prince, committed suicide by taking poison, because his father asked him if he entertained the intention of rebellion. This statement in Siamese history would not lead one to suppose that this act of suicide was connected in anyway with the Japanese. The story is so incomplete that one turns to other sources to ascertain the reason for the suicide. I find in the *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century* (National Library, Bangkok) a letter dated 3rd May 1612, which gives us a clue to the reason for the suicide of Prince Suthat. I relate the story in full in

Part IV, paragraph 1. The reader will gather that I connect the suicide of Prince Suthat with the Japanese raid on Petburi and their occupation of Bangkok. These acts must have taken place in A. D. 1612 and, apparently, caused some anxiety in the Kingdom. If one can trust the statement made by the writer, Mr. Cornelius van Nyenrode, the Japanese were ordered to leave Siam, and he believed that four days after the issue of the order of expulsion all Japanese would have left the country.

I relate this story here as it is of some historical importance, supplying the historian with data for the reconstruction of Siamese history.

The second reference to the Japanese in Siamese history occurs in the reign of King Song Tham, A. D. 1620-1628. Siamese history tells us that several Japanese trading vessels came to Ayudhya. The men on these vessels were angry, because they believed that the Ministers of State had conspired with King Song Tham and murdered the previous King. The Japanese, in a body numbering five hundred men, massed themselves on the Royal plaza waiting to seize the person of the King when he came out to go to the Chom Thong Palace to listen to a religious discourse. At the moment when eight priests from the Wat Pradu seminary went in and brought the King out, passing before the Japanese, the Japanese became excited and called out one to the other saying: "We are here to seize the King. Why are we standing quiet?" The Japanese began quarreling among themselves. At this juncture Okphra Maha Ammat (ออกพระมหาอำมาตย์) appeared on the scene with some soldiers and dispersed the Japanese, many of whom were slain in the fight. The survivors, who escaped, went to their vessels and fled from the country. This history then tells us something which is not true, for it places on record that from that time Japanese ceased coming to Siam.

This statement raises a suspicion in the mind of the reader that something must have happened before, which caused the Japanese seamen to commit this act of violence, for as foreigners, they were not concerned with political happenings in Siam. One therefore makes an attempt to ascertain the true reason for their behaviour. King Song Tham was in regular diplomatic correspondence with the Shoguns of Japan, and the relations between the two countries were most friendly. One of the first letters sent by King Song Tham of which we know, was written in A. D. 1621, the year following his

accession. In all this correspondence, there is not a single note or tone of anger or annoyance against the Japanese. Rather the contrary, for when the King was despatching a military expedition against Cambodia in A.D. 1623, he informed the Shogun and asked him to warn Japanese nationals in Cambodia to be neutral. One is therefore forced, at first sight, to suspect that this act of violence did not take place in the reign of King Song Tham, but rather in the reign of King Prasat Thong, during which there was much trouble with the Japanese, hundreds of whom were killed and imprisoned, only a slender remainder escaping in their vessels from Siam. Furthermore it was during the reign of King Prasat Thong that the Japanese ceased to come to Siam. I deal with this matter in the latter portion of this part of my critical analysis. In this connection, however, it is suitable to remember what van Vliet says in his *Historical Account* about the growing influence of the Japanese. These are van Vliet's words:

"But in place of being grateful for this civility, the Japanese became more arrogant, and did not scruple to say aloud that they would go and attack the King on his throne, and that they would put the town into the same state as in the time of the Great King."

The Great King referred to is King Song Tham, and as van Vliet is so accurate in what he relates, one is forced against logic to believe that an attempt was really made to seize the person of King Song Tham or at least that the Japanese created a disturbance near the palace as related in Siamese history, and that King Prasat Thong was threatened with the same treatment. Hence his reprisals against the Japanese. If one accepts this as correct, the last portion of the statement, namely, "that from this time the Japanese ceased to come to Siam," cannot be applied to the reign of King Song Tham. The wording of the statement in Siamese history, regarding the attempt to seize the person of King Song Tham, causes one to suspect that the Japanese had been implicated in some acts of violence in the previous reigns. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, in his work entitled *Wars Between Siam and Burma*, page 198, says:

"Amongst the European and Japanese records relating to the happenings in Ayudhya at this period, is found a statement that some Japanese merchant ships came to Ayudhya during the reign of King Sri Saowaphak (A. D. 1620). The Japanese, like sailors of other nationalities roaming the seas at that time, frequently committed acts

of piracy. The men of these vessels, finding the government to be weak and the person of the King neither respected nor feared, entered the city of Ayudhya which they pillaged, and then, proceeding to the palace, seized the King and forced him to sign with his own blood a document agreeing to protect the Japanese, and to prevent anyone doing them harm. They then took the Buddhist Primate or Archbishop with them as security for their safe exit from the country, only releasing him on their arrival at Paknam."

It is believed that this act of humiliation, in which the King acquiesced, prompted Prince Intha Raja to remove Sri Saowaphak from the throne and take the reins of government into his own hands. Did this occurrence really take place or not? Siamese history is silent about the attack on King Sri Saowaphak. It may be that the mention of the attempt to seize the person of King Song Tham is merely an echo of what happened in the previous reign. In connection with this matter, however, we have the statement of van Vliet regarding the conduct of the Japanese in the reign of the Great King. (*vide* extracts from his *Historical Account* given above). In his *Treatise*, he makes a statement which is in accord with the story mentioned by Prince Damrong. The following is an extract from this *Treatise*:

"But as the confluence of Japanese increased considerably, their natural pride and impudence grew so great that at last they dared to attack the palace and to seize the King in his own room. They did not let him free again from their tyrannic hands before His Majesty had sworn that He never would remember the harm done to him, nor take any revenge and that he would take the Japanese in his service as soldiers and as bodyguards to the end of his life. These promises remained in force, by which the rogues, not only enjoyed the usurped advantages, but practised also great impudence and violence against the natives and against the foreign traders."

Accounts written by other foreigners such as the Englishman, Peter Williamson Floris, and the Hollander, Sprinckel also give us a picture painted in much the same colours. In some of these accounts a Siamese nobleman, given the name of Okya Krom Nai Wai, is referred to and credited with intriguing to seize the Royal power. This man is believed to have brought some Japanese to Siam and to have been supported by them. He is also said to have favoured the Dutch, who are supposed to have helped him to ascend the throne. This man, Okya Krom Nai Wai, is undoubtedly Pra Ong Lai. It was a



common usage at that time to speak of Siamese noblemen by their name and not by their titles, and this practice was always used by the Japanese, who never refer to Yamada by his title. Krom Nai Wai is one of those curious anomalies in pronunciation so common to Europeans when referring to strange names.

As I have mentioned above, the story of the Japanese having entered the Royal palace and seized the person of the King Sri Saowaphak whom they compelled to sign<sup>a</sup> a bond with his own blood, in which he agreed to grant them the Royal protection, and to employ them as soldiers in his service as well as to concede to them certain privileges, is referred to by Floris. He said that King Sri Saowaphak had executed Krom Nai Wai, whom he suspected of plotting to seize the throne. The Japanese, who were the staunch retainers of Krom Nai Wai, numbering two hundred and eighty, entered the palace, seized the King, and forced him to sign a bond and to hand over to them the four noblemen who had been responsible for the execution of Krom Nai Wai in order that the Japanese might put them to death to satisfy their revenge. Floris, who lived in Patani, must have obtained a garbled version of what took place, for although it is certain that Pra Ong Lai did plot against the King, he was not executed, because he eventually succeeded, with Prince Intha Racha, in deposing and executing King Sri Saowaphak. Sprinckel relates that Okya Krom Nai Wai brought some four or five hundred Japanese, disguised as traders, into Siam in order to help him to seize the throne. He was unable to accomplish this end during the reign of King Song Tham, who was known to Europeans in Patani as Ragihapi. (This word is probably Rajahadji or Rajanabi.) Krom Nai Wai was frustrated from carrying his plot into effect by the action of the noblemen and the Dutchmen, who, although they had received many favours at his hands were loyal to the Royal House, and thus Prince Chetthathirat succeeded his father and on his death was succeeded by his younger brother. When Sprinckel left Patani, the position in Ayudhya was obscure. The references to Krom Nai Wai by both Floris and Sprinckel can leave no doubt in one's mind that Krom Nai Wai was Pra Ong Lai. There is no evidence to prove that Phra Ong Lai ever became Phra Nai Wai, which some scholars believe to be the correct rendering of the word Krom Nai Wai. I therefore conclude that Krom Nai Wai must be a corruption of Phra Ong Lai.

Did the title Phra Nai Wai exist in those days? I have not come across it in the old Law regulating Sakdina (นพดลเวือน).

After analysing the evidence recorded above, I am inclined to think that the Japanese did attack the palace and seize the person of King Sri Saowaphak, and that they compelled him to sign a bond with his own blood, promising to protect them and to grant certain privileges. I also accept the statement of van Vliet that in the reign of the Great King, Song Tham, the Japanese entered the city and made a menacing demonstration against the King on the Royal plaza near or within the palace wall, but on this occasion no act of violence was committed against the King.

The third reference to the Japanese in Siamese history occurs in the reign of King Suthamaracha (A. D. 1656). The story is that when this King ascended the throne, his nephew, Prince Narayana, was appointed Maha Uparaj. The King desired to enjoy the person of a younger sister of Prince Narayana, a beautiful Princess. She complained to her brother, who decided that on account of this offence against royal morality, his uncle was not fit to reign and should be removed. Prince Narayana commenced to collect a force to attack the palace. Okya Senaphimuk and Chaiya Sura (ไชยสุระ) offered their services and that of forty Japanese under their command. This Japanese force took part in the fighting. They joined Rajalila's troops and were present at the assault on the Sri Sanphet palace. This Rajalila was a Malay official. The title Chaiya Sura is, probably, Mūn Chaiya Sura, (หมื่นไชยสุระ) the Paymaster of the Japanese contingent. There was another officer Khun Sura Songkhram (ขุนสุระสงคราม), who was the Palat Krom or Adjutant. The word Sura is synonymous with bravery and was aptly given to these Japanese officers, for the Japanese had the reputation of being the bravest people in the East. An interesting light is thrown on this incident by which Prince Narayana seized the Royal power and ascended the throne. (*vide* extract from *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century* quoted in Part III, paragraph 3.)

### 3) KING PRASAT THONG AND THE JAPANESE.

Having placed on record what is said in Siamese history about the Japanese, I now return to van Vliet to ascertain what he says about

the attitude of King Prasat Thong towards them. In his *Historical Account* now under analysis he tells us:

"Then the King, being warned of the arrogance of their words and fearing the result of a desperate resolve, determined to be beforehand with them. For this purpose, he had fire set to the Japanese quarter on the night of the 26th October 1632, when, by the overflowing of the river all the streets of the town were under water. Further, he at the same time had cannon fired on their houses with such fury that they were compelled to throw themselves into their junks. But inasmuch as they were not in sufficient numbers to be able to arm both junks, they made use of only one, in which they descended with the current of the river, fighting all the time as they retreated. The King caused the attack and pursuit to be kept up, at the cost of the lives of several Siamese. Then these Japanese, who had dwelt in other quarters of the town, were diligently searched for, and were cruelly put to death, to the great contentment of those to whom their arrogance had been unsupportable."

This is the last act in the drama which led to the expulsion of the Japanese from Siam in A. D. 1632. Is there any evidence to support this statement of van Vliet? We find in a Japanese work, entitled *Tsuko-ichiran*, a long account of the happenings in Siam during this period making special reference to the position of the Japanese. The *Tsuko-ichiran* was compiled during the last years of the Tokugawa Shogunate (A. D. 1853) by the diplomatic authorities in Japan. It purports to be a history of intercourse between Japan and foreign countries. Although the account is garbled and inaccurate in many parts, for it brings forward to the reign of King Prasat Thong events which happened several decades before, still, that portion of the account which refers to the expulsion of the Japanese agrees in a large degree with the statement of van Vliet. This Japanese book tells us that Yamada was poisoned by an emissary named Chanthra, (จันทรา) sent from Ayudhya to Petburi by the King's mother, who was engaged in an amorous intrigue with the Kalahom. The matter of this intrigue is merely an echo of the intrigue between Lady Sri Suda chanthra (ท้าวศรีจุฑาจันทร์) and Khun Worawongsathirat, so we need not pay any attention to it. The story now goes on to relate that O-In, the son of Yamada, who was in Nakhorn Sri Thamarat, was so incensed against Ayudhya for this act of treachery, that he determined to

have his revenge. Ayudhya, fearing that O-In would rebel, sent an embassy headed by the same Chanthra to Nakhorn Sri Thammarat, requesting O-In to surrender the Government. O-In agreed, but stipulated that the handing over should be done with traditional ceremony. Chanthra, not suspecting treachery, went with three hundred men to the place appointed for the meeting. He had no sooner arrived there than he realised that he was surrounded. A fight ensued, in which his men were defeated and he himself alone fell into the hands of O-In, who thus satisfied his vengeance. O-In immediately began collecting forces for the attack on Ayudhya and if successful, he had the intention of placing a member of the Royal House on the throne. Rumours began to circulate in Ayudhya that the army of O-In numbered 300,000 men. The Kalahom became panic-stricken and feared that if the Japanese rose in revolt, Ayudhya would fall into their hands. He therefore conceived the plan of seizing their vessels so that, having no means of escaping, they would fall an easy prey to the Siamese soldiers. An order was sent to the Japanese community living in Ayudhya to send the captains of the two Japanese vessels lying in the river into the city. When the captains received this order they went and consulted with Iva kura He-i-je-mon, the Japanese head-man, at his house. The Japanese head-man was convinced that it was the intention of the Government by this move to find out whether the Japanese in Ayudhya were partisans of O-In, who had killed the Siamese ambassador Chanthra, or were loyal to the country of their adoption. If the Government felt that the Japanese were disloyal, then it was certain that they would kill the two captains. Therefore, whether the captains went or not, the danger would be the same. A conference was convened, which was attended by the principal Japanese. The conference came to the conclusion that the Government desired to hold the two captains as security, knowing full well that the Japanese people loved justice and their kith and kin and that they would not dare to cause any disturbance or attack the city, for fear of the two men being killed in revenge. Furthermore the meeting realised that, as there were many friends of O-In in the city, O-In would not make an immediate onslaught, in the hope that the difficulty might be overcome by negotiation, and the two captains be released. On the other hand, this policy would give the Siamese authorities time within which to collect their forces and attack the Japanese later. Anyhow, when

the manoeuvres of the Siamese were so clear, it would be an act of stupidity to play their game. It was therefore thought best that the Japanese community should take refuge on the Japanese ships and defend themselves there. While the Japanese were in consultation, a second messenger arrived, and conveyed an urgent order for the surrender of the two captains. These two men, named Osajemon and Jubei, said if they did not go in response to the order they would be characterised as cowards. Therefore, when death was coming to them whether they went or not, death would be their lot. The two captains decided to go into the city with a small armed force, having arranged with their compatriots that on hearing a signal, which would be given by discharging a gun, all those who were true men were to rush into the city to assist and fight by the side of the captains even unto death, and by this act of supreme sacrifice, the renown of the Japanese would spread to the surrounding countries. The two captains with twenty-five men carrying pistols, ten carrying bows and arrows, and a number carrying spears marched into the city, while the remainder of the Japanese, under the command of He-i-ye-mon, held themselves in readiness to go to the assistance of the captains. When the Kalahom heard that an armed party of Japanese had come into the city, he sent an army officer to go and ask them why they had come armed. The Japanese replied that O-In having killed the Siamese ambassador at Nakhorn, this act might cause the Kalahom to believe that the Japanese would side with O-In, and he would therefore attempt to slay the Japanese in retaliation. For these reasons they had come armed, for the Japanese hold as a military tenet that, when danger approaches and they have to die, they should do so facing the enemy with their weapons in their hands. When the Kalahom was told what the Japanese had said, he sent a second time to inform them that the Siamese Government had sent the military expedition to Nakhorn to punish O-In for his act of rebellion. The Japanese not concerned in this matter had the right to return to their own country whenever they desired to do so. He feared that the Japanese in Ayudhya might join O-In, and therefore he ordered them to give back the land occupied by them to the Government and return to Japan immediately. However, as their ships were easily handled and sailed, and could be used in acts of piracy, he commanded that the Japanese should hand their ships over to the Government, and the Government on their part would

place at their disposal six or seven large Siamese vessels and convey the Japanese as far as Annam. A member of the party replied to this request saying:

"As regards the land, we only hold it on lease, and therefore we willingly return it, but the ships being our property, we will on no account surrender them. As regards the question of our leaving your country in Siamese ships, we beg to say that we are not conversant with the sailing qualities of Siamese vessels; we therefore reject your offer, and there is only one way by which we will return to our own country and that is in our own ships."

The Japanese, having submitted this ultimatum, turned and marched out of the city and joined their friends. They laughed among themselves at the great plans which they had prepared for their own protection, seeing that things had not turned out as they believed would be the case. They agreed that to remain in Siam any longer under the existing conditions would be impossible, so they collected together their property with the intention of leaving. At this juncture an order was issued by the Government laying down that as the Japanese had decided to leave the country, no Japanese should be allowed to enter any of the gates of the palace. Should any Japanese disobey this order, he would be punished according to his offence. One Japanese went through a gate. He was immediately chased by the Palace guards, and, in defending himself, killed four and wounded nine of the guards before he was captured. The next morning the Government demanded that the Japanese community should send thirteen of their members into the city that they might be executed as the price of the blood shed by the Japanese in the palace. The Japanese refused. Negotiations went on for some time without any result, and finally an ambassador from India, who was in Ayudhya at the time, was asked to act as arbitrator in the dispute. The arbitrator ordered that the Japanese should pay as blood money 133 catties weight of silver and that the Government should return to the Japanese the thirty ships belonging to them. It is true that, although, the Japanese had the strongest desire to return to their country, they felt that they could not take this step till they had arranged for the protection of the families of the men who were with O-In, which was a first and necessary step of importance. They therefore decided to remove the property and the families of those men to their ships. On the fourth waning of the second month,

January or February, in the year A. D. 1633, the Japanese pulled up anchor and left Ayudhya. The Siamese, seeing that they had taken the families of the men who were serving with O-In away with them, believed that they would go to Nakhorn Sri Thammarat and join forces with O-In and return to attack Ayudhya. The Siamese therefore, collected their forces and attacked the Japanese ships as they were preparing to leave. A great fight took place on the river. The Siamese were repulsed losing a large number of men and ships; and the Japanese then left Ayudhya, having suffered small losses. The Siamese then reorganized their forces and chased the Japanese down the river. When they came near the bar they called on a Portuguese ship, which was lying there, to prevent the Japanese from getting away. A second fight ensued, in which the Portuguese were worsted, and the Japanese escaped to the high sea. In these two fights, it is computed that the Japanese losses were forty-three dead and a large number wounded; but the exact number is not known.

As the wind was favourable, the Japanese ships soon arrived at Nakhorn, the men on board having the intention of joining O-In in an attack on Ayudhya. The Patanese, however, not having supplied the contingent of three thousand men they had promised, O-In was unable to move. The people of Nakhorn, seeing his difficulty, deserted from his standard, an example which was also followed by many of the Japanese. O-In's position became desperate, and, eventually, with sixteen or seventeen followers, he fled to Cambodia. Some of the Japanese were able to return to Japan. When O-In arrived in Cambodia a civil war was being fought between the King and his brother. O-In and his men fought on the side of the King, and he and six of his men were killed in a battle in which the King was defeated.

In this Japanese account, the Kalahom is King Prasat Thong. This Japanese account of what happened to the Japanese and the manner in which they left the country is, probably, fairly correct, although it does not agree entirely with van Vliet's story.

According to these statements of van Vliet and the record in the *Tsulco-ichiran* quoted above, exact dates are given for the attack organised by King Prasat Thong on the Japanese in Ayudhya. Van Vliet says the attack commenced on the 26th October 1632 and the *Tsulco-ichiran* gives January or February 1633 as the date on which the Japanese pulled up anchor and were attacked. A question arises as to whether King Prasat Thong had had trouble with the Japanese

in Ayudhya before A. D. 1632. I ask this question because I find an entry dated 5th December 1631 in the *Dagh Register* or the Daily Journal of Dutch East India Company in Batavia, which cannot be doubted. We learn from this entry that the King of Siam sent a letter with valuable presents to the Prince of Orange and the Governor General of the Dutch East Indies in reply to a letter from the Governor General, whose letter had been received by the King himself "with such solemnities and honours as never heretofore have been shown to any ambassador." The entry now gives us the reason for the high honour shown to the Dutch Ambassador. It states:

"Last year the King, who feared that the Japanese residents might attack and murder him, intended to surprise the Japanese on a certain date and to kill them, for which purpose he held 4,000 soldiers at his disposal. The Japanese however, who had been warned in time, made their escape unnoticed in a junk, which was moored abreast of their quarters and sailed down the river. They were, however, pursued to the estuary, by a Siamese fleet of 100 vessels and 4,000 men, and then succeeded in driving the Siamese back, killing 500 of their enemies.

"As the Japanese were not allowed to land in Ligor, they sailed to Cambodia, trying to induce that country to declare war on Siam. The Siamese, by way of defence, left a fleet of about 100 vessels moored in the mouth of the Menam.

"The King earnestly appealed to the Dutch for help, this explaining the above extraordinary honours shown by his Majesty."

When did this incident occur and is it the same affair as is referred to by van Vliet and the *Tsuko-ichiran*? This entry is precise and causes me to think that this incident has no connection with the attack organised by King Prasat Thong on the Japanese at the end of A. D. 1632 or the beginning of 1633. If I am correct in this conjecture then King Prasat Thong must have expelled a certain section of the Japanese community before the final expulsion in A. D. 1632.

Van Vliet speaks of the Japanese threat to attack the King on his throne, and to put the town into the same state as in the time of the Great King. Can this attack on the Japanese, which must have taken place in A. D. 1630, be the King's reply to the threat and can it be that van Vliet was not aware of it? Reading van Vliet's *Historical Account* one is led to believe that the attack organised on the 26th October 1632 was the King's reply to the threat. I am not



inclined to think that the entry quoted is a mistake, for it is supported by a definite date, the 5th December 1631, a year prior to the date mentioned by van Vliet.

The record of this incident should be of value to the historian for it shows that King Prasat Thong was not viewed by the Japanese with favourable eyes after he had got rid of Yamada, which he did towards the end of A. D. 1629. Thus there were two major incidents; first, the attack on the Japanese in A. D. 1630 and the second, in A. D. 1632.

Although King Prasat Thong had expelled the Japanese from the Kingdom in the manner described above, it would seem that, some time after, he relented and permitted some seventy to eighty Japanese to return to Ayudhya, where they were allowed to settle and were given every consideration. In May 1635, King Prasat Thong attempted to re-open negotiations with Japan. In that year he sent an ambassador Okkhun Sri Phakdi to Japan for that purpose, but the attempt failed for the Japanese refused to receive Okkhun Sri Phakdi. He left Japan on the return voyage and called at a port in Formosa. While on the river Mattauw on the 11th January 1637, a gale arose, the ship was wrecked, and the ambassador drowned. The King refused to accept defeat, for he made another attempt to negotiate with Japan in A. D. 1639, which was also unsuccessful.

King Prasat Thong, in allowing the Japanese to re-enter the country and in his endeavours to restore political and commercial relations with Japan, was probably moved to do this owing to the unfavourable economic conditions which had fallen on the country. The trade with Japan was of paramount importance for Siam, for the Japanese brought large amounts of silver bullion to Siam, with which to finance the trade. We know that the foreign commerce of Siam during the reign of King Prasat Thong had shrunk considerably. This must have been a cause of anxiety to the King, who, seeing his country becoming poorer year by year, feared that rebellion and plots against himself might be fomented, on the ground that the disgrace in the country was ordained by the Gods as a punishment for his many evil acts in murdering the Princes and the flower of the nobility.

It is generally believed by historians that the refusal of the Shogun to restore friendly political and commercial relations with Siam was due to the acts committed by King Prasat Thong against members of the Royal Family and his usurpation of the throne, as

well as to the brutal manner in which he had treated the Japanese. It is certain that the usurpation of the throne and the murders of the Princes came as a shock to the Shogun, for such acts of disloyalty were opposed to Japanese ideals, and this may have influenced the Shogun in breaking off treaty relations, but this is doubtful. The treatment of the Japanese in Siam by King Prasat Thong would not seem to have annoyed or perturbed the Shogun, for we learn from a work, entitled *A Description of the Mighty Kingdoms of Japan and Siam*, written by Francis Caron and Joost Schouten about the middle of the 17th century, that the Shogun did not approve of the acts of violence committed by Japanese nationals in foreign countries. They say :

"The Japanners of old had great correspondency with them in China, whose Kings sent ambassadors yearly to each other, for entertaining their alliance, and the negotiation of their subjects. It happened that the Japanners, who were numerous in China, did mutiny, and in a tumult destroy a whole city, plundering, ravishing, and spoiling all ; but the Chineses, getting into a body, fell upon the Japanners again, and put all they could meet with to the sword. The King of China, hearing of these discords, was no lesse amazed then in a wonder, that so few could do so much mischief, and therefore resolved to banish the Japanners for ever out of his Kingdom ; in memory whereof he caused a great stone Pillar to be set up, with the story of their exile in letters of gold. He likewise set out a proclamation, that none of his subjects, upon paine of death, should saile any more to Japan ; which order was then more exactly observed then at present, and yet they do not directly go thither ; for the Chineses, under a colour of other voyages, do often slip into Japan. The Emperor of Japan doth not at all obstruct their traffick, permitting them to enter and leave his country when they please, saying he will not reward evil for evil ; considering also that the reason of this prohibition, on the other side, came not through any fault of the Chineses, but by the disorders of his own people. Since the Japanners have been banished out of China, they used to sail to Tayouan (Taiwan, Formosa) where the Chineses brought them their merchandises ; but that being discovered by the Court of China, they were prohibitted this traffick likewise. Many years after the Japanners obtained leave to return to Tayouan, as also to go to Touckien, Cambodia, and Siam ; which negotiation was again disturb-

ed, upon this consideration, that the Emperour of Japan would neither offend nor be offended by any strangers, which had already happened by the extortions of the Governours of Siam and Tayouan; and therefore none of his subjects should any more traffick or deal with strangers out of their own country. Another reason was, because he would have no arms transported out of his Empire, (which could not be hindred by no way but this), insomuch that two Chinesses, Father and son were both crucified at Finando, for endeavouring to convey some away in private; and five Japanners, who had sold them the said Arms, without knowing their design, were beheaded. But the chief cause of this inhibition is, least the Natives of this Country, travelling into strange places, might be converted to the Christian Religion, and upon their return infuse those forraigne principles into their Countrey-Men, which they have endeavoured, to suppress with so much blood and violence."

The prohibition referred to in the above statement, was, probably, the prohibition contained in an Edict promulgated in the year A. D. 1636, and not the prohibition of A. D. 1620. This must be the case, for the statement alludes to the extortions of the Governor of Siam.

The Japanese do not take a prominent part in the affairs of Siam from this time on, for it was only in A. D. 1887 that treaty relations between the two countries were restored.

#### 4) TOPOGRAPHY OF AYUDHYA AND THE JAPANESE SETTLEMENT.

It may interest the reader to know something about the topography of the ancient city of Ayudhya, a city which was truly glorious and impregnable. Ayudhya was besieged several times between A. D. 1350 and 1767, but was never taken by force of arms and assault. The enemy only succeeded in capturing the city by the treachery of some of its defenders. Japanese, who occupied such a prominent place in Siamese history, had their principal settlement outside the city for, it would seem that foreigners were not allowed to live within the city walls.

The city of Ayudhya was situated on an artificial island lying between the Prasak and Chao Phya rivers, which were connected by a canal running from East to South-West known as Klong Muang, forming the Northern and Western boundaries of the city. From the point, where the Prasak river entered this Klong Muang, another waterway known as Lam Khu Khü Na, (ลำคูชื่อน้ำ) which forms the Eastern

boundary, runs South and joins the Chao Phya river, which is the Southern boundary of the city. Thus Ayudhya is surrounded by water. Below the point south of the city, where the waterway Lam Khu Khü Na joins the Chao Phya river, was situated the harbour, to which all trading vessels went for examination before unloading their cargoes. The following foreign settlements in the order given were situated on the East bank of the Chao Phya river: Chinese, Dutch, English, and Japanese. Across the river, nearly opposite the Japanese settlement, lived the Portuguese, whose settlement had a river frontage of three kilometres. Each settlement had its own wharves. Thus it will be seen that the Japanese settlement was some distance below the city.

## PART SIX.

*Concerning the position of Yamada Nagamaza.*

## (1) EARLY LIFE OF YAMADA NAGAMAZA.

Yamada was known to his friends as Yamada Nagamaza, but when Yamada wrote to the Ministers of State in Japan at the command of the King, which he did several times he signed his name as Yamada Nizayemon Nagamaza and sometimes Yamada Nizayemonjojo Nagamaza, but when the Ministers of State in Japan wrote to him, they gave him the style of Yamada Nagamaza (ยามาดา นากามาซา). I learn from Mr. R. Amada of His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Legation that Nagamaza is the personal name of Yamada. On attaining manhood the term Nizayemon was added to the name. This term sometimes signified that the bearer had a military position, and particularly so when *jo* was added. A full account of the correspondence referred to here will be found in Part VII of this critical analysis.

When a man of the people attains to celebrity, it is the practice to try and find out where and when he was born, and who his parents were. I have never understood the necessity for this, as I hold that it is not a matter of any importance. The man lived, possessed high qualities and did great deeds: that should be enough for the historians. As, however, the human mind demands information of this kind, I will try to supply it. There has been much conjecture and much research work done to settle this point, but without much success.

I learn from a work entitled *The Exploits of Okya Senabhimuk (Yamada Nagamaza) the Japanese General in the 17th century* written by Mr. Sakae Miki of the Department of Fine Arts in Siam that certain authorities believe that Yamada was born in the Province of Suruga, while others state that he was a palanquin-bearer of Okubo Jiemon. We are not told anything of his parentage, or his age when he left Japan for Siam, whether he was married and had children by a Japanese wife or not, but we do know from van Vliet that, at the time of his death *circa* A. D. 1630-31, a son who held the title of Okkhun, aged eighteen years, was with him in Nakhon Sri Thammarat. This boy is referred to in Japanese records as O-In, which some people believe to be a corruption of Okkhun. I cannot agree to this. Some scholars are inclined to think that Yamada came to Siam in A. D. 1620 or 1621, but favour A. D. 1620. If this date is correct, the son I have referred to must have been born of a Japanese

mother in Japan and accompanied his father to Siam, when a little child. I am not prepared to accept either A. D. 1620 or 1621 as the year of the coming to Siam of Yamada. We find a letter from Yamada to Doi Toshikazu, dated 13th May 1621, in which he informed this high dignitary that the King of Siam was sending an embassy composed of two officials named Khun Phichitsombat (ขุนพิชิตสมบัติ) and Khun Prasert (ขุนประเสริฐ) to the Court of the Shogun, and asked Doi Toshikazu to be so kind as to arrange that these ambassadors be presented to and granted an audience by the Shogun. Yamada sent a personal present of two shark skins and two hundred catties weight, approximately 266 lbs, of gunpowder. Is it likely that Yamada, a palanquin-bearer in Japan (a man of no position), would be entrusted by the King or the Minister of Foreign Affairs with the important duty of writing to a high official in Japan about such a delicate matter as a diplomatic mission immediately after his arrival in Siam? For Yamada's letter to be of the slightest value, it is necessary to suppose that Yamada was well known to be a trusted servant of the King, by the Court and other high officials of state of Japan. Furthermore, it is significant that Yamada sent a personal present of gunpowder. Now Siamese gunpowder at that time had the reputation of being the best in the East and could not be exported without the royal sanction. The Siamese embassy sent to Japan, referred to above, carried a personal letter from King Song Tham (A. D. 1621) to the Shogun of Japan, telling him of his desire that the trade between the two countries, which was already considerable, should be further increased. The King then went on to say that he had appointed Khun Chai Sunthon as head of the Japanese community in Ayudhya and therefore the interests of Japanese traders and others would be well cared for. Yamada's letter went with this royal despatch. The Khun Chai Sunthon mentioned in the King's letter is generally believed to have been Yamada, but I have some doubts about this. It is possible that a mistake has been made by the translator and that the official referred to held the title of Khun Chaiya Sura (ขุนไชยสุระ). This seems the more likely, as the title Khun Chaiya Sura was the one held by the Paymaster of the Japanese troops (สมุหบัญชีกรมอาสาญี่ปุ่น). If my surmise is correct then Yamada may have become the Adjutant or Palat Krom (ปลัดกรม) with the title of Khun Sura Songkhram, before becoming Okya Senaphimuk. For these reasons only, I dismiss

A. D. 1620 or 1621 as the year of Yamada's arrival in Siam. Yamada must have come to Siam many years earlier, probably in the reign of King Ekathosrot, and, that having gained the King's favour, was an important personage amongst the Japanese community and well known to the Shogun's representatives who, one supposes, came to Siam from time to time, although it does not appear in the diplomatic correspondence between the two countries that the Shogun ever sent an embassy to this country. This belief of mine is supported by a statement in the work written by Francis Caron and Joost Schouten entitled *A True Description of the Mighty Kingdoms of Japan and Siam*. On page 84 under the heading *Their correspondency with Strangers*, we find this statement:

"The Japanners hold no correspondency at all abroad, having never yet sent their Ambassadors into any forraigne countries, except China, which they have also long discontinued. The King of Spain, the Pope, and the King of Siam, have sent several extraordinary Ambassadors to this Court, which were indeed honourably received and feasted, *though never any returns made again by this Prince.*"

If this is true the Shogun and his Ministers could only have known of the high position held by Yamada through reports conveyed to Japan by the captains of trading vessels or by the Siamese envoys several years prior to A. D. 1621.

There is another point to be considered and that is the age of Yamada's son at the time of his father's death. There is no evidence to show that Japanese women accompanied their men to Siam, nor does it seem likely that they did, for not only was the voyage full of perils but the lives the men led was adventurous and surrounded by danger. It is possible that Yamada brought his baby son with him, but this is not likely. I therefore accept the theory that Yamada married a Siamese wife by whom he had children. There is a story extant, that Yamada's wife was a lady of the royal blood and there should be no obstacle to accepting this as being true, for a lady of rank below that of Princess (หม่อมเจ้าหญิง) could marry a commoner. Supposing that Yamada's wife was a lady of this position, then she would be able to advance his interest as she had the right of entry to the inner chambers of the palace. I am inclined to think that Yamada came to Siam about A. D. 1610 or even earlier and was probably not quite fifty years of age at the time of his death.

It may intrigue the reader to know where this man Yamada, who played such an important part in history during the reigns of four Kings, actually lived. The foreign settlements in Ayudhya were established outside the city. It is certain that Yamada, even at the zenith of his power, lived outside the city in the Japanese settlement known to-day as *Ban Yipun*, for van Vliet records that when Okya Kalahom wished to see Okya Senaphimuk, who refused to attend the palace audiences, he went to him secretly, travelling by boat on the river, and again when Okya Senaphimuk who had been cajoled into accepting the appointment of Governor of Nakhon Sri Thammarat was returning to his house, his boat nearly capsized in the river owing to the weight of the many presents showered on him. The Japanese settlement was situated below the other foreign settlements on the east bank of the river. An explanation of the topography of the city and the foreign settlements has been given in Part V. of this critical analysis, which deals with the Japanese in Siam.

## (2) YAMADA'S OFFICIAL POSITION IN AYUDHYA.

From what van Vliet tells us about the position of Yamada in the Court, it is clear that he had been raised to high rank, for he attained the title of Okya Senaphimuk, a title specially created for the officer in charge of the Japanese volunteers in the military service of the Kings of Siam. When this title was first created, judging from the *Sakdina* law (นพพลภินัน), said to have been promulgated by King Ekathosrot, it was only that of *Okphra* not *Okya*. Working on this analogy, it would be but reasonable to assume that a Japanese had held the position of *Okphra* Senaphimuk, perhaps in the reign of King Naresuan, prior to its being conferred on Yamada. This is confirmed by Siamese history, for an *Okphra* Senaphimuk commanded a body of five hundred Japanese volunteers in the army of King Naresuan, who were present at the battle in which the Crown Prince of Burma was slain (A. D. 1593).

It would seem that when Yamada first joined the service of the King, he held a minor position. He may have held a civil appointment, Khun Chai Sunthon, as head of the Japanese community or he may have been Khun Chaiya Sura, the Paymaster of the Japanese troops; but be this as it may, he rose step by step until became the head of the Japanese soldiers serving the King. There is on evidence to show that he ever led the soldiers in war. Yamada



was always in attendance at the court, like any other Siamese nobleman, and the position he eventually attained as Okya Nakhon Sri Thamarat was that of a Governor or Royal Commissioner, a position which included that of the chief of the military forces, somewhat akin to the position of a British Governor, who is also Commander in Chief of the Forces.

There is some doubt as to whether Yamada held a military position in his youth; but if he did, he was not a soldier in the modern sense of the word, though he possessed, like many Japanese, all the qualities of a soldier. It was usual in those days, and for many years after, to transfer a man from a civil to a military title, and the title of Senaphimuk in the military hierarchy was given him as being the Chao Krom Asa Yipun (เจ้ากรมอาสาญี่ปุ่น), which may be translated as Chief of the Japanese soldiers. Phra Ong Lai himself had always held Court appointment as Chamün Sri Sorarak (จามื่นศรีวรราช) and Okya Sri Worawong (ออกญาศรีวรพงษ์), but he eventually received a military title as Okya Kalahom Suriwong. His real title was probably ออกญมหาเสนาบดีวิริยภักดีบดีดินพระสุรินทร์ ภาชีอภัยพิริยปรการมพหุสมุหะพระกลาโหม which means, shortly, the Chief Minister of State in charge of the Kalahom (Ministry of Defence). The words used in this title all have military implications.

Yamada was a man of great spiritual courage and of devoted loyalty to the Royal House he served. A Japanese holds loyalty to the Imperial House as the only ideal of his life, for which he will willingly sacrifice it. Yamada gave the same loyalty to the Kings of Siam as he gave to his Emperor. It is clear from what van Vliet said that Yamada was frequently tempted by Okya Kalahom to desert this ideal and to join with him in his plots to seize the Royal power. Yamada always resisted these attempts and continued to give his devoted loyalty to the King and his children. It would seem that Yamada was very susceptible to flattery. In his struggle against Okya Kalahom he was outmatched by the superior astuteness and the adroit language used by Okya Kalahom, who was a past master in intrigue. He was outwitted and fell into the snare prepared for him by the flattery which Kalahom showered on him. This weakness in the character of Yamada led to his death. In reviewing the career of a foreigner who has attained to high rank in the service of a country not his own, one should allow for the

difficulties which such a man has to face every day. He is a foreigner; he is not fully trusted; he is the envy of, and the target for all the darts of jealousy fired on him by the noblemen; and when such a man as Yamada had the military strength to impose his will at any moment on the noblemen or even on the King, if he desired so to do, one can easily understand the difficulty of his position and the necessity for accommodating his acts to the circumstances as they arose. This was the more necessary in the case of Yamada, as he refused to be disloyal to his ideal of service to the King and his children. If Yamada had not given way to Okya Kalahom and accepted the position of Okya Nakhon Sri Thamarat, there would have been a struggle to the death between the two men, in which Yamada would probably have been the victor, and the history of the country would have been very different from the history which we know.

### (3) YAMADA'S INFLUENCE ON CURRENT EVENTS IN SIAM.

What I have already written is merely a sketch of the man, Yamada, and his position at Court. I now propose to fill in the picture, so that the reader may be able to have a better understanding of the character of this remarkable man, who played such an important part in Siamese history, and his influence on current events about which this history is silent. Yamada first appears in the political arena at the time of the death of King Song Tham, when the noblemen were divided into two factions regarding the succession. Van Vliet tells us that the dying King wished that his son, Chetthathirat, should succeed in opposition to the legitimate claim of his brother, Prince Sri Sin. The controversy led to a political crisis. Okya Sri Worawong, the confidant of the King, did all in his power to further the King's desire. Van Vliet tells us:

"That in order to remove all obstacles which might prevent his son succeeding, he (the King) desired by means of Okya Sriworawong to secure Okya Senaphimocq, the General of the Japanese, who are maintained by the Kings of Siam to the number of about six hundred; and this was done, Senaphimocq promising to the other and swearing solemnly that he would help to put the King's son on the throne. In order to give proof of his affection, Senaphimocq secretly lodged a good number of his Japanese in the Palace and its environs."

Okya Kalahom Suriwong of the reign of King Song Tham, who had been elevated to that rank from the position of Okphra Maha Amata-yathibodi as a reward for having saved the King's life when it was threatened by some Japanese seamen in the first year of his reign, attempted to seduce Okya Senaphimuk from his loyalty to the King, but failed. This Okya Kalahom was put to death in the reign of King Chetthathirat, because he supported Prince Sri Sin. This political crisis, about which van Vliet gives us full details, was a turning point in Siamese history. If Prince Sri Sin had ascended the throne the history of Siam would probably have developed in a way totally different from the course it actually took. Yamada, by supporting what he believed to be the true wishes of King Song Tham, and by his refusal to assist Okya Kalahom in placing Prince Sri Sin on the throne, gives us an insight into his character, which knew only of loyalty, a loyalty so strong, and so firm that it could not be seduced. This loyalty was the keynote of his life.

Van Vliet places on record an incident connected with this political crisis or its aftermath, which shows the nobility of character of Yamada and how he was ready to sacrifice his own life in order to succour the lives of his friends or those in distress. I give the story in van Vliet's own words:

"Those who were known to be attached to the late King's brother, or who had not clearly declared themselves when the late King wished to know their feeling in the matter, were at once arrested. They were closely imprisoned, and their houses and goods given over to pillage. Their slaves were taken from them, and at the same time the King had three of his principal prisoners taken from prison and cut in pieces at Thacham, (Tha Chang) one of the gates of the Palace, as disturbers of the public peace, and as having conspired against the true and legitimate heir of the Crown. Their heads and other members were exposed on various lofty places in the town to serve as a warning to those who might wish to offer opposition to this illegitimate succession. In addition, all their property was confiscated, and the King caused it to be distributed among his favourites.

"These three lords who were thus executed were among the most powerful, the most wealthy, and the most highly placed in the Kingdom, and in the previous reign (King Song Tham) had been greatly considered by the people and greatly loved by the King.

One was Oya Calahom, General of the elephants, who was one of the six leading Mandarins and one of the richest men in the Kingdom, possessing as he did more than 2,000 slaves, 200 elephants and a number of very beautiful horses. The second was Opera Taynam, General of the Cavalry, who had previously been Oya Berkelangh (ออกญาพระคัลัง) for five years and two months on end, and in that position had amassed great wealth. The late King had honoured him with his special favour, because of his virtues and his eloquence. The third was Oloangh Thamtraylocq (ออกหลวงธรรมไตรโลกย์), who had been governor of Tanassary, and who was a noble of great age and held in high esteem among them. It was solely the hatred of Oya Siworrawongh which brought about the death of these nobles, and they had not merited it.

"There were also taken from prison and led to the gate of the Palace two other nobles, to wit Opera Sersy Anerat (ออกพระศรีเนาวรัตน์) and Opera Tjula (ออกพระจุลา), bound and pinioned, the intention being to put them to death. But Oya Senaphimocq, General of the Japanese, saved their lives by embracing them and covering them with his body, in such a way that the blows of the executioner could not reach them without killing him, and by sending at the same time to Oya Siworrawongh to ask that they should be pardoned. This powerful intercession, joined to that of the ecclesiastics of the country, saved their lives, but they were deprived of their offices, their property and their titles, and even of their liberty, since they were confined in a close prison all the time till after the revolution of the administration, when some were executed, others exiled, and others set at liberty."

The revolution referred to by van Vliet took place in the year A. D. 1629, within which year Okya Kalahom executed Kings Chetthathirat and Athitayawong, and placed himself on the throne. Yamada, who had now come into great prominence, and displayed such loyalty to his noble ideals as to be a potential danger to Okya Kalahom, was got rid of and sent to Nakhon Sri Thammarat. These events constituted the revolution.

Events moved rapidly. On the death of King Song Tham which took place in April 1628, his son Chetthathirat was proclaimed King.

A Prince, a brother of the late King, who was a Buddhist priest highly respected for his sanctity and knowledge of the scriptures, was in residence at Wat Rakhang. This was Prince Sri Sin. Okya Sri Worawong, when holding the position of Chamün Sri Sorarak, had had adulterous intrigues with the wives of this Prince, and had also plotted to murder him, for which offences he was punished. (See Part IV). Prince Sri Sin was an everpresent danger to Okya Sri Worawong and, therefore, had to be disposed of, and disposed of quickly, because he had a strong claim to the throne and many faithful followers. Okya Sri Worawong turned to Yamada, the strong man, and solicited his help in a plot to bring about the death of this Prince. Yamada fell in with the plot, because the King's son was on the throne largely due to the support he had given to the late King's dying wish. I cannot do better than tell you what van Vliet says in his own words:—

“There seemed then to be wanting to both only the repose of spirit that they could not find, save in the death of the Prince, the King's uncle, who gave them umbrage by his refusal to come to court though he had been summoned several times. This rendered Oya Calahom uneasy, and by offers and presents he obliged Oya Senaphimocq (Yamada) to promise and swear to him that he would bring the Prince to Court in secular dress, since in that of an ecclesiastic no one would have dared to lay hands on him. To do what he had promised, Oya Senaphimocq found the Prince, and, pretending to share in his affliction at seeing himself thus deprived of the Crown after the death of the King, his brother, declaimed loudly against the execution, the banishment and the imprisonment of so many Mandarins and persons of quality. Enlarging further on the severity, bad conduct and cruel government of the King, and on the too great authority and power of the Oya Calahom, he protested to the Prince that he himself and several other Mandarins were so distressed about it that they had often deliberated among themselves as to the means they could take to kill the King as well as his Oya Calahom, and to raise his Highness to the throne. He added that if the Prince could be prevailed upon to go with him to the Court, he would use his Japanese soldiers and his friends to deprive the King of the Crown, to expel him and his favourite and to open to his Highness the way to the succession to the throne. Although he had been strongly advised not to do so, the Prince too readily trusted the

words of Oya Senaphimocq. He set out and went with this traitor straight to the royal Palace and seeing the Japanese guards at the gate, he made the more sure of the affection of Senaphimocq. But that disloyal man, starting to carry out what he had promised to Oya Calahom, told the Prince that, those friends whom he would find in the Palace being armed and waiting only the arrival of the Prince in order to begin to act, it was necessary that his Highness should put himself in the same state as they, and that he should quit his ecclesiastical robe, which henceforth would be of no use to him, in order to show himself a man of heart and action. The Prince made no scruple to follow this advice, and so throwing aside his robe, he appeared as a Prince. But scarcely had he entered the Palace in this state, with Oya Senaphimocq and with some Japanese soldiers, than he was seized and bound, and in this condition was conducted before the King. Oya Calahom, imagining that he had no more enemies to fear now that he had in his hands the only one who could serve as a pretext for rebellions and disorders, the only one who could put himself at the head of the discontented, thanked Oya Senaphimocq very heartily for this important service and made him very considerable presents."

It will be noticed that Yamada's acquiescence in this plot was gained by the arch-intriguer, Okya Sri Worawong, giving him very considerable presents. If van Vliet is right, this giving of presents and the acceptance of the same supports my theory that Yamada had a weakness in the armour of his character, which could be played on. Flattery and gifts swayed him in matters not connected with his ideal of loyalty to the Royal House, which was inflexible.

As will be seen from what has been written above, Yamada had given valuable support to Okya Kalahom in placing King Chetthathirat on the throne, and in securing him on the throne by joining Okya Kalahom in his plot to get rid of Prince Sri Sin, for Prince Sri Sin alive constituted a danger for Okya Kalahom. Okya Kalahom never diverged from the plan which he had prepared for his own elevation to the throne. Events moved in his favour. King Chetthathirat made a tactical mistake which brought about his death at the hands of Okya Kalahom some eighteen months after he was crowned. Van Vliet places on record what took place. The Court and the city were dismayed; the Ministers and noblemen were overcome by fear. This was Okya Kalahom's opportunity. He tried to gain the support

of Yamada for the nefarious intrigue to seize the royal power. Yamada was now more powerful than before and nothing could be done without his acquiescence. Okya Kalahom, by the use of all those gifts of political genius and suavity of manner which he possessed in such a high degree, tried to gain Yamada to his side. He failed, as Yamada refused to fall in with the plot which meant that he would have to dishonour himself by breaking away from the one ideal of his life, loyalty to the Royal House he served. This story is so interesting, and places Yamada on such a high pinnacle that I propose to give a few extracts from van Vliet:—

“The King having been executed, in the manner we have just described, the two Oyas, Calahom and Berckelangh, took advantage of the darkness of night, entered a boat alone, without any following of guards or slaves, and went to find Oya Senaphimocq, the Colonel of the Japanese, for the purpose of discovering his sentiments with regard to the election of a successor to the throne. Calahom put before him that the Kingdom could not exist without a King; that the great King, father of the one just dead, had left only several small children; that it would be dangerous to entrust the royal dignity with such young princes, and that it would be a pity to see so powerful a Kingdom governed by a child. He begged Oya Senaphimocq to consider if it would not be wise, in order to prevent all these inconveniences, to proceed to the election of some one of the most powerful Mandarins who should reign, and who should be crowned provisionally till the prince was in a position to govern in person, the idea being that this Mandarin should then renounce the dignity and replace it in the hands of the legitimate heirs. Oya Senaphimocq, discerning Calahom's intentions, replied to him that, if it was necessary to proceed to the election of one of the Mandarins, it would inevitably fall on his (Kalahom) own person, because, as he was of the blood royal, and the most powerful of all the Mandarins, no one else could be appointed without prejudicing him. “On the other hand,” said Yamada, “if they did elect you (Kalahom) everyone would have reason to condemn our actions and to believe that we took up arms only through partisanship, in order to favour your unjust designs and to cause to fall into your hands a violent and illegitimate dominion. And besides, if we select some one of the other Mandarins, it is to be feared that he will desire to remain master even after the Prince shall have reached years of discretion, and that, in order to secure the

crown for his own person and family, he will extirpate the whole Royal House." Further, he (Yamada) said, they must consider that already two Kings had been put to death, that much blood had been shed, and that it was time to put an end to the disorders, and to restore peace to the kingdom. His advice was that they should crown King the Prince, who was the eldest of the brothers of the one last dead, and that they should give the guardianship of his person, and the regency of the kingdom, to him, Calahom, who having been first minister under the last reign, was capable of giving good counsel to the king and of re-adjusting the affairs of the kingdom. He (Yamada) went on to protest that for his part, he would not consent that the crown should be put on the head of a stranger while there were princes of the Royal House who could hope for this dignity by the fact of their birth, and that he would oppose such a proposal with all his might."

Okya Kalahom, finding that he could not obtain Yamada's support for his plan and not wishing to bring Yamada and his Japanese into active opposition, proceeded to the Palace and called a meeting of the Council of State. This Council met the next day and it was agreed to place Prince Athitayawong on the throne, with the title of Athitya Chakrawong (อภิตยจักรวรรค์), and that Okya Kalahom, being closely related to the young Prince then only ten years of age, should be appointed guardian of the young Prince and Regent. Okya Senaphimuk was present at this meeting of the Council of State, and, finding that events had moved in the direction he wished, was satisfied. This resolution came to by the Council of State only brought about a lull in the ambitions of Kalahom. Van Vliet tells us in his *Historical Account* that Okya Kamhaeng (ออกญากำแพง), a great nobleman had seated himself on the throne after King Chetthathirat had fled from the Palace, and that he had done this with the consent of Okya Kalahom. Okya Kalahom, therefore, feared that Okya Kamhaeng might resent his appointment as Regent and endeavour to remove him from his high position, in order that he himself might become King. Okya Kalahom now knew that he could not seize the supreme power as long as Yamada was alive and in the city. He therefore determined to get rid of Okya Kamhaeng and Yamada. A charge of rebellion was brought against Okya Kamhaeng who was executed. This execution brought Yamada on the scene as an



inflexible enemy of Okya Kalahom, but this arch-intriguer knew how to deal with him. Van Vliet, having given a graphic account of the events which led to the execution of Okya Kamhaeng, tells us that:

"Oya Senaphimocq had not been to court that day, but learning what had been done to Oya Capheim (Kamhaeng) and how he had been executed, he was greatly angered, particularly against Oya Calahom, since if he was not the instigator of the death, he could at least have prevented it by his authority, and by interceding with the King. At first he could not believe that Calahom had been Capheim's accuser, but he was angry with him because he had not himself been warned so that he might have spoken to the King. Thereupon, having gone to Court, he caused the body to be taken off the gibbet, and had it buried, weeping tears for his friend. This compassion of Senaphimocq was not pleasing to Oya Calahom, but he did not dare to show his displeasure because of the great authority of Senaphimocq and the consideration in which the Japanese were held."

Van Vliet now makes it very evident that Okya Kalahom conceived a great fear of Yamada. He says that Okya Kalahom began to circulate rumours in the city that Yamada had the intention of attacking the King in the Palace with the assistance of Mr. Sebald Wondereer, the Captain of the vessel *Pearl*, and his men. This rumour had no truth in it for Okya Kalahom had bought over Captain Wondereer by giving him a jewelled sword. The rumour, however, gained such credence that the Ministers and the people began to arm themselves against Yamada. This was not the result hoped for by Okya Kalahom, for if fighting started, it might be the end of his ambitions. He therefore determined to go in person and explain the situation to Yamada in order to prevent his taking decisive action. Van Vliet describes the interview in the following words:

"Calahom resolved to go and see Oya Senaphimocq in his house, and, having obtained an interview, he was skilful enough to lay before him so many reasons, and cajoled him so completely, that the Japanese yielded, conceived a very good opinion of the intentions and conduct of Calahom, renounced all his resentment, and promised an inviolable friendship, as also to espouse his interests in all eventual-

ties. This they both confirmed by a solemn oath with the usual ceremonies of the country."

Peace having thus been made between these two noblemen and their friendship having been solemnly confirmed, Okya Kalahom at once planned to rid himself of the one who alone could prevent him from carrying out his design to gain the royal power. The plan was to get Yamada with his Japanese out of the Capital by conferring on him the high appointment of Governor of Nakhon Sri Thamarat. This plan succeeded. Yamada accepted the appointment, which was sanctioned by the King. Okya Kalahom's fear of Yamada was so intense that he was not satisfied with placing several hundred miles between himself and the man he feared, for van Vliet tells us that instructions were sent to Nakhon that the death of Yamada was to be brought about. I will now relate the events which led to the death of Yamada.

Yamada, probably, accepted the position of Governor of the Southern provinces simply because he trusted the deceitful words of Okya Kalahom that he would do no harm to the young Prince Athitaya-wong. The events, which led to his leaving the capital to take charge of the administration of the Southern provinces, have been described above. What happened there during the rule of Yamada and the manner of his death as well as what took place after has been graphically described by van Vliet. The story he tells us is probably true, although it differs from the Japanese account recorded in the *Tsuko-ichiran*.

Van Vliet tells us that when Yamada arrived in Nakhon Sri Thamarat, he found the province in a state of rebellion. He and his Japanese soldiers were so feared that their presence in the province was sufficient to quell the disorders. Yamada meted out punishment to all who were concerned in the revolt, and made use of the former Governor as his adviser and kept on friendly terms with this man's brother, Okphra Amorarit.

Yamada sent a report to the King stating what steps he had taken to re-establish the authority of the King and the great success which had attended his operations. Okya Kalahom, who by this time had ascended the throne as King Prasat Thong, was much disturbed at the rapidity with which Yamada had carried out the work of suppressing this rebellion, but dissimulating his real feelings, suggested to the Council of Ministers that great rewards should be given to

Yamada and his officers for the eminent services rendered to the State. The Council agreed with the King, and many rich presents together with beautiful girls and women were sent to Yamada. Amongst the women was one of high rank, whom Yamada could marry in accordance with the custom of the country.

Yamada, on hearing of the execution of the young King Athitaya-wong in contravention of the promise given to him by Okya Kalahom, and that this nobleman had seized the royal power, gave voice to remarks which had better not have been made. When Yamada recovered from his anger and emotion he outwardly gave expression to feelings of loyalty and fidelity to the King. He ordered great festivities to be organised in honour of the coronation and accession of King Prasat Thong. This astute monarch had sent secret instructions to the former Governor to get rid of Yamada and his Japanese. Yamada, on his part, conceived a great distrust of this man, but continued friendly with his brother. At this time (probably at the end of A. D. 1630) the Patani Malays raided Patalung and Nakhon Sri Thammarat. Yamada drove them back, but was wounded in the leg. The wound was not serious, and Yamada was making preparations to marry the young lady sent from Ayudhya. Okphra Amorarit, the brother of the Governor, suggested the application of a plaster to the wound to hasten the healing. Yamada, who was anxious to consummate his marriage, agreed. The plaster was poisoned, and in a few hours Yamada was dead. This story must have been the one current in Ayudhya at the time, and heard by van Vliet.

The story given us in the *Tsuko-ichiran*, differs from that of van Vliet. This work says that when King Song Tham was dying he entrusted the guardianship of his son Chetthathirat to Okya Kalahom and Okya Senaphimuk. These two noblemen should hold the office of guardian alternately for one year, and during such period the other nobleman should live in Pipri (Petburi). After the King's death Oya Kalahom became guardian and Oya Senaphimuk retired to Petburi. The Queen Mother fell in love with Okya Kalahom and a clandestine love intrigue followed. The Queen Mother poisoned her son, having the desire to place Okya Kalahom on the throne. This act of murder was hastened, because the young King Chetthathirat, being cognisant of the immoral conduct of his mother, determined to have Okya Kalahom executed. The King lost the game. This murder was kept secret. The Queen Mother gave

out that her son had died of a sudden ailment, and she gave him a royal cremation. Yamada, in Petburi having heard what had taken place in Ayudhya, sent a special messenger there to find out the truth. Yamada was informed of the love intrigue on the part of the Queen Mother, of the murder of her son, and of the Queen Mother having placed herself on the throne as reigning Sovereign. Yamada was so enraged that he determined to collect forces, attack Ayudhya, put to death the Queen Mother and her paramour, Okya Kalahom, and place the young Prince Athitayawong on the throne. The Queen Mother became afraid when told of Yamada's intention. She sent an emissary named Chanthra (จันทรา) to Yamada to tell him that the young King had died a natural death, and that she had taken the reins of Government in her own hands temporarily in order to prevent disturbances in the Kingdom. She invited Yamada to Ayudhya to consult with him regarding the appointment of a new King, which question when settled, she would abdicate. Furthermore, Chanthra informed Yamada that the Queen Mother knew full well that Yamada had been misled into believing in the truth of the acts imputed to her, which story had been invented and circulated by enemies desiring that harm should befall her. She denied the accuracy of the story in a personal letter sent to Yamada, in which she also said that she would appoint Yamada's son, O-In, to be the Governor of the Provinces of Nakhon Sri Thamarat and Patani, and that she would send the appointment order later. Yamada told Chanthra that he accepted the word of the Queen Mother and that he was much pleased at the appointment given to his son.

O-In went to the southern provinces and entered on his appointment. When Chanthra was in Petburi hospitality was shown him by Yamada, and a dinner given in his honour, which hospitality was reciprocated by Chanthra. When this emissary returned to Ayudhya he reported to the Queen Mother that, notwithstanding the sweet words of Yamada he was convinced that Yamada distrusted her and Okya Kalahom, and would take steps to wreak his vengeance on them, and that being so convinced, he had put poison in Yamada's food, which would bring about his death in three months' time. The Queen Mother was delighted at what Chanthra had done, for she now felt sure that her powerful enemy was disposed of. When Yamada realised that he had been poisoned and that death was

imminent, he instructed his officers to order O-In to take revenge on the Queen Mother and Okya Kalahom.

This story cannot be true. The love intrigue imputed to the Queen Mother seem like an echo of the intrigue between the Lady Sri Sudachan (ท้าวศรีสุดาจันทร์) and Khun Worawongsathirat, during which she murdered her son. There is no evidence to support the story related in the *Tsuko-ichiran* just quoted, that King Song Tham appointed Okya Kalahom and Okya Senaphimuk to act alternately as guardians of the young King Chetthathirat, and that when one of the guardians was in office, the other should retire to Petburi, nor is there any evidence to uphold the story that Okya Senaphimuk lived in Petburi, but rather to the contrary; for we know that Okya Senaphimuk was in daily attendance on the King, except for those periods when he was in disagreement with the policy of Okya Kalahom, but even then he remained in his house at Ayudhya where van Vliet tells us he was visited by Okya Kalahom.

I am inclined to brush on one side the whole of this story recorded in the *Tsuko-ichiran*, and to accept van Vliet's version of what took place as correct. However, there is one interesting point in the story, and that is the manner in which Yamada was poisoned: the poison administered would only have fatal effect three months after it was given.

It is believed that the people of the provinces south of Petburi, who are not pure Siamese, having mixed with the Indian colonists in ancient days, frequently used a medicinal concoction known as *ya sang* (ยาสัง) in order to procure death. This poison does not have an immediate effect, the progress is gradual, being accelerated or slowed down according to the food taken by the person poisoned. Death, however, is inevitable.

In some of the Japanese works treating of the life of Yamada, he is called the King of Ligor or Nakhon Sri Thamarat. The title of King as applied to Yamada has been the cause of much misunderstanding as regards his real position. However, the question presents no difficulty to one conversant with the titles given to Governors of provinces in the south. All Governors of these southern provinces were called Raja or King up till quite recent times. The Malays, Europeans and even the local Siamese inhabitants spoke of their Governor as a Raja. When I came to this country in A. D. 1897, this

appellation was still in use. The people spoke of the Raja of Ranong, the Raja of Tha Luang, the Raja of Phuket, the Raja of Nakhon Sri Thamarat, the Raja of Songkhla (Singora), and even the Governor of Langsuan was given locally the title of Raja. This title, however, was not conferred or recognised by Ayudhya or Bangkok, but was one of local usage only.

[To be Continued].