

PART SEVEN.

Concerning the political and economic position of Siam in the 17th Century with particular reference to Japan.

(1) IN THE EKATHOSROT PERIOD A. D. 1605-1620.

Japan was torn by internecine wars prior to 1603. The Ashikaga Shogunate collapsed in 1573, when the power fell into the hands of usurpers. The third of these, Hideyoshi, was one of the most able men Japan has produced. The power of the usurpers passed into the hands of Ieyasu, an officer, who had fought under Hideyoshi. With the accession to power of Ieyasu in 1603, the Tokugawa Shogunate came into being. It was from this time that Japan began to enjoy peace and prosperity.

During these internecine wars many soldiers who had fought in them left Japan. It would seem that many must have come to Siam, for we find a reference to a body of five hundred Japanese soldiers fighting in the army of King Naresuan at the battle in which the Crown Prince of Burma was defeated and slain (A. D. 1593). These men must have come to Siam before that date. It is stated that their commanding officer had the title of Okphra Senaphimuk. It may be due to the migration of these soldiers to Siam that Siam became known to Japan. We find that three years after Ieyasu became Shogun, he entered into political relations with Siam. In 1606 this Shogun despatched a letter to King Ekathosrot. The envelope holding this letter was addressed to two foreign officials, Fernando Miguel and Jacobe Quanaranaka. In this letter the Shogun asked that scented wood and cannon be sent to him, and on his part sent as presents for the King three suits of armour and ten long Japanese swords.

In 1608, a second letter, dated 17th November, came from Japan asking for heavy cannon and gunpowder, which the Shogun appraised as having wonderful qualities. This time six suits of armour were sent. On the 7th October 1610 the Shogun wrote a personal letter to the King in which he thanked His Majesty for the kind messages he had sent to the Shogun in the previous year, and for his promise to send heavy cannon and gunpowder in the next year by a trading vessel. The Shogun sent fifty pistols for the King and fifty pistols for the Foreign Minister, Okya Phra Khlang, as well as one suit of armour, one sword and one double-edged dagger. The Japanese

Foreign Minister wrote to Okya Phra Khlang, thanking him for the promise to send heavy cannon, and also expressing a hope that Siamese traders would visit Japan.

Students of the diplomatic intercourse between Siam and Japan at this period have been led to believe that the last letter in this diplomatic correspondence during the reign of King Ekathosrot was the letter dated 7th October 1610. Mr. Gunji, a learned Japanese scholar, says, in his work entitled *The correspondence between Tokugawa Shogunate and Siamese King at the beginning of the Tokugawa period*, that a Siamese envoy was sent to Japan in A. D. 1616. The credentials of this embassy were only found in quite recent times by Assistant Professor S. Iwao of the Formosan University. It will thus be seen that there was considerable diplomatic activity between Japan and Siam in the reign of King Ekathosrot, Japan having taken the initiative. Copies of the letters from the Shogun and his Foreign Minister exist, but the letters from Siam are not to be found, except the credentials mentioned above.

It would seem that in the month following the despatch of the Shogun's letter, dated 22nd October 1606, the Japanese port authorities were authorised to permit Siamese ships to trade with Japan, but it would appear that advantage of this permission was only taken in 1612. This permission for Siamese vessels to trade with Japan, granted in 1606, and taken advantage of in 1612, does not mean that there was no trade between the two countries before that date. The export trade of Japan was carried on under a system of licenses or trading passports. Vessels, leaving a Japanese port, whether commanded by a Japanese or a foreign national, had to obtain a licence approximating to a port clearance pass, which had to be surrendered on the return of the ship to Japan. There are records in the Japanese Admiralty to show that fifty-three of these licences were issued between 1592 and 1615. It is possible that many of the surrendered licences or trading passports may have been lost. This record also shows that the Japanese exported goods in their own vessels to Ayudhya, Nakhon Sri Thamarat, Patani and the Malay country. As this licence trade system only governed the export trade in vessels leaving Japan, it was necessary to obtain special authority for foreign vessels to enter Japanese ports, and this is the reason why the Shogun granted such special authority for Siamese vessels to trade with Japan at the end

of 1606. There is a curious act on the part of the Shogun, which is worth recording. In 1604, the Shogun granted three licences to Japanese traders domiciled in Siam to trade with Japan. This is proof that Japanese were settled in Siam in this year, and must have been there for many years before. This licence system remained in force, probably, till 1636, though the records do not go beyond 1615.

This short sketch of important events in this reign shows that Ieyasu realised the value of being on friendly terms with a power in South Eastern Asia, which by its military prowess had thrown off the yoke of Burma and established its authority over a vast territory. Burma had brought Siam under subjection in 1564, and ruled the country through the Royal House of Siam till 1569. In that year Siam rebelled and was again conquered. The Burmese King removed the King and appointed as his Regent, Phra Maha Thamaracha, who ruled in the name of Burma till 1590. In that year Prince Naresuan, a son of this Regent, declared himself King and independent. Burma sent an army under the command of the Crown Prince, who was defeated and slain in 1593. King Naresuan, having broken the fetters of this yoke and freed Siam, used his energies in reconsolidating the Kingdom. He made Burma fear him; the southern provinces and the Malay States were made to understand that they had a master; territory on the Bay of Bengal once again came under Siamese suzerainty; Cambodia was crushed; and the northern Princes of Chiengmai, Lampang, Chieng Saen and Nan were forced to pay homage and give allegiance to Siam. King Ekathosrot, himself a soldier who had fought by the side of his brother in all the wars, reaped the fruits of his brother's military genius, and, realising that a country could only be strong if it had powerful friends, reciprocated the offer of friendship made in 1606 by the Shogun. The King also knew that a sound economic condition was a fundamental requirement, if his country was to move along the road of progress. He, therefore, not only cemented friendly relations with foreign states, but also did all in his power to foster trade. He welcomed foreign traders, particularly Japanese, Dutch and English, and granted them the privileges of residence, protection, and the right to trade. His own trading vessels were commanded, and manned by foreigners. His Court attracted men of many nationalities, several of whom were given patents of nobility. Amongst the

Europeans, the Dutch were the most favoured, for Portugal was losing its position and credit in the East.

The position of Siam in this reign was so strong, that not only did the Shogun desire her friendship, but the King of Tongu, then the paramount power in Burma, sent an embassy to the Court of Siam craving protection, as he feared a rebellion on the part of the Mon. The Mon people, who rebelled against the King of Tongu, also sent envoys and asked for protection. The King of Lanchang, seeing the trend of political events, also sent an embassy asking for the protection of King Ekathosrot.

The relations between Siam during the reign of King Ekathosrot and western nations were more extensive than are generally believed. The *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century* (National Library, Bangkok) supplies us with the following interesting information.

During the reigns of King Ekathosrot and the Kings, who succeeded him in Ayudhya, a political and commercial struggle was taking place between the Spaniards, Portuguese, Dutch, English and eventually the French. Each of these nations was intriguing for political and commercial supremacy in Siam and her seaboard provinces on the Bay of Bengal. At the time of which we are writing, the Dutch had established themselves in Java with their headquarters at Batavia. The centre of Portuguese authority was at Goa in India where the King of Portugal was represented by a Viceroy. The English, although commercial opponents of the Dutch, had come to an understanding with these people under which they were allowed to establish commercial depôts in the Dutch possessions. The power of the Spaniards was waning and the French did not come on the scene till towards the end of the 17th Century.

King Ekathosrot in 1607 sent an embassy to Holland. We know of this from two documents, one from Mr. Gabriel Towerson at Bantam to the (English) East India Company dated 16th December 1607, and another dated 4th January 1608 from the King of Portugal to his Viceroy at Goa. I quote these two letters in full as they show what was taking place at the time and the fears entertained by the nations concerned.

Gabriel Towerson to the East India Company.

Dated Bantam, 16th December 1607.

The 9 December came into this road the Moritious (? Mauritius) from Patania, where they got no cargo. They brought along with them 16 men

of Siam, whereof 4 are principal, which are sent by their King to the King of Holland upon an embassy carrying with them a present of rubies and other stones and to treat of friendship between the two Kings, besides some other weighty affairs of Cargoes, by the Flemming reports. But the ambassadors do deny it, for when I did ask them the question they were very angry at it, saying that their King was a great King and needed nothing the Hollander had but this, that if they will come and trade in his Country as other nations do, they shall be as free there as the Portugals (Portuguese) or other nations, and that they go into Holland to see their Country, their buildings, towns and ships, and if they require anything it shall be shipwrights, carpenters, and other handicrafts men, because, as it seems, their merchants there had told that their King is a great King and will grant them all this. But at their coming to Bantam the Admiral gave them very little, being very angry with the merchant that brought them, so that it stands in suspense whether he will carry them into Holland or be King himself, take their embassy and present, and send them back to Siam again . . .”

The King of Portugal to his Viceroy in India.

Dated Lisbon, 4th January 1608. (N. S.)

(26 December 1607 O. S.)

Likewise was I informed that it would be convenient to have a Fortress made in the lands of Martavan, which are depopulated, in order from thence to conquer them and populate them ; And, although on this matter I ordered some information to be gathered in this Kingdom, we were unable to verify what would be most convenient to my service, hence I deemed it proper to remit it in council, taking into consideration that the rebels maintain much communication with the King of Siam, and took his Ambassadors to Holland with the aim of securing a league and friendship with him, assuming to found a fortress in one of the ports of his kingdom, as by this one I write to you ; and if making it will prove a great inconvenience to Malacca and for the commerce of the South ; And that this King of Siam is one of the greatest of those parts both in power of men as in wealth, and if the rebels introduce the exercise of war and artillery, as it is understood they are endeavouring to do, it will be an irreparable evil ; And that by making a Fortress in Martavan, so close to the said Kingdom of Siam, it appears he will not dare to afford the Dutch the position they pretend to in his Kingdom, because the fortress of Siriam placed so much further from him, it stands that it will behove him to secure himself by peace treaties with the Viceroy of India, respecting which he sent Ambassadors, as the Governor writes ; And that the Kingdom of Pegu is so wrecked and depopulated that it seems that in effect this fortress can be placed there without labour of war or much expense, because with it and the others the whole coast of Pegu and

Bengala will remain very much under subjection to my lordship, and that it behoves not to lose (as it appears necessary) such an occasion as this, and prevent by it that any other more powerful enter in; And after considering all these reasons on both one and the other side, and what else may further appear, you will advise me of all, and finding that the greater weight bends to the opinion that the said Fortress in Martavan should be erected, and that by the delay of awaiting my reply an occasion may be lost, after being well informed in this matter and doing all that can be done as quickly as it behoves, you will set it in hand at once, and execute what you should hold as most convenient."

If the King of Portugal is correct in what he says, the Siamese embassy to Holland was conveyed to that country by the Dutch notwithstanding the obstructions put in their way by the English. The English continued their policy of penetration and advance in the East. The Dutch tried by all the means at their disposal except force to frustrate the policy of the English. The English got a footing in Ayudhya in 1612. The fears of the Dutch are well expressed in two letters from Dutchmen in Ayudhya to Hendrik Janssen a colleague in Patani. These letters are dated 2nd September and 5th November 1612, and should be of value to the historian. I quote them in full:

Cornelis van Nyenrode to Hendrik Janssen at Patani.

Dated Judea, 2nd September 1612. (N. S.) = 24 August 1612 (O. S.).

The English ship has arrived here outside the river, and the merchant called Adam came on the 29th here in the town and directly informed the mandarins that the vessel was outside the town with letters from the King of England, addressed to His Majesty here. Then His Majesty sent Adam with Opra Chula and some *prahus* thence yesterday to fetch those letters and the captains, as the King is very much pleased that another nation has arrived in his country; so their (the English) trade cannot be prevented, as you and Lambert Jacobson know very well that this King tries to attract every nation to his country. But what they (the English) ask for here and how they ask we will advise you as soon as possible, or if we have no opportunity you will hear it from Mr. Nienroot (van Nyenrode), who will start from this place within 15 or 16 days with the junk of Okpra Rajsidhi. If the English bring any Dutch or English Merchandise with them they will obtain here what they like with their presents, as they are very liberal . . .

Janssen has prevented a certain Okkhun Sriyot (probably a Chinese), an ambassador, from sailing with the English by simply keeping him in his vessel for 4 or 5 days. Of course the ambassador was wild over it and

would commit suicide for the dishonor done to him and his Prince. This writer has heard from another of his countrymen, called Okkhun Chin, who had arrived with the same ship and brought letters to the Okya Praklang. The same Okkhun Chin seized this opportunity to tell something more of the Dutch, viz., that Okya Praklang would bring the case of Okkhun Sriyot before the King; that the Dutch had taken his oath that he should not accompany the English to Siam; that he had not received a single penny from the Dutch and that Lambert Jacobson in the presence of all the mandarins in public had made a fool of him and thereby had offended his King; that the Dutch factor had offered him 4 or 5 tael when he saw that Okkhun Chin intended to sail with the English. The Dutch, of course, denied this, and told this to Mr. Adam, as they thought Okkhun Chin was bribed by the English. Mr. Adam, however, said he did not know anything of it, and confirmed by oath that the English had not given any order for it. Mr. Adam promised to punish him, but would not promise to prohibit him delivering his letters to Okya Praklang.

The treaty with the King of Ligor was already in sketch (written by Oran kaya Tuwen Amer de Radje), viz.

Freedom of tolls and duties, no trade-allowances to other nations, a house of stone walls, and allowances to build all the G. G. (Governor General) would like that should be built. The Chinese too will not have to pay anything more than the ordinary tolls and duties, nobody being allowed to do them any harm or cause them any trouble, like those of Patani do.

The King told them that he consented to this as he had promised it verbally to Mr. Janssen and Mr. van der Lecq; that he did not want any money, but should like to have some cloth and Dutch Merchandise, which the factors promised to send him. Though they were very much surprised all this was granted to them without any presents being given, still they advise Mr. Janssen to provide them with something to present to the King, as with presents much more can be done than without.

They obtained from the King that Mr. Cornelis (van Nyenrode) could leave the country; the former, namely (....?), had two letters to be delivered—one to the Governor General: 'that he expected to see the Governor General within a short time, that he had sent Ambassadors to him for that purpose, that he knew the Governor General was the representative of His Excellency the Prince, that he thus by seeing his representative, would see something like the Prince, that he would make a treaty with him, that he had to tell him many things secretly', etc.; the other also to the Governor General, containing a description of the countries Tenasery and Marghy (Mergui), which countries the King intended to give to the Dutch. The factors persuaded the King not to send ambassadors with Mr. Cornelis, etc. etc.

If the General comes, the English will not be in great favour with the King, as they cannot do very much against the Portuguese; also only a few of their ships visit the country.

Maerten Houtman to Hendrik Janssen at Patani.

Dated Judea, 5th November 1612. (N. S.)

(27) October 1612. (O. S.)

The 28th September the English received the key of the Godown and instantly began to repair it with windows, but as it is very much fallen to ruin, they will have to incur large expenses before they will have made something out of it, that at the same price nearly a new stone house could be built.

The 29th September as the water of "juremente" (allegiance) would be drunk, I was invited to come in, and in the afternoon when every one had drunk the water, the English were called in, of whom the captain and Mr. Adam came instantly, but Mr. Lucas remained behind, being indisposed; and thus the letter from His Majesty of England was read loudly, the contents being that the King of Great Britain, Ireland, Scotland and France sent his compliments to the Mighty King of Siam, and further asking only that the English should enjoy, under the protection of His Majesty, free trade and commerce, then that what this King would ask from the King of England the latter would do (if it was in his power) . . .

The Dutch would enlarge the place whereon their house was built and the English would build a bridge at the same time. They asked and obtained permission from the owner of the ground to buy it, if the King allowed, which the latter did.

The King went on a boating party: the Dutch factor followed him with his *prahu*, whereon the King sent one of his gentlemen to him with a "boisette" of food, saying that He sent it to them as they were the only nation that followed them so faithfully. Mr. Lucas had gone out in a *prahu*, sent by Okya Praklang, but had not followed the King.

The letter of the King of Portugal quoted above gives us an insight into the Portuguese policy to uphold their domination in the East against the growing power of the Dutch. The Portuguese having lost their position in Syriam attempted to obtain a foothold on the Peninsula and their objective was Martaban, called by the King Martavan. The plan was to fortify this place to prevent the adjacent territory being occupied by the Dutch. The policy laid down by the King in his letter to his Viceroy at Goa was the subject matter of long and protracted negotiations with Siam. The material at my disposal does not tell us what happened between 1607 and 1618

beyond the fact that the King of Portugal, in a letter dated 17th January 1618 to his Viceroy in Goa, mentions that the Kings of Siam and Ava had sent embassies to Goa in 1617. Siam offered Martaban and Ava offered Arracan to the Portuguese. The King suggested that a policy of dissimulation and prudence should be followed in these matters as Martaban did not belong to Siam and Arracan did not belong to Ava. The Viceroy replied to the King on the 8th February 1619. This letter tells us that the King of Siam had despatched an ambassador to Goa in 1618 and requested the Viceroy to send the embassy to Portugal in connection with the negotiations regarding Martaban and other matters. This embassy did not get beyond Goa owing to sickness amongst its members. The letter is of historical importance so I quote it in full. H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, in his work entitled *Wars between Siam and Burma*, page 193, says that the object of the mission to Goa was to request the Portuguese to patrol the Siamese seaboard on the Bay of Bengal in order to prevent the Burmese attacking this territory. In return for this the Siamese would allow the Portuguese to fortify Martaban. Martaban was now of importance to the Portuguese on account of the Dutch military threat against Malacca, which place they wrested from the Portuguese in 1641. It is clear from the letter of the Viceroy that the negotiations were eventually carried on in Ayudhya. Prince Damrong states that Portugal required (1) a military alliance between Portugal and Siam for the purpose of waging war on Ava; (2) that the nationals of both countries should have the right of trade in each other's territories free of all taxes and duties; (3) that Siam should expel the Dutch from Siamese territory. Siam was prepared to agree to the first two clauses but refused the third, stating that the Dutch had always been good friends of Siam and therefore there was no reason for expelling them. The negotiations failed.

I insert here the letter of the Viceroy at Goa to the King of Portugal referred to above:

The Viceroy of Goa to the King of Portugal.

Dated Goa, 8th February, 1619 (N. S.)

29th January, 1619 (O. S.)

The Ambassadors sent last year by this King of Siam for them to pass on to the Kingdom to your Majesty in company of Frei Francisco da Annunciacao, of the Order of Preachers, I sent back to their lands, as by other letters

I give an account to your Majesty, because they were unable to effect their Embassy through the absence of Christovan Rebello, who had started with them with the same object of proceeding to the Kingdom, but who did not arrive. And for this reason was the letter and present which they had brought from their King sent on by the leading ship, as by the *Via* (sic) which she took and advised Your Majesty: And because subsequently those Ambassadors sickened in this city, and pleaded with great instance that I should allow them to leave, and it was the opinion of the Council of State where this matter was discussed, that I ought to accede to this also, on account of obviating the expense which would result should they have to remain here until a reply should arrive from your Majesty, as because this King might take umbrage at keeping them here without sending them to Portugal, I sent them in a galliot under the care of Joao da Silva. . . . and by him I wrote to the said King stating the reasons why these Ambassadors of his had been unable to proceed on to the Kingdom, and that I had forwarded on to Your Majesty his letter and present, and what reply I should receive I would send on by the said Father Frei Francisco da Annuniação, and which I fully expected would be very much to the spirit in which he had written that letter, and as from the Royal grandeur of Your Majesty might be expected; and that meanwhile, pending the arrival of this reply, that the said King should continue in friendship with the State, being (a?) friend to friends, and an enemy to enemies, enjoining his vessels to continue plying trade with Malacca and other ports of the State, as was done formerly; and whereas it has been understood in Council of State that the Peace besought by this King has conditions which are not of very great importance for many reasons which are of consideration for the service of Your Majesty, and in particular for his urgent justification on his part in regard to the loss of the fleet of Dom Francisco de Menezes, which was dispatched there by the last Viceroy, I bade a Father of the Society of Jesus, called Andre Pereira, the eldest of all those residing in those parts, and Constantion Falcan, visitor of the Bishopric of Meliapor there, and Gaspar Pacheco de Mequita, a married man, resident of Cochin, who was there at the moment, being a person of talent, experience, services, and rank, that they should all together discuss this peace treaty with the King, for me to conclude with such conditions as should be more advantageous and of greater credit and repute for the State, and for this object the King to send me his Ambassadors for me to witness their oath, and to Gaspar Pacheco I wrote that he should likewise insist on the ward being opened in the large port, as it formerly was. In order (in) like manner to release from captivity many Christians who were there, and attain other good effects for the service of Your Majesty, and so that the said Gaspar Pacheco should endeavour with greater efficacy to have the said ward opened, I passed, as Captain in Chief of it, a provision on to him with

the same powers and jurisdictions as former Captains in Chief had enjoyed, because so it was agreed upon by the same Council. To this letter I have had as yet no reply, and what on the matter should be done I will advise Your Majesty by the first occasion.

One has always understood that Burma had been rendered impotent by the wars with King Naresuan. Apparently this was not the case, for we learn from a letter of Mr. John Gourney, dated 28th July 1614. to the (English) East India Company, that the two countries were at war in that year. All communication with Chiengmai and Lanchang was blocked by the hostilities, and trade ceased. On the 23rd February 1618 Mr. William Wilson at Jakatra wrote to Mr. Edward Longe at Bantam saying that he had learnt for certain that about three months ago a treaty of peace had been signed between Siam and Ava under which Chiengmai and many other places were ceded to Siam. This treaty of peace must have been concluded at the end of 1617, Prince Damrong tells us that Martaban was one of the places given to Siam. If this is true the King of Portugal could not have been aware of it when he wrote to his Viceroy at Goa on the 17th January 1618 advising dissimulation and prudence in the negotiations as Martaban did not belong to Siam. When the negotiations were continued at Ayudhya in 1618, Martaban was probably Siamese territory.

During the reign of his son, Sri Saowaphak, which was a short one (A. D. 1620) we have no evidence of either political or commercial activities, but it is reasonable to assume that trade continued on normal lines. We learn from a letter written by Jan van Hasell at Singora to Jan P. Coen in Jacatra, Java, dated 4th October 1620, that the English were taking steps to negotiate a new commercial treaty with this King, and that the Dutch did all in their power to frustrate this design. Nothing however was accomplished as the King was executed at the end of 1620.

(2) IN THE SONG THAM PERIOD, A. D. 1620—1628.

In the reign of King Song Tham, there was great political and commercial activity between Siam and Japan. This King did not believe in the use of force for the settlement of international disputes, and therefore continued the policy of his father, Ekathosrot, which aimed at cementing friendly relations with all his neighbours.

The King was compelled against his will to engage in war against Cambodia, which had rebelled against his authority (A. D. 1622-1628).

King Song Tham, when writing to the Shogun in A. D. 1623, informed His Highness of this event, and again in A. D. 1626 wrote to Japan saying that the rebellion had not been quelled. The Japanese Government, understanding the religious nature of the King and his abhorrence of shedding blood, administered a rebuke. In a reply to a letter from the Chief Minister of Siam to Doi Toshikazu and Sakai Tadayo, which has been lost, the first dignitary replied, saying The waging of war entails the taking of life, and all its accompanying horrors. Every means should be employed to avoid war, but peace is not to be attained by neglecting to take up arms. (*vide* Correspondence, A. D. 1626). The King's outlook on war reminds one of the Provisions of the Kellogg-Briand Pact.

The foundations laid down by King Ekathosrot on which the friendship with Japan was built were strengthened by King Song Tham during his reign. He picked up the thread of friendly relationship immediately after his accession to the throne, for we find that he sent an embassy to Japan in 1621. Others were sent in 1623 and 1626, and there was much diplomatic correspondence between the two countries. As this diplomatic correspondence speaks of matters of great importance, and is evidence of the extraordinary height to which friendly relations had ascended, I propose to give the substance of these letters in some detail, and in some cases a full translation of the letters. There is a record existing to show that seven letters passed between the King of Siam and the Shogun of Japan including letters between their Ministers in the 1621. These letters are couched in the most friendly language, showing that the political relations were based on a perfect understanding. The following are the letters.

(1) *Letter from the King of Siam to the Shogun of Japan conveyed by the two Siamese ambassadors, Khun Phichit Sombat (ขุนพิชิตสมบัติ) and Khun Prasert (ขุนประเสริฐ).*

This letter is so interesting that I give its contents in full. The King said :

It is a duty of Kings from ancient times to govern their countries on the principle of justice and benevolence, and foster friendly relations with neighbouring states. By upholding this principle the citizens of neighbouring states live in happiness, and the people of other countries come to enjoy equal happiness in our country.

Siam and Japan enjoying a state of equal prestige, it is our firm desire that our two countries should continue to live on friendly terms in the future as in the past. Our two countries are distant one from the other and separated by the sea, which is an obstacle to easy communication. The people of our countries follow the religion of the Buddha, and our habits and customs are similar, with the exception that we are not conversant with the tenets of Mahayanism, which you must understand. We, therefore, will be honoured by your kindly sending us an explanation of its principles.

Trading vessels from Japan have been coming to Ayudhya frequently for many years, and We have always granted the Japanese traders such facilities, that it may be said that We have favoured them more than our own subjects. We have instructed our officials to look after the interests of the Japanese that they may trade freely, and have appointed an officer holding the title of Khun Chai Sunthon (ขุนไชยสุนทร) to watch over their affairs, not only the affairs of new arrivals, but also of those who have been domiciled in our kingdom for many years in order that they may all enjoy equal opportunities in trade. We have adopted this policy in the hope that it will draw an ever-increasing number of Japanese to trade in our country. In order that Your Highness may understand fully our desires in these matters, we have deputed Khun Phichit Sombat and Khun Prasert to be our ambassadors to present this letter and gifts to Your Highness as a memento of our friendly sentiments and of our best wishes.

Should Your Highness be animated by a wish for the continuance of friendly relations between our two countries, then let no hindrance or obstacle arise that may break off our communications in the future. If We both hold feelings of true friendship, then the people of our two countries will enjoy the blessings of peace and happiness.

Siam is not a rich country, but notwithstanding this, should Your Highness give voice to any desire, We, your true friend, will endeavour to fulfil it. Moreover, the fact that We both follow and practise the religion of the Buddha should be an important bond in cementing and furthering our friendship in a higher degree for all times. The administration of both our countries, being so excellent, gives great satisfaction to those foreigners who enjoy our protection, and should be a model for other states to emulate.

We fervently hope that, when our ambassadors have presented the feelings of friendship which actuate us, and have fulfilled their mission, Your Highness will arrange for their return that they may convey your messages to us speedily.

(2) *The Shogun replied to the King of Siam in October 1621.*

The letter is quite personal in character. The Shogun said :

Having read Your Majesty's letter and having conversed with the two ambassadors, I feel that without having to move a single inch I have become fully acquainted with all matters pertaining to yourself and Siam.

He then spoke of the systems of religion practised in Japan, and informed the King that quite apart from religious creeds, Japan had advanced along the road of culture, was efficient in the science of war as had been noted by the ambassadors. The Shogun noted the King's wish to be in yearly correspondence with him, and on his part held a strong desire that the two countries should live in friendly relationship. The Shogun acknowledged receipt of the gifts sent by the King, and sent presents in return.

(3) *Letter from Okphra Chula, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, written under instructions of Okya Sri Thamarat, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the Governor of Nagasaki.*

Okphra Chula said that the Minister for Foreign Affairs had received the royal command to express the King's fervent wish for the promotion of friendly political relations with Japan in order that the trade between the two countries might increase and flourish. In furtherance of this object the King had appointed Khun Phichit Sombat and Khun Prasert to be his envoys. Okphra Chula went on to request the Governor to receive the envoys, to give them such help as they might require, and to arrange for their journey to the Capital that they might be received in audience by the Shogun in order to present a personal letter from the King. In this letter was mentioned the fact that the renown of Japanese horses had reached Siam, and that the King wished to possess some of these animals. Okphra Chula, therefore, asked the Governor to procure and send some to Siam with the embassy when it returned. This act of kindness would ever remain fresh in his mind.

The King sent as gifts for the Governor of Nagasaki ten piculs of tin, and one picul of ivory. At the same time he sent for presentation to the Shogun one long sword, one short sword, two fowling muskets, ten rolls of foreign cloth, one gold salver, one ink grinding stone, and ten piculs of ivory.

(4) *Letter from Okya Sri Thamarat, Minister for Foreign Affairs, to Honda Masusumi, Minister of State.*

This letter is couched in the same language as that written by Okphra Chula. It expressed the strong desire of the King to cement friendly relations with Japan that trade might flourish. A request

was made for horses to be sent to Siam. The Siamese Foreign Minister gave a present of two rolls of foreign cloth on his own account to this Japanese Minister, and ten rolls of foreign cloth as the personal gift from the King. This letter mentioned the presents sent by the King to the Shogun.

(5) *The Council of Minister in Japan* replied to *Okya Sri Thamarat* saying that they were glad to have had the opportunity of meeting the ambassadors entrusted with the duty of furthering friendly relations between the two countries, and had not only placed all matters before their master, the Shogun, but had also introduced Khun Phichit Sombat and Khun Prasert to His Highness. The envoys had at this audience presented the royal gifts. The Shogun had expressed the liveliest satisfaction and pleasure on hearing the royal messages, and had given them a letter for presentation to the King. His Highness was pleased to accede to the royal request that Japanese horses be sent to Siam, and had given several to the ambassadors. This request of the King was the more pleasing to the Shogun as the Japanese, being soldiers, required and bred good war horses. The Council of Ministers begged *Okya Phra Khlang* to submit their humble thanks to the King for the royal presents sent them, and also thanked the Minister for his personal gifts.

The Council of Ministers sent for the King one horse, and for *Okya Phra Khlang* one Japanese sword. The presents for the King from the Shogun were three Japanese screens made of gold paper, and three horses fully equipped with saddles and bridles.

(6) *Letter from Yamada Nagamaza to Doi Toshikazu dated 13th May 1621.*

This letter was written for the purpose of obtaining the assistance of Doi Toshikazu to arrange for the Siamese ambassadors to have an audience with the Shogun.

Yamada sent two shark skins and two hundred catties weight of gun powder as a personal present.

(7) *Letter from Honda Kosukenosuke and Doi Toshikazu to Yamada dated October 1621.*

This letter informed Yamada that the Siamese embassy had arrived safely in Japan, and that his letter with the present of two shark skins and two hundred catties weight of gun powder together with the letter from H. M. the King of Siam had been received. The letter then went on to say that the envoys had been received in audience

by the Shōgun and had presented the royal gifts, and that the Shogun had delivered to them a personal letter for presentation to the King, and felt sure that the envoys and the Japanese interpreter would make a full report on their return. These dignitaries sent twenty rolls of white cloth to Yamada in lieu of any specific message for himself.

The Siamese ambassadors arrived at Yedo on the 11th October 1621, and were lodged in a temple at Sia Kwan Chi. This embassy was composed of some sixty to seventy persons excluding two Japanese, one the interpreter, the other a merchant from Sakai. Of the Siamese employed on this mission, eighteen enjoyed the special right of private audience with their King. The envoys were received in audience by the Shogun on the 13th October at which ceremony the royal rescript and a list of the gifts were presented. The Shogun, having read the letter and examined the list of presents, commanded the envoys to attend a second audience on the 15th when the royal gifts should be presented. The King's letter in Siamese characters was inscribed on a sheet of gold 6 x 18 inches, and was accompanied by a translation in Chinese written on white paper. These documents were put in an ivory tube or cylinder which was encased in a box having the shape of a boat. This box was wrapped in many folds of cloth and sealed. The Shogun at this audience was robed in a long garment with pale green epaulettes. He sat on an embroidered carpet on a dais, his body being hidden by a silk screen so arranged that his face only was visible. The King's letter was placed on a mat to the right of the Shogun. Two of the Siamese envoys, together with their interpreter, were admitted to the audience hall, sitting on the floor towards its end some distance from the Shogun. The third envoy sat outside the hall. The King's letter was presented by Sakai Utanokami Fujiwara Tatado to the Shogun, who, afterwards speaking a few words to the envoys, retired. The Siamese ambassadors were received at a farewell audience on the 17th October and returned to Siam.

King Song Tham evidently recognised the value of friendship with Japan, for in A. D. 1623 another embassy was despatched to that country. In this year seven official letters passed between the two countries. The King himself wrote a personal letter to the Shogun from which it would appear that the Shogun had written to the King

in the previous year, but apart from the reference to this in the King's letter, no record would seem to exist.

This letter and the reply of the Shogun are of so intimate a character and so interesting that I give a full translation.

(1) *The King of Siam to the Shogun of Japan.*

Last year We received your charming letter, and from its contents We feel convinced of the sincerity of your wish that our friendly relations may continue. We are sure that Your Highness is the embodiment of the highest principles of justice and honour, that your Ministers are wise, that your country enjoys peace, that your people are happy, that the religion of the Buddha flourishes, and that all traditions and customs are upheld. This affords Us great pleasure.

The fact that the sea separates Siam from Japan has hitherto rendered communication difficult, but now Our trading vessels come and go from one country to the other, which enables the bonds of friendship to be linked together. Now it is abundantly clear that Your Highness has a sincere affection for Us, which is even stronger than that of close relations.

Last year We had the intention of sending a letter to enquire about the health of Your Highness, but a serious obstacle arose. King Sri Suphanarat of Cambodia, whom We have placed on the throne, and has always been a loyal vassal of Ours, has just died. His son, Prince Chetha, the Heir-Apparent, has not acted in accordance with the commands of his father, which enjoined him to be faithful to Us, for he has ascended the throne of his own will without Our authority. In thus doing he has treated Us with disdain, has not presented the customary tribute and does not obey the orders of Ayudhya. Our Council of Ministers, after consultation, sent a special mission to admonish the young Prince and require him to return to his allegiance, but he refused to listen to Our advice and rose in rebellion against Us. This is the cause why We were obliged to hold in abeyance the despatch of a letter to Your Highness.

Now Ayudhya is organising an army which will proceed by land and water to crush this rebellion in Cambodia. Japanese nationals are in the habit of visiting Cambodia, and should it happen during the fighting between Siam and Cambodia that any Japanese siding with Cambodia be killed, this may lead to an estrangement between us. For this reason, We ask Your Highness to prohibit Japanese going to Cambodia, because we are united by such strong bonds of friendship like unto the bones and flesh of the human body, which are so knitted together as to be inseparable. The interests of our two countries are identical, and we are joined together in our joys and sorrows. Please do not allow anything to arise, which might interrupt or disturb our present relationship, and it is Our sincere hope that we may communicate one with the other every year without interruption. Should Your

Highness desire anything which We can procure for You, only give expression to your wish and it shall be fulfilled so that our friendship may ever be increased. We have appointed Luang Thong Samut (หลวงทองสมุทร) and Khun Swat (ขุนสวัสดิ์) to be Our ambassadors, and have entrusted them with Our letter inscribed on a tablet of gold together with a translation in Chinese, and also gifts for Your Highness.

The presents sent were more numerous than usual. The following is a list: A hat made of fine woven bark; four catties weight of scented wood; two catties weight of camphor; one roll of five coloured striped gold cloth; one roll of five coloured striped silver cloth; one roll of five coloured striped yellow cloth; one roll of three coloured striped silver cloth; ten rolls of white netting; ten rolls of foreign cloth; two fowling pieces with gold damascened barrels; ten catties weight of white feathers.

(2) *The Shogun Minamoto Hidetada replied to this letter in September 1623.* The letter is brief, and as it is a reply to the points raised by the King, I propose to summarize its contents.

The Shogun said that he was gratified to learn of the King's wishes for the continuance and development of friendly relations between their countries. As regards the attitude of the Japanese in the Cambodian rebellion, he assured the King that there was no cause for anxiety. If Japanese nationals took sides in the disputes they should be punished according to their offence, for the Japanese, being traders, should not concern themselves with politics. The Shogun promised to do all in his power to increase the commerce between Japan and Siam. The Shogun then went on to say that he had sent personal messages by the ambassadors. In conclusion, the Shogun prayed for the health and happiness of the King, and also sent a few gifts. The following is a list: two throwing lances; thirty coats; two horses with saddles and bridles.

(3) *Letter from Okya Phra Khlang to Sakai Utanokami Fujiwara Tadayo, A. D. 1623.*

This letter is complimentary in tenor. The Foreign Minister said he regretted that he was prevented from sending a letter during the previous year, but as His Majesty had commanded that an embassy be despatched to Japan to convey a letter to the Shogun, he would ask that the Japanese Minister would arrange for a proper reception to be accorded, and that the ambassadors be presented to the Shogun.

The Foreign Minister sent three piculs of ivory, four rolls of white cloth, and eight rolls of white netting.

(4) *Letter from Sakai Utanokami Fujiwara Tadayo to Okya Phra Khlang, dated 27th September 1623.*

As this letter is of some importance I give a full translation as follows :

I have received and read your letter several times, and have placed it before the Council of Ministers for consideration, and have also reported to the Shogun that Luang Thong Samut and Khun Swat have been sent as ambassadors by your King, and have brought with them a royal letter and presents for the Shogun. When the ambassadors arrived, the Shogun was not in residence at Yedo; he had gone to Kyoto. I, therefore, had the honour of introducing the ambassadors to the Shogun at that city, on which occasion they presented the King's letter with the royal gifts. The Shogun handed a reply to the ambassadors, and the presents for the new Shogun have been delivered. The Shogun has sent as a present a horse of the best breed, together with a saddle and bridle for the King. Kindly inform His Majesty.

I cannot find words good enough in which to express my thanks to you for the kind gifts you have sent to me. The bonds of friendship between our two countries are unbreakable, and because we both hold the same sentiments of loyalty, the fact that our countries are separated by the sea is of no importance. I, on my part, beg to send your Royal Master a horse, which I hope you will present to His Majesty for me. As both the Shoguns are about to return to Yedo, my time has been occupied so fully in arranging for the audience, that I am unable to write a full letter to you, but feel sure that the ambassadors will make a full report of what has taken place here. May you enjoy happiness and prosperity.

It will be noticed that this letter makes reference to two Shoguns and speaks of the new one. The Shogun, who replied to the King, was Minomoto Hidetada. Now we know that Hidetada abdicated in favour of his son, Iemitsu, in this very year A. D. 1623. The new Shogun was, of course, the son, but according to Japanese custom, the Shogun who abdicated always held a controlling hand over important affairs of State. Iemitsu did not take full charge of the Government till A. D. 1632, when his father died.

(5) *Letter from Okya Phra Khlang to Doi Toshikazu.*

This letter is couched in the same terms as the Foreign Minister's letter to Sakai Utanogami.

(6) *Letter from Doi Toshikazu to Okya Phra Khlang, dated 27th September 1623.*

In this letter the writer says that he has informed the Shogun of the arrival of the two ambassadors from Siam, and took the opportunity of telling His Highness that when the Siamese envoys who had visited Japan two years ago (1621) returned to their country they had duly presented the Shogun's letter to the King, and informed His Majesty of the happy state of affairs prevailing in Japan at the time. The rest of the letter is similar in tenor to that of Sakai Utanokami. A pedigree horse was sent by this dignitary for the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

(7) *Letter from Itakura Suonokami Minamoto no Ason Shigemune to Okya Phra Khlang, dated 15th October 1623.*

This letter acknowledges receipt of a letter from Okya Phra Khlang together with a present of a pair of elephant's tusks, and four rolls of foreign cloth. The letter itself conveys to Okya Phra Khlang the same information as is given in the letters from other Japanese Ministers.

The letter from Okya Phra Khlang is not found in this series.

King Song Tham continued to keep in close contact with the Shogun of Japan. In 1626 several diplomatic letters passed between the two countries, but I cannot find that any personal letter was sent by the King of Siam or the Shogun as in previous years. This may be due to the letters having been lost or mislaid in the Department of Archives in Japan. There were four official letters, two from Siam and two from Japan. There was also a fifth letter but this seems to be of a private nature, and was addressed by one Makino Nobunari to Okya Phra Khlang, the Foreign Minister, in September 1625 (Chalu, the year of the Ox which synchronises with the year 987 of the Little Era). This letter says that the writer is taking advantage of the departure of a ship to convey to Okya Phra Khlang his pleasure at knowing that he is in good health, and asks the Minister to use his influence with the King to advance the interest of the writer. The captain of the ship is a friend of the writer, who trusts that the Minister will do all he can to help his friend to dispose of the cargo quickly, and to the best advantage of both countries. The writer then goes on to say that if the Minister expresses a wish for anything, he will be glad to send it, and takes advantage of the present opportunity to send the Minister a suit of armour.

The first of the official letters is one from Okya Phra Khlang, the Foreign Minister, to Sakai Tadayo, and this letter is dated the

fifteenth day of the waning of the fourth month in the year of the Tiger, 987 of the Little Era (*circa* March 1626). Okya Phra Khlang says :

It has been brought to my notice that the administration of your country is firm like unto the stone walls of the city, and therefore the people enjoy happiness and prosperity. It is a matter of pleasure to my Royal Master that the renown of your government should have spread throughout all lands. I am commanded by His Majesty the King to say that though there are many countries in this world under the same sky inhabited by different races and separated by water, still if we give profound consideration to the matter, it will be seen that Siam and Japan are among the important states.

In ancient times although there was little communication by water between our countries, still the high renown and honour of Your Excellency was known to me, and the people of other countries must have been aware of the greatness and superiority of your land over theirs much as the sky is above the earth. At the present time although we are distant one from the other, still the existing means of communications has led to a state of great friendship, which is a matter for congratulations, but it is a matter for regret that as we are separated by a vast expanse of water, Siam is unable to enjoy that prosperity which is yours. Although traders voyage between our countries without hindrance, I have no better means of hearing about Your Excellency than the reports brought to me by your envoys, who inform me that your country enjoys peace. If, for this reason, other countries are envious of our fortunate circumstances, it need cause us no anxiety.

In the year of the Pig, 985 of the Little Era (A.D. 1623), my Royal Master sent an embassy with a letter and a few presents of little value to His Highness the Shogun as a token of respect, and to enquire after his health and happiness. He, in his turn, sent a gracious letter with many handsome gifts. It gave me great pleasure to learn that your country was well governed, and that you have shown such a gracious manner to the envoys; but not only this, it gave me greater pleasure to know of your expressed wish for the continuance of friendly relations between our countries. I have heard of these matters from the envoys, but to me it is not the same as if we had conversed together.

It is owing to the kind thoughts of the Shogun that our people are happy and enjoy the fruits of a bountiful harvest, but the state of rebellion in Cambodia still continues. My Royal Master is sending reinforcements to quell the revolt. The King has appointed Khun Raksa Sithiphol (ขุนรักษาสีทิพพล), and acting Wat Nong At (วัจนองอาจ), an interpreter, to be his ambassador to convey his Royal Letter to the Shogun, being assured that His Highness the Shogun regards Siam as his own, and thereby our state of friendship will

continue for ever. His Majesty also hopes that envoys may continue to exchange visits from time to time. Should Your Excellency desire anything which I can send you, please let me know and I shall send it forthwith. I feel sure that should Siamese traders visit your country, you will see that they are allowed to carry on their business without let or hindrance, so that they may be able to return to their native land quickly. I trust that my wish in this matter may bear fruit. Three years ago a Siamese trader, Luang Chaiyasun (หลวงไชยสาร), who is now Phya Khun Raksa Montri (พระยาคุณรักษามันตรี), sent a ship to trade in Japan. This vessel has not returned and as I am unaware of the reason, I therefore beg your good offices to ascertain the cause, and to arrange that the ship returns at once. Your compliance with this request will give me great pleasure. My Master, the King, is much attracted by the breed of horses in your country, and in the last two or three years has sent to buy some of these animals but without success. I, therefore, must trouble you to arrange that the envoys may be able to purchase some. His Majesty the King has held a desire to possess some of these horses for several years. I, therefore, hope that Your Excellency will be able to satisfy this desire. Allow me to say that I appreciate highly your devoted loyalty to your country, and the effort made by you to further and cement the bonds of friendship between our countries, and I should appreciate that a reply be sent by the hands of envoys, and that they may return as soon as possible. I beg you to accept from me as a token of respect four rolls of flowered cloth, and four rolls of white netting.

(2) *Letter from Sukai Tadayo to Okya Phra Khlang, written on the 10th waxing of the year of the Tiger (A. D. 1626).*

I have read your delightful letter and have received the four rolls of flowered cloth, and the four rolls of white netting.

It is a matter of gratification to me to learn that you have received my previous letter. As regards the Siamese traders in Japan I am arranging that they shall return without hindrance. The truth is I had already once tried to send them back, but they could not leave, because they had not sold the whole of the cargo. I will see that they go now.

I learn that your country is engaged in suppressing a revolt on the frontier. As the rebels are not strong, it is probable that they will be unable to resist a superior force. I, therefore, feel sure that you will be able to crush the rebels before long.

As regards the horses you ask for, I will procure and send them. However, your envoys have already bought some. Besides the horses the envoys are taking, I desire to present to the King a horse of good breed. Kindly inform His Majesty.

In the matter of our countries being faithful one to the other, and of commercial intercourse, if these two conditions can be developed and in-

creased to their fullest extent, it will be a most excellent thing, about which I need not say much as you yourself must be aware of its desirability.

(3) A letter was sent by the *Chief Minister of State in Siam* to *Doi Toshikazu* and *Sakai Tadayo*, but its contents are unknown as the letter cannot be found.

(4) *One of the two Japanese Ministers addressed in letter No. 3, namely, Doi Toshikazu, replied in the 10th month (probably October) in the year of the Tiger (A. D. 1626), saying:*

The Siamese ambassadors have arrived in Japan by a sailing vessel, and they have given me your letter with the two presents which I accept. I thank Your Excellency. It gives me pleasure to learn that you received my letter sent two or three years ago. I understand that Siam desires to quell the rebellion on the frontier. The waging of war entails the taking of life, and all its accompanying horrors. Every means should be employed to avoid war, but peace is not to be attained by neglecting to take up arms.

Japan is enjoying a state of profound peace, and good law and order are upheld, which condition has been observed by the Siamese ambassadors, who will undoubtedly inform you of this. I feel sure that no cause or incident can arise which would lead to the existing state of friendship between our countries being lessened or weakened. In the case of the Siamese traders who have stayed in Japan for several years without returning to Siam, it is not due to any act on the part of the Japanese authorities, but simply owing to the traders not having sold the whole of their cargoes. I have told them to return immediately.

Regarding the desire of the King to obtain some more horses, as those already sent were not fleet of foot, I have no objection, and the ambassadors are free to buy at any time. I send a fleet horse for His Majesty the King, and beg you to present it on my behalf to His Majesty. As regards other matters you will learn of them from a letter which I will send latter.

In Part XX of *A Collection of Historical Data* (ประชุมพงศาวดารภาคที่ ๒๐) the year given in these three letters is A. D. 1625. This is obviously wrong, and whether due to a miscalculation or other reasons I am not in a position to say. The year 987 of the Little Era commenced on the 14th waxing of the fifth month), about 11th April 1625); therefore, the fourth month would be eleven months later, and would fall in the year A. D. 1626 about the end of March. The year of the Tiger is mentioned. This is further evidence that the year was A. D. 1626, for the zodiacal year changes a few days before the year of the Little Era. The letter from Makino Nobunari was written in the year of the Ox (Chalu) L. E. 987. Now the year of

the Ox precedes the year of the Tiger. Therefore, this official correspondence must have taken place in A. D. 1626. I have come across a Report of a Dutch ambassador to Japan published as a supplement to a work entitled *A True Description of the Mighty Kingdoms of Japan and Siam* by Francis Caron and Joost Schouten, and translated by Roger Manley, who received permission from the British Government to print his translation in 1662. The copy from which I quote was published in London in 1671. The Dutch ambassador, Coenraed Krammer, tells us that he was in Yedo on the 28th October 1626, when he witnessed a grand ceremonial procession, (of which he gives the most interesting details) which accompanied the Emperor, the Empress and his other consorts on a State visit to the Shoguns. The procession was composed of the high dignitaries of the Court, noblemen, military officers and courtiers. The scene must have been truly wonderful. Mr. Coenraed Krammer tells us that there were two Shoguns, the old and the young. He mentions the fact that when he was in Yedo, embassies of "Siammers and Portugals" were waiting to be received in audience by the Shoguns, as their reception had been postponed till the State visit of the Emperor was over. He records that the Shogun granted him audience before the arrival of the Emperor, as the Shogun desired to dispose of the business of the Dutch envoy quickly.

This report is additional proof that a Siamese mission was sent to Japan in 1626, not 1625. The Siamese ambassador was Khun Raksa Sithipol. The two Shoguns were Hidetada and Iemitsu. Hidetada was the third son of Ieyasu, the first Shogun of the Tokugawa Dynasty. Ieyasu was Shogun from 1603 to 1605 when he abdicated in favour of his son, Hidetada; but retained a controlling hand over the affairs of State till his death on the 8th March 1616. Hidetada ruled till 1623, when he abdicated in favour of his son, Iemitsu, but still continued to take an interest in the affairs of the Government. Hidetada died in 1632.

In the days of which we are speaking, I think that it was customary for the foreign countries enjoying trading relations with Siam to renew the treaties on the accession of each king. King Ekathosrot had trading agreements with the foreign countries which had influence in the East. On his death, the English and the Dutch were attempting to prevent each other from obtaining trading privileges from the new King, Sri Saowaphak, but nothing happened as he was executed.

In the reign of King Song Tham it is clear from the correspondence given above that he entered into a new trading arrangement with Japan. In the *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries*, there are documents to show that after his accession, but before his coronation, he had negotiated a treaty of friendship and commerce with King James of England, whom he called his brother in accord with interroyal custom. We learn of this from a speech made by Okya Phra Khlang, the Chief Minister, on behalf of the King at the time of His Majesty's coronation, which act in the speech is translated as his "appointment." The English translation may have been made direct from the Siamese or from a Portuguese translation of the Siamese. It seems that Portuguese was the diplomatic language used at that time, for I find in another document Mr. Edward Long, the English trading representative of the East India Company, spoken of as Señor Duarte Longo. The speech of King Song Tham is interesting and of value to the historian, so I print it in full. Confirmation of van Vliet's statement about the destruction of the Siamese army in Cambodia, mentioned in Part four, will be found in the King's speech. This speech was probably made in 1622, for evidence goes to show that the Siamese forces were annihilated in that year. The King and Okya Phra Khlang both sent valuable presents to Mr. Richard Fursland, "the President of the English Nation" at Jacatra, with a copy of this speech:

The Speech of the King of Siam, and at his appointment, written by CHAWPEEA OYBARKALONG or Vice King Seree Darnaratt Dee Chawchat amat yay nocheet Peepitt rat nunt Coosatebe dee rphrapenu baka Orum bawhoo. (Undated,? 1622).

I, Prebat Sumdet Borum bopitt prabuddha chau yu hua, have given orders to Oybarkalong, one of my principal and chiefest Servants, to write from my own mouth the assured confidence I have of the league and unity agreed of and concluded between that great and famous King of England, my Brother, and myself. And for that His Majesty, by his Ambassador, and in his letter sent unto me, did require that I would give leave unto his people to settle in my country and suffer them to perform their affairs under my protection, as my own subjects, and whatsoever I should do for them in this kind he promised for the joining of peace and friendship between princes, that if I or my people should desire it, he would do the like. On the which promise I do build an immoveable constancy and settled assurance, for which, and other most worthy reports that have been told me of his highness by many strangers I do so truly and entirely affect His Majesty and his people

as if he were myself, and his mine. Now since I have heard that my Brother the King of England has caused a principal and Governor to settle at Jaccatra, for the more commodious and speedier understanding how business may proceed from England, as also here in this and other parts, and likewise to govern and oversee that His Majesty's people do demean themselves well, and to right their injuries if any be offered. These things being known unto me, rejoices me very much, and entices me (by my chief servant, Oybarkalonge) to write unto you Richard Fursland, whom I take as general commander of His Majesty's people in these parts, and account you as one of his great men having such authority committed unto you, entreating you withal, that being I take (as it were) the subjects of my brother the King of England to be mine, and mine likewise his; and for that there is a loving friendship between his master and me, so you will be now a mediator, being so near and England so far off, to maintain love and friendship between our great men (or mandarins) that all things may give good correspondence to either part. I have forborne a long time to write expecting answer to my letter from His Majesty, or some news of his good health from you, but hearing not of any, have now sent my own people with this letter and small token of remembrance unto you, earnestly requesting that if my letter or news come unto you of His Majesty's welfare, that I may be a partaker thereof, for I long to hear how he does and whether he lives in peace and free from rebellious subjects.

If you shall at any time want such things as may be procured within my kingdom, let me know of it, or wherein I may pleasure His Majesty or his people, and you shall well find me ready to perform according to your desires (expecting and nothing doubting the like love from him and his people). I further thought fit (you being chief and Governor of His Majesty's people in these parts) to acquaint you with some wrongs that have been offered unto me, and the rather lest by your not knowing thereof, some prejudice may unwittingly happen unto me.

Whereas my late deceased Grandfather, upon some difference waged war with the King of Cambodia, then being and having got the Victory, by taking the king prisoner and subduing his people, yet in a while after seeing the humility of the said King to be much, restored his kingdom to him again, provided that he and his successors should acknowledge the King of Siam and his heirs for their lord and master, and for that purpose appointed them to pay yearly a small tribute of remembrance. All which the King of Cambodia and his Successors duly observed with all love and humility. And the Father of this King being at the point of death, called his son unto him, warning him, as he had lived peaceably and quietly under his lord and master the King of Siam, so that he now, after his decease, should likewise go and acknowledge himself obedient unto the Crown of Siam and perform those

duties which his father had formerly done, and then all would go well with him. This his Son promised to follow his father's admonition, but as soon as his father was deceased, he did not only take upon him the Crown and government of the kingdom without my consent, but left off to pay his acknowledgement, which by his father he was strictly charged to perform and bound per duty to observe. Whereupon I called my Mandarins unto me, laying before them his obstinacy and required their opinions, who answered me that the King of Cambodia his proceeding was against all reason. I therefore held it fitting to send unto him, both per sea and land, for this purpose that all things might be settled as formerly and with love. Also I sent one of my great Tallapoies, promising by my faith unto him, that if he would submit himself, to place him in my high favour and forget all injuries, but he, seeing my force on either side, deferred my Mandarins with promises that he would be conformable, until such time as the monsoons were spent and his people fortified, which having cunningly brought to pass, knowing my sea Army of necessity forced to return, detained my Tallapoy and fell upon my people by land, slaying the most of them and keeping the rest prisoners.

Thus I have declared the injuries offered unto me, by my servant Cambodia, and for those abuses that you will not suffer any of your people to trade there, but take so many of them as you can until such time as it be quieted. And if it be my fortune to take it, (as I doubt not), you shall not have only trade there, but as before I have said, in all my dominions, to your full content, and as I hold the King of England my brother, counting his people mine and mine his, so whosoever does injury to the one does wrong to the other, and thus I request you to have a regard unto my letter and the speeches of my people, and to return them so speedily as you may with such news as you shall think fit to impart unto me.

A present from the King of Siam unto the President of the English nation at Jaccatra.

				Catt tale m :	
one Bullset of gold poiz	19.	10
one Skife of gold poiz	4.	-
two turrett Cupps of gold poiz	4.	-
one tobacco box of gold poiz	2.	2½
one lime box poiz	2.	8
one box for pens gold poiz	1.	-
one spoon gold poiz	-	8
one knife poiz gold	-	6
				1.	14.
one Crown of gold poiz	4.	10½

A present from Oybarkalong to the President. One open Bullset set with mother of pearl and a standard for the said Bullset bordered with leaf silver.

Mr. Richard Fursland, the representative of the English East India Company and thereby representative of King James of England, wrote to the King of Siam on the 27th March 1623 informing the King that he had received the King's ambassadors at Jacatra, Batavia, with such honour and ceremony as was at his disposal, but he felt that the reception accorded the ambassadors fell far short of what should have been given the envoys of such a high and mighty Prince, because he himself was only a guest on Dutch subdued territory. This point is of interest as showing the position of the English in the East in those days. Mr. Fursland thanks the King for the privileges he has granted the English in his own dominions, and for his promise to extend such privileges to Cambodia when that rebellious country shall have been subdued. Mr. Fursland warned the King that he was about to close down the English trading depôt in Ayudhya as it was run at a loss. I quote Mr. Fursland's letter :

Extract of Letter from Richard Fursland dated Jacatra, 27th March 1623, to the High and Mighty Monarch of Judia, Prabat Somdet Parama Bophit Phra Buddha Chao Yu Hua, &c.

Your Majesty's gracious offer unto me, of privileges at Cambodia, (when you shall have subdued them), as also your promise of such other privileges as I shall request in all places of your Majesty's Dominions, I do most gratefully accept of, and shall be bold to make use of them, and of your gracious favour upon all fit opportunities which shall be offered, and may tend to the good of my Sovereign's subjects.

The respect and entertainment which I have given here unto your Majesty's servants has been such as is befitting the messengers of so mighty a King as is your Majesty, yet it has not been so ample as I desire, by reason of the place where we do live, which is the Hollanders' subdued country; but I hope your servants are contented, and that your Majesty will also be pleased when they shall relate unto you their usage, and such other matters as I have related unto them concerning our common abode in this Town of Batavia. And thus much your Majesty may please to receive in answer to your Letter sent me.

The state of Siam trade is at present for us English so small and the charge thereof so great, that we can reap no profit by it, and it is not unknown to your Majesty that the life of merchants is to gain by the trade they follow, for otherwise they cannot subsist. The want whereof at present in that trade which we have in your Majesty's Dominions is the only occasion that I must now remove our merchants from thence, and so lessen the great

charge which now they are at without any profit to maintain it. Wherefore I request and entreat your Highness that you will be pleased to give them leave to depart in this Ship, which I have now sent at a great cost and charge, purposely to return your Majesty's servants, and to bring my people from thence. And I further entreat your Majesty, that you will be pleased to appoint some of your servants to keep the house which you bestowed upon the English, until such time as they shall return thither again, which I trust will be shortly. In the mean time I request and entreat your Majesty that you will be pleased to send me your Tra, for free trade at Ligor in as large and ample manner as the Hollanders have it, which if you shall be pleased to grant unto the English, I shall accept it as a singular favour from you, and shall thereby be encouraged to send again the next year into your Majesty's Dominions.

(This document is a late copy. The original has not been traced).

On the 2nd August 1624 the President and Council of the English East India Company at Batavia wrote to the King of Siam a letter couched in the most complimentary language begging His Majesty to allow their chief shipwright who had been lent to the King to return to Batavia by a ship which was sent for the purpose. I quote the letter here as a good example of the language used in diplomatic correspondence at that time:

Translation of the preceding letter of 2nd August 1624.

The President and Council of the illustrious English Company, subjects of the most High and Mighty King, James, By the Grace of God King of Great Britain, France and Ireland, Defender of the Christian faith, pray for health, peace and tranquillity for the Most High and Invincible Eastern Emperor, King of Oudea (Ayuthia), Phrabad Somdet Parama Bophit Phra Buddha Chao Yuhun &c., with increase of the favours of God in this life and eternal happiness in the future.

It was your goodness alone (Invincible Emperor) which made you value the friendship of foreigners in the high degree shown by the letters and gifts of Your Majesty sent, not only formerly, but also now by Señor Duarte Longo.

But as this is the outcome of your most noble intentions, it only remains for us to show our appreciation of such high favours by conveying with zealous energy the graciousness of the King of Oudea to our Most Noble Sovereign and the other kings of the northern world that they may marvel at the eternal glory of your Majesty. Meanwhile, we humbly beg that Your Highness may be pleased to give us leave to abridge and include the several parts of the letters of Your Majesty in these two small paragraphs.

The first is that we take as expedited, and already done and accomplished, all the matters promised by Your Majesty in your letters.

The second that, on our side, all that we can do for the honour of Your Majesty will be carried through with as goodwill as we now promise to do it.

This we desire most strongly to prove to Your Majesty that we have changed the destination of this ship from countries near by, to which it was sailing in search of supplies, and are sending it to Your Majesty's territories especially to convey (agreeably to Your Majesty's wishes) our chief shipwright, for whose service there is (apparently) some hurry, humbly begging that the said shipwright may be allowed to return at the end of a year to the supervision of our big ships in these parts.

And we beg, for the better dispatch of this ship, that the subjects of Your Majesty may show all diligence and amity in selling to us, for our money, the supplies and necessaries for the lading of the said ship by such time that she can conveniently return to us at the commencement of the summer monsoon, under God's guidance.

All which we will always acknowledge and remember among the multitude of noteworthy favours of Your Majesty. And so, with our prayers to Almighty God, &c.

In Batavia.

2d. August in the year 1624.

While the English were consolidating their position in Siam, the Dutch, although opposed to the penetration of the English, do not appear to have taken any active steps. Trade was at a low ebb in the reign of King Song Tham because this monarch neglected to strengthen the military position of his country. The Dutch closed their factory in Ayudhya in 1622, but trade relations continued and diplomatic courtesies were exchanged. The English closed their factory or dépôt in 1624. This was done with some difficulty as Mr. Edward Long for some reasons of his own declined to obey the orders of his employers, and remained on at Ayudhya where he got into trouble with the Dutch and nearly lost his life at the hands of the Government. Mr. Edward Long eventually left Ayudhya in December 1624 on board the "Robuck," and died on the voyage to Batavia.

Maurits Prince of Orange, Stadtholder, having died, was succeeded by his brother, who on his succession sent a letter dated 17th January 1627 to King Song Tham notifying his accession. In this letter the Prince asked for a continuance of the royal favours to the Dutch people. The letter then goes on to thank the King for having rescued the yacht *Seelandt* from the Spaniards and requests that the restoration may be complete by handing over the merchandise and cash so that the Dutch "may have reason for complete thankfulness."

King Song Tham died in April 1628. He was succeeded by his son, Chetthathirat. An embassy was sent to Japan in 1629 to inform the Shoguns of the accession of the new King. The ambassadors were Luang Sakol Decha (หลวงสกลเดชะ), Khun Sawat (ขุนสวัสดิ์) and Khun Yothamat (ขุนโยธามัตย์), and it is stated that they were received in audience by the two Shoguns, father and son. The father, Hidetada, received the ambassadors on his yacht the "Nishiromaru," and the son, Iemitsu, on board the yacht "Comaru" the 4th of November 1629. At the audience, the ambassadors presented the King's letter which was written on a tablet of gold together with a translation in Chinese, the two documents being encased in an ivory cylinder. Presents were sent to both the Shoguns and many of the dignitaries of State, as well as the Governor of Nagasaki. This embassy, having carried out its mission, had a farewell audience of the Shoguns on the 16th November 1629, and returned to Siam. We have a copy of King Chetthathirat's letter which is said to be dated 23rd April 1629. In this letter the King informs the Shogun of the death of his father, and expresses a wish for a continuation of friendly relations with Japan, and promises to give all assistance in his power to the Japanese traders as though they were Siamese. He told the Shogun that he had appointed an official to look after the interest of the Japanese.

It is a curious fact that the King in this letter should refer to himself as the Heir-Apparent. It should be remembered in this connection that van Vliet tells us that the Heir-Apparent was the brother of the King, and that King Song Tham, by insisting on the succession going to his son, broke the law of succession in use in Siam at that time. It was held that Chetthathirat was not the legitimate King, because two brothers of King Song Tham were, probably, alive; and we know for certain that one at least Phra Sri Sin was living at the time of the death of the King. We do not know whether the other brother, Prince Thong (พระองค์ทอง), died before or after his brother, the King Song Tham. Can it be that Okya Kalahom insisted on this phrase being put in the letter to the Shogun in order to prevent Japanese susceptibilities about right of succession being shocked? Our records, in the *Collection of the Historical Data*, Part XX, tell us that Yamada despatched a trading vessel from Ayudhya in the latter part of October, and that the three ambassadors travelled on this

ship. As the Siamese Ambassadors, mentioned in Yamada's letter dated 27th March 1629 (that is a month before the King wrote his letter) addressed to Seki-Chikara-no-suke, a Minister of State in Japan, are the same as given in the Royal rescript, one must presume that they were the ambassadors received in audience by the two Shoguns in November 1629. During the years 1628 and 1629 there were many happenings of great import in Ayudhya. King Chetthathirat ascended the throne in April 1628. He reigned for eighteen months when he was executed. This would bring us to September 1629. This King was succeeded by his brother, Athityawong, who, van Vliet says, ruled for only thirty-six days. This would bring us to the first or second week in November. Van Vliet in his *Historical Account* leads one to believe that Yamada left the Capital to take up his new appointment as Governor of Nakhon Sri Thammarat after the accession of King Athityawong, but before his execution. I have said in another part of this paper that King Athityawong may have been deposed after reigning for thirty-six days, but was executed some time later. Our record says that Yamada wrote to Sekai-Chikara-no-suke on the 27th March 1629, but the letter together with that of the King was only despatched from Siam in the latter part of October. This ship must have left Ayudhya at the end of September or the beginning of October, for if it was despatched in the latter part of October, it could not possibly have been in Japan early in November, so that the ambassadors were able to see the Shoguns on the 4th of November. Another curious fact in connection with this matter is that Sir Ernest Satow places on record that this embassy was sent to Japan to apprise the Shoguns of the accession of King Athityawong not Chetthathirat. It is noticed that two dates are frequently given for the writing of a letter, and that these dates are twenty-eight days apart. This leads one to believe that the recorder was not certain in his mind of the exact European month which corresponded with the Siamese month. If I am right in my assumption in this matter then Yamada's letter may have been sent in the latter part of September, and then all would be well. The letter written by King Chetthathirat may have been sent and used for the purpose of informing the Shogun of the accession of King Athityawong. This is the more probable, as we know that King Prasat Thong did not wish to stand before the Shoguns of Japan as the executioner of King Chetthathirat. When the Siamese ambassadors were having their

audience with the Shoguns, King Athityawong had certainly been deposed, and may have been executed. It was only about three years after this embassy returned to Siam that Japan broke off all relations with King Prasat Thong, and that this King expelled from the country those Japanese who had not been murdered.

(3) IN THE PRASAT THONG PERIOD A. D. 1629-1656.

The years 1628 and 1629 were years during which political crises followed each other with great rapidity. Two Kings were executed and three Kings were crowned. These changes necessitated the shedding of much blood principally that of the best men of the country. No countries could thrive under these conditions. The years between 1629 and 1633 saw a continuance of disorders largely due to the steps taken by King Prasat Thong to establish himself firmly on the throne. Many princes and noblemen of both high and low estate, who had not espoused his cause or had shown dissatisfaction, were ruthlessly murdered. This process of elimination was extended even to the princesses and other female members of the Royal House, many of whom were executed. That great personality, Yamada, was sent out of the Capital with his soldiers as the King feared him. Although Yamada was murdered, according to Mr. Gunji, the Japanese scholar, at the end of 1630 or the beginning of 1631, King Prasat Thong did not feel safe till O-In, Yamada's son, had been disposed of. As the King feared a general revolt on the part of the Japanese to avenge the death of their leader, this process of elimination was continued, and was brought to bear in a brutal manner on all the Japanese in the Kingdom. The King succeeded by acts of murder and exile in destroying the Japanese, for it would seem that in the early months of 1633 none of them remained in the Kingdom.

The trade between Siam and Japan was a factor of paramount importance in the economic life of Siam, probably more important than the combined trade between Siam and other foreign countries. I am convinced that the balance of trade was in favour of Siam. The Japanese traders bought Siamese goods with silver bullion, which was of great value in strengthening the economic and financial position of Siam. Japan bought deer skins in almost incredible numbers, for we are told both by van Vliet and Schouten that the aggregate annual export amounted to 150,000 skins. Japan also took tin, tim-

ber, teak, Saphan wood, planks, sugar, coconut oil, lead and a variety of other commodities. The disturbances in the Kingdom between 1628 and 1633 seriously affected the Japan trade. After the Japanese had been driven out of the country, this trade ceased altogether, for no ships came from Japan. The Siamese could not trade with Japan without a special licence, and such licences were withheld by the Shogun. The trade between Siam and Japan continued to be carried on by the Chinese in a sporadic and intermittent fashion.

Dating from 1612, when Siamese vessels commenced to trade with Japan, it was the custom for the Government to appoint Siamese Trade Commissioners to travel on the ships, and to supervise the sale of the cargoes, and the purchase of commodities as cargo for the return voyage. These Trade Commissioners were officials, and the ships and the cargoes were generally the property of the King. Although the Chinese continued to carry on the trade, Siamese Trade Commissioners travelled on the ships as formerly, for a large portion of the cargo belonged to the King. These Commissioners, being Siamese, were not allowed to go on shore in Japan although this privilege was granted to the Chinese and Malay crews of the ships.

The economic and financial position of Siam was seriously affected by the steps taken by King Prasat Thong to eliminate all rivals whether Siamese or foreigners, who might question his right to the throne. Silver no longer came from Japan. Van Vliet tells us that trade began to shrink. As the King was himself the chief trader, his profits and his wealth were much diminished and, therefore, King Prasat Thong changed his policy, and relenting of what he had done to the Japanese, tried to induce them to return to the country. Some seventy or eighty responded, and were allowed to settle in the Capital. They were given land, and special privileges and again enjoyed the right to appoint their own headman. The King, in May 1635, sent an embassy headed by Okkhun Sri Phakdi to Japan in an attempt to restore the old friendly relations with that country. The ambassador failed in his mission because the Japanese refused to receive him. On the return voyage to Siam the ship conveying the ambassador called at a port in Formosa; and, while at anchor in the river Mattauw on the 11th January 1637, was struck by a typhoon and wrecked and the ambassador drowned. In October 1641 a rumour was current in Ayudhya that the King was about to send another embassy to Japan and two ships were requisitioned

from Chaiya and Nakhon Sri Thammarat for the purpose of conveying the embassy. We do not know whether this embassy ever left Siam, but it is clear from van Vliet's *Historical Account* that ambassadors were sent to Japan and had not returned to Siam in 1645. This embassy, probably left Ayudhya in 1643 or 1644. The reason for the Japanese refusal to receive Okkhun Sri Phakdi was probably because the Japanese Government did not recognise King Prasat Thong's right to the throne, but the later embassies were refused admission to the country owing to the promulgation of an Edict closing Japan. The reasons for the promulgation of the Edict closing Japan to foreign intercourse were threefold; firstly, because of the unruly conduct of foreigners in Hirado and Nagasaki and the activities of missionaries of the Christian faith, which had led to some extent to the disintegration of the social laws and customs of the people. Foreigners were banned from the country. The Dutch alone were granted in 1640 a restricted form of residence on a small islet called Deshima in front of Naosacbi and the right to trade. Secondly, because the Shogun feared ~~that~~ the Japanese, by going to foreign countries, might create awkward political problems; and thirdly because it was feared that if the Japanese nationals were allowed to go to foreign countries, they might be converted to Christianity, and on their return spread the tenets of that faith in Japan. This prohibition also laid a ban on the export of military weapons.

Friendly relations with Japan were not restored till the 25th of September 1887, and these friendly relations only began to bear fruit in 1897. In that year Mr. Inagaki was appointed the first Minister of Japan to the Court of Siam, and negotiated a treaty to replace the one mentioned above. This new treaty was signed in 1898. Since last year the friendship between the two countries has increased to such an extent, that one feels as if we were back in the days of King Song Tham.

Having digressed from the main theme in order to show the extraordinary results based on the principle of cause and effect, which arose from King Prasat Thong's action in driving the Japanese out of the country, an action which continued to have effect for 255 years, I will now continue my story.

Japanese participation in the trade of Siam having ceased in the year 1633, the Dutch, perhaps the most diplomatic of the foreign traders, took advantage of the new commercial situation to strengthen

their position in Ayudhya. The Dutch East India Company, through their depôt in Ayudhya, picked up the commercial thread lost by the Japanese, and carried on the Siam trade with Japan. Their trade was so flourishing and their position so strong as they now had few competitors, that they decided to erect a great stone house or lodge with warehouses and wharves on the river in place of the old wood building which Joost Schouten says was in the city of Ayudhya. The following extract taken from Joost Schouten's *A Description of the Government, Might, Religion, Customs of Siam*, written in 1636, will make the position clear.

It is more than thirty years since the Netherlanders came first to Siam, and were admitted of by His Majesty, so that the company have judged it necessary, for the cherishing of their traffick and alliance with so mighty a Prince, to settle there; to which end they builded a house, or lodge, of wood in the the City of Iudia (Ayudhya), where they trade in inland commodities, and selling of clothes, as also buying of Harts-skins, Sappang, etc. which are sent yearly to Japan: the Company indeed hath not profited much, by reason of several misfortunes by this traffick; but they have gained more reputation than any Europeans besides, by the great friendship and correspondence which is betwixt them and the King; also have had the benefit of transporting great quantities of all sorts of provisions in Batania (Batavia), which friendship, notwithstanding the several successions of the Princes, disturbing the Companies Cantore and Servants, is yet sufficiently conserved and continued, and ought in my opinion to be cherished, as absolutely necessary for the good and welfare of our Company, as also in regard of the King's civil usage of us, and his aversion to the Spaniards, our common enemy; finally our factory established there in the year 1603, and trading during my four years direction, are so much corrected and increased, that the Company hath remarkably gained by them, with probability, with good management of more signal advantages. To which end the General and Councel of India caused in Anno 1634 a stone lodge, with fit pack-houses, pleasant apartments, and a commodious landing place, to be builded on the borders of the River Menam, being one of the convenientest and best scituated of any that unfortified in all the Indiaes.

I have just said that the Dutch had few commercial competitors, and this is borne out by Joost Schouten. The Portuguese, who had attained to a position of military and commercial supremacy in the East, were unable to hold that position against the unrelenting and stubborn advance of the Dutch, past masters in commercial intrigues and politics. The Portuguese lost the great influence they had in Ayudhya, and their power was crumbling. The Kings in

Ayudhya at this period commenced to withdraw their favour which they transferred to the Dutch. The Portuguese retaliated by attacking and seizing the King's ships, and attempted unsuccessfully to blockade the coast of Mergui and Tenasserim which then belonged to Siam. This brought about their downfall in Siam where many were in prison. The astute Hollanders turned the situation to their own advantage. They even went so far as to give King Prasat Thong military assistance against his enemies.

Owing to the trade being in the hands of the Dutch, the actual profit to Siam was, probably, not so great as when the Japanese bought Siamese commodities with silver. King Prasat Thong, finding that the economic position of the country was weakening, turned his eyes to India in order to increase trade, and, possibly, to break the Dutch monopoly in the trade of the country. Van Vliet, in his Treatise, throws a most interesting light on the policy of the King. He tells us :

The Siamese King has during his reign made alliances and has kept up friendship with the kings of Rammaradt Cotopsia, on the coast of Choramandel, and with the Nawab of Bengal. Every year ambassadors are sent out from both sides with letters full of praises and compliments and also with small presents. This is only due to promote trade, for the Moorish and Gentile merchants often try to secure the assistance of the embassy in order to pay less duties and to become more free in their trade. The Siamese subjects in the above named places try to get the same advantages. So that this friendship is not kept up for political considerations, but only to get more profits. The governors of Paliacatta (Kalighat, modern Calcutta), seeing that their neighbours through the gorgeous embassy have gained the King's favour and enjoyed many profits, have imitated the same comedy and have abased themselves so far, that besides a rich present, they offered the king duly five successive years the golden and silver flowers. This means, that the town Paliacatta is subjected to the Siamese Crown. The principal object was to get a few elephants. It was dishonour for the towns and Moorish castes and by this action great disrespect was also shown towards the (Dutch) Company's servants. For now the arrogant Siamese believe, that they have the supreme power, not only over Paliacatta, but also over the Netherlands fortress and everything connected with our trade. It means also that the Company's servants reside out there under the shadow of the king. Notwithstanding their humbleness the ambassadors from Paliacatta were so little respected, that they have never been allowed to appear in audience before the King or His Majesty's Council, but they have only been received by the Berckelagh in the public court.

This policy was rendered possible, because Siam possessed two ports namely Mergui and Tenassarim on the Bay of Bengal. These provinces were brought back under Siamese suzerainty by King Naresuan. The King, finding his share of the profits accruing from the trade diminishing, began to impose all kinds of imposts and restrictions on the movements of the trade. He may have gained a temporary advantage, but the logical result was that Siam became economically weak for trade, and under these conditions could not flourish.

The above sketch of the conditions prevailing in Siam during the reign of King Prasat Thong is supported by the letters and reports collected and printed in the *Dagh Register*, a daily journal kept in Batavia Castle by the Dutch, and the *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries in the 17th Century* (National Library, Bangkok).

The English, who closed down their trading depot in Ayudhya in 1624, do not seem to have taken any interest in the Siam trade during the reign of King Prasat Thong, for no mention is made by the Dutch of English commercial or other competition during that period. The position of the Dutch in Ayudhya was strong but not stable. The Dutch had practically entered into a military alliance with Siam, based largely on selfish ground, because they desired to use Siam for the purpose of breaking the Spanish and Portuguese power, and they were successful. Cambodia from the time of King Song Tham had remained in a state of rebellion, and the Dutch had promised the King military support in suppressing the revolt. The Southern provinces, including Patani, were in a state of continual ferment during the whole of this reign. The Dutch offered to send warships, but they do not seem to have come on the scene at the right time. For there was little co-operation between the Siamese and Dutch forces. This led to many disputes with the King who retaliated by placing all kinds of obstacles in the way of the Dutch traders. The Dutch, however, held the trump-card. Whenever the King and his officials became unpleasant they threatened to close down their factory in Ayudhya and remove the same to Cambodia. This threat always brought the King to his knees, because he feared that the Cambodians supported by the Dutch might overcome him, and also because it would mean the cessation of Siam's foreign trade. The Japanese traders had been eliminated, the English were not interested, the Spanish and Portu-

guese had little authority, there only remained the Dutch. If they became exasperated and gave up Siam, the King with all his might could do nothing, he could not even trade, for the Dutch held command of the seas.

A short account of the diplomatic relations existing between Siam and Holland in this reign may interest the reader. Mr. W. Blankwaardt has written and published in the Journal of the Siam Society, Vol. xx, part 3, 1927, a valuable paper on the relations existing between Holland and Siam from the time of the coming of the Dutch to the East to the present time. This paper is not complete as regards the reign of King Prasat Thong.

I find that in 1631, the Governor General of the Dutch East India Company wrote in friendly terms to the King in order to improve the relations especially the trading conditions between the two countries. The King replied to the Governor General and at the same time sent a letter to be forwarded to the Prince of Orange. The King, being at the time in trouble with the Japanese, received the Governor General's letter with great pomp and ceremony as he desired to obtain military assistance from the Dutch.

The governing body of the Dutch East India Company at the Hague, composed of seventeen Commissioners, wrote in 1632 to the Governor General in Batavia stressing the importance of keeping on friendly terms with Siam. The King wrote again to the Prince of Orange in 1633, but I cannot trace the letter. Friedrich Henrich, by the Grace of God Prince of Orange, Count of Nassau, etc., replied to the King in 1634 or 1635 sending the Royal missive together with a crown and sword by the hands of a special Commissary to the Governor General for delivery to the King. Joost Schouten was appointed special commissoner and travelled to Ayudhya, leaving Batavia on the 13th August 1636. The Royal message and presents from Holland were received with pomp. The letter is interesting, so I reproduce it:

The Prince of Orange to the King of Siam.

(Dated 1634 or 1635).

Friedrich Henrich, by the Grace of God Prince of Orange, Count of Nassau, &c., &c., Captain General and Admiral of the United Netherlands, to the mighty King of Siam in the city Judea, wishes long life, health a prosperous reign and victory over his enemies,

We have received by our ships recently arrived from the East Indies your Majesty's agreeable and valuable letters together with the accompanying gifts from your Majesty's royal city, presented to us by the captain of the fleet, whereby we clearly perceive your Majesty's particular royal affection and love to our Netherland nation, with frank declaration and testimony of your Majesty's good will towards the maintenance of the old alliance and correspondence between your Majesty's Kingdom and this state, which we esteem and value as highly as anything in the world. With reference to which we also find ourselves bound hereby to assure Your Majesty again, that as long as the world lasts we and our successors will always maintain these relations inviolate and unchanged.

It was beyond measure grievous to us to hear of the death of your Majesty's predecessor, our worthy and trust (?), but, on the other hand, on learning that your Majesty by the direction of the great God, Creator of Heaven and Earth, has been openly acknowledged and crowned King of Siam, to the great content of all the subjects of your Majesty's Kingdom, we have even better reason to rejoice that we have found in the person of your Majesty one still greater and more trusty. We have no doubt that your Majesty, of your natural loving kindness, has, long before now, taken Cambodia and Patani into favour again, or by other means has brought them back to their bounden duty and obedience. We wish it were possible to give help to your Majesty in this matter, wherein we should do you the best and most agreeable service, the more so since we see that your Majesty continues willing and inclined to continue the war against the Spaniards and Portuguese, your Majesty's and our hereditary enemies, being assured that thereby your Majesty's state will be maintained in greater tranquillity.

In order that it may appear how much we esteem your Majesty's good inclination and love to our nation, we are sending by our special commissary a crown, and sword, the peculiar ornament with which European kings are adorned and arrayed, begging that your Majesty will be pleased not to consider this small gift but as a token of our goodwill and affection.

With reference to what our Commissary shall report to your Majesty about this country's war we beg your Majesty to trust him.

In conclusion, relying on your Majesty's continuing (as before in the most praiseworthy fashion) to be helpful and to lend a favouring hand to our Netherland nation in their business and all their endeavours appertaining thereto, so that they may carry on their trade, and without hindrance freely and undisturbed get and export what they need, may God the Lord keep your Majesty more and more to your utmost satisfaction and desire in your rule. So with our most dutiful respects and hearty greetings, Your Majesty's
&c.

The story of the manner in which this royal missive together with a letter from the Governor General were received in Ayudhya is most illuminating and also of historical value, for not only does it give us an insight into Court ceremonial but it also throws light on the political condition existing in Siam in 1636 and provides evidence of the military alliance between Siam and Holland. Reference is made to the submission of Patani to Siam after six years of war, and of the King's intention to continue the war against Cambodia which had been in a state of rebellion since 1622 or possibly earlier. It is interesting to know that the King (Emperor) of China was obliged to appoint a permanent mission composed of four cultured Chinese to reside in Ayudhya in order to prevent misunderstanding between Siam and China which had occurred owing to the language difficulty. It also appears that although Patani had submitted to Siam, and Siam was in alliance with Holland, the Governor General of the Dutch East Indies threatened to declare war on Patani should a claim put forward by some Javanese under Dutch Protection not be satisfied. The Siamese Foreign Minister in polite language tried to make the Governor General understand that such hostile proceedings would not be in accord with international procedure. The cargo of rice referred to in this Report, which the King permitted to be exported, is the same cargo which Joost Schouten obtained a licence to export through the good offices of the Queen and her ladies, thus showing the means used to attain an object. I insert the report here :

30th. December 1636.

With the vessel Delft came the commissioner Joost Schouten from Siam, who was sent last 13th August from here to present to His Majesty the gold missive together with the excellent gift of his princely grace the Sire Prince of Orange, consisting of a beautiful gold crown and a sword.

From the same report and written account submitted to the Governor General and to the Council of India we extract the following :—

That the vessels above mentioned, after much trouble and after many dangers, arrived at last on the 15th of September in the river of Siam and reached Bangkok on the 19th of September with the letters and the gifts. There they stayed owing to the indolence of the Siamese till the 23rd, at which date the letter of the Sire Prince of Orange after Siamese Custom was received in state, and, with a suite of 10 *prahus* and about 400 persons, was brought up to a point one mile below the town of Judia. From there the same was conveyed with pomp on the 26th by 12 *prahus* and 800 men to

the city and brought into the King's palace, where it was opened in presence of the highest mandarins of the kingdom in the hall. It was translated into Siamese, and as it came written in gold from such a high Prince, it was placed with the gold statues of the Gods and of the ancient kings, an honour showed only to the gold letters of the Kings of China and Pegu.

The said missive of the Prince of Orange and the added gifts of the gold royal crown and of the sword have pleased the King so much that the sword shall be carried before his Majesty in the yearly splendid procession to the principal temple of Judia, and if the crown had been of pyramidal shape and if the sword had been decorated more richly it would have pleased His Majesty still more, and the crown would have been worn by the King in the war or on expeditions.

The missives of the honourable Heer General to the King and to the Oya Berkelangh were brought in state on the 23rd of September to the new compound, and they were literally translated in the hall of a fine temple in the presence of many delegated mandarins. The translation was communicated the next day by the Berkelang to the King and to his council, who were very astonished at the clear advice concerning the rice as they did not expect such outspoken statements, and the delegate Schouten was informed that this letter convinced them of their error. Beyond his expectation, in view of the indolence of the Siamese, the delegate was granted an audience very soon, so that on the 2nd of October the letters and gifts of the Sire Prince of Orange and of the Honourable Heer General were presented, with assistance of the merchant van Vliet, and in the presence of the most powerful mandarins of the kingdom, in due form, in the great royal hall, and were received and accepted by his Majesty with great pleasure and contentment. The translation of the letters was read in public—but what the Honourable Heer General had written concerning the rice and the restitution of the debt from Patani, was omitted with caution,—so as to show the minor mandarins and the common people that their prince was in complete continued friendship with the Netherlands Government. After having finished the reading of the letters and after some discussion, the king asked the delegate whether he had still to propose to or to beg anything else from his Majesty, stating that he could do so if he wanted through the Berkelang, and his requests would be granted in every reasonable matter. For this his Majesty was thanked and after the presents with due ceremony of betel chewing had been received, and a catty of silver given, they departed from the palace to the compound of the Company.

The next day delegate Schouten was asked, by a sabander, by order of the king, what he had to say or to beg that was not mentioned in the missive of the Heer General,—if his Honour had ordered him to claim this year rice and paddy, and how much we had the intention to claim. Also from which junks

those from Patania had taken the 5603½ Rs. and what were the names of the amackodas.

Thereupon the delegate answered, that he had to ask nothing else than that his Majesty would continue his favourable affection towards the Netherlands and show them his continued favour and assistance, that the property taken was to be restored to the Batavian Japanese, and that the Oya Signorativo (!) should be condemned to restore the damage to Jan van Meerwyck, that the King's command on those of Patany to restore the above mentioned 5603½ Rs. might be given, or that otherwise they had to claim it by hostile ways. Also that the Honourable Heer General was not satisfied with the poor supply last year of 100 coyan rice and 200 coyan paddy, after His Majesty's promise to our people of 400 coyans rice and 400 coyans paddy, that therefore we were compelled to provide ourselves from other quarters and that in future the Siamese could keep their rice and paddy. All these reasons were written down by the sabander, read by the Berkelang and submitted to the King, who was very astonished at them, and who observed very well that he had been deceived in his erroneous idea, that Batavia could not do without the Siamese rice. About the restitution of the Japanese taxed property and about the claim of the Meerwyck on the Oya Singorat (!) the delegate has obtained nothing. About the pretended 5603½ Rs. from those of Patany, he received no other answer, than that His Majesty had not sufficient reasons to order the Patanese the restitution wanted, as the amackodas of the captured junks (according to the words of the Berkelang) had said that they were not in possession of Batavian goods. With this impudent and simple lie this lawful matter was excused and refused. Thereupon the delegate Schouten by order of the Heer General wrote a missive in the Malay language from Siam to Datu Bandara, first mandarin of Patany, which runs as follows:

'Missive of Joost Schouten, delegate of the serene Prince of Holland and of the Honourable Heer Governor General of India, to His Royal Majesty of Siam, addressed to Datu Bandara, first mandarin of Patany.

Six years ago, when Patany revolted from Siam, Siamese junks from Batavia were returning to India and arriving at Patany they were seized by order of the Queen. The Chinese citizens of Batavia had put goods of a value of 5603½ Rs. on board as detailed in the subjoined memorandum. These goods were taken from them as well as the Siamese goods by the Dato Besaar, in defiance of the duty of friendship, for which reason the Heer Governor General wrote the next year from Batavia to Dato Bandara asking him for a fair restitution, but this has been refused without a reply. About this matter the Heer General sent the next year Commander Anthony Caen to Patany with such letter as is known by your honour and by the other regents,

upon which, however, no peace with Siam or restitution of the damage committed followed. That was the reason that the Hon. General assisted the King of Siam against Patany.

‘Since then Patany has conciliated the King of Siam by the customary reverence, which was communicated by His Majesty to the Honourable Heer General in Batavia, who thereupon asked for the restitution of the stolen property. We trust that justice will be done so that Batavia and Patany can be united as before.

‘When, however, the Queen and the mandarins of Patany will put off the restitution from day to day or, with stupid reasons, excuse themselves, then its people is warned by order of the Heer General, that notwithstanding that Patany is at peace with Siam, the war with the Hollanders will go on, so that the junks sailing for Siam and elsewhere will be seized in a hostile way, as is written by the Heer General to His Majesty of Siam. But if the Queen and the mandarins will decide to restore the 5603½ Rs., the Heer General will give peace to that people, when they send a delegation to Batavia, and the trade of the Company with Patany will be renewed. Finally your Honour and the other Governors of Patany are advised to do in this important matter, what is necessary for the contentment of the King of Siam and for the safety of Patany and its inhabitants. Done in the Royal capital Judia in the year of the Rat the 4th of the month Oij (!).

Signed Joost Schouten.’

What the answer on the missive about the restitution claimed will be, time will tell. After that the delegate Schouten begged His Majesty urgently to grant him leave from Siam, but owing to the indolence of the Berkelang, the superstitious worship and the continual water-feasts of the King, it was not granted until 23rd November, when the King asked him if the vessel for starting was ready, if his business in Siam had been brought to a happy conclusion, etc. Thereupon the delegate replied that he had been tolerably successful in his business and that he was ready to start.

The King said furthermore that he had received the golden letter and the gift of the Prince of Orange with great pleasure, and that he intended to send with him as a proof of friendship also such a letter and gift to His Excellency. Also that the letter and gift of the Honourable Heer General had given him great pleasure and in reply thereto he would cause a letter to be written and same to be sent with a gift to Batavia, etc. After this speech the delegate was awarded a gold garland, the value of which was about 50 Rs., and a Siamese gown, and his leave was granted. On the 28th of November the missive of the King and the gifts for the Prince of Orange and for the Honourable Heer General were handed to the delegate and were brought on board the vessel *t Wapen van Delft* by two delegated mandarins with great pomp by means of one rowing frigate and three *proas*, and were accepted with respect-

ful ceremonies. Thereupon the delegate started from the river of Siam on the 4th of December after having handed instructions to advance the interests of the Company to the merchant van Vliet (according to his orders). The gift of the King to His Princely Excellency consists of a Siamese Royal crown, decorated with red and green stones, and 10 pieces silk stuffs were sent by the King's brother to his Honour.

At the end of December the above mentioned missive and the gift of the King of Siam for his Grace the Prince of Orange and for the Honourable Heer General were brought by the delegate from the vessel *t Wapen van Delft* into the castle, and landed with salutes from the guns and three volleys of musketry. The missive runs as follows:—

Translation of the missive to the Prince of Orange:—

‘Golden written evidence of alliance full of divine radiance, the most excellent things, all wise sciences included, the happiest one existing with the human beings in the world, the best and the strongest bond ever formed in heaven, on earth or in hell, the sweetest and kindest royal words, which by virtue of known capacities and glorious fame runs through the earth by divine power as if the dead rose and wondrously were freed from all spiritual and corporal corruptions, wherein the reigning trading and serving people were astonished with a strange gladness, so this is without any comparison with any dignity as it comes with a glad heart and loving friendship and divine, graceful, unconquerable golden crown decorated with many pure stones from the greatest and purest divine lord of the everlasting souls, the holiest all shading ruler of the greatest and noblest kingdom of Siam, a radical of the fine big city Judia which has its many folds, streets and gates filled with people, and the greatest capital of the world which adorns the earthly royal throne with nine sorts of stones and which is the most agreeable country the owner of which is more than the gods and his house is of gold and precious stones, the divine lord of golden thrones of the white and red elephants and of those with a long tail, which three sorts are the specimen of travelling animals given by the supreme lord of nine gods to none else than to the divine lord in whose land is the most the victorious sword, fiery arm of the god of war.

‘To the illustrious, puissant, victorious Prince Frederick Heyndrick, by the Grace of God Prince of Orange, Count of Nassoun, Catsenellebooghen, Vyandon, Diets, Linghen, Meurs, Bueren, Leerdam, Marquis of Veer, and Vlissinghen, Sire and Baron of the city Grave and of the country of Cuyck, Diest, Granbergha, Horstal, Cranendenck, Warnoston, Arley, Noserayst, wt Daesburgh, Poolannen, Willemstadt, Nieuwevaert, Iselsteyn, St. Kaertensdyck, Geertrydenbergh, Chasteau Reguardt de Hooghe en de lage Swaluwe, Naeltwyck and hereditary Viscount of Antwerp and Besançon, hereditary Marshal of Hollant, Governor of Gelderlandt, Hollandt, Zeeland and

Westvrieslandt, Zutphen, Utrecht and Overysel and Captain General and Admiral of the united Netherland Provinces.

'Your Excellency's eminent golden missive and royal gift have been presented to us by your Excellency's delegate with pleasure, and we learned with satisfaction that the person of Your Excellency with his lands and subjects, through God's protection, enjoys good and happy welfare, with which news we were as delighted as if the high God had given the whole world for ourself alone.

'It is true that our states and Your Excellency's dominions are separated by a long distance, but through the old firm friendship they were united to a gold mass, so that we consider as our duty to fight against his enemies with our force of elephants, horses and soldiers, if Your Excellency wish, and to assist him also on water with our galleys, *prouas* and military till the enemies are annihilated, trusting that if our kingdom wants help at any time, Your Excellency will also assist us with his forces and ships because our mutual great friendship requires such assistance.

'The Hollanders, Your Excellency's subjects, negotiating in our states, are favoured by us, and treated with more care than our own vassals.

'While our friendship is so great and excellent that it is confirmed with the sending of golden letters, the hearty affection cannot be declared clearly. The Kings of China and Judia used to send each other in the old times their golden letters to cement their friendship, but as the King of China could not explain his heart's meaning (for want of experienced interpreters) he has sent four learned men to Siam as permanent servants for the Siamese Crown. Since then the letters are well and thoroughly translated which is the strongest preservation of such a durable friendship that the strong friendship of us and our successors may increase and may last as long as the sun will shine and the moon will give light, so Your Excellency has to consider and to order, how that can be done in the best way.

'From our royal city Judia in the year of the rat, the 9th day of the 12th full (waxing? . . . ed.) moon, that is 21st November 1636.'

Translation of the missive written by order of the King of Siam by the Oya Berckelagh to the Honourable Heer Governor General:—

'The Oya or Duke, radiant of sincerity, noble of race, one of the highest vassals of the great King, wise in forethought, illustrious and of royal birth in which no one equals him, mighty ruler of the King's treasures and foreign affairs has sent this letter with a pure heart and friendly affection by order of the divine, illustrious, unconquerable, mightiest, highest sovereign of a hundred and one crowns, the highest, purest and holiest of the immortals.

'To the noble, generous, wise, severe Heer Anthoni van Diemen, Governor General of the possessions of the United Netherlands in India Orientalis, as

Your Honour is devoted to the royal Majesty with a pure heart and with devotion.

‘With the delegate Joost Schouten the golden missive and the gift of the Prince of Holland arrived here in Judia likewise Your Honour’s missive and gifts, also the letter addressed to me, the contents of which were announced and reported to my King. The delegate was soon granted an honourable audience with his Majesty, and the letters and the gifts of the Prince and of Your Honour were silently offered by him. His Majesty was pleased very much that Your Honour sent him with devoted affection the letter and the gifts of the Prince, a thing which will be of much profit for the Hollanders visiting and negotiating in the kingdom of Judia.

‘From the missive of Your Honour our King learnt with great pleasure the affection of Your Honour for his and my ancestors (*sic*) and the old friendship, honour and service for his Majesty. And notwithstanding that there has been no opportunity to prove the willingness completely to his Majesty, yet it was appreciated as if Your Honour’s willingness and affection had been proved completely, and His Majesty has therefore a great affection for Your Honour.

‘On the recommendation of Your Honour I have shown to Captain Schouten as much favour and help as was required of my office and as was reasonable and in my power.

‘In Your Honour’s letter was mentioned that some inhabitants of Batavia have sent hither some merchandise with two Siamese junks, which were captured by those of Patany, but the anachoda called Napit Ockum syey Sacon (!) declares himself ignorant of the fact that their junks returned with Batavian property. Therefore there is no reason why the Patanese should be ordered to restore. When Your Honour will send thither the owners, and when they can make good their claims, then the restitution will be ordered to those of Patany. Your Honour writes that in case of refusal and in default of restitution the hostilities against the Patanese will recommence at sea, a thing which is really not reasonable, and it is no firm friendship between the Kings of Siam and Holland and contrary to the pure affection of Your Honour towards His Majesty. On the contrary Your Honour’s good fame will increase with the neighbouring princes and nations when Your Honour will prevent hostile ways. This is to be kept in consideration, and a lawful procedure is advised to Your Honour.

‘At the request of the Captain Schouten, His Majesty has licensed the purchase and export of 200 coyan rice and 100 of paddy.

‘The King sends to the Prince of Holland a golden triple royal crown set with red and blue precious stones and with cat’s eyes in double rows of red and white stones.

‘To Your Honour His Majesty presents a gold crown set with the same sort of ornament and rubies, and 50 Siamese coyan paddy.

‘In the royal capital Judia, the first day of the waxing moon in the year of the rat, which is 28th November 1636.’

The political and commercial relations between Siam and Holland continued to run along lines normal to the period. The Dutch would be in or out of favour with the King consequent on differences of opinion and the attempts of one party to get the better of the other in trading transactions. The Prince of Orange and the Governor General of the Dutch East Indies continued to write to the King, who replied in a dilatory but courteous manner. Presents were exchanged as usual. The King and Okya Phra Khlang had suggested to the Dutch traders that good jewellery should be brought to Ayudhya for sale to the Court. These transactions were not fruitful of benefit to the Company but rather the otherwise as they led to much bickering and quarrelling over the price. The King had asked Joost Schouten to have a model of a Dutch warship complete in all detail made as a toy for one of his children and two paintings of elephants made also. Van Vliet presented these gifts to the King on the 29th October 1641, when he was received in audience for the purpose of presenting letters and gifts from the Prince of Orange and the Governor General. The paintings of the elephants did not please the King who, however, felt highly honoured by the attention paid him by the Prince of Orange. I append the reports dated 29th November and a few extracts from that of the 14th December 1641 below. These reports disclosed two interesting facts. One, that Van Vliet recognised that the continuance of direct correspondence between the King and the Prince of Orange was producing an atmosphere in Court circles of disrespect for the dignity of the Governor General and a consequent loss of prestige in Siamese eyes. Van Vliet suggested to his Government that the practice should cease or obstacles be put in the way of the despatch of letters. Two, it appears that the Company conceived the plan of bringing out to Ayudhya four young Dutch boys to be educated in Siam in order that they might gain a full knowledge of the language, customs, literature and arts. The plan was put into execution, and van Vliet brought four Dutch boys with him to Ayudhya. When the King heard of this he was much pleased and offered to bring up and educate the boys in the palace placing them in the Pages' Corps.

Van Vliet did not like the idea and therefore found some excuse for not gratifying the King's wish. It is possible that one of these boys died for in a later report only three are referred to. This attempt to educate young Dutch children in the Siamese fashion, for it would seem that they were placed with honest Siamese people, is proof of the determination of the Dutch to place their business on a permanent foundation. The report of the 29th November is as follows:

29 November — The vessel *de Snoek*, which had left Siam on the 24th of October, arrived with a cargo and with advice of the delegate Jeremias van Vlieth and of the merchant Reynier van Tzum.

The delegate Jeremias van Vlieth reports that on arriving on the 23rd of September at the Siamese river, he went himself immediately to the town of Judia, and informed the Berckelagh of his arrival bringing letters from His Highness the Prince of Orange and from the Heer Governor General of India, besides rare gifts. This was reported to the King, who was very pleased and who immediately ordered that the reception of His Highness' letter (engraved on gold after Siamese fashion) should take place with more splendour and pomp than ever had been shown to the letters of the King of China or of the Emperor of Japan. This was effected magnificently with many people, ships and great reverence to the princely letter (the same reverence as to the King himself). His Majesty had sent 20 small metal guns to the Company's compound, with which salutes were fired. The procession of 1200 armed soldiers and musicians was received in the palace, where the letter was opened and translated in the presence of many great personages and then the letter was immediately brought to the King. His Majesty was so pleased with it, that he declared he never had received a more agreeable missive and that he would cause it to be deposited, after the fashion of the Court, with the gold statues of the deceased kings and with the gold letters of the monarchs of China, Japan and Pegu.

The next day the letters of the Heer Governor General were taken with due honour from the factory and translated in the presence of many of the nobility; the King was pleased with the letters, but Berckelagh's orders*

**Note.* The orders of Phra Khlang referred to here relates to an agreement which van Vliet was compelled to sign by the Phra Khlang in September 1636 owing to the fear of the Siamese of the growing power of the Dutch. The document reads as follows:—

“On the 5th day of the waxing moon, named *duen ji* in the year of the rat, Oya Berckelagh has exacted from me, Jeremias van Vliet (chief of the Company's factory in Siam) by the sabander Olang Tsuijt Rajmontri this writing, in which I promise that every thing, which will be ordered or commanded, from this day forward, by order of the Berckelagh to me or the Hollanders residing in Siam, by the sabander or interpreter, will be obeyed as exactly as is in our power according to the laws and to the customs of the Kingdom, and that I (being the chief) will be kept responsible for the trespasses wherefore I pledge my own person.

“In Judia on the factory Siam, September 1636.”

remained in force although somewhat modified, as has been proved by the King's licence, which had just been obtained. The four Netherlands children, who had been sent for the study of the country's language, literature and arts, pleased the King very much. He offered to lodge them in the palace and to educate them in his service; the delegate had excused them, but anyhow he was ordered to bring them with him and to show them at the audience. The delegate's audience with the King had been postponed till after the end of ceremony of the hair-cutting of his Majesty's eldest son and through a mistake of the sabander was postponed till after the departure of the vessel *de Snoek*. But his Majesty had let the delegate know, that there was no doubt about his royal favour and that his kingdom would be open for the Netherlands and their trade. He had also ordered the Berckelagh to assist our people in their requests and to provide the delegate with letters to the rulers of Lygor, Sangora, Bordelough and Patany for his visit to the gulf of Siam. Also he consented to the purchase of 500 piculs sappanwood and that the payment might be postponed till the arrival of our vessels from Japan.

Neither the King nor the Berckelagh had been pleased by the gift which accompanied his Highness's letter or with the missive of the Hon. Heer General; so the gift had to be increased to keep his Majesty's favour and the Berckelagh's necessary assistance; the paintings of the elephants had not found favour either.

The jewels had pleased the king, especially that he might choose before the Atchinese king, but they had been valued by his obsequious jewellers without any cause far below their value, the Atchinese $\frac{2}{5}$ and the big diamond ring $\frac{1}{3}$ of cost-price, so there is apparently no chance of selling one of the jewels.

In the report dated 14th December 1641 van Vliet makes the following statements:

In Siam the letters of the Sire Prince of Orange meet with much success; however the delegate thinks it better to discontinue these letters as the respect in which the Governor General is held is decreased by them (to the detriment of the Company), and that therefore he has the intention to treat the matters in that way (if possible) that the letter of the King to His Highness of Orange will be neglected or the answer at least postponed for some years

The King has ordered that nobody, except Portuguese, may enter the Papist church or go to mass, upon pain of death.

It was rumoured abroad that the King had the intention to send again a commission to Japan, therefore a new junk from Taiya (Chaiya) or a vessel from Oya Lygor is expected.

In A. D. 1650 King Prasat Thong again showed great favour to the Dutch by sending a special mission to Batavia conveying a gold jewelled crown and twelve elephants for the Governor-General. This direct dealing with the Governor General and the presentation of such valuable gifts may be interpreted to mean that van Vliet's policy of compelling Siam to deal directly with the Governor General only had borne fruit.

King Prasat Thong died in August 1656, leaving Siam weaker than when he usurped the throne in 1629.

(4) THE PERIOD FROM A. D. 1656 TO 1767.

In 1656 King Chai, a son of King Prasat Thong, who succeeded his father, made an attempt to renew diplomatic relations with Japan. He sent a letter, by the hands of his ambassadors, to the Shogun of Japan, which letter was presented to the Governor of Nagasaki on the 9th July 1656. The vessel, conveying this mission, carried a cargo for sale. On its arrival at Nagasaki, the Shogun who was staying at Yedo was informed, but he refused to receive the mission or the gifts sent by the King. No Siamese was allowed to land although this privilege was granted to the Malay and Chinese members of the crew. Permission to sell the cargo was also refused, but the ship was allowed to sell just sufficient to provide the funds to purchase food, firewood and water for the return voyage. King Chai, in his letter, said that the report, conveyed to the Shogun that the Siamese had ill-treated the Japanese, murdered many of them and driven the remainder out of the country, was not true. He had an earnest desire to renew commercial relations with Japan, and begged the Shogun to allow Japanese traders to visit Siam as before. The Shogun refused, giving as his reason that by an Edict of 1636 Japanese nationals were not allowed to leave Japan.

In 1687 King Narayana commanded his Minister for Foreign Affairs, Okya Phra Khlang, to write to the Shogun requesting the latter to open trade relations with Siam as formerly, and suggested that the Siamese traders should be allowed a quota equivalent to that enjoyed by the Hollanders. In this letter the King praised the high quality of Japanese goods which were superior to anything produced in Siam, and went on to inform the Shogun that in 1685 and 1686 Siamese traders, who had gone to Japan, were not allowed to sell the

cargoes in their ships, but only permitted to sell sufficient to find the money to purchase the necessities of life for the return voyage as in the time of King Chai. We do not know what reply the Shogun made to this request. Trade, however, was carried on between the two countries by the Chinese and Hollanders without the participation of the Siamese. There are records to show that Siamese trading vessels visited Japan in 1693, 1716, 1718 and 1745. However, there is no evidence to prove that the friendly diplomatic relations which existed between 1606 and 1629 were renewed until 1887.

Many of the Kings of the Ayudhyan dynasty were men of great ability, in some cases even approximating to genius, but many were not. The frequent wars with Burma prevented any real economic development. Burma was the only powerful enemy of Siam, and these wars were continued with only occasional lulls from 1548 to 1824. Ayudhya was captured in 1564, and again in 1569, and Siam was brought under the domination of Burma, which lasted till 1590. The economic development of the country received a severe blow, for in these struggles many of the people lost their lives; and thousands of families were taken captives to Hongsawadi. The country regained its freedom in 1590, and the Kings between that year and 1629 did all in their power to rehabilitate the trade of the country. King Narayana did more, perhaps, than any other of his predecessors to foster the political relations of Siam with foreign countries, turning to the West, now that Japan refused to accept his offer of friendship. This was but natural as trade always follows the course of political events.

King Narayana inherited from his father a kingdom weakened by internal disorders and an unsound economic policy. The Dutch were all powerful in matters of commerce and also on the sea, for in 1656 when King Narayana ascended the throne the English had not attained to that state of sea power in the East which they enjoyed in 1686. The disorders in the country continued but perhaps in a lesser degree. There were many uprisings. Constantine Phaulcon had become the Chief Minister of State, but it is doubtful whether his policy was the best for Siam. He seems to have used the policy of playing one power off against another to such a degree that Siam nearly lost its independence and he lost his life. Religious fanaticism was an important factor in the game. In 1661 the Dutch became

involved in a dispute with the King over the capture by the Dutch of a ship flying the Portuguese colours in the Gulf of Tongking. The cargoes on the ship belonged to the King, who claimed an indemnity for the loss sustained against the Dutch East India Company of Fl. 84,000. Troubles now surrounded the Dutch in Ayudhya which they believed were brought about by the machinations of Phaulcon who, in 1663 had gained the confidence of the King. The Dutch factory was besieged by armed Chinese, but the resident, Poolvoet, acting under instructions from the Governor General in Batavia, managed to escape with all his men and goods. If Phaulcon was responsible for bringing about this state of affairs then he showed a lack of political vision. Poolvoet on arrival at the estuary of the river proceeded to blockade the river. This action brought the King to his senses. Ambassadors were sent to Batavia and the Governor General appointed Commissary Pieter de Bitter to proceed to Ayudhya as the Dutch representative to effect a settlement. The settlement was most favourable to the Dutch and on the 22nd August 1664 a treaty was signed between Siam and Holland under which the Dutch gained many privileges including extra-territorial rights for the Company's residents. I give here a copy of this Treaty which, being the first of its kind signed by Siam, is of paramount historical importance.

First Treaty.

11 August O. S. (22 August N. S.) 1664.

Agreement and closer Alliance of Peace made and concluded between his Majesty the King of Siam on the one side and the Commissary Pieter de Bitter on the other, deputy of the Governor General Jan Maetsuijcker and Council of India ruling (in the name and on the behalf of the high and mighty States General of the United Netherlands) the State of the United East India Company in the East.

Firstly, it is agreed, concluded and determined, that from now onwards and henceforth a just, inviolable, secure, sincere alliance and friendship shall exist and be maintained between the King of Siam and the Netherlands Company, together with the subjects of both, and that from this day onwards such questions, differences and further disputes as have arisen between his Majesty's subjects and the Company shall be put out of mind and never more thought of, provided the King punishes and shall punish duly and as they deserve the authors of the affronts done to the Company.

Secondly, it is agreed that henceforth the Company shall enjoy in Siam, Ligor, Oetjangh, Salangh, and all other places and lands of the King, without exception, the peaceful, undisturbed exercise of trade in all such goods and merchandize as are to be found in each (place), without reservation of any nature whatever.

Item. That the Company shall have power to trade, deal and correspond with all and any persons that they choose, be they of high or low degree, without let or hindrance, either direct or indirect, from any person whatsoever.

Further it is agreed and determined, that neither now nor hereafter shall the Company be charged with nor have raised against them in any manner whatever, higher duties etc. on imported or exported goods and merchandize, be it in Siam, Ligor, Oetjangh, Salangh or anywhere else, but shall satisfy and pay all dues according to former customs, as has been stipulated and agreed in the statutory ordinance of the King.

Item. It is agreed that neither now nor hereafter shall his Majesty the King or his subjects, of whatever station they may be, have the power to place any Chinese, viz., the inhabitants of Japan, Canton, Cochin-China, Tonquin, on their junks, ships or smaller vessels, much less to endeavour to introduce men of that nation within their boundaries; that all junks and ships on which natives of that country shall be found, if met by ours at sea, shall be seized as prizes and the Company shall not be bound at any time to make any restitution.

Further, it is agreed and determined that the said Company shall for all time have the exportation of all the deerskins and cowhides which come to Siam, as also the retailing of all other merchandize from any other nation or of any kind, and his Majesty shall be bound by all means to maintain the Company in this privilege.

Moreover, if it should happen that any debtors refuse to make their payments to the Company, as has formerly happened frequently, his Majesty shall, through Oja Berckelang, the advocate of the foreigners, give his assistance, and those debtors he shall keep in strict confinement until the Company shall have received its own, and in case the Company fail to secure payment of just claims by these means, then the King or Oja Berckelang shall be bound to hand over said debtors to the Company.

In case (which God forbid) any of the Company's residents should commit a serious crime in Siam, the King and the judges shall not have the right to judge him, but he must be handed over to the Company's chief to be punished according to the Netherlands laws, and if it should happen that the said Chief was his accomplice in a capital offence, his Majesty is to have the power to keep them both confined in their own houses until he has sent word of the matter to the Governor General.

Further, it is agreed and determined, that in compensation for the capture of one of his Majesty's junks by the flyboat *de Roode Hart*, three years ago, near the islands of Maccauw, the Company shall pay to his Majesty as restitution a sum of 156 catties in Siam coinage or 18,720 guilders, his Majesty moreover to resign all claim formerly made to the property on account of the seizure of the said junk.

Item, it is agreed and determined that the Company shall restore and hand over to his Majesty such goods and merchandize belonging to the King as were recently taken from one of the same junks coming from Japan by the flyboat "Hoorghcarpsel", near the island of Poelewij.

Item, it is agreed and determined, that whenever it shall happen that his Majesty resolves to send a junk manned by Siamese to Japan, the Company shall be bound to deliver to the King 7,000 or 10,000 deer-skins (provided the supply of the same skins is large or average that year) at the price at which they were bought, on condition that his Majesty's factors, or some one else, shall undertake (not) to buy directly or indirectly any skins, still less to have them collected by others.

If it should happen at any time that his Majesty should determine to send envoys to Pachin (Pekin) to the great Cham, he shall have the right to send with his ambassadors two Canton Chinese, experienced in the Tartar tongue, that is to say, so long as the Company continues and remains in friendship with that Prince.

That the junks or ships, not only of his Majesty but also of his subjects manned by Siamese, shall have the right to voyage to Maccauw, Manila, Canton or other place so long as the Company is in friendship and alliance with those places, wherefore for the security of their voyaging passes or letters shall be given them.

That all junks and ships of the allied friends of the United East India Company, who come from other places and are designed for the Kingdom of Siam on the Company's ships shall not be let or hindered in the accomplishment of their voyage, provided that no native of a hostile nation be among them.

In case the Company's ships happen to meet at sea any junks manned by Siamese belonging to his Majesty the King or his subjects, they shall put no let or hindrance in the way of their voyage, but on the contrary shall show them all helpfulness (if they ask it) provided they are not going to a place with which the Company is at enmity and war. If at any time it should happen (which God forbid) that some of the Company's ships should through danger or other reason, be shipwrecked on or near lands subject to his Majesty and also if his Majesty's junks in like manner, should meet with the same misfortune near the Company's ports or districts, the subjects of the same at the place where this shall happen, must give a helping hand in saving the

goods and the people on board and also see to it that all such as it may concern should at the earliest convenience give up and surrender the salved goods and the former crew.

That the Company shall not have the right here in Siam to attack any ships or junks nor to commit any, even the smallest hostilities against them *

These prescribed points shall be maintained and followed, not only by the present King of Siam and the present Governor General Jan Maetsuijcker and the Council of India, but also by their respective successors and followers for ever and ever.

Done, agreed and decided thus in the city Judia in the Kingdom of Siam, on the 22nd August 1664, and sealed with the King's seal in red, having the figure of a Siamese angel or devil on it, and below with the Company's seal.

Second Treaty.

22nd August 1664. (N. S.)

11th August 1664. (O. S.)

TREATY

of Peace with the King of Siam.

There shall be perpetual peace between the Contracting parties, on condition that the King causes those who have molested the Company to be severely punished. The Dutch will be allowed a free trade throughout the Kingdom of Siam, on paying the established duties, but without being subject to any other restrictions.

His Highness will prohibit Chinese being employed on board of Junks trading to certain places specified in the original contract, and all junks of this description which shall be found to have any Chinese on board will be lawful prize to the Dutch cruizers.

The exportation of deer and cow skins is entirely ceded to the Company.

Respecting Company's debtors, the same practice will be adopted as heretofore established, &c.

The ill-conceived action of either the King or Phaulcon caused Siam to lose a portion of her political freedom which had only been regained in 1637. On the 14th November 1668, a clause was added to this treaty giving the Company the sole right to buy and export all the tin of the country with the exception only of such quantities as His Majesty would require for himself.

* The remainder of this passage is obscure. It deals with the attitude of the Dutch towards ships belonging to powers with which they were at enmity.

One would have thought that the King and his advisers would have been more careful after this incident in their dealings with foreigners. Phaulcon does not seem to have learnt his lesson for in 1686 Siam became seriously embroiled with the English East India Company. The English accused Phaulcon of committing acts of bad faith, molestation of the English in Siam, interference with their rights of trade and his failure to pay them their just debts. Many Englishmen were massacred in the country. The cumulative effect of all these acts brought Siam into hostility with England. A state of war was declared in 1686, and continued into the reign of King Narayana's successor. The loss to the King's ships and trade was serious. Phaulcon tried to counter-balance the power of the English by bringing in the French. The results of this policy are historical and were disastrous, for Siam passed through the throes of another revolution in which the economic development of the country was again brought to a halt.

In 1767 Ayudhya was captured and entirely destroyed by the Burmese. This blow was so severe that it took several decades of wise government to place Siam back on the road of economic development. What has taken place from the year 1781, which saw the establishment of the Bangkok Dynasty, is modern history, so I do not propose to touch on it.

PART EIGHT.

Concerning Titles in Siam.(1) A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
OFFICIAL HIERARCHY IN SIAM.

The Thai people have used titles of rank to distinguish the appointments held by officers of the State and other persons for many centuries. When the system first came into being one cannot say, for the earliest history of the Thai people—that is the time before they settled in Szechuan—has not been written; and very little is known about the Thai States in Szechuan and Yunnan. Such information as we have has been gained from the Chinese archives and from a great number of chronicles recording the establishment of many Thai Kingdoms.

Mr. Parker, in a valuable paper published in the *China Review*, gives us some information about the old Thai Empire of Nanchao which had its capital at Tali, situated on a lake known to the Thai people as Nong Sae (หนองสา). The use of the name Tali or Taho (Great Happiness) for the capital of a Thai State is fairly common, varying only according to the dialects spoken. Mr. Parker tells us that in the archives of the After-Han period (A. D. 947-51) is found a description of the administration of the Nanchao Empire. If the Chinese records are to be trusted, the administration of Nanchao was based on a system of government not very different from that which existed in Siam till recent times. He says:

There were ministers to decide matters of State, governors, army officers, officers over the finances and the public works, even officers over horses, cows and granaries are mentioned; then come officers for levying and collecting taxes, for the management of secret business, and officers in charge of the palaces. The last were probably eunuchs, though this is not expressly stated. Land was parcelled out to officials and others according to their rank.

If land was parcelled out to officials and others according to their rank, we have an early example of the use of the *sakdina* system, which is the foundation on which the Siamese official hierarchy is built. I use the word *sakdina* in a general sense, as it is a convenient term for the purpose of this paper. The King and Princes of the Thai State of Nanchao were known as *Khun* (ขุน) and *Khun Luang* (ขุนหลวง) and this term is still used to some extent in the Northern Thai principalities.

During the Ayudhyan dynasty reigning Kings were known as *Khun Luang*, but it would seem that in the later years of this dynasty the title was used only for Kings who had passed away. We have examples in *Khun Luang Su'a* (ขุนหลวงเสีย), *Khun Luang Thai Sra* (ขุนหลวงท้ายสระ), *Khun Luang Boromkot* (ขุนหลวงบรมโกษฐ์), *Khun Luang Ha Wat* (ขุนหลวงหาวัด), and *Khun Luang Phrathinang Suriyamarin* (ขุนหลวงพระที่นั่งสุริยamarin). This title was used for King Tak of Thonburi, who was frequently spoken of as *Khun Luang Tak*; after this period the term fell into disuse.

The Princes of the Thai people, who settled in Upper Burma in the early years of the Christian Era, were called *Sao*, or *Chao*, and this title was adopted by Burmese Kings and continued in use up to the reign of King Anawrahta, 1044-1077. The Burmese rendering of this word is *Saw*. The same word was used for a Prince by the Shans or Thai Yai from a quite early period, but the ruling Prince was known as *Sao Pha* (Burmese *Sawbwa*), in Siamese *Chao Fa*. The use of the word *Chao* for a Prince in Siam seems to date back to about the fourteenth century of the Christian Era. It is evident from the Sukhothai inscriptions that this term was also used in a slightly different form in the fourteenth century. The form is *Phraya Pha Kong* and *Pha Ngom*. The word *Phraya* is the equivalent of *Chao* (Prince) and *Pha* or *Fa* (Heaven). The Siamese probably took *Chao Fa* from the North. The Thai of the Shan State called the King of Burma, their suzerain, *Khun Ho Kham* (ขุนหอคำ), the equivalent in Siamese of *Phra Chao Prasat Thong* (พระเจ้าปราสาททอง). This word *Khun* is not now used for the King in Siam, although its use is still retained to represent the King in the game of chess which may be taken as evidence of the antiquity of that game. It is difficult to find out what titles were given to officers of State in the Nanchao kingdom. In the Shan States, although there are ministers and officials both civil and military, there is no system of titles as we know it in Siam. In Burma the officials received titles to indicate the nature of their functions, but they were not graded into different ranks such as *Phraya*, *Phra*, *Luang*, etc., as in Siam. A system similar to that in Burma appears to have been used in the Cholian kingdom of Southern India. During the Sukhothai period the King and Princes were known as *Khun* and also *Phò Khun* (พ่อขุน). Before

this State enlarged its frontiers, the Chief or Prince was known as *Khun*, but as Sukhothai conquered other Thai principalities the King assumed the title of *Phò Khun*, Father or Head of the Princes. The title Phra Rāma Khamhaeng was conferred on Khun Rāmarat by his father for an act of bravery which probably saved his father's life and Kingdom. When Phra Rāma Khamhaeng assumed the royal dignity he was known as *Phò Khun*. This, I think, is the first instance of the use of the title *Phra* in Siamese history and dates back to about 1238. It seems that after the death of *Phò Khun* Rāma Khamhaeng the title of *Phraya* (พระยา) was substituted for that of *Phò Khun*. This term *Phraya* has since been used among the Thai to denote Kingship. There is no evidence to tell us what titles were conferred on officials during the Sukhothai dynasty.

On the establishment of the Ayudhyan dynasty in 1350 an official hierarchy was instituted and the officials were graded on a system simpler than that now in use. It is a curious fact that the Thai of Siam should have introduced an official hierarchy based on the *sakdina* system which was unknown to the Thai of the Shan States; this may be evidence that the Thai of the Shan States migrated from their original home prior to the consolidation of Thai power in Nanchao. If it is true that the officials of the kingdom of Nanchao were given rank based on a system of land tenure which is the fundamental principle of the *sakdina* system, then there may be some connection between the Thai of Siam and those of Nanchao. It is almost certain that the ruling class of this country and probably a large percentage of the commonfolk came from the North-East and East. In some of the northern principalities bordering the Mekhong river there are traces of an official hierarchy. The link connecting Nanchao with the Thai of Siam may be found here. Whether the Khmer derived their *sakdina* system from the Thai who migrated from Nanchao or developed it themselves is a matter for conjecture. As far as I know, the official hierarchy with graded titles as we know it in Siam was not used in India, and as Khmer culture was to some extent derived from India there is a possibility that the Khmer adopted the *sakdina* system from the Thai. According to Siamese history the title of *Khun Luang* (ขุนหลวง) to designate a Prince was still in use in territory near Ayudhya in 1347, for we are led to believe that Ramathibodi I married a sister of Khun

Luang Pha-ngua, a Prince of Suphan. Suphan became the capital of the old Thai State of U Thong which had been destroyed by floods. The old city U Thong is situated near Chorakhesamphan. There is reason to believe that the city of U Thong was of some antiquity as the site bears traces of having been built over several times. At what time Suphan became the capital we do not know. I hold to the belief that Ramathibodi, the first King of the Ayudhyan dynasty, was probably a scion of the old Royal House of Cambodia. It seems possible that a member of this family may have fled from Cambodia and settled in Siamese territory in the beginning of the fourteenth century, for something happened in Cambodia about this time which led to a new régime being established. As the tradition of Ramathibodi's connection with a gardener who became King is so persistent, it may be that he was descended from the melon gardener who became King of Cambodia. (cf. *The Royal History of Cambodia*, translated and published by the National Library, Bangkok, 1917, B. E. 2460). I do not think that Ramathibodi had any connection with Chiengsaen or U Thong except by marriage. King Ramathibodi I. was succeeded by his son, Phra Ramesuan, who after reigning for a few months handed the reins of government over to Khun Luang Pha-ngua of the U Thong family and retired to Lopburi. Khun Luang Pha-ngua was crowned as Phra Boromrachathirat I. He was succeeded by his son, Prince Thong Chan, who was murdered seven days after his father's death by Prince Ramesuan, who seized the throne. This Prince was succeeded by his son, Ramarachathirat. In the fifteenth year of this King's reign he was murdered by the Chief Minister of State, who invited Phra Nakhon In (พระนครศรีอินทร์) of Suphan, a grand-son of Khun Luang Pha-ngua, to ascend the throne. Thus a Prince of the U Thong family re-ascended the throne, and the House of Ramathibodi was extinguished.

The above is a rough sketch of my theory of the establishment of the House of U Thong in Ayudhya.

I have given the above brief outline of the lineage of the first Kings of the new Kingdom of Ayudhya, because I think that King Ramathibodi was not of pure Thai blood and therefore the system of government introduced by him was probably based on a foreign model. A new Kingdom required a new government and a body of officials to carry on that government. The new Kingdom does not

seem to have fallen under the cultural influence of Sukhothai. Judging from the Sukhothai inscriptions, an official hierarchy did not exist in that Kingdom. If this is true, the question arises as to where Ramathibodi I got his official hierarchy from, for three titles are mentioned in the history of this reign, namely, Phra Sri Swat, Khun Phinitchai and Phra Sri Mahosot. In the succeeding reigns prior to that of King Trailokanat other titles are mentioned. It is, therefore, possible that King Ramathibodi I, established an official hierarchy based on a system which had been used by his forefathers, or on a system already in use amongst the Thai principalities situated south of the Ping river. Burmese history of the reign of King Anawrahta of Pagan, 1044-77, tells us something of interest in connection with this matter. It says the boundary of the Kingdom of his time on the east from Pagan was the Pinka country. This country is that region lying in the upper watershed of the Ping river. Lying to the South-East of Pagan was the country of the Gyawns, also known as Arawsa. Arawsa is undoubtedly Ayocha (Ayudhya) and the Gyawns are descendants of the Thai Yuan who accompanied Prince Phromkuman of Yonoknakhon in his victorious war against the Khom when he came as far South as Khamphaengsaen. Their numbers were augmented by the Thai Yuan who accompanied King Chaisiri of Chaiprakan when he fled from his country. It would seem that an old state called Ayocha (Ayudhya) existed before the establishment of the new Ayudhya in 1350. I do not propose to discuss where the old city of Ayocha was situated. Burmese history tells us that the Thai Yuan of the old state of Ayocha attacked Pegu (Hongswadi), during the latter years of the reign of King Anawrahta. The Governor asked for the military assistance of Pagan, which was sent. The Thai Yuans were defeated under the walls of Pegu and their generals captured. The names of these generals are given as *Okphra* Ram, *Okphra* Re, *Okphra* Bun and *Okphra* Paik. This latter name is probably *Okphra* Phitsnu. As this event occurred about 1070, if Burmese history is to be trusted, then this is evidence that an official hierarchy existed in Siam as early as that date. The titles of those early days were founded on the honorific term or word *Ok*, which, I am convinced, is an old Thai word having the meaning of "excellent," "honourable", "noble", and "great". This word was probably adopted by the old Khom from the Thai of the North and is not a Cambodian word. I discuss this point in paragraph 3 of this Part.

According to Siamese history, King Trailokanat ascended the throne in the year of the Little Era 796 (A. D. 1434) and developed the system of government placing the official hierarchy on a legal basis. The Luang Prasert's manuscript does not uphold this date. I deal with this problem later on in this Part. It is recorded in the history of this reign that he granted names (titles) to officials on the basis of land, that is the *sakdina*. He gave the appointment of *Samuaphrakalāhom* (สมุทพรกลาโหม) to a soldier, the appointment of *Samuhanāyok* (สมุหนายก) to a civilian. He gave the official holding the office of Khun Mu'ceng the title of Phra Nakhonbān Mu'ceng (Minister of the Metropolis and Interior), Khun Wang the title of Phra Tharamathikon (Minister of the Household and Justice for the King himself was the source of justice), Khun Na the title of Phra Kasetra (Minister of Agriculture), Khun Khlang the title of Phra Kosathibodi (Minister of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Taxation). To each of these titles was attached a *sakdina* of 10,000 rai of land (4,000 acres). Thus we have two principal Ministers of State and four executive Ministers known as *Chatusadom* (จตุสดมภ์).

The *sakdina* attached to a title did not give the holder of such a title any right of possession in such land, but only gave the right of use as long as he was required by the King to carry out the duties pertaining to the title. The *sakdina* ranged from 100,000 rai in the case of a Prince who was *Maha Uparaj* down to 5 rai in the case of a *Phrai* or menial or soldier. As time passed the *sakdina* lost its original value, for land is no longer attached to a title.

Having established an official hierarchy based on a *sakdina* system, the area of land attached to a title became the basis on which criminal offences were settled; hence it became necessary to promulgate a law laying down the principle under which persons who had committed offences should be punished, thus the *Kromasak* law came into being. The provisions of this law are most complicated and obscure and almost unintelligible to any one not conversant with the *sakdina* system. This will be evident when I say that the law itself as published by Prince Rajaburi contains twenty-eight clauses occupying forty pages of print, whereas a note explaining the principle underlying the law and the method of computing the punishment to be awarded to any offender prepared by Luang Thamasaṭ (หลวงธรรมสาต), in a rhythmic form for the purpose of easy memorising, covers ninety-

two pages of print. H. E. Chao Phya Mahidhorn (เจ้าพระยามหิธร) has most kindly sent me a note explaining briefly the meaning of the law and how it was applied. This learned authority says that in the first place it is essential to have some understanding of the punishments meted out to offenders under the ancient laws. These were *phinai* (พินัย), a fine the whole amount of which was paid to the King or State; *sinmai* (สินไหม), a fine the whole amount of which was paid to the person offended against or his heirs; half *pinai* and half *sinmai*, a fine the proceeds of which were paid in equal parts to the King and the person offended against. All offences were governed as regards punishment by the laws applicable to each offence.

As regards the amount of the fine to be imposed on any person it was necessary to know the legal price of each such person, man or woman, which price was laid down in the law according to the rank, sex, age and class. According to this system a male (not a service-man) attained to his prime and highest value at the age of forty. His price, which at the age of one month was six *bahts*, increased progressively to fourteen *tamlu'ngs* (fifty-six *bahts*) at his prime, after which the value of a man dropped till between the ages of ninety-one and one hundred years he was only worth one *tamlu'ng* or four *bahts*. The price of a female between the ages of one month and three months was four *bahts*. The price increased progressively till she was worth ten *tamlu'ngs* or forty *bahts* on attaining the age of thirty years, which was her prime. After this her price decreased to three *bahts* between the ages of ninety-one and one hundred years. This rate of fine applied to the most serious of offences, that of murder. Less serious offences were punished by a lighter fine. One understands from this system that capital punishment was not inflicted for murder, although it seems that capital punishment was inflicted for offences against the person of the King, against the State, for cowardice etc. in time of war and for certain breaches of the Palace Code.

In addition to the above mentioned principle, many other factors had to be considered in trying a case such as whether the hand, a stick or a metal weapon was used in inflicting the injuries, and whether the injuries were slight or severe. The place at which the offence was committed, as well as whether the complainant and defendant were related, had also to be considered. In cases in which persons related to each other were concerned, if the injuries were merely bruises the punishment was lighter than in a case of persons

not related. If open wounds were inflicted there was no reduction in the punishment. I find on reading the law that the value of servicemen (ไพร่พล) was different to that of ordinary persons. The value of a serviceman was governed by the Group, or *Krom*, to which he belonged. The highest value was one hundred and four *bahts* and the lowest fifty-six *bahts*. Beyond this the principle of punishment was the same as mentioned above. Furthermore all punishments to be imposed on any offender were always governed by the highest price of the body and the highest *sakdina* of the person concerned in the case. All cases in which bodily injury was inflicted were punished according to the principles laid down in the *Kromasak* law which had to be calculated or computed according to a most complicated system. Luang Thamaset has prepared a ready reckoner in order to help the judges to know the fine applicable to each kind of offence and class of offender. Offences against property were not judged under the *Kromasak* law but came under the law known as *Laksana Betset*. Chao Phya Mahidhorn also tells me that the *Kromasak* law was used to punish officials who committed offences connected with their duties. In order to arrive at an understanding of the amount of the fine to be imposed on an official it was necessary to know his *sakdina*, the offence he had committed and the system of computation. The official entrusted by the King or any Minister to ascertain the amount of the fine having computed the basic unit of fine according to the *sakdina* for the purpose of imposing the fine, it simply rested with the King or Minister to decide whether the official should be fined one unit or more. Four units were the maximum fine. The basic unit was known as the *la* (ลา). During my long experience in Government service, I have seen many officials fined under this system. In fact until the King granted the Constitution, this system was used in the Palace and other Departments and also to punish officials who failed to attend the King's audience. The unit of fine or *la* for the punishment of a *phrai* or menial with a *sakdina* of five rai was twenty *bahts*, which meant that if he was to be punished by a fine of four units, the fine would be eighty *bahts*. In the case of an official like myself with a *sakdina* of 2,400 rai, the unit of fine or *la* would be ninety two *bahts* and a fine of four *la* would amount to three hundred and sixty-eight *bahts*. Officials felt deeply the dishonour which attached to their titles when they were punished in this way. H. R. H. Prince Damrong Raja-

nubhab, whom I have consulted, says that the last system of fine is mentioned in the *Kot Monthienban* (Regulations governing the Royal Household or Palace Code.). Prince Damrong has drawn my attention to a portion of the *Kromasak* law which lays down that, in accord with the principles of the ancient *Mano Thamaset*, offences are grouped under three categories: one, Mental Offences or evil thoughts; two, Vocal Offences or evil speech; three, Bodily Offences or evil acts committed by using force. As all offences arise from evil thought it seems that a basic formula was laid down for mental offences and that vocal offences and bodily offences were calculated according to a formula connected with this basic principle. Although it is not clear, it is probable that the formula laid down here was used for the purpose of computing the punishment to be imposed on officials holding a *sakdina* rank other than servicemen (ไพร่พล).

With the reorganisation of the Courts of Justice about the year 1896 and the promulgation of laws based on modern principles, the provisions of the *Kromasak* law fell into disuse.

In a country where surnames did not exist, it is easy to understand the necessity for providing a name to distinguish an official holding a certain appointment. Many of these names are derived from Indian history and mythology. A name having been prescribed for an official to denote his duties, it did not take long for the officials and the people to know the department to which such an officer belonged and the nature of his duties. For these reasons the system must be praised for it overcame many difficulties. In the Sixth Reign of the Chakri dynasty a system of surnames was introduced, and in the Seventh Reign many officials were given titles according to their surnames. By this practice the main principle of the system was destroyed, for it was then no longer possible to know to what department any official belonged; the system of granting titles under the old principles seems to have disappeared.

(2) WHEN WAS THE SAKDINA SYSTEM PUT ON A LEGAL BASIS?

I have stated in Paragraph 1 that if the Chinese archives of the After-Han period (A. D. 947-51) are to be trusted, an official hierarchy existed in the ancient Thai Kingdom of Nanchao which was based on a certain tenure of land. This seems to approximate to what we now call the *sakdina* system or land attached to a title. I have

suggested that this system may have been carried by the Thai people when they migrated along the valley of the Mekhong and that the Khmer got the *sakalina* system from them. The *sakalina* appears to have been used in Siam for the first time by Ramathibodi, the first King of the Ayudhyan dynasty. We have a definite date, 1350. The *sakalina* system is referred to in Siamese history in the reign of King Trailokanat, who is said to have made appointments under this system. The record of the reign of Ramathibodi I mentioned three titles: Phra Sriswat, Khun Phinitchai and Phra Sri Mahosot; and that of Ramesuan mentioned the title Phya Chainarong. Chao Phya Mahasena is mentioned in the reign of Rama Rachathirat. As these Kings reigned before King Trailokanat, then titles existed in Siam from 1350.

The record of the reign of King Trailokanat states that he conferred names on officials, prescribed their duties and the area of land for each title. (For details see paragraph 1).

King Phra Phutthayodfa came to the throne in 1782 and carried on the work of consolidating Thai power in Siam, which had been commenced by King Tak (Sin) of Thonburi. When the capital, Ayudhya, was occupied by the Burmese in 1767 they committed such acts of vandalism that practically nothing was left. The monasteries and pagodas even were destroyed. The archives were burnt, many officials were put to death and many others of the highest rank were deported to Burma as captives of war. There were few left who had any knowledge of the history and laws of the kingdom. We know that it was impossible to find any law or record relating to the ceremony of coronation, and the ceremony had to be performed in a manner which it was believed approximated to the traditional rites. This process of destruction extended throughout most of the territories of the kingdom. It is easy to understand when destruction was carried out on such a vast scale, that nothing of a perishable nature as archives, laws, records, or histories could have escaped. King Phra Phutthayodfa appointed Royal Commissions to attempt to rehabilitate the laws and history of the country. It is possible that fragments of documents and even whole documents relating to these two matters may have been found and examined by these Royal Commissions. Siamese history as we know it, even the Royal or Autograph version, is full of errors. The dates given for the accessions and deaths of the Kings and the length of their reigns are mostly incorrect. Many

events of importance are not mentioned. We know this from the writings of foreigners who lived in the country and were eye-witnesses of the events they wrote about, and from official documents preserved in foreign countries. The version of history I mention was apparently examined by competent authorities such as King Phra Nang Klao and King Mongkut. It is noteworthy that the calendar used is that of the Chulasakarat or Little Era. This history commences in the year of the Little Era 712 (A. D. 1350). It is doubtful whether this era was used in Siam till A. D. 1569. Prince Damrong is inclined to think that the calendar of the Little Era was brought to Siam by the first conqueror of Ayudhya, and became the official calendar from the date of the accession of Phra Mahathamaracha, L. E. 931 (A. D. 1569). It should be mentioned here that the calendar of the Little Era was used in the latter portion of the Sukhothai period. If Prince Damrong is right, and I think he is, then the use of the Little Era prior to that year is evidence of the history having been rewritten, and rewritten several centuries later. It is almost certain that the Maha Sakarat or Great Era which was used in Sukhothai continued to be used in Ayudhya till at least A. D. 1569 and even later. There is reason to believe that the use of the Little Era fell into disfavour, and to some extent was changed to the Buddhist Era in the reign of King Narayana. I have mentioned these facts because a reference to the old laws resuscitated in the reign of Phra Phutthayodfa becomes necessary. These old laws have been published from time to time and I propose to use the edition issued under the authority of that great jurist, Prince Rajaburi, in 1901, known as *Kotmai Rajaburi*.

We find a collection of Laws relating to the *sakdina* of the members of the Royal family and some of the female officials of the palace as well as Civil and Military Officers.

The first of these Laws commences with a preamble and has a heading *Na Pholun'oen* (นพพลเรือน). The whole comprises twenty-eight clauses. This Law is followed by a List of Provincial Military Officers without a preamble running from Clause 1 to 29. Clause 30 is the preamble to what appears to be a second Law prescribing that titles be conferred on Provincial Administrative Officers and the status of the provinces, and Clause 31 gives the titles of the officers and the status of each province. These laws or collection of fragments of laws contain two preambles. The first tells us that Chao Phya Tharamathibodi Sri Ratanamontienban petitioned H. M. King

Trailokanat on the subject of the status and rank of members of the Royal Family and female officials of the Palace craving for His Majesty's ruling in order to put this matter on a definite basis. The King gave his decision and the Law was promulgated in 1298. This must be a year of the Great Era and would synchronise with A. D. 1376 (L. E. 738). It is most significant that the preamble to this Law should refer to the King's decision regarding the status of members of the Royal House and female officials of the palace only. This question is completely settled in the first five clauses, in fact the latter part of Clause 5 lays down the *sakdina* of the *Chao Krom*, and *Palat Krom* attached to Princes of *Krom* rank and other palace male officials. Clause 6 refers to Chamu'n and other palace officials. This causes me to believe that this Law in its original form only contains five clauses and was, in reality, the genesis or beginning of the *Kot Montienban*. If, however, one compares the language used in this Law with that used in later *Kot Montienban* a suspicion arises in one's mind as to when this Law was really written.

Clauses 7 to 28 refer to the status and titles of Civil Officers in the Capital. The status of these officers has no connection with the Royal Family and the female palace officials which form the personal entourage of the King and his children. This List of Civil Officers has, I think, been joined to the Law under discussion by the Royal Commissioners appointed by King Phra Phutthayodfa. This List contains many titles which certainly did not exist in Siam prior to A. D. 1569 or L. E. 931. The titles of officials connected with the activities of the Dutch, the English and the French must be interpolations, for persons of these nationalities did not come to Siam till the beginning of the seventeenth century. It is curious that officials having to do with Portuguese and Castilians are not mentioned at all, although we know that these people were in Siam prior to the other three nationalities mentioned. At the time of the examination of the old laws in 1805 the Portuguese and Spaniards had lost all power in the East, and it did not enter the minds of the Royal Commissioners that in the early days there must have been officials such as interpreters, etc., who had to deal with these people. I am convinced that an exhaustive examination of the List would prove that the Royal Commissioners did their work badly, and were swayed by their knowledge of the titles which existed when they did their work. There is another fact which must be considered. In Clause 8, which

lays down the office of Chakri, will be found a curious insertion which requires some explanation. The insertion runs:

On Friday the ninth waning of the seventh month in the year of the Cock being the eighth year of the denary cycle Phra Sri Mahosot received the Royal Command to place the status of swift footed couriers in the Krom Mahathai on an official basis.

Then follows a list of the titles and the land attached to them. One naturally asks why Phra Sri Mahosot should have received the Royal Commands in this matter, he being one of the Court Physicians and not connected with the Krom Mahathai. It will be noticed that the year is not given which is suspicious and, furthermore, the term รับพระราชโองการใส่เกล้าใส่กระหม่อม was, I think, not used in the early days of the Ayudhyan dynasty. One cannot but surmise that the Royal Commissioners, having before them a fragment of a document with these words on it and not knowing where it came from, inserted it in the clause referring to the Chief Minister in charge of the Civil Service. This title Phra Sri Mahosot cannot be the title Mahosot Sri Phiphat which was only created twenty years ago.

The List of the Provincial Military Officers does not commence with a preamble and contains many interpolations.

Clause 11 lays down the title Phra Phiphitdecha, Chief of the Training Section of the army on European models. One doubts whether this office existed prior to A. D. 1569 (L. E. 931) although we know that Portuguese adventurers did follow in the military train of the Kings.

Clause 22, which refers to the Ten Departments of Artificers (ช่างสิบหมู่), seems to be in the wrong place and should, I think, have been included in the list of Civil Officials in the palace.

Clauses 23 to 29 contain matters entirely extraneous to provincial military appointments.

Clause 24 lays down the *sakadina* of officials who have been retired from the Government Service.

Clause 25 lays down a special *sakadina* for officials of the rank of Phra down, holding appointments in the Capital who were sent to the provinces on duties.

Clause 26 lays down the *sakadina* of the four classes of wives of officials.

Clause 27 is most curious for although the clause is numbered 27 the actual article commences with the word "Section One"

(มาตราหนึ่ง) and is complete in this one Section. This clause refers to the *sakdina* of novitiates (สามเณร), priests (ภิกษุและพระครู), brahmans, and members of the laity (ตบะขาว) conforming to the rules of religious discipline. The *sakdina* is different according to whether these persons possess or do not possess a knowledge of the Law of their religion.

Clause 28 commences with the word "Section one" (มาตราหนึ่ง). This clause is somewhat obscure, but appears to refer to the status of persons related to officials of *sakdina* rank.

Clause 29 lays down the method of computing the *sakdina* of officials of the Palace Department (กรมพระราชวัง) [*i. e.*, the กรมพระราชวังบวร or Second King's establishment. Ed.], basing it on the *sakdina* of officials of the Royal Palace (พระราชวังหลวง).

Clause 23 seems to be an insertion similar to the insertion in clause 8 of the List of Civil Officials. It reads as follows: Khun Chakrawadechinda (ขุนจักรวัดจินดา) petitioned the King, craving His Majesty to define the *na* or land to be attached to a number of appointments. The King gave his ruling on this question and the area of *na* or land for each officer is stated in this clause. The list covers a large range of officers none of whom seem to have any connection with the army. It is significant that the title of the officials who petitioned the King is not to be found in any list of the official hierarchy in my possession.

Clause 30 of this List of Provincial Military Officers is in reality the preamble of a separate law fixing the *sakdina* of administrative officials of the provinces, both north and south, according to the status of each province which is also fixed. There were four classes of provinces, First, Second, Third and Fourth—a First Class provinces being the most important.

Clause 31 gives a long list of officers, their titles and *na* or land as well as the class of the province.

The preamble given in Clause 30 is similar to the preamble to the law fixing the status and rank of members of the Royal Family and some female officials of the palace, except that the style of the King Boromtrailokamat differs in form.

The reader will now understand the almost unfathomable confusion into which these Laws have fallen. The Royal Commission must have had some documentary evidence before it of such a fragmentary nature that it did not know how to piece it together. This fact

together with the many signs of interpolation and tampering renders these Laws in their present form quite unreliable. Their only value is that we are given a list of titles. These titles may have been and were probably created from time to time as the service of the State demanded. It does not help us to know what titles existed in the early days of the Ayudhyan dynasty and when additions were made. Without an examination of the actual documents and evidence which came before the Royal Commission it is impossible for any one to say what is based on actual fact and what was added by the Royal Commission itself. Three main facts stand out (1) Chao Phya Tharamathibodi, etc., Phra Srimahosot and Khun Chakrawadehinda received the Royal instructions regarding the fixing of the *sakdina* for officials and others; (2) the two preambles mention King Trailokanat as the law-giver, but differ as regards the Royal style. In the first preamble the style is *Boromtrailoknayokkilok phu pen chao* and in the other *Phra Ramathibodisriboromtrailokanat*; (3) the same year 1298 is given in both preambles.

It will be noticed in both preambles that the Minister of the Palace, who approached the King, is Chao Phya Tharamathibodi Sri Ratanamonthienban. This is evidence that the old title of Khun Wang had been changed to Tharamathibodi and not Tharamathikon as mentioned in Siamese history. (Reign Trailokanat). The latter title is quite modern and was, I believe, created by King Mongkut, for an official named Su'a Sonthirat (เสด็จสนิทสนม). It is significant that the new form is not mentioned in the Laws I am discussing. The other titles given in Siamese history for the three remaining Chatusadom Ministers also bear traces of modernity. These are examples of tampering with history. The next point is the year 1298 which has a significance bearing on the King, who promulgated these Laws. The year 1298 of the Great Era synchronises with the year 738 of the Little Era or 1376 of the Christian Era. Siamese history tells us that King Trailokanat ascended the throne in L. E. 796 (A. D. 1434), and that he reigned for sixteen years. These dates do not agree.

In the year B. E. 2450 (A. D. 1907) Luang Prasert Aksoranit gave to the National Library a manuscript written in the characters used during the Ayudhyan period purporting to be historical notes from the year of the Little Era 686 to 966. This manuscript relates that its details were prepared under the command of King Narayana in

L. E. 1042 (A. D. 1680). It is fortunate that another copy came into the possession of the National Library, Bangkok, six years later which had been prepared for King Tak (Sin) of Thonburi. The written characters are different but the contents are the same. If one compares the dates given in this manuscript with those recorded in Siamese history it will be found that they do not agree. Furthermore, some of the events recorded do not appear in Siamese history, and it is significant that no mention is made of King Trailokanat having established, revised or changed the *sakdina* status of officials. The authenticity of this manuscript can not be doubted, and that it was prepared in the reign of King Narayana is supported by a stone inscription set up by that monarch in B. E. 2223 (L. E. 1043) at Chulamani Temple near Phitsnulok. This stone inscription relates that the Temple Chulamani was built by King Trailokanat in L. E. 826 and that in the following year the royal builder was ordained as a Buddhist priest and took up residence in this monastery. He remained in the priesthood for eight months and fifteen days. His son and Ministers of State begged the royal monk to leave the priesthood in order to assist in governing the country. The words used are ขอนมัญญ์ด้วยพระเดชไศธีจลาจนวชช่วยครองราชฎกรมทัพปม. The royal monk consented, left the priesthood and returned to the Capital, Sri Ayudhya. In the year L. E. 1042 King Narayana commanded that a replica of the footprint of the Buddha on the hill known as Suwanbanphot (สุวรรณนภพต) be made and sent to Chulamani Temple so that those who were unable to make the journey to the holy hill might be able to worship the footprint. This replica of the footprint and the stone inscription were set up in the Temple Chulamani in L. E. 1043. A record of the events mentioned here was prepared and after examination by the King this record was sealed with a seal depicting a man holding a book (มนุญห์ถือสมุด) which is the official seal of the Registrar of Archives, and Servicemen (สมุดพระสุริยวงศ์). This stone inscription was set up some two hundred and sixteen years after King Trailokanat built Chulamani Temple, and entered the priesthood. The dates for these events given in the Luang Prasert's manuscript are the same.

An examination of the Luang Prasert's manuscript proves that the date given for the fall of Ayudhya, L. E. 931, the accession of Somdet Phra Mahathammaracha, L. E. 931, and the marching of the expedition

under King Naresuan against Ava, L. E. 966, are correct for they agree with the information which we now have in our possession. The dates in Siamese history are different. As the Luang Prasert's manuscript is correct about these three important dates, it is but reasonable to assume that other dates given in the manuscript are also correct. The following table is of interest :

No.	Royal Version		Luang Prasert	
	Name of Kings	Date : Little Era	Name of Kings	Date : Little Era
1	Ramathibodi I.	712-731	Ramathibodi I.	712-731
2	Ramesuan (First time)	731-732	Ramesuan (First time)	731-732
3	Boromrachathirat I.	732-744	Boromrachathirat I.	732-750
4	Thongchan	744 (15 days)	Thonglan	750 (7 days)
5	Ramesuan (Second time)	744-749	Ramesuan (Second time)	750-757
6	Ramrachathirat	749-763	Phya Ram	757-771
7	Intharacha I.	763-780	Intharacha I.	771-786
8	Boromrachathirat II.	780-796	Boromrachathirat II.	786-810
9	Trailokanat	796-811	Trailokanat	810-826
10	Intharacha II.	811-835	Boromracha	826-853
11	Ramathibodi II.	835-871	Ramathibodi II.	853-891
12	Boromrachamaha phut-thangkun	871-875	Boromrachamaha phut-thangkun	891-895

As we are concerned with the reign of King Trailokanat only, because the Laws prescribing titles and ranks I have referred to above are supposed to have been promulgated by him, I will confine the discussion to the dates given for this reign in Siamese history and the Luang Prasert's manuscript. Siamese history places on record that this King ascended the throne in L. E. 796 and died in L. E. 811. The Luang Prasert's manuscript tells us that this King ascended the throne in L. E. 810, and that in L. E. 825 he went to Phitsnulok still vested with the royal authority. King Trailokanat commanded that the King should rule the country in Ayudhya. King Trailokanat apparently abdicated in L. E. 826 and entered the priesthood in L. E. 827. This gives his reign a length of sixteen years, which agrees with

Siamese history. He was succeeded by his son, Phra Boromracha, in L. E. 826 though this Prince seems to have wielded royal authority in Ayudhya from L. E. 825, and it was this son who begged his father to leave the priesthood, return to Ayudhya and assist him in governing the country (*vide* the Chulamani inscription of King Narayana). There are many examples of Kings abdicating but still retaining a controlling influence in the government. This was always the case in the early days of the Tokugawa Shogunate, in Japan. As Ayudhya was in the grips of a death struggle with King Maha Sri Suthantilokarat of Chiengmai (the Maharat or Thao Lok of the manuscript), it was dangerous to leave the King monk in Chulamani Temple, and his son lacking experience required the riper understanding of affairs of his father to help him. If one reads the last lines of this manuscript referring to the death of King Trailokanat, which took place in L. E. 850, it will be noticed that he was not succeeded on the throne by any King. This is but natural, as his son, Somdet Phra Boromracha, was the reigning sovereign and continued to reign till L. E. 853, when he died and was succeeded by his son, Ramathibodi II. H. R. H. Prince Damrong in his Notes explaining the Ayudhyan dynasty, published as Part 5 of *A Collection of Historical Data*, states that King Trailokanat reigned from L. E. 810 to L. E. 850, a period of forty years and that the confusion in Siamese history is due to his using both Ayudhya and Phitsnulok as his capitals. My understanding of the Luang Prasert's manuscript does not bear out the statement of this learned authority. The *Chiengmai Chronicle* gives us some evidence to support the dates in the manuscript. This *Chronicle* says that King Trailokanat entered the priesthood in Ayudhya but does not give us a date. As, however, it admits, that this event took place after L. E. 822 it may be that the ceremony of ordination took place in L. E. 823 or 824.

Thus we have three statements regarding the time when King Trailokanat was on the throne. Siamese history L. E. 796 to 811, the Luang Prasert's manuscript L. E. 810 to 826, and the *Chiengmai Chronicle* to a great extent agreeing with the manuscript. We must now make an attempt, after an analysis of the evidence before us, to ascertain who promulgated the Laws we are discussing, and the year in which the Laws were promulgated.

As I accept the Luang Prasert's manuscript as correct, it is evident that King Trailokanat was on the throne between the years L. E. 810

and 826, which years synchronise with the year 1370 to 1386 of the Great Era. Such being the case, how could King Trailokanat have promulgated these Laws in the year 1298? H.R.H. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab tries to overcome the difficulty by changing the year 1298 of the Great Era to 1998 of the Buddhist Era. Now 1998 of the Buddhist Era synchronises with the year of the L. E. 817, and therefore, by this transformation, the Prince brings these Laws within the reign of King Trailokanat.

My understanding of the evidence is that the rebuilders of Siamese history had some documentary evidence or tradition before them which led them to believe that King Trailokanat had revised the official hierarchy, and they inserted in Siamese history the sentence I have already mentioned in the paragraph referring to the changes in the titles and status of the Ministers. On the other hand the Royal Commission appointed for the purpose of rehabilitating the laws of the country came across fragments of evidence to show that a law dealing with the questions of the status of members of the Royal Family had been promulgated in the year 1298 of the Great Era and other fragments relating to the official hierarchy, civil, military and ecclesiastical. Some of these fragments may have borne the name of King Trailokanat, and others the date 1298. The process is now simple. The Royal Commissioners, probably, entered the name of King Trailokanat in the preamble of the Law relating to the members of the Royal Family. I am inclined to think that the Law referring to the status of the members of the Royal Family and some of the female officials of the palace (Clauses 1 to 5) was promulgated by King Phra Boromrachathirat I in the year 1298 of the Great Era (L. E. 738). King Phra Boromrachathirat I was on the throne in the year L. E. 738 and, as the dynasty had only been established twenty-six years before, it is but natural that this King should define the *sakdina* of the members of the new Royal House and the female entourage. I cannot believe that the Kings should have allowed nearly one hundred years to pass before defining the *sakdina* of the Royal House. Furthermore, now that the dynasty had been established and the central and southern provinces brought under its sway, it became necessary for this same King to define the *sakdina* of some of the civil officials in the Capital and some of the provincial military officers. These lists must have been amended and added to by later Kings as the increasing requirements of the service

demanded, hence the numerous interpolations and the resulting confusion. It is probable that the lists of the civil and military hierarchy were originally promulgated as separate laws, but that the preambles have been lost, all that remained being the petition of Phra Sri Mahosot and Khun Chakrawatchinda.

The Law referring to the titles of Provincial Administrative Officers, their titles, and the status of the provinces may have been promulgated by King Trailokanat, because it was only just prior to his reign that the northern provinces had been brought under the domination of the new dynasty and included in the Kingdom as an integral part thereof. The Royal Commissioners apparently retained the same year 1298 without considering its implications.

The ancient criminal jurisprudence of some parts of the East provided for the punishment of offenders based on the age of the persons offended against and the value of the body of such persons, which value was fixed according to age and sex. With the introduction of the *sakdina* system a new element came into being and had to be considered when deciding criminal cases. A *Kromasak* Law was, therefore, drafted and brought into force. The *Kromasak* Law which has come down to us is one which the preamble tells us was promulgated by King Ekathosrot in the year L. E. 955, the year of the Cock. Siamese history records that King Ekathosrot ascended the throne in L. E. 955, year of the Little Serpent. One can, therefore, excuse the Royal Commission for putting this date in the preamble if they have evidence to prove that the Law was promulgated by King Ekathosrot, but one cannot forgive the Royal Commission for stating that this year was the year of the Cock. The year L. E. 955 was the year of the Little Serpent. Research work has brought to light the fact that King Ekathosrot ascended the throne in L. E. 967, year of the Little Serpent (A. D. 1605), not L. E. 955. The Royal Commission probably did not know this, although they may have had a copy of the Luang Prasert's manuscript before them, as a copy of this manuscript had been made a few years before in the reign of King Tak. This manuscript must have been well known to scholars of those days. A reference to it would have shown the Commissioners that King Naresuan was still on the throne in the year L. E. 966.

Phya Prachakitkorachak (พระปราชัยกิจกรจักร์), in his work *Phongsawadan Yonok* (History of Yonok), discusses the question of the dates given in some of the ancient laws for the promulgation of such

laws and the names of the Kings. He produces evidence to prove that in the preamble of a law said to have been promulgated in the reign of King Prasat Thong, this King is called *Ekathosrot*, and attempts to prove this by pointing out that the palace in which the King promulgated the law was built in the reign of King Prasat Thong. Another law was promulgated in the reign of King Narayana. The preamble called the King *Ekathosrot*, but as this is qualified by the word *King Narayana* there can be no question about the promulgator of this law. There are several other instances of the words *Ekathosrot* appearing in the preambles of other laws.

A question now arises as to whether the Royal Commissioners inserted the title *Ekathosrot* themselves or not. If they did, as seems likely, for these two Kings are not given this title in Siamese history nor does this style appear on the Chulamani inscription actually written by King Narayana himself. In this inscription the King gives his full title and these words do not appear.

H. R. H. Prince Damrong, knowing that King *Ekathosrot* was not on the throne in L. E. 955, may have been influenced by this fact, and changed the year from L. E. 955 to L. E. 995 so that it falls within the reign of King Prasat Thong. Whether the Prince was also influenced by the fact that L. E. 995 was the year of the Cock is not evident because he does not use this argument.

I am inclined to think that the Law was promulgated by King *Ekathosrot*, the brother of King Naresuan, and that the Royal Commissioners inserted the year L. E. 955 themselves, as history told them that this King ascended the throne in that year.

The whole question of the Laws relating to the *sakdina* and the *Kromasak* as well as the dates given in history is in such a state of confusion that it seems hardly worth while trying to clarify it. I have given my understanding of this matter because it has a bearing on the titles and rank of officers mentioned by van Vliet which are not in accord with statements in Siamese history. I deal with this question in paragraph 3.

(3) CONCERNING THE RANK OF MEMBERS OF THE ROYAL FAMILY AND THE NOBILITY.

In the previous paragraph I have made an attempt to unravel the confusion in which the laws relating to the *sakdina* have fallen. I hold that the first of these laws ascribed to King Trailokanat relating

to the rank and status of members of the Royal Family and some female officials of the Palace was promulgated by King Phra Borom-rachathirat I. in the year of the Great Era 1298, which synchronises with the year of the Little Era 738 (A. D. 1376), and that this law comprised five clauses only. In this law provisions are made for giving members of the Royal House a *sakdina* according to their birth status. The rank of the members of the Royal Family is to some extent graded according to the status of the mother. A full brother of the King and a son by the chief Queen were qualified by the prefix Somdet. Princes of this rank had on birth a *sakdina* of 20,000 rai and 15,000 rai respectively which on promotion to the rank of *Krom* or *Nai Krom* was increased to 50,000 rai and 40,000 rai respectively. If Princes of this rank were appointed to the high position of Maha Uparaj or Second King, the *sakdina* was increased to 100,000 rai. A brother of the King other than a full brother only had a *sakdina* of 7,000 rai which was increased to 15,000 rai on promotion to the rank of *Krom*. A son of the King by a mother other than the Queen and a grandson, a son of the son of a Queen, enjoyed a *sakdina* of 6,000 rai, which was increased to 15,000 rai on promotion to the rank of *Krom*. Grandsons of the King other than those descended from a Queen enjoyed a *sakdina* of 4,000 rai which was increased to 11,000 rai on becoming a *Krom*. (Note. I presume that the sisters, daughters and grand-daughters of the King enjoyed the same status as brothers, sons and grandsons). Princes of the rank of *Mom Chao* enjoyed a *sakdina* of 1,500 rai. Princes of the rank of *Chao* enjoyed a *sakdina* varying between 800 rai and 1,000 rai according to the position they held on the personal staff of the King. These Princes rode on the King's elephant and acted as the cavalry bodyguard of the King. Princes of the rank of *Mom Ratchwong* (หม่อมราชวงศ์) enjoyed a *sakdina* of 500 rai.

As I have already said, this law which I believe dates back to the fourteenth century of the Christian Era (the original of which must have been destroyed) was reconstructed in the reign of the first King of the Chakri dynasty in 1805. The law in its present form shows undoubted signs of having lost its original character, the language is modern.

In the law the words *Somdet Phra Chao Lan Thoe* (สมเด็จพระเจ้าหลานเธอ) and *Phra Chao Lan Thoe* are used. The word *Lan* (หลาน) in Siamese means both a nephew and a grandson. In this law

I think the word *Lan* refers to a grandchild, and this is supported by the use of the word *Nadda* (นัดดา), grandson, in the preamble. If this is the case it is difficult to understand why a Prince of the rank of *Mom Chao*, who to-day is a grandchild of a King, should be referred to separately. I do not think that the rank of *Mom Chao* existed when this law was promulgated. If this rank did exist then the Princes specified in the law as grandchildren of the King must have been Princes of the rank of *Mom Chao* elevated to the rank of *Phra Ong Chao*, a practice which was followed after the establishment of the Chakri dynasty. That the grandsons of a King referred to in the law were elevated *Mom Chao* I consider most improbable. It is doubtful whether the rank of *Mom Chao* existed in the early days of the Ayudhyan dynasty. Prince Damrong mentions in his work *Records of the Status of the Royal Family of the Chakri Dynasty* that the sons and daughters of the Maha Uparaj by a mother not a member of the Royal Family were known as *Mom Chao* and supports this statement by referring to an inscription of the reign of King Boromakot, which records that the sons of the Second King of that time were called *Mom Chao*, and gives as an example *Mom Chao Athit* (หม่อมเจ้าอาทิตย์). When this practice first came into use is not clear, but it seems probable that this rank was instituted just before the destruction of Ayudhya, and that the status *Phra Chao Lan Thoe* in the old law was then changed to that of *Mom Chao*. I, therefore, feel that the rank of *Mom Chao* in this law is an interpolation.

This law lays down the *sakdina* of a Prince when promoted to the rank of *Krom*. We understand that the rank of *Krom* only came into being in the reign of King Narayana, 1656-1686, many years after this law is supposed to have been promulgated. This is, probably another example of interpolation.

H. R. H. Prince Damrong has sent me a note in which he explains the origin of the word *Krom* and *Nai Krom* as applied to a Prince or Princess. His Royal Highness says that the servicemen of the Kingdom were divided into groups, and these groups were under the jurisdiction of a *Chao Krom* or Chief of *sakdina* rank. In the days of King Narayana among others there were two groups of servicemen, one under Luang Yothathip and the other under Luang Yothathep. The King placed the first group under the authority of his sister and the second under the authority of his daughter. As these servicemen belonged to these two *Kroms*, it became the practice to

speak of these two Princesses by the names of the *Kroms* under their authority, and thus the sister was known as *Krom Luang Yohathip* and the daughter as *Krom Luang Yothathep*. The word *Nai Krom* came into being at the same time for the servicemen were grouped in a *Krom* (ในกรม).

If the title *Krom* was for the first time applied to Prince or Princess as a symbol of rank or position in the reign of King Narayana then it is evident that this rank did not exist in the fourteenth or fifteenth century and must have been inserted in the old law by the Royal Commissioners or someone else.

The status of *Chao* mentioned in this law cannot apply to great-grand-children or any other group of persons related to the Royal Family, because the law uses the word *Chao* as though it were a title. The title *Chao* was conferred on ten officers riding on the King's elephant probably as a kind of bodyguard, their *sakdina* ranging from 1,000 to 800 rai. There were four *Chao* in charge of the flocks of buffaloes with a *sakdina* of 800 rai. The purpose to which these buffaloes were put is not revealed, but they were probably draught animals. There were also four officers of the rank of *Chao* who were apparently cavalymen in attendance on the King with a *sakdina* of 800 rai, and two other officers of this rank with the same *sakdina* whose duties are not mentioned.

That this title is of ancient origin is proved by the fact that Chao Ramkhob rode on King Naresuan's war elephant in the battle in which the Crown Prince of Burma was killed (1593) and was rewarded for some act of bravery. It is difficult after this lapse of time to ascertain the true status of this title *Chao*. H. R. H. Prince Damrong understands that this rank was known originally as Chao Ratnikul (เจ้าราชบุตร), and persons elevated to this rank enjoyed a status equivalent to that of *Mom Chao*. The point is obscure, however, and I think it is possible that this status of *Chao* was conferred on persons related to the mother of the King or the Queen. Prince Damrong tells us that in the reign of Phra Phetracha the title was changed to *Chao Phra*, and towards the end of the Ayudhyan dynasty the word *Chao* was dropped entirely, *Phra* alone remaining. King Phra Phutthayodfa continued the use of the title *Phra* for persons of this status, and his successor conferred the rank of *Phra* in the category of Ratnikul on two sons of King Tak (Sin) of Thonburi.

Probably owing to the confusion which arose from the practice of conferring the title of *Phra* on persons of the status of *Chao Ratnikul*, King Mongkut changed the title to *Mom*.

There are many persons holding the rank of *Mom* to-day, but I do not think they have a status equivalent to that of *Mom Chao*, nor are they necessarily related to the mother of the King or the Queen. On promotion they were given the title of *Phya*.

Persons falling within the category of *Ratchinikul* (ราชินิกุล) to-day known as *Ratchinikul Bang Chang* are those who are descended from the mother of Queen Amarinthraboromratchini (พระยัณนิตยพวกรมราชินี) of King Phra Phuttyodfa. This lady's name was San (สั่น) and as she prior to her death had become a nun King Mongkut conferred on her the posthumous title of *Somdet Phra Rupsirisophakmahanaknari* (สมเด็จพระอุปสิริโสภาคย์มหานคนชิ), which is evidence of her having entered the holy order. It is thus clear that the *Ratchinikul* of to-day have no connection with the *Chao Ratnikul* of to-day have no connection with the *Chao Ratnikul* of the early days of the Ayudhyan dynasty.

The status of *Mom Ratchwong* mentioned in this law as being a descendant of the Royal family is difficult to understand, as H. R. H. Prince Damrong considers that the status of *Mom Ratchwong* was created in the reign of King Mongkut (1851-1868). If this is true, then persons other than the Royal Commissioners must have tampered with this law. I find that the status of *Mom Ratchwong* is mentioned in the edition of the old law published by Nai Mod (นายโหมด) in 1849. However this may be, it seems certain that the style *Mom Ratchwong* did not exist at the time when this law is believed to have been promulgated.

Many of the titles of the female officials of the palace have a flavour of modernity about them. A reference to the old *Kotmai Montienban* might throw some light on this subject.

Following the titles of the female officials of the palace are a number of male official titles (*vide* Clauses 5 and 6 of the law). Clause 5 lays down the *sakdina* for the Chiefs (*Chao Krom*) and subordinate officers of groups of servicemen under the authority of brothers, children and grandchildren of the Kings after they had been elevated to the rank of *Krom*. If Prince Damrong is right in believing that Princes and Princesses were not known as *Krom* or *Nai Krom* before

the reign of King Narayana, then this clause could only have been added several hundred years after the law is supposed to have been promulgated. Clause 6 lays down the titles for the head (*Chamu'n*), of the four Corps of Pages. These four titles of *Chamu'n* may have been created in the early days of the Ayudhyan dynasty.

At the time when this law is believed to have been promulgated I think that the members of the Royal House were graded as follows:—

- (1) The King, *Phrabat Somdetborombophitphraphutthachaoyuhua*.
- (2) A full brother of the King, *Somdet Phra Anuchathirat*.
- (3) A son of the King by a Queen, *Somdet Phra Chao Luk Thoe*.
- (4) A brother of the King other than a full brother, *Phra Anucha*.
- (5) A son of the King by a mother other than a Queen or Princess, *Phra Chao Luk Thoe*.
- (6) A grandson of the King descended from the Queen, *Somdet Phra Chao Lan Thoe*.
- (7) A grandson of the King descended from a mother other than a Queen or Princess, *Phra Chao Lan Thoe*.
- (8) *Chao Ratnikul*.

An examination of the titles given in the list of the official hierarchy shows that there are the following:—

- (1) Chao Phraya, (2) Okphraya, (3) Phraya, (4) Okya, (5) Okphra, (6) Phra, (7) Okluang, (8) Luang, (9) Okkhun, (10) Khun, (11) Ok Mu'eng, (12) Mu'n, (13) Phan, (14) Chamu'n, and a few other titles which do not concern this paper.

Van Vliet in his *Historical Account* mentions several titled persons. The titles he speaks of are: *Okya*, *Okphra*, *Okluang* and *Okkhun*, and in no case does he mention a title without the prefix *Ok* which word he writes *O*, for example *Oya*, *Opera* (Opra). When speaking of the two chiefs or Arch-ministers, namely, *Chakri* and *Kalahom*, he gives their titles as *Okya*, not *Chao Phraya*. Other European writers of the same period mention the same titles as van Vliet. De la Loubère, in his work *A New Historical Relation of the Kingdom of Siam*, says that the Maha Uparaj enjoyed the title of *Pa-ya*, to which was added the prefix *Chao* meaning Lord and sometimes only that of *Oc-ya* as stated by van Vliet. Siamese history on the other hand never mentions any title with the prefix *Ok* which is certain evidence that it was edited many years after the prefix *Ok* was dropped or fell into disuse. The term *Chao Phraya* is used in the histories as though it were a specific title, and not an honorific prefix. I do not believe that in those early times of which we are speaking the term *Chao Phraya* was a title as we understand it to-day, and I also think that

De la Loubère did not understand the full significance of this word. The word *Chao* is a pure Thai word meaning lord, chief or principal and is used today when speaking of a Prince.

In the Siamese language this word *Chao* is used in combination with many other words such as *ban* and *sap* to denote the head, the principal or the owner, thus the word *chao ban* means the lord or the head of a house, and *chao sap* the lord or owner of property. Having explained this elementary principle it becomes necessary to examine the word *Chao Phraya* from the same angle. I have given the meaning of the Thai word *Chao*, and it now remains to ascertain the meaning of the word *Phraya*. This word is not a Thai word, and one naturally turns to Sanskrit to obtain its real value. A Sanskrit scholar tells me that the Sanskrit word *vara* means excellent, best, eldest; and this is supported by Pandit Sivaram Apte in his Sanskrit Dictionary. It is generally believed that the word *Phra* which has become incorporated in the Siamese language is a corruption of this Sanskrit word *vara*. In due course the term *Phra* was applied to designate a rank in the official hierarchy. This same Sanskrit scholar states that the superlative form of *vara* is *varya*, which written in the Siamese language would be *Phraya*. Following up this line of reasoning the combination of the two words *Chao* and *Phraya* can have but one meaning, namely, the lord or possessor of excellence. My argument is supported by a document found in the *Records of the Regulation between Siam and Foreign Countries* etc. This document gives us a speech made by King Song Tham in 1622 on the occasion of his coronation using the voice of *Okya Phra Khlang*, who is referred to as *Chao Phraya Okya Phra Khlang*. The phrase is *Chao Phraya Okya Phra Khlang Sri Thamaratdechachatanamatayanuchit phiphit ratanaratkosathibodi appaiphiriyabrakromphahu*. Did this official have two titles *Okya* and *Chao Phraya*? I think not, for van Vliet and other writers speak of him as *Okya Phra Khlang*. I am convinced that the words *Chao Phraya* have merely the sense of Excellency and thus the correct rendering would be *His Excellency Okya Phra Khlang*. The combination *Chao Phraya Maha Senabodi* mentioned in Siamese history and *Chao Phraya Maha Uparaj* mentioned by de la Loubère is not a title but means His Excellency so and so for the words, *Maha Senabodi* and *Maha Uparaj*, designate the office held.

My understanding that the title *Chao Phraya* did not exist in the earlier days of the Ayudhyan dynasty is also supported to some extent by Burmese history. The evidence of this history cannot be easily brushed aside for I refer to that period when Siam fell under the sway of Burma and the Burmese official world had a most intimate knowledge of Siamese administration. I refer to the period from 1548 to 1590. According to Siamese history Prince Thienracha ascended the throne with the help of a number of young men who joined him in a conspiracy to overthrow the usurper Khun Wora-wongsathirat spoken of in the Luang Prasert's manuscript as Khun Chinarat, and his paramour Thao Sri Sudachan, the widow of King Chairachathirat. This conspiracy which took place in L. E. 910 (A. D. 1548) was successful, and Prince Thienracha ascended the throne under the style and title of King Maha Chakraphat. The Royal version of Siamese history tells us that he rewarded his fellow conspirators by conferring high rank on them and gave each a daughter in marriage. Khun Intharathap was made Chao Phya Sri Thamaskarat, Luang Sri Yos, Chao Phya Maha Senabodi, and Mu'n Ratsneha, Chao Phya Maha Thep. The two provincial governors Phya Phichai and Phya Swankhalok were promoted to the rank of *Chao Phya*. It is noteworthy that in Burmese history Somdet Phra Maha Thamarachathiratchao is referred to as *Oya* Thamaracha during the whole period he was connected with the Court of Burma up till 1569 when he became King.

Chao Phya Maha Thep is spoken of in Burmese history as Phra Maha Thep. The two provincial Governors of Phichai and Swankhalok who like their Chief Somdet Phra Maha Thamaracha, became the allies of the King of Burma, are referred to in Burmese history as Oya Phichai and Oya Swankhalok. The latter in the Luang Prasert's manuscript is given the rank of Phya Ong Swankhalok (พญาองค์สมรคโกล), which was probably a title used in the North. It is also remarkable that the officer holding the title of Chakri who played an important part in the history of this period and called Phya Chakri in Siamese history, is referred to in Burmese history as Okya Chakri and not Oya Chakri. This differentiation in the manner of spelling this title found in Burmese history causes one to wonder whether there were two titles one *Oya* and the other *Okya*.

As no mention is made in the old records which we can rely on of the title *Phraya*, it seems most unlikely that the title of *Okephraya*

ever existed. I think that these two titles have been inserted in the list of old titles by some tampering hand.

We should now discuss the word *Okya* (ออกญา). What does the word mean? This word is written in the Kotmai Ratburi (ออกญา), whereas in a paper entitled *Siamese Documents of the Seventeenth Century*, published in the Journal of the Siam Society, Vol. XIV, part 2, containing photographic copies of treaties between Siam and France in the reign of King Narayana, this word is written ออกญา. These documents supply further evidence that titles of that period 1687 still retained the prefix ออก. It also seems likely that the title พระยา had not replaced the title ออกญา at that time. I have endeavoured to find out to what language this word *Ok* belongs. As it is generally believed that the word is of Cambodian origin, I referred the question to Mlle. S. Karpelès, Conservateur de la Bibliothèque Royale du Cambodge in Phnom Penh. This lady has most kindly gone into the matter and has sent me a note prepared by a learned monk Phra Sasnasophon of Unnalom Monastery, in Phnom-Penh. I give the note, which is written in the Siamese language in full:—

“คำว่า ออก โดยสังเกตเห็นว่าเป็นคำโบราณ หมายความว่า “ตรง” เพราะมีคำซึ่งเขมรใช้ติดมาจากทุกวันนี้ว่า ออก แปลว่า “ตรง, ขนาน, ดิ่ง, บั่น, ค้ำ, ว่ากล่าวตามอำนาจใจ” หรืออีกนัยหนึ่งว่า “ประเสริฐ” ก็ได้ บางท่านเข้าใจว่า คำนี้ออกมาจากคำสันสกฤตว่า อู มาเป็นออก แปลว่าพระ “พรหม” หรือพระ “คิระ” เห็นจะไม่ใช่ออกมาจากคำสันสกฤตอย่างนั้น กระมัง? หรือจะเป็นคำญวนก็ไม่ใช้เหมือนกัน

“เขมรใช้เฉพาะแต่ ออก กับ ญาและหลวง คือ ออกญา = ออกญา ซึ่งใช้เป็นคำแห่งฐานันดรศักดิ์ ของมนตรีชั้นสูง กว่าที่ “พระ”, และถึงที่ เสนาบดีใช้กันหนาหน้าเหมือนกัน ออกหลวง = ออกหลวง เป็นฐานันดร ของมนตรีผู้ ตรงตระกูลพระในครั้งโบราณ (แต่ในสมัยปัจจุบันนี้ไม่มี เพราะเด็กไม่ให้มีตระกูลพระเลยแล้ว) ออกพระ ออกขุน เขมรไม่เคยใช้ เคย ใช้เฉพาะแต่ ออกญา และ ออกหลวงเท่านั้น”

The following is a rough translation :—

“ It is generally considered that the word *Ok* is an old word having the meaning of examine, inspect, because in the Cambodian language of to-day we have the word *Ok* meaning examine, inspect, strike, beat, abuse, scold and also meaning excellent. Some scholars believe that this word is derived from the Sanskrit word *U* and has become changed to *Uk* meaning Brahma, Siva. I do not think this word comes from Sanskrit or that the word is an Annamite one.

Cambodians use the word *Ok* in combination with the word *Ya* and *Luang*, thus *Okya* or *Okya* designate the title of an official (มนตรี) higher than that of *Phra*. This title is used for a Minister of State. *Okluang* or *Okluang* was the title of an official having the duty of inspecting persons belonging to the Sudra caste in ancient times, but this office no longer exists because this caste has been abolished. The titles *Okphra* and *Okkhun* are unknown in Cambodia where the titles *Okya* and *Okluang* alone have been used.”

I think this learned monk intends to convey the understanding that the prefix *Ok* was never used in conjunction with the title *Phra* and *Khun*, and this seems to me logical.

Is this word *Ok* a Cambodian or Thai word? In a work entitled *Lilit Phra Lo* which H. R. H. Prince Damrong believes was written by King Trailokanat who reigned in Ayudhya in the middle of the fifteenth century is found this word *Ok* in combination with other words. The scene of this work is laid in the North of Siam. The following are a few examples *Okthao*, *Okthao-thirat*, *Oknang*, *Okthai*, (ออกฟ้า, ออกฟ้าวิมาศ, ออกนพ ออกไฟ). The word *Ok* evidently means great, excellent and honourable. In the dictionary published by the Ministry of Education we find the word *Pho Ok*, *Mae Ok* (พ่อออก แม่ออก). The word *Ok* (ออก) having the same meaning as given above but it will be noticed that in this combination the word *Ok* (ออก) is an affix not a prefix. I am told by a scholar that this word is still used in some of the Northern Thai principalities and also in Southern Siam. The inhabitants of Southern Siam are of ancient Thai stock, who settled there many centuries ago. It is likely that the first settlers were soldiers and others who accompanied King Rama Kamhaeng of Sukhothai in the first Thai movement to the South in the latter half of the thirteenth century. Since then prisoners of war made captive in campaigns against Chiangmai and other Northern

principalities have been sent to colonise this territory notably in the reign of King Ramesuan 1388-95 when many thousands of Lao families were sent to Singora, Phatalung and Nakhon Sri Thammarat.

I am inclined to think that this word *Ok* (เอก) is a pure Thai word having the meaning of great, excellent, honourable which was used towards persons of higher status than the person speaking, to show respect and homage. As time passed this word was used in combination with other words to denote a title in the official hierarchy. The word *Ok* of ancient days had the same value as our present day *Khun* (คุณ). The title *Okya* (เอกยา) may be an abbreviated form of *Okpraya*, therefore, the titles of *Okya*, *Okphra*, *Okluang*, *Okkhun* would in modern parlance be *Khun Phraya*, *Khun Phra*, *Khun Luang*, etc.

It has been suggested to me that the titles with the prefix *Ok* were of higher rank than those without. I do not think that this can be the case, for as I have already stated, even up to the reign of King Narayana these titles were never used without the prefix *Ok*.

It would require a great deal of research work to prove when the title *Chao Phraya*, as we know it to-day, was first created and when the title *Okya* was changed to *Phraya* and the prefix *Ok* discarded. This change, probably, took place after the reign of King Narayana (1688).

It is, however, quite clear that when the title *Chao Phraya* was created, and the title *Okya* changed to *Phraya* that, the honorific or courtesy title of *Chao Phraya* could no longer be used and had to be changed for one could not say *Chao Phraya Phraya Indramontri*. The genius of Siamese thought found an easy solution, the word *Khun* (คุณ meaning good, excellent) was substituted for *Phraya*, thus the form *Chao Khun Phraya Indramontri* came into being.

Having made an attempt to clarify the obscurity surrounding the word *Chao Phraya*, an explanation which may shock the preconceptions of some Siamese scholars, I now propose to deal with the title *Chao Phraya* as we know it to-day. In modern times the title *Chao Phraya* is divided into three grades. The first grade was only conferred on persons related to the Royal family and those belonging to the Ratchinikul (ราชินิกุล) that is persons descended from the mother of the Queen of King Phra Phutthayodfa, known to-day as Ratchinikul Bangchang. The patent of title was inscribed on a tablet of

gold (สุพรรณบัฏ). The second grade was conferred on Ministers of State or persons whom the King desired to specially honour. The patent of title was inscribed on a tablet of silver (หิรัญบัฏ). The third grade was conferred on persons other than those mentioned above. The patent of title was inscribed on paper or vallum (สัญญาบัตร). In the reign of King Mongkut a new title was created, that of *Somdet Chao Phraya* with a *sakdina* of 30,000 rai. This title conferred on the holder, rank and status practically equal to that of a Prince, somewhat analogous to the rank of Prince conferred on Bismarck with the difference that it was not hereditary.

The title *Phraya* in modern days is also divided into three classes but this classification was made by means different to that used in the case of the title *Chao Phraya*. Conferring different grades of the Chulachomklao Order was the method used. Up till quite modern times the rank of persons holding the title of *Phraya* was demarcated by insignia of this Order conferred by the King. The insignia differed according to the honour which the King desired to bestow.

There were other means by which the Kings showed special favour to any particular official. They took the form of granting the right to ride in palanquins of different design; the right of carrying swords the scabbards and hilts being more or less richly decorated, and to use areca nut boxes and gold or silver salver etc. given by the King.

(4) CONCERNING PERSONAGES REFERRED TO BY VAN VLIET.

In his *Historical Account*, van Vliet refers to the acts and doings of many high personages and others, and also to some temples and places. It is most difficult, owing to the method of spelling these names, to identify many of them. I have been at much pains to overcome this difficulty, for I feel that unless one knows who the persons are the value of the account is lessened. I therefore propose to deal with the matter in this paragraph.

(1) *Pra Marit* (Phra Marit).

The name Phra Marit can only refer to King Phra Naresuan. The word Marit means black and this King was known as the Black Prince owing to his swarthy complexion. Phra Marit may have been the name under which this Prince was known in his childhood and youth and it may be that he adopted the name Naresuan on his

coronation." The word Naresuan means *Lord of Men*, a title which he richly deserved owing to the high qualities of courage and leadership he possessed. This word Marit may be Naret the short form for Naresuan.

(2) *Ekathosrot*.

The actual name of King Naresuan's brother who succeeded him on the throne does not appear in the *Historical Account*. As, I, however, have referred to this brother, King Ekathosrot, it may interest the reader to know what this word implies. In the Ramayana the King of Ayodhya, father of Rama, was known as Daçaratha. This name has a peculiar significance. The word Daçaratha (Thosrot), in its simple form means ten chariots, but this is not the significance, it holds as the name of the King. Pandit Sivaram Apte tells us in his Sanskrit Dictionary that the real significance of the word is that King Daçaratha was so great and so mighty a King that his war-chariots knew no frontiers, i.e., his chariots went to the eight directions or the eight cardinal points of the compass as well as to the firmament of heavens above and the nether world below the earth. It simply meant that he was all-powerful, a Universal Monarch. King Ekathosrot of Siam thought he would go one better than this by declaring that his chariots were able to go in eleven directions, that is the ten over which Daçaratha had sway as well as the centre of the earth making eleven.

Phya Prachakitkorachak in his *History of Yonok* explains the meaning of this word. He says that Ekathosrot means that the King had sway over eleven States or Kingdoms, that is the suzerain state and ten vassel principalities. This authority states that the title Ekathosrot was not the specific style or title of any particular King but was used generally by monarchs who desired to eulogise their power and might. Phya Prachakit's explanation of the meaning of the word Ekathosrot does not appeal to me as having any philological or historical foundation. This Prince was known as the White Prince in contradistinction to his brother, the Black Prince.

(3) *Praongsry dharma Raetsia Thyara* (Phra Ong Sri Thamarachathirat).

One learns from Siamese history that King Prasat Thong was crowned King under the style and title of Prasat Thong in the year of the Little Era 992 (A.D. 1630). Van Vliet, however, tells us that "After the death of the King, in 1629, the Regent (Okya Kalahom)

was declared absolute King, with much ceremony and pomp, he being then thirty years old. On his coronation he was given the name of Praongsry d'harma Raetsia Thyara." The title of the King as given by van Vliet is unmistakable. It is Phra Ong Sri Thamarachathirat. If this is true why do Siamese historians tell us that he was crowned under the style of Prasat Thong? There is a legend extant which relates that some years after becoming King the God Indra appeared to him in a dream and told him that owing to his great merit a notable omen would occur which would add glory and renown to his name. The God told the King that a beautifully modelled golden palace would be found hidden in a great ant-hill on a certain place. The King ordered the Ministers of State, courtiers and other officials to make a search. The ant-hill was found and on being demolished a golden palace was recovered. From that day on the King was known as King Prasat Thong.

(4) *Pra Ongly* (Phra Ong Lai).

In Part two, I have placed on record the legends relating to the birth of Phra Ong Lai. I fully accept the story that he was a son of Prince Ekathosrot and the Bang-pa-in village maiden born some five years before this Prince became King. He attempted to hide his connection with this girl by placing the child under the care of the elder brother of one of his recognised concubines. The Prince did not take Phra Ong Lai's mother into his palace and he does not seem to have admitted the parentage as King Narayana did in regard to Nai Du'a. We do not know whether Prince Ekathosrot was a full or half brother of King Naresuan, at any rate they were sons of King Phra Maha Thamaracha who was born of parents belonging to the old Phra Ruang Chao family of Sukhothai. This King as a boy had no royal rank but was known in history as Khun Phirentharathep, this may have affected the status of his children and grand-children. Phra Ong Lai was the grandson of Khun Phirentharathep and would be entitled to the position of *Phra Chao Lan Thoe*, and, therefore, would be called *Phra Ong*. The father endeavoured to keep the parentage secret but this could not prevent those closely connected with the boy knowing the truth. Accepting the theory that Phra Ong Lai was a Prince by birth but not by recognition, it might be asked how a member of the Royal family of the rank of *Phra Chao Lan Thoe* could be given a title as a nobleman such as Chamu'n Sri Sorarak (Chamu'n Sanphet?), Okya Sri Worawong and Okya Kalahom. In

the *Sakdina* grading of Princes mentioned by me in Paragraph 3 of this Part will be found Princes termed *Mom Chao*. As provision is made for grandchildren of a King these *Mom Chao* cannot be grandchildren but may be Princes of a lower status. A *Mom Chao* to-day as I explained in Paragraph 3 is a grandchild of a King and may be elevated to the rank of Phra Ong Chao. It is quite possible that the children of Princes born of mothers having no recognised status were known as *Mom Chao*. This *Sakdina* Law shows so many signs of having been tampered with in the first Reign of the Chakri dynasty or even after, that there are two possibilities, one that the rank of *Mom Chao* was given to sons of Princes by unrecognised mothers or that this title *Mom Chao* did not exist at all in those days and the children of those unrecognised mothers were known as *Chao*, a rank provided for in the Law. However interesting these speculations about the rank of the Princes in those days may be, it is a mere waste of thought, for we can know little about this Law, which may have been promulgated in either A. D. 1376 or 1455, nearly four hundred years before the destruction of Ayudhya, and the attempt made by a Royal Commission to reconstruct it. In Part two, concerning the birth story of Phra Ong Lai, I of deliberate purpose related the story of Nai Du'a as given in the official Siamese History which has received the sanction of the Royal Historian, King Mongkut. In this history under the reign of King Narayana full details are given of the relationship between the King and one of his pages Nai Du'a. These words are used “สมเด็จพระเจ้าอยู่หัวตรัสได้ทรงฟังดังนั้นก็ทรงพระเมตตาถามแก่นายเดื่อมหาดเล็กซึ่งขึ้นพระราชบุตรนั้นขึ้นว่า”, which, translated, means *His Majesty the King showed the greatest affection towards the page, Nai Du'a, who was his son.* On account of the courage and knowledge in the handling of elephants shown by Nai Du'a the King commanded that he be given the rank of Luang Sorasak in the Elephant Department. Here we have a case of a King having a son by a Princess of Chiangmai whose parentage he desired to hide, but eventually admitted making that son a Luang. This boy Du'a was a *Phra Chao Luk Thoe* and therefore, entitled to be called *Phra Ong Chao* yet his father gave him a patent of office as a nobleman. This case proves that the sons of King whose parentage it was desired to hide could be given the rank of a nobleman. King Ekathosrot made his son, Lai, a humprae and afterwards

Chamu'n Sri Sorarak (Chamu'n Sanphet?), and this precedent having been established King Song Tham made his brother Lai, Okya Sri Worawong. This proves conclusively that, in certain cases a King could give a son the rank of a nobleman, if he desires to do so.

I discuss the point as to whether Phra Ong Lai was Chamu'n Sri Sorarak or Chamu'n Sanphet in my notes explaining the various titles. (See No. 17 *Pramonsy Saropha*).

(5) *Oya Calahom* (Okya Kalahom).

The word Calahom appears on almost every page of van Vliet's *Historical Account*. Most people have heard of the Ministry of War or Defence as Krasuang Kalahom by which name it is still known to-day. The word Kalahom has been the subject matter of much speculation, argument and discussion, but no one seems to have ever been able to state definitely what the word means or where it comes from.

I have approached several Siamese scholars in an endeavour to find a solution of the mystery surrounding this word. One scholar tells me that the correct way to write this word is Kralahom and this is the form used in the Dictionary published by the Department of Education in 1927. Since then many scholars have favoured the form Kalahom which is in use to-day. This scholar remarks that the Minister of Marine in Cambodia was known as Okya Kràlahom and the Minister of War as Okya Chakri, and that this fact caused him to look further afield for the origin of this word. He tells me that in Arabic the "killa" means a fort or defence works and "homa" means Minister of the Army. Thus he believes the word Kalahom is of Arabic origin and came to Siam through the Khmer.

Another scholar says that there can be no question about the derivation of this word. He states that the word Kalahom as used in Siam is a corrupt form of the Sanskrit word Kalahama (कलहम) which means war. This scholar feels that the last syllable of the Sanskrit original was lengthened into "homa" (โหม) in order to make it convey a meaning to the Siamese. This is due to popular attempts at etymology which account for curious spellings of many other borrowed words as for example "Ya fran" (Saffron หอมฝรั่ง).

I myself thought the word might possibly have a Mon origin. In the Mon language a Prince or Lord is known as Tala, sometimes pronounce Kala. Portuguese writers have spoken of the King of Luang

Phrabang as Kalamu'oeng, and as the word "homa" (โหม) in the Siamese dictionary is said to mean war, a combination of Kala meaning "lord" and "homa" meaning war would fit in with the Siamese system used for giving names to officials to distinguish the nature of their duty. Thus Okya Kalahom would mean the excellent or great one, Lord of War. However, I rather favour the opinion of the scholar who says the word is derived from Sanskrit.

Having attempted to clarify the obscurity surrounding the personages, etc., spoken of by van Vliet I now propose to give a brief sketch of the genesis and history of some of the titles.

(4) *Oya Siworrawongh* (Okya Sri Worawong).

It is a curious fact that this title, which is a well known palace appointment and even exists to-day, is not given in a list of officials which accompanies the law ascribed to King Trailokanat. There can be no question about this title having been in use during the reign of King Song Tham. It may be that the title which means "excellent lineage" was created during that reign to suit the peculiar circumstances of Phra Ong Lai's birth and then fell into disuse until modern time.

(6) *Oya Kheeu* (Okya Kien).

The vowel "u" is probably a misprint for the consonant "n". The officer referred to is I think Okya Kien, Chao Krom Dang Thong Sai (เจ้ากรมตั้งทองซ้าย), an important Mon officer in the army with a *Sakdina* of 1,600 rai next in rank to Okya Mahayotha. He was the chief of the golden shield bearers of the left, Mahayotha being a Changwang of the right.

(7) *Opera Tuynam* (Okphra Thainam).

An officer in the army holding this title of Thainam appears in Siamese history from very early days. Thainam is an abridgement of the full title which is Siharatdechochai Thainam Aphaiphiriyabrakromphahu and according to the *Kotmai Rajaburi* was an Okphraya had a *Sakdina* 10,000 rai which I doubt. The title does not seem to exist to-day.

(8) *Opera Sirsy Anerat* (Okphra Sri Saowarat).

Van Vliet's method of spelling this title leads me to think that it is Sri Saowarat and not Sri Nawarat (ศรีนาวรัตน์), as held by a scholar of note. The title in full is Sri Soawaratphakdi Sri Samuhaprakalahom, had a *Sakdina* of 2,400 rai, and was held by an army officer. The title Sri Naowarat belonged to the Kromthakhwa (Foreign Office) and was probably held by a Malay or Indian. This title I think is of a comparatively modern origin.

(9) *Opera Tiula* (Okphra Chula).

This is a Foreign Office title and was of some importance being held by an Indian Mohammedan. The full title is Chula Ratmontri with a *Sakdina* of 1,400 rai and is in existence to-day.

(10) *Oloung Thun Aray-lucy* (Okluang Thamatrailok).

This is a high army title enjoyed by the officer in charge of the Kalahom and had a *Sakdina* of 3,000 rai. The title is Thamatrailok and the office Samutha-phra-kalahom.

(11) *Oya Senaphimucq* (Okya Senaphimuk).

In the days when van Vliet was in Ayudhya there was only one Japanese Corps forming part of the foreign Legion in the service of the King. This Corps was fully constituted having for its chief or colonel, Senaphimuk, sometimes holding the rank of Okphra and sometimes that of Okya with a *Sakdina* of 1,000 rai. There was a *phat-krom* or adjutant, Khun Sura Songkhram, with a *Sakdina* of 600 rai and a *suabunchi* or paymaster, Mu'n Chaisura, with a *Sakdina* of 500 rai. As time passed another Japanese Corps was created, but we do not know when this took place. The first Corps commanded by an officer with the title of Senaphimuk became the regiment of the right, and a new regiment of the left was recruited. This new regiment was under the command of an officer holding the title of Luang Narairitha (หลวงนารายณ์ ฤทธ). The adjutant was Khun Phonphaibul (ขุนพลไพบุลย์) and the paymaster was Mu'n Rakyotha (หมื่นรักษ์โยธา). Judging by the title, it seems probable that this new Corps was founded by King Narayana who had received the support of the Japanese soldiers when seizing power (1656). It is a curious fact that although there are no Japanese serving the King now all these six titles still exist and are held by Siamese officers.

(12) *Oya Bergkelang*; *Oya Burekelangh* (Okya Phra Khlang).

This title has been known to Europeans in Siam for centuries, probably, because they had to do business with this officer. Okya Phra Khlang was in charge of the King's trading enterprises, his ships, and certain classes of taxes such as customs, dues and royalties collected at the ports of the Kingdom. As the Europeans who visited Siam in those early days were traders they had to do their business with officials of this Department which was known as Phra Khlang. In addition to the duties pertaining to this Department mentioned above all matters referring to foreign policy, diplomatic correspondence emanated from it, and as the years passed this Department became known to foreigners as the Foreign Office (Krom Tha). Before the status of a Foreign Office was arrived at, centuries had passed and it was only after the signing of the treaty with Great Bri-

tain in 1856 when the King's trading monopoly was abolished and the right of free trade instituted, that the functions of this office became crystallised. During all this period of evolution and transition I cannot find that the title Phra Khlang existed. It is not mentioned in the official hierarchy. However, in the first Reign of the Chakri dynasty there were two Chao Phya and one Phya Phra Khlang, in the second Reign three Chao Phya Phra Khlang and in the third, one only. The title then disappeared. The official known as Chao Phya Phra Khlang in the fourth Reign did not hold this title. His title was Chao Phya Thiphakorawongmahakosathibodi. It is significant that during the Chakri dynasty the title Phra Khlang was not always connected with the Foreign Office (Krom Tha), but Chao Phya Phra Klang sometimes held the office of Minister of War. In the early days of the seventeenth century diplomatic correspondence was sealed by Okya Phra Khlang, and the King speaks of Okya Phra Khlang which leads one to suppose that the title was an official one and not one of popular usage. In the *Na Pholau'oen* attached to the law ascribed to King Trailokanat will be found the title Okya Sri Thamarat det chat amataya nuchit Phiphitratanatratkosa thibodi aphaiphiriyabrakromphahu with a *sakdina* of 10,000 rai. The duties pertaining to this title are the same as those performed by Okya Phra Khlang. It is difficult, however, to understand why all letters connected with foreign policy written by command of the King should have been issued in the name of Okya Sri Thamarat etc. and have been sealed by an official holding the title of Okya Phra Khlang. Under the system relating to official correspondence there were two forms in use. Letters issued under the instructions from the King were known as *Santra* (สารตรา), and letters issued by a Minister or Chief of a Department were known as *Thongtra* (ท้องตรา). The first King of the Chakri dynasty had held the title of Chao Phya Chakri, the Chief of the Civil Section of the Government. The Mahatthai was the Department entrusted with the duty of conveying the King's benevolent desires and wishes for the welfare of the people to the people, hence the name Mahatthai (Mahad Thaya). From this time on all *Santras* emanating from the Mahatthai were written under the name of Chao Phya Chakri but signed by the Minister in charge. It is difficult, however, to apply this same line of reasoning to the office of Phra Khlang. That the title Phra Khlang existed in the seventeenth century is certain, but why

it is not mentioned in the *sakdina* of the official hierarchy is difficult to understand. King Song Tham in 1622 made a speech on his Coronation using the voice of Chao Phya Okya Phra Khlang or Vice King Sri Thamarat det chat amatayanuchit phiphitratanatkosathibodi aphiphiriyabrakromphahu. The word Chao Phya here has the meaning of Excellency. The title, therefore, would be His Excellency Okya Phra Khlang, etc. I have already said that the title of Phra Khlang was connected with the title Sri Thamarat. The use of this title by the King goes to prove that these two titles were one and the same, and that the title Phra Khlang was used officially rather than that of Sri Thamarat. It may, however, be that the title is simply a memory of the ancient Ministerial office of Khun Khlang from which it is undoubtedly descended.

(14) *Oloangh Mancough* (Okluang Mongkhon).

In the early days of the seventeenth century the official holding this title was the revenue officer, chief of the department collecting taxes in the Metropolitan area. The title in full is Okluang Mongkhon Ratanaratmontri, and had a *sakdina* of 2,400 rai.

(15) *Oya Capheim* (Okya Kamhaeng).

Owing to the curious method of spelling words adopted by van Vliet, some doubt exists as to whether this title is Okya Kamhæng or Okya Kamphæng. In the list of titles *Na Pholru'oen* (Civil Branch) will be found the title Luang Kamphæng ram phakdi sri suriyachat with a *sakdina* of 3,000 rai. This officer held a high position in the Elephant Department of the right. In the Military Branch will be found Okya Kamhængsongkhram ram phakdi phiriyaphaha with a *sakdina* of 10,000 rai. This officer was in charge of the Province of Nakhon Ratsima. As van Vliet says that Capheim attempted to seize the throne himself and considered him to be a nobleman of high dignity and power, I lean towards the belief that Oya Capheim is Okya Kamhængsongkram. However as van Vliet in his *Historical Account* also refers to a nobleman holding the title of Oya Carassima who is undoubtedly Okya Nakhon Ratsima my identification may be wrong. In this connection, however, it is well to remember that officials are frequently called after the name of the Provinces they governed, for example Okya Phitsnulok whose real title was Okya Surasri etc.

(16) *Oya Sidarma Thyra* (Okya Sri Thamathirat).

This is a palace appointment and it still exists to-day.

(17) *Prāmonsý Saropha* (Chamu'n Sri Sorarak).

In Part two, Part four paragraph 4 and elsewhere in this paper I have adopted H. R. H. Prince Damrong's understanding that this title is Chamu'n Sri Sorarak and was held by Phra Ong Lai (*vide Wars between Siam and Burma*). I have given voice to a note of suspicion in Part four paragraph 4 because I doubt whether there could have been two men holding the title of Chamu'n Sri Sorarak at the same time, for it must be remembered that Siamese history states that Chamu'n Sri Sorarak assisted King Song Tham to seize the throne. This official was created Maha Uparaj and died almost immediately after. If this story is true this Chamu'n Sri Sorarak was not our Phra Ong Lai. An examination of the title as written by van Vliet *Prāmonsý Saropha* lends colour to this suspicion. Van Vliet only gives the name in full in one place, and in others the abbreviated form *Prāmonsý*. *Saropha* has no resemblance to *Sorarak* but might easily be a van Vliet's method of spelling "Sanphet", which although pronounced in this way, is written "Saraphet." This theory may be refuted by exposing the fact that the title was Chamu'n Sanphet and not Chamu'n Sri Sanphet. The *Kotmai Rajaburi* gives the title as Sanphet but that means nothing, for the title in those days might have been Chamu'n Sri Sanphet. This point raised by me seems worthy of consideration. If my suspicion that Phra Ong Lai was Chamu'n Sanphet can be proved to have a foundation and that he was in reality Chamu'n Sri Sanphet or Chamu'n Sanphet then that portion of Siamese history which states that Chamu'n Sri Sorarak assisted King Song Tham to seize the throne and became Maha Uparaj may be correct after all.

In ancient days there were four Chamu'n of superior rank in personal attendance on the King, each holding a *sakdina* of 1,000 rai connected with the Sak, Sit, Rit, and Det Wen or Corps of Pages. In addition there were many Chamu'n of inferior rank with a *sakdina* of 800 rai. These superior Chamu'ns were each in charge of a section of the Corps of Pages, these men were known as Huamu'n Mahadlek and were assisted by four officials called Nai Sak, Nai Sit, Nai Rit and Nai Det with a *sakdina* of 800 rai each. The titles, according to the *Kotmai Rajaburi*, are Chamu'n Sanphetphakdi, ton chu'oek (จันทรเพ็ชรภักดี ต้นเชือก), Chamu'n Sri Saorak, ton chu'oek (จันทรเสวก ต้นเชือก), Chamu'n Wai Woranat, plai chu'oek (จันทรไววรณต ปลาย

เชือก), Chamu'n Smoe-chai-rat, plai chu'oek (จมื่นเสมอใจราช ปลายเชือก). It is difficult to ascertain the meaning of the words ต้มเชือก and ปลายเชือก which undoubtedly denoted the nature of the duties of these four officers. In modern times with the reorganisation of the Palace Department these four superior Chamu'ns became Chaomu'n in order to draw a line of demarcation between them and the inferior Chamu'n. These four Chaomu'ns were generally referred to colloquially as Phra nai, a courtesy title. The use of this courtesy title is certainly quite modern. Thus in modern times in the Palace Department there were three grades of Mu'n: viz. 1) Mu'n; 2) Chamu'n and 3) Chaomu'n. In the reign of King Chulalongkorn the duties of these four Chaomu'ns became specific, each being placed in charge of a group of pages known as a Wen. Chaomu'n Sanphet was in charge of the Wen Sak and performed the duties of the Steward of the Household. Chaomu'n Sri Sorarak was in charge of the Wen Sit and had the duty of looking after the upkeep of the palaces, furniture and fittings, etc. Chaomu'n Wai Woranat in charge of the Wen Rit, whose duties were to look after the Royal stables, vehicles and boats. Chaomu'n Samoe-chai-rat was in charge of the Wen Det and supervised the Royal buttery and kitchen. The title Nai Sak, etc., became Luang Sak. In the Palace of the Second King or Wang Na there were also officials holding the rank of Chaomu'n in charge of Wens or groups of pages named differently to those of the Royal Palace.

(18) *Oya Kharu* (Okya Kaeo).

This title is difficult to identify. As, however, van Vliet tells us that the astrologers informed the King that the omens were against the appointment of a high dignitary of state to carry out the duties of mock-king in connection with the ploughing ceremony it became necessary to select an official of low rank in order to placate the displeasure of the God. For this reason I have gone over the list of the official hierarchy and find a title Luang Kaeo Kharuhatana (หลวงแก้วคหรัตน) chief of the King's orchards and gardens. This is the officer of lowly rank, I think, selected to perform the ploughing ceremony in the name of the King and was created an Okya for that purpose. This official nearly lost his life at the hands of Phra Ong Lai.

(19) *Feyna*; *Flyna* (Faina).

This refers to the Crown Prince who was known to foreigners by

this designation. The reason for this is because the Crown Prince or Second King was spoken of colloquially by the name of his palace, the Wang Na. This word means, according to Prince Damrong, the palace in front of the King's palace. I find that in the old State of Nan the Crown Prince was referred to as Uparaj Ho Na (อุปราชทอน). The words Ho Na have the same meaning as Wang Na. In Burma the residence of the Crown Prince was called "Ein-she", the word "Ein" meaning house and "she" meaning in front. However as the palaces of the King of Burma and his Queens were known by their situation namely the Central, the Northern, the Western and the Southern, there is a possibility that the house of the Crown Prince was situated on the East, for the word "She" also has the meaning of East. In Ayudhya the palace known as Wang Chan Kasem, generally used as a place of residence by the Second King, lay to the East of the Royal palace.

(20) *Zian Crao Mady Tjan* (Chao Khrua Mani Chan).

The title of Khrua Yai (ขวัญยาย) was conferred on a lady, the maternal grand-mother of a Prince (Phra Ong Chao). In this case the lady was a widow of King Naresuan. I find many references to this title in the Epic of I-Nao (อิเหนา).

(24) *Oloangh Pibon* (Okluang Phibun).

There are many titles in Siam in which the word Phibun is used. However I am convinced that this title is Phibun Songkhram the title of the military Governor of the Province of Nakhon Nayok with a *Sakdina* of 800 rai.

(26) *Choen Choenpra* (Chong chai phak).

This title as written by van Vliet does not afford any clue for its identification. There are several palace titles such as Luang Chong chai phob (หลวงจงใจภพ), Nai Chong chai phak (นายจงใจภักดี), and Chamu'n Chong phakdi ong (จมนจกภักดีองค์), any of which may be the official spoken of by van Vliet. As Phra Ong Lai conspired to murder Prince Sri Sin and Prince Thong, who were living in the palace of the Second King, it is probable that his fellowconspirators were connected with that palace. As the title Nai Chong chai phak, generally spoken of as Chong chai phak without the Nai, was a humphrae in charge of a group of pages in the palace of the Second King, I am inclined to think that this is the title mentioned by van

Vliet. The title Chong chai phob was also held by an official of the Second King.

(27) *Eptiongh Omongh* (Aphai Ronarong).

The spelling of this title is not helpful, I identify the word as Aphai Ronarong, a military title of some importance.

(29) *Tiongh Maytiau Wangh* (Changmai changwang).

This word is puzzling and requires a stretch of imagination to identify it. As I think the conspirators were connected with the palace of the Second King this title may be Rit Ronachai (ฤทธิรงค์ชัย), the chief of the soldiers guarding the outer precincts of the palace of the Second King, the title in Siamese is ฤทธิรงค์ชัย เจ้ากรมล้อมวัง. The word Tiongh May may be Changmai (ชาวมัย). The "o" being a misprint for "a". The word tiau Wangh may be Changwang. It is quite possible that the title Changwang in days of van Vliet may have been known as Chaowang (ชาวมัง). There is a Changwang Krom Changmai, the Chief of the Royal carpenters whose title is Katha wichan chamnong (กัฏฐวิจรรย์จ้านง). It is a curious fact that van Vliet when speaking of the fellowconspirators of Phra Ong Lai does not mention their rank which, to some extent, supports my theory that they belonged to the palace of the Second King.

(30) *Oya Ombrat* (Okya Uparat).

This title may be Okya Yomarat or Okya Maha Uparat. The latter is the more likely as I find that when van Vliet refers to Okya Yomarat he spells the word Iumerat or Immerat, the first "m" being a misprint for "u." The full title would be Okya Maha Uparat chat worawong ongphakdi bodinthon surintharadechochai mahaisuriphak saen ayathirat (ออกยามหาอุปราชชาติธรรมศาสตร์องค์ภักดีบดินทรสุรินทรเดโชไชยมหาศัยสุริย์ภักดีแสนอาญาพิราช). It is possible that when speaking of this official in intimate terms that the word "Maha" was dropped. The title Maha Uparat was very important one.

(31) *Sompan Mon.* (Phan Ngoen พานเงิน).

Phra Ong Lai (Chamu'n Sri Sorarak, Sanphet?) had committed the heinous offence of conspiring to assassinate the two brothers of the King, for which he was imprisoned as an ordinary malefactor. He remained in jail for three years and was only released on the intercession of Okya Uparat with the King in order that he might

join the expedition being sent to crush the rebellion in Cambodia. On his return van Vliet tells us that "he was once more taken into the good graces of the King, who made him return to the court and honoured him with the rank of Sompan Meon." The crime committed by Phra Ong Lai against the brothers of the King was of such a diabolical nature as to be most unforgivable, and he was treated as a criminal of the worst type. This fact leads me to believe that Phra Ong Lai was degraded and his title taken from him. On his return from Cambodia he regained the King's favour and was given the rank of Sompan Meon. It is most difficult to identify this title. Phan Mu'n (พันหมื่น) would not be so difficult but what does the word Som mean which, according to my understanding, was not a title and van Vliet's system of orthography does not give us any clue. I do not think that this title or rank had anything to do with the Corps of Pages in which the rank of hua mu'n mahatlek (หัวหมื่นมหาดเล็ก) existed but not hua phānmu'n (หัวพันหมื่น), nor do I know of any Krom pan mu'n (กรมพันหมื่น). It may be that Phra Ong Lai was given a silver salver as the insignia of rank. If this is so the word "meon" should be "ngoen" meaning silver. Thus Phra Ong Lai may have been given a *phan ngoen* which the King frequently conferred on officials. I find there was a title *phan ngoen* (พันเงิน) held by the palat krom (ปลัดกรม) of the Krom Aphiromratchyan (กรมอภิรมราชยาน). This Department had the duty of administering to the King's comfort by holding umbrellas to protect His Majesty from the sun during Royal processions. This may be the title.

(32) *Apra Marit* (Okphra Amorarit).

This may be the title Okphra Amorarit Thamrong (อมรฤทธิธรม) or Amorarit Thada (อมรฤทธิธาดา). I think that the first title is the more likely as Amorarit Thamrong was generally an official of the Southern provinces. It has been suggested that this title may be the colloquial name for the Governor of Mergui which is called Marit in Siamese. I do not think this view can be upheld as Mergui did not fall within the jurisdiction of Nakhon Sri Thammarat. Mergui was under the direct control of Ayudhya. Moreover Apra Marit was a brother of the Governor of Ligor and resided in that territory.

(33) *Praongo Marit* (Phra Ong Amorarit).

This is undoubtedly the name of a Queen of King Song Tham. I

do not think the word here means black (and thus the black Queen), although many Princesses have been known as Phra Ong Dam owing to the darkness of their skin. I think the title is Phra Ong Amorarit (พระองค์อมรฤทธิ), which would mean the Queen or Princess of Immortal Power. On the other hand, it may be Amarit (อมฤต) which word has much the same meaning.

(35) *Oya Ligor*, Oya Ligoor (Okya Nakhon).

This is Okya Nakhon Sri Thamarat whom all Europeans even up to recent time speak of as Okya or Phya Ligor.

(38) *Opera Soupa Pontrook* (Okphra Sakdapholarit).

This title as written by van Vliet is difficult to identify. I think the title must be Okphra Sakdapholarit (ออกพระศักดิ์ดาพลฤทธิ), a palat in the Krom Phra Suraswadi Sai (กรมพระสุรัสวดีซ้าย) in the palace of the Second King. This official was the Registrar of servicemen. There is also Sakpholarit (ศักดิ์พลฤทธิ) of the same Department and Sakdapholarak (ศักดิ์ดาพลรักษ์) an army title.

(39) *Iauphia* (Thao phya)

This term should be Thao phya (ท้าวพระยา) and not Iauphia. It is generally used to refer in a collective sense to high dignitaries both civil and military. The initial letter "i" is frequently used by van Vliet in the *Historical Account* and must be a misprint for "t".

(42) *Oya Siery*; *Oya Siery* (Okya Chakri).

This is probably Okya Chakri Sri Ongkharak (ออกยากิจวัตรวังศรีวงศ์รักษ์). This title is given a *sakdina* of 10,000 rai in the list of titles. Van Vliet tells us that Chakri was a title of one of the first dignitaries of the Kingdom. This dignitary had been Okya Yomarat and on his elevation to the title of Okya Chakri was accused of high treason and nearly lost his life. He was in prison and lost all his property. On release from prison he resumed his title of Okya Yomarat. This title Chakri does not seem to have been one of good omen, for we know that an officer holding this title played a sorry part in betraying his country in 1564-69. I do not mean that the title had fallen into disuse. This title continued to be used during the Ayudhyan dynasty and in the reign of King Tak (Sin) two officials were honoured with this title and created Chao Phya, i.e., raised to the highest rank in the official hierarchy of that reign.

(43) *Oya Rabasit* (Okya Ramasit).

In writing this title Rabasit, van Vliet, probably, followed colloquial usage. A "b" being frequently substituted for "m". The title is really Ramasit (รามสีทิ), and I think the holder was a Mon. There are two titles of this name in the official hierarchy, one Ramasit in the Krom Atmat Sai (กรมอาทมาตซ้าย) and the other Ramasitthison in the Krom Mahatthai (กรมมหาดไทย). I think the Ramasit referred to by van Vliet is the former. The Krom Atmat Sai was connected with the Intelligence Service of the army. Prince Damrong tells me that there is a reference to this Department in the History of the reign of King Phra Phutloedla of the Chakri dynasty (Page 297). The title still exists to-day.

(44) *Trackousa Tsibidi* (Phra Kosathibodi).

This official sent as an envoy to the King of Champa was undoubtedly Okphra Kosathibodi holding office in the ancient Krom Phra Khlang from which the present day Foreign Office sprang. This title became of some importance in the reign of King Narayana. I cannot find this title in this form in the list of the official hierarchy although it is mentioned in history. Kosathibodi forms part of the title of the great dignitary of State Sri Thamarat, etc., but this envoy to Champa can not be this high official.

(46) *Oya Pitterrasia* (Okya Phetracha).

This title was held by the official in charge of the Elephant Department. The full title is Phetrachathibodi Srisuriyapichatsuriya-wong ongsamuhaphrakhotchban (เพชรราชพิบัติศรีสุริยาภิชาติสุริยวงศ์ องค์สมุหพระคชบาล) and in ancient times had a *Sakdina* of 5,000 rai. An official holding this title played an important part in Siamese history at the close of the reign of King Narayana. Okphra Phetracha, having driven the French out of Siam and reinstated Siamese authority, ascended the throne himself. The title exists to-day.

(47) *Sabartiban* (Sombatthiban).

Van Vliet does not mention this title in his *Historical Account*, but it appears in the extracts from the *Record* I have quoted in Part seven. There are two possible explanations of this title. One that it refers to the head of a section of the Mohammedan Indian community in Ayudhya. In Burma this community is known as Zabadi and their children by Burmese mothers are not spoken of as Burmans but

as Zabadi. Indians of this community undoubtedly lived in Ayudhya as well as in Burma and it seems likely that their headman received this title. The official referred to in the Record was an Indian. Another explanation is that it is the title Sombatthiban (สมบัติธิบาล), head of Phra Khlang Nai Khwa, a department concerned with the collection of taxes and duties, and had a *sakdina* of 8,000 rai.

It is a matter for regret that no Siamese scholar has undertaken the task of writing the history of Siamese titles. The subject is not only interesting, but fascinating. It is doubtful whether any country in the world had developed such a perfect system for its official hierarchy. The *na* or land affords evidence of the responsibility of the appointment and the *Sakdi* or title affords immediate evidence of the duties of the official. All the titles are Sanskrit and a large number have been adopted from the Mahabharata, a few from the Ramayana and all have been adopted to the genius of Siamese thought. The few explanations I have attempted to give above may not be in all cases correct for the whole subject requires not only study but profound exploration. For this reason I crave the indulgence of the reader for any acts of omission or commission.

Appendix.

In Part Seven of this paper will be found translations of letters which passed between the Courts of Siam and Japan. These letters were addressed to Japanese officials holding different offices in the Government of the country. It adds to the interest of the subject if we know who these Japanese officials were. Mr. Amada of His Imperial Japanese Majesty's Legation has most kindly given me an explanation, and I quote the relevant passages:

(1) *Honda Kozukenosuke Fujiwara no Masasumi.*

Honda—the family name.

Kozukenosuke—Title of a position equivalent to the governor of Kozuke province.

This title was originally given to the Governor of that Province, but later on given often to high war-lords without regard to whether they were actually governing that province or not.

Fujiwara—Name of the great family. The native Japanese, viz., excluding Ainu and naturalized Koreans and Chinese, are said to have been originally belonging to the four great families—(1) Fujiwara, (2) Tachibana, (3) Minamoto and (4) Taira; the first one being the oldest and most closely related to the Imperial Family, (to which the present Prime Minister Prince Konoye belongs, while the Amada family belongs to the Minamoto).

No—of.

Masasumi—Personal name or same as a christian name.

The name of Honda is commonly understood to come from the name of a village. The ancestor of the Honda family, of course a descendant of the Fujiwara, settled down at the village named Honda and assumed the village-name as his surname in order to distinguish his family from other members of the Fujiwara. From the above explanation the name of (1) will be: Mr. Honda Masasumi, a descendant of the Fujiwara Family, the Governor of Kozuke Province.

(2) *Doi Oinokami* or *Doi Oinokami Fujiwara Toshikazu* was the same war-lord so far as this case is concerned.

Doi—Name of a family belonging to the Fujiwara.

Oinokami—Title of a position originally given to a certain post in the Imperial Household or to a high rank in the Imperial Bodyguard in the older days when the Shogunate had not come into being. But later on as in the case of Kozukenosuke, this title was often given to war-lords under the Shogun in the recognition of their distinguished

service. The surname of Doi is also understood to come from the name of Doi village where the ancestor of this family lived.

(3) *'Sakai Utanokami Fujiwara Tadayo.*

Sakai—Surname of a family belonging to the Fujiwara.

Utanokami—Originally was a title of a position in the Imperial Household, commonly understood as equivalent to "Head of the Bureau of Court Music". This title was given only to that Head before the Shogunate era, but later on given often to war-lords under the Shogun.

Tadayo—Personal name

Sakai Utanokami Fujiwara Tadayo then means: Sakai Tadayo, a descendant of the Fujiwara, the Head of the Bureau of Court Music.

(4) *Itakura Suonokami Minamoto no Ason Shigemune.*

This war-lord is the same man as Itakura Shigemune if it is the name appearing in the records regarding Yamada Nagamasa. I venture to suggest that the name written in Part seven as สุกุโงโนกามิ should be สุกุโงโนกามิ and ชินมุน or นิคมุน should be ชินมุน.

Itakura—Surname of a family belonging to the Minamoto.

Suonokami—Governor of the province of Suo. This title, as in the case of Kozukenosuke, was given only to the Governor of that province, but later on often given to war-lords as a reward.

No—Of.

Ason—Literally means an Imperial Court Officer.

Shigemune—Personal name.

Itakura Suonokami Minamoto No Ason Shigemune—Itakura Shigemune, the Governor of Suo, Court Officer belonging to the Minamoto family. (This war-lord was the Shogun's representative staying at Kyoto, then the place of residence of the Imperial Household).

Honda, Doi and Sakai were the Shogun's highest Councillors, while Itakura was a little lower in rank than the former three.

Well, a question may be raised as to the reason why a nominal title should be given without regard to whether a recipient of that title was actually an occupant of the post or not. Every Government official had his own court rank according to his official post. The Court Rank is divided into 8 ranks from the 1st to the 8th, each rank being subdivided into "jo" the First grade, and "ju" the Second

grade. In ancient days titles of the Governmental or Imperial Household officials had also their own court ranks. Therefore if any warlord was given some nominal title then he had the right to be treated in the Imperial Court according to the rank attached to that title. Only officials or warlords having court rank could be admitted to the Imperial Court. This was a great honour even to war-lords under the Shogun. These various nominal titles were existing until the Meiji Restoration.