

Robert B Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks Including a Translation of Traditions of Royal Lineage in Siam by King Chulalongkorn* (Data Paper: Number 81, Southeast, Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, June 1971),

A review article published in *Journal of the Siam Society*, Volume 62, part 1,  
January 1974

The title of the present Data Paper is certain to excite the interest of historians of Southeast Asia, for, as Prof Jones remarks in his Introduction, ‘A thorough description of the elite hierarchies would seem to be a necessity for any comprehensive understanding of the social and political institutions of a nation .... but as yet no very complete understanding .... has been forthcoming ....’ (p 1). As part of the reason for this lack of knowledge, Prof Jones mentions that ‘Thai sources of information have not been easy to find’ (p 1).

Now the problems posed in Southeast Asian studies by the lack of sources are well known, but it seems to me that before definitively attributing gaps in our knowledge to such lack, scholars should first do everything possible to extract information from the sources which are known. In the case of Thai ranks and titles we have a voluminous raw source in the 1805 compilation of Thai laws for which, unfortunately, ‘The best discussion has been that of Wales’ (p 1), who too often resorted to speculation and *a priori* assumptions rather than clear analysis of his sources.

As is presented, the work under consideration here could lead one to expect something going beyond the work of Wales and providing at least a preliminary treatment of the problems involved in study of the titles contained in the laws, chronicles and inscriptions; and readers are therefore warned not to expect a new study of Thai ranks and titles complementing and improving on Wales’ *Ancient Siamese Government and Administration*. What Prof Jones’ book provides, and what would have been a better title is, ‘Text and Translation of “Traditions of Royal Lineage in Siam by King Chulalongkorn” Including Some Comments on Thai Titles and Ranks’. It touches only lightly on some of the stickier problems in the history of Thai titles and administration, such as the idea that, ‘the Palatine Law of King Trailokkanat was derived largely from the Khmer system’ (p 2), and that ‘most of the Khmer titles for the mandarinat had been borrowed and adjusted until they were operating in the same relative hierarchy in Thailand as they did in Cambodia’ (p 3).

This question of Khmer influence is a subject which I particularly wish to discuss, but first a few remarks need to be made about King Chulalongkorn’s essay, composed in 1878.

The essay, which forms the major portion of Prof Jones’ book, is

concerned with Thai royal titles as they were used in the 19th century, and its purpose, as Prof Jones suggests (p 5) was clearly, it seems to me, related to the shift of power from nobility to royalty and the Front Palace Incident of 1874. It should perhaps also be related to the birth in 1878 of King Chulalongkorn's first *câwfáá* son, Vajirunhis, whom, according to Prince Chula Chakrabongse, he intended to make his heir in spite of the existence of an *uparāja* (Jones' *ṛupàrààd*), also called 'Prince of the Front Palace'.<sup>1</sup>

As the reader will observe, most of the essay is devoted to the exaltation of *câwfáá* princes and the setting up of hierarchies among them and other royal relatives which are nowhere justified in the traditional law texts and in many cases are specifically tailored for the living relatives of King Chulalongkorn. As a result King Chulalongkorn's cousin and *uparāja*, by birth belonged in a category far down the list, obviously too low to be entitled to the position into which he had been thrust at the insistence of King Chulalongkorn's regent.

Although the 19th-century system had been much modified, King Chulalongkorn referred nevertheless to the *Palatine Law* as authority, but treated its provisions in an interesting way, by saying that 'In that law *câw* (royalty) are divided into four ranks' (p 11). As Prof Jones' note 3 makes clear, the law lists five ranks, and the one King Chulalongkorn omitted was the second, that of *uparāja*, reflecting, I should say, his preoccupations with contemporary conflicts among members of the royal family. King Chulalongkorn cited the *Palatine Law* further as 'Evidence of the antiquity of the ranks of the royal family' (p 11), but, with the exception of *uparāja* which he chose to ignore, none of the four royal titles in question are found anywhere else in the laws or chronicles and thus were probably not commonly used by Thai royalty. King Chulalongkorn was of course aware of this and offered a partial explanation in noting that 'In time the rank of *somdèd nɔɔ phráphúthácâw* completely disappeared' because 'kings seldom had a supreme queen with rank higher than the others' (p 17).

An alternative explanation is that the *Palatine Law*, at whatever date it

---

<sup>1</sup> This is based on Prince Chula Chakrabongse's statement that Vajirunhis "was created Crown Prince .... an entirely new position and an unprecedented step seeing that the Uparāja was still alive" (*Lords of Life*, London, Alvin Redman Limited, 1960, pp. 221-2), although the official proclamation to this effect only came in 1886 after the Uparāja's death. [\*King Chulalongkorn's *uparāja*, was son of King Mongkut's brother and Second King, and was 15 years older than Chulalongkorn who became king under a regent at the age of 15. In 1874 there was an attempted *coup d'état* against Chulalongkorn involving the regent, head of the Bunnag family, and the *uparāja*, and concerning which many of the details are still unclear. The *coup* was thwarted, but Chulalongkorn had to suspend his reform policies, and he certainly entertained an animus against his cousin. See *Lords of Life*, and for a semi-fictional account, *Fanny and the Regent of Siam*, R.J. Minney, World Pub. Co., 1962. .\*]

was first composed<sup>2</sup>, represented, like King Chulalongkorn's own essay, the situation of one particular royal family rather than a general statement about the ranking of royal children.

Another example of King Chulalongkorn's attempt to reconcile contemporary practice with confusing statements in the laws is his discussion of *câwfáá*. The statement, that, "According to the Palatine Law there were only two kinds of *câwfáá*" (p 15) is not quite accurate, for nowhere in the *Palatine Law* is the term *câwfáá* mentioned. In fact, in the whole corpus of laws dated before the reign of King Rama I, I have found *câwfáá* only once, used for King Naresuon in the *Law on Treason*, article 68, IV, p 156.

As Prof Jones states in his Introduction (p 3), it is generally believed that *câwfáá* was brought into Siam from Burma, or at least from the Burmese Shan states, since the term itself is Thai rather than Burmese; but King Chulalongkorn's remarks on the shift in meaning of the title (p 15), and Prof Jones' comment on the same subject (p 3), are speculation, there being no precise evidence on the matter. King Chulalongkorn's problem was to reconcile the contemporary fact of *câwfáá* being the highest rank for royal children, a belief that the title had originally meant a ruler or at least a provincial viceroy, and the statement of the *Palatine Law* implying that only princes of the third and fourth ranks were sent out to govern provinces and were thereby *câwfáá*. The reader should be aware that His Majesty's remarks are of unquestionable accuracy only in so far as they concern the 19th century situation and that the historical parts of sections 9-12 are speculative and may or may not be true.

In section 20 (p 23) the details on *krom* ranks and dignity of *câwfáá* are taken from the *Law of the Civil Hierarchy* which, we should note, although dating, in the conventional view, from the same reign as the

---

<sup>2</sup>.References to the law texts are from the 5-volume set published by *Guru saphā*, copied from the Lingat edition, and thus preserving the original orthography. The citations will be by volume (roman numerals) and page. *The Palatine Law*, I 69-159, is dated 720, which if *cula* era, would mean 1358 AD. Quaritch Wales, *Ancient Siamese Government and Administration*, pp. 19, 22, following Prince Damrong, said the date should be 1458, or 820 *cula*. David Wyatt, "The Thai '*Kata Maṅḍiarapala*' and Malacca", *JSS* LV (2), July 1967, pp. 379-286, identifies this date as *culāmaṅī* era which would make it equivalent to 1468 AD. [\*On problems of the *culāmaṅī* era see Vickery, "Prolegomena to Methods for Using the Ayutthayan Laws as Historical Source Material", *JSS*, vol 72 (1984), pp. 37-58";, pp. 00-00 in this volume; and Vickery, "The Constitution of Ayutthaya", in *New Light on Thai Legal History*, Edited by Andrew Huxley, Bangkok: White Orchid Press, 1996, pp. 133-210.\*]

*Palatine Law*<sup>3</sup>, gives quite a different picture of the royal ranks, and again King Chulalongkorn has interpolated details from 19th-century actuality. Thus, for example, the law says nothing about *câwfáá* or *phrá?oŋcâw*, but rather calls the king's highest ranking younger brother *phrá?oŋcâw anuchathirat* instead of *phrácâw nɔɔŋjaathæcâwfáá*, and does not indicate that the differences in rank among brothers, sons and grandsons correspond to the 19th-century use of *câwfáá* and *phrá?oŋcâw*.

The intention of the text as a description of the royal family at a specific time comes through clearly in the remaining sections devoted to the ranking of its members (up to p 67), particularly with respect to some of the lower ranks, apparently devised for the children of specific individuals. We may note with interest that King Chulalongkorn's Prince of the Front Palace (*uparāja*), in this system, would have been merely a *worawoŋthæ*, fourth class (section 58, p 57), and thus only in the 14th rank of all *phrá?oŋcâw*, far below the seven levels of *câwfáá*.

In the remainder of the essay devoted to the *krom* ranks of princes, order of precedence, and ranks of women, the reader should still be aware that its value is as a description of 19th century practice, and that the historical details are largely speculative and need to be checked against the laws and chronicles. The system of *krom* ranks, for example, is nowhere set out in the old laws and the history of its development is not at all clear.

In addition to text and translation of King Chulalongkorn's essay, Prof Jones' volume also includes a section on 'Development of Royal Titles' and sections on other types of titles, such as 'notability', which contain historical remarks and comments on the relationships between Thai titles and those of neighbouring countries, chiefly Cambodia. It is on these sections that I wish to introduce several observations.

For the history of the titles Prof Jones notes his indebtedness to Prince Damrong who consecrated 'a few all too brief statements' to the subject (p 115). In fact the brief statements are largely speculative and do not always fit the evidence of available documents. For instance, that "the first use of *câwfáá* in Thailand comes in the middle of the sixteenth century when .... King Bayinnaung of Burma established Thammaraja as King of Siam with the Shan title of *câwfáá*" (pp 115-116), is not borne out by the chronicles, in

---

<sup>3</sup>. The date in the preamble of this law is 1298, which would normally be construed as *śaka* era, equivalent to 1376 AD. However, there is certainly an error, for the animal year is off by 6 years. Quaritch Wales, op cit, pp. 22, 34, followed Prince Damrong in assuming the date should be one equal to AD 1454 in the reign of King Trailokkanat. Phipat Sukhathit, in "*Sakaraat culāmaṇī*", *Silpākon* 6 (5), Jan 1963, pp. 47-57, p 56, said the date intended must have been 1278, which he assumed to be in the *culāmaṇī* era, thus equivalent to 1466 AD.

which Thammaraja is given titles of traditional Thai type. Neither are there any laws in his reign in which the title *câwfáá* might be found, and the first use seems to be that which I cited above, for King Naresuon. Perhaps Prince Damrong was influenced by a Burmese source, but that would merely reflect Burmese usage rather than titles actually used in Ayutthaya. Of course, the reigns of Thammaraja and Naresuon are the most likely periods to look for Burmese influences, but since *câwfáá* is a Shan, that is Thai, title, it seems more likely that it had always been known to the Thai of Siam even if it has not been preserved in extant texts and inscriptions.

One would also like to see some specific references for the statements that King Thaisa “established that children of *câwfáá* princesses should also bear that same title by virtue of their mother’s rank”, thereby setting aside the rule of declining descent (p 116), and that the title of *phrá?oŋcâw* was established by King Petracha (p 116), since such information is not to be found in the chronicles.

As for *məmcâw* being introduced by King Barommokot and *məmrâadcháwoŋ* by King Mongkut, both are listed in the *Law of the Civil Hierarchy* dated 1298 (1376), but currently attributed to King Trailokkanat (1448-1488). Of course, since the extant edition of the laws dates only from 1805, *məmcâw* could still have been introduced by King Barommokot, in which case we have evidence for a later interpolation into the law; and since in the law *məmrâadcháwoŋ* is mixed in with the *mahātlek*, it may have been an old title to which King Mongkut gave a new function.

Concerning the relationship with Khmer titles and practices, which is the subject of my remaining remarks, some introductory comment is necessary.

The conventional view for some time has been that the massive Khmer borrowings in Thai administrative and royal vocabulary result from an influx of Cambodian scholars and brahmans to Ayuttaya following the final conquest of Angkor by the Thai in 1431, the date given in the *hlvañ prasro'th* (Luang Praso't) chronicle. The Khmer influences reaching Ayutthaya at that time were then formalized a score or so of years later in the administrative reforms of King Trailokkanat.

In the days when Prince Damrong was devoting his attention to the chronicles this explanation seemed to account for most of the facts, but such is no longer the case. Attention has been drawn in recent years to certain pieces of evidence showing that from pre-Angkorean times there were localities on territory which later formed the core of the Ayutthayan kingdom, using Khmer, and apparently independent of any polity in what was to be the Angkor Empire<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup>. G Coedès, “Nouvelles Données Épigraphiques sur l'histoire de l'Indochine Centrale”, *Journal Asiatique* 246 (2) 1958, pp. 125-142, see 127-128.

This situation continued in certain places into Angkorean times as is proven by the inscription on the Buddha of Grahi and the 1167 inscription from Nakhon Sawan<sup>5</sup>.

Together with this long tradition of the local use of Khmer, parts of the Menam basin came under the direct control of Angkor - Lophburi under Suryavarman I (1002-1050), and probably the lower Menam basin and contiguous territory under Jayavarman VII (1181-1220)<sup>6</sup>. Even more interesting is that the early kingdom of Ayutthaya reserved an important place for the Khmer language which appears in the majority of original Ayutthayan documents preserved from before the 17th century<sup>7</sup>.

The logic imposed by these pieces of evidence is that Khmer influence in Ayutthayan language and administration does not have to be accounted for by borrowing from Angkor or the pre-Angkorean states of Cambodia proper, but may be due to a long, independent, local Khmer tradition; and that even if due to direct Angkorean influence the process was not necessarily contingent on a Thai conquest of Angkor in 1431 or at any other date, but could have resulted rather from the extension of Angkorean power into the Menam basin in the 11-13th centuries (it is interesting to note that recent writers on the subject w accept that King Trailokkanat instituted important reforms in the 1450's-1460's, and that these reforms were Khmer inspired, also accept Prof O W Wolters' new reconstructions which place the final

---

<sup>5</sup>. *Ibid*; and *Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam*, deuxième partie, pp. 29-31. The interpretation in Weerapajak, *Inscriptions in Thailand IV* [in Thai], 1986, Bangkok, Fine Arts Department, cited in Charles Higham and Rachanee Thosarat, *Prehistory of Thailand*, Bangkok, River Books, 1998, p. 270, that this inscription "is said to be the earliest evidence for the use of Thai in Thailand, as it includes two words, *Phra* (cleric or royal prefix) and *nam* (bring) must be rejected. Those two words in Thai are loans from Khmer, and the inscription is entirely in Pali (one section) and in Khmer (the longer section).

<sup>6</sup>. Coedès, *États hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie*, 1964, pp. 252-3, 314, 320-321; and *Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam*, deuxième partie, pp. 21-31.

<sup>7</sup>. Michael Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: a Reinterpretation", *JSS* 61 (1), Jan 1973. Ayutthayan inscriptions of this period are extremely rare. One which seems to have gone unnoticed is on the pedestal of a bodhisatva image currently believed to be one of a set cast by King Trailokkanat in 1458. See *Sinlapakam samaay ayuthayaa*, published for National Children's Day, 2514, p 65 and fig 25. The inscription, which is not visible in the photograph, reads, in graphic transliteration, *anak jā brahm rishi*, 'he/the one/a person, as/ who is a brahma rishi', and the first two terms are certainly Khmer.

conquest of Angkor in 1389, nearly a half-century earlier than the hitherto accepted date, and yet fail to discuss whether the longer period between presumed initial cultural impact and resultant reforms is consonant with received views on King Trailokkanat's reforms or should force revision of our ideas about them. This is the sort of thing I had in mind when I introduced the term 'scholastic involution' into an earlier review<sup>8</sup>.

In addition to the foregoing theoretical considerations of Khmer influence in Ayutthaya, a few pertinent facts relating to the possible connection between the Ayutthayan and Angkorean administrative systems require emphasis. As Prof Jones noted (p 115), the Angkorean administration and its titles have been insufficiently studied. In fact, we know next to nothing about Angkorean administration, not even having lists of titles comparable to the Thai laws of civil, military and provincial hierarchies<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>. O. W. Wolters, "The Khmer King at Basan (1371-3) and the Restoration of the Cambodian Chronology During the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries", *Asia Major* 12, 1 (1966), pp. 44-89; Akin Rabibhadana, *The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period 1782-1873*, Data Paper 74, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, July 1969, see pp. 21, 27, n 60, 190; David K Wyatt, "The Abridged Royal Chronicle of Ayudhya of Prince Paramanuchitchinorot", *JSS* 61 (1), Jan 1973, pp. 25-50. See pp. 33, n 10; 34, n17; and Wyatt, op cit, note 2, above; Jones, n. 2; D.G.E. Hall, *A History of Southeast Asia*, pp. 130, 178-80, seems both to accept Wolters' view and yet maintain the date 1431, but does not repeat the suggestion that the reforms of Trailokkanat were a result. [\*I used the expression 'scholastic involution' in a review of H. L. Shorto, *A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions From the Sixth to the Sixteenth Centuries, incorporating materials collected by the late C O Blagden* (School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, London Oriental Series, Vol 24, Oxford University Press, 1971), *JSS* LXI, 2 (July 1973), pp. 205-209.\*]

<sup>9</sup> At the present time [1974] the best compilation of information, from inscriptions and secondary sources, relating to Angkorean administration and titles is, Sachchidanand Sahai, *Les Institutions Politiques et l'organisation Administrative du Cambodge Ancien (VI-XIII siecles)*, where the reader familiar with Thai titles can easily see the great difference between the latter and Angkorean terminology. [\*Since writing the above Pre-Angkorean Cambodian titles have been studied in my *Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia: The 7th-8th Centuries*. Tokyo. The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, The Toyo Bunko, 1998; and two indexes of the Ayutthayan *Three Seals* laws have been produced in Japan, the *KWIC Index of the Three Seals Law* (Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, 1981) of 75 large volumes listing every occurrence of every word alphabetically; and *The Computer Concordance to the Law of the Three Seals* in five volumes, by

However, any student reasonably familiar with Ayutthayan titles and who has even casually leafed through the several volumes of *Inscription du Cambodge* and Coedès' other epigraphic studies should have been struck by the almost complete absence of similar titles in the two areas. Certain Angkorean royal titles were apparently adopted in Ayutthaya, but scholars have generally ignored them and they have not figured in any treatment of the subject<sup>10</sup>. Mention of *vraḥ kralāhom* is found in Angkorean inscriptions, but its meaning is not certain, and perhaps it should not be assimilated to the Ayutthayan *kalāhom*<sup>11</sup>. The famous oath inscriptions of Suryavarman I contain long lists of *tamrvāc* (Thai /damruot/), whose function, aside from being somehow territorial, has not been determined<sup>12</sup>. Some Sanskrit titles such as *purohita*, *guru*, and *senāpati*, are found both at Angkor and Ayutthaya, but Sanskrit titles occur all over Southeast Asia as well as in India, and a case may be made for borrowing from one specific place to another only if the title is both identical and applied to the same function. The Khmer royal and sacred title, *kamrateñ*, which is hidden away in an odd place in the Ayutthayan laws<sup>13</sup> is also found in Sukhothai inscription no 4, in the Grahi inscription, and in the 1167 inscription from Nakhon Sawan, and is thus evidence for my contention that Khmer influence in Ayutthaya was

---

Yoneo Ishii, Mamoru Shibayama, and Aroonrut Wichienkhiew, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto. See also Vickery, "The Constitution of Ayutthaya", in *Thai Law: Buddhist Law, Essays on the Legal History of Thailand, Laos and Burma*. Edited by Andrew Huxley, Bangkok: White Orchid Press, 1996, pp. 133-210\*]

<sup>10</sup>. These titles are *śrī śrīndra* and *jayavarmmadeva*. See Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim", p. 69 and p. 57, n 25.

<sup>11</sup>. Coedès variously treats the term as 'l'aire du *homa*', 'salle de l'oblation', 'l'aire des oblations', and 'nom de fonction'. G Coedès et P Dupont, 'Les Steles de Sdok Kak Thom, Phnom Sandak et *Prāḥ Vihār*', *BEFEO* 43 (1943-46) pp. 56-154, see pp. 107, n 1; 118, n 4; 144, n 1; G Coedès, "Stèle du Vat *Prāḥ Thāt* de Tuk Cha", *Inscriptions du Cambodge* V, pp. 222-228, see pp. 225, 228; and G Coedès, "Stèle de *Samroñ*", *IC* IV, pp. 175-205, see p 197.

[\*On *kralāhom/kalāhom* see Michael Vickery, "The Constitution of Ayutthaya", in *Thai Law: Buddhist Law*, ed. by Andrew Huxley, Bangkok, White Orchid Press, 1996, p. 201, n.30\*]

<sup>12</sup>. George Coedès, "Études Cambodgiennes IX Le Serment des Fonctionnaires de *Sūryavarman I*", *BEFEO* 13 (6), 1913, pp. 11-17; and Coedès, '*Inscription du Gopura Oriental du Phimeānākas*', *Inscriptions du Cambodge* III, pp. 205-214.

<sup>13</sup>. Laws I 249. Six relatively low-ranking (*śakdinā* 600) officials in the Registrar's Department had the title *kumṝtaeñ* (graphic) < *kamrateñ*.



independent of any presumed invasion and conquest of Angkor.

Apart from these few examples and possibly others which may appear when a list of Angkorean titles is eventually compiled, the great mass of the latter consists of terms which have no counterpart at all in Ayutthaya.

As a provisional conclusion we must admit that at the present time nothing may be said about Angkorean influence on the Ayutthayan administrative system at any time, pre- or post-Trailokkanat, but that preliminary observation of the materials tends to indicate that very few titles were borrowed and that it is certainly mistaken to state that, 'By this time (Trailokkanat) most of the titles of the Khmer mandarinat were in use in Thailand...' (p 115).

It is likewise very risky to use post-Angkorean Cambodian evidence, as Prof Jones did, to show Cambodian influence at Ayutthaya on the grounds that in 'the latter part of the nineteenth century the Thai and Cambodian systems are very similar' and 'Khmer influence on the Thai system thus seems clear'. (pp 2-3).

In fact, there is a nearly complete break in contemporary Cambodian source material between mid-14th century, the time of the last Angkorean inscriptions, and the 16th century, when the so-called Modern Inscriptions of Angkor and a few other scattered texts begin to appear. These consist of short inscriptions at Angkor Vat in 1546 and 1564, then inscriptions at Angkor Vat and in Kompong Cham in 1566, some 30-odd inscriptions, a few of considerable length, at Angkor Vat dated from the end of the 16th century to 1747, plus a dozen or so inscriptions in other parts of the country<sup>14</sup>. Other documents relevant for the study of Cambodian titles and administration are law texts, some apparently dating from the 17th century, and chronicles written in the 18th and 19th centuries.

As one would expect, the Khmer language changed significantly between Angkorean times and the 16th-17th centuries<sup>15</sup>. What is less expected is evidence of an almost complete break in administrative traditions

---

<sup>14</sup>. G Coedès, "Deux bas-reliefs tardifs d'Angkor Vat", *Journal Asiatique* 1962, pp. 235-243; Jean Filliozat, "Une inscription Cambodgienne en Pāli et an Khmer de 1566 (K 82 Vatt Nagar)", Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, *Comptes Rendues des séances de l'année 1969 janvier-mars*, pp. 93-106; *Silā cārik nagar vatt (Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor)*, 2ème édition, Phnom Penh, Institut Bouddhique, 1958

<sup>15</sup>. Saveros Lewitz, "Textes en Khmer Moyen", *BEFEO* 57 (1970), see p 102. For a description of some of the processes of change see Saveros Lewitz, "La Toponymie Khmer", *BEFEO* LIII (2), 377-450; see pp. 384-390; and for the post-Angkorean absorption of Thai influences Saveros Lewitz, "Recherches sur le Vocabulaire Cambodidgien" (III), *Journal Asiatique* 1967, pp. 285-304; see 286-7.

and even of toponymy; and the place-names found in post-Angkorean inscriptions are nearly all readily identifiable, while most of those from the Angkor period are still a mystery.

However, there is much similarity between post-Angkorean Cambodian titles and those of Ayutthaya, which together with clear linguistic borrowings from Thai to Khmer, seems to indicate that the similarities are due to Ayutthayan influence in post-16th century Cambodia rather than the other way round.

Specifically, with respect to Prof Jones' remarks, the institution of *krom* was indeed known in Cambodia, and the word is Khmer, meaning 'department, group, etc, but in Prof Jones' explanation (p 117) information for Ayutthaya, Angkor and post-Angkorean Cambodia has been garbled. Part of the confusion is due to Prof Jones' use of a phonemic transcription in which *krom* bears a superficial resemblance to Sanskrit *grāma*, 'village'. Graphic transliteration would have shown that Khmer *krum*, written form of the word pronounced *krom*, could not have derived from Sanskrit *grāma*, which, if it had been maintained in Khmer, would be pronounced today as *kream*, as indeed it is in the neologism /kream-pheasaa/, 'dialect'. The Pali form, *gāma*, is however known in Khmer with the expected pronunciation, /keam/, although still written *gāma*, and is also found in Sukhothai inscriptions. Thus, in Cambodia, Punnāgavarman, in his AD 1019 Sanskrit (not Khmer) inscription (K136), founded a village (*grāma*), not a *krom*, and if *krom* in Ayutthaya really 'functioned as villages' (p 117), it is not because they had at one time been such. The relationship between Thai and Cambodian *krom*, like the whole subject of the administrative history of the area, must await detailed exploitation of the Angkorean inscriptions to this end. At least it can be said that neither *kram* nor *krum* are found in the Angkorean inscriptions.

Prof Jones is also in error in attributing a Khmer origin to some of the Ayutthayan titles of nobility (p 128). I shall comment on *phájaa* below. As for the rest, only *phra?*, old Khmer *vrah*, is of fairly certain Mon-Khmer origin. The titles *m`yyn* (10,000) and *phan* (1,000) are numerical terms belonging to several Thai languages. *Khun* and *luaṅ* are not known in Khmer titles until after Ayutthayan influence had permeated Cambodia, and although I have never seen any discussion of their origin, the latter seems always to have been treated by linguists as a Thai term, and the use of the former in Thai traditional histories as far afield as the Luang Prabang and Ahom chronicles seems to be fairly good evidence for it too being an old Thai term. The Luang Prabang chronicles, we will remember, place a long list of rulers entitled *khun* in a more or less legendary period before the 14th century. The late date of the extant version of these texts of course makes it impossible to completely exclude Khmer influence, but the use of *khun* in the Ahom chronicles as the title of the two ancestors who first descended

from heaven to become kings on earth shows conclusively, I think, that no Khmer borrowing is involved<sup>16</sup>.

The prefix 𑜀𑜃𑜂𑜫, like *khun* and *luan*, is only found in Cambodia in post-Angkorean times and is thus probably a borrowing from Ayutthaya. As for its origin, if it is not Thai, the logical place to look would be Burma, where the term, generally written *ok*, is used in official titles. For the sake of completeness we should note that one of the 𑜀𑜃𑜂𑜫 titles, 𑜀𑜃𑜂𑜫 *pháyaa* (graphic *ok bañā*), has been omitted by Prof Jones. It was given to the ministers of *khlañ* and *vañ* in the *Law of the Civil Hierarchy* (I, 233, 237), and may thus have been at one time equivalent to *câw phájaa*.

A certain amount of confusion occurs in Prof Jones' treatment of *phájaa* and *phrájaa* and their compounds with *câw* and *somdèd*. He considers *phájaa* to be a Khmer borrowing which replaced *khun* as a title for Sukhothai kings (p 3) and later became a title of nobility (p 128). He also seems to think that *phájaa* is different from *phrájaa*, although his remarks on that point are not entirely clear to me (p 128), and that the titles *câw phájaa* and *somdèd câw phájaa* came into existence in the late Ayutthaya period and the reign of King Taksin respectively (p 127).

As I read the evidence *phájaa* and *phrájaa*, which are not found in Cambodia until the post-Angkor period and are thus probably due to Thai influence, represent two forms of a single title which has a long history, including the forms with *câw* and *somdèd*, in the Thai-Mon area. The evidence, which I cite in graphic form for clarity, is (1) the inscription of *văt brah yū'n*, no 62 of the Thai corpus, which shows *brañā* as the title of three rulers of Chiang Mai; (2) Sukhothai inscriptions nos 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 11, 14, 40, 45, and perhaps others, using *brañā* as a king's title; (3) The use of *bañā* as a royal or noble title in a number of Mon inscriptions<sup>17</sup>, (4) the law texts

---

<sup>16</sup>. *Ahom Buranji*, translated and edited by Rai Sahib Golap Chandra Barua, Calcutta 1930, pp. 3-12.

<sup>17</sup>. For the use of *bañā* in Mon see H L Shorto, *A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions*, 'bañā', "The Kyaikmaraw Inscription", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 21 (2) 1958, pp. 361-367; "The Dewatau Sotapan: A Mon Prototype of the 37 Nats" *BSOAS* 30(1), 1967, pp. 127-141; "The 32 Myos in the Medieval Mon Kingdom", *BSOAS* 26(3), 1963, pp. 572-591. [\*Saveros Pou, *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge, volume IV*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 2011, pp. 142-3, has tried to argue that the origin of *bañā* was in Khmer *vrah ājnñā* from which it passed into Thai and Mon, not from Mon or Thai as "some researchers have tried to say". But from the work cited above there can no longer be doubt that the origin was Mon *bañā* which passed with phonetic changes into the languages (Thai and Khmer) of Sukhothai and Ayutthaya, and thence into the Khmer of Cambodia.\*]

of 1805 which consistently show *cau bañā*, *bañā*, *òk bañā*, (I. 224, 229, 237, for examples), and even contain a list like those of Jones (pp 127-8) showing the titles without *òk* (𑜋𑜃𑜂𑜫) and reading, *bañā*, *braḥ*, *hlvañ*, *khun*, *hmū'n*, *bǎn* (I. 314); (5) chronicle manuscripts of the 19th century which consistently use *bañā* for titles which in updated spelling, such as found in published editions of the Royal Autograph chronicle, are written with *brahyā* (Jones' *phrájaa*). I would thus suggest that we are faced with a single title generally written *bañā* by the Mon and in Ayutthaya, *brañā* in the north and at Sukhothai, and that in the later 18th century the unusual spelling *brahyā* (*phrájaa*) was officially adopted due to its conformity with contemporary pronunciation and perhaps also through a false etymology linking it with *braḥ* (*pra?*), old Khmer *vrah*. Two early exceptions to this pattern of regularity are inscription no 9 with *braḥñā*, which in this case may be due to spelling conventions associated with the use of Khmer script, and no 49 which has the modern form *brahyā* (*phrájaa*) and which is in other respects linguistically anomalous [\*see review of Sukhothai glossary in this volume, pp. 00-00\*].

As for the combined titles with *cau* and *samtec* (*cāw*, *somdèd*), they are also attested as early as the 14th century. Specifically, but not exclusively, *cau brañā* is found for the chief of Nan and Phlua in inscription 8, dated between 1359 and 1370, referring to the ruling prince of a *mo'añ*; inscriptions 45 and 49 have *cau brañā/brahyā* 'the grandson'; and in nos 13 and 14 we find *cau brañā srīdharmāsokarāj*, possibly a local ruler. The Vat Pamok inscription, the "earliest documentation" for such a title of nobility (Jones, p. 127) has, in fact, *cau bañā*, not *cāw phrájaa*, and the Dutch record of 1622 (?) also shows this title in its transcribed form 'Chaw peea' (Jones, p 127). Prof Jones has apparently misunderstood this last document. The title 'Chaw peea' is not what "the editors have suggested", but is the title of the original text. The editors' suggestion, in a footnote, is that this individual was the same as the *braḥ glañ* designated in the laws as *òk bañā* (not 𑜋𑜃𑜂𑜫) (Laws I, p 233), and the close correspondence of the remaining elements of the title in the laws and the letter shows that the identification is certain. The interesting feature about this letter is the evidence that *cau bañā* was in use as an official title before the time of Van Vliet and Loubère, who both mention *òk* titles, and that both types of title were used concurrently for time before the latter became obsolete.

The higher-ranking title, *samtec cau brañā*, is given in inscription no. 40 to a person whom Griswold and Prasert believe to be King of Ayutthaya, and in a short inscription from Nan published by Griswold and Prasert the

ruler of Nan in 1426 is also accorded this title<sup>18</sup>.

What may then have been the innovations of the Ayutthaya and Thonburi periods was to use these formerly royal titles, attested from the very beginning of recorded Thai history, as titles of nobility, thus illustrating very clearly the phenomenon to which Prof Jones alluded in his remarks about the declining value of titles over time (pp. 3, 115). Along with his analysis of the development of titles Prof Jones includes a description of the Thai and Cambodian rules for declining descent which is generally very clear and should prove very valuable for students in their first contacts with the subject. In the search for parallels in neighbouring countries it would be useful also to note, “Les titres et Grades Héréditaires à la Cour d’Annam”, by A. Laborde, *Bulletin des Amis du Vieux Hué*, 7 (4), Oct-Nov 1920, pp. 385-405, which depicts a declining descent system almost exactly like that of the Thai court.

However, the comparison with the Cambodian royal family structure as set up by the edict of King Ang Duong may not be very meaningful, for the latter was very likely modelled on the Thai system, even including some Thai titles such as *câw côm*, and is even more theoretical, since between King Ang Eng (1779-1796), when the chronicles begin to provide rather full information on royal family unions, and King Sihanouk, no reigning king, with a single exception, took a wife who was already a princess by birth, and the highest rank for princes and princesses was in fact *preah-qṛṅ-mcah*, which, according to Bitard’s article on the Ang Duong edict, would have only been given to children of wives lower than fourth rank. The sole recorded exception was King Norodom’s union with Princess Snguon, daughter of Norodom’s uncle, King Ang Chan, but no children of this princess, if any, were significant enough to have found a place in extant records. Norodom’s brother Sisowath, long before he was king, married a half-sister, Princess Chongkolani, but both being of commoner mothers their own rank at the time was *preah-qṛṅ-mcah*, and their son Essarovong, direct ancestor of Sirik Matak, was therefore also only a *preah-qṛṅ-mcah*.

The case of Sihanouk’s parents is not an exception either, for Suramarit at the time of his marriage was a *preah-qṛṅ-mcah* prince whose parents, half-siblings were both *preah-qṛṅ-mcah* children of Norodom; and

---

<sup>18</sup>. Vat Pamok: A B Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, 'Devices and Expedients Vat Pa Mok 1727 AD', *In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon*, pp. 147-220; see pp. 182, 185; and *prachum cotmai het samay ayuthaya phak* 1, p 56; the Dutch document: *Records of the Relations between Siam and Foreign Countries* Vol I, p 131; inscription 40: “Epigraphic and Historical Studies no 5”, *JSS* 59 (1), Jan 1970, pp. 89-114; see p 92; the Nan inscription: “Epigraphic and Historical Studies no 3”, *JSS* 57 (1) Jan 1969, pp. 57-108; see p 105.

Princess Kossomak, although daughter of King Monivong, was still only a *preah-qɔŋ-mcah*. Sihanouk himself had at least three royal wives, but all were of *preah-qɔŋ-mcah* rank and his children have always been referred to as *preah-qɔŋ-mcah*<sup>19</sup>.

As for the supposedly higher ranks for children of royal wives, they appear to have been given indiscriminately according to royal favour. In 1845, for example, Ang Duong gave two of his daughters, both of commoner mothers, the ranks, *sɔmdac-preah-riec-thiidaa preah mahaa ksatre*y and *sɔmdac-preah-riec-thiidaa preah srey vo ksatre*y respectively<sup>20</sup>.

Thus, concerning the table on p. 124, there is really nothing in Cambodian practice which corresponds to Thai *câwfáa*, and the title *sɔmdac* is not a separate rank, but an honorific title which may be granted to any *preah-qɔŋ-mcah* as well as to commoners.

After the foregoing remarks it is only fair to note that the weak points of this data paper may be due to its presentation in a form differing considerably from the author's original intention. Judging from Prof Wyatt's Foreword it was compiled first of all as a first-year study aid, and as such it is very good. I wish I had had something like it several years ago to facilitate the transition from Mary Haas' *Reader* to the *Phongsawadan Krung Ratanakosin*. Of undoubted value for this purpose, in addition to the main essay and its translation, are the very last sections (pp 131-143) on 'The Corps of Royal Pages', 'The Ministries', 'Military and Police Titles', 'Rank Correlation of Titles', 'Titles for Women', 'The Inner Palace', and 'Appendix: Royal Kin Terminology', some of which of course are pertinent only to the 20th century. If the data paper had been limited to this there would be no grounds for criticism.

It is of less value, however, for the community of scholars working in Thai history, and I assume that this is the level for which data papers are intended. The late 19th century is a period for which there is relatively little mystery regarding titles and administration, and the remarks on historical explanation and relationships with neighbouring countries, fields for which the current published material is woefully inadequate, nearly all require modification.

---

<sup>19</sup>. This information comes from a variety of sources: J Moura, *Le Royaume du Cambodge*; Eng Sot *Ekasār mahā puras khmaer*, copied from the most recently compiled Cambodian Chronicle; the various Cambodian chronicle manuscripts in the Buddhist Institute, Phnom Penh; numerous published accounts of royal family activities in Cambodian language newspapers for the years 1945-1970; and Princesse P.P. Yukanthor, "Généalogies des Familles Princières du Cambodge", *France-Asie* no 113, Octobre 1955, pp.. 248-258.

<sup>20</sup>. Eng Sot, *op cit*, p. 1074.

Of course Prof Jones cannot be faulted for repeating the conventional wisdom in fields not his own, such as Angkorean administration, Cambodian titles, and their relationships to Thai systems, but colleagues on the Cornell faculty should have been able to warn him about the shaky foundations underlying some of the current assumptions. The Cornell Southeast Asia Program has also missed a chance to use its considerable resources of linguistic and historical talent in a collective effort toward a historical study of Thai titles and 'elite hierarchies' for the whole Ayutthaya period. There is a serious need for this type of study, and a valuable beginning would be an index of all the occurrences of all titles in the laws, chronicles and inscriptions, something that would fill several data papers and would be of immense value to all students of Ayutthayan history.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> [\*As stated above in note 10, this now exists in the *KWIC Index of the Three Seals Law* produced in Japan.\*]