

## The Lion Prince and Related Remarks on Northern History

A review article on Manit Vallibhotama, *Tāṃnān siṃhanavatīkumāra*, chapap sòp gan, Commission of the Publication of Historical Documents, Office of the Prince Minister, Bangkok 2516.

*JSS*, Jan 1976, Vol 64, pt 1, pp. 326-377

The present publication of this *Tāṃnān*, together with other recent articles may signal a renewal of interest in the historiography of northern Thailand<sup>1</sup>. Although a number of important studies of particular texts have appeared over the past half century, there has been no modern attempt to deal critically with the many problems posed by these texts or to reconcile their contradictions and write the history of the northern region.

Coedès' translation and study of the *Jinakālamālī* has probably influenced more western students than any other work on northern history<sup>2</sup>, but the *Jinakālamālī*, even while covering some of the same ground, disagrees with the Chiang Mai chronicle in certain important respects. The latter is one of several northern works included in the collection of Notton, who translated them into French but neglected, as Mus pointed out, to criticize his sources<sup>3</sup>. Wyatt's edition of the Nan chronicle has made many students aware of the history of that province, but how many are aware that it contradicts at times the Chiang Mai chronicle, or that there are two parts to the Nan chronicle which overlap and are in mutual disagreement?<sup>4</sup> Increasing numbers of inscriptions have been published, but in so far as they have been related to the chronicle material it has been to force them into the framework of the latter<sup>5</sup>.

In addition to the above, any study of northern Thai history must also give close attention to the *Tāṃnān siṃhanavatīkumāra* (*TS*), "The Story of Prince Siṃhanavaṭī (the lion prince)", a chronicle of Chiang Saen, part of which has been republished as the volume under consideration here with a commentary and analysis by Manit Vallibhotama, whose interpretation supplies an interesting contrast to recent results of studies in Thai linguistics and northern history as well as puts into relief a number of problems in the use of Southeast Asian source material.<sup>6</sup>

---

1. Donald K Swearer, "Myth, Legend and History in the Northern Thai Chronicles," *JSS* LXII (1), Jan 1974; Georges Condominas, "notes sur l'histoire lawa à propos d'un lieu-dit lua' (lawa) en pays karen' (Amphoe Chom Thong, Changgwat Chiangmai)" and Srisak Vallibhotama, "แคว้นหริภุญชัย" (The Region of Hariphunchai)+, both in *Art and Archaeology in Thailand*, The fine Arts Department, Bangkok, 1974; A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No 13, The Inscription of Wat Pra Yün," *JSS* LXII (1), Jan 1974. The last will be cited as *EHS* 13, and their other "Epigraphic and Historical Studies" as *EHS* plus number.

2. G Coedès, "Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental", *Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extrême-Orient*, XXV (1-2), janvier-juin 1925, pp 1-200. Cited as "Documents".

3. Camille Notton, *Annales du Siam*, 3 vols, Paris, 1926-1932; Paul Mus, *Compte rendu*, Camille Notton, *Annales du Siam*, *BEFEO* 30, 1930, pp 466 ff, see p. 467, n 2.

4. David K Wyatt, Editor, *The Nan Chronicle*, Translated by Prasert Churatana Southeast Asia Programme, Cornell University, Data Paper no 59. The first part of the Nan chronicle is called *Baṅśāvatār lānā daiy/Phongsawadan Lanna Thai* and is a chronicle of the north resembling closely the Chiang Mai chronicle. The second part is that of Data Paper 59. Both are in Part 10 of *Prahjum baṅśāvatār/Prachum Phongsawadan (PP)*, volume 9 of the *guru sabha* edition, pp. 188-344.

5. *EHS* 13, p. 131, n 7.

[\*<sup>6</sup> David Wyatt, "Chronicle Traditions in Thai Historiography", in *Southeast Asian History and Historiography: Essays Presented to D.G.E. Hall*, ed. by C.D. Cowan and O.W. Wolters (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1976), pp. 107-122, reprinted in *Studies in Thai History*, Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books, 1994, pp. 1-21, commented, Silkworm edition, p. 9, on the tortuous chronology of

It is for the analysis and interpretation that the present volume is of greatest interest, since the text itself has been published before in part 61 of *Praḥjūm baṅśāvātār/Prachum Phongsawadan (PP)*, “Collected Chronicles”, which carried the story up to 1728 AD<sup>7</sup>. Manit while admittedly taking his text from *PP* part 61, cut it off at the end of the first part ending just before 638 AD (or 1108 AD as he interprets the dates). In neither publication is there any indication of the nature, location, or date of any manuscript with the exception of a vague reference by Manit to another text consulted about an obscure point<sup>8</sup>.

A French translation of *TS* also appeared among Notton’s collection and is obviously from a different manuscript tradition<sup>9</sup>. It ends with a colophon just at the point where Manit cuts off his text, includes the section for which Manit had to consult another manuscript, and also contains a long chapter of Buddha prophecies which is missing from *PP* and Manit, but which the logic of the story requires<sup>10</sup>. Notton likewise had little to say about his manuscripts beyond mention of two persons who put their collections at his disposal, but it seems certain that he worked directly from a manuscript which, according to its colophon, was copied in *cula* ear 1242 (1880 AD) at the *Jetavaṇṇarāma*<sup>11</sup>.

Manit’s text and analysis follow an introduction by Sukich Nimmanahaeminda, President of the Commission, who, after noting the contribution Manit has made to the understanding of a number of eras used for reckoning time in the northern texts and to the question of Thai-Chinese relations in early times, states that it “should be a handbook for the study of history and antiquities<sup>12</sup>”. Such would indeed seem to have been Manit’s intention. A large part of the material consists of his discussion of problems in dating and historiography, and gives emphasis to original and interesting points of view held it seems, by a number of Thai scholars working within a traditional historiographic framework. Since this book is presented by a prestigious official body and since more and more students in western countries are making use of Thai material in their research, it seems useful to bring this discussion to a wider audience and examine the extent to which the publication of *TS* fulfils the promise of being a historian’s handbook.

First I shall summarize the content of the text very briefly in order to bring out the points requiring further discussion.

The story begins with the reign of a Thai king, who is also a *hò*, named *devakāla*, ruling in “*nagara daiydesa* [Thai-country] which was *mo’añ rajagr̥h*, the capital” in the year 17 of the *mahāśakarāja*, which usually means *saka* era, equivalent to AD minus 78<sup>13</sup>.

The king had 30 sons and 30 daughters. The eldest son was *bimbisāra* and the second was named *Sinhanavāṭikumāra* because he had the strength of a lion (*rājasīh*). King Devakāla divided his

---

*Sinhanavāṭikumāra*, “by far the most interesting--and potentially important” of its genre, adding that “One recent editor of the text has... attempt[ed] also to unravel the chronology of the entire chronicle”. In this Wyatt was referring to the work of Manit under discussion here, where we shall see the degree of success of his ‘unraveling’\*]

7. *PP* 61, pp 56-208, original edition.

8. Manit Vallibhotama, *Tāṃnān sinhanavāṭikumāra*, p. 36, and see below p. 329. This publication will be cited as Manit. *TS* will be used to refer to the story in general, whether Manit’s or other editions.

9. Notton, vol I, pp 141-202.

10. Notton, *ibid*, pp 148-168.

11. Notton, *ibid*, pp XII, 202.

12. Manit, p. ๗

13. Manit, p. 27. In order to avoid a surfeit of italicized forms with diacritics, proper names will be so written only on their first occurrence unless they are in quotations or the spelling and etymology are being emphasized.

realm among his children, making Bimbisara *uparāja* and letting him reside with one of his sisters in the capital, and sending the others out to establish themselves in other regions.

Prince Sinhanavaṭī and a sister with a large suite crossed over the *sārahbū* river and headed southeast. After a 4 month journey they reached a country not far from the *kharanadī* river, the country of *suvarrṇagomgām*. There was already a population of *milākkayu* under their own king and Sinhanavaṭī made his camp not too far away.

The local naga, *bāndhunāgarāja*, appeared as a brahman and invited Sinhanavaṭī to establish a city there. It was named *mo 'aṅ nāgabāndhu-sinhanavaṭīnagara* by combining the names of the *nāga* and Sinhanavaṭī. The prince began to rule the area and brought all the *milākkayu* chiefs under his protection, but 4 days march to the southwest was another city, *umoṅselānagara*, inhabited by *khòm*, which refused to submit and had to be conquered. By *mahāsakarāja* 22 Sinhanavaṭī had subdued all of Lanna Thai<sup>14</sup>.

The story then becomes somewhat confused. Four earthquakes occur, the last in the year 102. Then there is the beginning of a prophecy explaining why the city was built at this place, but it is broken off by a statement that *brahyā bāndhanaṭī* had been ruling in *mo 'aṅ yonakanagara* for 29 years and died at age 71 in the year 148, which was the year the Buddha entered *nirvāna*.

At this point Manī refers to another copy of the text which makes the connection between Sinhanavaṭī and the new ruler, his son. This is also clear from Notton's version which, pp 148-168, in a section entitled, "Les temps bouddhiques", relates the life and activities of the Buddha, including travels around northern Thailand and predictions about the cities to be founded there.

King Bandhanati was followed by his son *ajutarāja* who married *padumavatī*, daughter of a *rishi*. The boundaries of his kingdom are given as *hnòṅ sae* in the north, *lavarāṭha* in the south at the mouth of the *maenām raḥmiṅ*, in the east the mouth of the river *mūa* at the border of *mo 'aṅ cuḷaṅī*, and the west the river *gaṅ*<sup>15</sup>.

In the same year as Bandhanati's death, 148 of the ancient (*porāṅ*) era, King *Ajātasatrū* and *Mahāk āssaparthera* cut the era and established the *mahāsakarāja* anew. Now Ajatasatru, who was a historical king in India, a son of Bimbisara and a contemporary of the Buddha, and Maha Kassapa, who was one of the Buddha's disciples, are believed, in Southeast Asian buddhist tradition, to have established the Buddhist era (AD +543/544) at the time of the Buddha's death<sup>16</sup>. Thus the new *mahāsakarāja* of this text would seem to be the usual Buddhist era and the old one a pre-Buddhist era also familiar to Southeast Asian tradition. The foundation of the Buddhist era as recorded here is in the Ceylonese tradition which makes the first year of the era the same 'snake' year in which the Buddha died. The Thai tradition begins BE in the following horse year<sup>17</sup>.

---

14. Manī, p. 32.

15. Manī, pp 37-38 *hnòṅ sae* is believed to be in Yunnan, Lavarattha is Lophburi (old Lavo) *raḥmiṅ* is another name for the Ping river, *cuḷaṅī* is supposed to be Tongking and the *gaṅ* is the Salween. In my opinion only Lavo, *raḥmiṅ* and *gaṅ* (Kong) are certain, and the rest require more investigation. See references in Notton.

16. In addition to *TS*, see references below, note 54.

17. Notton I, p. 170, n 1: Piphat Sukhathit "Kān n p pī haen buddha sakarāj", *Silpākon* 7 (1), pp 48-58; *Prajum silā cāru'k* vol IV p. 68; Shway Yoe, *The Burman, His Life and Notions*, Norton NY 1963, p.

Then there follow stories of Maha Kassapa and *Mahākāccāyanathera*, another of the Buddha's disciples, bringing relics of the Buddha from Rajagrha to deposit at various places in northern Thailand. Maha Kassapa's death is noted along with the tradition that his body remains interred in a mountain, without putrefaction, until the coming of the future Buddha, Maitreya<sup>18</sup>.

King Ajutaraja is said to have died at the age of 120 after a reign of 100 years, and was followed by a son, *mānraynarāja*, and a grandson, *jo 'aṅ*, in whose reigns more Buddha relics were brought to the area.

After this there is a list of 16 kings with monosyllabic Thai-type names such as *jin*, *gām*, *ko 'n*, *jāṭi*, etc, who reign through a period of 312 years, 183-495 of the new era, in which no events are recorded except their occasional repairs to reliquaries. There seems to be no doubt about the era, since it is frequently identified as that of the Buddha's nirvana.

Then the scene shifts to the outside world with mention of *braḥyā dutthagāminī*, ruling in Ceylon, and the fourth Buddhist council which was held at that time in 495 of the new era. The synchronism shows some confusion with respect to Ceylonese chronology, which places the writing down of the scriptures and the council in question in the reign of King Vattagamani over a half century later than Dutthagamani, although the date given by *TS*, 495 (BC 48), is rather close, by one reckoning, to the accepted date for these events<sup>19</sup>. We are probably faced here with a simple case of scribal confusion of names, as Manit also noted<sup>20</sup>.

Five years later, in the year 500 after the Buddha's nirvana, the text says, "the religion of the nuns" has died out and Buddhism has disappeared from all the great countries. It is only flourishing from *mo 'aṅ rājagṛh* down to *mo 'aṅ yuon jāṅ saen*<sup>21</sup>. This seems to be a reference to an ancient prediction concerning the admission of women to the order<sup>22</sup>. With the name *yuon jāṅ saen* the chronicler is getting ahead of his story, for that name has not yet been established and the country is still known as Yonakanagara.

Then after seven more reigns with which no events are associated we reach the date 622 after the Buddha's nirvana or as the text of *PP* part 61 has it "the Buddha's religion had completed 622 years"<sup>23</sup>.

At that time *trī cakkhu* ("three eyes") of *bhukām* (Pagan) had become *braḥyā dharmā*, and seeing that the religion was no longer flourishing he cut the era which had been established by Ajatasatru of Rajagrha by 622 years and established a new era. Since 622 is precisely the conversion factor necessary to transform the Buddhist era used in Burma and Ceylon to *saka* era, or *mahāsakarāja*, as it is known in Thai material, it would seem clear that this is the new era which has been established. The identification is reaffirmed throughout several succeeding reigns in which both the new era and the number of years since the nirvana are mentioned. We need only note that the difference is frequently 621, the Thai conversion factor,

---

549.

18. *Présence du Bouddhisme*, nos 153-157 of *France-Asie*, fev-juin 1959, p. 353, where the tradition is mentioned in slightly different form. Hereafter cited *Présence*.

19. The authorities seem to differ over these dates. Wilhelm Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times* p. 223, has Dutthagamani reigning 101-77 BC, and Vattagamani in 43 BC and from 29-17 BC, while C W Nicholas and S Paranavitana, *A Concise History of Ceylon*, pp. 59, 71, place these reigns respectively in 161-137 and 89-77 BC. Note the variant spelling of the royal names in the Thai tradition.

20. Manit p. 60, section 136.

21. Manit p. 61.

22. *Présence*, p. 658.

23. *PP* 61, p. 76.

rather than 622<sup>24</sup>. This would seem to indicate that the BE dates were inserted after the text and *saka* dates had been composed, a point to which I shall return later.

After this there are twelve more empty reigns which bring the story up to 279 *saka* or 900 BE (AD 357), at which time there is a long story about war between Yonakanagara and the *khòm*. The latter, who lived to the southwest of Yonakanagara, had been tributary to the Thai since the time of Sinhanaṭṭikumāra. Now, however, they conquered their former overlords and all the Thai were forced to move to another location and pay tribute to the Khòm. This situation lasted 19 years until a Thai prince *brahmakumāra* drove the Khòm out and chased them as far as the sea where they settled in a large plain in the territory of *indapaṭhanagara*, and the Thai moved back to Yonakanagara. Shortly after this Brahamakumara founded another city, *viañ jaiyaprākāra*<sup>25</sup>.

The next story is that of *buddhaghosa* of *sudharmavatī* (Thaton) on the west bank of the *mae gañ* (Salween) who, in the 949th year of the buddhist religion, brought the 84,000 parts of the dharma from Ceylon to *sudharmavatī*, *hañsavatī* (Pegu), *bhukām* (Pagan) and on to *mo'añ yonaka* where he also placed relics in various sanctuaries<sup>26</sup>.

Then, after a couple of reign changes, there is the story of a king of Sudharmavati who invaded the recently established city of Jaiyaprakara. An astrologer told its king that the city was fated to disappear, so, rather than be conquered, the king and the whole population evacuated the city. This occurred in the year 366 of the new, presumably *saka* era, and when, according to *PP* part 61 and Notton, the Buddhist era had reached 1000 ๓๓ years. However, BE 1000 should correspond to *saka* 378. Manit has emended ๓๓ to ๓๓๓ (“go beyond, elapse”), producing a phrase, “after the buddhist era had elapsed completely”.<sup>27</sup> In any case there is a confusion in dating here which I discuss below (pp. 351-55).

Finding the city deserted the invading forces retreated, but even so a flood prevented the

---

24. See note 17, above. ZZZ

25. Manit, pp 73-85. In modern times, from at least the end of the 18th century, *khòm* has been used to mean the Khmer of Cambodia, although I have previously called attention to evidence that in earlier times this was not so. See Vickery, Review of *Prajum silā cāru'k* etc, *JSS* 60 (1) Jan 1972, pp 397-410. Since *TS* has the *Khòm* finally settling at *Indapaṭhanagara*, one of the names of Angkor, it is certain that *TS* uses *khòm* in the modern sense. However, this name for Angkor is never found in Angkorean inscriptions and first appears in the so-called modern inscriptions of Angkor Vat in the 16th century, so that its mention here serves to help date the story included in *TS*. Of course at the date in question, in the 4th century AD, we have no knowledge of the Khmer, Thai, or any other peoples of the interior of Southeast Asia, and the story here must be considered a legend reflecting history only to the extent of mentioning that at one time (the Angkor period) the Khmer had been more powerful than the Thai, a situation which from the Thai point of view was aberrant. Thus, at the very beginning of history it is said that the Khmer were tributary to the Thai. Another such story is found in central Thai and Cambodian sources. It makes Phra Ruong the Thai hero who broke the bonds of Khmer suzerainty, although no earlier period of Thai superiority is mentioned. Evidence for a common origin of both stories is in the names of the Khmer leader, *khòm tām* in *TS* and *khòm tām tin* in the other story. The former means “black khom”, and the latter “the khom who plunged into the ground”, because he followed Phra Ruong by burrowing through the earth.

26. Here *TS* extends to its own area the activities of the famous 5th-century scholar whom Burmese writers had earlier brought to Thaton, but who for Indian and western historians only moved between India and Ceylon. See B.C. Law, *The Life and Work of Buddhaghosa*, Calcutta Oriental Series No 9 E3, 1923, pp 1-25, 40-42, *Présence*, p. 686, Geiger, op cit, pp 66 ff.

27. Manit, p. 91, section 262.

Jaiyaprakara king and his people from returning home. They continued moving eastward until they came to a favourable spot and founded a new city which they called *kāmbaenbejr*. “From that time on the kings of the two sister cities [*mo’an*] lost touch with each other and were far apart. From that time on our Thai kings were divided into two [dynasties of] kings”.<sup>28</sup> The reference to sister cities is to Yonaka and Jaiyaprakara, and the two distantly separated groups of Thai are those of Yonaka and the new city of *kāmbaenbejr*. It appears that the intention of the chronicler may have been to identify the new city of *kāmbaenbejr* with the city of the name in central Thailand, even though the direction of migrations, “eastward”, is wrong. Manit accepts the identification, but notes that the story at this point is “confused”, and provides his own, more acceptable, migration route<sup>29</sup>.

The story then returns to Yonakanagara and after two reign changes, in the year BE 1003 corresponding to an erroneous *saka* 467 (see below, p. 353), it is said that the people saw an albino carp (ปลาตะเพียนเผือก) in the river. It was caught and eaten. Then the sun became dark, a great noise like thunder was heard several times and the city of *viañ yonakanagara hluoñ* disappeared leaving in its place a large pond. All the people also disappeared except one old women. She told the story of what had happened to villagers from the surrounding area who arrived the next day. These people feared attacks from other cities so they chose a rich man from one of the villages as king, built a new city, and named it *viañ pru’kṣā*.

After the death of the first king of the new city there is a list of 15 more rulers containing nothing but names and dates, which brings the chronology up to 559 of the, apparently, *saka* era (AD 637, BE 1180/1). A summary paragraph then reviews “the story of *mo’an yonakanagara* together from the beginning [when] Prince *siñhanavatī* came from *mo’an rājagr̥h hluoñ daiy desa* and established *mo’an nāgabāndhusiñhanatīnagara* [sic] right up to [the time when] our Lord Buddha became enlightened and came to save [the people] there. Later on it changed to *mo’an yonakanagara rājadhānī jaiypurī srī jā ni saen* and then became *viañ pru’kṣā* which lasted 93 years”<sup>30</sup>.

At this point Notton has a colophon ending his text.<sup>31</sup> Manit and *PP* part 61 note that the first part of the story ends here, but while Manit cuts off his text, *PP* part 61 continues without a break to the second part, the first events of which are essential to an understanding of part I and Manit’s analysis<sup>32</sup>.

This second part of *TS* begins with a review of the changes in era which have occurred within the time span of the first part of the story, plus a few important dates from Buddhist history. They are as follows:

- The Buddha died in the year 420 of the ancient (*porāṇ*) era.
- King Ajatasatru then cut the ancient era and established year 1 of the new era (Buddhist era) in a *kāt met* year.
- In the year 99 of the new era, a *rahvāy sāñ* year, the second Buddhist council was held at Vesali.
- In the year 218 Asoka conquered *jambūdvīpa*.
- In the year 223 *mahā moggalīputrathera* convoked the third Buddhist council.
- In the year 64 [sic], a *po’k yī* year, *brahyā trī cākku* cut this era and established the *dutiya*

---

28. Manit, p. 93, sections 267-8.

29. Manit, p. 92, section 265.

30. Manit, pp 100-101.

31. Notton I, p. 202.

32. *PP* 61, p. 99.

*sakarāja* (second era).

- In 560 of the *dutiya* era, 1182 years after the Buddha's nirvana<sup>33</sup>, there is a story about the coming of a new king to Chiang Saen and then a statement that the era established by *trī cā kkhu* was finished and a new one, *tatiya sakarāja* (third era was begun in a *kāt gai* year<sup>34</sup>.

With the exception of the ancient era and the clearly corrupt figure for the year in which the *dutiya sakarāja* was established, the order of the eras is exactly like that of the first part and also corresponds to the known Buddhist, *saka (dutiya)*, *cula (tatiya)* sequence. It thus indicates with certainty that, in spite of the unexpected terminology, such was the chronological sequence intended by the person or persons who composed *TS*.

As for the ancient era the writer of part 2 must have had in mind a tradition different from that of the compiler of part 1. This does not need to cause any embarrassment in the analysis of the text. Several traditions concerning 'ancient' eras are known, and all such eras, judging by epigraphic evidence, are fictitious. In an earlier review in these pages I called attention to a belief that an ancient era had been cut at a date corresponding to AD 639 in order to establish the *cula* era. Burmese tradition holds that the Buddha's grandfather, at a date corresponding to BC 691 abolished a 'Kawza' era which had been in use for over 8650 years, and the ancient era of *TS* part 1, which lasted 148 years until the Buddha's nirvana, is known elsewhere in Thai tradition as the *añjana*, and the Burma as the 'Insana' era, after the name of the Buddha's grandfather who is supposed to have established it<sup>35</sup>.

The year 64 for the change for Buddhist to *dutiya* era is certainly a textual corruption for the expected 621/622 and need not detain us.

As for the dates of Asoka's conquest and the Buddhist councils, it should be noted that conversion to BC dates using the standard 543/544 will not give the dates accepted for these events in western literature due to the Buddha's death in Southeast Asian tradition being placed 60-80 years earlier than calculated by modern historians (see below p. 346).

The cyclical years associated with these dates are also of interest. The second part has BE beginning in a *kāt met* instead of a *mo 'n met* year as in the first part (the snake year in which Southeast Asian tradition places the Buddha's death was really *mo 'n sai*), BE 99 is given as *rahvāy sān*, while the arithmetic of part 1, although not mentioning that year, would make it *rahvāy set*. *Rahvāy sān* is correct, but is not coherent with *kāt met* for BE 1. Besides, *rahvāy sān* as BE 99 is in the Thai tradition, although *TS* begins the era according to the Ceylonese. For the beginning of the era of *trī cākkhu* part 2 has *po 'k yī*, part 1 *tau yī*. The former is correct, as is the *kāt gai (kai)* for the beginning of the *cula* era. All of this is evidence that the cyclical years, especially in part 1, were inserted haphazardly, probably after the text had been composed..

The establishment of the *cula* era in part 2 is closely involved with the narrative which is carried on from part 1. As the story goes, there was at that time a great country (*nagara*) to the southeast with 1000 royal cities (*rājadhānī*) in which the royal dynasties had died out and rulers could not be found. The most important were *ālāvī* (India) *culanī*, *candapurī* (Vientiane), *kosāmbī* (India and Shan states), *haṅṣāvātī* (Pegu), *kaliṅgarāj* (India), and *sāṅkaṭā* (India). There was also a ruler named *anuruddha dharmmarāja* in the Mon (มอ) country who was greater than all the others. In the whole of *jambūdvīpa* there were 8400

---

33. *PP* 61, p. 91.

34. *PP* 61, p. 101.

35. Vickery, "A Note on the Date of the Traibhūmikathā", *JSS* 62(2), July 1974, pp 275-286; Notton I, p. 170, n.1; *Shway Yoe*, p. 549.

large *mo'ahn*.

Indra then asked Anuruddha to cut the era and establish a new one. All kings were present for the occasion, but since the 1000 Thai-Yuon *mo'ahn* had no kings, they could send no representatives. Therefore Indra sent down from heaven 1000 *devaputra* to be born as kings, and among them was *lavah cāṅkarāja devaputra* who came down to *viañ pru'kṣā jiañ saen*. All the other of the 1000 *mo'ahn* received rulers at this time except *haribhuñjaiy* and *sukhodāy*. In Chiang Saen itself a new city was built and named *viañ herāñanagara no'n yāñ jiañ saen* because, according to the story, Lavahcankaraja descended from heaven on a golden (*herāña*) stairway.

The reign of Lavahcankaraja is filled with stories of relics and temples and folk etymologies on the names of localities in the Chiang Saen area. He dies after a reign of 120 years. His son then reigns for 62 years and is given credit for establishing several Buddha relics. He is followed by nine empty reigns which take the story up to a date corresponding to AD 1023. Then after several episodes of partly supernatural folklore involving Chiang Saen and its neighbours we reach the story of *khun cu'o'uñ* at a date around AD 1108.

Since Khun Cu'o'ng is an important folk hero for several northern peoples it is well to take note of the story recorded here. It begins with an invasion of Chiang Saen by vassal states of which the most important were *kosāmbī*, *kaliṅgarāj*, *sāvātthī* (Sravastī), *hañṣāvātī*, *ayodhayā* (Ayutthaya) in order to obtain two beautiful girls who had been born there. The ruler of *cāṅdapurī* and his elder brother *brahyā kaev hluoñ* (Vietnam?) also invaded for the same purpose. Khun Cu'o'ng defeated the invaders, got both girls and the throne of Chiang Saen, and was given the title *brahyā cu'o'n fā dharmikarāja* in the year AD 1120.

Later *brahyā hlum fā kau bimān* of *mo'ahn videharāj* (India and China) and his brother *brahyā cuḷañī* also started to attack to obtain the girls, but when they heard of Cu'o'ng's victories they gave up the attempt. From that time on he received tribute (ᨾᩣ᩠ᨾᩣ) from all the *hò* and *kaev* in the east and north as well as from *Kosāmbī*, *Kaliṅgarāj*, *Hañṣāvātī* and *Ayodhaya*.

After more than fifty years of rule Cu'o'ng died in an elephant duel with a ruler of an unidentified kingdom, *maen tā tòk khòk fā tā yū'n*, "far to the east", and his kingdom was divided among his five sons in the year 554 (AD 1192)<sup>36</sup>.

No more events are mentioned for three generations until the reign of Cu'o'n's great-grandson *lāv meñ*, in the line ruling in Chiang Saen, who was to be the father of King Mangrai. Immediately the story is

---

36. *PP* 61, p. 121. The names I have identified in parentheses are those which are known for certain to have been in use at one time or another for the areas concerned. The others have been localized by various writers, but it is not clear to me whether such identifications were based on mere guesswork or more solid evidence. In Notton, for example, *Alavi* is Chiang Rung (I, 156), *Culani* is a part of Tongking (I, 1, 3). *Saṅkata* is not mentioned by Notton and I am suggesting that it derives from *Saketa*, one of the cities of classical Buddhist India (see Hermann Oldenberg, *Buddha*, Goldmanns Gelbe Taschenbucher, pp. 96, 369). Since this name cannot be attached to any local place, it is evidence that the whole group of Indian names in *TS* was taken from Buddhist literature. *Maen ta tok*, etc is not clearly identified, and in one story "Phraya Maen Ta Tok" is a person while "Khok Fa Phi Ta Yuen" is a country with which he is at war (Notton I, 18 ff, III, 18, 28). *Videha* was known to the Shans, at least, as a name for China (Sai Saimong Mangrai, *The Shan States and the British Occupation*, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, Data Paper no 57, p. IV, n 2).



again filled with folklore, omens and predictions of which one example should be noted. This concerns the choice of name of *lāv meṅ*'s son, based on a combination of the names of the two parents and a hermit who was predicting the child's future greatness. According to the story, Mangrai's name was formed in the following way: The father's name, (*lāv*) *meṅ*, and the hermit's, *pādamāṅkar*, supplied the first syllable, *māṅ*, and then they "took the name of the mother, *deb gāṃ khāy*, daughter of *dāv jiaṅ ruṅ kaev jāy mo'aṅ*, and arranged it [ᩈᩣ᩠ᨦ] to fit".<sup>37</sup> Thus the name of the child was *māṅrāy*. This is obviously a folk etymology, and a very tortuous one, devised to explain a name unlike the ordinary run of northern Thai names and the origin of which had long been forgotten.

With the appearance of Mangrai the story becomes very much like that of the well-known Chiang Mai chronicles, but with the emphasis on Chiang Saen, and we very soon reach a period for which the relationship between the chronicle and true history is not much in doubt. I shall leave it for the moment and return to the *TS* proper.

To most readers the story of *TS* part 1 and the beginning of part 2 would appear, I believe, as a fairly clear case of Indian and Buddhist themes being taken over, mixed with local lore, placed in the geographical setting of northern Thailand, and of interest mainly for the way in which it was done. If there is any of the real history of northern Thailand to be gleaned from the mixture, it can only be done when the foreign elements have been identified.

Manit, however, prefers to see it as a work of straight Thai history "concerning the period when the Thai people entered and became important in the area of present Thailand"<sup>38</sup>. Nevertheless, he says, it may appear confused if read superficially, due to lacunae and poor arrangement in successive stages of copying. It is only when read carefully and interpreted that the full meaning is clear, and his copious notes are to show us what the true meaning is and to explain the assumptions which his interpretation requires.

The most drastic of Manit's revisions of what seems to be the superficial meaning of the text concerns the chronology. Instead of a sequence of pre-Buddhist era, Buddhist era, *saka* era and finally, in part 2 which he didn't publish, *cula* era, Manit claims that the eras used in *TS* are:

-*porāṇ* (ancient), or *pāṭhama* (first) era, beginning from 413 BE (130 BC), the era with which the text opens.

-*duṭṭiya* (second) era, which the text calls the era dating from the Buddha's nirvana, and which in Manit's calculations would start from 17 AD

-*ṭaṭiya* (third) era, 622 years later, which Manit identifies with the *cula* era<sup>39</sup>.

Of course, since he omitted the second part of the text, he does not have to account for the era which is explicitly identified as *ṭaṭiya* or *cula* era.

In addition to this Manit goes into some detail regarding an era which he calls the "original Thai" (ไทยเดิม) era<sup>40</sup>, and this is made necessary by his views on the 10 and 12 year cycles which accompany nearly all dates in the text, which are frequently wrong, and which he attempts to rectify. For example, the first date of the story, the year 17 of an era called *mahā sakarāja*, is called a *kat cai* year. This is an error, and Manit wished to emend it to *kat mau*. The only way to convey to the reader an idea of the type

37. *PP* 61, p. 124.

38. Manit, p. 4.

39. Manit, pp. i, 6, 12, 13.

40. Manit, pp 8-11.

of calculation involved and to justify the further discussion which I shall pursue, is to translate Mani's passage on this point.

“At the time it was the year 17 of the *mahā sakarāja*. [The expression] a *kat cai* year 17 of the *mahā sakarāja*’ is here the ancient era equivalent to BE 430 (adding the figure 413). As for *kat cai* year being equivalent to rat year, seventh of the decade, this cyclical year here, so far as has been investigated,... is in error by 3 years. It should be a hare year. If the cyclical year is taken as a base, the year of the era at the beginning of the story should be 14 which is equivalent to rat year, BE 427. Before indicating whether the year of the era of the cyclical year should be taken at the correct base, I should like to first discuss the year in which the *porāṇ* era started. [The words] ‘it was year 17 of the *mahā sakarāja*’ or *porāṇ* era mean that the time in which the era had been in use was 17 years and was equivalent to BE 430. Thus, if we count back to find the year when it was first established, that is *mahā sakarāja* or *porāṇ* era 1, it will be equivalent to BE 414, a pig year. Using the 10-year cycle [Ēi] together with the era as ‘year 1’ [*ekasak*] it will be thus: pig year, first of the decade, *porāṇ* era 1. In the language of the northern Thai it would be expressed as *porāṇ* era 1, a *kap kai* year. When the *porāṇ* era had reached 17 years the 10-year cycle and the era would have completed one full turn plus a remainder of 7. The remainder of 7 is equal to *sapta* of the southern Thai or *kat* of the northern Thai, and corresponds to year of the hare *thauḥ* or *mau* as well. Thus it can be concluded that *mahā sakarāja* 17, *kat cai* year is really a *kat mau* year, that is, hare year, 7th of the decade, [Buddhist] era 430”<sup>41</sup>.

If the foregoing appears very tortuous to uninitiated readers, let me hasten to assure them that it is equally hard going for those in the habit of working with Thai dating systems. As a matter of fact, and for reasons which I shall set forth below, not only is *kat cai* incorrect for the year in question, whether considered as pre-Buddhist *porāṇ* era or equivalent to BE 430, but *kat mau* as well is both incorrect for the year in question and, in addition, is an impossible combination. The true cyclical combination for pre-Buddhist *porāṇ* 17, had such a system been in use at the time, would have been *rahvāy saṅāa* and the true cyclical date of BE 430 was *mo ’n mau*, which was indeed a hare (*mau*) year, as Mani calculated, but *kat mau* is impossible, since in the way the system works one of those terms, no matter what numerical year count is used, will always accompany odd numbers and the other even.

Although most readers probably have some familiarity with these cycles, an understanding of which is essential to the treatment of Mani's analysis, the descriptions I have seen often leave important points in obscurity.

The so-called northern cycle consists of two series, one of 10 and the other of 12 terms, such as, for example, the numbers 1-10 and the letters A-L, combined in the manner 1-A, 2-B and so forth up to 10-J, after which the first series starts again, 1-K, 2-L, 3-A, etc. The result is 60 combinations which repeat over and over plus 60 other combinations which never occur, that is half of the series of 12 always occur with odd terms of the 10 series and the other half with even.

In addition to northern Thailand and Laos, this cycle is also known in Vietnam and China where it is found in very early documents and almost certainly originated. On this point we must be clear - it is not that China, Vietnam and Thailand have similar cycles, but a single cycle has been used in local chronologies in all three countries. Some of the Chinese, Vietnamese and Thai terms seem clearly related, although others are not, and entries in the Chinese histories show that years in China had the same cyclical designation as they have in the system presently found in northern Thailand.

---

41. Mani, p. 16.

In the paragraph quoted above Manit referred to corresponding southern and northern cycles and seemed to have in mind an idea which often finds expression in the literature, but which leads to unnecessary confusion - that there is a difference of 5 between the numerical value of the 10 series in northern and southern (Ayutthaya-Bangkok) Thailand. In fact, the southern Thai never used the cycle in question, but combined a Mon-Khmer series of 12 animal names with a 10 series of Pali numerical terms, *ekasak*, *dosak* etc., corresponding to the digit figure of the dates both in the *saka* and *cula* eras which, judging by extant documents, were the only precise year dating system in regular use in all of Thailand as well as in Cambodia before modern times.

In China, where the so-called northern cycle came into being, there was no long-term era, historical events being dated by reign periods, and the 60-year cycle was the only permanent continuous system known. Traditionally the 10-series began with *chia* (Viet *giáp*, Thai *kāp*), but when, at an undermined time, the Chinese 10/12 cycle began to be combined in Thailand with the *cula* or *saka* eras, *kāp* years, which were such by virtue of the cycle which had been repeating itself for hundreds, if not thousands, of years, coincided with *cula* and *saka* dates ending in 6. Thus the term which in northern Thailand was felt to be inherently first of its series actually fell on numerical dates of the *saka* and *cula* eras which ended in 6.

Therefore when dealing with this cycle in the Thai context one may ignore statements about the “northern cycle being behind the southern by 5 years”, or “*kāp* representing first of the decade in the north, but sixth of the decade in the south<sup>42</sup>”. *Kāp* and the other terms of this cycle were never used in the south, there is *no* northern era with digit 1 corresponding to *kāp*, and with respect the *cula* and *saka* eras *kāp* always coincides with digit 6.

This cycle might occasionally be found in use with Buddhist era dates in relatively late documents, and depending on whether the BE date in question corresponded to *cula* plus 1811 or 1182, *kap*, for example, would fall on dates ending in digit 7 or 8. I cannot cite any examples using the northern 10-year cycle, but such use of the southern 10-year cycle, *ekasak*, *dosak*, etc, is well attested. Thus, in inscription 97 we find, “cock year, ninth of the decade, Buddhist era 2260...”, in inscription 98, “era 2057...dog year, 6th of the decade”, and in a 19th-century document, “snake year, first of the decade, BE 2412”<sup>43</sup>.

In *TS* this cycle is much in evidence and is found with nearly every mention of a year, no matter in what era. Manit, who devoted considerable attention to this cyclical system, recognized at one point the unity of the northern Thai and Chinese cycles<sup>44</sup>, which should have caused him to realize that some of his reconstructions were impossible, but following other Thai scholars, he erected on this basis a mythical “original Thai” era established in the 27th century BC by the legendary “Sino-Thai” emperor Huang-Ti and which he apparently believes to have included a continuous year count as well as the 60-year cycle<sup>45</sup>.

Now as far as the earlier use, and probable origin, of the cycle in China is concerned, there is rather precise information available. That it is as old as the period ascribed to Huang-Ti seems certain. The characters for the cyclical terms “are among the commonest on the oracle-bones of the mid-2nd millennium [BC]” but “they were used strictly as a day-count” and did not come into use for the years as well, “until the end of the Former Han in the ... 1st century<sup>46</sup>”. Thus there was no continuous era in early China corresponding to what Manit wished to call the “original Thai era”. Moreover, such an era never developed. “Under Wu Ti [141-87 BC] it became customary to count years by arbitrary year periods (*nien-hao*) chosen largely for their magical potency.... The result has been a chaotic method of counting

---

42. Manit, p. 7.

43. *Prajum silā cāru'k* IV pp 70-71, 79; and Natthawut Sutthinsongkram, *Samtec cau brahṃyā param mahā srī suriyavaṅs*, pp 611-12.

44. Manit, p. 8.

45. Manit, pp 8-11.

46. Joseph Needham, *Science and Civilization in China*, III, p. 396.

years, which has made the Chinese all the more dependent on dynasties for reckoning time<sup>47</sup>”. As for the initial term of the cycle, there is a clear statement in the *History of the Former Han Dynasty*, “[Wang Mang] ordered that in the primary schools of the empire [the day] *mou-tzu* should take the place of [the day] *chia-tzu* as the first day of the sixty-[day] cycle.... [But] most of the people did not obey [this order]”<sup>48</sup>. Thus *chia* (Thai *kāp*) had always been the traditional first term and even an emperor was unable to push through such a drastic reform as changing a cycle. It is also certain that when the cyclical terms were used for years in China they had precisely the same relative chronological positions as several centuries later in Thailand. Two 9th-century examples suffice. *The Veritable Record of the T’ang Emperor Shun-Tsung* gives the years corresponding to AD 805 and 806 the cyclical designations *i-yu* and *ping-hsu*, which correspond exactly to *tap lau* and *rahvāy set*, the correct designations for these years in Thai usage<sup>49</sup>.

Close examination of the cyclical combinations of the text of *TS* shows most of them to be in the realm of utter fantasy. Thus, to first take only the sequence of cyclical years without reference to the accuracy of the numerical dates, the first three, *kat cai*, *huoñ pau*, *tāp sai* for the years 17, 18, 22 form a coherent sequence even if wrong for the dates in question, but the next one, *mo ’n kai* for year 67, does not. By accurate arithmetic *mo ’n kai* would be 64 and 67 would be *kat yi*<sup>50</sup>. The next three dates, *po ’k cai*, *mo ’n sai*, *tau set* for the dates 68, 97, 102 are coherent with respect to *mo ’n kai* - 67, but then out of order with the earlier dates<sup>51</sup>. Accurate addition from this point would place 148, the year of the Buddha’s nirvana, in a *po ’k sǎn* year, but if the following year, first of the new era, is *mo ’n met*, as the text says, 148 should be *rahvāy sañā* two years earlier than *po ’k sǎn*. Year 2 of the new era, as *rahvāy sǎn*, is quite incoherent, since *rahvāy* precedes rather than follows *mo ’n* and the next date, *kat sai* - 82, is not only out of sequence with all that has gone before, but is an impossible combination. Following this there are year dates 151, 152, 183, 200, 216, 218, 276 the cyclical combinations for which are all but one incoherent with each other and with that has gone before. Only 183, *kāp set*, followed by 200, *luoñ mau*, provide a correct sequence<sup>52</sup>.

It is only when the dates get up to the beginning of what is clearly the *cula* era, or as *TS* calls it, the third era, that we find some coherency in terms of cyclical usage as preserved in extant contemporary documents. Thus the year 1 of the third era is *kāt gai*, as it should be. In the *saka* or second era this would be 561, which the chronicler well understood since he wrote that the third era was established by cutting 560 years from the second era.

Let’s again test some of the earlier dates by proceeding back from the coherent one. The year 560 *saka* would then have been *po ’k set* and 559 *mo ’n lau*. But the text has 559 *po ’k set*. This shows that the cyclical terms were probably inserted *post facto* and the chronicler forgot that “cutting 560” from the

47. Edwin O Reischauer and John K Fairbank, *East Asia the Great Tradition*, p. 113.

48. by Pan Ku, Homer Dubs, translator, pp 346-7.

49. Translated with introduction and notes by Bernard S Solomon, Harvard University press 1955, pp. 2, 58. For comparison of Thai and Chinese cyclical terms see Roger Billard, "Les Cycles Chronographiques Chinois dans les Inscriptions Thaïes", *BEFEO LI* (2), 1963, PP. 403-413. The correct reading of cyclical dates in the past may be easily determined by extending backward the tables published by Cham Thongkhamawan in *Thalaeñkār prahvāṭisāstr ekasār porāṇagati*, pī đī 4, lem 2, 3, Bangkok 2513. Of course all such dates before AD, at least, are purely theoretical.

50. Manī, pp 27, 30, 32, 34.

51. Manī. pp 34-35.

52. Manī, pp 34-35.

era meant that 561 corresponded to year 1 *kat gai*. The next earlier date in the text is 550 *rahvāy cai* which is entirely incoherent no matter from where it is counted<sup>53</sup>.

The foregoing seems to demonstrate that before the year 1 of the *cula* era the cyclical dates of the text were inserted carelessly and often even capriciously after the text as a whole had been compiled, and cannot possibly have been taken over from an ancient contemporary document. They also reveal an author who was ignorant of the way in which the cycle really worked.

As I noted, Mani also recognizes that the cyclical dates are full of errors and he attempts to revise them according to his conception of the eras which were actually in use and succeeded one another in northern Thailand between one and two thousand years ago. Following the mythical “original Thai” era in this sequence comes the Buddhist era which, according to Southeast Asian theravada tradition, was established immediately after the Buddha’s death in a snake year, and Mani notes the one-year difference between Ceylonese usage in which year 1 of BE is the snake year of the Buddha’s death, while in Thailand year 1 is the following horse year, resulting in a situation in which, with respect to AD, a Buddhist date equals either AD + 543 or 544.

Now these dates for the Buddhist era, since they are valid for nearly all the extant documents of Burma, Siam, Cambodia or Laos are proper when discussing the Buddhist era as a cultural item within this region, but when dealing with a story such as *TS* which involves India and China as well, such Southeast Asian assumptions may not be taken as absolute facts. First of all, in the opinion of historians of India, the death of the Buddha did not occur in 543/4 BC, but rather in  $\pm 480$ , or  $\pm 460$ , and even such an ardent Ceylonese nationalist as S. Paranavitana found himself forced to admit that although “the Buddha, according to Ceylon tradition, was born in 623 BC... modern historians favour a date some sixty years later<sup>54</sup>” Thus it seems that the best scholarly opinion outside Southeast Asia views the 543/4 date as nothing more than a provincial tradition.

Whatever the truth about the exact date of the Buddha’s death, it is certain that never did “the holy arhats and disciples led by Maha Kassapa together with the princes, in particular King Ajatasatru, agree to establish the era of the religion, or Buddhist era...”<sup>55</sup> soon after the Buddha’s death, nor was such an era in use in northern Thailand or anywhere else in Southeast Asia at a time close to its hypothetical year 1. Ample Indian epigraphic records, with a multiplicity of eras, show that no Buddhist era existed there until the second millennium after the nirvana, at least; Pali, Sanskrit, and early Chinese texts show a wide variety of beliefs about the date of the Buddha’s death; and the earliest mainland Southeast Asian record of the use of such a reckoning is the so-called Myazedi inscription of BE 1628 (AD 1084)<sup>56</sup>.

The *porāṇ* (ancient) era is a different sort of problem. Although the text states explicitly, and its name also implies, that it should have been the earliest, even preceding the Buddhist era, Mani wishes it to begin later, in BE 413, although he does not relate its origin to any specific event. The identify of detail in

---

53. Mani, p. 100.

54. C.W. Nicholas and S. Paranavitana, *A Concise History of Ceylon*, Colombo, 1961, p. 38. For other examples of this opinion see, *Présence*, pp. 219; Wm. Theodore de Bary, ed, *Sources of Indian Tradition* I, p. 90; R.C. Majumdar, H.C. Raychaudhuri, Kalikinkar Dutt, *An Advanced History of India*, p. 56; Paul Masson-Oursel, Helena de Willman-Grabowska, Philippe Stern, *Ancient India and Indian Civilization*, p. 153.

55. Mani, p. 11.

56. Sten Konow, “Notes on the Eras in Indian Inscriptions”, *India Antiqua*, pp 193 ff; Rhys Davids, *Ancient Coins and Medals of Ceylon, International Numismata Orinetalia*, London 1879, pp 38, 43, 44; *Epigraphia Birmanica* Vol I, Part 1, Rangoon 1919; and see the discussion between J.F. Fleet and C.O. Blagden in several articles, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1909-1912; Edward J. Thomas, *The Life of the Buddha*, pp. xxi, 27, 27, n.1.

the text, however, leaves no doubt that the compiler of *TS* intended it as the pre-Buddhist *añjana* era which, although fictitious, was a part of Buddhist tradition in Burma as well as Thailand<sup>57</sup>.

Also fictitious is Mani's *duṭṭiya sakarāja*, beginning at a date corresponding to AD 17. It is only made necessary by the artificial sequence into which he has fitted the eras, although it does coincide with a local tradition<sup>58</sup>.

Of course, in altering the meaning of the eras, Mani had to find explanations for the very explicit statements of *TS* concerning the Buddhist era and such well known figures as Ajatasatru and Maha Kassapa. His explanations are found in note 45, pp 38-39, note 55, pp 43-45, and note 170, pp 70-71.

In the first of these notes he declares that Ajatasatru and Maha Kassapa of *TS* are not the persons of those names known from Buddhist lore, but rather local figures from northern Thailand. He identifies Ajatasatru with King Ajutaraja, ignoring the logic of the narrative that Kassapa first cut the era with Ajatasatru, then took relics to Yonaka where he met Ajutaraja. Maha Kassapa himself, in note 55, has become the Kassapa-Matanga who introduced Buddhism into China about 65 AD.

As for the many explicit remarks about dates in "the Buddhist era", or so many years "after the Buddha had entered nirvana", Mani has provided a long explanation in note 170, pp 70-71, in order to circumvent the difficulties.

He starts by saying that since the "Buddhist era" of the text does not fit the known facts of BE, it must be something else, even though the reason it does not fit is because of his own arbitrary arrangement. Then he reasons that:

- *brahyā bāndhanati* and the Buddha of the text died in the same year.
- The Buddhist religion then spread from "China down to the area of *yonaka*", which is his interpretation of the statement in paragraph 140 that the Buddhist religion "was only flourishing from *mo 'aṅ rājagṛh* down to *mo 'aṅ yuan jān saen*".
- The religion of China at that time was Taoism.
- *brahyā bāndhanati* must have been a strong supporter of Taoism and considered as a sort of angel (*brahmadeva*) of Taoism.
- When Buddhism had spread in the *yonaka* area as much as Taoism, the people must have started using the term "Buddha" for *brahyā bāndhanati*.
- Thus this so-called Buddhist era, which, according to Mani's calculations would have begun in 17 AD, and is not attested in any other source, would have been a Taoist era established at the death of a king of Chiang Saen.

In connection with this and with Mani's *duṭṭiya* era it should be noted that in at least one other version of northern history, Notton's translation of the Chiang Mai Chronicle, there occurs a *bāndhumatti* era in conjunction with a date equivalent to AD 17. Thus in Notton III, p. 11, it says, "En 560 de cette ère [Buddhist era] *Bāndhumattidhammikarāja* de Laṅka supprima cette ère 560 et en fonda une nouvelle..." There, however, the *porāṇ* and Buddhist eras are accepted as I have presented them above and the era following *Bāndhumatti*'s and established in its 622nd year, equivalent to AD 639, is the normal *cula* era. We thus find some of the same elements of Mani's revision arranged in a different way and dating from the 19th century or earlier. In fact, this older revision is better than Mani's for it involves no arbitrary historical assumptions. Just as in Mani's case, though, enough is known about early South Asian time reckoning to be certain that the *Bāndhumatti* era of 17 AD is fictitious and the only problem is to

---

57. Notton, pp 170, n 1204; Shway Yoe, p. 549.

58. See below concerning the era of *bandhumatti*.

discover how it got into the chronicles.

My own conjecture is that at some stage in the descent of the manuscripts from copy to copy the figures 622 and 560, the usual conversion factors for, respectively, Buddhist to *saka* and *saka* to *cula* eras were simply transposed. The next step, possibly by a later scribe, was then to invent a designation for the “new” era. In this system, though, the *saka* era has disappeared and the two Pagan rulers, Tricakkhu, who in *TS* founded the *saka*, and Anuruddha, who established the *cula* era., have been fused into one, the latter<sup>59</sup>. This arrangement might be particularly easy for a scribe in the north where *saka* was never in current use, and who therefore might have ignored its importance.

Until more manuscripts are studied the history of this fiction can only be conjectural. It also appears in the Nan chronicle, which in its early part is almost exactly the same as that of Chiang Mai, and is indeed presented as a history of Lanna, but here the date is 570 rather than 560<sup>60</sup>. Since the Nan version is later than Notton’s original, it may be merely another copy of the same tradition.

The Chiang Mai chronicle published by the Commission and reviewed in these pages by David K Wyatt<sup>61</sup> has a serious *lacuna* just at this place. On its page 3, in the 8th line from the bottom, an incoherent phrase, “... joins the sentences which in Notton read, “Les deux freres... naquirent cette annee-la. Chama:t’evi [regna 53 ans, etc...]”, on p. 11, and “... demeurant dans le ciel *Tavatimsa* [allait terminer cette existence, etc...]” on p. 12, and the entire section concerning the eras of Bāndhumatti and Anuruddha is missing. The *lacuna* undoubtedly corresponds to 1 or 2 palm leaves which were turned together by mistake either during copying of the manuscript itself, or in the preparation of the published text. Judging from Notton’s notes the *Yonaka Chronicle (PY)* ignored the special Bāndhumatti era, stating simply that Bāndhumatti of Ceylon founded the *saka* era<sup>62</sup>. For the sake of completeness we may as well note that the Ceylonese chronicles mention no King Bāndhumatti at all and no remotely similar name at dates close to 17 AD or the beginning of the *saka* era<sup>63</sup>. The story must be a northern Thai misconception of Ceylonese history. However, I believe we should accept that Bāndhanati of *TS* associated with changes of eras called *mahāsakarāj* (*saka*) and Bāndhumatti of the Chiang Mai Chronicle, associated with the change to an era which either is, or should be, the *saka* era, represent a single structural element which has been used differently in the two stories. It is also interesting to speculate that BE 560, the date at which Bāndhumatti cut the Buddhist era in the Chiang Mai Chronicle, if taken together with a date for the Buddha’s death acceptable to modern calculation, say BC 482, would give AD 78 for the new era. This would then be the true *saka* era and we would have a relic of a time before the present Southeast Asian Buddhist era was in use and BE calculations were made with a figure closer to that accepted by indologists. The relic is still preserved in Bāndhanati of *TS*, who is associated with eras called “*mahāsakarāj*” even though they are clearly something else.

As for Mani’s arrangement, we can only say that it is an extremely arbitrary construction made to fit a preconceived picture of northern history.

Before moving from the subject of chronology there is one series of dates into which, all consideration of historical truth aside, scribal errors have slipped, the rectification of which is important to the investigation of the original structure of the story. I apologize to readers in advance for leading them into and, hopefully, through the following maze, but the chronological structure is important to the analysis of such texts and examination of its detail cannot be avoided.

The dates in question begin on p. 89 with *saka* 349 given together with BE 968, which is incorrect

---

59. Notton, III, p. 12.

60. *PP* part 10, volume 9 of *guru sabhā* edition, p. 198.

61. *JSS* 61(1), Jan 1973, pp 348-350.

62. Notton I, p. 182, n 8.

63. Geiger, op. cit., pp 223-227.

since  $349+621/2=970/1$ . Then, in a passage which is apparently contemporary, we find date 456, but on p. 91 the date is back to 366, equivalent, in Notton and *PP* 61, to BE 1000, an error of one 12-year cycle ( $1000-622=378$ )<sup>64</sup>. After this, p. 94, the *saka* dates jump again to 469 followed by 467, and on p. 98 are back to 376, 378, etc. Total confusion reigns.

In looking for the source of these errors and in trying to restore the dates to their original pattern we must first of all take note that errors and impossible arithmetic abound in the text. For example, on p. 72, a certain king is said to have taken the throne in 259, reigned 17 years and died in 259, and his successor who also succeeded to the throne in 259, is said to have been ruling for 2 years in 279, close to, but not exactly what correct addition from 259 would have given. Again, on p. 77, a prince was born in 283, but 13 years later the date was 213. However, approximately 3 years later the date, on p. 83, is 299, which is what the true date should have been. It would seem that errors were made in one stage of copying and partially corrected in the next. Then, following the section I wish to examine, in the last reign sequence of the story, on p. 99, we have the following: *khun lāñ* took the throne in 386, reigned 11 years and died [date 396]<sup>65</sup>. His successor *khun jāñ* then reigned 7 years and died in 492, a date which cannot be logically explained except as the result of a random scribal error in copying the correct 402. The next king, *khun lāñ*, reigned 9 years and died in 500, showing correct addition of 9 to the erroneous 492, and this erroneous series continues right on the change of era from *saka* to *cula*.

With erroneous figures alternating with correct ones, one scribe might perform addition from one base and another from a different one, resulting in several layers of chronology and extreme confusion of the type which I wish to analyze. For clarity refer to the table immediately following the discussion.

To return to the section which is of immediate interest, pp 88-98, we should note first that up to this point whenever two eras are mentioned together they generally agreed arithmetically. The last date before the confused part, in which the eras do not agree, is 344, the death of King *bāñ* and succession of King *dukkhitta*. The latter then reigned 16 years, which would place his death, by traditional arithmetic, in 359 instead of the 349 which has already appeared suspect. Such an error, confusion between the figures “4” and “5”, is rather common in Thai manuscripts. The date 359 would be equivalent to BE 980/1 rather than the 968 of the text. However, 344 itself is in error if we accept the 54 years given for the reign of King *Bāñ* from the last date mentioned for him, 279. Taking the reign lengths and adding them traditionally to 279 gives us 347 for *Dukkhitā*’s death, equivalent to BE 968, which explains the occurrence of that date in the text. Or, alternatively  $279+54+16$  by modern arithmetic gives the 349 which accompanies 968,

---

64. Notton I, p. 196; *PP* 61, p. 93; Mani p. 91, does not accept the interpretation “1000”, พัน to พัน, as explained above.

65.  $386+11=396$  is “traditional arithmetic” in which the specified period includes the base year. Most, but not all, of the calculation in *TS* has been done by this method. Traditional arithmetic has been recognized by scholars (see, for example, A.B. Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 38), but I feel that there has not been sufficient awareness that addition of reign periods in pre 20th-century chronicles is almost always by this procedure. Thus, if King X took the throne in 1500 and died in 1505, the old-fashioned chronicler would count 1500, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1504, 1505, and give him a reign of 6 years. If his sources said that the succeeding King Y reigned 4 years, he would count 1505, 1506, 1507, 1508, and place the end of his reign in 1508, whereas today we would add  $1505+4$  and say he died in 1509. In a long series switching from one method to the other when chronicles were recopied has sometimes led to great confusion. One of the best examples of traditional arithmetic as a system of calculation is in the Cambodian *Nong* chronicle published in Thai translation in *PP*, part 1, as *Bāñsāvātār khamer*. There the long series of dates with the lengths of intervening periods stated explicitly leave no doubt about the reality of this system.



showing another possible reason for the former. Embedded in the text are two layers of arithmetic, apparently created by the process I suggested above, and I am proposing that at some time in the history of this text another layer showed  $344+16=359$  for Dukkhitā's death and that this series was carried on to the date of the destruction of the city.

The date 359 again comes up logically in the following passage which relates contemporary events in the sister city of Jaiyaparakara. The text has 456 for the death of King Brahmaraja, aged 77, but if we add 77 to his recorded birth date, 283, we get 359. The next king reigned 7 years, bringing us up to 366, which is in fact the next recorded date of the text, on p. 91. When we get back to the kings of Yonaka, on p. 94, we have 469, for the death of *mahāvārma* after a reign of 21 years. If we assume a simple error of 469 for 369, the addition is correct from the given date of 349 for this king's accession. The trouble comes with the associated Buddhist era dates, for the next king is said to have reigned until 467, or BE 1003, a manifest error whether figured from 467 or 367. We can assume here the same type of error as in the previous entry, writing 467 for 367. But still we have 367 following 369. This is probably due to an earlier scribal error, writing 367 for 376. There is in fact evidence for this.. The cyclical term *kat* accompanies  $469 < 369$  and *mo 'n*  $467 < 367 < 376$ . There is a 7-year difference between the two terms, so that if the first is associated with 469/369 the year with the second must be 476/376. In fact the associations are wrong as I explain below.

Manit commented on some of these errors. Thus he corrected 469 to 369 and 467 to 376, and he saw that the difference of 8 years by traditional calculation meant that Jayajana's age of 42 at the former date would give 50, not 70, at the latter (Manit, p. 94, sections 270-273).

The series  $344+16=359$  now has meaning. The reign of King Mahavārma would then be  $359+21=379$ , and his successor, *mahā jāyajanaḥ*, would have reigned until "... era ... Buddhist religion had completed ... years, King Maha Jayajanah had reigned 1 year ...<sup>66</sup>", that is, 380, or perhaps even 379 if strict traditional arithmetic is applied. Now either 379 or 380, depending on the conversion factor used, produces BE 1000 ( $379+622$  or  $380+621$ ) which, as I shall indicate below, is pertinent to the structure of the text. Since it comes forth naturally from one layer of arithmetic I suggest that it actually belonged in an older version of the story.

The following date, on p. 98, is, however, 376, which might seem to go back to one of the erroneous layers of calculation, since even after all the corrections, the preceding date was 379. But this 379 had been supplanted by a date 467, which was doubly erroneous, resulting from scribal errors  $467 < 367 < 376$ . Thus one earlier stage of the text very likely had 376 in both entries.

Now if we look at the cyclical years we find *mo 'n mau* accompanying both  $467 < 376$  on p. 94 and 376 on p. 98. This notation is in error, for a *mo 'n* year always ends in 9, precisely the digit I have proposed for the correction on p. 94. Therefore I suggest that the 376 on p. 98 be emended to 379. The cyclical years of the following series, so far as they are given, are all off by 2 or 3 years, so the emendation will bring the year dates closer to the 10-year cycle and provide thereby additional evidence for the legitimacy of the change. The last few dates of the series, though, are not logically explicable since, at the very least, a random, or arbitrary, error of over 90 years has been inserted to make the two parts of the story connect. Interestingly, the *kat* cyclical term accompanying  $469 < 369$  on p. 91 always indicates digit 2, the expected 7 years before the date which I corrected to 379, which gives added weight to the correction and shows that there is probably still another old layer of chronology connected with the cyclical terms.

The purpose of this chronological digression, I repeat, was to show that the text at one time had

---

66. Manit, p. 94.

1000 BE for the date of the disappearance of Yonaka Nagara<sup>67</sup>. The process of demonstrating this seems very tortuous, it is true, but it was eventually possible, as in most such texts, to show that apparently anomalous dates result from different layers of chronology plus often predictable scribal errors. In *TS* there are many different sets of calculations, apparently by different hands, showing that *TS* as we have it cannot possibly be a composition written down as a whole and based on accurate earlier documents. It seems rather to have been put together bit by bit by many hands who revised and tinkered according to the way they thought the story “ought to have been”. Below is a table showing the layers of chronology I have identified and the processes I explained above. Dates in brackets are those implied, but not expressed, in the text.

		Layers of chronology				
		1	2	3	4	
<i>Event</i>						<i>Event</i>
Bāñ on throne	279/900		279			
reign	<u>54</u>		54			
	[332]					
					283	Brahmakumār born
Bāñ died	[332]			344		
Dukkhita	[332]			344		
reign	<u>16</u>		<u>16</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>77</u>	age
	[347]	<b>968</b> ✕	349	[359]	[359] 456	Brahmarāja died
Mahāvārṇa			349	[359]	[359]	Jayasiri
reign			<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>7</u>	
died			469[369]	[379]	366±1000	
Jayajana			469[369]			
reign			[7]	1		
	1003	±	467[376]			
				[379]	1000	

As for Mani’s chronological revisions and proposed interpretations of the text, it seems to me impossible to give them serious consideration. When we include part 2 in the discussion we see without a doubt that the chronicler intended his eras to be pre-Buddhist ancient, Buddhist, *saka*, and *cula* in that order, arranged in accordance with traditions well-established in Burma, at least, as well as Thailand. Even if the chronicler intended that Ajatasatru and Maha Kassapa be considered local rather than Indian figures, as may well have been the case, this does not mean that we should conclude the existence of a second pair of individuals repeating exactly parallel acts at different dates, but rather that the chronicler displaced the locale of a traditional story.

The reasons for Mani’s revisions are not hard to find and lie in his decision about the identity of the first ruler mentioned, King Devakala of the *hò* country (roughly Yunnan), and also king of Rajagrha in *daiydesa*, and the decision was prompted by his view of Chinese history which I shall now discuss.

His point of view is immediately clear in his own introductory section which he begins by saying that one historical tradition holds the original area of Thai settlement to have been in the Altai (อเลอไทย) (*aloedaiy*) Mountains, thereby suggesting an etymology based on “Thai”, whence they migrated to the

---

67. See below, pp 363-64.

Huang Ho basin and on to their present location, while another school says that the Thai are one branch of the Malay race dwelling in the islands of Malaya and the islands of western India. The most progressive groups of the race, the Thai and the Japanese, then migrated, the latter to their present location while the Thai migrated first to the Huang Ho and Yangtze basins and on southward<sup>68</sup>.

Manit says, however, that he will not go into this problem of ultimate origins, since even the question of the entry of the Thai into their present location is uncertain. He then cites the opinions of several writers on the subject, such as Lacouperie, Cochrane, Holt Hallett, Taw Sein Ko, and a Thai publication entitled, “Story of the Thai and Chinese” (เรื่องไทยจีน), all of which put forth the view that in the distant past the Thai had occupied large parts of China - the Yangtze and Huang Ho basins, or at least Szechuan and Hupei. Manit apparently accepts this version, but not the opinion that the Thai only moved into their present area in the “16th-18th centuries of the Buddhist era”, that is 7-900 years ago. According to him, the Thai occupied the river valleys of *laem dòn* the “golden peninsula”, at least 2000 years ago, and *TS* is proof of it<sup>69</sup>.

He continues his argument with reference to Mr Wolfram E Berhard’s [sic] *A History of China* as a source for information that China was only unified under Ch’in Shih Huang Ti in the 3rd century BC and that earlier it has consisted of various tribes (*gotra*), whom Manit assumes to have been mostly non-Chinese. He then asks, “If [Huang Ti, the legendary yellow emperor] was not Chinese, of what ethnic group was he?”. His answer, following another Thai writer, is that Huang Ti was a Thai พ่อขุนอ้ายเหลือง, “King Yellow”, and he provides a table showing that all the traditional Chinese dynasties, apparently including the Shang and Chou, were Thai<sup>70</sup>.

He takes up the subject again on pp 66 ff in a section called, “A Brief History of the Thai in China”. It is not clear here to what extent he really considers the Chou to have been Thai, for he notes the breakdown of Chou in the 8th century BC into a number of states including Ch’u and Ch’in, of which he accepts the latter as truly Chinese. As for Ch’u he says, quoting another Thai work, “European historians say the Ch’u were not Chinese [but] were a group whom the Chinese called barbarian. If the Ch’u were not Chinese, then the Ch’u could have been Thai”<sup>71</sup>.

This becomes important in Manit’s interpretation of Ch’u expansion in the 3rd century BC when King Wei of Ch’u sent Chuang Ch’iao to conquer lands to the south of the Yangtze and he went as far as T’ien (near present Kunming). But when he was due to return to the Ch’u capital the way was blocked by Ch’in conquests of intervening territory. As a result Chuang Ch’iao remained in T’ien as its ruler and his descendants continued to rule there<sup>72</sup>.

Later on in the reign of Han Wu Ti the ruler of T’ien came into conflict with a ruler of the “Thai mo’an” people who occupied the area near Talifu to the west, and because of the support of Han Wu Ti the Thai mo’an ruler, Jen Kuo, won and became ruler of both the eastern and western districts<sup>73</sup>.

---

68. Manit, pp 1-3.

69. Manit, p. 3.

70. Manit, pp 8-9.

71. Manit, p. 20.

72. Manit, p21. For Chinese names I am using the standard transcription found in modern scholarly works, while Manit has written them according to what appears to be a southern Chinese pronunciation. Thus for Chuang Ch’iao Manit has Chuang Kiao, and for Jen Kuo he writes Jin Kaḥ.

73. Manit, p. 24. Traditional Chinese history makes Jen Kuo one of a line of Indian princes descending from Asoka (Joseph F. Rock *The Ancient Na-Khi Kingdom of Southwest China*, 2 volumes, Harvard Yenching Monograph Series VIII. Cited further as *Na-Khi*, pp. 7-8). What we should think of this, though, is clear from further information about this tradition which held that not only Jen-Kuo, but also the

Manit's conclusion is that "King *khun mo 'aṅ* or Jen Kuo and *devakāla* [of *TS*] were active in the same area, at the same time, must have been one and the same Thai king, and was the one who established the *porāṇ* or *pathama* [first] era also"<sup>74</sup>.

This then is the reason for tinkering with the dates of *TS*, in order to identify Devakala with a certain character of Chinese history. Since it is already clear that the proposed revision of the eras is not acceptable, the identification, whatever the worth of *TS* otherwise, is not valid. Moreover, Manit's view of the Thai in Chinese history is probably equally unacceptable. The idea that the Thai occupied large tracts of China in the distant past was a creation of certain late 19th-century European sinologists and explorers. Not long ago a modern sinologist, F.W. Mote, refuted this contention in vigorous terms and I believe his arguments are now accepted by all western scholars concerned with the subject. For detail I refer the reader to his articles and repeat here only his conclusion that, "We can safely rule out North and Central China" as areas of early Thai settlement, and his judgement that earlier western writers on the subject, among whom he cites Lacouperie, Davis, Cochrane, and Dodd of the authorities used by Manit, based their opinions on "partial knowledge of the facts, on somewhat misused evidence, and on far too simple a view of the problem". As for Thai in south and southwest China, this region "is one of the world's most complex cultural zones", and "It is quite unjustified to assume that all the Non-Chinese in the area were Thai" (*pace* Manit, pp 8, 20,24,25)<sup>75</sup>.

In addition to this the latest linguistic research indicates that the dispersion of Thai-speaking peoples was from east to west, not north to south and that if it is proper to speak of an original Thai homeland at all it would have been in the northern Vietnam-southeastern China border region with migration of the Thai peoples proceeding to the west or southwest<sup>76</sup>.

Whatever the final decision on these points may be, the evidence is all sinological and linguistic and must be dealt with by persons competent in these fields, working directly with the sources and not simply referring to the outworn views of 60 and more years ago. It is regrettable that a publication issued by a prestigious body such as the Commission still relies on these old theories without at least noting the newer evidence to the contrary and trying to face it.

Even if Manit's identification of Devakala, the *hò* king reigning in *daiydesa* is to be rejected, the opening of *TS* is intriguing and of intrinsic interest to students of Thai historiography. Does *TS* supply an ancient native Thai tradition, however inaccurate, of Thai descent from China, something which western scholars have assumed not to exist?<sup>77</sup> Or does the story of Devakala and his descendants provide some

---

Tibetan, Chinese, Ceylonese, the people of Chiao-chih (Hanoi region), and the Pai-i people whom Rock identifies as "Tai (Shan)" were also descended from Asoka (*Na-Khi* I, p. 51, n 9). At this writing I have no access to the latest work on the area. Rock himself was not concerned with the question of Thai in Southwest China, but the old tradition makes Jen-Kuo and the Pai-i descend from different branches of the Asoka family (*Na-Khi* I, p. 51, n 9).

74. Manit, p. 25.

75. F W Mote, "Problems of Thai Prehistory", *Social Science Review* 2 (2), Bangkok, Oct 1964, pp 100-109; and "Symposium on the Thai People", *Social Science Review*, Special Issue No 3, Bangkok, 1966. Quotations are from pp 102, 104 of "Problems".

76. This research has been so far confined to rather obscure publications and deserves wider currency. See James R Chamberlain, "The Origins of the Southwestern Tai", *Bulletin des Amis du Royaume Lao*, 7-8, 1972, pp 223-244, and further references therein which indicate in particular that this view has the support of the well-known Thai specialist William J Gedney. **CHECK CITE GEDNEY**

77. Mote, "Problems", p. 104, "No Thais of our grandfathers' generation had heard of the Nan-Chao Kingdom...certainly none of them thought of it as a Thai state", and p. 102, "...the view, first advanced by those earlier Western scholars, that the Thai peoples had undergone a First Migration from North China

true information about an area which *may* have contained a Thai state, even if identification with Jen Kuo or any other specific individual is impossible?

To answer these questions we must pay some attention to the story's structure and examine the meaning and relationships of some of its motifs - something which should be undertaken first of all in the study of such texts, before seeking to relate them to events known from other sources.

The first thing to look at is the Indian and Buddhist framework into which most of the story is fitted. Sinhanavaṭī, founder of Chiang Saen, is younger brother of the famous king of Rajagrha, Bimbisara, a contemporary of the Buddha, and the Chiang Saen area, where Sinhanavaṭī settles, is southeast of Rajagrha. Mithila, another Indian place name, is located to the north. Another connection with Rajagrha is made when, at the Buddha's death, King Ajatasatru and Maha Kassapa gather up the relics and the latter transports them to Chiang Saen. Thus Chiang Saen is established as a centre with close connections to the homeland of Buddhism from the very beginning of the religion, and even the story of Sinhanavaṭī and his brothers pairing off with sisters to found new kingdoms is the same theme as the dispersion of the Sakyas in Buddhist lore.<sup>78</sup>

In the second part of the story Chiang Saen is included with *candapuri* (Vientiane) and *haṅsāvattī* (Pegu), as well as such Indian place names as *kosāmbī* and *kaḷṅgarāj* among the 1000 *mo'añ* of the southeastern part of Jambudvīpa. Somewhat later Chiang Saen is attacked by the rulers of *kosāmbī*, *kaḷṅgarāj*, *sāvattī* and others, and was threatened by the ruler of *videha*, to the north, who, however, has a title given by the Shan to Chinese governors of Yunnan<sup>79</sup>.

Now the fact of Southeast Asia borrowing Indian place names since very early times is well known, and their presence generally leads to no more confusion than the adoption of European place names in the United States. Indeed, with respect to *TS*, Manit declares that Rajagrha is simply a name given to Talifu, and that Mithila is another location in China for which this particular name was chosen because its first syllable resembled the Chinese name for a local tribe<sup>80</sup>. We also know that certain of the Shan states, even in late historical times, were embellished with classical Indian names<sup>81</sup>.

Even if this explanation is reasonable, and I believe there is no evidence that Mithila and Rajagrha were ever used by local inhabitants for places in Yunnan<sup>82</sup>, it is too much to accept Manit's conviction that in these Southeast Asian places with Indian names there were also rulers with famous Indian names who accomplished exactly the same acts as their eponyms.

We must admit, I think, that wherever the compiler to *TS* believed these places to be located, for him Rajagrha, Mithila, King Bimbisara, etc were the originals, known from Indian history and Buddhist tradition. Moreover, there is strong evidence that he believed them to have been, not in geographical India, but rather in the Northern Thai - Burma-South China area.

---

into Central China...and a Second Migration from Central China into the Southwest...and then a great Third Migration...into modern Thailand". Much earlier, E.H. Parker, in a report of 1892, noted that, "In speaking four years ago to Siamese of high rank at Bangkok, I found that they were totally ignorant of the history of the Shan Empire", by which Parker meant Nan-Chao. Quoted in Sao Saimong Mangrai, *op cit*, p. 250, n l.

<sup>78</sup> Thomas, *op cit*, pp 6-7.

79. Sao Saimong Mangrai *op cit*, p. 23, *PP* 61, 119.

80. Manit, p. 16.

81. Sao Saimong Mangrai, *op cit*, pp XXV-XXVI.

82. The evidence for this, I admit, is negative, that is, these names are absent from such works as Sao Saimong Mangrai, who treats the classical names used by the Shan, and Rock, *Na-Khi*, who quotes extensively from the traditional histories concerned with Yunnan.

It is noteworthy that in *TS* Videha, Mithila, Kosamphi and Kalinga are distributed with respect to Chiang Saen more or less as in relation to the classical middle country of India, the first two to the north, the last two to the southwest, and it would seem that several names may have been borrowed as parts of a system.

All of these names came to Southeast Asia along with Buddhism and the Indian literature associated with it, and in time the belief gradually took root that the Buddha himself had travelled to Southeast Asia and had predicted a glorious future for the places in which he stopped. Popular belief has even gone further on occasion and held that the Buddha was born in Southeast Asia<sup>83</sup>

Even in traditional scholarly works and official opinion the idea that the classical middle country, where the Buddha had lived and worked, extended into Southeast Asia found favour. For example, the Burmese *Glass Place Chronicle* says that Buddhaghosa took the Tripitaka to the southeastern corner of the middle country, to Prome, Pagan, and the Mon area, and Bayinnaung forbade his men to take prisoners in Chiang Mai on the grounds that Buddhism had come to Burma from there<sup>84</sup>.

Two other Indian geographical terms making the journey to Southeast Asia were *kamboja* and *yonaka* which in India had been on the northwestern frontier. The former became an official designation for part of the Burmese Shan states, while the latter, as we already know from *TS*, was given to part of Northern Thailand<sup>85</sup>. Thus, whereas Rajagrha, Videha, Mithila, Kosambi and Kalinga are in *TS* placed in their correct relative positions, Yonaka has been displaced and occupies a position somewhat south or southeast of the middle country. I think this can be explained systematically. In the old Indian tradition Yonaka and Kamboja were far off, on the northwestern frontier. In the Burmese tradition, as for example recorded in the *Sasanavamsa*<sup>86</sup>, there is distortion, but both are still on a distant border, even if in the northeast rather than the northwest. The probable explanation for the *TS* pattern is that the chronicler was brought up in the Burmese Buddhist tradition and knew that his own country was Yonaka. He also desired to incorporate local belief that it was an important Buddhist centre and had been founded by a member of the Magadhan dynasty. The result was a distortion of the classical system through which Chiang Saen, while still remaining Yonaka, was also close to the important middle country.

We must acknowledge, I think, that *TS*, in its early part, was intended as a story of the original Buddhist middle country, but the chronicler believed that country to have been spread over Yunnan, the Shan States and Northern Thailand.

One more aspect of the composition of *TS* seems also to be attributable to an Indian origin. Chiang Saen, in the story, has four lives. That is, after its foundation by Siṅhanavaṭī it is destroyed or deserted three times and rebuilt under new names, thus:

1. *mo'ān nāgabāndhusiṅhanavaṭīnagara*, founded by Siṅhanavaṭī. There are hints in a confused part of the text that it was destroyed by earthquake and flood. In any case it appears, very close

---

83. Subcontractor's Monograph HRAF-37, NYU 2, Burma, vol I, New Haven, 1956, p. 247; Adolf Bastian, *Reise durch Kambodja nach Cochinchina*, Jena 1868, p. 66.

84. U Tet Htoot, "The Nature of the Burmese Chronicles", *Historians of South East Asia*, ed D G E Hall, London, 1961, p. 54.

85. Sao Saimong Mangrai, op cit p. 43. Note that *kamboja* is not *kambujā*~Kampuchea (Cambodia). See Michael Vickery, "Cambodia After Angkor, the Chronicular Evidence for the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries", Yale University, Ph.D., December 1977. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, University Microfilms, pp. 369-377

86. *Sasanavamsa*, Mabel Bode, ed, Pali Text Society, London, 1897, and in English, *Sasanavamsa*, B.C. Law, translator, *Sacred Books of the Buddhists*, vol 33, London 1952. See the former, pp 3-10, and the latter, pp 1-18.

to a change of era, from ancient to Buddhist, with a new name,

2. *mo 'aṅ yonakanagara jaiyapurīrājadhānī srī jiaṅ saen*. This city was in turn destroyed by earthquake and flood at a date which I have suggested should be 1000 B E. The city was then recreated as
3. *viaṅ pru'kṣā*. Then a new ruler sent down from heaven established the *cula* era and renamed the city
4. *viaṅ herañanagara ṅo 'n yāṅ jiaṅ saen*.

The reader will note that the 1st and 3rd of the renewals coincided with the establishment of new eras, while the 2nd was n B E 1000, a type of date traditionally associated with important changes<sup>87</sup>. In another important Southeast Asian Buddhist work, *Sāsanavamsa*, the latest of these eras, *cula*, is consistently called the Kali era, one of the 4 *yuga* of classical Indian cosmic time reckoning. Since one of the ideas of the *yuga* system was that cities reappear with new identities in each *yuga* (for example, Ujjain, in previous *yuga* was known as *padmavati*, *bhogavati*, and *hiranyavati*), it would seem that this feature of *TS* was due to an adaptation of the Indian *yuga* system to the history of Northern Thailand<sup>88</sup>. The implication of this, of course, is that everything before the last renewal of Chiang Saen, at least, is pure fiction.

We see now that nearly all of the structure and important details of the early part of *TS* are adaptations of internal - Indian, Ceylonese, Burmese - motifs which can have nothing to do with the history of Northern Thailand. They were placed in the geographical framework of Thailand, the Shan States and Yunnan and tied together with lists of kings of whom only the bare names are recorded and who may safely be presumed invented for that purpose. In fact, of the approximately 1920 years *TS* purports to cover from its beginning up to the lifetime of Mangrai, at which point probably all scholars would agree that true history is involved, about 1030 are covered by such empty lists.

With this much established we can examine a few more motifs which, at first glance might appear to be more certainly local. Such a one is the story of a hero-king, *lavacāṅkarāja*, who came down from heaven, founded a new city, and established the last, *cula* era. Stories of hero-kings who founded various

---

87. Dates at 500 a 1000-year intervals after the nirvana have been important in prophecies concerning the disappearance of Buddhism, See *Présence*, pp 657-662. For a belief in the importance of BE 1000 in Central Thailand see the *Baṅsāvātār hno'a/Phongsawadan No'a* or the so-called British Museum Chronicle, Bangkok, 1964, pp 6-17, concerning Phra Ruong, who was believed to have established a new era at that date. See also Sir John Bowring, *The Kingdom and People of Siam*, Oxford in Asia Historical Reprints, 1969, I p. 36, for an English translation of the same remarks. King Prasat Thong also believed that 1000 of the *cula* era was a mystically important date. See the various editions of the *Royal Autograph*, British Museum, or *Bāncāndanumās* chronicles under the year 1000. Of course, underlying the very term "millenarism" is a conception of drastic changes occurring in thousand-year periods.

88. Heinrich Zimmer, *Myths and Symbols in Indian Art and Civilization*, Bollingen Series VI, N Y 1946, pp 13-18; *Sasanavamsa*, Law, examples of Kali equivalent to *cula* in introduction, p. ix, and p. 44; on Ujjain, see *Kathāsaritsāgara*, *The Ocean of Story*, translated by C.H. Tawney, London 1922, vol VII, p. 1. It is interesting to note that *hiranya-vati* was established in the third *yuga* and *herañā-nagara* in the third (*tatiya*) era. This suggests more than random borrowing by the compiler of *TS*, although I have seen no material which suggests why there should be a special connection between Ujjain and Chiang Saen.

eras abound in Southeast Asian literature. For example, the traditional central Thai belief was that Phra Ruang had founded the *cula* era. The Chiang Mai and Nan chronicles attribute it to Anuruddha, and although *TS* still preserves the association with Anuruddha, the principal task is given to a local ruler<sup>89</sup>.

Since it is quite certain that the *cula* era came to Thailand from Burma, any story of its founding by a Thai ruler is of course fictitious. However, some might choose to argue that only the era-founding is fictitious, the person of the king himself being real, or at least a ‘reflection’ of something genuine in the country’s history. In the case of *TS*, however, this view does not hold up, for the king’s name gives away both his mythical quality and his origin. We may suppose *cāṅkarāja* to be formed from *sāṅkarāja* and the latter term is well-known as a Thai/Lao corruption of *śakarāja*, ‘era’, and thus this ruler is King ‘era’. Moreover, in one Burmese tradition there is also a king *sakarāja* who is undoubtedly the eponym of the Thai personage<sup>90</sup>. The latter merely has *lava* prefixed to his name making him the King Era of the *lava* people, who may be interpreted as either the Lua or the Lao. His golden stairway from heaven is of course a theme borrowed from the life of the Buddha, who descended from the thirty-third heaven to the summit of Mt Meru on a stairway of gold, silver and crystal.<sup>91</sup>

Finally we may take up the problem of the opening sections of *TS* beginning with the name *siṅ hanavati* itself, deriving from *siṅha* (also *siha*), ‘lion’. This is also an international motif, with associations outside the Thai area. In Mon tradition *sīharāja* came from India to found Thaton and died in the year of the Buddha’s nirvana<sup>92</sup>. The theme goes back even farther, to Ceylon, where it provides an explanation for one of the names of the island, *sīhaladīpa*. There the ‘lion’ king was first called *sīhalabahu* and was a son of a lion and a Vanga (India) princess. Later he became king of Kalinga and was given the name *sīhala*. His descendants were the first colonists and conquerors of the island and established the ruling dynasty there. No better comment on the Northern Thai story of a lion king can be made than Geiger’s on the Ceylon story. “The mythological and legendary character of these traditions is manifest, on the whole as well as in the details. Their tendency obviously was to join the dynasty ruling in Ceylon with the most prominent dynasties of India, the Kalinga rulers and the Sakyas”. Since it is known that one current, at least, of Buddhism and associated literary traditions passed from Ceylon to Lower Burma to Northern Thailand, in the case of *TS* we cannot even adopt Geiger’s further hypothesis that, “. . . in all those stories there is at least the germ historical truth . . . Ceylon was overrun by three successive waves of immigrants . . .” etc.<sup>93</sup> In *TS* we are faced with nothing but a literary motif, the lion king who came from India to found a local kingdom, which motif came to Northern Thailand from farther afield and had been used by the Mon in writing their chronicles and even earlier by the Ceylonese.

Starting with the more obvious we have found probable origins for the important motifs of the early part of *TS*, except for the very first, that of a “. . . *hò* king named *devakāla* . . . who ruled *nagara daiydesa* or *mo’añ rājagrha* the capital . . .”. It has already been determined that this king is associated with a fictitious, but traditional, era, the *añjana*, named after a grandfather of the Buddha, and I have adduced evidence that the compiler of *TS* believed the original homeland of Buddhism to be in Southeast Asia - not, as Manit holds, that he wrote about a second Rajagrha in Yunnan. The geographical situation of the Rajagrha in *TS*, which I say was intended as the original, cannot be in doubt since Devakala is called a *hò* king, and the *hò*, for the northern Thai, have always been a people residing to the north. At present *hò*

---

89. For Phra Ruang see references in note 85 above, and for Anuruddha, Notton II, p. 12 and *Nan Chronicle, PP*, guru sabha edition, vol 9, p. 199.

90. *The Glass Palace Chronicle*, edited by Tin and Luce, London 1923, p. 52.

<sup>91</sup> GCoedès, *Angkor*, p. 47

92. Sir Arthur Phayre, *History of Burma*, London 1883, p. 288, n 1; *Glass Palace Chronicle*, p. 49.

93. Geiger, op cit., section 21, p. 28, both quotations.



seems to be applied only to Yunnanese Chinese, but it is not their own term, and its origin “as applied to the Yunnanese in Thailand remains an unsolved mystery.”<sup>94</sup>

Thus we do not have to assume the *hò*, for the Thai, always meant Chinese, Prince Damrong for example, wrote that at the time of the so-called *hò* wars in the late 19th century, people of Bangkok believed *hò* to be a separate ethnic group and were surprised to find the northern people giving the name to Chinese.<sup>95</sup>

The terms *daiydesa* for the area in which Devakala ruled is no problem. We may assume that much of the region for a long distance north of Chiang Saen, in the Burmese and Chinese Shan states, was probably inhabited by various Thai peoples at whatever reasonable date we wish to place the first composition of *TS*, and without doing violence to the latest theories of Thai migration.

With Mithila and Rajagrha transposed to the ‘golden triangle’ it was obvious to the chronicler that this was Thai country, and *hò* rulers in Yunnan, whatever ethnic group may have been designated by that term, were a political fact of life for the northern Thai states. In fact, the equation by the writer of *TS* of Thai and *hò* in the person of Devakala shows that for his time *hò* did not have to mean Chinese. Moreover, not all versions of *TS* contain the term *hò*. Notton calls him “chef des T’ai”, and notes that the text which the compiler of *PY* called the original *TS* had “...Devakala, et qui était chef de tous les T’ai”, with no mention of *hò*.<sup>96</sup>

Like the Thai of Lanna, many of the ethnic groups of Yunnan had legends connecting them to Indian royalty, and thus for a chronicler of the area they could be classical Indians, Thai and *hò* at the same time.<sup>97</sup> It seems certain, then, that this aspect of *TS* does not indicate an early Thai “descent from China” theory in the sense given this concept in the last 100 years. Although geographically there was a descent from Yunnan to Lanna in *TS*, the important connection was not with China, but with Buddhist India transposed to Yunnan.

The last element which needs to be explained is the name Devakala for which there seems to be no association in classical or Buddhist India or Ceylon, and it might thus be argued that it is a genuine name taken into *TS* from some ancient source. However, as I tried to demonstrate in the case of *bāndhanati/bāndhumatti*, and *siṅhanavati/sīharāja/sihala*, perfect identity of names is not required to establish related or identical motifs. It is only necessary to have names which include the same essential elements. There is such a name which I believe can be paired with Devakala. In both the Chiang Mai chronicle and the Nan version of Lanna history there is a *kāladevīla* rishi who, together with his brother Añjana, maternal grandfather of the Buddha, and Sihahanu, the Buddha’s paternal grandfather, cut a more ancient era to establish the one known as *añjana* and which is the era associated with Devakala in *TS*. This theme derives in part from classical India where an ascetic, Kaladevala, was a contemporary and frequent visitor in the house of the Buddha’s father, and at the Buddha’s birth made predictions concerning his future<sup>98</sup>. Since Devakala and Kaladeva are transpositions one of the other, I suggest we are faced with literary motifs concerning persons believed to have been associated with the Magadhan royal family and the *añjana* era. We should not be surprised either that some versions of *TS*, for example that of Notton, contain the story of Kaladevīla alongside that of Devakala. We have seen the manner in which *TS* was put together, adopting themes from various sources and, where necessary, inventing elements to connect them.

*TS*, then, is an interesting piece of historical folklore put together by men steeped in local written

---

94. F.W. Mote, "The Rural 'Haw' (Yunnanese Chinese) of Northern Thailand", in Peter Kunstadter, ed *Southeast Asian Tribes, Minorities, and Nations* vol II, chap 13, pp 487-524, see pp 490-491, n. 3.

95. *PP* part 24, vol 14, *guru sabhā* edition, p. 176.

96. Notton I, pp 142-3 and n 3.

97. *Na-Khi*, I, pp 7, 9, 51n.

98. Notton III, *PP* 8, 11; *Nan Chronicle*, p. 194; Thomas *op. ci.,t* pp 42-43.

and oral tradition, with little knowledge of the world outside their own region, and who had no reason to doubt that it had been an important early Buddhist center, in fact one of the parts of the classical homeland of Buddhism. Their efforts to show that their own homeland was the center around which other parts of Southeast Asia revolved, the center in which all known methods of time reckoning (and some unknown) were devised, and a center with which the Buddha himself had been closely connected, are reminiscent of Ptolemaic astronomy in which the sun and planets revolved around the earth and irregularities of movement which the theory imposed were explained by epicycles corresponding to the assumptions which have to be made in order for such traditional history to appear coherent.

Manit's revised version is also traditional history in that he accepts uncritically the basic premises of *TS* concerning the importance of Lanna in early times. However, Mani knows that the true Buddhist middle country was not located there and that, for example, the Buddha's disciple, Maha Kassapa, did not fly through the air to bring relics to Lanna. His epicycles, or assumptions, thus become more and more complicated in order to bring *TS* within the realm of the possible while preserving its structure and premises.

It is not enough, however, to simply destroy the credibility of the first part of *TS* as history. Chiang Saen has a history, and judging by its monumental remains an extremely interesting one. In fact, these remains indicate that at some time in the past 4-500 years Chiang Saen may have been more wealthy and powerful than any other northern *mo'ān*, including Chiang Mai, and if insufficient notice has been taken of this it is because Chiang Mai survived until the present as the principal city of the north and more of its literature has been preserved.

The real problem of Chiang Saen history, then, is not whether it was a centre of the first Thai expansion into the 'golden peninsula', a matter probably impossible to determine, at least on the basis of extant chronicles, but rather when, why, and how did Chiang Saen in early modern times become a city wealthy enough to erect and maintain the monuments we see there, and when and why did it then decline. Altogether too much attention has been given to the *TS* period of the chronicle,<sup>99</sup> while the period which really deserves study is that which begins well after Mani cut off his text. For this later period *TS*, or rather the Chiang Saen chronicles, published in full in *PP* 61, is a valuable source. Like the Chiang Mai chronicle and other histories of Lanna, it makes the royal dynasty of Chiang Mai the rulers of Chiang Saen as well, and the princes in each generation rotate between Chiang Saen and Chiang Mai with younger brothers sent to govern other northern *mo'ān*. This political system comes to an abrupt end in the reign of *kū'nā* (Keu Na, Kilana, *soñ saen nā*). He gave the governorship of Chiang Saen to a commoner who had distinguished himself in warfare and thereafter Chiang Saen was ruled by governors appointed from Chiang Mai.

From this time on the Chiang Saen chronicle becomes a history definitely centred in Chiang Saen, although it does little more than name the governors, record their religious activities and note their relations with other *mo'ān*. A record of one of these governors, at least, seems to be preserved in an inscription from Chiang Rai. It mentions an official from Chiang Saen named *jāv hmū'n jiañ saen gāṃ lān* who was involved in the construction of a temple in Chiang Rai in 1496<sup>100</sup>. In the chronicle, where *jāv hmū'n* often indicates a governor, there is a *jāv bra:yā suvarṇa gāṃ lān nā jiañ saen* who is said to have died in

---

99. For example, Kachorn Sukhabanij, "Proposed Dating of the Yonok-Chiengsaen Dynasty", *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, XLIII, I, June 1960, pp 57-62; Kachorn Sukhabanij "Two Thai MSS on the k'unlun Kingdom", in F.S. Drake, ed, *Symposium on Historical, Archaeological and Linguistic Studies on Southern China, South-East Asia and the Hongkong Region*, Hong Kong University Press, 1967, pp 70-74. I suppose the present review might also fit into this category.

100. *Prajum silā cāru'k* III, pp. 174-177, no. 69.

1487 after ruling for 25 years<sup>101</sup>, and no other Chiang Saen governor of the last half of the 15th and first quarter of the 16th centuries has a name resembling *gām lān*. The difference in dates suggests an error of one 12-year cycle in the chronicle.

As I remarked earlier, probably all historians would agree that true history begins with the period of Mangrai. Not only do Mangrai and his descendants play an important role in all the northern chronicles, but there is contemporary evidence concerning some of them in the inscription of Wat Phra Yu'n<sup>102</sup>.

An important fact which has been carefully skirted in all previous studies is that although the chronicles provide six generations from Mangrai to Ku' Na -- Maṅgrai, Jaya (Xǎi, Jaiy) Saṅgrām, Saen Bhū, Gām Fū, Phā Yū. Kū' Nā - the inscription, erected by the last king of this list, only has four - Maṅgrai, Gām Fū, Phā Yū, Soṅ Saen Nā (Kū'Nā) -- who are designated great grandfather, grandfather, father, son, that is, Soṅ Saen Nā is said to be son, grandson and great grandson of the other three. Proper methods, taking the evidence of a contemporary inscription over that of a late chronicle, should already have led scholars to reject, or explain, two fictitious generations, Jaya Saṅgrām and Saen Bhū, but instead the problem has either been ignored or epicycles have been devised to account for it.

In fact, the chronicles themselves contain information sufficient to make the genealogy suspect, even without the evidence of the inscription. This is the way the chronology of birth dates and ages is squeezed in order to insert two new generations into a four-generation time span. Thus, in *Jinakālamālī*, one of the oldest chronicles, Haripyava (Gām Fū) was born in 1324, became King at the very early age of 10 years in 1334, "reigned 12 years", yet died in 1336 at "age 28". His son, Phā Yū, was born in 1336, became king in 1336 at "age 12", and died in 1355. Finally Kīlana (Kū' Nā) was born in 1339 when his father would have been 3 years old. The Chiang Mai chronicle squeezes them in a different way. There Saen Bhū's birth is implied in 1276 when his father would have been 11 years old, not impossible of course, but suspect. Because Saen Bhū is inserted in this way the life span of his son Gām Fū -- born 1302, enthroned 1328 - appears normal, but his son, Phā Yū, is born in 1316 when his father would have been 14, and the last of the series, Kū' Nā is born in 1327 when his father would have been only 9<sup>103</sup>. These different dates in different chronicles, with squeezing at different places, are conclusive evidence, along with the inscription, of interpolation. That is, two generations, Jaya Saṅgrām, and Saen Bhū, are fictitious, as are the stories in the chronicles connected with them. Interestingly, the time span from Mangrai to Kū' Nā contains enough chronological space to fit all six generations with normal lives had the chroniclers tinkered carefully. Instead they evidently maintained a few true dates and reigns and fitted the rest in as best they could.

Before considering these fictitious rulers further, let's examine some of the implications of Wat Phra Yu'n for northern history in general. We should note first of all the titles of the four kings, *brañā maññrāy hluoñ*, *brañā gām fū*, *brañā phā yū*, *cau dāv soṅ saen nā*. Royal titles were not chosen haphazardly, but each polity had styles peculiar to it, and sudden changes in style of titles reflected changes in political or cultural orientation. In the above list there are four different types of titles. First there are three titles beginning with *brañā*, found in both Thai and Mon inscriptions, and probably of Mon origin<sup>104</sup>, but whereas in the second and third *brañā* is followed by what appear to be Thai proper names, in the first the

---

101. *PP* 61 pp. 181-182.

102. Coedès. "Documents", pp 195-200; *Prajum silā cāru'k* III, pp 136-144. no 62; *EHS* 13.

103. Coedès, "Documents", pp 87-103; Notton III, pp 74-92. These are the basic data given in the passages devoted to chronology. There are also conflicting statements implying other ages and birth dates, but they only illustrate the difficulty which the chroniclers faced.

104. Vickey, Review of Robert B Jones, "Thai Titles and Ranks, etc". *JSS* 62 (1), January 1974, pp 160-174. See pp 170-171.

second element is *maññrāy* which, as I noted above, furnished the occasion for a complicated folk etymology<sup>105</sup>. In fact, even casual perusal of published material on Burmese royalty will show that it was a common Burmese royal and official title based on the Burmese word for ‘king’, *māñ*<sup>106</sup>. Why the founder of Lanna royalty had a Burmese title is a problem for which no explanation is readily apparent, but it deserves study, and an adequate treatment would probably modify much of the accepted story of his reign. The title of the fourth ruler makes a complete break with its predecessors in being entirely Thai with no hint of Mon or Burmese influence.

Thus if our only document on early Lanna were the inscription we might conclude that the ruler really responsible for making it a Thai kingdom was Soñ Saen Nā rather than Mangrai.

Another interesting aspect of the inscription is the prominence it gives to Lamphun, rather than Chiang Mai, as the most important city of the region, whereas in the chronicles Chiang Mai had by this time been the capital for six generations. It will not do to gloss over the fact by calling Lamphun “the cultural capital<sup>107</sup>”. In the inscription Chiang Mai is mentioned after Kum Kam and is not even called a *mo’añ*, let alone a *nagara*, both of which titles are given to Haripunjai. If we favoured the contemporary inscription over the chronicles we should say that Lamphun was not only culturally, but also politically, more important as late as the period of Kū’ Nā. In fact, one of the old chronicles, *Jinakālamālī*, shows some evidence of uncertainty in this respect. For example, after Mangrai, his son Grāmarāja reigned in Bingapura (Chiang Mai) for a short time and then passed the throne to his son, Senabhū. Then the latter’s uncle Gro’n came and conquered Haripunjaya, forcing Senabhū to flee. Then “King Gro’n...took Haripunjaya...and reigned 9 years”. The logic of the story of course, requires Chiang Mai instead of Haripunjaya. The next usurper, Najjotthara, also reigned in Haripunjaya, and several generations later Mahabrahma, wishing to overthrow a king in Nabbisipura (Chiang Mai), “raised a great army, marched on Nabbisipura, took Haripunjaya”.<sup>108</sup> Later chronicles, such as that of Chiang Mai, have resolved the contradiction and substituted Chiang Mai for Haripunjaya in each of those sections.

Although it be agreed, then, that the true history of the north begins with the reign of Mangrai, that history as given in the chronicles is in many ways distorted and requires much more study and interpretation.

One of the distortions, as we have seen, is the interpolation of Saen Bhū and his father Jaya Saṅgrām. These two extra generations of the Mangrai genealogy must have been inserted for a reason, and in the case of Saen Bhū we might guess that the reason had been to integrate Chiang Saen, after it had become a rich and powerful city, into a political system encompassing all of the northern valley kingdoms and believed to have originated with a hero-king, Mangrai.

There seems to be no special reason for the addition of Jaya Saṅgrām<sup>109</sup>, but the name occurs in another interesting context, and one which casts further doubt on the legitimacy of its place in Chiang Mai

---

105. See above, pp 338-39.

106. Than Tun, "History of Burma : AD 1300-1400", *Journal of the Burma Research Society* 42 (1959) pp 119-133, see table at end; Yi Yi, "Life at the Burmese Court Under the Konbaung Kings", *JBRS* 44 (1), 1961, pp 85-129; Tin Hla Thaw, "History of Burma : AD 1400-1500", *JBRS* 42 (1959), pp 135-150, see p. 148; Yi Yi, "The Thrones of the Burmese Kings", *JBRS* 43 (2), 1960, pp 97-123, see p. 101.

107. *EHS* 13, p. 124.

108. Coedès, "Documents", pp 29, 103.

109. "Jaya" is the conventional correct spelling for the name written *Xāi* = *sai* (ᐃᐃ) in Notton and *jaiy* (ᐃᐃ) in the published Chiang Mai chronicle (note 61, above). See Coedès, "Documents," p. 90, n 2.

history. The document to which I refer is Inscription 45 of the Thai corpus<sup>110</sup>. Its date is equivalent to AD 1392, just a few years after the end of the reign of the king responsible for the Wat Phra Yu'n inscription, and it contains two lists of ancestor spirits, one of which Griswold and Prasert interpreted as former kings of Nan and the other former kings and related royalty of Sukhothai.

This latter list, besides the expected names, includes others previously unknown, one of whom, *nua nāṃ thaṃ*, Griswold and Prasert felt should be added to the list of Sukhothai kings. I present below the names of the Sukhothai kings as known from other inscriptions<sup>111</sup>, the list of Inscription 45, a list of Sukhothai kings found in the version of the Phra Sihing story included in *Jinakālamālī*, and the names of certain Chiang Mai rulers as they are given both in *Jinakālamālī* and the Chiang Mai chronicle<sup>112</sup>.

Sukhothai	Inscription 45	Phra Sihing	Chiang Mai
Śrī Indrāditya 13th c	pū brañā śrī indrādity	rocarāja	Mamrāya, Mangrai
Bān Moaṅ 13th c	pū brañā pān	rāmarāja	
Rāmarāj (Rām Kamheṅ) 1279-1299/1316	pū brañā rāmarāj	pālarāja	
Lö Tai 1299/1316-1346	pū sai saṅgrām pū brañā lödai		Grāmarāja, Jaya S 1265-1326
Lü Tai, Mahā	pū brañā nua nāṃ thaṃ	udakajjotthatarāja	Najjotthara, <u>bò</u> <u>dāv nāṃ thvam</u>
Dharamarājā I 1347-1374	pū brañā mahādharmarājā	lideyyarāja <sup>113</sup> 1350-1369	1320's
Mahādharmarāja II, 1376-1398	ba nāṃ mo'āṅ <u>ba</u> lödai 1392		

Griswold identified Nua Nam Tham of Inscription 45 as a king because of the title *pū brañā*, while the other unexpected names were dismissed as royal family members who did not become king, because they are not given the title *brañā*<sup>114</sup>. It seems clear though that Nua Nam Tham parallels Udakajjotthatarāja, which name Coedès translated, "the king who plunged into the water," adding that this was, "a probable allusion to one of the legends of the Phra Ru'ang cycle, that is, his mysterious disappearance in the rapids

110. In *Prajum silā cāru'k* III. See also *EHS* 1, *JSS* LVI(2), July 1968 and especially *EHS* 3 *JSS* LVII (1), January 1969, pp 68-99, for its interpretation by Griswold and Prasert; and A.B. Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 29.

111. Both the names and dates are taken from Griswold, *Towards*.

112. See Coedès, "Documents," pp 99, 91-93; the published Chiang Mai chronicle, p. 33; Notton III, pp 71-76.

113. The dates are those of Ramathibodi I of Ayutthaya, in whose reign the activities of Lideyyaraja are placed. See Coedès, "Documents," p. 99-100.

114. *EHS* 3, p. 82 and n 20.

of Keng Mu'ang".<sup>115</sup> It would also seem that in spite of the unorthodox spelling, Nāṃ Thạm of Inscription 45 is the same name as Nāṃ Thvam/Najjotthara of the Chiang Mai histories which Coedès translated, "inondation" (flood)<sup>116</sup>, and that they relate to the same legendary cycle.

It is also interesting that the Chiang Mai Chronicle, although not the earlier *Jinakālamālī*, provides Nāṃ Thvam with a younger brother *nua* [นัว] and their names together thus comprise all the elements of Nua Nāṃ Thạm of Inscription 45. These two brothers also have the unusual title *bò dāv* [พ่อดำ], in contrast to their elder brother Saen Bhū, whose title is *dāv*, and their father, entitled *cau brahyā*.

I find it highly unlikely that at about the same time in both Sukhothai and Chiang Mai there were princes named Jaya Sangram and Nua Nam Tham/Nam Thvam, Nua, in the same generational sequence, the name of one of whom has legendary associations, and both/all of whom appear only in late texts or in an inscription which designates them as ancestral spirits. The conclusion I propose is that these names go back to an older Thai mythology, common to both Sukhothai and Chiang Mai, and perhaps other areas, that they were evoked as spirits in 1392 along with the spirits of genuine kings, and that they were taken into later Chiang Mai chronicles when extra generations were required to fill out an expanded story.

As for Chiang Saen itself, its architectural remains leave no doubt that the city at some time, perhaps the 15th-16th centuries, was extremely wealthy and important. However, the extant chronicles are generally Chiang Mai-centric and Chiang Saen is not given the attention appropriate to what was probably its position.

I would like to put forward as a hypothesis that Chiang Saen began to become important in the late 14th or early 15th centuries and in the course of the 15th-16th centuries became one of the most important, if not the most important, in the north, gaining wealth from trade along the river (of course, explanation must be sought for the position of Chiang Saen becoming especially advantageous at that time and not earlier or later).

As it grew to importance chroniclers began to devise appropriate historical beginnings and Saen Bhū was grafted onto the family tree of Mangrai to bring Chiang Saen within a Chiang Mai-centric political system from its beginnings. The story could have been invented either at Chiang Mai to account acceptably for an increasingly powerful rival, or at Chiang Saen, in order to prove early association with the older cultural, religious, and political centre. Then the Chiang Saen chroniclers went even farther back in time, and developed the *TS* story to make their region appear preeminent from the beginning of significant time.

The history of the north indeed deserves more attention, and its materials are truly fascinating. The Commission should be encouraged to collect and publish more northern histories, starting with those that are little known or not easily accessible. It must be remembered, though that study of these materials has to begin with dissection and identification of the elements entering into their composition and not with ever more complicated epicycles to justify their original structure.

---

115. Coedès, "Documents," p. 99, n 5.

116. *Ibid.*, p. 92, n 4. The spelling of Inscription 45 is *ถုံ* and in the Chiang Mai chronicle *ถုံม* instead of current Thai *ถုံม*, but there can be no doubt of the intended meaning in the chronicles since the etymology, "flood" is explicit.