

Jeremias van Vliet, *The Short History of the Kings of Siam*, translated by Leonard Andaya from a transcription by Miriam J Verkuijl-van den Berg, edited by David K Wyatt, Bangkok, The Siam Society, 1975 iv, 97 pp.

For a number of years historians concerned with early Ayutthaya have been aware that a chronicle version older than anything else extant had been compiled in Dutch by the early 17th-century VOC representative in Ayutthaya, Jeremias van Vliet, and its publication has been eagerly awaited for light it might shed on points which remain obscure in other texts.

Now The Siam Society has provided in very attractive format a transcription of van Vliet's original text with an English translation and a certain number of notes on the historiographic problems of the text and its relationship to other sources¹.

Van Vliet's chronicle begins with a very interesting version of the history of the peninsula and lower Menam basin before the founding of Ayutthaya. Here van Vliet relates several stories which were current concerning the first king of Siam in ancient times - that he was a son of a Chinese emperor and had come to the peninsula about 2000 years before, that he was a brahman named Phrommathep, and that Siam was founded by the Buddha himself. A long time later, about 300 years before van Vliet's day, another son of a Chinese ruler, Chao Ui, arrived on the peninsula and became the Thao U Thong who founded Ayutthaya. His acts in accomplishing this are described in some detail. No absolute year dates are given, but tiger year, which may be assumed to represent the 1350-51 of other texts, is specified for the founding of the city. Thereafter the chronicle runs through the reigns of kings who may generally be recognized as those of the standard Ayutthayan chronicles² and ends in the period of Prasat Thong, in 1640. The text is generally very summarized and there are few political or military details before the time of King Maha Chakrapathirat (1548-1568). Thereafter relations with Burma and Cambodia are reported quite fully, but with the details often confused. For the 17th century, the period which van Vliet knew from personal experience, there is a good deal of information which must represent his own research and which is also included in his other works.

Although the kings are the same as in the other chronicles, their reign periods are usually quite different from both of the major chronicle traditions. The textual material is also different, and this, together with its brevity for the first two hundred years, leads one to

1. In what follows I shall use 'van Vliet' for the author and *vV* for the text. Proper names and royal titles will follow Wyatt's system of transcription except where etymology is to be emphasized, and there, as in quotations from Thai texts, the graphic system of transliteration will be used. [*Wyatt's treatment was republished unchanged, but without the Dutch text, in Chris Baker, Dhiravat na Pombejra, Alfons van der Kraan, David K. Wyatt, *Van Vliet's Siam*, Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books, 2005. Footnotes here (in the form 9/191) include page references both to Wyatt's original publication and the later book. Page references 13-52 are to the Dutch text not included in the book.*]

2. These are the *Hlvān prasro 'th*/Luang Praso't (*LP*) chronicle and a group which I shall refer to as the 1157 tradition (*1157*), consisting of a chronicle composed at that date, equivalent to AD 1795, and represented today by *Bāncāndanumās* (*P*), and its direct descendants: the version of *Samtec braḥ bānrātn* (Wyatt's Phonnarat), the so-called British Museum version, the Bradley version, and The Royal Autograph Chronicle (*RA*), of which the edition to be cited here is the sixth, Chonburi, 2511 (1968).

wonder whether van Vliet translated a Thai text or put together a history from disparate information he had collected from various informants.

Although the editor, Wyatt, felt that, “it is much too early to begin to assess the full value” of *vV* (p 9/191), material is readily at hand to go much further in this direction than he chose to do, and in fact should have done, in the present publication. I intend therefore, to use this occasion to compare “his [van Vliet’s] version with that of the several versions of the Royal Chronicles of Ayudhya and other documents”, (p 9), in order to situate it much more firmly within the picture of Ayutthayan history such sources have provided.

Since Wyatt cited me as one of several persons who provided “assistance and advice” (p. i), the reader might legitimately feel that my comments should have been offered to the editor for inclusion rather than saved for a review, and therefore I must note briefly the extent to which I was involved.

In 1972 I found out that Wyatt was working on *vV* and I wrote to him for a copy of the translation in order to check it for information useful in my dissertation research. He very kindly sent me a copy of the typescript of the English translation, for which I am very grateful. At the time I was mainly interested in what *vV* had to say about Thai invasions of Cambodia, and finding that it provided no information about such before the time of Naresuan, I put it aside. My only suggestions to Wyatt at the time, as far as I remember, were that *vV* provided clinching evidence that the true title of the king known as Ekathotsarot had been Ramesuan and that *vV*’s transcription of proper names and titles should be clearly indicated in the final publication. The typescript I received did not contain any of the Dutch text, nor its version of titles, nor any editorial comment, none of which I saw until receiving a copy of the publication a couple of months ago. Neither did I study the whole of *vV* very closely until recently, when I saw some of its more obvious relationships with other texts, and in the meantime Wyatt had had access to a partial draft of my dissertation in which, although not discussing *vV*, I had treated the ‘invasion’ of 1369 with respect to other sources and had described clearly the chronology of *Sāṅgītiyavaṅś*.³ Certain other of the comments I shall make below are based on material I have already published and which presumably would have come to Wyatt’s attention.

The first comment required is a question of bibliography. In his ‘Abbreviations’ on p. iv Wyatt has a note on *LP* in which he says that the text published in *PCSA* is in the original spelling.⁴ As I pointed out in a review of that volume, not only does the text of *PCSA* not have the original spelling, but it is not even the original *LP*.⁵ It is another two-volume copy, probably that of King Taksin’s reign which had already been identified by Prince Damrong.⁶

3. *Sāṅgītiyavaṅś samtec braḥ vānarāṭṭh vāt braḥ jeṭuban nai rājakāl dī 1*, Bangkok 2466 (1923). This volume provides the original Pali text and a Thai translation in parallel columns. Coedès translated the Ayutthaya chronicle from another manuscript of *Sāṅgītiyavaṅś* in his “Une recension palie des annales d’Ayuthya”, *BEFEO* Vol XIV (3), 1914, pp 1-31. There are some minor, but interesting, differences in the two versions. *Sāṅgītiyavaṅś* proper will here be cited as *S* and Coedès’ translation *Sc*.

4. *Prahjūm cathmāyhetu sāmāy ayudhayā bhāg 1* (Collected documents of the Ayutthaya period part 1), Commission for the Publication of Historical, Cultural and Archaeological Documents, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, 2510 (1967). The *LP* text is on pp 93-103.

5. In *JSS* Vol LX (2), July 1972, pp 319-329. See p 325.

6. See Prince Damrong’s introduction to *LP* in the various editions of *Prahjūm baṅsāvatār* /Prachum Phongsawadan, part 1.

As far as I know, no published edition of *LP* preserves the original spelling, and curious readers may check out any copy to which they have access by comparing it with the plates of PCSA, which have been taken from the original.

Contrary to what Wyatt felt (pp. 6-10/189-192), the single major source for *vV* is very clear. It is the version of Ayutthayan history preserved today in *S*. The relationship is clearest in the chronological framework, which I present below in tabular form beginning with the foundation of Ayutthaya in the reign of U Thong, Ramathibodi I (*vV*'s pre-Ayutthayan section belongs to other traditions and must be treated separately). The reign periods are totalled both by modern and traditional arithmetic, which I have explained earlier in a review of *Sirihanavatikumār*.⁷ Brackets indicate details for which *vV*, *S*, and *Sc* differ among themselves. Note that the first date of *S*, 1892 Buddhist Era, is incorrect, for tiger year *cula* era 712, equivalent to AD 1350-51, should be BE 1893 or 1894. For convenience the calculation of year dates is in AD beginning with 1351, which, since the date is near the end of the year, is the correct synchronism in this case for 712 tiger.⁸ The corresponding *LP* dates and periods are also provided for contrast.

<i>LP</i>	<i>Saṅgīti/vV</i>	<i>modern/traditional</i>
712 tiger/1350-1 Rāmādhīpatī	1892 tiger Rāmādhīpatī 19 years	1351 1370/1369
731 cock/1369 Rāmeśuor	Rāmessaro/Ramesuan 3 years	1373/1371
732 dog/1370 Param rājādhīrāj	Guṅlum baṅu/Khunluang 18 years Pha-ngua	1391/1388
750 dragon/1388 Dòh lǎn	Suvāṇṇacāndolo/Thong Chan 211 7 days	1391/1388
750 dragon/1388 Rāmeśuor	Rāmessaro/Ramesuan 9 years/6 years [<i>vV</i> , <i>Sc</i>]	+9 +6 [<i>vV</i> , mod] 1400/1396 1397
757 pig/1395 Bañā rām	Son of above/ Phra Ram [<i>vV</i>] 3 years	1403/1398 1400
771 bull/1409 Indarāja	Nagarindo/Nakhon In	

7. "The Lion Prince and Related Remarks on Northern History" ', *JSS*, LXIV, 1 (Jan 1976), p 352, n 64.

8. See Wyatt's comment, *vV* p 58/201, n 23, and his review of Prasert ṇa Nagara, (*Researches in Thai History* (ผลงานค้นคว้าประวัติศาสตร์ไทย), *JSS* Vol LXIII (2), July 1975, p 414.

	20 years	1423/1417 1420
786 dragon/1424 Param rājādhirāj [II]	Paramarājā/Borommaracha 20 years Thibodi	1443/1436 1440
810 dragon/1448 Param Trailok cau	Tilokanātho/[⁹]Boromma trailokanat 20 years	1463/1455 1460
825 goat/1463 Trailok to Phitsanulok Param rājā in Ayutthaya		
850 monkey/1488 Trailok died	Indarājā/Intharacha 37 years	1500/1491 1498
853 pig/1491 Param rājādhirāj died Rāmādhīpatī reigned	Rāmādhīpatī/Ramathibodi 38 years	1538/1528 1535
891 bull/1529 Hnò buddhānkūr	2072 bull (S, Sc) Buddhānkūr/No Phutthangkun 5 years	1543/1532 1540
895 snake/1533 Son of above	Aṭṭhādhīrājākumār/Wora- ratsadathirat 5 months	1543/1532 1540
896 hors/1534 Jaiyarājādhirāj	Jayarājasi/Chaiyaracha 13 years	1556/1544 1553
908 horse/1546 Yòt fā	Yòtta/Yot Chao 3 years	1559/1546 1556

⁹ [*Note that for the Palicizing writer(s) of *Sāṅgītiyavaṇṇ* ‘tilok~’ was the equivalent of ‘trailok~’, a point which will be seen as relevant in discussion of the Lanna chronicles and their relationships with those from Ayutthaya. Prince Damrong, moreover, although not in a context concerning Chiang Mai, considered that ‘tilok’ was equivalent to ‘trailok’, and if so, the the entire conception of these names deriving from numerals is weakened. See his “Commentary to the reign of Trailokanāth”, *RA*, p. 263, remarking that some texts called Trailokanāth ‘Trailokanāyak’ or ‘Tiloka’, but “it is all the same” แต่ก็เป็นความเดียวกัน)]

910 monkey/1548 Khun jinarāj	Guṇ Jinarāj/Chinnarat 40 years/40 days	1559/1546 1556 ¹⁰
910 monkey/1548 Dhiarrājā, Mahā cākrabarrtirāj	Dehrāj/Thianracha 16 years	1575/1561 1572
930 dragon/1568 Mahindrādhirāj	Mahind/Mahin 6 years/7 years [<i>vV</i> , <i>Sc</i>]	1581/1566 1579
931 snake/1569 Mahādharrmarājādhirāj	Dharrmarājā/Mahathammarach a 22 years	1603/1587 1601
952 tiger/1590 Narāyṇ ¹¹	2134 tiger (S, <i>Sc</i>) Narissa/Neret Rachathirat 'a few years' + 'a few years' +15/28, 20 (<i>vV</i>), 15 (<i>Sc</i>)	+20 1623/1606 1621
966 dragon/1604 End of <i>LP</i>		
<i>Reconstructed</i> ¹² <i>True dates</i>		<i>traditional</i>
967 snake/1605 Ekādaśaratha/ Ekathotsarot	snake (S, <i>Sc</i>) Rāmesso/Ramesuan 6 years/7 (<i>Sc</i>)	1606, +6 +7 1611, 1612
[dog] 1610-11 Drañ Dharm/ Song Tham	Dog (S, <i>Sc</i>) Indarājā/Intharacha 19 years	1629, 1630
[dragon] 1628-29	dragon (S, <i>Sc</i>)	

10. The '40 years' of *S* is an obvious scribal error due to the structure of the Pali phrase, thus: *Sc cattālīsa divasāni*, 'forty days'

S cattālīsa vassāni, 'forty years'.

11. *LP* gives the name 'Naray' to the king known in the other chronicles as *Nareśuor*/Naresuan. In this case *LP* is probably in error, since Europeans less than half century later were familiar with the name 'Naret', which can derive from Naresuan, but not from Naray..

12. These dates have been reconstructed through the evidence supplied by 17th-century European writers, including van Vliet. See Wyatt's notes 113, 118, 119, 124, 128, 129. See also W.A.R. Wood, *A History of Siam*, pp 160, nn 1-3, 171.

Jeṣṭharāja	Chettaracha 8 months	1629, 1630
[snake] 1629 Adityasuravaṅś	snake (<i>S</i> , <i>Sc</i>) Athit Surawong 38 days	1629, 1630
[snake] 1629 Prasat Thong Prāsād Dòh	horse (1630 <i>S</i> , <i>Sc</i>) Sri Thammarachathirat 11 years at end of <i>vV</i>	1629, 1630

It is quite clear now that *vV*, in its chronology, belongs to the tradition embodied in *Sāṅgīyavaṅś*. With the exception of the reign of Naresuan its periodization always agrees with either *S* or *Sc*. This shows further that the 1789 *Sāṅgīyavaṅś* is not an entirely original composition, but is based on a tradition already written down at least as early as the first half of the 17th century. Even in the case of Naresuan, *vV*'s 28 years, which Wyatt seems to have treated as a typographical error, can be shown to fit the *S* pattern. This figure of 28 years appears in *vV*'s heading for the section dealing with Naresuan's reign (p 38), but in the English translation (p 82/228) it has been 'corrected' to 20, apparently to agree with *vV*'s later statement that 'he was king for twenty years' (p 87/232). The passage in *S* has no definite statement about the length of this reign, but twice mentions periods of 'only a few years' [ไม่กี่ปี] and then a further period of 15 years.¹³ Since the next reign began in a snake year, and the correct snake year, 1605, is just 15 years from 2134/1590, the additional periods of 'a few years' imply that the following snake year, 1617, is meant, and this is exactly 28 years, by traditional arithmetic, from 1590. These details show that the 28 years of *vV* is not a scribal error and that in this passage the text of *S* as we find it today existed essentially in the same form in van Vliet's time. The original writer probably did not intend his passage to be interpreted as 28 years, but rather envisaged the two periods of 'only a few years' as included within the 15, which was the true length of Naresuan's reign, and is the interpretation adopted by Coedès.¹⁴ The contradictory statement about 20 years, which is also incorrect, was probably added by the compiler of *S* from another tradition.

A notable feature of the above chronologies is the multiple possibilities for calculation which they provide. There is the result provided by modern arithmetic, which was not used by the Thai, and is only of interest for the clues it gives concerning van Vliet's own calculations. Then there is the traditional calculation from the inserted BE date for Naresuan's reign, which, taking the true 15 years of *Sc*, results in the true date for the end of Song Tham's reign. The alternative 20-year reign period for Naresuan found in *vV*, if added to the previous reigns as given, also provides very nearly the correct date for the reign of Song Tham, depending on the choice made at those points where *S* and *Sc* offer different possibilities. The same results will be obtained by using the maximum reign lengths from the erroneous BE date at the beginning of *S*. Thus the one thing which all of these schemes have in common is the goal of making the cumulative reigns reach the true dates for the Song Tham-Prasat Thong period. This would seem to be proof that *S* and *vV* as we have them represent a written tradition compiled at that time and including older traditional dates and periods which had to be in error since they did not add up to known contemporary dates.

13. See *S*, pp 385-386.

14. Coedès, *Sc*, pp 21-22.

It is also worthwhile to note that in spite of the different reign periods, and in mid-15th century of different kings, the dates of *S* on the whole are very close to those of *LP*, much closer than the chronology of the *1157-RA* tradition. For the first five reigns *S* and *LP* are always within one year of each other. Then there is serious divergence, due partly to the unlikely circumstance that in *S* three kings in a row have reigns of precisely 20 years. However, Intharacha's 37 years in *S* brings the chronologies back together for the reign of Ramathibodi II and they remain no more than two years apart for several more reigns.

Wyatt did not notice these details, due to his use of modern arithmetic, which led him to calculate that the total of all the reigns from 1351 to 1640 came to 307 years, thereby pushing the terminal date logically up to an impossible 1658 and placing the Burmese conquest of Ayutthaya in 1579 rather than 1569 (p. 8/189).

It would seem that van Vliet also worked with modern arithmetic, which may be the cause of some of the chronological confusion in the later reigns. The clearest evidence of this is in his statement about the first Siamese mission to Holland (p. 84/229). Van Vliet of course knew the correct date, 1607, but his modern arithmetic put that date in the reign of Naresuan, rather than that of Ekathotsarot-Ramesuan, where it belonged. From the reign of Song Tham-Intharacha van Vliet must have known the true dates and although he would have seen that the reign periods of his source eventually added up to an impossible total, he had no way to check them, and left them as they were.

Other examples of chronological confusion of events, the true dates of which are fairly certain, begin in the reign of Phra Thianracha, or King Maha Chakrapatthirat, and not all are due to van Vliet. For example (p. 74/218-9), it is implied that an attack on Ayutthaya by Patani (1563), the death of Thianracha (1558-9), and the death of the Burmese king (presumably Bayinnaung, 1581) all occurred within the same year. In this case the fault is probably not van Vliet's addition but confusion in the text from which he worked, and perhaps due to the circumstance that the Patani attack came in the same year as another Burmese invasion, and the deaths of the two kings, depending on the way the Thai records are read, could be interpreted as both having occurred in snake years, something which has more than once led to difficulties in the composition of chronicles¹⁵.

The next instance of such confusion may more easily be analyzed with reference to van Vliet's addition. Thus two Burmese attacks which seem to correspond to events dated elsewhere in about 1584¹⁶ bracket the death of the Burmese king (1581). For van Vliet, however, 1581 was only two years after the beginning of the reign of Maha Thammaracha, rather than twelve, and van Vliet has confused a Burmese pursuit of Naresuan after his incursion into Burma in 1584¹⁷ with one which may have occurred about one cycle earlier following Naresuan's escape from captivity in Burma, just over two years after the true date of the beginning of Maha Thammaracha's reign. But on this point see further below. In the Burmese attack of 1584 one of the leaders, according to *vV*, was Sarrathij, whom Wyatt hesitantly identified as Prince of Tharawaddy (pp. 78-9/224). There is no need for hesitation. In *LP* he is called Savatti and leads the same attack, and the Burmese chronicle relates that he

15. See the *LP* entries for the years 925, 930 and 943. It is not clear from *LP* whether Maha Chakrapatthirat died at the end of 930 or the beginning of 931. The Burmese chronicle says it was 931, which, like 943, when Bayinnaung died, was a snake year. See *Relationship With Burma-Part I*, The Siam Society, 1959, p 59.

16. The *LP* entry for 946, and *Relationship*, pp 126-128. The dates differ by one year in the two accounts.

17. *Ibid*.

had been made ruler of Chiang Mai in 1578¹⁸. *LP*, like *vV*, also mentions *bañā* Bassein as another leader in one of the same campaigns.

Van Vliet's responsibility for the next set of chronological errors, concerning Cambodia, is even clearer, and shows he was mixing information from some other source into his basic framework. Still in the reign of Maha Thammaracha, which for van Vliet ended in 1601, but for which the true date was 1590, *vV* mentions a Cambodian attack on Nakhon Ratchasima and yearly raids on the Siamese rivers. *LP* and the best Cambodian tradition seem to confirm that the former occurred in 1580 and the latter between 1575 and 1581.¹⁹ Then a punitive expedition was sent by the Thai, but it had to be called off due to the famous Burmese attack in which the Burmese Maha Uparacha was killed. The true date for this event was 1592.

Following this the great Thai invasion of Lovek of 1593-4 is described, although *vV* is in error in stating that the Cambodian king was captured, rather than his brother. Still in the reign of Maha Thammaracha *vV* includes the return of the Cambodian king (read his brother) to his throne, an event of 1601.

Due to this chronological squeezing in the text of *vV* the only clear political events of Naresuan's own reign are his campaigns in Burma between 1596 and 1605, plus a possible reference to a campaign in the second year of his reign, really 1592-93. There is also one more campaign into Cambodia which appears to correspond to events dated elsewhere to 1603,²⁰ but which were not a revolt by the new Cambodian king as *vV* writes, but a conflict among Cambodian princes in which the Thai aided the one whom they had restored to the throne. Unexplainable though, as Wyatt remarks, is that Naresuan is said to have gone from Cambodia to conquer Champa, something which finds no support in any other source. Could it be that there is here confusion of events of the 1590's when the Cambodian prince Ream Choeung Prey, who ultimately drove the Thai forces out after the invasion of 1593-4, then sent a Cambodian army to conquer Champa?

As I remarked before, and as Wyatt also noted (p. 8/191), the chronological confusion shows that van Vliet had some other source for the true dates of many events. It should not be thought that *vV* may possibly preserve a more accurate account than the standard chronicles or that it will "assist in opening, and hopefully settling, the question of (the) validity" of the chronology in "the period immediately following the Burmese sack of Ayudhya in 1569" (p 10/191). The true dates for wars with Burma and Cambodia in the latter half of the 16th century are fairly certain from the combined evidence of the Burmese, Cambodian and *LP* chronicles plus contemporary European writings,²¹ and van Vliet must

18. *Relationship* p 112.

19. A Cambodian attack overland is placed in 1580 by the *Nong* chronicle, for which the best published version is the Thai translation in *Prahjum bañsāvatār* /Prachum Phongsawadan (*PP*), part 1. See p 200 of the Guru Sabhā edition. Naval attacks are recorded in *LP* between 937 and 943.

20. These events are not absolutely clear in any source. They seem to be reflected in different ways in *LP*, date 965, *Nong* at the same date, p 205, *RA*, pp 208-209, where the date is one cycle too early, and in the fragmentary, but detailed, *Bañsāvatār laḥvaek* (Chronicle of Lovek), *PP*, Guru Sabhā edition, Vol 44, pp 274-275, where the date is 1605.

21. The chronicles are *Relationship*, *LP*, and *Nong*, cited above. The European evidence is *Les Voyages Adventureux de Fernand Mendez Pinto*, trans by Bernard Figuier, Paris 1628 [*on which see also Michael Vickery, review of *The Travels of Mendes Pinto*, edited and translated by Rebecca D. Catz, in *Asian Studies Review* (Australia), Volume 14, Number 3 (April 1991), pp. 251-253.*]; Reports from Europeans who were in Burma between 1569 and

have tried to insert these events in a framework which his ignorance of traditional arithmetic, and perhaps also the basic text he used, had distorted. Another bit of evidence for his use of different sources is the double mention of Chiang Mai as ‘Jangoma’ and ‘Tsieengh Maeij’ (p. 86/232, n.110), the first the common term used by Europeans of the time, and the second which van Vliet would have taken from his written Thai source, perhaps not realizing they were the same place.

As to textual content, there is somewhat more difficulty in identifying van Vliet’s sources than in the case of his chronology. Since the latter is the framework of *S* one could legitimately expect its textual matter to have influenced him, but in the last few reigns van Vliet clearly added much material in his own words and deriving from what he knew of recent events. In the early reigns, however, Wyatt’s characterization (pp. 8-9/191) of *vV*’s style is exactly that of *S*, although the latter is even more succinct. Thus, rarely does *vV* appear to be an exact translation of the extant *S*, and the text from which van Vliet worked must have been fuller. It is possible, however, to show that the model for *vV* was the *S* tradition, for both contain certain important textual diagnostic features which differentiate them from the other Ayutthayan chronicles, and *vV*’s entries often include a nearly verbatim translation of the opening sentence of each *S* reign concerning the succession of the king and the length of his reign.

These features begin in the reign of Ramesuan, the second king, both the reign of U Thong and the pre-U Thong details of *vV* being quite different from *S* and probably deriving, as Wyatt remarks (p. 9/189), from oral tradition. *vV*’s first two sentences on Ramesuan, “The son of the dead king succeeded his father in the kingdom peacefully when he was thirty years old. He was called Phra Ramesuan”, are almost verbatim for the corresponding passage in *S*. Wyatt remarks that, “no other source gives his age at accession”, evidently having neglected to check *S*.²² *vV* in this way supplies the ages of all the kings, something which occurs only irregularly in *S*, but where they are to be found they agree with *vV*. This is more evidence that van Vliet probably worked from a more complete text of the *S* type.

Next is the name of the third king, *guṇ lum baṇu* in *S* and tJaeu Couloangh Phongh Wo-ae (Chao Khunluang Pha-ngua) in *vV*, a name not found in the two major Ayutthayan chronicle traditions.²³

Another correspondence is the name of the fourth king, Thong Chan in *vV*, *Suvāṇṇacānd*, in *S*, whereas as Wyatt notes, “The usual form of his name is Thong Lan”²⁴.

The name of the seventh king is also common to *vV* and *S*. This is Nakhon In of Suphanburi who seized power in Ayutthaya. *LP*, as Wyatt remarks (n 42), calls him Intharacha, as does the *1157* tradition, while the name ‘Nakhon In’ is reserved in those texts for the Thai prince left to govern Angkor in the next reign. In this connection it should be noted that both *vV* and *S* ignore the invasion of Cambodia between 1384 and 1388 found in *1157* and *RA* as well as the conquest of Angkor recorded in 1431 by *LP* and 1421 by the long Ayutthayan chronicles.

For the following king the opening sentences of *vV* and *S* are nearly the same and both mention his personal name, Phrachao Sam (*vV*) or *samtec braḥ sām* (*S*) without referring to Chao Ai and Chao Yi and their duel.

1600 in *Publications of the Hakluyt Society* Extra Series, Vol X, pp 110-217; letters of Diego Beloso and Blas Ruiz de Hernan Gonzalez, who participated in the Cambodian events of the 1590’s, in Blair and Robertson, *The Phillipine Islands*, Vols IX and XV.

22. *vV*, p 60/203, n. 34; *S*, p 374.

23. Readers familiar with *RA* hold your fire. I shall get back to this point later.

24. *vV*, p 61/204, n. 38. Again *RA* is an exception.

The next diagnostic feature is the successor of Trailokanāth, Intharacha, who does not figure as king in the *LP* and *1157* traditions. As Wyatt notes, the dating of this period “is confused and complex” (n 47), and it is clear that *vV* and *S* are partners in one particular tradition.

After this *vV* includes more and more detail not found in *S* and which may come from quite different sources. *S* also has details, such as a summary after the first ten reigns, which may not have been in its own 17th-century ancestor. Nevertheless, there are still small clues showing the relationship between the two texts.

Thus the officials who killed the usurper, Khun Chinnarat, are called in *vV* Okphra Thainam and Okluang Ratchayut. In *1157* and *RA* the titles of these men are quite different, the two leaders being *Khun birendardeb* and *Khun indardeb*, but in *S* the first is called *varaudakaheṭhaca*, which the Thai translator rendered as *braḥ dāy nām*.²⁵

In the reign of the king known as Thianracha or Maha Chakrapat, the text of *S*, which calls him *Dehasin* or Deharājā, may have contributed to some of the confusion which we have already noticed in *vV*. Thus his reign is said there to have begun in a monkey year, which is the *LP* date 910/1548, in disagreement with *S*'s own chronology. Then the first event mentioned is in a pig year (*LP* 925/1563) when Burma invaded, and with this invasion the king's reign ends, as in *vV*, but with abdication, not death. There is no mention in *S* of the Patani attack or a Burmese king's death. Thus van Vliet could easily have been following a textual framework like the extant *S*, and the insertion of the Patani detail, which he probably obtained from elsewhere, could only fall at the end of the reign.

Although *S* has Maha Chakrapat become a monk, it does not bring him back, like the chronicles, to replace his son Mahin for a second reign. *S* and *vV* thus agree with *LP* in giving Chakrapat and Mahin one reign apiece, although *LP*'s periods are different.

In the next reign, of Mahathammaracha, there are more interesting correspondences. *vV* gives him the title Phra Mahathammaracha Phrachao Song Queen, of which Wyatt seems not to have understood the last two terms (p. 77/223, n. 90, explanation by Chris Baker). However, Song Queen should undoubtedly represent Song Khvae, ‘two river branches’, the ancient name of Phitsanulok, Mahathammaracha's own principality.²⁶ Here *S* is extremely interesting, calling this king *dviratnonāma*, “named ‘two jewels’”, which the Thai translator rendered as “Brah Mahadharmmaraja received a name meaning, ‘the king has two jewels [*kaev, ‘jewel’ for *khvae*, ‘river branch’*]””. This shows not only that *vV*'s unusual features still belong to the *S* tradition, but that the extant *S*, in its chronicle, is not an original Pali composition, but a translation from an older Thai text. Thus its author misunderstood the old name for Phitsanulok, สองแคว ‘two river branches’, as a scribal error for สองแก้ว, ‘two jewels’, and translated it that way in his Pali version, a circumstance which probably indicates that the old name was still current in the early 17th century, but had been forgotten in the late 18th, to be rediscovered by modern research into the Sukhothai inscriptions.²⁷

Further comparison with the *S* treatment of Mahathammaracha's reign shows that *vV*'s confusion in this period is at least partly due to the framework he took over from his model. First, *vV* devotes much attention to the story of Naresuan being held hostage for a time in

25. *S*, p 380, line 12. *Sc*, p 20, agrees with *1157* on these details. *LP* does not name these men at all.

26. For the relationship of Mahathammaracha to Phitsanulok see *RA*, pp 75-76, 83, and A.B. Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p 56. For Song Khvae, see Griswold, *Towards*, pp 6, 37, 40, 56. And see *S*, p 382.

27. The misunderstanding was especially easy when reading old-style mss, in which tone marks are often lacking and the letters ก and ก may be very hard to distinguish.

Pegu following the war of 1569, a story not part of the two Ayutthayan chronicles, nor of the Burmese chronicle, although it is solidly rooted in Thai tradition²⁸. This story is also found in *S*, where the famous duel with the Burmese Maha Uparacha comes immediately after Naresuan's escape when the Maha Uparacha leads a force to pursue him. This occurs, apparently, during the reign of Mahathammaracha. What is more likely to be the true story, since the better Ayutthayan chronicles, the Burmese chronicles, and European sources agree on it, is that the duel with the Maha Uparacha took place in 1592, in the beginning of Naresuan's own reign, but, according to the chronicles, the Maha Uparacha had led earlier campaigns into Siam in about 1584, 1585, and 1590²⁹. Naresuan also, whether ever a hostage or not, in the major Ayutthayan chronicles led a campaign into Burma, up to a place called *graeñ*/Khraeng, and retreated under pursuit in 1584³⁰, and it seems that these different campaigns have been confused in the tradition represented by *S* and *vV*. This confusion is also found in the two collections of 'testimony' from the end of the Ayutthaya period³¹, where there is only one campaign led by the Maha Uparacha, and it is in order to pursue Naresuan after his escape.

vV also has only one campaign led by the Maha Uparacha, but, correctly, does not make the duel a result of Naresuan's escape and places it after several other Burmese campaigns. Where *vV* seems to confuse two campaigns is in the mention of 'Creng', probably the *graeñ* which Naresuan invaded in 1584, in connection with Nong Sarai and the battle with the Maha Uparacha³².

The campaigns in which the Prince of Tharawaddy figures are not found in *S*, but the paragraph of *vV* relating Naresuan's attacks on Pegu, its surroundings, and Müang Hang near the end of his reign is very close to the wording of *S*, even though *vV* has no mention of Toungoo³³.

The *S* account of Naresuan's major invasion of Cambodia is different from *vV*, and even more in error, relating that Naresuan killed the Cambodian king after defeating him in a naval battle³⁴. The well-known true account is that the Cambodian king escaped to Laos while his brother was captured and taken to Ayutthaya³⁵.

For the remaining reigns, in which *vV* has much extra material, the significant details to compare with *S* are the royal titles, Ramesuan for Ekathotsarot, Intharacha for Song Tham, and Sri Thammarachathirat for Prasat Thong (in *S braḥ srī sudharrmarāj*), all of which are missing from the standard chronicles.

It is safe to conclude, then, that *vV* belongs first of all to the same tradition as *S*, textually as well as chronologically, even though much other material has been added.

28. See the two collections of 'testimony' from the end of the Ayutthaya period, *Gām hai kār jāv kruñ kau* and *Gām hai kār khun hlvañ hā vāt*, Bangkok, 2510, pp 89-91, 299-304; Prince Damrong's commentary in *RA*, p 365, W.A.R. Wood, *A History of Siam*, p 128.

29. *LP* dates 946, 947, 952. *Relationship*, pp 126-7, 135-6.

30. *LP* date 946. The Burmese chronicle says he tried to take Pegu, *Relationship*, p 126.

31. *Gām hai kār*, etc, op. cit., n 27, above, pp 89-94, 300-309.

32. Kreng, mentioned among Naresuan's conquests on pp 86-87, is probably the same place. Modern maps show a River Gyaing, graphic *graiñ*, at the same approximate location.

33. *vV*, p 86/231-2; *S*, p 385.

34. *S*, pp 384-385.

35. See the accounts of Beloso and Ruiz cited in n.20, above, and B.P. Groslier, *Angkor et le Cambodge au XVIe siècle*, Chap II.

Although the chronology generally gives an impression of less reliability than the later *LP*, and the textual matter where it can be checked is frequently garbled, *vV*'s sources nevertheless preserved certain genuine details of royal titles absent from later chronicles. The first example is in the titles attributed to U Thong after his founding of Ayutthaya. To illustrate the discussion I present them below (1) as they are given by *vV*, (2) as transcribed by Wyatt, (3) in my own version using Wyatt's phonetics, and (4) in a graphic transliteration of my reading as it would be in standard spelling and Thai script. For (1) and (2) see pp 18 and 59/201.

(1)	Somdit Pra	Raetsja	Rama tijbodij	srisoerin Thae	Borom
(2)	Somdet Phra	Racha	Ramathibodi	Sisurintha	Boromma
(3)	Somdet Phra	Racha	Ramathibodi	Srisurintha	Boromma
(4)	samtec braḥ	rāja	rāmādhīpafī	śrīsrindra	Parama
(1)	t'Jaccerae phad	Thieraeija	ramisoon	d'harmamij Craij	Dij'tsiou
(2)	chakkaphat	Thianracha	Ramesuan	Thammikarat (thi)	Chao
(3)	chakraphatthiracha		Ramesuan	Tharmmikarat	Decho
(4)	cākṛabarttirāja		rāmeśvara	dharmikarāja	Tejo
(1)	siaejij	baramma Thip	Thrij phova nadt thij Bis	Borroma Bophit	
(2)	Si Aiya	borommathip	Siphuwanatthibet	Borommabophit	
(3)	chaya	barmmathip	Triphuvanathibet	Borommabophit	
(4)	jayabarmmadeb		ṭribhūvanādhipeśa	Paramapabitra	

Following this there is 'Prae Thaeu Outongh' (Phra Thao U Thong), about which there is no controversy.

Wyatt's rendering seems to contain several anomalous, even improbable elements. All genuine titles of the 14th or 15th centuries consisted of elements which were meaningful in Sanskrit, Pali or one of the local languages, most often Khmer, and they fell into rather regular, recognizable patterns. Thus it is immediately clear that 'Thian', '(thi)', 'Si Aiya', and 'Si' before 'phuwanatthibet' are impossible, and, if, in fact, van Vliet had intended them as such, it would have been because he misunderstood titles he had heard from an informant.

In the transcription I have proposed all the elements are meaningful and traditional. Among those subject to controversy, proof than van Vliet intended 'Thier' in the way I have rendered it is to be found in the titles, among others, Woo-Rhae Rassae Thae Thieraya (p 27), Prae Anoet Tsiae Thieraij (p 43), and d'Harmae Raatsiae Thieraija (p 49), which Wyatt respectively transcribed, just as I have proposed, Woraratsadathirat (p 70/214), Phra Anuchathirat (p 87/233), and Thammarachathirat (p 94/241), and where 'Thianracha' is certainly correct, as the personal name of the king more formally known as Maha Chakrapat, *vV* has uniquely Prae then Nae Rhae Tsiae (pp 29, 72/217). As for dij t'siou = tejo/decho, t's/ts is *vV*'s usual way of rendering syllable initial ๓, as in Tsieeng May (เจียงใหม่), on p 43, tsiaeij for ๓๒๒ in Pratu Chai (pp 24, 66/210), and Prae Tsij Tsieeugh for พระจิมเจียง (pp 28, 71/215). There are also several other such examples. Where van Vliet clearly intended 'Thi chao', as in the expression *braḥ buddhi cau* (พระพุทธิเจ้า) he wrote Prae Probu dij t'Jaeu, with t'J as his usual rendering of syllable initial ๑ (pp 15, 55/197 where Wyatt inaccurately transcribed *buddhi* as *buddha*). For examples see t'Jan for Chan (จันท) in the titles Phra Phra ThongChan (p20, 61/204) and tJaeu for Chao (เจ้า) in the title Chao Ui (p 55/197). He was not, however, perfectly consistent, and examples of the opposite usage can be found. As for siaejij = *jaya* (ชัย), there is no other example of van Vliet transcribing ๓ by s, but since these

titles as a whole are known from epigraphy, and only *jaya* is meaningful in this position, my proposal is still acceptable.

For what is particularly interesting about these titles is that they are found in inscriptions from the reigns of kings Trailokanāth and Naray, but are entirely absent from extant chronicles, and have only recently been recognized as Ayutthayan³⁶. Minor differences in the epigraphic examples are absence of *rāja* after *samtec braḥ*, addition of *adhirāja* after *cākrabarttirāja*, and *ātideba* affixed to *jayabarrmadeb*.

Wyatt's assertion to the contrary (p 59/201, n 28), if the written documents of van Vliet's day were in the same state as the chronicles extant today, he was perfectly justified in saying, "they were never assumed by any other Siamese kings" (p 59/201). Some of the elements do, as Wyatt remarked, occur in various combinations in very many titles, but comparison is only meaningful when the same elements are found in the same order. Wyatt's citation of other examples from the laws is also curious. He refers to a new edition of the somewhat exotic Prince Ratburi edition³⁷, rather than the more accurate Lingat edition reproduced by Guru Sabha³⁸, and, in the examples he gives, the titles of Rama I (Chakri) and those of King Borommara II, do, in fact, bear formal resemblance to the *vV*, and Tenasserim, titles, but his choice of 'Ekathotsarot's' titles as another example is inexplicable. The actual title of the passage he cites is *ekādadharatha*, which may not *a priori* be assumed a corruption of Ekathotsarot, and the date 1565/1643 shows that it is certainly not Ekathotsarot in the commonly accepted sense of that term³⁹. Moreover, the only expressions identical to the *vV* titles are *samtec* and *paramapabitr*. The evidence of the laws is important though, for they do contain one nearly perfect, and other partial examples of the *vV* and Tenasserim titles, which help support, as I indicated elsewhere, the interpretation of these titles as Ayutthayan,⁴⁰ and the *vV* evidence is final proof, if any doubt still remained, that they

36. Michael Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: A Reinterpretation". *JSS* LXI (1), January 1973, pp 51-70.

37. *Kaṭhmāy lem 1*, Braḥ cau paramvaṅsdhoe kram hlvaṅ rājburī tirekrddhi, Commemoration volume for the cremation of Baldo Ambar Śrījaiyint, 2513/1970, reprint of the second edition of 1902.

38. *Kaṭhmāy trā sām dvaṅ*, Guru Sabhā 5 vols, numbered vols.1602-1606.

39. The only contemporary documents containing this type of title show that 'Ekathotsarot' may be a corrupt form and the genuine title Ekādaśaruda. See A B Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Devices and Expedients Vat Pa Mok, 1727 AD", *In Memoriam to Phya Anuman Rajadhon*, Siam Society, 1970, pp 149-150, and Prasarn Bunprakong. "The Royal Letters in Thai Language, Ayudhya Period", [in Thai], *Silpākon* IV (3), September 1960, pp 43-54. In the laws *ekādadharatha* is the common form, being found eleven times against one for *ekādaśaratha*/Ekathotsarot. Furthermore, the law to which Wyatt refers is one of those with a *cuḷāmaṇī* date (See Wyatt's "The Thai 'Kata Maṅdiarapāla' and Malacca", *JSS* LV (2), July 1967, 279-186), which, if the *cuḷāmaṇī* hypothesis is correct, means that its date 1565 is equivalent to AD 1753 in the reign of King Borommakot. These points cannot be discussed here, and I only wish the reader to be aware that the Eka-type titles are a very complex problem on which practically no work had been done. [*See analysis and critique of the *cuḷāmaṇī* hypotheses, which so badly led Wyatt astray in his work cited here, in Vickery, "Prolegomena to Methods for Using the Ayutthayan Laws as Historical Source Material", *JSS*, vol 72 (1984), pp. 37-58. *]

40. Vickery, 'Tenasserim', p 57, n 25.

were an old, eventually forgotten, Ayutthayan tradition. It is tempting to speculate that *vV* here preserves a contemporary datum and that these were the true titles of Ramathibodi I.

Another genuine old title preserved in *vV* is Phra Borommaracha Thibodi/*braḥ parama rājādhipatī* (p 63/206), also missing from other chronicles, but found in at least two 15th-century inscriptions.⁴¹ In *vV* it is given to the king who corresponds to Borom Rachathirat II, (father of Trailokanāth) of other texts and whose *LP* dates are 1424-1448. The inscriptions in question are number 49, dated 1418, which Griswold and Prasert have interpreted as belonging to Intharacha (*vV*'s Nakhon In), Trailokanāth's grandfather,⁴² and a gold plate found in Suphanburi and dated 1?5?. This date has been restored by Maha Cham Thongkhamwan as *śaka* 1357/1435 AD on the grounds that inscription 49 proves *rājādhipatī* to have been a title of Borom Rachathirat II, within whose reign this date would fall, which is not a sufficient reason, nor is it even accurate, since number 49 belongs to the reign of Intharacha, not Borom Rachathirat⁴³. However, the restoration itself is not arguable, since the only other plausible hare years with '5' in the tens position are 1153/1231 and 1453/1531, the first of which is too early for this type of Ayutthayan inscription and the second of which falls at a time when it is believed the ruling king had quite different titles⁴⁴. The contents of the latter inscription also helps to date it. In addition to the king it includes a second person, *braḥ rāmeśvara*/Ramesuan, in the act which it records, and according to *LP* the king at that date had a son, Ramesuan, who later became King T Trailokanāth.

One more epigraphic occurrence of this title is worth a brief note. It is found in a 14th-15th century Khmer inscription of Angkor which is totally illegible except for two royal titles, *rājādhipatirāja* and *dharmikarājādhirāja*⁴⁵. According to *LP parama rājādhirāja* II, whose real title it now appears included *rājādhipatī*, was the conqueror of Angkor in 1431, and it is tempting, even if illegitimately speculative, to suggest that the inscription included a record of that conquest.

We may now devote some attention to the ways in which *vV* contributes, and does not contribute, to certain problems of early Ayutthayan history. One of the most important of these is the question of relations between Ayutthaya and Cambodia. There is a good deal of reference to Cambodia in the reigns of Mahathammaracha and Naresuan, but both the details and the chronology are confused and it is only possible to disentangle them by reference to the better information of *LP* and contemporary European reports.

⁴¹ In the original published text I wrote "Ayutthayan inscriptions", but I have subsequently realized that No. 49, found in Sukhothai, may have belonged to that polity instead. Nevertheless, *vV* is evidence that the title *rājādhipatī* was (also?) a royal title in Ayutthaya. See Michael Vickery, "A Guide Through Some Recent Sukhothai Historiography", *JSS* 66, Part 2, July 1978, pp. 182-246

42. A B Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 1", *JSS* LVI (2), July 1968, pp 230-247.

43. *PCSA*, p 28. See also Vickery, "Tenasserim", pp 61-63. By any of the known Ayutthayan chronologies these two inscriptions would belong to different consecutive reigns, but it is well-nigh impossible that the two kings had exactly identical titles, (*braḥ*) *parama rājā dhīpatī srī mahā cākrabartirāja*, and these inscriptions are probably evidence that the Ayutthayan reign sequence at this point is wrong in all the chronicles.

44. No Phutthangkun. However, there are no contemporary documents from his reign.

45. Inscription K.489 of the Cambodian corpus. See Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* [textes] III, p 229.

Moving back in time, in the reign of Chaiyaracha, *vV* mentions that the king, “waged war often with Cambodia”, and, “toward the end of his life went to the borders of Cambodia and captured the city of Lamphun”. Wyatt understandably exclaims that this is “an apparent contradiction Lamphun is hardly near the borders of Cambodia! *LP* makes no reference to warfare in the east” (pp 70-71/215, n 71). Actually, the passage provides proof for the solution of a very interesting historiographic problem which I discuss thoroughly elsewhere⁴⁶. This is the existence of two quite different terms, *Kamboja* and *Kambujā*, the latter meaning since early Angkorean times the kingdom of Cambodia and based on the etymology *kambu-ja*, ‘born of Kambu’, and the former the name of one of the sixteen great divisions of classical India, later transferred to Southeast Asia as part of a geographical system and localized in the Burmese Shan States, and in northern and central Siam⁴⁷. Eventually the two terms became conflated, leading to all sorts of confusion. This is clearest in Tome Pires, who describes Cambodia encircling Siam from the east and around the north to the borders of Pegu⁴⁸; Pinto who makes the King of Cambodia (probably either Mahathammaracha of Phitsanulok or Phraya Sawankhalok) one of the leaders of the group who placed Thianracha on the throne⁴⁹; and the present passage of *vV*, which is conclusive evidence. In all of the other chronicles, Chaiyaracha warred more than once in the north, but never with Cambodia, and his contemporary, Pinto, had heard of the campaigns⁵⁰. Van Vliet had obviously heard ‘Kamboja’ applied to the north, or his written source used the term, and he considered it to be the same as the name of the country to the east.

The most serious result of the *Kamboja/Kambujā* confusion is the conquest of Cambodia placed by *1157* in approximately 1351-52 and borrowed from that source by the Cambodian chronicles. It is most probably due to the *Jinakālamālī* description of conflict in *Kamboja*, meaning central Siam, in the reign of Ramathibodi I⁵¹, but 18th-19th century writers no longer understood it correctly. This is not as radical a revision of history as some might think. Wolters, in his attempt to find solid support for a Thai invasion of Angkor in the reign of Ramathibodi, recognized that the *Jinakālamālī* story and the entry in the *1157* chronicles were referring to the same event, and in the last few years scholars conversant with the Thai texts have recognized that the ‘Kamboja’ of the *Jinakālamālī* refers to Siam⁵².

46. In my dissertation on Cambodian and Thai chronicles. [*Michael Vickery, “Cambodia After Angkor, The Chronicular Evidence for the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries”, Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1977, pp. 369-377, not yet available when the present article was written.*]

47. See *Sāsanavamsa*, edited by Mabel Bode, Pali Text Society, p 15; G.P. Malalasekera, *Dictionary of Pali Proper Names*, I, pp 526-7; Dr Than Tun, “Administration Under King Thalun”, *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, LI (2), December 1968, pp 173-188.

48. A. Cortesão, ed, *The Suma Oriental of Tome Pires*, pp 108-109, 111-112, 388.

49. Pinto, op cit, p 943.

50. *Ibid.*

51. G Coedès, ‘Documents sur l’histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental’, *BEFEO* XXV, 1925, pp 1-201, see pp 99-100.

52. O.W. Wolters, “The Khmer King at Basan (1371-3), and the Restoration of the Cambodian Chronology During the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries”, *Asia Major* XII (1), 1966, see pp 8-81; O.W. Wolters, “A Western Teacher and the History of Early Ayudhya”, *Saṅgamsāstr paridāśn, The Social Sciences Review*, Special Number 3, June 1509 (1966), p 97; A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, “Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 11 (2)”, *JSS* LXI (2), July 1973, pp 107-108; Charnvit Kasetsiri, *The Rise of Ayudhya: A History of Siam in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University,

None of them, however, saw the final implication of this for the first ‘invasion of Cambodia’ in the long Ayutthayan chronicles, a story which may now be replaced in its proper context.

In fact, the most important problem in the history of early Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations is the date of one or more conquests of Angkor supposedly carried out in the 14th-15th centuries. All Cambodian chronicles mention a pair of invasions dated variously 1352/1372, 1388/1408, 1369/1389, 1352/1457, 1472/1492, etc (the list is not complete), the late Thai chronicles have three conquests, 1351-52, 1384-88, and 1421, but *LP*, generally considered most accurate, has only one such conquest, in 1431. The latest published work on the subject seeks to prove that the true dates were 1369 and 1389⁵³. The *vV* chronicle records none of these at all, and does not even mention Cambodia from the end of the reign of U Thong to that of Chaiyaracha, where, as we have seen, it is used inaccurately. The first reaction is thus that *vV* provides no evidence for any invasion theory, even though, because of its extremely succinct text, its silence is not evidence against any invasion either.

There is, however, a curious story from the reign of U Thong (pp 59-60/202-3). According to this, after ruling about ten years, thus in about 1360, U Thong left Ayutthaya on the advice of astrologers, and moved to Cambodia where he built Nakhon Luang (Angkor). After nine more years, or in about 1369, he left his son in Nakhon Luang and returned to Ayutthaya where he died. Both Wyatt and Charnvit Kasetsiri have taken this story as support for Wolters’ thesis of an invasion in 1369, Wyatt believing that “van Vliet reinforces the Royal Autograph Version’s dating of the first Thai attack on Angkor, as against the later date of *LP*”⁵⁴.

This is a very dubious conclusion. An alternative explanation for the *RA* entry has been proposed above. As for Wolters, through a very fastidious analysis of Chinese sources and, frequently erroneous, French translations of Khmer chronicles, he sought to prove that there was an invasion, not sometime in the 1360’s or sometime in the reign of Ramathibodi, but precisely in 1368-1369. If *vV* has a disguised account of an invasion, it was in 1360, something which would quite contradict Wolters’ calculations.

There is, in any case, a better explanation for *vV*’s story. Its chronological schemes have shown that it was probably composed about the time van Vliet worked on it, and it is known that both Song Tham and Prasat Thong were frequently preoccupied with Cambodia, attempting to assert suzerainty which the Cambodians denied and were strong enough to resist⁵⁵. Prasat Thong, moreover, seems to have had a deeper interest in his neighbour, for he copied the plan of Angkor Wat, built two temples modelled on it, and at one point planned to give the classical name for Angkor, *yaśodhara*, to one of his palaces⁵⁶. The *vV* text makes U

pp. 95-97 [*now published as East Asia Historical Monographs, Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press, 1976. See pp. 64-65. See also my review, “A New Tamnan about Ayutthaya, *JSS* LXVII, 2 (July 1979), pp. 123-86; **and in this volume, pp. ...***].

53. O.W Wolters, “The Khmer King at Basan”.

54. *vV*, p.10/191, p. 60/202, n 33; Charnvit, op cit [*thesis, p 177, book p. 110*].

55. *vV*, p 90/236; and see van Vliet’s other works, “Description of the Kingdom of Siam”, trans. Ravenswaay, *JSS* 7(1), 1910, p 36; and *Historiael Verhael*, etc, ed. Seiichi Iwao, Toyo Bunko, Tokyo, 1958, p 200. [*In addition to the European writings, the Cambodian chronicles record unsuccessful Ayutthayan attacks in 1622-23, events which have been expunged from the Thai chronicles and from the work of Thai-centric western historians, such as David K. Wyatt in his *Thailand A Short History**]

56. *RA*, pp 428-429; Tri Amatyakul, *Silpa sāmāy ayudhayā* [Art of the Ayutthaya Period], Kram Silpakar, 2510, p. 52; Hiram W Woodward, Jr, “The Art and Architecture of the Ayutthaya Period”, Kram silpakar 2514, p 64.

Thong the founder of most of the important towns of south central and peninsular Siam, the absurdity of which Wyatt correctly indicates⁵⁷, and what is more natural than to make him, in such a text, the founder of Angkor as well? This would have provided an ancient justification for the ardently desired suzerainty. The date 1369 is, I repeat, not the time when *vV* makes U Thong go to Cambodia, but the year in which he returned, and return was made necessary by an even older tradition, perhaps true, that U Thong/Ramathibodi had died that year in Ayutthaya. We must finally conclude, I think, that *vV* contributes nothing to an understanding of Ayutthayan conquests of Angkor.

Another historiographic problem is “the bi-polar interpretation of Thai politics in this period (14th century) that has featured in the recent work of A. B. Griswold, O. W. Wolters, and others” (p 63/206, n 44). Wyatt feels *vV*'s remark that during the reign of Phra Nakhon In “the land was burdened with internal wars, but he conciliated the two parties”, is confirmation of this bi-polar interpretation.

I think it is time to subject this bi-polar theory to critique before it takes on too much of a life of its own and becomes a basic fact on which to build further hypotheses. The ‘bi-polarity’ refers first of all to rivalry between Ayutthaya and Suphanburi, something about which there can be no doubt if we accept any version of the Ayutthayan chronicles as at all factual. Wolters, who originated the ‘bi-polar interpretation of Thai politics’, went much further, though, and claimed that the Suphanburi house, which was ethnically Thai, followed a policy of conquering Sukhothai and other northern neighbours, while the house of Ramathibodi, perhaps Mon, and originally from Lopburi, was interested in conquering Angkor, and that the foreign policy of early Ayutthaya shifted as kings of these two houses alternated in the 14th century⁵⁸. His views on this fall into line with his conviction that the two conquests of Angkor occurred in 1369 and 1389 in the reigns of Ramathibodi and his son Ramesuan. Griswold accepted the bi-polar theory, but for him Ramathibodi was definitely Thai while the Suphanburi house “was perhaps more Mon or Khmer”, and his position is puzzling since he also emphatically accepts the *LP* chronology which places the sole invasion in 1431, in the reign of Borommarachathirat of the Suphanburi house⁵⁹.

Wolters also based his interpretation on the existence of the two major Thai chronicle traditions, *LP*, which ignores Cambodia before 1431, and which he therefore attributed to the Suphanburi house, and the *I157* group which has three invasions at earlier dates, and which would have been a chronicle drawn up by the Ramathibodi faction. This is extremely unlikely, since *LP* only dates from 1680, long after both houses had died out, and *I157*, both in its textual framework and chronology, derives from *LP* and probably did not exist in its present form before the end of the 18th century⁶⁰. As for its accounts of war with Cambodia, the first, in the 1350's has been explained, the second, in the 1380's, is filled with anachronistic details and must have been borrowed from a story belonging at a later date, and the last, in 1421, is the story which *LP* places in 1431. Thus in both traditions there is only

57. *vV*, pp. 56, 57, 59/185-190, nn. 10, 12, 16, 30.

58. Wolters, “The Khmer King at Basan”, pp 82-84; “A Western Teacher”, pp 96-97.

59. A.B. Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 31; A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, “Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 1”, p 209, and EHS No. 3, *JSS* LVII (1), January 1969, p. 62.

60. The proof of this is too long to even summarize here. See [*Michael Vickery, “Cambodia After Angkor”, , especially chapters 8-10; and Michael Vickery, "The Composition and Transmission of the Ayudhya and Cambodia Chronicles", In *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, ed., by Anthony Reid and David Marr, ASAA Southeast Asia Publications Series, 1979, pp. 130-154.*]

one possibly genuine record of an invasion of Cambodia, for which the best date so far is *LP*'s 1431.

What *vV* seems to be noting is the conflict between Suphanburi and Ayutthaya for domination of the Menam basin, something which is adequately documented, but there are no grounds for extending this to a bi-polarity of policy, which may, of course, have existed, but about which there is no information in the extant texts.

It is perhaps time now to say a little more about *vV*'s treatment of the pre-Ayutthaya period, something which does not appear to derive from the *S* tradition. As mentioned above, van Vliet listed three different legends concerning a first founding of Siam about 2000 years before, and these are of course folklore. Of more interest is his story of the background of U Thong, a Chinese prince exiled from China. Thus we have one more version of the U Thong story, and a new etymology for the name U Thong, as due to his marriage with a Chinese princess named Pacham Thong (p 57/109).

U Thong is also said to have built the cities of Langkasuka, Ligor, Kui, Phetburi, Chongh (?), Cout-Thiam (?), Bankgkok, Nakhon Chaisri, Phitsanulok, Sukhothai, Kamphaengphet, and Angkor in addition to Ayutthaya. As Wyatt notes, most of these claims are fantastic⁶¹, and it is therefore strange that he wishes to take seriously the account of U Thong's sojourn at Angkor, which, in *vV*, is intimately connected with the story that he built that city. When a source is full of details known to be in error, it is hardly legitimate to simply pick out other details and declare them to be important new discoveries.

Neither is *vV*'s mention of Langkasuka as surprising as Wyatt seems to feel.⁶² Although "no other Thai historical source" mentions it (p 10/192,198), and it required Wheatley's work on Chinese sources to locate it to the satisfaction of western scholars, Langkasuka is a part of Malay tradition, and many Malays, at least in the northern states, 'know' where it was even if they have never heard of Wheatley or the scholarly discussion concerning the place. Given the extent of Dutch activity in Patani, they could easily have picked up local traditions. Of course, this tradition could also have still been current in Ayutthaya and, together with U Thong's other activities in the peninsula would reflect current preoccupation with that area in the reigns of Song Tham and Prasat Thong. As I see it, none of the U Thong stories may yet be accepted as true, but each is due to particular interests of the Ayutthayan court at the time it was written down.⁶³ This is also something that should be noted by proponents of n-polar theories of early Ayutthayan politics. Early reports make quite clear that in the 14th and 15th centuries Ayutthaya asserted strong claims to the peninsula all the way down to Malacca, yet there is little sign of this in any Ayutthayan chronicle except *vV*, where it comes through in legendary fashion.⁶⁴ This 'pole' was thus important during reigns of both the early royal houses, and if it is not given sufficient attention in the standard chronicles it is probably because they were written at times when the capital's attention was directed chiefly to other regions and the peninsula was no longer a major problem.

Above I noted the concurrence of *vV* and *S* in certain details not found in other chronicles. In fact, some of these details appear in *RA*, although not in its direct ancestors of

61. *vV*, notes 10, 12, 16, 30.

62. *vV*, pp 10, 56, and n 10.

63. A number of these stories have been collected and discussed by Charnvit Kasetsiri, op cit, chapter 4, whose interpretation differs from mine.

64. For comment and further references see O.W. Wolters, *The Fall of Srivijaya in Malay History*, pp 108-9, 154-5, 169. The standard chronicles mention one attack on Malacca in 1455 (*LP*) or 1441 (*RA*).

the 1157 tradition, nor in *LP*. The circumstance that *RA*, just because it is the Royal Autograph Chronicle, has become a sort of official version, has obscured the fact that it is the final link in a long chain of transmission, and as a source of history is much less valuable than its several extant ancestors. The chain of transmission that led to *RA*'s incorporation of details from the *vV*-*S* tradition is rather easy to determine.

Sāṅgītiyavaṇṇ was compiled by Somdet Phra Phonnarat⁶⁵, who, together with his pupil, Prince Paramunuchit Chinorot, prepared in 1807 a version of the 1157 chronicle⁶⁶. Later on, in 1850, Prince Paramanuchit wrote a short chronicle (*Saṅkhep*), which was an abridgement of the 1157 tradition, but included some of the diagnostic features of the *S*-*vV* tradition, such as the names of the Suphanburi princes and the reign of Intharacha following Trailokanāth. At the time these details must have been taken over from *S*, the work of Prince Paramanuchit's teacher, since the earlier versions of the 1157 tradition did not contain them. Then when *RA* was prepared in the reign of King Mongkut these features, for unknown reasons, were adopted, probably from *Saṅkhep*, in preference to the pure 1157 tradition. This is the reason for my statement above that these details are not part of either major tradition.

The evidence on the filiation of these texts and the role of Somdet Phra Phonnarat in their preparation provides material for some interesting speculation about his view of the historian's task and his beliefs concerning the true history of Ayutthaya, for the works in which he had a hand comprise three different chronologies and for certain events and periods two differing textual traditions. There is *S*, which he continued beyond the *vV* period right up to the destruction of Ayutthaya in 1767 and the ensuing disintegration of the kingdom. Besides its own unique chronology, which is found in *vV*, both *S* and *Sc* contain a number of inserted dates, probably from the hand of Somdet Phra Phonnarat, and which agree with the tradition of *LP*, not rediscovered by later historians until the 20th century. The third chronology he used is that of 1157, one version of which he prepared. Certain questions thus come to mind. Did he favour any one version as being most accurate? Was he concerned only with preserving all old traditions? Did such considerations trouble him at all?

At least we now know that what had hitherto appeared as his own, chronologically peculiar, composition was a much older history which he preserved and prolonged. One can certainly agree with Wyatt (p 10/193) on the importance of the publication of van Vliet's version of this older history, but its importance, I feel, lies in its evidence for the analysis of Ayutthayan historiography rather than for any startling contribution to our knowledge of the facts of early Ayutthayan history.

65. His title has been variously transcribed elsewhere as Phonrat, Wannarat, Wanratna, Banaratn, Vanaratn.

66. For more details and further references see David K Wyatt, "The Abridged Royal Chronicle of Ayudhya of Prince Paramānuchitchinōrot", *JSS* LXI (1), January 1973, pp 25-50, see pp 26-27.