

## **The Old City of 'Chaliang'--'Srī Satchanalai'--'Sawankhalok' a Problem in History and Historiography<sup>1</sup>**

*Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 78, Part 2 (1990), pp. 15-29.

The old city which is under discussion here is that located about 50 km north of Sukhothai on the west side of the Yom river, and 14 km south of the Amphoe administrative center officially named Srī Satchanalai, but locally known as Hat Siaw.<sup>2</sup> Just 2-7 km north of the old city extend the ancient ceramic kiln fields of Pa Yang and Ban Koh Noi which have received much archaeological attention in recent years, and which must have constituted a major economic activity for several centuries, although they are unmentioned in any legendary or historical sources.<sup>3</sup>

This old city and the names which have been attributed to it have come under new attention as a result of archaeological study of the kilns and their wares, the transformation of the area into a 'historical park' at the hand of the Fine Arts Department, and the new Rām Khamhaeng controversy which involves both Sukhothai and Sri Satchanalai.<sup>4</sup>

Because some of the material to be examined, and conclusions reached, impinge on problems of the history of the Kingdom of Sukhothai in a wider sense and on the status of the Rām Khamhaeng inscription, and because another historian has recently discussed some of this material in connection with that inscription, I hasten to state at the outset that those issues are not what is of primary concern here.<sup>5</sup> This paper was conceived as part of a historical

<sup>1</sup> Research for this paper and writing of a first draft was done while I was attached to the Centre for Asian Studies, University of Adelaide, working for the Thai Ceramics Archaeological Project and the Research Centre for Southeast Asian Ceramics, and supported by a grant from the Australian Research Grants Scheme. Much of my familiarity with the old city which has permitted me to make the observations below results from conversations with, and on the spot guidance by, Don Hein, who carried out the kiln archaeology for the Thai Ceramics Archaeological Project, and whose knowledge of the area and its ancient constructions is unparalleled.

<sup>2</sup> These are road distances; as the crow flies they would be shorter.

<sup>3</sup> Don Hein, "'Bullet' Coins Excavated at Sisatchanalai, Thailand" p. 1, the ceramic industry "operated from about the tenth century AD for...about six hundred years....The site contains the ruins of about one thousand kilns...also remains of about one hundred metal furnaces"; Don Hein and Mike Barbetti, "Sisatchanalai and the Development of Glazed Stoneware in Southeast Asia".

<sup>4</sup> See Michael Vickery, "The Ram Khamhaeng Inscription, A Piltdown Skull of Southeast Asian History?"; "Piltdown Skull--Installment 2", in *The Ram Khamhaeng Controversy*, Collected Papers, Edited by James R. Chamberlain, 1991, pp. 3-52, 333-418; online in Michaelvickery.org; and "Piltdown 3: Further Discussion of the Ram Khamhaeng Inscription", in this volume, pp. 000-000.]

<sup>5</sup> See Betty Gosling, "Where is Rām Khamhaeng's Stupa?"

background study of the development and decline of the 'Old City' as a ceramic production center, and its narrower purpose is to determine which of the names in question were attached to it at different times in the past.

The reason for placing the names 'Srī Satchanalai' (*sajjanālai*), 'Chaliang' (*jalyan*) and 'Sawankhalok' (*savarrgalok*) in single quotation marks is because the names themselves involve historical and historiographical problems, not the least of which is the identities of the places to which they were attributed in the past. That is, did they always, as in current opinion, represent a single location, or two, or three?

There are even problems with the literal meanings of the names. If '*sajjanālai*' could be understood as Sanskrit 'abode of good people', this gloss does not fit the forms '*sejanālai*' or '*sajanālai*' found in some inscriptions; and if '*savarrgalok*' means 'heaven's world', the origin of the name may have been '*sangalok*' ('sangkhalok') which cannot be explained in the same way.<sup>6</sup> The third name 'Chaliang' (*jalyan*), which must be from a non-Thai language, has so far not been understood, and it should probably be investigated in connection with the still-occurring toponym '*chaliang*' (*chalian*), found, for instance, in the village named 'Ban Kong Chaliang', just east of the mountain Khao Luang, some 12 km south of Old Sukhothai, and in the name of a stream, 'Huay Khlong Wang Chaliang' running 20-25 km to the northeast of Kamphaeng Phet.<sup>7</sup>

Lest linguistic purists object that the initial low consonant of the historic term and initial high consonant of the modern names make the identification impossible, I must emphasize that we are in the domain of popular etymological reinterpretation of foreign term(s) in which anything may happen. Thus after Old Thai *j* devoiced to /ch/ the local population might well have adopted a pronunciation of the initial short syllable /cha?/, or perhaps even pronounced it

---

<sup>6</sup> Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*, p. 1135, *sajjana*, 'well-born, respectable, virtuous'. Other possible etymologies for *sajjana* are 'equipment, preparation', 'memorization (of scripture)'; for '*sajja*' 'silver', a kind of tree, or resin; or understood as *sa/se-jana* 'with people'. None of these at the moment helps in resolution of any historical question. See further below, pp. 53-56, for discussion of *saikhkalok/savarrgalok*.

<sup>7</sup> In the title and in my text these and all other Thai terms and toponyms are spelled according to rough phonetics and as is common in modern Thai romanization. In parentheses I have indicated transliterations from their most regular forms in Thai script, and these or original spellings will be used in citations from original sources or where attention to orthography is important. Nevertheless, inconsistency abounds in the original sources, with '*sajjanālai*', sometimes *sejanālai*, also written with final -*lay* or -*laya*, and Sukhothai transcribed variously with final -*dai*, -*daiy*, -*dáy*. *Jalyan* represents the orthography of the inscriptions, whereas chronicles and laws write *jalian*. Thus the apparent consistency introduced into transliteration by A.B. Griswold and Dr. Prasert na Nagara in their "Epigraphic and Historical Studies" (cited hereafter as *EHS* and number) is misleading, and sometimes suggests false etymologies. The toponyms with 'Chaliang' are from the Royal Thai Survey Department's 1:250,000 maps. Khao Luang is marked there with the elevation 1185±.

as a consonant cluster /chl/ in such a way that modern surveyors understood it as high consonant *ch*.

The official view on the location(s) of places bearing these three names, concretized in the writings of Prince Damrong Rajanubhab (1862-1943) is that there was a site named Chaliang at the bend in the River Yom just 4 km south of the old city; then one of the early Sukhothai kings added constructions (i.e. the old city under discussion here) above Chaliang and renamed the entire area Srī Satchanalai; finally in the Ayutthaya period both Chaliang and Srī Satchanalai together were renamed Sawankhalok. The same view is upheld in the Department of Fine Arts report on the archaeology of Wat Chang Lom in which the last name change is dated to B.E 2099/A.D. 1556 in the reign of King Mahā Chakrabartirāj. This is erroneous, as I shall show.<sup>8</sup>

The evidence which led Prince Damrong to this reasoning was: (1) inscription no. 1, that of 'Rām Khamhaeng', mentions Sukhothai (*sukhodai*) and Srī Satchanalai several times, in particular as a place where Rām Khamhaeng buried relics and constructed a *cedi* over them, and Chaliang once, which shows that Chaliang and Srī Satchanalai were distinct sites, and that there is no question of the former simply having been renamed to become the latter; (2) in the same inscription Rām Khamhaeng is said to have placed an inscription at a temple in Chaliang called Srī Ratnathāt, which 'must be' the one at the bend of the river, now known popularly as Wat Phra Prang, (3) the Ayutthayan "Law on Abduction", ostensibly dated 1356, pairs Chaliang with Sukhothai, without mention of Srī Satchanalai, (4) no other inscription than no. 1 mentions Chaliang, and its mention there is because Rām Khamhaeng placed an inscription in Chaliang, not in Srī Satchanalai, while (5) Chaliang, is not mentioned in other inscriptions because by then (14th century) it had been included in the new Srī Satchanalai, and (6) although everything written at Sukhothai [except no. 1], that is inscriptions, name only Srī Satchanalai, material written elsewhere, such as the chronicles of Chiang Mai or the Ayutthayan laws, show the name Chaliang, but not Srī Satchanalai, "to such an extent that one can say the two names are not found together in the same text"-- the other political centers saw no point in using a new name (Srī Satchanalai), and continued to use the old name which they knew (Chaliang).<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> H.R.H. Somdet Krom Phraya Damrong Rajanubhap, *Nithan boranā khadi* (NB) ['Antiquarian Tales'], pp. 220-221; Krom Silpakorn [Department of Fine Arts], *Wat Chang Lom [Vat jāñ lòm]* (DFA, Chang Lom), p. 3.

<sup>9</sup> NB, 217-221; A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies" (EHS) 9, p. 217. Gosling, p. 268, has erred in accepting from Prince Damrong the view that the name Srī Satchanalai "was an official, honorific one...coined by Rām Khamhaeng". That was part of a provisional hypothesis which Prince Damrong later modified (see his p. 217), and it is in any case infirmed by the evidence of inscription 2 presented below. And of course, by now, it is certain that nothing may be accepted from Inscription no. 1.

Now first of all Prince Damrong was mistaken about the distribution of the two names Chaliang and Srī Satchanalai, partly because not all of the inscriptions now known were available to him. At least three more, nos. 2, 10, and 38 contain the name Chaliang, and in nos. 2 and 38 Srī Satchanalai is also found, while at least two northern chronicles, *Jinakālamālīpakarn* of Chiang Mai and *Tāmnān Mūlaśāsanā* of Lamphun refer to Satchanalai.

A.B. Griswold and Prasert ḥa Nagara, who did know all of the inscriptions discovered since Prince Damrong's time, still opted for an equivalent explanation. Chaliang "...in the thirteenth and the fourteenth century...was the second most important city of the kingdom of Sukhodaya...it was known as Sajjānālaya....[s]ome of the inscriptions of Sukhodaya make a distinction between Sajjanālaya and Chalieng; but later the two names are used interchangeably". As for non-epigraphic sources, in the Ayutthaya chronicles "the whole complex is called Salieng, which is a doublet of Chalieng; in the Chieng Mai Chronicle it is called Chalieng, except in one entry where it is called Chieng Chün; in Y[uan] P[hai] it is called Chieng Chün, except in one place where it is called Chalieng".<sup>10</sup>

Let us first review the relevant contexts to see how solid these conclusions about the names 'Satchanalai', 'Chaliang', and 'Sawankhalok' really are.

### The epigraphic evidence

The occurrences of these names in the Sukhothai inscriptions other than no. 1 are as follows:

-Inscription 2 (1361?): side 1, near the beginning, lines 8-9, Srī Nāv Nām Thum, an ancestor of the inscription's protagonist "built (or ruled) in two *nagar*, one named Nagar Sukhodai, one named Nagar Srī Sejanālai..."; line 10, "founded a *brah śrī ratnadhbātu* beside the water in *nagar* Sukhothai" [broken passage]...line 12, *mōan* Jalyañ...[broken passage]"; lines 23- 25, "Ba Khun Pān Klāñ Hāv captured *mōan* Srī Sejanālai....Ba Khun Phā Möañ took his army to...Srī Sejanālai and Sukhothai";<sup>11</sup> side 1, lines 36-37, Rāmarāj built a *brah śrī*

---

<sup>10</sup> A.B. Griswold and Prasert ḥa Nagara, "A Fifteenth-Century Siamese Historical Poem", p. 129.

<sup>11</sup> Thus the name 'Srī Satchanalai' dated from before Rām Khamhaeng. The interpretation 'ruled', and the construction of a *ratnadhbātu* in Sukhothai are from a new reading produced at a seminar in 1980, while 'built' was the earlier interpretation. See *Śilā cāru'k sukhoday hlak 2 (cāru'k vat śrī jum)*, Bangkok, National Library, 2527 [1984]. In the new reading it is also clear that Chaliang was distinct from Srī Satchanalai, although this inference could not be made with certainty from the older reading. I have earlier, in "Piltdown Skull--Installment 2", note 29, called attention to what I consider the partly unconvincing circumstances of the new reading, "in which hitherto invisible passages, entire sentences...were suddenly revealed", and I am pleased that it helps my case here. An apparent further development from the new reading, "In the time of Ba khun s'rī nāv nām tham Great Relics (*brah param dhātu*) were

*ratnadhāthu* in Śrī Sajanālai; lines 38-40 "Ba Khun Phā Möaṇ..resided in Śrī Sejanālai";<sup>12</sup> side 2, line 8, a journey by the inscription's protagonist via "Sukhodai, *pāṇi chlaṇi*, Śrī Sajanālai";<sup>13</sup> -Inscription 11 (1360s?): side 2, line 13, "...then went to Sukhodai Sejanālai...";<sup>14</sup> -Inscription 3 (1357): side 1, line 4, Lithai "ruled in *mōaṇ Śrī Sajjanālai Sukhodai*"; side 2, line 55, Buddha footprints were placed in "*mōaṇ Śrī Sajjanālai* on top of Mt.--" and in "*mōaṇ Sukhodai* on top of Mt. Sumanakut";<sup>15</sup> -Inscription 4, in Khmer (1361): in 1347 Lithai "led an army from Śrī Sajanālay", and "entered to reign in *sruk* [=*mōaṇ*] Sukhodai"; he "ruled in Sukhodai"; there was a Buddha image "in the middle of this *sruk* Sukhodai"; the "Mango Grove is west of this Sukhodai";<sup>16</sup> -Inscription 5 (1361): Lithai "ruled in *mōaṇ Śrī Sajjanālai Sukhodai*"; "he had been ruling in *mōaṇ Śrī Sajjanālai Sukhodai* for 22 years"; a Buddha image "in the middle of *mōaṇ Sukhodai*";<sup>17</sup> -Inscription 8 (1359): "the road from *mōaṇ Sukhodai* to this mountain"; "*mōaṇ Śrī Sajjanālai Sukhodai*"; "from Sòn Gvae to Sukhodai";<sup>18</sup> -Inscription 102 (1380): "*mōaṇ Sukhodai*";<sup>19</sup> -Inscription 45 (1392): "the deity on Mt. *yann yan brah śrī*", which Griswold and Prasert have interpreted as the "spirit Brah̄ Khabaṇ of Mount Yannyāṇ [the spirit of Mount] Brah̄ Śrī", because in inscription no. 1 there is a Brah̄ Khabaṇ "generally identified with Khau Hlvaṇ" at Sukhodai, whereas "Mount Brah̄ Śrī is the hill of that name...south of Sajjanālai";<sup>20</sup>

built in Sukhothai, Śrī Satchanalai, and Srahluang-Song Khvae", cannot, however be accepted. See *Khao Phiset*, no. 675, 21-27 May 2533 [1990], p.48. Of course, it is now generally recognized that inscription no. 1 of 'Ram Khamhaeng' cannot be accepted as historical evidence.

<sup>12</sup> The reading 'resided' is also new. In the older reading the connection between Phā Möaṇ and Śrī Satchanalai in the passage was not clear. See *EHS* 10, *JSS* 60/1 (Jan 1972), pp. 21-152; see p. 112.

<sup>13</sup> *EHS* 10, see pp. 108-12, 118, which represents the old reading of Inscription 2; translations and orthography modified slightly here; *pāṇi chlaṇi* has not been identified, but in Mon *pāṇi* means '(river) mouth', indicating that *chlaṇi* was a waterway. See H.L. Shorto, *A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions from the Sixth to the Sixteenth Centuries* (DMI), p. 229.. In the present context all controversies over the dates of inscriptions 2 and 11 are irrelevant.

<sup>14</sup> *EHS* 10, pp. 135-144. It is believed that this inscription is the work of the same person as no. 2.

<sup>15</sup> *EHS* 11, Part 1.

<sup>16</sup> *EHS* 11, Part 1; inscription 4, lines I.3 (Face 1, line 3), I.8-9, 2.10-11. 2.22, 2.32, 4.16.

<sup>17</sup> *EHS* 11, Part 1; lines 1.6, 2.18-19, 3.11.

<sup>18</sup> *EHS* 11, Part 2, Inscription no. 8, lines 2.2. 3.4, 3.16.

<sup>19</sup> *EHS* 7; line 1.7.

<sup>20</sup> Side 1, lines 15-16; *EHS* 3, p. 83, n.24. Here Griswold and Prasert have forced the evidence of inscription no. 45 to make it fit a picture inferred from other sources; but the language of no. 45 is perfectly clear and may well have been intended to mean a single hill, which would then perhaps force reinterpretation of the other texts. In particular the

- Inscription 64 (1390s?): "the dynasty of Sukhodai";<sup>21</sup>
- Inscription 38 (1373?, 1397?, 1433?): a list of 4 officials placed in relationship to Sagāpūrī, Śrī Sejanālaipūrī, Dvaiynadī Śrī Yamana, Nagor Dai; the king "proceeded to Sukhodaipūrī"; "in the middle of möan Sukhodai...cities such as Jalyañ, Kambhaen Bhejr, Dañ Yāñ, Pak Yam, Sòn Gvae";<sup>22</sup>
- Inscription 46 (1403): "...king of (*nagara* Śrī Sajjanālai) Sukhodai";<sup>23</sup>
- Inscription 10 (1404): "möan Jalyañ"; "then prince/venerable [dān cau] Phán left Jalyañ and went to stay in Sòn Gvae..."; "...went to Jian Mai..."; "...built a chedi in möan Jian Mai";<sup>24</sup>
- Inscription 9 (1343-1406): this record consisting of three obviously related inscribed stones is the only inscription which is believed to have come from the 'old city' under discussion here, and which is otherwise completely bereft of epigraphic records. This belief, however, is an inference from its contents, for the immediate provenance, and original location, of the stones is unknown. The entire record was probably written at or soon after the latest date, and it is thus an historical account of the previous 60-odd years.

The relevant details of its content are: (side 1, lines 11- 15) in 1359 King 'grandfather' Mahādharmarājā (Lithai) had a *kuti* (monk's dwelling) built for a monk, Mahā Kalyāñathera, when he went to worship the Mahathat ('great relic') at Śrī Sajjanālai, and he also had the Red forest Monastery built for him; (lines 19-21) in 1361 the narrator, a monk named Tilokatilaka, says he went to Sukhodai to do homage to Mahā Kalyāñathera; then the latter became ill and they both [returned?] to "this Red Forest Monastery"; as Kalyāñathera's condition worsened they "sent word to [the king] at Sukhodai"; (side 2) a damaged and therefore very fragmented account of acquaintance and visiting between Tilokatilaka and Mahāsamanathera (Sumana of other sources) involving rainy season retreats at "this" [i.e. 'here'] Red Forest Monastery and the Mango Grove Monastery, possibly at Sukhodai. First the king invited Sumana to the Mango Grove; Sumana wanted to go...also wanted to visit "me"

identification of a large hill west or southwest of the old city on the Yom with a Mt. Phra Śrī would no longer be certain. Again, inscription no. 1 may be ignored.

<sup>21</sup> *EHS* 3; line 1.17

<sup>22</sup> English translation taken from Griswold and Prasert, *EHS* 4, lines 1.5-7, 1.10, 1.16. The date on the stone is damaged, but most publications, such as *Cāru'k samāy sukhodai*, have taken it to represent the equivalent of A.D. 1313, 1373, or 1433, of which the first seems far too early for consideration. Griswold and Prasert have maintained that the date was misread, and that it was really equivalent to A.D. 1397. The question does not need to be pursued further here, for it does not affect the problem of names under investigation.

<sup>23</sup> *EHS* 1, lines 1.6-7, the part in parentheses being a reconstructed reading of a damaged section.

<sup>24</sup> Not treated by Griswold and Prasert; see G. Coedès, *Receuil des inscriptions du Siam/Prajum s'ilā cāruk bhāg 1 or Cāruk samāy sukhoday*; lines 1.11, 1.18-19, 1.35 1.38; the provenance of this inscription is unknown.

in the Red Forest; he came to see this Red Forest Monastery and after he had paid his respects [I] sent him to worship the Mahathat; he spent the rainy season at the Mango Grove "there" and I spent it at the "this" Red Forest; in [1362] and [1363]...spent the rainy season in this Red Forest...in [1364]...[broken context] in the Mango Grove, in 1369 Sumana went 'north'.<sup>25</sup>

Between sides 2 and 3 there is a break in time from 1369 to 1388, probably indicating that a fourth stone has been lost. In side 3 the story has switched to a Kalyāṇa Forest Monastery which Griswold and Prasert assume to be the old Red Forest Monastery renamed in honor of Mahā Kalyāṇathera.<sup>26</sup> Sukhothai and Satchanalai are not mentioned, but there is an account of a monastic dispute being settled at Lake Chāñ, which Griswold and Prasert seem to have taken as located near Sukhothai, and in the last paragraph reference to a Mt. Svargārāma, apparently associated with the Kalyāṇa Forest Monastery. If, however, the action of Face 3 was in Sukhothai, the concluding lines, in their reference to "this Kalyāṇa forest Monastery", would seem to place the latter, and the original site of Inscription no. 9, at Sukhothai, rather than Śrī Satchanalai, wherever that city was located.

Whatever the status of the details on side 3 this inscription at least associates a Mahathat with Śrī Satchanalai, and situates a Red Forest Monastery in the vicinity. It is the assumptions associated with these terms which have led to the placing of inscription no. 9 in the 'old city' on the Yom. That city was assumed to be Śrī Satchanalai, and the Mahathat was assumed to have been either Wat Chang Lom or the large edifice at the river bend. A Red Forest Monastery is mentioned in *Jinākālamālī* near a Mount Siripabbata, now assumed to be the Mount Phra Śrī just west of our old city, although none of the visible ruins has been identified as the Red Forest Monastery. However, as I shall describe below, there is another Red Forest wat, still traditionally identified as such, at another location which, once the assumptions are bracketed out, makes a better case for the location of Śrī Satchanalai.<sup>27</sup>

From the contemporary 14th century references in the inscriptions we may infer that Sukhothai and Śrī Satchanalai were close enough to be considered a joint political entity, *mōan/nagara* Śrī Satchanalai Sukhothai. They were not, however, just a single city, for certain contexts separate them. Inscription 3 speaks of separate Buddha footprints on separate hills in each; and in inscription 4 Lithai is said to have led an army from Śrī Satchanalai, and to have entered to rule in Sukhothai.

It cannot, however, be accepted that Satchanalai was a later name for Chaliang at the bend in the river. Inscription 2 shows that for the mid-14th

<sup>25</sup> EHS 12, JSS 62/1 (January 1974), pp. 89-122. See pp. 107-108 for this passage.

<sup>26</sup> Indeed in their translation of side 3, lines 35-38, p. 113 they have substituted 'Red forest Monastery' for the *kalyāṇavanāvās* of the original. Side 3 does not mention 'Red Forest'.

<sup>27</sup> See EHS 12, p. 93; and further below on *Jinakālamālī* and the other location.

century Sukhothai elite Śrī Satchanalai was already an ancient city, the three etymologically different orthographies of its name indeed indicate it was of such age that its origins were forgotten; and in inscription no. 38 a king, accompanied by an official of "Sejanālaypūri", is described as issuing a law in *mōan* Sukhothai, surrounded by several cities, including Chaliang, but not Satchanalai. Even later, after frequent use of the name Satchanalai in Sukhothai epigraphy, inscription no. 10 ignores it and refers only to Chaliang as a place from which monks went to Song Khvae (Phitsanulok?) and to Chiang Mai, and by its date proves that wherever Chaliang was located, it was not a place which was later renamed Śrī Satchanalai.<sup>28</sup>

### Textual references

One of the early northern chronicles makes the separation of Sukhothai and Satchanalai quite explicit. In a long section concerning monks who brought Sinhala Buddhism to the Sukhothai kingdom, the *Tāmnān Mūlaśāsanā* tells of a *cau* Anomadassi who went to reside in *mōan* Satchanalai, while another, *cau* Sumana, stayed in the Red Mango Forest Monastery in Sukhothai. They often went back and forth to help one another ordain monks in either place. This seems to be the story recorded in inscription no. 9.<sup>29</sup>

On one such journey Sumana was on his way to Satchanalai and was led to a miraculous relic in a deserted chedi at a place called Pang Cha (*pāñcā*), described as situated with Sukhothai 2 *yojana* to its southwest and Satchanalai 1 or 2 *yojana* to its northwest, which given the old length of the *yojana* places it 22 km from Sukhothai, and places Satchanalai 33 or 44 km from Sukhothai, whereas the old city of Chaliang-Sawankhalok is over 50 km from Sukhothai. These distances have traditionally been reinterpreted to fit the distance from Sukhothai to Sawankhalok, which also lies northeast of the route Sumana was following; but taken as given, these details place *Mūlaśāsanā*'s Satchanalai in an interesting location which will be discussed below.<sup>30</sup> 'Pang Cha' is not identifiable, but given the Mon gloss of *pāñ* as 'river mouth', it may indicate the

<sup>28</sup> Betty Gosling, "Where is Rām Khamhaeng's Stupa?", p. 268, has tried to have it both ways, saying Prince Damrong's analysis was correct, but "it would not be surprising for the old popular name 'Chaliang' to continue in use long after the new official name had been devised", as evidenced by inscriptions 1, 2, and 38. There is no evidence that 'Chaliang' was 'popular' and not official, and as we have seen, she is mistaken in believing that Śrī Satchanalai was new and more official. As support she adds such irrelevant comparisons as the continuing dual usage 'Kampuchea/Cambodia', simply native and foreign pronunciations of the same term, and 'Thailand/Siam', forgetting that both are non-native, although the first is a translation of an ancient local designation, *mōan dai*.

<sup>29</sup> See EHS 12, p. 120.

<sup>30</sup> *Tāmnān Mūlaśāsanā*, pp. 195- 196; EHS 10, p. 60, n. 26, where the length of the old *yojana* is given as 11 km.

confluence of a 'khlong' with the Fa Kradan river, which in contrast to other versions of the story and descriptions of the route, is otherwise unmentioned.<sup>31</sup>

The other famous northern religious chronicle, *Jinakālamālīpakarn*, also keeps Sukhothai and Srī Satchanalai separate.<sup>32</sup> Its passage corresponding to that cited above from *Mūlaśāsanā*, says "King Dhammarājā was ruling at Sukhodayapura", and from there "one day Sumana was going to Sajjanālaya, he stopped beside the river named 'Pā'", and found the relic, which he took "to Sajjanālaya, where a son of Dhammarājā named Lideyyarājā was ruling", and Sumana was installed there in the Mahārattavanārama (Great Red Forest Monastery) at the foot of Mt. Siripabbata ('Mt. Srī'). Further on, in a legendary section about the acquisition of the Phra Sihing Buddha image by Rocarājā (Pali for Phra Ruang), father of Rāmarājā (mentioned in inscriptions 2, 3, 5, 38, 45), the former, reigning at Sukhothai, is credited with construction "at Sajjanālayapura of a grand and magnificent stupa in bricks and stone, covered with white plaster", apparently in honor of the Sihing statue.

This detail, as will be clear below, means either that the Satchanalai mentioned here was not the 'old city' under discussion, or the author of *Jinakālamālī* did not have accurate information about Satchanalai, for no major temple in the old city on the Yom may any longer be attributed to Rāmarāj or to his father.<sup>32a</sup> This event would of course have been earlier than the adventures of Sumana. Later, in a section about another group of monks returning from abroad in the 15th century, they are said to have come from Ayutthaya "to Sajjanālaya...then to Sukhodaya", a route which now appears unusual.<sup>33</sup>

Indeed, in a study of the Rām Khamhaeng inscription Dr. Piriya Krairiksh has used this itinerary as evidence that 'Satchanalai' meant Phitsanulok. This is not a necessary conclusion, because on a journey up the Yom from Nakhon Sawan, Satchanalai, understood either as Chaliang or as the now deserted alternative site which I propose below, would be more directly reached with the usual transportation of the time than Sukhothai. Part of Dr. Piriya's argument depends on a rejection of the early name, 'two [river] branch-city', (*sòni gvae, dvisākhā*), as a name for Phitsanulok, and its displacement to Nakhon Sawan, but this is difficult to accept. The references to King Narešuor's (1590- 1605) father, Mahādhammarājā as Lord of Phitsanulok in all sources, and as "Phraya Song Khveen" in the van Vliet chronicle, means that the name

<sup>31</sup> For *pāni* '(river) mouth' see note 13 above.

<sup>32</sup> *Jinakālamālīpakarn*, Thai translation by Saeng Manavidura, printed as cremation volume for Nay Phongsavat Suriyothay, 15 November 2518 [1975]; in English, *The Garlands of the epochs of the Conqueror, translation of the Jinakālamālīpakaranam*, by N.A. Jayavickrama, Pali Text Society, translation series no. 36, 1968; in French, G. Coedès, "Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental", BEFEO 25 (1925), pp. 1-202.

<sup>32a</sup> See below on archeology

<sup>33</sup> *Jinakālamālī*, Thai text, pp. 106, 110; Coedès' translation, pp. 95-96, 99, 106.

'two branch' cannot be displaced to Nakhon Sawan, however attractive the hypothesis.<sup>34</sup>

As noted above, Griswold commented on the Ayutthayan chronicles' treatment of "the whole complex" as *salieng*, equivalent to *jalyāñ*/Chaliang. At least that equivalence of name is acceptable, but the most accurate Ayutthayan chronicle, that of *Luang Prasöt*, records in 1460 that "Phraya Jalyāñ turned traitor and joined the Mahārāja [King of Chiang Mai]". Then in 1474 "the king [of Ayutthaya] went to take *mōañ* Salieng". Neither of these entries is related to any details of location, and it is not only impossible to affirm that they refer to "the whole [Chaliang-Satchanalai] complex", but without the information available from other sources it would be impossible to determine their location at all, or even to infer that *salieng=jalyāñ*. In fact use of different names, one after the other in closely related contexts is suspect, and perhaps indicates that the compiler of the *Luang Prasöt* chronicle was working from disconnected records which he did not fully understand. Thus the pronunciation /saliang/ represents a Lao/Isan treatment of *jalyāñ*, but not the pronunciation of either Chiang Mai or Ayutthaya.

As for the Chiang Mai chronicle (*CMC*), which Griswold also cited for its use of Chaliang in all contexts except one where "the whole complex" is called Chiang Chün (*jian jün*), those two names do occur as Griswold said. In the first instance, during a struggle with "the southern ruler" (i.e. King of Ayutthaya) which seems to correspond to an Ayutthayan invasion of Chiang Mai recorded in *Luang Prasöt* in 1442, one of the enemy is called "Phraya Chaliang Sukhothai", a terminological pairing quite different from anything in the inscriptions and of no help at all in the problem, if it was intended to mean that Chaliang was Srī Satchanalai, something the inscriptions show to be untrue. Perhaps the intention was that Phraya Chaliang also ruled Sukhothai, which if not entirely accurate is at least concordant with other chronicles noted below which show Chaliang as the most important *mōañ* in the area in mid-15th century.

Following this there are other references to Sukhothai without Chaliang, and some years later a story of the ruler of Chaliang betraying Chiang Mai. Still later the 'southern ruler' became a monk, recorded in *Luang Prasöt* in 1465, and asked Chiang Mai for Chaliang as alms. Finally, in 1474, the Chiang Mai chronicle says Hmün Dan, governor of Chiang Chün, died and a new governor

---

<sup>34</sup> Piriya Krairiksh, "Towards a Revised History of Sukhothai Art: A Reassessment of the Inscription of King Ram Khamhaeng", pp. 49-51, 59-60. Indeed the name 'two-branch city' fits the geographical situation of Nakhon Sawan much better than Phitsanulok; and a major mystery of Chao Phraya Valley history is why no important political center ever developed at Nakhon Sawan. The 1167 Khmer and Pali inscription of Dong Mae Nang Möang (no. 35) indicates that an attempt was probably made in earlier times. See Vickery, review article on Jeremias van Vliet, *The Short History of the Kings of Siam*, pp. 221-222; **in this volume, pp. 00-00**

was appointed. The ruler (Phraya Luang/*brañā hlvan*) of Sukhothai attacked and took Chiang Chün, which corresponds in date to the *Luang Prasöt* record of an Ayutthayan attack on Salieng. Comparison of the two texts then does suggest that Chiang Chün=Chaliang, but since it is the last record of the place in *CMC*, and occurs after a period under governors appointed from Chiang Mai, it may be simply a new name in the northern Thai pattern (Chiang/*jian*) imposed by the northern suzerain. The Chiang Mai chronicle then is of no help in distinguishing among the names 'Satchanalai', 'Chaliang' and 'Sawankhalok', although it indicates that Chaliang was involved politically with Sukhothai.<sup>35</sup>

The name Chiang Chün occurs in one other text, the allegedly 15th-century poem *Yuan Phai*, an epic of the mid-15th century struggles between Ayutthaya and Chiang Mai for control of the Yom-Nan basin *mōan*, Phitsanulok, Sukhothai, Srī Satchanalai, Chaliang. There, like a mirror-image of the Chiang Mai Chronicle, 'Chiang Chün' occurs in all but one instance where Chaliang is found, and there can be no doubt of the identity of Chiang Chün, for one descriptive passage certainly represents the old city which is the subject of this enquiry.<sup>36</sup> The single occurrence of 'Chaliang', unlike that of Chiang Chün in the Chiang Mai Chronicle, occurs in the middle, following and preceding several mentions of Chiang Chün, and it seems to be devoid of significance.

*Yuan Phai* also, without mention of Satchanalai, is of no help for our inquiry, but close attention to the other sources may permit new inferences about *Yuan Phai*, a text with its own problems which have so far been pushed into the background.<sup>37</sup>

The chronicle of Nan, a polity closely connected with Chiang Mai and involved in the 15th-century disputes between Chiang Mai and the Sukhothai area, relates that in 1434 its ruler, Cau Indakeen Dāv, was imprisoned by his brothers, then escaped and fled "down to the southern *mōan*...to seek refuge with *bra:yā Chaliang*"; and the following year he was helped by troops from Chaliang to retake Nan. Later, in 1450 King Tilokārāj of Chiang Mai attacked Nan and Indakeen Dav again fled south to get help from "his friend *bra:yā Chaliang*".<sup>38</sup> These statements do not contribute to our discussion, except as another indication of the importance of Chaliang.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Tāmnān bün mōan jian hmai*/'The Chiang Mai Chronicle' (CMC), pp. 58, 59, 64. Note that there has been controversy, ignored by Griswold and Prasert, over the localization of *jian jün*. CMC p. 64, note 1 says it should be located in Amphoe Lòn, Phrae province, which would mean no connection at all with Chaliang.

<sup>36</sup> Griswold and Prasert, YP, p. 128.

<sup>37</sup> Of immediate concern here is *Yuan Phai*'s description of walls which have the appearance of much later construction, including gun ports which would not have been conceived until the 16th century. See below, pp. 33-35.

<sup>38</sup> 'The Nan Chronicle', in *Prajum ban sāwatār* (PP), Guru sabhā edition part 9 [original PP part 10], pp. 305, 306, 307.

It is not certain when the names Chaliang, Satchanalai, and Sawankhalok came to be accepted as indicating a single place. Two old chronicle fragments, which were apparently unknown to Prince Damrong, illustrate the relations among the upper Chao Phraya basin chiefdoms and with Ayutthaya just before mid-15th century, a time when there are no longer any useful inscriptions and when the hitherto standard Ayutthayan records are of an unhelpful brevity.

The two documents are Ayutthayan chronicle fragments one of which I discovered and published in 1977, and the second, which precedes it by a few years, discovered and published by Miss Ubolsri Atthaphandhu in the 1980s.<sup>39</sup> Together the two fragments provide a detailed treatment of Ayutthayan relations with the Central Thai chiefdoms, Angkor, and to some extent the Phimai-Phanom Rung area during the years 1439-1444, with details hitherto unsuspected from a reading of the standard chronicles. The dates given in the two fragments fit the presumed reliable chronology of *Luang Prasöt*, and this together with the style of official titles, which appear to predate the reforms ascribed to King Trailokanath (1448-1448), indicate that they are based ultimately on genuine 15th-century records which have disappeared.<sup>40</sup>

Like the standard treatment of the period, which to the extent it is factual is based on the *Luang Prasöt* chronicle, the two fragments show that a major thrust of Ayutthayan foreign policy was toward control over the Central Thai chiefdoms. They indicate, however, that some details of the standard picture are mistaken. Both fragments show the Central Thai chiefs in alliance with the King of Ayutthaya campaigning in what is now the Burma border region beyond Kamphaeng Phet and Tak, campaigns which are also reflected in *Luang Prasöt* as a series of Ayutthayan attacks on the Kamphaeng Phet region.

Another interesting aspect of these fragments is that Mahādharmarājādhirāj, the ruler of Phitsanulok, contrary to the assumptions of standard history, does not appear as the paramount chief of the Yom-Nan valleys. In the several passages in which the chieftains are listed precedence is usually given to Brañā Chaliang, ruler of *mōan* Sawankhalok. In addition to Brañā Chaliang and Mahādharmarājādhirāj, Brañā Rāmarāj of Sukhothai and Brañā Saen Soy Tāv of Kamphaeng Phet are frequently mentioned, and in one passage Brañā Dharrm, whose *mōan* is unidentified. These are the earliest sources which make a direct connection between two of the three problematic names, Chaliang and Sawankhalok, and as early as the 15th century.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</sup> These chronicle fragments are now catalogued at the Thai National Library as "Chronicle of Ayutthaya", nos. 222 and 223. I published no. 223 as "The 2/k.125 Fragment: A Lost Chronicle of Ayutthaya", [in this volume pp. 00-00](#). Number 222 was discovered and used in a Silpakorn University thesis by Miss Ubolsri Atthaphandhu, whose supervisor, Dr. Thamsook Numnond kindly provided me with a copy of the chronicle text.

<sup>40</sup> For details see Vickery, "The 2/k.125 Fragment".

<sup>41</sup> Inscription 86 (1528) from Sukhothai confirms that the titles '*brañā rāmarāj*' and *brañā śrīdhamm* were in use at that time, but does not identify their territorial authority. Griswold

If there was a name change, as Prince Damrong suggested, these chronicles show it as having occurred in the opposite direction (Satchanalai>Chaliang); or else they are evidence that Chaliang-Sawankhalok and Satchanalai were quite distinct places. These fragments, which must be given a fair amount of credence, for they have helped clear up several mysterious entries in other better-known chronicles,<sup>42</sup> indicate that the name *savarrgalok*'/Sawankhalok' was in use earlier than believed.

When Prince Damrong said 'Ayutthaya period' in connection with a name change, he was probably thinking of the evidence in the standard Ayutthayan chronicles. In those texts, however, there is no question of an adoption of a new name, or any kind of name change. There is simply a reference to the Lord of Sawankhalok (*bra:yā savarrgalok*), one of several noblemen, including the Lord of Phitsanulok, "of the lineage of Phra Ruang", who plotted to overthrow an apparent usurper and place on the throne the prince who became King Mahā Chakrabartirāj. The first mention of the title '*savarrgalok*/sawankhalok' is dated A.D. 1545, not 1556 when the new king promoted his supporters to higher ranks.<sup>43</sup>

On the other hand, the Ayutthayan Law on Military and Provincial Hierarchies, traditionally attributed to King Trailokanath (1448-1488), ignored Chaliang and gave the governor of "Srī Sajanālay" the title "bañā Savarrgalok" as well, which does not with certainty indicate that they were considered the same place, only that the same governor administered both. Moreover, the governor was entitled Rāmarāj, which one would expect associated with Sukhothai, while Sukhothai is listed as a quite separate province from Satchanalai-Sawankhalok, and its governor is named Okñā Srī Dharmāsukarāj, which epigraphy has shown us to have been associated with Kamphaeng Phet in Sukhothai times.<sup>44</sup> Thus these sections of the law, like other parts of the Three

and Prasert, *EHS* 23, assumed that the former was governor of Sukhothai, but did not take notice of the latter. Betty Gosling's misapprehension, *loc. cit.*, p. 268, that "[a]s far as I have been able to determine, it was not until the 1920s that 'Chaliang' came to be associated with Sawankhalok", and any further inferences therefrom, must be rejected.

<sup>42</sup> They have contributed to understanding difficult passages in *Luang Prasöt*, the Nan Chronicle, and in particular the Cambodian "Ang Eng Fragment". See Vickery, "The 2/5.125 Fragment".

<sup>43</sup> *Brah. rājabāns'āvatār chapap brah rāja hathalekha* ("Royal Autograph Chronicle") (*RA*), pp. 81, 83. The DFA report on Wat Chang Lom missed the first reference. The dates are the correct ones of *Luang Prasöt* (*LP*) interpolated into the *RA* story--see Vickery "Cambodia after Angkor, The Chronicular Evidence for the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries", chapter 9, "The Chronology of the Ayutthayan Chronicles", for explanation of *RA* and *LP* dates.

Although this incident is not discussed, a juxtaposition of *RA* and *LP* dates for that period is in Vickery, *Ibid.*, vol. 2, "Annexes", pp. 118-122.

<sup>44</sup> On 'dharmāsukarāj' see *Kāthmāy trā sām tuān*'Laws of the three seals', Guru sabhā edition, vol 1, 'Law on the Military and Provincial Hierarchies, pp. 278-327; inscriptions nos. 13 and

Seals Code, may have become garbled in successive recopyings, and the very absence of 'Chaliang' from a text allegedly of the reign of Trailokanath is reason for suspicion. But the title for governors of Phitsanulok, reflecting total subordination to the Ayutthayan government, and abolition of the old title *Mahādharmarājā(dhirāj)*, indicates that this law as a whole should not be attributed to any date before the reign of Nareśuor (1590-1605), and is not as reliable for the question of names and titles as the chronicle fragments discussed above.<sup>45</sup>

An Ayutthayan law text which does name Chaliang, and which influenced Prince Damrong in his explanation, is that on Abduction (*Lak bhā*). Prince Damrong wrote that it seems to pair Chaliang with Sukhothai in a list of north central *mōan* as follows: Jalyān, S'ukkhodai, Dun Yān, Pān Yam, Sòn keev, Sahlvān, Jāvdañrāv, Kāmbeeñbej. In fact there is a second list of the same places in different order, Jalyān, Dun Yān, Pān Yam, Sahlvān, Sòn keev, Jāvdañrāv, Kāmbeeñbej, Sukkhodai, which if it were the only list would not have permitted the conclusion drawn by Prince Damrong. Thus this law in itself is not at all helpful, and only becomes comprehensible in conjunction with other sources. Its traditional date is within the reign of King Rāmādhipatī I of Ayutthaya (1351-1369), and in that respect mention of Chaliang but not Sawankhalok is not surprising. Although it has gone through a revision which supplied it with a spurious year date, this section might indeed be thought to represent an early Ayutthayan record, but then the absence of Sri Satchanalai from its list merits suspicion.<sup>46</sup>

The *Phongsawadan Nöa* (Northern Annals) a collection of legendary historical tales compiled and written down in the first Bangkok reign, indicate an association of the names 'Satchanalai' and 'Sawankhalok' through the agency of a Rishi named Satchanalai who had the city of Sawankhalok, clearly the old city under study here, built. Here, however, there is no recollection of 'Chaliang', and the story indicates that by the time the tale found in *Phongsawadan Nöa* had developed no true memory of a city named Satchanalai had been preserved. In another section, however, Wat Khok Singkharam, approximately one-third of the way between the present walled city and the

14, EHS 14 and 15. See also Michael Vickery, "Prolegomena to Methods for Using the Ayutthayan Laws as Historical Source Material". **In this volume, pp. 00-00**

<sup>45</sup> *Kaṭhmāy*, vol 1, p. 317, article 31, the title *cau bañā sūr srī bisamādhirāj*, etc, governor of Phitsanulok, subordinate to *prateen senāth khvā* of the central government. This title seems to reflect the '*cau brahyā sursīh*' given to a new governor of Phitsanulok appointed by Nareśuor (*RA*, p. 166). See also Vickery, Review of Yoneo Ishii, et. al., *An Index of Officials in Traditional Thai Governments*, pp. 428-429; and Vickery, "Prolegomena to Methods for Using the Ayutthayan Laws as Historical Source Material", **p. ??; in this volume, pp. 00-00**

<sup>46</sup> See *Kaṭhmāy*, vol. 3, pp. 1-2; Prince Damrong, *Nithan Boranakhadi*, p. 218; Vickery, "Prolegomena".

Mahathat at the river bend, is described as located in the center of *möan* Satchanalai. The dating of the events of this section in 1000 of the Buddhist era, however, shows that no historical value may be imputed to it.<sup>47</sup>

Another detail of *PN* is more interesting for the history of the old city. When the city walls were built, so the story goes, the hill *bnam blön* ('fire hill', which is Khmer and suggests an ancient tradition) was kept within the wall *pen dī srāñ brat puja kund*, "as a ritual place to worship the bowl/pitcher/pot (*kendi*)", taking *kund(a)* in its original Sanskrit sense, although it has now been translated by the Department of Fine Arts in a sign set up for tourists as "to worship the sacred fire", which in itself, because of the local ceramics industry, would fit the same historical pattern.<sup>48</sup>

These last two sources are too different from the inscriptions to be accepted as evidence for the 13th-14th centuries, and they simply indicate that the modern beliefs about the three names, that is association of all of them with the old city on the Yom, may have been formed as early as the 16th century, and certainly as early as the first Bangkok reign.

Another document of uncertain origin, the *Traiphumi phra ruang* (*Traibūmi brah ruan*), traditionally attributed to King Lithai of Sukhothai, says in its exordium and colophon that the author's father ruled in *möan* Sri Satchanalai and Sukhothai, and that the author had ruled in Satchanalai for 6 years when the work was written.<sup>49</sup> These details accord with the picture of two closely related but separate cities seen in the inscriptions, but do not otherwise indicate the location of Satchanalai.

### The old city: description

The first modern description of the old city, which I shall henceforth call 'Sawankhalok/Savarrgalok' and of the route to it from Sukhothai, was Prince Vajiravudh's account of his trip to "the land of Phra Ruang" in 1907, following

<sup>47</sup> *Phongsawadan Nöa/Barisāwatār hnöa* (*PN*), several editions; see respectively section 3 of text, "srāñ möan savarrgalok"/'Con-struction of möan Savarrgalok', and section 4, "Röan brah rvai..."/'Story of Phra Ruang...', which describes the establishment of a new era in B.E. 1000, and the creation of the alphabets, for Thai, Mon, Burmese, and Khmer. Since the origin of the popular names now used for the temples in the old city is not known, one might wonder if the name 'Wat Khok Singkaram' had not earlier been associated with Wat Chang Lom or Chedi Chet Theo.

<sup>48</sup> It should be noted that the Royal Institute Dictionary justifies the gloss *kund*='fire' with a citation from *Inao*, which because of its different cultural background and possibilities for divergent reinterpretations is hardly decisive. Moreover, even there the term is sourced to Sanskrit, in which *kunda* apparently is never glossed as 'fire', although it may mean a fire pit, particularly intriguing in relation to the old city under investigation and its ceramic industry (See Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p. 289).

<sup>49</sup> Vickery, "On Traibhūmikathā"; pp. 00, in this volume, pp. 00 See also Vickery, "A Note on the Date of the Traibhumikathā"

the Phra Ruang 'road' from Kamphaeng Phet to Sukhothai and thence to Sawankhalok. Prince Vajiravudh's opinions about what he saw, modified in a few details by Prince Damrong, became the authoritative position on these old cities until the cautious beginnings of archaeological study in recent years.<sup>50</sup> Some attention to his route helps put the problem of Srī Satchanalai into perspective; unfortunately not all relevant distances are mentioned in his report.

Starting from Sukhothai's northern gate Prince Vajiravudh's party crossed the Khlong Sakes, still visible on the 1:250,000 map, just after midday, and went on to camp that night at Tambon Nong Yāv, not shown on the map, but perhaps, given the time of travel, near Ban Na Phong, about 15 km north of Sukhothai. The next day, about 3km farther on they came to a deserted wat which the local population called Wat *pā teen tai*, 'Red Forest South'. The *bot* was built of brick with laterite pillars. About 4km farther there was another deserted wat called Wat Bot (*posth*). Prince Vajiravudh considered it well worth a visit. Around the square mandapa was a wall made of round or hexagonal blocks of laterite placed close together like the posts of an elephant corral with a laterite column laid across the top and bevelled to imitate a sloping roof ridge. From the height of the doors in the wall it could be seen that it had been much higher, but silting had occurred, to the extent that a person had to stoop to pass through the gates in the wall.<sup>51</sup> It appeared to have been an important place, and Prince Vajiravudh was puzzled as to why it had been constructed in the middle of a forest, but then examination showed the existence of *mōai* Bang Khang (*pān khāñi*) about 2.8 km due east of Wat Bot on the Fa Kradan river.

Another 4 km brought them to still another old wat locally known as Wat Yai (*hñai* 'big'), with a surrounding laterite wall just like the one at Wat Bot. The area within the temple wall was about 60 m in width and length. In the center were ruins of a square edifice for relics with several chedis surrounding it, all indicating, according to Prince Vajiravudh, the previous existence of a *mōai*. Moreover, the local governor related that in the forest between Wat Bot and Wat Yai were many old wells, indicating former habitation sites; and Prince Vajiravudh considered that the *mōai* must have been deserted because of a change in the course of the Fa Kradan river, meaning a shift eastward to its present course, which in this area runs north northwest to south southeast.<sup>52</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> H.M. King Vajiravudh), *Diav mōai brah ruan*. The details which follow are from pp. 81-86.

<sup>51</sup> *Diav*, p. 83. This is just like the wall around Wat Mahathat at the bend in the river below the old city of Sawankhalok. See further discussion below.

<sup>52</sup> *Diav*, p. 84. In June 1989, in the company of Don Hein, I visited both Wat Bot and Wat Yai, and found them both precisely as described by Prince Vajiravudh with respect to location, size and detail. The only difference from 1907 is that the forest has been cleared and the entire area turned into farmland.

About 1.6 km beyond Wat Yai they crossed the Fa Kradan.<sup>53</sup> From the point where they crossed the Fa Kradan it was 10.8 km to Nong Chik, then 4 km to Sra Manohra, and from Sra Manohra to Mt. Phra Srī 2.8 km.

Prince Vajiravudh's route had taken him up the old Phra Ruang road, approaching the old city of Sawankhalok from behind (on the west side of) Mt. Phra Srī. The estimated total distance from Sukhothai to the spot where they camped just outside the northern wall of Sawankhalok was 52.2 km, and it had taken two days by elephant and horse, probably in a leisurely manner. Indeed Prince Vajiravudh wrote that a horseman could make it in a day without stopping.

The area where he had seen manifold signs of old temples and old *mōan* was about one third of the way from Sawankhalok toward Sukhothai, or two-thirds of the way starting from Sukhothai, meaning that it could have been linked with Sukhothai in the best times by communications of less than a day. That area, judging by the distances given was near a hill marked on the 1:250,000 map with an elevation of 261 m, slightly lower than the 325 m. of Sawankhalok's Mt. Phra Srī, but considerably higher than any other hill in the immediate neighborhood. Thus the only topographical feature associated with Satchanalai in the contemporary epigraphic record may be imputed to this place as well as to the hitherto favored location; and the name of the hill, 'Phra Srī', it should be noted, is non-specific, meaning no more than 'sacred auspicious'.

At this point we should recall the story of *Mūlasāsanā* cited above. If its distances are taken as given, without reinterpretation to fit preconceived views, Satchanalai should be placed near the Wat Yai of Prince Vajiravudh's itinerary. This conclusion cannot be avoided, as Griswold attempts, by asserting that "the Fa Gradan cuts across the route a little over 30 km north-northwest of Sukhodaya",<sup>54</sup> which would put it beyond the area of the deserted old temples and city, for in that area the old road is partly obliterated, the river runs nearly north-south leaving a large space in which the ancient crossing could have lain, and as Prince Vajiravudh determined, the river in ancient times would have been west of its present channel, placing the crossing even closer to Sukhothai. With this interpretation even the apparently aberrant azimuths of *Mūlaśāsanā*, placing Satchanalai northwest of the river crossing, do not need to be arbitrarily reinterpreted.

If this now deserted area were ancient Satchanalai, the problems of name changes, and seemingly contradictory references in the inscriptions disappear. Satchanalai and Chaliang were distinct, the former lying two-thirds of the way between Sukhothai and the latter, and the name 'Satchanalai' fell into disuse, or was reinterpreted, as the city declined and disappeared.

<sup>53</sup> That is, the distance from Wat Bot to Wat Yai is given as 100 *sen* (4 km), and from Wat Bot to the crossing 140 *sen* (5.6 km).

<sup>54</sup> EHS 10, p. 60, n. 26.

Old Sawankhalok comprised the traditionalists' Chaliang, represented now by Wat Mahathat and ancillary structures at the bend in the Yom river and the area within and around the rectangular walls 3 km to the north, the traditionalists' Sri Satchanalai.

The wall has distracted a number of observers from the true ancient layout and led to views that distinguish between the walled or hill area and the river bend area, but as Don Hein has pointed out, the wall in fact makes a narrow southward extension to include the temples at the river bend.<sup>55</sup> The wall is also of late date, as revealed by the square openings still visible at the top of its south side, and which can only be gun ports, indicating construction no earlier than early 16th century.

The treatment of the walls in recent historical literature has been interesting. As I remarked in another context, Prince Vajiravudh and Prince Damrong were both perfectly willing to accept that the triple walls at Sukhothai, based on reasoned consideration of their construction, were 16th-century works; and the official view only changed after 1923 when Coedès showed that a previously misunderstood term in inscription no. 1 meant 'triple wall', and therefore the construction had to have taken place in the 13th century.<sup>56</sup> Likewise at Sawankhalok, A.B. Griswold at one time considered that the "city walls of Sajjanālaya...revetted with great blocks of laterite, probably received their revetment in the 16th century...when both the Burmese and Siamese armies started using artillery operated by Portuguese mercenaries...". Before that time "[e]arthen embankments with wooden stockades on top had previously served well enough [before 16th-century artillery]". Then, having studied the supposedly 15th-century poem *Yuan Phai* with its description of a laterite wall, he revised his opinion which otherwise would cast doubt on the date of that literary work, and wrote "[t]he walls themselves, built with huge blocks of laterite, are over fifteen feet high", with no notion of revetment. He did not, however allude to the gun ports, which may not yet have been described anywhere. In a footnote he acknowledged the embarrassment ensuing from his change of opinion, referring to his earlier statement about 16th-century construction, and adding "but it now seems certain to have been earlier, though they may not have been built up to their present height until then". In fact, for lack of evidence nothing can be known about any possible earlier state of the walls, nor can it be deduced from inspection, for the walls indeed seem to be of solid laterite, as implied in *Yuan Phai*.<sup>57</sup> Thus an open-minded study of the truly

---

<sup>55</sup> Hein, personal communication, detailed description not yet published. See map ??

<sup>56</sup> Vickery, "The Ram Khamhaeng Inscription: A Piltdown Skull of Southeast Asian History?", p.208); Vickery, "Piltdown Skull--Installment 2", where I took note of William J. Gedney's suggestion that the term *tripura* in question could mean 'three' but nevertheless designate city walls in general, even if single.

<sup>57</sup> A.B. Griswold, *Toward a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 57; A.B. Griswold and PrasertnaNagara, "A Fifteenth-Century Siamese Historical Poem", p. 128. The high walls

ancient city (pre-16th century) should start by visualizing it as without the walls, as a settlement integrating the area now within the walls, as well as the area thickly built up with temples to the west and north of the walled area, and including Wat Mahathat and the other temples lying to the east.<sup>58</sup>

This larger area is bounded on the east, and in part on the north, by the river Yom, and is partly encircled from the southwest around the west by hills which cross through the present walled city area in a slight southwesterly to northeasterly direction, continuing on the eastern side of the river, forming a naturally enclosed whole. Moreover, as Don Hein showed me in June 1989, earthen embankments were at one time constructed to fill some of the gaps between the western hills, thus enhancing their rampart effect. It should also be emphasized that the geomorphological history of the Yom River shows much shifting of course, and erosion of banks. It seems inconceivable that when Wat Mahathat was begun the river formed such a narrow loop around it as is seen today; and proof there of shift in the river course is in old wells now revealed right in the river bank, indicating that when the wells were dug the river was some distance away.<sup>59</sup>

Within this larger area of old Sawankhalok there are edifices which follow at least two distinct orientations, undoubtedly indicating different periods of construction. There is a row of large temples built over and among smaller edifices along the ridge line of hills extending from west of the walled part of the city, through its northern sector, and on to the hills across the river, all following the orientation of the ridge line, roughly west to east, with a slight deviation northeastward. Besides the large temples on the hills, there are numerous, mostly ruined, small buildings, both within and outside the existing walls on the west, which also follow this orientation. These small structures consist of a place for an image with a small hall or *vihāra* in front of it on the east, but the *vihāra* are too small for a congregation, and the ensemble looks more like a temple for devotion to a god than the standard view of a Theravada wat in Thailand. They would seem to represent a type of Buddhism in which buddhist images were offered devotion as Hindu gods, or else they were all small neighborhood wats, each serving a very small population, as the number of such constructions could easily indicate.

with obvious gun ports in fact cast doubt on the received interpretation of *Yuan Phai*. I first observed the gun ports in 1986, and have not discovered a published description of that feature of the wall.

<sup>58</sup> Betty Gosling, *loc. cit.*, was correct in denying that the hill and river bend areas were separate settlements.

<sup>59</sup> Paul Bishop, "Geomorphic history of the Yom River floodplain; Paul Bishop, "Late Holocene Alluvial Stratigraphy and History in the Sisatchanalai Area, North Central Thailand"; Paul Bishop, Don Hein and Alan Fried, "Geomorphic and Stratigraphic Studies at the Ban Ko Noi Kiln fields, see p. 10 for notice of the wells.

More such small edifices, apparently of similar style, but now almost totally ruined and forming shapeless mounds covered with earth and brush, are found extending from just beyond the northern wall through the pottery area and beyond Ban Koh Noi. Their orientation, approximately north-south, is parallel to the river and thus nearly perpendicular to the ridge line and the temples following that orientation. Two of them, known as Wat Kuti Rai, just north of the city wall, have been reconstructed to their presumed original form. Ten more, 5-7 km farther north in Ban Koh Noi were surveyed, and eight of them excavated, by the Australian architect Dr. Zig Kapelis in 1985; and it was determined that they most probably had been, in fact, small wats of a type like Kuti Rai.<sup>60</sup>

The other main set of large edifices within the walls is oriented almost perpendicularly to the first, and thus face east southeast, and are nearly parallel to the river, like the small wats north of the city wall. Along this axis are all the large temples within the walls, Chang Lom, Chedi Chet Theo, Uthayan Yai, Nang Phaya, etc., except those on the crest of the hills, which belong to the first axis.

Outside the walls on the west and southwest there are other edifices larger than the small ruined wats described above, and which stylistically seem to belong to very different periods. One of them is of the type of Wat Sri Chum at Sukhothai, though smaller.<sup>61</sup> Pending art historical and archaeological study which, I emphasize, has never been undertaken, nothing more may be said about them.

Also outside the walled area, and extending eastward from it, are four more structures which deserve notice. First, approximately one-third of the way from the walls to Wat Mahathat is Wat Khok Singkharam, which appears to be an early 17th century construction, and which *Phongsawadan Nöa* in one context describes as located in the center of the city.<sup>62</sup> Then there is Wat Cau Cand, a Khmer edifice of the time of Jayavarman VII (1181-1220?), Wat Chom Chün, perhaps late Ayutthayan or even post-Ayutthayan, and last, the now largest of all, Wat Mahathat.

In considering the history of the old city of Chaliang- Sawankhalok it must be emphasized that Wat Mahathat as it appears now did not yet exist in the period of relevance for the present discussion. It is an Ayutthayan edifice probably attributable to King Trailokanath with further work carried out in the 18th century.<sup>63</sup> According to current theories the original construction was

---

<sup>60</sup> Zig Kapelis, "Field Report of Mound Survey at Ban Koh Noi", Thai Ceramics and [sic] Archaeological Project, Jan-Feb 1985, [n.p., no pagination]. In his Part C, section 5, Kapelis describes how the size, orientation, and structural remains of the mounds excavated indicate that they were wats like Kuti Rai.

<sup>61</sup> This was described in *Diav*, p. 126, by Prince Vajiravudh, who called it 'Wat Sra Pratum'.

<sup>62</sup> See above, p. 27.

<sup>63</sup> Griswold, *Towards*, pp. 2, 11, 57; *EHS* 12, p. 105, n. 9.

Khmer, although nothing of it is visible, then Rām Khamhaeng added "the two storeys of the square basement, which are still visible, [but] are not at all typical of a *prāng*,...of the same design as at Chang Lom...".<sup>64</sup> As we shall see below, however, if the earliest visible structures of Wat Mahathat are really of the style of Wat Chang Lom they cannot have been built at the time imputed to Rām Khamhaeng; and this means that since the putative early Khmer construction is only theoretical, not demonstrated, perhaps Wat Mahathat in its entirety dates only from the 14th century and later.<sup>65</sup>

### **Art History and Archaeology**

So far art historians and archaeologists have focussed their interest on the constructions within the walls and on Wat Mahathat at Chaliang, the largest structure in the area, with some notice given to Wat Cau Chand.<sup>66</sup>

There is no certain documentation about the history of this area. With the possible exception of no. 9 no inscriptions from Sawankhalok have been discovered, and what has been written about its history, like most other aspects of early central Thai history, has been based on the Rām Khamhaeng inscription.

In inscription no. 1 Rām Khamhaeng is said to have buried relics (*brah dhātu*) in the middle of Srī Satchanalai with a chedi built on top of them, and this has been interpreted as "almost certainly the stupa now called JāñLòm (Chang Lom...)".<sup>67</sup> The same passage of inscription no. 1 continues, "a wall of rock enclosing the Brahma Mahā Dhātu was built...", and this has been interpreted as the large wall around the Mahathat (Wat Phra Prang) of Chaliang, without regard for the context of the inscription which indicates that the wall should be understood as around the relic (*brah dhātu*) which Rām Khamhaeng buried.<sup>68</sup>

The dating of the other large monuments within the walls has followed from this interpretation of the origin of Wat Chang Lom as seen through inscription no. 1. With Chang Lom taken as the original central temple, the others had to come later, and the one directly in front of Chang Lom, Chedi

<sup>64</sup> Griswold, *Towards*, p. 11. Again, Rām Khamhaeng must be forgotten.

<sup>65</sup> The idea of Khmer origin for Wat Mahathat seems to have started with Prince Damrong, who recognized Wat Cau Cand as Khmer and theorized that the *mōan* of Chaliang located there started as a Khmer settlement, although Prince Damrong did not specifically attribute the foundation of Wat Mahathat to them. See his *Nithan boranakhadi*, p. 220.

<sup>66</sup> A.B. Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 3; Piriya Krairiksh, in *Muang Boran*, 12/1 (January-March 1986, pp. 223-237). Griswold called Wat Cau Chand one of the Dharmaśālas of Jayavarman VII, whereas Dr. Piriya has described its differences from the Dharmaśāla, and considers it a *prāng* from the same period.

<sup>67</sup> EHS 9, p. 217, n. 119.

<sup>68</sup> EHS 9, p. 217, n. 120. Betty Gosling, *loc. cit.*, understood the logic of these statements. As will be seen below, archaeology now shows that if inscription no. 1 were accepted genuine, it also would show that Srī Satchanalai cannot be Sawankhalok.

Chet Thaev, has been attributed to Rām Khamhaeng's grandson Lithai.<sup>69</sup> Little has been written about the other Srī Satchanalai monuments, although Griswold attributed Wat Nang Phaya to the 15th or 16th centuries.<sup>70</sup>

Even ignoring the arbitrary attributions based on inscription no. 1, there is little in that treatment which helps in understanding the history of the city of Sawankhalok. Implicitly the city within the walls originated with Wat Chang Lom, and temple construction continued in the same axis through Chedi Chet Thaev and Wat Nang Phaya from the 13th to 16th centuries. This is acceptable as a relative sequence, but then all of the edifices along the crest of the hills and the associated small wats are left out of consideration, while their different axis indicates an entirely different period and view of city planning, which given a sequence Chang Lom-Nang Phaya, can only have been earlier than the latter.

A new interpretation of some of these structures has appeared during the last few years in the work of Dr. Piriya Krairiksh. Although strangely silent in his *History of Art in Thailand* about the Sawankhalok monuments, he did in general attribute the temples with surrounding elephants to early 15th century; and in an article in *Muang Boran*, he expressed strong reservations about the traditional dating of Sukhothai and Sawankhalok art, as well as of the Rām Khamhaeng inscription, on which much of the periodization of Sukhothai art has been based.<sup>71</sup>

Finally, though, there has been a beginning of real objective study of the monuments through archaeology, an excavation of parts of Wat Chang Lom.

The report of the Fine Arts Department excavations at Wat Chang Lom in 1984-1985 has presented what are really revolutionary conclusions about the history of that edifice, and which, although not stated in the report, impose revisions in a wide area of Sukhothai-Sawankhalok art history.<sup>72</sup>

As noted above, the modern standard interpretation of the Rām Khamhaeng inscription holds that Wat Chang Lom was the edifice built for the relic which Rām Khamhaeng deposited in the center of Srī Satchanalai, and that it was the oldest of the major temples in that old city.

Although doubts had occasionally been expressed by art historians on stylistic grounds, a first archaeological probe in 1969 seemed to offer a way around them by revealing a hitherto hidden inner construction behind the wall of the processional gallery, which would have been the original Rām Khamhaeng edifice, even if convincing evidence for later dating of the visible construction were demonstrated.<sup>73</sup>

<sup>69</sup> Griswold, *Towards*, p. 33.

<sup>70</sup> Griswold, *Towards*, p. 57.

<sup>71</sup> *Muang Boran*, 12/1 (January-March 1986), pp. 223-37.

<sup>72</sup> Krom Silpakorn [Department of Fine Arts], *Wat Chang Lom [Vat jāñi lòm]*, Archaeological Document no. 1/2530, Bangkok 1987 (DFA, *Chang Lom*).

<sup>73</sup> DFA, *Chang Lom*, p. 174.

Among the conclusions of the latest excavations, however, is the assertion that the, now three, different layers of construction in the processional gallery and elephant terrace were all parts of an original continuous process, with the builders changing plans as they went along, for "Thai artisans did not work from drawn plans, but built straight away, making alterations when the results seemed unsuitable in any way".<sup>74</sup>

Although this explanation may seem unconvincing to some readers, we must be cognizant of the constraints under which Thai scholars may have to work in areas touching 'Rām Khamhaeng', and this conclusion at least has the utility of eliminating the possibility that the inner layer could date from Rām Khamhaeng if the outer one were shown to be later.

And indeed, the most interesting, and revolutionary conclusion is that Wat Chang Lom as a whole was not built, not even begun, until the 1370s, the reign of King Lithai, and nearly 100 years later than the time attributed to Rām Khamhaeng. Test pits around and under the outer edges of the platform revealed three habitation layers, on top of the latest of which Wat Chang Lom was built. In these habitation layers were burials, and post holes indicating earlier constructions, probably of wood, which were removed for the construction of the Wat. A similar succession of three buried habitation layers has been discovered at Wat Mahathat, and the lowest, showing an earthenware pottery industry, has been carbon dated to the 8th century. The next level is that on which the now buried base of Wat Mahathat was built, according to current assumptions in the 12th-13th centuries, but not carbon-dated, and as we have seen of altogether uncertain date.<sup>75</sup>

The latest habitation layer at Wat Chang Lom was dated by the presence of Yuan (Mongol) dynasty (ended 1368) ceramics, which fix the end of that habitation layer and construction of Wat Chang Lom after that date, but, inferentially before ceramics of a later date had been imported. Eventually more precise dating may be possible from locally-made ceramics and bullet coins which were also found, but unfortunately not depicted, nor discussed in detail, in the report.<sup>76</sup> Moreover, if specialists eventually reach the reasonable conclusion that the three stages of construction were not part of an uninterrupted plan, the date of the final form of Chang Lom will be even later.

Another archaeological conclusion was that the small wats just behind Chang Lom, belonging to the roughly east-west orientation parallel with the line of hills behind them, indeed predated Chang Lom, the rear wall of which

<sup>74</sup> DFA, *Chang Lom*, p. 117.

<sup>75</sup> Paul Bishop, Don Hein and Alan Fried, "Geomorphic and Stratigraphic Studies at the Ban Ko Noi Kiln fields: The Physical Setting of a Ceramics Industry", pp. 1-14.

<sup>76</sup> DFA, *Chang Lom*, p.77 mentions coins, pp. 127-130 lists types of ceramic shards, including several local types, found in test pit 1, and on p. 131 it is stated that there were no blue and white shards, but only 'crow-egg' green of the Yuan period.

deviated slightly from a right angle because of them, but still cut off part of the outer wall of one.<sup>77</sup>

Since the position of Wat Chang Lom suggests that it was the first of the large temples which extend southeastward from it in a line, the others must be dated much later than traditionally has been done. The major works of construction at Sawankhalok would have been later than the Sukhothai high classic, and in particular there can be no more speculation that the lotus bud towers of Sawankhalok (Chedi Chet Thaew), Sukhothai, and Kamphaeng Phet were the work of early Sukhothai kings.<sup>78</sup>

There are also important implications for the Rām Khamhaeng inscription. First, Wat Chang Lom cannot be the place where Rām Khamhaeng deposited a relic; second, if inscription no. 1 were genuine, Srī Satchanalai, where the relic was deposited, cannot have been the walled city of Sawankhalok; and third, if the earliest visible parts of Wat Mahathat are really of Chang Lom style, as Griswold described, they can no longer be attributed to Rām Khamhaeng. The Chang Lom report does not hesitate to draw the first conclusion; as for the second and third, it contradicts hitherto current art historical opinion and suggests the Mahathat at Chaliang on the river bend as the place mentioned in no. 1, saying the situation of Satchanalai in the time of Rām Khamhaeng is not known and that temple might then have been in its center.

This is special pleading, but the report is certainly correct in asserting that the wall around the Mahathat fits the inscription's depiction of a "wall of rock enclosing" it better than Wat Chang Lom.<sup>79</sup> That interpretation of inscription no. 1 was already a case of extreme special pleading, and, as has been noted above, two constructions in the deserted old city on the Fa Kradan two-thirds of the way from Sukhothai to Sawankhalok have surrounding walls like the one at the Mahathat of Chaliang and which fit the description in no. 1. Of course if inscription no. 1 is a much later work of conjectural history these details may have no relationship to 13th-14th-century reality, and its author may indeed have had in mind a situation like that of the traditionalist interpretation as depicted by Griswold and Prasert in their EHS 9.

Finally we must emphasize that attention to the other examples of such megalithic walls noted above contradicts Betty Gosling's assertion that "[t]he wall [around Wat Mahathat] is unique...it is the only wall anywhere that fits Inscription I's specification of *phā* in the construction", and these other constructions help to cast doubt on the authenticity of Inscription 1.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>77</sup> DFA, *Chang Lom*, pp. 20, 84.

<sup>78</sup> Griswold, *Towards*, pp. 20-21, 22, 33.

<sup>79</sup> DFA, *Chang Lom*, pp. 174-175.

<sup>80</sup> Gosling, p. 266. On p. 269 she denies that Wat Chang Lom was "Rām Khamhaeng's stupa", suggesting that "it was the river bend area, not the hill area, that was contemporary

In any case it seems safe to dissociate study of old Sawankhalok from inscription no. 1 and the activities of Rām Khamhaeng, and also to dissociate it from the Satchanalai of the epigraphic corpus. The proximity of Sukhothai-Satchanalai which the records imply suggests the latter was the site of the deserted temples and habitation areas on the Fa Kradan some 20 km south of Sawankhalok. Hill 261 located there could well have been the sacred mountain associated with Srī Satchanalai, and with the Wat Mahathat at the river bend viewed in its greatly reduced probable 14th-century dimensions it does not merit, on grounds of size, priority over either Wat Bot or Wat Yai in the now deserted area.

### **Conclusions**

The foregoing epigraphical, textual, and architectural evidence indicates that Chaliang and Srī Satchanalai were separate locations, that the earliest recorded name for the area comprising the old city under discussion was the non-Thai and still not understood 'Chaliang'/*jalyanī*, and that by the first half of the 15th century the same area had also acquired the name Sawankhalok/*savarggalok*. The last two names are solidly linked in chronicles which give evidence of being the earliest and most complete records of political relations among the central Menam basin polities. The original Chaliang-Sawankhalok comprised the entire plain surrounded by hills on its southwest, west, and north, and bounded by the Yom to the north and northeast, as well as the major kiln area extending for some 10 kilometers northward along the river beyond the northern ridge of hills.<sup>81</sup>

Inscription no. 2, in spite of damage and lacunae, shows definitely that in mid-13th century Srī Satchanalai and Chaliang were quite separate places and that the former, at least was already believed to be ancient. Since Srī Satchanalai, therefore, must be dissociated from Chaliang-Sawankhalok, the most likely location is some 20 km to the south, where remains of old wats, including walls of the type surrounding Wat Mahathat in Chaliang, as well as signs of ancient habitation sites, were first described by Prince Vajiravudh.

Although Inscription no. 9, *Mūlaśāsanā* and *Jinakālamālī* are in most details compatible with the assumption that Srī Satchanalai was the same place as Chaliang-Sawankhalok, they do not require it, the text of *Mūlaśāsanā*, written a century later than the crucial story, has been considered corrupt in some of its

---

with Rām Khamhaeng", and that the place where he buried a relic and built a wall was the Wat Maha That (Wat Phra Prang) located there. A fourth example of a similar megalithic wall is at Wat Avas Yai (*āvāś hñai* at Kamphaeng Phet. These now four known examples suggest that they should all be studied together as a regional style, and dated objectively on that basis, rather than as a unique construction of 'Rām Khamhaeng'.

<sup>81</sup> The chronicle fragments numbered 222 and 223, discussed above, pp. 22-23. The Sukhothai inscriptions also make references to such relations, but they are anything but clear, and do not mention 'Sawankhalok' at all.

details, and the allegedly more accurate *Jinakālamāṭī*, written nearly 200 years after the event, contains architectural detail which can now be understood as either wrong or in contradiction with an assumption that Srī Satchanalai was located at Chaliang- Sawankhalok.<sup>82</sup> Moreover, since the sections of those two chronicles relevant to the discussion concern a quite fictitious event, supernatural revelation of a magic relic, the details surrounding it may not be of the greatest accuracy.

The only sources which seem to require an identification of Srī Satchanalai and Sawankhalok are the *Hierarchy Law* and *Phongsawadan Nōa*, both of which are compilations of records or tales from diverse epochs set down in their present form in the early 19th century. Thus they may only reflect a then current belief which, like the now current one, may be based on a misapprehension.

The inscriptions give Srī Satchanalai great importance as a sort of twin city with Sukhothai, located not far away, and treated in some inscriptions as a joint city. Chaliang is given notice only briefly and without detail. The latter was obviously of little importance to Sukhothai in the 14th century. While Sukhothai developed as a political center, it seems that the importance of Srī Satchanalai declined. There is no record of a prince ruling there after Lithai took power in Sukhothai in 1347. Chaliang, on the other hand, continued to develop after the end of the 14th century. Eventually the true location of Srī Satchanalai was forgotten, and its name, in some late compilations, was associated with the still flourishing city of Chaliang-Sawankhalok which by the 15th-16th centuries had come to rival, if not outshine, Sukhothai in size, economic importance, and political hegemony.<sup>83</sup>

The first use of the name 'Sawankhalok' is unknown. It is not found in Sukhothai epigraphy, which might suggest that it was post-14th century, but those inscriptions in any case give little attention to the area.

'Chaliang' is a name whose meaning and origin are unknown, but it is certainly non-Thai and is evidence that the population was of some other ethnicity. The structure of the word suggests Mon-Khmer, and I have earlier shown the population involved in the ceramic industry of Chaliang/Sawankhalok was probably Mon. That is, the only two ancient ceramic-associated terms which have been preserved, *sūn*, 'hole in the ground'='kiln', and /thuriang/ (*durian*<*dulāñ*, 'dish', are Mon.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>82</sup> This is the statement that Rocarāja, father of Rāmarāja, built a large edifice of brick and stone in the center of Sajjānālāya.

<sup>83</sup> This importance is seen in the chronicle fragments 222 and 223, in the hegemonic role of Chaliang in the relations between the central plain polities and Ayutthaya, and in the monumental edifices built in Chaliang-Sawankhalok long after such construction at Sukhothai had ceased.

<sup>84</sup> Vickery, "Some New Evidence for the Cultural History of Central Thailand", *The Siam Society's Newsletter*, Vol. 2, No. 3 (1986), pp. 4-6. Although *sūn* appears in inscription no. 2,

Chaliang lay outside the political center of the Sukhothai kingdom, was ethnically distinct, and developed on the basis of its ceramics production. This is why it receives so little attention in the Sukhothai inscriptions, and no doubt the reason why no inscriptions of the classical Sukhothai type have been found there.

Before any of the datable edifices were built the area was inhabited at least as early as the 8th century by people who practiced basic ceramic techniques.

The first approximately dated edifice, Wat Cau Chand, is attributed to the late 12th or early 13th century. The choice of site for it, and for anything which may have been built at that time on the site of Wat Mahathat, indicates that the river course must have been more distant. Like other temples of the type it was probably planned for a large settlement, with the ring of mountains forming a natural enclosure, and the Yom following a course somewhat to the north of its present channel, without the tight loop which now surrounds Wat Mahathat. No visible part of Wat Mahathat itself dates from that period, although the four-faced head surmounting the east gate in the outer wall apparently imitates Bayon style (Jayavarman VII), indicating some kind of edifice was built at the same time as Wat Cau Chand or earlier.<sup>85</sup>

Although Wat Cau Chand, like the earliest edifices at Sukhothai, was constructed as part of Angkor penetration into the area, Sukhothai, because of its more strategic location between the Ping and Yom/Nan rivers became the Angkor outpost and the Thai capital.

The next approximately dated edifice is Wat Chang Lom, now placed no earlier than 1370; and the other large buildings within the walls are later. It is not yet possible to precisely date the edifices on the ridge within the walled city, nor the numerous small wats within and outside the walls, except that the latter predate Wat Chang Lom, and by inference predate the other large wats extending in a line from it. The small wats also probably postdate Wat Cau Chand. The important inference to draw from the large number of these small edifices both within the mountain and river-enclosed original city area and north of it, is that there was a large and densely settled population before Wat Chang Lom and the other large temples were constructed.

These larger structures constitute a later phase, no doubt late 14th century at the earliest, and continuing to the 16th, or even 17th century (Nang Phaya and Wat Kok Singkharam). This last phase saw the construction of the walls which

and is thus connected with Sukhothai, not Chaliang-Sawankhalok, it demonstrates that 14th-century Thais in that area knew kilns by a Mon term.

<sup>85</sup> It is to be reemphasized that except for this gate decoration, the attribution of the origins of Wat Mahathat to the Khmer is strictly speculative and should be avoided until archaeological investigation proves or disproves it. Wat Cau Chand, however, is indubitably Angkorean.

now surround an inner part of the original Chaliang-Sawankhalok, and which must have been built in the 16th century or later.

The large temples were erected when ceramics production had attained large-scale industrial level. The number of kilns, the area they covered, their depth, and the wares which have been discovered, permit no doubt that ceramics was the main economic activity, not agriculture, and that the wealth which permitted construction of the old city as we see it, came from that industry. This industry developed from local beginnings, many centuries earlier, and continued at least until the 16th century.<sup>86</sup>

This brings us back to the name 'Sawankhalok'. It is popularly believed that the name 'Sangkhalok' (written *sangalok*), associated with its ceramic wares, is a corruption of 'Sawankhalok'; and the ceramics specialist C.N. Spinks thought it was a Chinese mispronunciation.<sup>87</sup> Prince Damrong also saw Chinese influence, but contrary to Spinks, considered that 'Sangkhalok' was the original and 'Sawankhalok' a later development. Thus, believing that the ceramics industry had been founded by Chinese potters who arrived during the Sung dynasty, he postulated that the syllable '/sang/' was from the Chinese dynastic name 'Sung'. He did not, however, offer an explanation for '-khalok'.<sup>88</sup> I would like to suggest that Sangkhalok/*sangalok* is indeed the original local name, but related to *sankok*, a Mon term for kiln, in particular a kiln dug into the ground, as many of those at Sawankhalok were.<sup>89</sup> This does not of course explain satisfactorily the ending '-khalok', which does not seem to be a variant of '-kok' in Mon. Two very speculative hypotheses may however merit attention. First, an original Mon *sangok* ('pit kiln') became an etymologically meaningless *sangalok* through popular etymology as the local language changed from Mon to Thai. A second possibility is that the original Mon was *sanglåk*, of which the second syllable, now pronounced /klòk, khlok/ means 'scoop out'.<sup>90</sup>

The dates at which either *sangalok* or Sawankhalok, written *savarrgalok*, were first used are unknown. The former appears on La Loubère's map of 1688; and it is still found written in 1st Bangkok-reign (1782-1809) script on a Buddha image brought down then from the north. More decisive, perhaps, is that by the end of the 16th century, at least, the term *sunkoroku*, obviously

<sup>86</sup> See footnote 3, above.

<sup>87</sup> Charles Nelson Spinks, *The Ceramic Wares of Siam*, Bangkok, The Siam Society, 1971, p. 128

<sup>88</sup> Prince Damrong, commentary to *Diav*, p. 137.

<sup>89</sup> Literally, /sang/ 'hole' + /kok/ (*gok*) 'kiln'. See H.L. Shorto, *A Dictionary of Modern Spoken Mon*, pp. 79, 192; and Vickery, "Some New Evidence for the Cultural History of Central Thailand".

<sup>90</sup> Shorto, *A Dictionary of Spoken Mon*, p. 82; Gérard Diffloth, *The Dvaravati Old Mon Language and Nyah Kur*, p. 169. The word now means 'scoop out with the hand', but this does not render impossible the supposition that in earlier times it could have meant scooping out a hole/kiln from a river bank.

derived from 'sangkhalok', was current in Japan for certain types of ceramics.<sup>91</sup> The version *savarrgalok* first appears in the early 15th century in two Ayutthayan chronicle fragments (2/k.125), then in the relatively reliable Ayutthayan *Luang Prasöt* Chronicle in an official title in 1556; and the Dutch text of van Vliet's Short History suggests that he was reading from a Thai text which had *savarrgalok*.<sup>92</sup> Neither term is found in the old inscriptions.

I would like to suggest that in the period covered by epigraphy the name for our old city was Jalyañ, that *sangalok* simply meant 'kiln', and by extension the important local ceramic industry, perhaps used colloquially to designate the whole area. Later, as Thai became the dominant official language, the meaningless, for Thai, *sangalok*, was given further popular etymological extension to become Savarrgalok, and replaced the equally meaningless, for Thai, Jalyañ, as official name for the city.

[\*New material added 2012.] This article was written and published before I had discovered the chronicle fragment 2/k.125 describing 15<sup>th</sup>-century events,<sup>93</sup> but the age of which seems impossible to determine beyond the probability that it is from the Ayutthaya period<sup>94</sup>. Lacunae at several points show that the contents did not originate with the manuscript at hand, which must in turn be a copy of an older one.

With respect to the argument of the present paper, the 2/k.125 fragment makes Bañā Jaliañ the most important chief in the Sukhothai region, and besides his own *mo'āñ* Jaliañ seems to give him authority over *mo'āñ* Savarrgalok as well, using this spelling which I have proposed above as perhaps a 17<sup>th</sup>-century development, at which time, in fact the extant text of 2/k.125 could have been written, bringing some terms up to date, even if its basic story is from the 15<sup>th</sup> century. Thus, when the king of Ayutthaya called the chiefs of the northern *mo'āñ* to Ayutthaya, "Bañā Jaliañ left *mo'āñ* Savarrgalok [to] Cau Rāj Śrī Yaś, who was his son"; and when they left Ayutthaya to return home "Bañā Jaliañ, when he had reached *mo'āñ* Savarrgalok, he left all affairs to Hmu'n Hluoñ

---

<sup>91</sup> Spinks, p. 127-128. Spinks was uncomfortable with the obvious conclusion, believing mistakenly that the ceramic industry at Sukhothai and Sawankhalok had ended in the 15th century.

<sup>92</sup> See *Caru'k samāy sukhodai*, p. 135 (for *sangalok* on Buddha image); van Vliet, *The Short History of the Kings of Siam*, p. 21, wrote Sovarcaloucq, which reflects Thai spelling, although the pronunciation is /sawankhalok/. For a discussion of van Vliet's sources, and their interpretation, see Vickery, review article on Jeremias van Vliet, *The Short History of the Kings of Siam*, pp. 221-222; Simon de la Loubère, *The Kingdom of Siam* [reprint], Kuala Lumpur, 1962; note 39 above.

<sup>93</sup> "The 2/k.125 Fragment, a Lost Chronicle of Ayutthaya", in this volume pp 00-00.

<sup>94</sup>. Conversation with Khun Prasarn Bunprakong, June 1975, which concurs with the opinion of Khun Bunnag. In a conversation Dr. Prasert na Nagara has said that the epigraphy of the Ayutthaya and Rattanakosin periods has been too little studied to permit a definite statement about the date of the script.

Bal...” while he became involved with the affairs of Nan and Chiang Mai.  
‘Satchanalai’, however written, does not appear in 2/k.125\*]