This paper is a continuation of two earlier short studies and, like them, is intended as a contribution to the determination of the correct dates of the Laws of the Three Seals, and to an understanding of the Ayutthayan constitution, that is the structure of government as set forth in the laws. It involves examination of the sources of both the structure and the language in which it was described, and one purpose is to correct the errors in H.G. Quaritch Wales's Ancient Siamese Government and Administration, which has been followed by several subsequent historians of Ayutthaya and early Bangkok.¹ In my first study, "Prolegomena", I established classifications for the dates and royal titles of the preambles of the laws, which are mostly quite different from the reign dates and royal titles found in the chronicles of Ayutthaya and generally accepted. I concluded that nearly all of the dates are spurious and result from changes introduced when the laws were recodified; and on the basis of those two elements, preamble dates and titles, I proposed that signs of five codifications could be identified before that of Rama I in 1805. They were "A pre-1569 recension with true šaka dates", "laws of Naresu'or's [Naresuan] reign with true cula dates", "a recodification by King Indarājā/Song Tham using Buddhist era dates", "a new code prepared for King Dhammarājādhīrāj/Prasat Thong", and new laws of Kings Naray and Phetracha, although not full new recensions".² My second paper was a very short version of what is presented here. Because of space limitations arguments made in "Prolegomena" cannot be repeated here, and when relevant I must refer readers to it.

This paper in no way completes the task of unravelling the complexities of the Ayutthayan laws. In particular for the lower levels of society, the brai and lek and their relations to the ruling classes and state, another study, perhaps longer than this, will be required.

NOTES


² Vickery, "Prolegomena", p. 54. There are two series of miscellaneous laws, Kāṃhnāt kau ('Old Decisions') and Kāt 36 khō ('Law of 36 Articles'), issued by 18th-century kings.
All of the work on Ayutthayan administration and state structure has to rely on the Three Seals Code together with a few European reports from the 17th century. As has long been recognized, the law texts themselves are full of unresolved problems, particularly in the dates to which they are attributed, and the possible confusion of provisions originating in different time periods. Nevertheless, there has not been an attempt to resolve the problems, and historians have continued to use the laws, or at least Quaritch Wales's interpretations of them, as though they were unequivocally true records.3

These laws, in their extant form, date from 1805 and are due to a decision of King Rama I to collate the existing Ayutthayan law texts and rewrite the whole code. The revision was accomplished in great haste, which may account for some of the anomalies to be described below.4 The new edition alone was considered authoritative and older manuscripts were presumably destroyed. This collection of laws is of particular interest to historians because several of the texts included outline the administrative structure of the kingdom and are thus a sort of written constitution of pre-19th century Ayutthaya.

The study of the pre-19th century administrative system of Siam would seem to have begun with the efforts of Thai royal personalities in the latter part of the 19th century to explain the existing administrative structure and account for the ways in which it differed from that set out in the old Ayutthayan laws. The impetus for such activity undoubtedly came from the intention of King Chulalongkorn and his brothers to reform the existing system, which forced them to examine closely a structure until then taken for granted.

Simply describing the existing administration should have occasioned no difficulty for these able men at the centre of the kingdom's government, but it is clear from King Chulalongkorn's two major writings on the subject, dated 1878 and 1887, that he also wished to take into account the

3. Akin Rabibhadana, "The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period, 1782-1873", Cornell Thailand Project, Interim Report Series, Number Twelve, Data Paper: Number 74, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, Ithaca, July 1969. For such awareness see also Lorraine Marie Gesick, "Kingship and Political Integration in Traditional Siam 1767-1824", Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University, 1976, p. 9, "one cannot judge to what extent the laws were changed in the process of 'restoration'...it is clear...that certain provisions of the Law of Provincial Hierarchy and the Law of Seals [presumably Dharrmanûn] reflect the early Bangkok situation". Gesick nevertheless accepted that "one may assume that such provisions were only added to 'touch up' these laws while their basic provisions were retained unchanged". The important question, however, is did the basic provisions represent continuing reality or not?

4. The code is entitled Kaṭhmûy trâ sâm dvau ("Laws of the Three Seals"). The best edition was prepared by Robert Lingat and published in three volumes in Bangkok in 1938-9 under the title Pra:mvan kaṭhmûy rajakâl dî 1, cula era 1166 ("Collected Laws of the Reign of Rama I, Cula Era 1166"). It has been reprinted by Guru Sabhâ in a five-volume set from which my citations are taken. References will be to 'Laws' followed by volume numbers in roman numerals and page numbers. Information on the revision of 1805 is in Lingat, "Note sur la revision des lois siamoises en 1805", JSS 23 (1929-30), pp. 19-28; and J. Burnay, "Matériaux pour une édition critique du code de 1805", JSS 31:2 (1937), pp. 155-68. Lingat, "Note", determined the length of the revision period as possibly from September to December 1805.
country's traditional laws, even when no direct reference to the laws was made. We may hypothesize that one reason for his interest in the laws was a desire to find out if some of the structures he most desired to modify did not owe their powerful situation to usurpation of functions beyond those outlined for them in the traditional law texts.

Among European scholars study of the laws has fallen into two separate channels, the first represented by the work of Lingat and Burnay, who were interested in establishing the exact texts of the 1805 compilation, finding clues to the texts antedating the reform, and investigating Siamese legal theory. Scholars of the Lingat-Burnay school would probably say that before further use of the laws in historical study is feasible, we must know more about the way in which the present code was compiled and the precise meaning of all sections of the laws. It is true, of course, that parts of the law texts are in difficult, archaic language and will require careful linguistic and textual analysis before their full value as historical source material is revealed. Extensive sections of the laws, however, may be read without much difficulty and historical scholarship has suffered from the neglect of direct investigation into these documents.

The other current, illustrated by the work of Quaritch Wales, who based his writing to a great extent on earlier interpretative studies by Prince Damrong, is directly concerned with the evolution of Ayutthayan society and administration and uses evidence from the law texts together with details of 19th-century practice to illustrate the process. Nevertheless, he neglected direct investigation of some of the more interesting, and contradictory, sections of the laws, but perhaps because his reliance on the authoritative statements of Prince Damrong gave his work a quasi-official

5 "A Royal Essay, Traditions of Royal Lineage in Siam", 1878, text and translation in Robert B. Jones, "Thai Titles and Ranks Including a Translation of Traditions of Royal Lineage in Siam by King Chulalongkorn", Data Paper Number 81, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, June 1971; and "Commentary by His majesty King Chulalongkorn on the Administration of the Kingdom" (Braj ráj támras nai brah pád samtec brah culàomklau cau ayū hua drah thaleń brah param rājādhipāy kee khai kār pakgroń pheentin) [1887], Bangkok 2470 [1927]. See also Michael Vickery, Review article on Robert B. Jones, "Thai Titles and Ranks", JSS LXII, 1 (January 1974), pp. 159-174.


7 As illustrations of their value for the study of Thai society, even in terms of the new domain of 'Cultural Studies', and not merely as antiquarian exotica, one need only note (1) the reason given for the initial interest of Rama I in the law texts (Laws I, pp. 1-3) which shows his sociological preconception, that the previous laws which gave women an absolute right of divorce must have been corrupt, or as Gesick, p. 9 considered, "clearly unjust" (2) his edict regarding linga worship, noted by Akin, p. 44, with its evidence for religious syncretism of the time, the extent of Hinduization, and the accuracy of current formulations of the greater/lesser tradition dichotomy. The first case, incidentally, offers a perfect opportunity to put gender into Thai history, as called for by Craig Reynolds at the London Thai Studies Conference (Craig Reynolds, "Predicaments of Modern Thai History", Third Conference Lecture, The Fifth International Conference on Thai Studies, SOAS, London, 9 July 1993).
status, subsequent historians have generally followed his outline of the evolution of early Siamese administration.8

Quaritch Wales' use of the laws

Quaritch Wales drew on the law texts in order to present a coherent evolutionary picture of the structure and development of early Ayutthayan administration—a picture which has not been carefully studied by other historians. His story begins with the final conquest of Angkor at the date found in the Hlvaṇ prasrōth chronicle, 1431, with the entry "samtec brah paramarāja cau [the King of Ayutthaya] went [and] took mōaṅ nagara hlvaṇ [Angkor] ...". As a result, there was an "influx into the Siamese capital of large numbers of Khmer statesmen and Brahmins. Their influence led ... King Paramatra-lokanatha (1448-1488), to undertake the complete reorganisation of the administration by the adaptation of many Khmer principles and methods ...". He divided "the population into two divisions, one military and one civil"; and this "was the administrative system...that was followed in broad principle until the reign of Rama V".9 These details, it should be noted, are not found in the laconic entry of Hlvaṇ prasrōth, nor specifically stated in any other source, but, with respect to the Khmer influence, result from scholarly speculation oriented toward explaining the large number of Khmer terms in Thai royal and administrative vocabulary taken in conjunction with the statement of the long versions of the Thai Annals, but not Hlvaṇ prasrōth, about reforms carried out by King Trailok.10 Before the reforms attributed to King Trailok, according to Quaritch Wales, Ayutthayan administration had been 'feudal', of the personal type, allegedly like Sukhothai.

The picture presented by Quaritch Wales is based on a number of assumptions supported by little or no evidence and made necessary by a preconceived idea of what the evolution of the Thai system should have been. Crucial to his conception of this evolution was a belief that certain features had originally been adopted directly from India and that others had been introduced from Angkor in the 15th century and formalized by King Trailok, and that the differences from this ideal structure which were observed from the 17th century on were due to deterioration of the original

---

8 H.G. Quaritch Wales, *Ancient Siamese government and Administration*, London 1934 and Paragon Book reprint 1965, from which my citations are taken. In order to limit the number of footnotes, the numerous page references to this work will be included in parentheses in the body of the text. The most important writings of Prince Damrong on the subject are Tāmnāṇ kathmāy daiy, 'Story of the Laws of Thailand', included in his commentary to the *Royal Autograph Edition of the Annals of Ayutthaya*, pp. 403-410, and his 'History of Military Organization', published in *Collected Chronicle (Prajum bāhśāvatār)*, Vol. 14. The former, in Thai Bāh rāj bāhśāvatār chapap bāh rāj hatthalekhā, has gone through several printings. My citations are from the 6th printing, Bangkok 2511, and will be cited as 'RA'. *Prajum bāhśāvatār* has also gone through several printings. My citations are from the *Guru Sabhā* edition and citations will be abbreviated 'PB'.


10 For discussion and analysis of the different versions of the Ayutthayan chronicles, see Michael Vickery, 'Cambodia After Angkor. The Chronicular Evidence for the 14th-16th Centuries', Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, 1977, pp. 0000
system. Some of his evolutionary conceptions, which are not always mutually consistent, are as follows:

- The Khmer modelled their civil administration on an existing military organisation.
- The 12th-century Khmer cabinet consisted of four chief ministers.
- King Trailok followed the Khmer model.
- In King Trailok’s system there were originally four general officers, each in command of one of the four divisions (*caturaṅga*) of the army, under the chief of the military division; and in the civil division the four ministers were under the control of the head of the civil division.\(^{11}\)

Each of these statements is entirely speculative. Too little has been determined about the structure of Angkor administration, either civil or military, to yet make useful comparisons, although it seems to me that Angkor was quite different from Ayutthaya. For the second, Quaritch Wales referred to the *galérie historique* of Angkor Vat, but this relief scene depicts 19 high officials, most of whom seem to be military, and there is no way to determine whether four of them were chief ministers. Moreover, in another context Quaritch Wales presented still a different evolutionary picture:

- The army in ancient India was divided into four great departments (*caturaṅga*), infantry, cavalry, elephants, and chariots.
- Originally in Siam there were four great departments in the military division under the *kalā hom*, modelled on the Indian tradition.
- King Trailok organized the four departments of the civil division on the model of the military division.
- Later the "original arrangement became much confused". The main generals, who seem to be called *bañā rāma caturaṅga*, are all of the infantry. There are six rather than four. The elephants and cavalry, composing one of the four "original" military divisions, are in the civil division, and the "original" artisan group, corresponding to the Indian chariots, has been split up into "many small groups, each under a commander of comparatively low rank".\(^{12}\)

Here the only statements based on any kind of evidence are the first, on the classical Indian system, and the last, on the Thai system as observed between the 17th and 19th centuries. There are no grounds for the postulated steps in between. As for elements of Indianization, such as the term and concept of *caturaṅga*, the process of selective borrowing and adaptation which occurred all over Southeast Asia could easily have altered the original Indian meaning long before the Ayutthaya period in which the term seems to have meant simply "military".\(^{13}\)

No conclusions may be drawn about direct Angkorean influence on Thai administration and in general probably very little was borrowed, at least in the Ayutthaya period. The reforms of King Trailok, if any, and the evolution of Ayutthayan administration must be deduced from other sources -- laws, chronicles, inscriptions -- not assumed as the result of any kind of contact with Angkor.

---

\(^{11}\) Deduced from Quaritch-Wales's remarks, *Administration*, p. 79, 79, n.2.

\(^{12}\) Deduced from remarks in *Administration*, pp. 141-2.

\(^{13}\) See Vickery, “Review of Jones”, on the question of Angkor influence, and on *caturaṅga* below.
Quaritch Wales arbitrarily assigned places in a developmental sequence to sections of the laws which are in mutual contradiction. Of course, the fault does not lie with Quaritch Wales alone, for often he was simply repeating what Prince Damrong had written; and although Prince Damrong's speculations were always interesting, and often valuable as hypotheses, we must recognize that they were only hypotheses, not solutions based on the results of careful historical investigation.

Quaritch Wales considered that the Palatine Law dated from 1458 (his pp. 19, 22, 171, 173), and the Hierarchy Laws from 1454, and "the correctness of the dates...[is] corroborated by definite statements in the Annals of Ayudhya" (173). Interestingly, he thought all the preamble dates purporting to be earlier than Trailok, and particularly those claiming to date from the 14th century, were false, and should be, in spite of the dates they contain, attributed variously to the 15th, 16th or 17th centuries. The last assumption was probably correct, but for the wrong reason. He believed that the preambles of certain laws with 14th-century dates "reveal the existence, at the time of promulgation, of a higher degree of administrative specialization, and of a well-developed official class, with indications that the separation of the people into civil and military divisions was already established, all of which we have abundant evidence to believe represents a stage in the organisation of society that was not reached before the reign of King Paramatrailoonanatha".15

This would be a good reason if we were absolutely sure of the date of "the separation of the people into civil and military divisions". In my opinion a sounder reason for rejecting the 14th-century dates of these preambles, as I do, is the use of the Buddhist era, which all epigraphic evidence indicates was not used for dating official documents in Siam at that time.16 The matter of separation of the people into civil and military divisions is extremely complex, and cannot be thoroughly treated here, but it may be said with confidence that the conventional view that this was accomplished by King Trailok is an oversimplification.

Griswold and Prasert challenged Quaritch Wales on this point with a law found in a Sukhothai inscription, which they dated to the late 14th century, and considered as an Ayutthayan intervention in Sukhothai because some of its provisions resemble the Ayutthayan Law on Kidnapping/Abduction (Lák bhā) with a Buddhist Era date equivalent to 1355-56. In an earlier study I gave reasons why the Sukhothai text should be considered a Sukhothai law, which perhaps influenced the Ayutthayan law code after 1569, and I shall take this up again below in the section on the origins of the Ayutthayan state structure.17

Quaritch Wales would seem to have been under the misapprehension that the Palatine and Hierarchy laws, the most important for the study of administrative structure, actually contained dates equivalent to 1458 (tiger year) and 1454 (dog year) respectively. In reality the former shows the date 720, which would normally be construed as cula era equivalent to 1358, and the two latter laws have 1298, apparently śaka, and equal to 1376. It is certain, however, that the dates found in these laws are in some way inaccurate since there is discord between the numerical year and the

15. Q.W., Administration, p. 173.
16. See Vickery, "Prolegomena", and below, especially the quotation from Roger Billard, in note 72.
animal cycle, and more than one attempt has been made to emend them. Prince Damrong, in his "Story of the Laws", gives the same dates as Quaritch Wales, but it is not certain whether he was responsible for the emendation or was copying from another source.\(^\text{18}\)

In both cases the emendation seemed necessary because the titles contain 'Trailok', and in the case of the Hierarchy Laws seem to reflect an administrative organisation believed due to the initiative of King Trailok, but the emendations were made on different principles. The choice of a date equivalent to 1454 involves a completely arbitrary change of numbers in order to fit the proper animal year, dog, somewhere near the beginning of Trailok's reign; while 1458 was achieved by assuming a copyist's error of 720 for an original 820, not too arbitrary an emendation, but one which still leaves a two-year discrepancy with the animal year.

Later efforts to emend these dates involved the resurrection of the culāmanī era which permits both placing the three preambles in question in the reign of King Trailok and reconciling the numerical year with the animal cycle. By this computation the Palatine Law is dated to 1468 and the Hierarchy Laws to 1466.\(^\text{19}\)

Later, Akin Rabibhadana accepted Quaritch Wales for the Hierarchy Law dates, but ignored his strictures concerning the 14th-century dates of certain preambles, and for the Palatine Law followed Wyatt. He also accepted the culāmanī era, but did not make consistent adjustments for it in his discussion. Thus after accepting that the implied culāmanī date for Dharrmanūn, AD 1743, might be the best, he accepted that there was support for the date AD 1633 in the occasional use of the title Ekādaśaraṭṭh by King Prasat Thong. If, however, the culāmanī dates are accurate, then none of the extant laws may be attributed to Prasat Thong.\(^\text{20}\)

Still another idea was put forward by A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, who suggested that the discovery of a law text in a Sukhothai inscription shows the existence of a law code as early as the 14th century and is evidence against Quaritch Wales' contention that all such preambles are false. A critic of Griswold and Prasert pointed out, however, that the date of the inscription has been obliterated and that the language is later than the period they wished to assign to it, and other Thai historians date that Sukhothai inscription in 1433. My own view is that, whatever its date, it predates the Ayutthayan law which it resembles, and which was adopted in Ayutthaya under Sukhothai influence, no earlier than the reign of Trailok, and perhaps only after 1569.\(^\text{21}\)

As for the Annals corroborating any of these dates, the long versions, the dates of which during the 15th-16th centuries are known to be wildly inaccurate, imply that at the beginning of his reign, in 1434, King Trailok changed the titles and functions of certain officials. The true date, if we accept the Hlvañ prasrōthi chronology, for which there is a wide consensus among historians,

---

\(^\text{18}\) See Vickery, "Prolegomena".

\(^\text{19}\) See further in Vickery, "Prolegomena", pp. 41-46; and on culāmanī pp. 00-00 below.

\(^\text{20}\) Akin, pp. 4, 20-21, 192, and Vickery, "Prolegomena", p. 43.

should be 1448, and since Prince Damrong has shown how the law texts may have influenced the composition of the long chronicle versions, any information they contain relating to the laws may have been taken from the law texts and is thus not independent evidence confirming the laws themselves.\textsuperscript{22}

We should also note that with regard to the \textbf{Hierarchy Laws} Quaritch Wales was not even consistent in his assumptions. Initially assuming them to date from 1454 rather than 1376, he then followed Prince Damrong in assigning the reforms they reflect to King Naesuan (1590-1605), and finally added that their structure better represents the 18th century.\textsuperscript{23} There is no doubt that the laws, and in particular the \textbf{Hierarchy Laws}, contain several layers of material from different periods, but before using the laws in historical reconstruction an attempt must be made to distinguish these layers and attribute them to their true dates. It is hardly legitimate, however, to assign a law to one date to fit one argument and to a different date to answer another, and if the details of the law concerning provincial hierarchies really fit the reign of Naesuan and the date of the preamble is really in error, there is no need to attribute it to King Trailok at all.

Quaritch Wales' use of the second element which has been important in dating the laws, the royal titles contained therein, also merits some comment. Quaritch Wales followed Lingat in asserting that the "names" of kings in the laws were "merely long titles applied to many monarchs and of no use as an aid to identification". This opinion was even more strongly stated by Griswold and Prasert: "such titles are purely conventional...The same elements, or some of them, are repeated again and again ... in the same or different order; and any king might use a different combination at different times...".\textsuperscript{24}

Akin, on the contrary, finds "that the kings' names are not unreliable as a guide" except for "a few kings who used the same names in their laws (e.g. Prasathong often used the name Ekathotsarot)".\textsuperscript{25} The underlying assumption in both cases is that the Ayutthayan kings are accurately named in the chronicles and that where the laws differ from the chronicles it is generally the former which are inaccurate. To the contrary, it is certain that royal titles followed definite patterns, and random combinations of elements in secondary documents prove the inaccuracy of those documents.\textsuperscript{26} Further discussion of Quaritch Wales analysis is included under specific topics below.

\textbf{Description of the laws}

It is now necessary to re-examine carefully the laws themselves in order to assess the accuracy of the formulations of Prince Damrong, Quaritch Wales, and later historians, to see if they may not be inaccurate owing to a priori assumptions and to the practice of following Prince Damrong in speculating about the evolution of the laws in cases where no direct evidence was available, and to present to students what the laws actually say rather than what Quaritch Wales believed they meant.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} Damrong, RA, pp. 398-400.
\item \textsuperscript{23} Quaritch Wales, \textit{Administration}, p. 109.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Akin, p. 188.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Vickery, "Cambodia After Angkor", pp, 265-296; Vickery, "Prolegomena", pp. 46-51, p. 47 on cäkrabarrti.
\end{itemize}
First some preliminary matters.

Foreign influences

The vocabulary of the Three Seals, like Ayutthayan Thai in general, is characterized by a very large quantity of Khmer and Sanskrit, especially in the formation of titles, and this together with the use of a 'Dharmaśāstr' as a framework for categorizing the laws, has led some writers to concentrate on foreign origins, in India and Cambodia. As shown above, Quaritch Wales based much of his description and analysis on the assumption that the Thai had first adopted and then modified Indian structures. With respect to Khmer, conventional wisdom, established for modern western scholarship by Prince Damrong and Quaritch Wales, holds that the Khmer input was a result of the conquest of Angkor in 1431 by King Paramarāja, father of Trailokanāth, and the capture of Khmer scholars who, in the reign of Trailokanāth aided in the drafting of laws for the reforms allegedly carried out by that king.27

Even radical Thai scholars, together with their praise for critical work in other areas of Thai history, have not questioned the traditionalist and royalist interpretation that the '[śaktinā] system was brought back from Cambodia by victorious Thai armies...in the late Sukhothai period and became firmly established under King Baromtrailokanand [hereafter Trailokanāth/Trailok] (1448-1488)'. This is perhaps because the most famous 'Thai radical scholar, Jit Pumisak, who found something to challenge almost everywhere, accepted this royalist tradition, and Prince Damrong's date of 1453/4 for the law in question, a matter of historical interest in itself, but which cannot be pursued here.28

Moreover, as Quaritch Wales wrote in one context, study of latter-day Cambodian administration "throws little light on the institutions of the ancient Khmer empire. Since the direct attack on this subject by means of the early Khmer inscriptions has unfortunately proved almost

27 The most accurate record of that period of Ayutthayan involvement in Cambodia is in two chronicle fragments now catalogued at the Thai National Library as "Chronicle of Ayutthaya", nos. 222 and 223. No. 223 was published in Vickery, "The 2/k.125 Fragment: A Lost Chronicle of Ayutthaya", JSS 65/1 (January 1977), pp. 1-80. No. 222 was later published in a thesis for Silpakorn University, Kār jāmra: brah rāj bahsāvatār naí rájasamāy brah pād samtec brah buddha yōtōc culāloč, by Miss Uboskri Akkhaphand, whose supervisor Dr. Thamsook Nummond kindly provided me with a copy of the chronicle text. These two chronicle fragments prove conclusively that the stories of the Thai conquest of Angkor in mid-fifteenth century found in either the official Ayutthayan or the Cambodian chronicles, and accepted in modern works on Thai and Cambodian history, are almost totally wrong. There has been an astounding reluctance by historians to accept the new evidence. David Wyatt, in Thailand: A Short History, writing after the publication of "The 2/k.125 Fragment", simply retold the old tale, citing "The 2/k.125 Fragment" in "Suggestions for Further Reading", p. 324 in a manner giving the impression that it supported the traditional history. David Chandler, A History of Cambodia, pp. 78-9, likewise concealed the importance of this text, refusing to acknowledge that the old history might have to be rewritten.

barren of result, it is probable that the indirect approach via the earlier Siamese institutions--and particularly via the Siamese administration as reorganized in the fifteenth century, owing much as it did to direct contemporary Khmer inspiration--may prove the most fruitful line of study....". 29 This gets dangerously close to a bad case of circular reasoning, that is, Khmer administration is believed to be the source of 15th-century Thai administration, but we really know nothing about the former. Therefore we must infer it from the Thai example and in this way reconstruct the assumed model.

I do not think the evidence warrants this assumption. First, hardly any of the Khmer titles in the Three Seals is found in the Angkor inscriptions. A possible exception which has been recognized is _kālāhom_ (possibly Khmer _kralāhom_), and an exception which has not usually been recognized is _kumṛṭēnlpraːtēn_ (Khmer _kamraten/mraten_). 30 Even one of the most common Khmer words used in the Ayutthayan, and modern Bangkok, bureaucratic hierarchy, _kram_ 'group', 'department' (Khmer _kram_), does not occur in the Khmer inscriptions of Cambodia, which suggests that not only did Angkor not contribute to the vocabulary of the Three Seals, but that the Angkorean government structure was quite different. The few Khmer terms which are common both to Angkor and Ayutthaya, such as _braḥ_ ('sacred', a rank) and _bala_ ('forces, personnel'), point to assimilation much earlier than the 15th century. Both are also common to 14th-century Sukhothai, which suggests 11th-13th centuries for the influence from Angkor, if such occurred. And in fact the rich corpus of official titles recorded in the Angkor inscriptions is quite different from Three Seals. 31

A better time to search for Angkorean influence on Thai official vocabulary would be the period from Sūryavarman I (1002-1050) to Jayavarman VII (1181-1220?) when large areas of central and northeastern Thailand were under Angkor administration, and when the assimilation of Khmer elements into Sukhothai Thai may be presumed to have occurred. The differences in the Khmer vocabularies, however, put this also in doubt with respect to Ayutthaya.


30 I would like to dissociate _kālāhom_, which I take as the canonical form in Ayutthaya, from Old Khmer _kralāhom(a)_ , and analyze it as Mon _kala_ 'chief' + _hom_ (?). The form _kālāhom_ is found in the oldest parts of Three Seals, and _kralāhom_ , most common in 18th-century decrees and in laws of Rama I seems to have been introduced (a hypercorrection?) in late Ayutthaya or Bangkok times. This would mean that the explanation proposed by Quaritch Wales, _Ancient South-East Asian Warfare_, London, Bernard Quaritch, Ltd., 1952, p. 151, was not correct, and that _kālāhom_ was not connected with "Brahmanical rites before war". The derivation of _kumṛṭēn_ from _kamraten_ seems indisputable, but _praːtēn_ from _mraten_ is admittedly hypothetical, although I cannot think of any other possibility. It would represent either an independent Khmer development in Ayutthaya, or pre-Ayutthaya, or a misconception by scribes after the term was no longer in use.

31 [*On _kram_, and misconceptions about it, see my review in Journal of the Siam Society, Volume 62, part 1, January 1974, of Robert B Jones, "Thai Titles and Ranks Including a Translation of Traditions of Royal Lineage in Siam by King Chulalongkorn" (Data Paper: Number 81, Southeast, Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, June 1971). *]Another certain Angkorean expression is _khlon dvār_ (in Khmer _khloñ dvār_) 'door officer', listed among the inner palace functionaries, _Laws I_, p. 221, and there are a few more occurrences of _khlon_. Such rare terms are just sufficient to show the strong Khmer background in early Ayutthaya.
In my earlier remarks on this subject I proposed that early Ayutthaya was Khmer, not Thai, and if so, they would have developed their own Khmer usage, which accords well with the evidence available. The extant written evidence shows that Ayutthaya was still mainly Khmer in the time of Trailokanāth, but that Thai influence was intruding. By mid-16th century the official language was probably Thai, but the script still Khmer, and a fully Thai polity was not in place until Sukhothai royalty took the Ayutthayan throne after throwing their support behind the Burmese invasion of 1569. Traditional scholarship established a false continuity of Thai culture between earliest Ayutthaya and Thai states in Sukhothai and Lamā. It seems now preferable to hypothesize a Khmer Sien-Ayutthaya in the 13th-14th centuries, with gradual Thai influence from the Northeast and what is now Laos, since linguists have established that the Thai language which emerged in Ayutthaya was a branch of Phuan, Phu Tai, etc., not the Thai of Sukhothai, then Sukhothai influence as Ayutthaya expanded in that direction from the end of the 14th century, and finally domination of Ayutthaya by Sukhothai, and full Thai-ization, after 1569. This subject need not be pursued further here, but it must be realized that the Angkor inscriptions are of no help in understanding the Three Seals. Whenever, and from wherever, Ayutthaya got its Khmer, that language was used in original ways when assimilated to Thai, and Three Seals is not evidence for either linguistic or administrative influence from Cambodia.

A new problem which is raised by a view of early Ayutthaya as an indigenous Khmer polity, is that its administrative structure at that time may have been quite different from the Thai administrative structure and practices prevalent in Sukhothai and other Thai states in northern Thailand, Laos and northern Vietnam. When the two societies were unified during the 15th-16th centuries it is likely that the result was a mixture of elements from both, with the northern, Thai culture and polity, victorious after 1569, imposing more of its practices on formerly Khmer Ayutthaya. Thus, as sources for the structure of government and administration found in the laws, we must consider a possibly pre-Thai Ayutthayan administration, which may have been influenced by Cambodia, but also the administrative structures of the Thai polities to the North and Northeast. Sukhothai, however, may not have been the most important influence, and the first Thai who became influential in the Ayutthayan area may have come from a northeastern polity with a government somewhat different from Sukhothai.

It has also been established, contrary to preconceptions at the time Quaritch Wales wrote, that Nanchao was not Thai, and that the route of Thai migration, or transmission of Thai languages and culture, was out of what is now northern Vietnam and its borderlands with China. It is thus a priori relevant to search in that area for antecedents to Ayutthayan administrative structures.

32 The proposal of a Khmer early Ayutthaya, which many may have thought irresponsible, has now been made respectable by the doyen of conservative western scholars of Thailand, David Wyatt, as quoted in Suda Kanjanawanawan, "Historical expedience or reality", The Nation, "Focus" (8 February 1990), pp. 25, 27. In addition to work cited, see Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: a Reinterpretation", JSS Vol. 61/1 (January 1973), pp. 51-70.


34 I am not denying that some ultimate sources may have been farther afield, in India or China, but the nearest sources must be examined first.

35 The basic facts on Nanchao and the ancient Thai language areas are in Wyatt, Thailand: A Short History, pp. 10-15. See James R. Chamberlain, "A New Look at the History and
Too much weight should not be given to the evocation of Dharmastra/ dharmasattra/dhammasattham in the Three Seals as evidence of foreign influence on Ayutthayan law. The concept of dharmastra had been floating around Southeast Asia since Funan times, but it is usually impossible to establish the content of the dharmastra to which reference is made. Even if the introduction to Three Seals says the Ayutthayan dharmasatra was adapted from Mon, that does not guarantee that such was the case. More important, the laws of the Three Seals, especially those concerning administration, are not a dharmastra. They are texts concerning practical matters arising in the particular cultures of the Menam basin. Within Three Seals the dharmasatra, much abbreviated compared to Indian or Mon versions, had become simply an apparatus for classification which bears no evidence for external influences on the matters classified.36

The nature of the early Ayutthayan polity

Most writings on early Ayutthaya have paid insufficient attention to certain details of Ayutthayan origins which indicate that Ayutthaya followed Hsien/Sien as a port state which took off in the late 13th century as part of the new wave of international maritime trade which started under the Sung and continued into Ming times, and that the region of Ayutthaya could only have developed in that way because most of its territory, to the south, was unsuitable for agriculture until the construction of modern drainage and irrigation facilities. Understanding was also hindered by the now obsolete belief that Sien was Sukhothai. Not only is there at least one Yuan dynasty record in 1299, which recorded envoys from both Hsien and Su-ku-tai at the same time, but there is an even more explicit Yuan period record which states that hsien [xian in the article in question] controlled, or was the link to, "upper water" or "go upriver" Su-gu-di, meaning that not only were Sukhothai and Hsien different places, but that Sukhothai was upriver from Hsien, implicitly placing the latter downstream.37

37. Tatsuro Yamamoto, "Thailand as it is referred to in the Da-de Nan-hai zhi at the beginning of the fourteenth century", Journal of East-West Maritime Relations, Vol. 1 (1989), pp. 47-58; Geoff Wade, "The Ming Shi-Lu as a Source for Thai History 14th to 17th Century", paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Thai Studies-SOAS, London, 1993, p. 25. I wish to thank Dr. Wade for reminding me of this information. Charnvit Kasetsiri agrees that in the 14th century the Chinese intended Hsien, their rendering of 'siam/syām (as it was written in Old Khmer and Cham), as a name for the lower Menam basin, including Ayutthaya, not Sukhothai. See his "Ayudhya: Capital-Port of Siam and its Chinese Connection in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries", JSS, Vol 80, Part I (1992), pp. 75-81. On the contrary, David K. Wyatt, ignoring new work, asserted boldly in his Thailand: A Short History, p. 58, that Sien (Hsien) was Sukhothai. This is his only reference to that term, and in citing Chou Ta-ku on's contemporary report on Angkor, where Hsien is prominent, Wyatt used 'Siam'. Nevertheless, when describing Rāmādhipa's settlement of Ayutthaya, p. 66, he called it "a port City of some antiquity", which fits precisely the Hsien described by Chinese writers since the 1280s, and which name the Chinese would continue to use.
Only when Ayutthaya lost out to Malacca for appointment as China's representative in the area did Ayutthayan rulers set out on the conquest of the agrarian hinterland. The earliest stage of Ayutthayan development, as a maritime polity intent on dominating the entire peninsula, is hardly at all reflected in the Three Seals, which constitute a body of law concerned with life in an agrarian polity. This early stage is not apparent in the Ayutthayan annals either, and modern historians have generally ignored it. The traditional legend of the chronicles, that Prince Rāmahathipāt arrived on the empty site of Ayutthaya with his followers and decided on it because of its agricultural fertility is not at all credible. Not only was Ayutthaya at the very southern edge of the cultivable flood plain, beyond which was an uninhabitable delta before modern canals were built, but the Khmer-style temples in nearly all the cities of the delta and its immediate hinterland, Suphanburi, Ratburi, Phetburi, Lophburi, show thick previous settlement.

This has led to a skewed vision of early Ayutthayan economy and of the structure of the relevant laws. Quaritch Wales believed that in early Ayutthaya the duties of the Treasury Ministry (glān) must have been light, because "revenue was small and most of the government work was done by forced labour". Only after trade began with China, which he seems to place in early 17th century, did the duties of the glān increase and the minister came to be called cau dā, "lord of the landing stage".

Sarasin Viraphol has taken off from that to say that "[i]n the reign of King Trailokanāth (r. 1488-1528) [sic, true dates 1448-88], which may be said to have been the first period in which the Siamese court entered consciously into foreign trade, an Office of Ports (Krom ta [kram dā]) was organized". It had three sections, Right (kram dā khvā), "in charge of ports on the western side of the Malay peninsula and trade conducted primarily by Mohammedan (Persian) traders"; Left (kram dā zāy), "in charge of ports on the Gulf of Siam and trade in the Eastern Seas conducted primarily by Chinese merchants"; and Central, (kram dā klān), "in charge of other foreign trade in general". Like Quaritch Wales, Sarasin considers that originally the glān, to which the kram dā was subordinate, had little to do, "since the income of the state was primarily in the form of corvée labour".

for Ayutthaya until modern times. [*for the latest and most conclusive work on his see Chris Baker, “Ayutthaya Rising: From the Land or From the Sea”, Journal of Southeast Asian Studies 34/1 (2003), pp. 41-62; Yoneo Ishii, “A reinterpretation of Thai history with special reference to the pre-modern period”, Paper presented at 8th international conference on Thai studies at Nakhon Phanom, Thailand, January 2002.*]  

38 O.W. Wolters, in The Fall of Srivijaya, indicated some of the important clues, but did not make use of them with respect to Ayutthaya. On the natural conditions of the Ayutthaya region see Yoshikazu Takaya, "An Ecological Interpretation of Thai History", JSEAS vol. 6, number 2 (1975), pp. 190-195; and for the historical interpretation, see Charnwit Kasetsiri, The Rise of Ayudhya; and Vickery, "A New Tāmnān About Ayudhya", JSS Vol. 67/2 (July 1979), pp. 123- 86.

39 Q.W., Administration, p. 90.

40. Sarasin Viraphol, Tribute and Profit: Sino-Siamese Trade, 1652-1853, Harvard University Press, 1977, pp. 19-20, where the dates given, 1488-1528, are not the reign of Trailokanāth, but of his successor. Perhaps the most fanciful reinterpretation of the structure of the Ayutthayan central government in that of Fred W. Riggs, Thailand the Modernization of a Bureaucratic Polity, pp. 74, ff. The main error, which skews his entire picture, was to misinterpret glān (ATO) ’storehouse, treasury’, a Khmer loanword in Thai, as Thai klān (AŌ), ’center’, and on the basis of this to posit a
Sarasin supplies no evidence for an increase in trading in the 15th century, and it would seem to be no more than belief in the dates traditionally attributed to certain laws, such as the Civil Hierarchy Law, traditionally dated to the reign of Trailokanāth, and in which the glañ ministry, but not the 'kram dā' as such, is included. It is more likely, however, that the time of Trailokanāth saw a decline in trading compared to the late 13th and the 14th centuries, as Ayutthaya moved inland after its attempt to control the peninsula failed.

Neither does the structure of the kram dā as described by Sarasin conform to what is found in the Hierarchy Law, and the basis for his description is uncertain, perhaps only an organization pertaining to the Bangkok period. In the Civil Hierarchy Law, which outlines the central administration, the department corresponding to the kram dā, which is not mentioned by that name, may be recognized from the title of its chief, hlaṅ jotūk šresthi. There is no division which may be identified as kram dā of the left, right, or center, nor is there a division of duties corresponding to west or east side of the peninsula. There were subordinate positions under the glañ designated as in charge of relations with groups of foreigners. One was assigned to the "khèk from Java, the Malays, and the English". Another dealt with the "khèk from England, the Ñuon [Vietnamese], and the French". Other officials were interpreters for English, French, and Dutch.

What this indicates is a section of the laws which in its present form may not be attributed to any date earlier than 1600. As for 'Right' and 'Left' kram dā, they are found only in laws of Rāma I. Indeed nearly all references to kram dā in the Three Seals are in his Kāññhat hmai (New Decisions). An exception to the lack of attention to the earliest phase of Ayutthayan history in the laws is the claim in the Palatine Law to suzerainty over, uyòn ta'hna: (hujung tanah, 'land's end' in Malay, probably the area of Johore and Singapore), Malacca, Malayu, and varavārī (?). This may be one of the oldest sections of the entire Three Seals, although I maintain my analysis that the royal titles and date of the Palatine Law are quite artificial concoctions.

A concentric arrangement of four courts centered on the glañ, as highest among the four. Not only is this linguistically wrong, but although there are indications of old structures with the vān and mōaṅ as first of the four, there is no evidence that the glañ held that position until perhaps the 17th century when all four were hierarchically subordinate below the Mahātdaiy. Sarasin cites two studies by Thai historians which I have not been able to consult, but in any case what is crucial is the original sources.

Laws I, p. 234.

I shall demonstrate below that the part of the Dharrmanūn in which kram dā is also mentioned is a law of Rāma I. There are two references to kram dā in pre-Rāma I laws of the 18th century, in kāññhat kau 43 of 1736 (Laws IV, p. 119), and kāññhat kau 48 of 1733 (Laws IV, p. 136).

Laws I, p. 70. "Prolegomena", p. 45-46, 51. The Palatine Law also contains details on royalty and organization of the population which are different from all other laws, and which may reflect an ancient system. Simon de la Loubère, The Kingdom of Siam, Oxford University Press, 1969, p. 82, confirms that Ayutthaya even as late as the reign of Naray (1656-1688) still entertained theoretical claims to suzerainty over Johore. See below, in the section on territorial organization, a detail from an older palatine law which may have been rewritten by Rāma I.
One section of the Miscellaneous Laws is in fact maritime law, but it is a very small part of the whole, and contains no details permitting its placement as early as the 14th century. Ayutthaya remained active in maritime trade, and those regulations could just as well have belonged to later centuries. This consideration means that all of the laws dated in the 14th century, in addition to problems with their preambles, seem anachronistic in their content when related to the main concerns of the Ayutthayan government of that time. If there was an Ayutthayan code in the 14th century, it must have emphasized maritime activities, such as the laws of Malacca.

Nevertheless, and contrary to the rationalizations of Quaritch Wales and Sarasin, the glān 'treasury' ministry, corresponding in function and etymology to the bendahara of the Malay maritime powers, would have been the most important ministry of early maritime Sien-Ayutthaya; and the kram dā, as described above, is a perfect counterpart to the shahbandar of the archipelagic states. Thus in spite of the anachronisms found in the extant Three Seals texts, the skeleton of those sections could date from the very beginnings of Ayutthaya.

The extant law corpus, then, reflects a state preoccupied with inland territorial administration and agriculture as the main economic activity, and the conventional attribution of major legal and administrative changes to Trailokanāth may therefore be true, even if the reasons traditionally proposed may no longer be accepted. There may be a connection with the short-lived move by Trailokanāth of the administrative center to Phitsanulok, in the old Thai agrarian heartland, and the failure of that change was no doubt because of the continuing importance of foreign trade at Ayutthaya.

The law texts

The Lingat edition of the laws, considered to be the most accurate text, consists of 29 laws of which 24 have titles dealing with specific matters while the other five are themselves collections of royal orders and decisions on various subjects. In format most of them begin with a preamble which includes the date, the earliest of which go back to the reign of Rāmadhipat, founder of Ayutthaya, the titles of the king, the official to whom the law was principally addressed and the subject to be treated. These preambles are among the most interesting, and also the most baffling, parts of the laws, and contain a number of contradictions, both among themselves and with generally received views on much of Ayutthayan history. The reason for the difficulties of the preambles undoubtedly lies in the nature of the revisions and codifications ordered by King Rama I and by several of his predecessors.

Lingat and Burnay have emphasized that King Rama I desired first of all to recover and restore the legislation of Ayutthaya, not to create something new. Even when some provision of the old laws offended his sense of justice, he adopted the working principle that the passage in question was due to the action of corrupt people who had tampered with the text and that his revision was in

---

47 Those five are Pet srec (Miscellaneous), Laws III, pp. 94-183; Kaṭ 36 khō (Law of 36 articles), Laws IV, pp. 229-257; Braḥ rājapaññati (Royal Orders), Laws IV, pp. 258-292; Braḥ rāj kāṃnat kau (Old Royal Decisions), Laws IV, pp. 293-354, V, pp. 1-193; and Braḥ rāj kāṃnat hmai (New Royal Decisions), all of Rāma I before 1805, Laws V, pp. 193-372.
fact a restoration of the true intention of the original law. Although full evidence for this aspect of the revision of 1805 exists for only one particular case, it would be a good working hypothesis to suppose that other changes may have been made in the law texts by Rama I, but that they have been disguised through inclusion under a preamble dated in the reign of one of his predecessors.  

There are also good reasons to suppose that similar revisions had been carried out at various times by earlier rulers, each operating according to the same principle, and thus through a desire to give an air of ancient authority to recent innovations much of the content of the extant laws may have been deliberately misdated. Furthermore, Rama I did not intend the laws as historical source material, they were the laws of his own reign even though preserving Ayutthayan tradition. Thus the Palatine Law, although dated in the early Ayutthaya period, was also his own Palatine Law, and the texts describing territorial administration, although not complete in all details, and in some places mutually contradictory, must have been felt by Rama I to describe adequately the ideal contemporary situation.

**Dates in the laws**

Nearly all of the laws are dated in their preamble, and several also contain sections dated separately. Altogether the laws contain dates expressed in three, or four, eras. Until relatively recently three eras, *saka*, *cula*, and Buddhist were assumed, and were easily distinguishable, since in no case, within the time period involved, AD 1350-1805, could there have been a possibility of confusion in the year dates. It was recognised, however, that some of the dates were in error since there was conflict between the expressed year date and the 12-year animal cycle.

Contemporary inscriptions show that in the area now called Thailand those three eras followed one another in official usage in the order *saka*, *cula*, Buddhist, with *saka* being used exclusively in Ayutthaya up to some time in the 16th century, *cula* then replacing it as the official era up to the end of the 19th century, and the Buddhist era becoming popular and being used in some official documents from the 17th and particularly in the 18th century. In Sukhothai the sequence is the same, but the *cula* era was introduced earlier, in the 14th century, and appears concurrently with *saka* for some time thereafter. Traditional Thai belief, on the contrary, holds that the Buddhist era was earliest and was followed by the *saka* and *cula* eras beginning respectively at dates corresponding to A.D. 79 and 639. The point of going into this is that genuine law texts should be dated in the era appropriate for their period.

---

48 The only certain case is that given as the impetus for the revision in the prologue, *Prakāś brahṛāj prārabh*, Laws I, 1-3. See also Lingat, "Note", pp. 19-20, and note 7 above.

49 That is any of the law dates lower than '1200' within this period must be *cula*, *saka* dates are those between '1272' and '1727', and any date over '1890' must be Buddhist.

50 As far as I know no complete table of dates has been prepared. The curious reader will have to check through, as I did, the first four volumes of the collected Thai inscriptions, *Prajum šilā cārūk*, plus, for examples of 17th-18th-century use of Buddhist Era, *Prajum cathmāy hetu samāy ayudhyā* I. The change from *saka* to *cula* era toward the end of the 16th century is standard doctrine. See "Prolegomena", note 4; and for hitherto neglected evidence of *saka* in early Ayutthaya see my "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: a Reinterpretation".

Assuming the existence of only these three eras, we note that the two earliest laws, of 1341 and 1345, are dated śaka, which is as it should be, but then there follow five laws dated in the Buddhist era with dates equivalent to 1350-1356, which is inappropriate. Later B.E. dates are found in seven laws between 1358 and 1364, two laws in 1382 and 1432, and finally three laws of 1611-1614. Only the last group fall in a period in which one might reasonably expect the Buddhist era to have been in use. What this seems to indicate is that all of the laws containing B.E. dates were codified or revised, if not composed out of whole cloth, in the 17th century, and the earlier B.E. dates show a deliberate effort to provide a false aura of antiquity for certain pieces of legislation.

The same considerations apply to two cula era dates, 720 (1358) for the Palatine Law and 796 (1434) for article 15 of the Law on Treason, both of which must have been inserted at the earliest toward the end of the 16th century when we also find cula dates corresponding to A.D. 1593 and 1599, but are even more probably results of the recodification of Rama I.52

A different and more difficult problem is posed by the laws between 1622 and 1669, apparently dated in śaka era in a period when it is believed to have fallen completely out of use in Ayutthaya. In the opposite case of laws being dated in an era not yet in use, it is easy to postulate false claims to antiquity at a time when the true sequence of eras was no longer known, but it is more difficult to find a reason for apparent misuse of the śaka era after it had become obsolete. One possible explanation is that these law dates are genuine and reflect a reaction by kings, one of whom at least is shown by other evidence to have been a conscious archaizer, against the Burmese-inspired cula era. King Prasat Thong (prāśāda don, 1630-55), had two temples constructed according to plans copied from Angkor Vat, was responsible for the first prāṅgk built in Ayutthaya since the 15th century, and attempted to resurrect the classical name for the city of Angkor, śīrī yaśodharapura, for one of his palaces. The chronicles also report that he came into conflict with the Burmese court over a question of calendrical reform, although the exact details of what was involved are not entirely clear.53

The rehabilitation of a fourth era, culāmaṇṭi, complicates the picture of the law dates even more. This era was known to, or had been postulated by, traditional Thai scholars and is mentioned by Prince Damrong in his "Story of the Laws", where it is also called the "law era", equivalent to śaka plus 300 years, but was ignored by Quaritch Wales. A few years ago an article in a Thai journal again gave it prominence and David Wyatt saw in it the possibility of explaining one of the anomalous details of the Palatine Law.54

The term culāmaṇṭi era is most properly applied to a group of twelve law dates which, while apparently śaka era, show a discrepancy of two years between the expressed year date and the twelve-year animal cycle. Two of these dates, as śaka, would be in mid-14th century, five more in the 15th century, and the remaining five in the 17th. Obviously such consistency in the 'errors' is not due to random miscopying, and some systematic explanation for the whole group is required. The culāmaṇṭi hypothesis accounts for these dates by claiming that this era, beginning 110 years

---

52 For the Law on Treason see Laws IV, p. 132.
53 RA, p. 429, date 994 cula, 1632 AD; p. 435, date 1001-1002 cula, 1639-40 AD.
54 Prince Damrong, in RA, p., 406, a hypothesis which could account for only a few of the earliest dates; Phipat Sukhathit, "Śakarāj culāmaṇṭi", Silpakorn, 6/5 (January 1963); David Wyatt, "The Thai 'Kaṭa Maṇḍiārapāḷá and Malacca", JSS LV, 2 (July 1967), pp. 279-86. Note that 'cula' ('small') and 'cul' - in culāmaṇṭi (Sanskrit cūḍāmaṇṭi) are of quite different etymological origins.
later than śaka, had been in use, for laws only, in the early Ayutthaya period, and was then forgotten, resulting in its dates being misunderstood as śaka. The 110-year difference is just enough to make the year dates and animal cycle synchronisms of these laws coincide, and to keep all of them reasonably within the Ayutthaya period.55

Jit Pumisak believed that all the culāmaṇī dates were really śaka, and proposed that there had been two systems of calculating the śaka era in Thailand, a 'fast' system with the expected normal animal synchronisms, and a 'slow' śaka with a two year difference in animal synchronism. One fault in this explanation is that he used the Buddhist era as the base and repository of the true animal year, which is obviously not true. Animal synchronisms belonged in origin with the śaka and cula eras, and the corresponding Buddhist year depended on calculations which differed from place to place and at different times.56

Phipat Sukhatit who resurrected this era, assumed that six more law dates in which there are varying discrepancies between the year and animal cycle, must also have been in the culāmaṇī era, and arbitrarily emended one or another figure of the 4-digit dates to make them fit the required pattern.57 But some of these odd dates are very likely the result of careless scribal work, or deliberate arbitrary alteration at later dates, and it would be equally legitimate to emend them to fit the śaka pattern. The only dates suitable for consideration in the culāmaṇī hypothesis are those showing the regular two-year discrepancy with the animal cycle.

One more law which shows this typical discrepancy, but which was not considered by Phipat, apparently because its expressed date is of the cula rather than śaka pattern, is that of the Palatine Law, 720. It was this date however, and only this one, which Wyatt considered in his use of the culāmaṇī era for historical interpretation. He accounted for its unique features by supposing that it had been converted to cula era from an original 'true' culāmaṇī date, 1280, by a scribe who misunderstood 1280 as śaka and subtracted 560 rather than 450, the correct figure for converting culāmaṇī to cula.58

In "Prolegomena" I argued that all the culāmaṇī dates must have been devised in a single codification, that they must all be studied together, not in isolation to 'solve' ad hoc problems, and that acceptance of culāmaṇī would have to involve the demonstration that all the laws in question could be better understood by adding 110 years to their dates.59 It is extremely unlikely that culāmaṇī was used briefly in the 14th or 15th century, then abandoned for one hundred years, used again for a few law texts, neglected for 150 years more, and finally adopted for a third time in the 17th or 18th century. The time at which all of these dates were composed must have been at, or shortly after, the last date in the pattern, 1643, if we do not accept the culāmaṇī hypothesis, or 1753 if we do. Admitting the latter date makes it difficult to accept Wyatt's idea of misconversion of the sole Palatine Law date, which would then most probably have occurred during the last, 1805,

55 If the culāmaṇī hypothesis is correct, the problem of late śaka dates noted above would disappear.
56. Jit, Thai Society, p. 37, and p. 44, where he credits Dhanit Yupo with the discovery of the double śaka systems, 'fast' and 'slow'. See comment by Roger Billard in note 72 below.
57. See note 54 above and "Prolegomena", pp. 41-42.
58. Wyatt, "Kaṭa Maṇḍiarapāla".
revision, for there would still have been scholars at court who could remember the use of a *cuḷāmaṇṭi* era 50 years earlier and who would have been able to cope with it correctly and consistently. My solution was that the 'cuḷāmaṇṭi era' consists of *śaka* era years given a mystically auspicious character by the attribution of false Buddhist era synchronisms, which involves artificial and inaccurate animal-year designations, and that the author of that innovation was probably King Prasat Thong. The *Palatine Law* date, even more anomalous, was probably imitation *cuḷāmaṇṭi*, devised in the 1805 recodification of Rama I.\(^{60}\)

**Royal titles in the laws**

Another problem of the law preambles is that the royal titles they contain combine terms in ways unknown to the Ayutthayan Annals, which have served as the major source for historical synthesis, but comparison with inscriptions shows that in some cases the laws preserve original titles more accurately than the Annals. For example, the law *rāp fôn* (*Institution of Litigations*) dated BE 1899 (AD 1355), two sections of the *Slavery Law* (*dāśa*) dated 1359 and 1387 in the *cuḷa maṇṭi* pattern, and a section of the *Miscellaneous Law* (*pet srec*) of apparent *cula* era 1146 (AD 1784), especially the first-named, show a set of titles unknown to the Annals, but preserved in several 15th century inscriptions, the Ayutthayan origin of which has been demonstrated; and 12 other law preambles dated between the 15th and 17th (or 18th) centuries, depending on whether or not the *cuḷāmaṇṭi* hypothesis is accepted, show a title generally believed to represent that attributed in the Annals to a king reigning between 1605 and 1610, but also apparently found in inscriptions of mid-18th century.\(^{61}\)

Together with the preservation of some genuine titles lost from the chronicles, the laws also complicate the picture by combining certain titles in ways which are not found elsewhere. The best example is the combination of *rāmādhipatī*, given in the annals for rulers in 1350-1369 and 1491-1529, with *trailokanātha*, ostensibly 1448-1488, found in the *Palatine Law* and *Law of Provin-cial Hierarchies* which contain apparent *cula* and *śaka* dates belonging to the reign of Rāmādhipatī I, but have so far been attributed, either arbitrarily, or via the *cuḷāmaṇṭi* era to King Trailok, in part to account for details in the text such as mention of Malacca, which are clearly anachronistic for the earlier period.\(^{62}\) We should note, however, that all scholars recognize the possibility of later interpolation in the texts, and thus the presence of these anachronistic details does not in itself show that the law was not originally drawn up in the reign of Rāmādhipatī I. Another point to consider is that the absence of the title *trailokanātha* from all known inscriptions of the 15th century suggests that this title was not contemporary, but is a later attribution, and thus all such preambles may have been attempts at archaizing undertaken at a later time.

---

60 Vickery, "Prolegomena", pp. 43, 46.
61 **Laws II**, pp. 27, 287, 317; **Laws II**, p. 173; Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim"; Vickery, "Prolegomena". Jit Pumisak, "Thai Society", pp. 45-46, asserted that the 1146 date, which he misread as 1156, was *śaka*, thus AD 1234, and over 100 years before the accepted date for the founding of Ayutthaya. This is certainly a fantasy to be rejected. The law of 1146 belongs to Rama I of Bangkok. Note, however, that I am not rejecting Jit’s argument that a pre-Ayutthayan polity existed in the lower Menam Chao Phraya basin.
62 Wyatt, "Kaṭa Maṇḍiārapāḍa".
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Analysis of all the titles together shows that they fall into two large groups, containing either rāmādhipatī or ekādadhā(ḍaśa)raṭh as major title, and a third, smaller group including three laws with cākrabarti titles, although not in the reign of the king generally known by this title, and two more laws with rāmādhipatī, but preceded by cākrabarti. Many of these titles, especially those of the eka-type, are in preambles set at dates where the title in question is otherwise unknown, another reason, in addition to confused dates, why the content of such laws may not without detailed study be attributed to the reign apparently designated.63

More on old recensions and original dates

There is still further evidence, beyond that discussed in my "Prolegomena", which proves that certain sections of the laws represent recodifications, and in some cases are out of place, that is they were originally composed for a date, perhaps even a context, different from that with which they are associated in the Three Seals. In most such cases the original date was almost certainly later, and they have been replaced in an earlier context, no doubt, as I suggested in "Prolegomena", in order to give them a patent of antiquity. If this is certain, it may still be impossible to determine the correct original date and context. There are also contexts in which earlier existing laws have been incorporated, with changes, in later revisions.

Perhaps the clearest case of the latter is the introductory statement to the Law of 36 Articles. It says that (an) unidentified defunct king(s) (samtec braḥ budḍha cau ḥlvaṅ nai braḥ param koṭ [i.e. 'Boromakot', but not the one conventionally known by that epithet]) promulgated 42 laws (40 rāp sān and 2 khānōn); but now the recent king samtec braḥ budḍha cau ḥlvaṅ nai braḥ param koṭ has removed ('cleansed') 6 articles (5 kaṭ and 1 rāp sān), leaving 36 (22 kaṭ and 14 rāp sān).64 These 36 articles date from 1650 to 1756, two years before the death of the king known conventionally as Boromakot (param koṭ).65

Three sections, in two different laws at different dates, and identified not by date, but by near textual identity, were already noted by Lingat and Burnay, who suggested that the purpose had perhaps been to make an innovation appear as ancient practice. Burnay, in fact believed that the heterogeneous laws and decrees at the end of the Three Seals, the Kāṁhnat kau ('old decrees') and Kāṁhnat hmai ('new decrees'), the latter all of Rama I between 1782 and 1804) were destined to eventually be incorporated into an appropriate section of one of the main laws.66 This is an acceptable hypothesis, but the three cases cited by Burnay seem rather to indicate something else, the use by the author of a recension, in the last case Rama I, of a slightly modified older text as part of his own new laws.

63. Vickery, "Prolegomena", p. 47 and end table, where the cākrabarti laws are respectively nos. 17, 20, 25, 9, and 26. It may not be assumed that all the titles in the laws are more genuine than those in the chronicles, although some of the latter are inaccurate.
64. Yes, the breakdown into categories is inconsistent. See Laws IV, p. 229.
65. The epithet param koṭ (<koṣa) 'great urn', is a posthumous title by definition (see Wyatt, Thailand, p. 127). Since this law emanates from the officials of the two main state councils, the lāk khun śālā and the lāk khun ṇa sār (śāla) hlvaṅ (on which see below), it may be that they issued it soon after the death of the Boromakot who died in 1758, and referred to all previous kings in the same posthumous style.
The three examples are: (1) article 22 of Kāṁhndk kau dated 1085/AD 1723 and article 14 of Pān phnek dated 1093/1731. (2) article 14 of Kāṁhndk kau dated 898/1527 and the first section of Pān phnek dated 1052/1690, (3) article 5 of Kāṁhndk hmai dated 1146/1784 and article 5 of Pān phnek dated 1086/1724.67

In all cases but Kāṁhndk kau 14 the dates appear to be absolutely coherent, and in the first two cases the date of the article in the heterogeneous decrees is earlier than the corresponding text in the main law, Pān phnek. The first two cases, assuming accurate dates, agree with Burnay's hypothesis about the incorporation of heterogeneous laws into main laws when a new recension was prepared, but not for the purpose of providing false patents of antiquity. In the new recension the old decision was updated when it was incorporated. Burnay did not take note of slight differences in the texts, which mean that the new text was considered to be a new law, and as such acquired a new date. In the first case, which is a question of the assignment of children from mixed marriages of phrai som and phrai hlvan, the kāṁhndk kau refers to coupling of a male phrai hlvan with a female phrai som belonging to officials of the left and right bala rōan, whereas Pān phnek refers to female som of officials in dahār and bala rōan. There is an implication of a change in organization of the population, or a change in the attribution of phrai som to officials; and indeed we know that at the latest stage division of population into dahār and bala rōan, not into left and right bala rōan was what mattered, although there had been a period in which left and right divisions of both bala rōan and bala dahār had existed.68 The other cases also contain slight differences in wording.

There is nevertheless certain evidence among the laws of back-dating. In "Prolegomena" I did not consider the indication of year of the decade in my analysis of the dates of the preambles, and only seven of those dates contain this element. They are, in chronological order:69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Law Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ājñā hlvaṁ</td>
<td>1895 BE [1351]</td>
<td>hare</td>
<td>fifth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ājñā raś</td>
<td>1902 BE [1358]</td>
<td>dog</td>
<td>third</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ājñā hlvaṁ</td>
<td>1976 BE [1432]</td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kra:pat šiś</td>
<td>796 c [1434]</td>
<td>tiger</td>
<td>sixth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṁhndk kau</td>
<td>961 c [1599]</td>
<td>pig</td>
<td>first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pān phnek</td>
<td>1052 c [1690]</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phua mia</td>
<td>1166 c [1804]</td>
<td>rat</td>
<td>sixth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first anomaly in this respect is that so few of the preamble dates contain indication of the decade, since that was an essential element in traditional Ayutthayan and post-Angkor Cambodian

67 These six contexts are found respectively in Laws V.36, II.12, V.1-3, II.1-3, V. 206, II. 24. Burnay called pān phnek ,mūlakhati vivād'. The subject is "division of brajphrai (Also Akin's description, p. 187).
68. See the discussion of provincial organization below.
69 BE is Buddhist Era, c is cuła era, and the dates in brackets are AD equivalents. The ordinal numbers are the number in the decade. These laws are found respectively in Laws IV, pp. 1-106; 106-115; 115-164; 293-354; Laws II, pp. 1-26; 205-284.
dates. It was used in *cūla* and *śaka* era dates, and always corresponded to the units figure. It thus provides a quick preliminary check on the accuracy of a recorded year, and an additional check is that six of the animal synchronisms were always odd and six even. Its absence from most of the law preambles already suggests transposition which would have rendered the original decade number inaccurate, and rather than rewrite it, it was suppressed.

A second anomaly is that in the first three of the above dates the decade number appears to be based on the BE date, something which was never done in true dates, at least of the Sukhothai and Ayutthaya periods. Moreover, dog years were always even and pig years always odd. This proves that those three dates, as I suggested on other grounds in "Prolegomena", were deliberate falsifications. Not only that, but 'third' for 1902 proves another stage of recopying, from an earlier 1903, one of the easy copyist's errors due to similarity of numbers. Since a Buddhist Era year never ends in the same figure as the corresponding *cūla* or *śaka* year these anomalies indicate (1) that the decade numbers were devised after recalculation from original *cūla* or *śaka* to Buddhist era dates, and (2) that the original *cūla* or *śaka* dates probably corresponded to the animal years given, which in the first two cases are still accurate when the dates are transposed back to *cūla* or *śaka*, and in the third only one year off. Although the errors may be identified, and the probable cause, recopying the law into an earlier context, is rather certain, there is no way, with only these elements, to even hypothesize the correct original date. Animal x, nth of the decade, recurred every 60 years.

In the four *cūla* dates of this series the indication of the decade agrees with both the year date and with the animal synchronism, and there is no objective way to fault these dates, although, as I indicated in "Prolegomena", there are other reasons to reject the preamble of the Law on Treason (*Krahat sihk*) dated 796. That entire law deserves study as a mixture of texts from different times, including one clear example of back-dating which probably occurred in the recension of 1805. Article 68 is dated 955 [AD 1593], apparently *cūla*, and the responsible king is entitled Ekādadharath, who is recorded as making provisions for soldiers who fought for his elder brother "cau fā nareś jeṣṭhādhipati". In fact, Naresuan reigned until 1605, but at the time of Rama I there

---


71 This may have been a result of the haste in revision, noted above, for scholars were quite capable of calculating true dates when laws were back-dated.

72 As Roger Billard wrote (cited in Griswold, *Arts asiatiques*, 1960, p. 202, n. 2), "...c'est bien l'astrologue qui s'est trompé de deux ans dans le millésime bouddhique qui pour lui, soyez-en assuré, n'est que le résultat d'une addition faisant passer de l'ère C.S., la seule usuelle et la seule échelle des temps indispensable à la chronographie et à l'astrologie, à l'ère mahasaka, puis à B.S. Cette erreur sur le millésime B.S. ne me surprend pas du tout (cf. l'écart d'un an entre les actuels millésimes B.S. de Ceylon d'une part, et de Birmanie, Siam, Cambodge, et Laos d'autre part), car je suis bien persuadé que B.S. n'a pas été une ère civile, un comput réel et suivi (le détail de sa technique est tout à fait artificiel et au demeurant non uniforme), mais une ère solennelle, un décompte effectué chaque fois que besoin dans les occasions solennelles".


was a belief that the reign change from Naresuan to 'Ekādaśaraṭṭh', whose true title was rāmeśvara, occurred in 1593.75

The 'dog, third of the decade' fits still another pattern which strengthens the case for transposition. The Three Seals Code includes three dates in three different laws with this false conjunction. In addition to the introduction to Ajnā rāṣ/Civil Offences it is found in undated passages in Ajnā hlvaḥ, article 106 and in Pet srec, article 46, and these passages show other similarities.76 In the second and third the day dates are Thursday, fifth month, tenth of the waning moon in the first case and fifth of the waning moon in the second.

The principal royal titles in the three laws are: (1) braḥ cau rāmādhipati...param cākrabarti rājādhīrāj, (2) braḥ mahā cākrabartiśra...mahārājādhīrāj, (3) braḥ param mahā cākrabarti rājādhīrāj.

Emphasis is on the term 'cākrabarti', which is rare among the royal titles in the laws, and is never found in the laws at a date within the reign of the king who has traditionally been given that title (1548-1569).77

In the second and third the responsible official to whom the king addressed his communication was one or another of the law court officials, who in the Hierarchy Law follow the 'brahmans', and whose titles there include the formula braḥ..subhāva:dī śrī mandātulrāj/maldhā tulrāj found in the laws under discussion.78 In the contexts under discussion they were accompanied by subordinate officials, nāy dāv rāj paṇḍity, and the clerk, nāy sām khlā. As principal official in the introduction to a law the mandā/mdl/hulrāj is found in only one other context, article 86 of Pet srec, associated with a date 1565 and a royal title in Ekādadharāṭṭh. Nāy sām khlā is equally rare, found in only one other context, the introduction to Lāk bhā/Kidnapping, where he is called the clerk of braḥ subhāva:tiṭ without the title mandā-, etc. They are associated, however with a king entitled samtec braḥ cau rāmādhipati śrī param cākrabartiśra. Although there are several rather low officials in the Hierarchy Law with the title rāj paṇḍity, none is associated with the law court judges, and this nāy dāv rāj paṇḍity is not identifiable. It is probably, however, the same title, incorrectly written in the nāy dau rāj paṇḍity of the Slavery Law. The form dāv, may be presumed correct because it is an ancient pan-Thai title, which was not important in late Ayutthaya or Bangkok.79

75. Vickery, 'Prolegomena', p. 51 and note 33; Vickery "Cambodia After Angkor", chapter IX, "The Chronology of the Ayutthayan Chronicles".

76 Laws, IV, p. 79 and III, p. 111.

77 Vickery, "Prolegomena", p. 47.

78 'Laws', I, p. 266. They were braḥ kṣemarāj suphāvatī..., and khun hlvaḥ braḥ kraiśrī rāj subhāvatī....

79. Laws II, p. 331. This is an appropriate place to cite the two indexes of the Three Seals produced in Japan, the first is the KWIC Index of the Three Seals Law (1981) of 75 large volumes listing every occurrence of every word alphabetically. The second is The Computer Concordance to the Law of the Three Seals in five volumes, by Yoneo Ishii, Mamoru Shibayama, and Aroonrut Wichienkhiew, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto. Without them careful research on the laws would be impossible, and I wish to thank the Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, for giving me a set of the first. Both, naturally, contain a few defects, and the more serious are in the Concordance,
There can hardly be doubt that the two passages from \textit{Ājñā hlvain} and \textit{Pet srec} belong to a single recension which was probably undertaken later than the main dates of those laws; and with somewhat less certainty the introduction to \textit{Ājñā rāṣ} and article 86 of \textit{Pet srec} may also be attributed to that recension.

There are two more preamble dates which add evidence to the argument that laws were recopied to an earlier date and certain elements which would be discordant either revised or suppressed. The \textbf{Law on Debts} (\textit{Kū hni}), now dated \textit{saka} 1278/AD 1356, and the \textbf{Palatine Law} of \textit{cula} 720/AD 1358, both contain the animal synchronism phrase, \textit{jvat} (rat) \textit{nāksāv} (asterism) \textit{š ak}, which, with respect to the animal, is incorrect in both cases, 1278 being monkey, and 720 dog.\textsuperscript{80} The redundant \textit{šak} at the end cannot be other than a relic of an original number of the decade, which always ended in \textit{šak}. Obviously here, when the laws were recodified, the decade number was suppressed rather than calculate a fake. The identical, and incorrect, phrase in these two laws whose expressed dates are only two years apart, suggests that they both were first promulgated in the same year.

Day dates, which include day of the week, the month, and day of the waxing or waning phase of the moon may also be checked for coherency. That is, did the \textit{nth} of a certain month, waxing or waning moon, really fall on day \textit{x} in a given year?\textsuperscript{81} This might seem like an attempt to introduce a degree of precision into the method which cannot be sustained by the nature of the material. The law texts are not like a stone inscription, or an original manuscript, in which we may be rather certain that a date written is what the original writer intended. All of the \textbf{Three Seals} texts have been copied at least once from their originals, and except for the \textit{Kāṃhnat hmai} of Rama I, they have been copied, and probably tampered with, more than once. Thus the very meaning of accuracy, or certain types of inaccuracy, in the dates is itself problematical. When we know that a certain text has undergone recopying, it may be legitimate to accept that certain day dates which when calculated are only one day off are in fact accurate, if the error involves two numbers, such 4 and 5, which are easily confused. Other apparent errors of only one day may nevertheless be correct because of arbitrary adjustments made in the old calendars to maintain the succession of days from one year to the next. When faced with a series of mostly coherent dates within a definitely established historical period, such as the \textit{Kāṃhnat hmai} of Rama I, the few cases of one-day error may be ignored.

One problem, that of the \textit{cuḷāmanī} dates, seems to be resolved by examination of the day dates. In "Prolegomena", as noted above, I proposed that the \textit{cuḷāmanī} years were really \textit{saka} dates with falsified animal synchronisms. Now, having checked the day dates, I find that this is probably true. In all cases the true year dates associated with the given animal years, two years later than the expressed year, are incoherent with the expressed day dates, but three of the year dates as given are totally coherent and two more are if we accept an error of one day. This is good evidence that the true dates were the years expressed, understood as \textit{saka}. Five more are incoherent either

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item which is arranged in such a way that it is impossible to make an immediate comparison of contexts in which the same person has different \textit{yāṣa}, for each official is listed with \textit{yaṣa} as an integral part of the entry.
\item \textit{Nāksāv} is a deformation of \textit{nāksatra}, itself used incorrectly in Ayutthaya and Cambodia as a designation for animal synchronism.
\item I did not check this in "Prolegomena", and Prof. Huxley suggested that it might be useful.
\end{itemize}
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way, and two lack one of the elements required for the check. Furthermore, the dates 110 years later, which culamaṇṭī is supposed to represent, are all incoherent with the expressed day dates. This is also true for the date of the Palatine Law, which I described in "Prolegomena" as imitation culamaṇṭī.

Within the texts of some laws there is also easily identifiable evidence of later additions to what were probably older basic texts. It is rather certain that the nearly identical provisions concerning domestic animals which follow one another in the Pet srec Law, with Khmer used to designate cattle and water buffalo (go, kra:pü) in one and Thai (vua, gvāy) in the next, the section with Khmer was earlier than that with Thai. It is impossible on this basis, however, to attempt any suggestion of absolute date, other than that such use of Khmer probably predates the reign of King Mahā Dharmarāja (1569-1590), the quisling prince of Sukhothai who became king after supporting the Burmese in their conquest of Ayutthaya.

Two cases in which the back-dated insertions may be attributed to Rama I are a section in the Treason Law discussed above, and in lists of provinces in the Dharrmanūn law as described below.

Still another clue to relative, and perhaps in some instances almost absolute, dating is the inconsistent attribution of yāśa ranks within the Three Seals. That is the same official, identifiable by his rājadinmām and/or tāmnēn may be given a yāśa inconsistent with the date of the text in question, and even mutually inconsistent within the same law. It is known from other sources that khun would have been an appropriately prestigious title for ministers in the early 15th century, that King Trailok may have raised them from khun to brāḥ, that titles with the prefix ḍōk were in use in the 17th century, and early 18th, but were discontinued sometime before the reign of Rama I, and that in his day, when the Three Seals was composed, ministers should have been ranked cau bañā.

There are two conventional modern descriptions of the yāśa grades, which may be compared with a list recorded for the late 17th century by La Loubère. Below are Quaritch Wales's list, and two lists from R.B. Jones, the second of which is that of La Loubère.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>samtec cau brahyā</th>
<th>samtec caubrahyā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cau brahyā</td>
<td>caubrahyā bañā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brahyā (ōkñā)</td>
<td>brahyā ḍōkñā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cau hmūn</td>
<td>brāḥ ḍōkbrāḥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brāḥ (ōkbrāḥ)</td>
<td>hlvaṅ ḍokhlvaṅ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82 The coherent dates are 1369, 1387, and 1555 (Dharmanūn), the dates off by one day are 1359 and 1373 (in which one number is a 5 which could have been miscopied from 4), the incoherent dates are 1263, 1267 (the two earliest dates in the laws), 1374, 1555 (udhar), and 1565, and the two dates which lack the day of the moon phase are 1544 and 1557. See pp. 56–6 of "Prolegomena", where these dates are numbered respectively 24, 27, 35, 23, 25, 1, 2, 26, 36, 38, 34, 37.
83 Examples are Laws III, pp. 98, 102, 108-9.
84 These points are explained in the discussion below.
85 Quaritch Wales, "Administration", p. 35; Jones, pp. 127-128; La Loubère, p. 79; Vickery, "Review of Jones".
Both Quaritch Wales and Jones missed Ḍkbañā, perhaps through neglecting to consult the law texts directly, and La Loubère's work is evidence that this title was perhaps not in use in his day. In Jones's case there is also a misunderstanding of the correspondence between brah and bañā.

The laws themselves list the titles without Ḍk as bañā, brah, Ḍlvañ, ḃhn, hmiñ, bān.86

Now the evidence from the laws, contemporary foreign sources, and Bangkok practice in the 19th century indicates that the titles with and without Ḍk were used concurrently for an at present indeterminable time which included most of the 17th century, with the Ḍk titles gradually dropping out of use in the 18th century.87 The combined evidence of the preamble and body of the Civil Hierarchy Law, which call the vāṅ minister respectively cau bañā and Ḍkbañā, also indicates that these titles were equivalent, and we know that cau bañā was used for the glāṅ, who is called Ḍkbañā in the law, at least as early as 1622.88 In Dharmānūn all the Ḍk titles are gone, supporting the other evidence that in spite of its 17th-century date, this law is mainly a composition of the time of Rama I (see further below).

Thus we should conclude that cau bañā equals Ḍkbañā, but may indicate a later usage and that the five ministers with one or another of these titles were equivalent both as to ṣaktinā and yaṣa.89 The hierarchy of yaṣa ranks should then read:

\[
\text{samtec cau bañā}
\]

86. Laws I, p. 314; Q.W., Administration, p. 36, was of the opinion that Ḍlvañ was "probably of Khmer origin" and brah and brahāyā "Indian titles". It is now known, however, that Ḍlvañ is Thai, brah Mon-Khmer, and probably adopted into Thai from Khmer, while brahāyā may be a conflation of brah with Mon bañā (see Vickery, "Review of Jones"). Quaritch Wales was correct in taking ḃhn as old Thai, but his theory of Ḍlvañ added later, and brah and brahāyā "added in comparatively recent times" has no basis in the evidence.


88 The double titles for the vāṅ are in Laws I, pp. 219, 237; Records of the Relations Between Siam and Foreign Countries, Vol. I, p. 131.

89 Although we should note that La Loubère, p. 79, considered that bañā outranked okñā.
All of the òk titles but one are simply òk prefixed to a known title which has been used by itself. The exception is òkñā, for the element -ñā has never been recorded as a title, and has no relevant meaning in any of the languages which might have been involved. Strictly as a hypothesis at this point, I suggest that the term òkñā resulted from the affixation of an ancient Thai/Tai term of respect, òk (ók/), to another term of respect, ñā, representing, as in modern Lao, Sanskrit ājñā.90

Then òk was separated out in a new sense and prefixed to a series of other titles. Besides the standard hierarchy, the Provincial Hierarchy Law lists 'òkmōa' for some governors of fourth class provinces.91

The epigraphical history of òk titles starts with Sukhothai Inscription 93 of 1399, in which the titles of persons, presumably dead, to whom merit was offered were, samtec bò ['father'] òk and samtec pū brañā ['ancestor/grandfather brañā'] bò òk. Then in 1403, Inscription 46, there was a samtec mee òk who has been construed as a queen; and in 1412, Inscription 49, a certain òkñā Dharmarāja seems to have been a king.92 This last is the highest recorded status of the title òkñā, which declined in value in Ayutthaya.

Political Structure
The royal family
Two different types of royal family organisation are outlined in the laws, one in the Palatine Law and the other in the Law of the Civil Hierarchy. The two are mutually irreconcilable. Quaritch Wales assumed these to be sequential, that of the Palatine Law being followed by the that of the Hierarchy Law. This, however, involves a contradiction with his analysis of the dates which placed the former in 1458 and the latter in 1454. In both cases he mixes in details of 19th-century actuality which are not mentioned in the laws, such as the use of the title cau fā and the kram titles of royal princes. In this he followed an earlier description apparently based on the opinions of Thai royalty, but this mixture of material from diverse sources merely confuses, since it is not known when the 19th-century institutions first came into use.93

90. In Black Thai there is a kinship term, ok, in the expression ok ao, pu of the first generation senior to ego. See Cảm Trong, "Some Questions of Ancient History and Culture of the Thai Ethnic Nationality in Vietnam", Proceedings of the International Conference on Thai Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra, 3–6 July 1987, pp. 200–205. This term is not listed in Dorothy Crawford Fippinger, "Kinship Terms of the Black Tai People", JSS 59/1 (January 1971), pp. 66–82.
92. See Griswold and Prasert EHS 1, 2, and 4.
93. Quaritch-Wales, Administration, pp. 22–27 cited E. Gibert who probably drew on an essay by King Chulalongkorn or on earlier information from King Mongkut. An English translation of Gibert[Bibl] is in Appendix I to Carl Bock, Temples and Elephants, Bangkok, White Orchid Press, 1985 [London 1884], pp. 405–20. See also Jones, and Review by Vickery. The title cau fā is found only twice in the entire Three Seals Code, once in a law of Rama I in 1794 (Laws IV, p. 221), and once in a section of the Treason Law, which although dated 1593, must be an insertion made in the time of Rama I (see above).
The Palatine Law first, in its preamble, lists the royalty who were in the king's presence at the moment of proclamation of the law as:

-samtec braḥ cau hnò buddhānkūr surivaṇṭ
-samtec braḥ barrṇameśvara
-baṇā ekasatrāj braḥ mahā uparāj,

of whom the last might be interpreted as two individuals, although the conjunction lee, which separates all the other names in the list, is missing. The title ekasatrāj is a garbled rendering of something else, perhaps ekādaśaraṭh.

A similar list occurs in article 158 of the law detailing the individuals who accompany the king on certain occasions, thus: samtec hnò braḥ buddha cau, samtec braḥ barrṇameśvara cau, braḥ rājakumār.95

The title which requires particular notice here is barrṇameśvara, which, as far as I have been able to determine, is not used elsewhere for Thai royalty and has not been discussed by Quaritch Wales or by his predecessors, King Chulalongkorn and Prince Damrong. Restored to its superficially apparent Sanskrit form, the term consists of varṇa- ēśvara, which is impossible. The first element is a masculine noun meaning "colour, caste" (correctly written varṇa) and the second is the form of ēśvara, "lord", in combination with a word ending in the vowel a. Correctly compounded, these two terms would result in varṇeśvara.

This type of confusion indicates the probability of a folk etymology based on a term no longer understood, and I would suggest restoring it as parameśvara, a royal title well attested among Malay and Javaneese royalty as well as at Angkor. Whether its occurrence in the Palatine Law indicates that the Thai once used this title, which has been preserved in no other source, or that parts of the Palatine Law have been taken over from a foreign source is a problem which remains to be solved.96 Mon influence is seen in the use of baṇā for a member of the royal family, and the term surivaṇṭ, found in Sukhothai royal epigraphy, may indicate incorporation into Ayutthayan titles after the reign of King Maha Thammaracha. In fact, all the anomalies suggest the last quarter of the 16th century.

A somewhat different hierarchy of princes appears in the third article of the law which deals specifically with "royal sons and grandsons", braḥ rājakumār braḥ rājanātā, ranking them in accordance with the status of their mothers. The list, which seems in fact to include only braḥ rājakumār (sons), is: samtec hnò braḥ buddha cau, born of braḥ āgamahēśī (Chief Queen); braḥ mahā uparāj, born of mè hyua mōaḥ; no title, born of a king's daughter, who "eats" (kin) mōaḥ

---

94 Laws I, p. 69.
95 Laws I, p. 138.
96 According to the Ayutthayan chronicles the third and youngest son of King Thay Sa (1709-1733) was named Parameś, and it would be interesting to know if this title was given to a certain prince in each generation. Unfortunately the chronicles do not offer that type of detail.
97 Laws I, p. 70.
ek; no title, born of a king’s granddaughter, who "eats" möañ do; braḥ yauvarāj, born of braḥ snam (king’s commoner wives).

Earlier studies have treated this list as a prescriptive statement for ranking royal children in general, although admitting that no specific instance of the ranks hnò braḥ buddha cau or braḥ yauvarāj had been recorded elsewhere and that instances of a braḥ āgamaheśī being appointed were extremely rare. In another context I suggested that it merely recorded the position of certain royal children at a particular time, and I would now like to elaborate on this a bit.98

The two highest titles, hnò braḥ buddha cau and braḥ mahā uparāj, would seem to have been one of a kind, that is, there would not have been at a given time more than one of each. Thus these two titles cannot be taken as general designations for sons of a braḥ āgamaheśī or a me hyua möañ, for each of these ladies could have had several sons. What the law seems to be saying is simply that at a certain time the princes holding the positions of hnò braḥ buddha cau and braḥ mahā uparāj were sons of the braḥ āgamaheśī and the me hyua möañ respectively.

The same would seem to hold true for the fifth rank of the list, although within the context of known Thai documents it cannot be said what this rank was. At the time of the promulgation of this law it was held by a prince born of a commoner mother, of whom there must have been many, with many sons, who could not all have been braḥ yauvarāj.

Only the third and fourth positions can be easily interpreted as general, prescriptive designations, that is, that princes "born of kings’ daughters" 'eat' möañ ek and those "born of kings’ granddaughters" 'eat' möañ do, of which there were undoubtedly several in all periods.

The statements on lük hlvañ and möañ ek, do, etc. have been the source for very speculative descriptions of provincial administration from Prince Damrong through Quaritch Wales to Charnvit Kasetsiri. Prince Damrong, followed by Quaritch Wales, considered that there were möañ lük hlvañ at the four cardinal points ruled by sons of the king "as almost independent kingdoms", and Charnvit, not citing Prince Damrong, amplified this with a theory of step-by-step shift northward from Lophburi to Chainat to Phitsanulok of the northern cardinal möañ lük hlvañ.99 As I demonstrated in my review of Charnvit, there is no basis for such speculative amplifications in the sources, and the law terminology suggests a much less contrived explanation, that rather than being functional governors, it may have been that kin möañ meant only that lük hlvañ and hlān hlvañ princes were assigned möañ as appanages for their support, as was often done in Burma.100

An entirely different royal family structure appears in the Law of the Civil Hierarchy.101

First, in the preamble, the Minister of the Palace (vāñ) enquires concerning the rank (śakti) of:

- braḥ anujādhirāj - the king’s principal younger brother
- braḥ rājakumār - royal sons
- braḥ rājaputr - royal sons

98 Q.W., pp. 22-24; Vickery, “Review of Jones”.
99. Quaritch Wales, Administration, p. 103; Charnvit Kasetsiri, The Rise of Ayudhya, pp. 21, 26-27, 52, 97-98, 125, 127-28, 137.
101 Laws I, pp. 219-220.
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Then in article 2 of the law, the ranks of princes, and their śaktinā, are listed as follows (with śaktinā in parentheses attributed if the prince in question headed a kram):

- **-samtec brah ṁanujādhirāj**  20,000 (50,000)
- **-samtec brah cau āuk dhoe-royal sons**  15,000 (40,000)
- either of the above, if mahā uparāj  100,000
- **brah anuja-royal younger brothers**  7,000 (15,000)
- **brah cau āuk dhoe**  6,000 (15,000)
- **-samtec brah cau hlān dhoe-royal grandsons**  6,000 (15,000)
- **brah cau hlān dhoe**  4,000 (11,000)
- **hmòm cau-king's great grandson**  1,500

Although entirely different from that of the **Palatine Law**, this list has been credited to the same reign. We should note here that the princes are listed simply by birth title, not by rank. The only rank mentioned is mahā uparāj, which could be held either by the king’s most important younger brother or by a son. Another thing to note is that the rank of princes is not linked to that of their mother. If the two laws really belong to the same time period, these features lend weight to my contention that the **Palatine Law** is speaking of the ranks of particular individuals rather than setting forth a general system.

The **Law of the Civil Hierarchy** also lists potential royal mothers, but of no higher rank than snam. Its article 4 shows four snam ek (first class) entitled dāv insurendr, dāv śrī sutācān, dāv indradevī, and dāv śrī culālākṣ. Of these at least two are attested elsewhere, śrī sutācān as the title of the ambitious widow of King Jayarāja (1534-1547) of the chronicles and Queen śrī culālākṣ as a Sukhothai queen in an early Bangkok literary work. The great differences between these two laws make it difficult to attribute their statements on the royal family to the same reign, and we should also note the absence of terminology, such as cau fā, which became common at some time in the late Ayutthaya period and has been in use ever since. In contrast to the **Palatine Law**, though, the **Civil Hierarchy Law** is easy to understand as a general prescriptive statement applicable to any royal family, since any number of brothers or sons could receive the designated amount of śaktinā.

It is significant that in the **Palatine Law** the brahḥ mahā uparāj, who in the Bangkok era, and perhaps since the end of the 17th century, was heir apparent, prince of the Front Palace, is only second in rank of princes, and that in the **Hierarchy Law** this office could be filled either by the king’s principal younger brother, brahḥ anujādhirāj or by a son.

These statements reflect an old practice which was in process of change in the 17th century, and which had entirely disappeared by the time of Rama I. Under ancient Ayutthayan practice the heir apparent was not the king’s son, but his younger brother, if there were one. Both Joost Schouten and van Vliet are insistent on this point. The former wrote that in principle, "when the King

---

102 **Laws I**, p. 221. Queen Čulālaksṇ was the alleged author of the story of Nān nabhamāṣ, written in the early Bangkok period, but presented as a Sukhothai work.
dies, it is not his Son, but his Brother who is heir to the crown; but in case he have no brother, then indeed his Son steps in by course, whose Brothers do succeed successively; lastly all the Sons of the eldest Brother, who hath reigned, follow by turns. According to van Vliet, "there is a fundamental law...which calls the brother of the deceased King to the throne, and excludes the son". King Song Tham defied it and appointed his son to the exclusion of his brother, which set the scene for the series of coups which brought Prasat Thong to the throne.103

The importance of this rule, in principle, is also seen in the identification of King Trailokanāth in van Vliet's The Short History of the Kings of Siam as brother of his predecessor, which is found in no other source. When Prasat Thong became king he named his brother heir, -widget. The brother, as heir, according to the 17th-century observers, was not mahā uparāj. That title was reserved for a person, who might or might not be a prince, who was a sort of Prime Minister or Chancellor, and who was not the king's heir. The process of change is seen in La Loubère's remark, some 50 years after Schouten and Van Vliet, that the preferred heir to the throne was son of the queen, but that succession was uncertain.104

The Central Administration

According to Quaritch Wales

The structure of the central administration, below the king, as described by Quaritch Wales, was first two chief ministers, agramahāsenāpatī, "heads of the civil and military divisions, or divisions of left and right". On the civil side there were also four ministers, senīpatī, known collectively as the catustambh, or four columns. Quaritch Wales believed they had at one time been directly under the agramahāsenāpatī of the civil division, by analogy with the military division in which "there were four general officers, each originally in command of one of the four divisions (caturaṅga) of the army".105 In addition, the civil division included departments for six mantrī, or councillors, directly responsible to the king, and a number of other departments.

On the military side of the central administration, Quaritch Wales believed that the military division formed a kind of professional army, although "in time of war the civil division was called upon to fight", that there had been professional armies both in the capital and major provinces, the former under the kalāhom, and that this situation was maintained "until the abolition of the distinction between dahār and bala rōan", which had been established by King Trailok, in the 15th century. He also believed that Siam retained the ancient Indian division of military forces into four departments (caturaṅga), infantry, cavalry, elephants, and chariots, except that "the last mentioned were replaced by artisans, or as we should say, engineers". However, according to Quaritch Wales,

103 Francis Caron and Joost Schouten, A Description of the Government, Might, Religion, Customs, Traffic and the Remarkable Affairs in the Kingdom of SIAM, 1636, English translation 1671. reprint Chalermmit Historical Archives Series, February 1969, p. 131; van Vliet, "Historical Account", p. 32.
104 Van Vliet, Short History, pp. 63, on Prasat Thong's brother, p. 87; Vickery, "Review Article on van Vliet, The Short History of the Kings of Siam", JSS 46/2 (July 1976); La Loubère, p. 102.
105 Quaritch Wales, Administration, p. 79, where the language, with respect to which side was 'left' or 'right' is not clear, but in his Ancient South-East Asian Warfare, p. 151, he said that military officials were on the right (south) side of the king in audience. In fact, although left-right distinctions are found in several sections of Three Seals, they never coincide clearly with a civil-military division, nor with geographical relationships.
"the original arrangement became much confused", a statement made necessary by the fact that in the Ayutthayan system the great generals were all infantry commanders and the organization depicted in the Law of the Military Hierarchy is not at all like that postulated by Quaritch Wales. The structure of two chief ministers, four other ministers, and six councillors has generally been accepted by subsequent scholars, and in diagram form would appear as illustrated below.

---

The Central Administrative structure according to the laws

In this section I propose to outline what the laws say, and engage in some comparison with other relevant sources.

The first text to examine is not a law, but the passage from the long versions of the Ayutthayan annals, all of which apparently date from a revision made in the Ayutthaya period, recording changes in the central government administration. Quaritch Wales believed that it contained "definite statements ... with regard to the reforms carried out by King Paramatrailokanath" corroborating "the correctness of the dates of issue of those laws--the hierarchy laws of A.D. 1454 ...", and which, according to Akin, "state that King Trailok gave honorific names to the nobles according to their sakdina [sic], and appointed the two chief ministers". In the texts where it occurs, this passage comes immediately after the entry recording King Trailok's assumption of the throne at a date corresponding to 1434; but it is now known that the dates in this portion of the

---

106 Administration, pp. 80, 140-1.
107 Quaritch-Wales, p. 173; Akin, p. 192.
annals are incorrect. In the Hlvaṅ prasrōṭh chronicle, which at present is accepted as chronologically accurate, the statement on administrative reforms is not included, but if interpolated from the long versions would fall in 1448.

It is not, however, certain that the inclusion of this passage in the annals, even with a correction of the date, represents independent corroborative evidence. Prince Damrong showed that some of the law texts were used as sources in the revision of the chronicles, were misunderstood, and led to errors in some of the dates of the latter. Thus the statement in the annals about King Trailok’s reforms could have been drawn from the very laws which the annals are supposed to corroborate. A detail which may, however, indicate early independent composition is the use of the title khun for ministers. In the earliest extant Ayutthayan chronicle fragment, devoted to the period of Trailok’s father, the highest ranking officials are khun.

Since the passage in question plays such an important role in all discussion of early Thai administration and since the translations of it to date appear to me inadequate, I reproduce it here in full with my own translation as well as the versions of Quaritch Wales, David Wyatt, [Richard Cushman]. Wyatt’s version is in his translation of an abridged chronicle of Ayutthaya which includes only a portion of the passage found in the complete annals, but enough to illustrate the main points I wish to make.

A text: braḥ rāj dān jūa khunnān tām tāṃhnēn nā
B MV: [the king] granted names [to] the nobles according to grade of nā [rice land?]
C QW: established the names, offices, and šaktinā grades of the dignitaries
D Wyatt: then he gave titles to the nobles and assigned them ranks of paddy land
[*E Cushman: Then he bestowed titles on the nobility of position and rank*]

A hai ao dāhār pen samuha braḥ kalāhom
B let take dāhār as multitude/cohort [of] braḥ kalāhom
C making the head of the soldiers samuha braḥ kalāhom
D organizing the military as (under the) samuha braḥ kalāhom
[*E he had the [head of the] soldiers made Chief Minister Phra Kalahom*]

A ao bala rōan pen samuha nāyak
B take bala rōan as multitude/cohort [of] nāyak
C making the head of the civilians samuha nāyak

On the recension of 1157 and the incorrect dates, see Vickery, "Cambodia After Angkor", Chapter IX.

Damrong, RA, pp. 398-400.

See Vickery, "The 2/k.125 Fragment", p. 54.

RA, p. 73; Quaritch-Wales, "Administration", p. 78; David K. Wyatt, "The Abridged Royal Chronicle of Ayudhya of Prince Paramānuchit chinorot", JSS 61/1 (January 1973), p. 36; [*Richard D. Cushman, The Royal Chronicles of Ayuttthaya, p. 15, from which I have considered only his translations of the Royal Autograph text*].
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D and the (civil side of government) under the *samuha nāyak*

[*E the [head of the] civilians made Chief Minister Nayok*]

A *ao khun möa nhagarapāl möaṅ*
B *take khun [of the] möaṅ as braṅ nhagarapāl möaṅ*
C *making khun möaṅ braṅ nhagarapāl möaṅ*
D

[*E the Khun Müang made Phra Nakhon Banmiang*]

A *ao khun vāṅ pen braṅ dharmādhikaraṅ*
B *take khun [of the] palace as braṅ dharmādhikaraṅ*
C *making khun vāṅ braṅ dharmādhikaraṅ*
D

E the Khun Wang made Phra Thammathikôn

A *ao khun nā pen braṅ kṣetṛ*
B *take khun [of the] fields as braṅ kṣetṛ*
C *making khun nā braṅ kṣetṛ*
D

E the Khun Na made Phra Kaset

A *ao khun glāṅ pen braṅ kośādhipati hai thūa śaktinā*
B *take khun [of the] treasury as kośādhipati let [them] hold śaktinā*
C *making khun glāṅ braṅ kośādhipati all with śaktinā*
D

[*E and the Khun Khlang made Phra Kosathibōdi each bear the rank of *]

A *hmūṅ*
B 10,000
C grade 10,000
D of 10,000 as a basis throughout [?]

[*E ten thousand sakdina.*]

My translation differs from the conventional treatment of this passage, and some of the differences will be justified later. With respect to the four lower ministries, this passage does not indicate that Trailok created anything new. He raised their *yaśa* from *khun to braṅ*, and gave them new *rājadinnām or tāṃthnēn* titles, formed from Sanskrit terms, and certainly not taken from Angkor. It is possible that the sense of the passage is that the offices of the *nāyak* and *kalāhom* were created at this time, although it might also mean only the assignment of certain groups of people (*dahār, bala rōan*) to *kalāhom* and *nāyak* offices which already existed.

The structure of all six phrases concerning the officials is the same and this structure is in no way obscure, but is very simple Thai--*ao x pen y*, 'take x as y', being equivalent, as Quaritch Wales
saw, to colloquial English 'make x y'. Where my translation differs from the standard versions is in adhering rigidly to this structure for the phrases dealing with the first two officials. In the other four cases the translation 'make x y' had always been accepted.

From a Bangkok, or 17th-century perspective, the precedence given the möañ minister over the vān and glān seems peculiar, for in the earlier period the vān and glān were both more important, and in the later period the glān at least was. The **Hierarchy Law**, however, also lists the möañ minister first after the cākri samuha nāyak, even though this appears anomalous both with respect to the time of Rama I who was responsible for the laws as we now have them, and to what may be presumed to have been the structure on which the next earliest codification was based.

The list is also peculiar in the inconsistency in the new titles for the four lower ranking ministers. The ministers of möañ, nā, and glān are named by reference to their new tämhnèn, which are incomplete, whereas the vān minister is listed with his rājādinnām. His tämhnèn was *manda*rapāl. parallel to nagarpāl of the möañ minister. This suggests an insertion into the chronicle at a later time, not a current entry at the date in question.

The terms *dahār* and *bala rōan*, modern Thai "soldier" and "civilian", have been left untranslated to emphasize that they may not have had this meaning in the early Ayutthaya period.

As a result it is necessary to separate *samuha* from the words immediately following, contrary to 19th century usage in which *samuha brah kalāhom* and *samuha nāyak* were inseparable titles for the chiefs of the military and civil ministries. In this passage the separation is necessary, however, for it would be nonsense to translate, "take the *dahār* as chief of the military, take the *bala rōan* as chief of the civilians". The separation is grammatically permissible since *samuha*, before becoming an inseparable part of various Thai titles, was a Sanskrit term meaning "group", "band", "multitude", as Quaritch Wales translated it in another context, and is so attested for Thai by the **Royal Institute Dictionary**. What the standard treatments of this passage show are not translations, but rather descriptions in terms of the 19th-century situation which had to be achieved by emending and adding parenthetically what was not included in the original text.

There are still other passages which legitimize my treatment of *samuha* in the translation in question. The first is in the section of the **Civil Hierarchy Law** concerned with the elephant forces, the title *samuha brah gajapāl*, which by analogy with the versions of Quaritch Wales and Wyatt cited above, should mean 'chief of the elephant guards'. Interestingly, however, in the table of ranks of the elephant guards there are four officers whose titles contain the same expression *samuha brah gajapāl*, as tämhnèn. The first two, one of the left and one of the right, have 5000 *saktinā*, and they are followed by two more with 3000 *saktinā*, also respectively left and right. On either side, of course, there could be only one chief, and this suggests that interpretation of such titles should be "so-and-so, of the cohorts (samuha) of the elephant guards---of the left side/right side".

A second example is in the kalāhom department where the titles of two officials, one the chief with 10,000 *saktinā*, and another of 3000 *saktinā*, both end with *samuha brah kalāhom*, whereas there cannot have been more than one person with the title *samuha brah kalāhom* in the sense of 'chief of the military division'. In both cases we should translate, 'cau bañā maḥāsenāpatī /brah dharmmatrailok of the cohort of the brah kalāhom'.

---

112 Quaritch Wales, 1934, p. 85
113 **Laws I**, p. 250.
The only apparently complete table of organisation of the central administration is that found in the *Hierarchy Laws, Civil, Military, and Provincial*, which are replete with problems of date, titles, and organization, some of which I have treated in "Prolegomena" and noted above.\(^{114}\)

They contain two separate preambles dated 1298 dog year and the royal titles in both are close enough so that it is clear the same king was intended. That date, however, is clearly in error. The year 1298, presumably ṣaka, was a dragon year, and the nearest dog years were 1292 and 1304, six years either way. Three different attempts at emendation have been made to place them within the reign of King Trailok, but such a procedure is hardly to be recommended, especially when the emendations cannot be justified on paleographic grounds.

Both preambles contain exactly the same copyist's error, which does not involve figures easily confused, and is unlikely to have happened twice independently, and thus the preamble of one of these laws was probably copied from that of the other, after the erroneous date had been established. Thus an earlier stage consisted of only one of these laws, or of parts of both included under a single preamble.\(^{115}\)

The clearest evidence of such composition is that the preamble-type section of the joint *Military and Provincial Law*, with the date and royal titles, does not come at the beginning, but in the middle, between the military ranks and those of the provinces. At a glance it would seem that this preamble should mark the beginning of a separate law on provinces, while the *kalāhom* and the rest of the military *kram* belonged in the preceding law with the other great ministries and councillors. This, however, would violate the separation of civil (*bala rōan*) and military (*dahār*) departments believed to have been instituted by Trailok. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that this division was not felt necessary until later, the suggested earlier arrangement of the two laws is easier to accept.

The collation of the dates and royal titles of the two laws below shows that *a priori* the derivation of one from the other may not be determined. Some elements of both are suspect. The first contains not *trailokanāth*, the expected title, but *trailoṇaṇaṇāth*, found in no other text, while the second adds *rāṃādhhipati", inappropriate in every way with respect to current views on Ayutthayan regnal periods.\(^{116}\)

---

\(^{114}\) *Laws I*, pp. 219-327.

\(^{115}\) Burnay, "Inventaire" I, p. 156 recognized that the "deux morceaux sont, en réalité, les deux divisions d'une même loi".

\(^{116}\) See respectively *Laws I*, p. 219 and 316.
One revelation of late tampering is that the official to whom the law is addressed in both preambles is the cau bañā ... etc., Minister of the Palace (vān) whose yaśa title in the body of the laws is still ōkbañā. As noted above, the period in which the ōk titles were abolished is uncertain, and this particular official was known as cau bañā as early as the first part of the 17th century.\(^\text{117}\) The preamble might then be at least that early, with the body of the laws even earlier. Since, however, his yaśa within the law is ōk bañā, it is preferable to impute the preamble to Rama I. Also of interest is that these laws which concern the entire administrative structure are addressed to the vān, illustrating his capacity as agahmahāsenādhīpatī, and perhaps indicating that the original law dates from a time before the cākri and kalāhom had attained their high positions.

In the Hierarchy Laws the principal officers are listed according to the familiar four-fold ranking system, in the order in which they occur of yaśa (hierarchical titles), rājadinnām (formal titles indicating the position held), tāmhnēn (grade of office), and śaktinā (numerical dignity marks), although in some cases it is difficult to make a distinction between the second and third of these types of rank.\(^\text{118}\)

In the law texts, because the use of yaśa is inconsistent, śaktinā is the best indicator of levels of rank, and thus I list below the heads of the main departments accordingly. There were nine officials in the Civil Hierarchy with the highest śaktinā of 10,000 who, together with the kalāhom and two other officers listed in the Military Hierarchy, seem to have made up the highest level, below the king, of the central government. They were:

\[
\begin{align*}
10,000 \ [hmūn] śaktinā & \quad mahā uparāj \\
cau bañā & \quad cākri śrī atgrakṣ \\
bañā yamarāj & \quad kram braḥ nagarpāl [mōañ] \\
ōk & \quad ōnā baldebrājasenāpatī krahsetrādhīpatī [nā] \\
ōk bañā śrī dharrmarāj & \quad kośādhīpatī [gλān] \\
ōk bañā dhārmādhīpatī & \quad maldiarpāl [vān] aga:mahāsenādhīpatī \\
ōk & \quad ōnā braḥ satec & \quad śrī subaharāj...
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{117}\) See note 88 above. He was not, however, given this title in La Loubère.

\(^{118}\) They are listed here in the order followed in actual titles. Akin, pp. 21, lists them as "four related methods of ranking...the sakdina [sic], the yat [yaśa], the honorific names [rājadinnām], and government position [tāmhnēn]".
The titles have been segmented to facilitate comparison of *yaśa, rājadinnaṁ* and *tāṁhnēn*, and ellipses indicate portions which have been omitted. In the case of the first named, there seems to be no *rājadinnaṁ* preceding the *tāṁhnēn*, and in fact, since this title seems to mean cau *baṇā* of the *mahā uparājī*, there is not even a *tāṁhnēn* in the sense this is found in the other titles. For the two *mahārājagrū* I find it difficult to distinguish these two elements. Words in brackets are the conventional designations for the ministers of 'city', 'fields', 'treasury', and 'palace' respectively.

With respect to the structure outlined by Quaritch Wales there are several things to note here. Judged by *saṅtinā* all of these positions would appear to be co-ordinate, equal ranking branches of the administration, but if their *yaśa* is examined differences appear, not all of which are easy to explain.

A second point is that there were indeed, as Quaritch Wales and other writers have indicated, two "chief ministers", *ag(r)amahāsenādhipati*, but the *kalāhom*, chief of the "military division", was not one of them. They were the *cākrī*, chief of the 'Civil Division', and the *vān*, Minister of the Palace, although the *cākrī* who was *śrī aṅgrakṣa*, 'royal bodyguard', was superior, shown by his designation *ek u*.

The *yaśa* of the other five ministers of 10,000 *saṅtinā* seem to be *baṇā* (mōaṇ), *ōk nå* (nā and *braḥ satec*), the latter of whom, according to Quaritch Wales, was chief of church administration, but who, for La Loubère, was governor of the city of Siam. Although *braḥ* would seem to be the *yaśa* of the two Brahman officials, the *mahārājagrū*, this is not certain, as will be indicated. If the law is not corrupt it would seem to indicate two levels of rank set up at different times, one providing for 10,000 *saṅtinā* and another with two or three different grades of *yaśa*.

The picture, however, is further complicated by evidence that some of the *yaśa* titles had more than one type of meaning. Thus the official who was head of church administration or governor of the city was *ōk nå * *braḥ satec*, apparently combining two *yaśa* titles. But *braḥ* besides being third or fourth highest *yaśa* title had a very old function as a high title meaning 'sacred' or 'royal', especially in a Khmer context, and *satec* also, in Khmer, could mean 'king'. Another example of

---

119 Quaritch-Wales, p. 93; La Loubere, p. 88. There may have been a complete change in the duties of this official, for Loubère’s description is clear and convincing, but all references to the *braḥ satec* in the laws show him to have had religious functions.

120 The title *braḥ/vraḥ pāda*, 'royal feet', was the Old Khmer equivalent of 'His Majesty', and was preserved in Ayutthaya, as can be seen from the preamble of the law in question which refers to the king as *braḥ pāda samteč braḥ parama...etc.*
this Khmer use of *braḥis* in the ṭāṃhṇē ṭe of the cau bañā mahā senāpatī. The title indicating either church official or city governor, then, was ṭokē by yaśa and braḥ was part of his rājadinnāṃ.

This distinction is important in assessing the rank of the two Brahman officials, braḥ mahārā jagnā, etc., who seem to have no yaśa, but whose titles, combining rājadinnāṃ and ṭāṃhṇē, use braḥ in the Old Khmer sense, and who are both outside the yaśa hierarchy and perhaps as high as the highest yaśa level. That they indeed were outside that hierarchy, and belonged to a different part of the administration is seen in the Dharmanuṁ Law where they are not listed as possessing any seals, meaning that they did not have executive authority.\(^\text{121}\)

Neither can the bañā rank for the mōaḥ minister be automatically considered to represent only the third level yaśa, for the title bañā, like braḥ, has an older meaning, the 'senior nobles of the realm' in the Mon kingdoms, and an independent ruler in the northern Thai principalities.\(^\text{122}\)

One final remark on the officials of 10,000 śaktinā level concerns the first listed, the cau bañā mahā uparāj. It would appear from a 19th-century point of view that he was the chief officer of the Front Palace Establishment, thus cau bañā of the mahā uparāj, although Quaritch Wales thought that it was a different office, to which La Loubère had referred, and which had long been abolished. It was not to be confused with 'the braḥ Maha Uparāja...a very exalted prince with the śakti nā grade of 100,000', who was heir apparent and prince of the Front Palace, vān ān.\(^\text{123}\)

Quaritch Wales, influenced by 19th-century practice, conflated two or three things which should be kept separate. The section of the Hierarchy Law which lists the śaktinā rank of 100,000, calls the official in question just mahā uparāj. This was also the rank cited by La Loubère who wrote "Maha Obarat", also called cau bañā mahā uparāj, describing him as a Viceroy who represented the king and performed regal functions when the king was absent. In neither case is he identified with the Front Palace, and in La Loubère it is clear that he was not the heir apparent.\(^\text{124}\)

Van Vliet, fifty years earlier, had still more interesting things to say about him, and about the ministers of the central government in general. In his 'Description of the Kingdom of Siam' he provided two different lists of the ministers. In the first he described the four ministers who were involved in collecting revenue. They were ṭokē vān, 'president of the king’s council', ṭokē baldeb, "chief purveyor of the kingdom" [Minister of Fields (nā)], ṭokē cákrī, "chief of the army and the navy and minister of interior", and ṭokē braḥ glān, "chief of the king’s warehouses, keeper of the great seal and intermediary for the foreigners". Van Vliet added that each of them had about one-fourth of the administration of the country and received one-fourth of the revenues.\(^\text{125}\) If this is

---

\(^{121}\) See below, pp. 41-42, on the possible comparative significance.


\(^{123}\) Quaritch Wales, Administration, p. 77, 23, 31.

\(^{124}\) La Loubère, pp. 95, 102. La Loubère legalistically refused to call him 'Chancellor', because he did not have use of the king’s seal. Here and below I transcribe the ad hoc renditions of Thai titles by European writers in the graphic system of Thai transliteration, even within quotations from those authors.

\(^{125}\) Jeremias van Vliet, 'Description of the Kingdom of Siam'. The two lists of ministers are on pp. 27-28 and 59. The identity of the 'great seal' attributed by van Vliet to the glān is uncertain.
accurate, it suggests a provincial organization quite different from anything known later, a matter to be discussed below.

Van Vliet's second list was more complete. Here he placed the ökñā uparāj before the six ministers as "first mandarin and stadholder", seemingly duties similar to those ascribed by La Loubère. Van Vliet also said if a king died without a designated successor the ökñā uparāj, vāṅ, baldebd, cákrī, and braḥ glāṅ had to represent the king and rule until a new king was chosen.126 Thus clearly the uparāj was not then the heir apparent. The heir apparent was, however, termed 'front', fāy hnā, and in Van Vliet's day was supposed to be a brother of the king.127 Following the ökñā uparāj were again the ökñā vāṅ, "president of His Majesty's secret council", ökñā baldebd, "chief purveyor", ökñā cákrī, "chief over the political, military, ecclesiastical and civil affairs", ökñā kalāhom, "general over the elephants and over the armed forces afoot and on horseback", ökñā braḥ glāṅ, "counsel and leader of all foreign affairs at the court and keeper of the great seal", and ökñā yamarāj, "chief judge for criminal and civil cases in [Ayutthaya]". Note that the mōan minister is last. The significance of the 'great seal' of the glāṅ is still not explained.

Van Vliet's observations are valuable as evidence that the structure of the central government as outlined in the Hierarchy Law is not aberrant, but represents reality at a certain time. The vāṅ was really a sort of first minister, ranking even above the cákrī; and the kalāhom, not only was not a prime minister, but was inferior to both, being merely a 'general', while overall control of the military, as well as civilian affairs, lay with the cákrī in the so-called 'civil division'. In this respect the structure of the Hierarchy Law postdates van Vliet, and seems to fit approximately the time of La Loubère. The yaṣa, consistently ökñā as recorded by van Vliet are in accord with this, for in the Hierarchy Law all but the baldebd and the yamarāj among the six ministers have higher ranks. La Loubère did not provide a full coherent list, but noted that both the braḥ glāṅ and the braḥ satec were ökñā, and the former sometimes baṅā, and the yamarāj ökñā, but he did not provide the yaṣa of the cákrī or kalāhom.128

In the Dharmmanūn Law, which shows several signs of editing at the time of the 1805 codification, the cákrī, glāṅ, vāṅ, and kalāhom ministers are ranked as cau baṅā, and the mōan, nā, and braḥ satec as baṅā.

The real chief minister's post in the 17th century, however, was one which disappeared, and by the late 18th century had been assimilated to heir apparent. This was the ökñā uparāj or mahā uparāj, whose status resembled a stadholder for van Vliet, and a viceroy for La Loubère.

Turpin, in the time of King Taksin, wrote that 'they formerly had an 'Oberat' (uparāj), whose functions and privileges were about the same as our ancient Palace Mayors (maires de palais)'. By his time that office had been abolished, and he implies that the uparāj had been non-royal. Turpin otherwise described a four-minister government, under the baṅā cákrī, "chief of the State Council...and all the business of the provinces", a braḥ glāṅ, who was "first minister", in charge of foreign affairs, the baṅā yamarāj, in charge of justice, and a baṅā baldebd, in charge of

126 Van Vliet, "Description", p. 59.
127 Van Vliet, "Historical Account", p. 87, concerning King Prasat Thong.
128 La Loubère, pp. 80, 88.
land, including management of the royal domain, inheritance, and corvée, which implies registration of the population.129

Possibly the two references to mahā uparāj in the Hierarchy Law, one with 100,000 śaktinā and one with 10,000, represent in the first instance a 19th-century interpolation after the term uparāj had become a very high royal title for the heir apparent, or else 100,000 was śaktinā for a royal prince in that position, and 10,000 was śaktinā for a non-royal person.

At the next lower level were officials who had śaktinā of 5,000, namely:

*braḥ udaiydharm royal apparel
*òkbraḥ rājasubhāva:tī...braḥ surāsватī klān central registrar
braḥ bedrājādhipatī...samuha: braḥ gajapāl elephant corps
braḥ surindrājādhipatī...samuha: braḥ gajapāl elephant corps
*braḥ bebjiaiy cānvān kram lōm braḥ rājāvān palace guards
braḥ rājaṇgrā (2) brahmans
*braḥ rājabhāktī a treasurer
*òkbraḥ śrī bhūriyprījārāj...śrī sāralākṣṇa scribes

[rewritten as: *braḥ udaiydharm, royal apparel; *òkbraḥ rājasubhāva:tī...braḥ surās vatī klān, central registrar; braḥ bedrājādhipatī...samuha: braḥ gajapāl, elephant corps; braḥ surindrājādhipatī...samuha: braḥ gajapāl, elephant corps; *braḥ bebjiaiy cānvān kram lōm braḥ rājāvān, palace guards; braḥ rājaṇgrā (2), brahmans; *braḥ rājabhāktī, a treasurer;
*òkbraḥ śrī bhūriyprījārāj...śrī sāralākṣṇa, scribes]

All of these, except the second-named officer of the elephant corps and the brahman officials, were supposed to be chiefs of independent kram directly subordinate to the king, and five of them, marked with an asterisk above, plus the òkñā braḥ satec with 10,000 śaktinā, were considered in the 19th century to form the group known as the six mantrī (councillors).130 The treasurer is generally known as chief of the glān mahā sampatī, a treasury separate from that of the koṣādhipatī (glān), although this designation does not figure in his titles. Their yaśa, braḥ and òkbraḥ, are all equivalent, although the two forms are unlikely to have been used at the same time, and are evidence for hasty editing when the new code was produced..

The officials of this level do not form a coherent group, nor can any number of them be classified as a special group of king's councillors, as they were in the Bangkok period. The braḥ udaiydharm, in charge of royal apparel, was mentioned by La Loubère, who considered him, and

130. Quaratitch-Wales, pp. 80–81; Akin, pp. 68–69, is unclear, saying only "some of the important krom [kram] which were directly under the king" were The Registrar, and "another krom which...should have been [sic!] an important krom, was Krom Lukkhum", the Brahmans. Laws I, pp. 244, 248, 250, 250, 260, 265, 267, 272 respectively.
all palace officials, to be more influential than indicated by their ranks, because of their proximity to the king. Interestingly, La Loubère gives him yasa of ḍkñā, higher than that recorded in the Hierarchy Law, the reverse of the situation of the highest level officials who are accorded higher yasa in the law than they had in the 17th century. The same is true of a deputy of braḥ udāydharm, rājvaḥṣa, whom La Loubère called ḍкраḥ, but who in the law is classified as ḱun.131 These discrepancies suggest the editing process, with lower ranking departments neglected when ranks were updated in a new recension.

The 'military' division

The structure of the military does not appear as Quaritch Wales described it, or as it was in the 19th century; and I would prefer to speak of dahār division, without prejudice about its meaning, since a clear civil/military distinction is not deducible from the laws, nor from van Vliet, La Loubère, or Turpin.

The form of the law text itself is anomalous, as has been described above; and before the recension of Rama I it would appear that the kalāhom and the rest of the military sections were included in a single text with, and following, the 'civilian' departments. Indeed, some departments with clear military duties, such as the elephant corps, the cavalry, and certain others, are still included in the civilian part of the law, and their subordination to one or another of the great ministers is not clear. Van Vliet implied that the elephant corps was under the kalāhom in his day, but it was separate when La Loubère wrote, as it is in the Hierarchy Law, and with equivalent rank, ḍкраḥ according to La Loubère, braḥ in the law.132

The first officer mentioned in the dahār division is of course the cau baḥa mahāsenāpati ...samuha braḥ kalāhom with śaktinā of 10,000. Subordinate to him are two more fairly important officers, braḥ [yaṣa] dharrmatrailok [rājadinnām] samuha braḥ kalāhom [tāṁhnēn] and hvan [yaṣa] śrī sāvarājabhākti [rājadinnām] śrī samuha braḥ kalāhom [tāṁhnēn], the first with 3,000 śaktinā and the second with 2,400.

Then there are six officers who all seem to be included under a heading baḥa ṛama caturan ga cāhvnā ṣāṣi 6 ḱlau, which I shall only attempt to translate to the extent of 'baḥa ṛama caturan ga chiefs of the 6 groups/types of ṣāṣ (volunteers?)'. The first two, like the cau baḥa mahā senā pati have śaktinā of 10,000. Their yaṣa, ḍkbaḥa, may also be equivalent to that of the kalāhom; and their rājadinnām (they have no tāṁhnēn) ends, like his, with a:bhaiybiriyaparākramabhāhu.

Furthermore the second in command of their kram, the bahlat dūl chhōn, held śaktinā of 1,000, like the bahlat of the cau baḥa mahā senāpati, and the third ranking officer in their kram, again like the corresponding officer under the cau baḥa mahā senāpati, held 800 śaktinā. All the evidence of the law text, then, is that these officers were of equal rank with the cau baḥa mahā senāpati and headed their own distinct kram, not included under the kalāhom.133

They are followed by four officers of 5,000 śaktinā and with braḥ as their yaṣa. Each was chief of a separate kram, with no indication of subordination to a superior kram. A relationship to

131 La Loubère, pp. 102, 96-97; Laws I, p. 244.
132 La Loubère, p 89, with a comment on van Vliet; Laws I, pp. 244, 250.
133 Laws I, pp. 278-280.
the bañā rāma caturaṅga, mentioned above, may be discerned in the description of the seals of office of these four persons, in all of which a Ramayana motif is dominant, thus "Bāli holding a sword", "Aṅgata holding a flag", "Aṅgata seated on a dais", and "Haṇumāñ holding a tree branch".134

There is nothing in the law text to justify Quaritch Wales' supposition of an original four-branch caturaṅga which then broke down into a six-fold arrangement. On the contrary the occurrence of this term in the titles indicates that for the Thai of Ayutthaya it no longer had its original Indian meaning and was simply a term used in connection with the military. It is found, not necessarily exclusively, in the titles of the following officials of the kram under discussion:

- bañā rāma caturaṅga, discussed above
- khun caturaṅga vijaīvahlát, 800 śaktinā (kram 2)
- khun cöm caturaṅga pahlát khen (kram 5)
- khun caturaṅga bayuhbahlát khen, 800 śaktinā (kram 6)
- hmīn mahā caturaṅga samupāñjīyī, 400 śaktinā
- hmīn hmī caturaṅga samupāñjīyī, 400 śaktinā

The last two belonged to two kram listed immediately after the six major ones. In addition to the above, the law on dahār shows a large number of lesser kram, that is, with lower śaktinā. Some of them provide evidence on the time at which the structure recorded in the law came into being. The next highest rank in terms of śaktinā were two officers with 3000, then several with 2000. Among the latter were the commanders of the "Great Right" and "Great Left" tāṃrvac, respectively entitled Ḥvan birenndeppatī and Braḥ inndeppatī. These titles are well known in Ayutthayan history as belonging to the officers, then ranked khun, who in 1548 led the coup against khun Voravongsa, enabling King Mahā Cakrāhat to take the throne; and as a reward the former of the two officers, who was a member of the old royal family of Sukhothai, was granted the status of ruler of Phitsanulok, with a traditional Sukhothai royal title samtec mahā dharmarājādhirāj.135 This was a step in the return to power of Sukhothai royalty which culminated with the Burmese invasion in 1569. The background of Ḫn̄ede/Inḍradeb is not given in the chronicles, but they say his reward was to be named cau bra:ya śrī dharmasokarāj, title of the governor of Sukhothai in the Hierarchy Law. The RA chronicle, however, in contrast to its predecessors, says he was given that title as governor of Nakhon Srī Thammarat. RA is probably in error, particularly since the

134 Laws I, pp. 280-82. Bāli and Aṅgata, like Haṇumāñ, were monkey heroes in the Rāmāyāṇa, including Thai and Khmer versions.

135 Laws I, pp. 286-289. The story is in RA, pp. 79-82, where the titles are in more correct etymological spelling, birendradeb, i.e., virendradeva, and indradeb. These two titles are very Angkorean in form, though not found in Angkor records. Note that in Angkor all titles ending in -deva denoted persons, usually living, not gods.
governors of Phichay and Sawankhalok were involved in the coup, which appears to have been a reaction of northern nobles.136

In the Hierarchy Law these two kram contain the unusual number of nine titles belonging to officers mentioned in the "2/k. 125 Fragment", which is a story of the 1430s-1440s, the time when the old Sukhothai kingdom was being absorbed into Ayutthaya. There is also one title, śrī yodhā, found in inscription no. 86 in Phitsanulok, and In ʿṣaraśākti (Nāy Inda Saraśakti), who is prominent in a Sukhothai inscription.137 This suggests that in origin these kram were originally from the north and commanded by Sukhothai princes, and remained as such from the time of Trailok until the end of the 16th century.

The state councils: lāk khun sālā and lāk khun sār hlvaṅ

Quaritch Wales's description of the two state councils is also misleading. The first was the "lāk khun sālā, a council of ministers and heads of chief departments of state, presided over in the absence of the king by the head of the civil division". The second was the lāk khun sālā hlvaṅ, a supreme court of Brahman judicial advisers", which "...consisted of twelve Brahman officials (who strangely enough, alone among officials retained the old Thai appellation lāk khun)". Their chiefs were the braḥ mahā rāja guru purohita and the braḥ mahā rāja guru mahidhara.138

These two councils are not found in any laws before the 18th century, and the expression lāk khun itself is absent from the Hierarchy Law, thus never associated with the brahmans except as members of that council when that council is treated in other laws, and in its use it is clear that lāk khun was not a special designation for brahmans. In Sukhothai lāk khun meant simply high-ranking officials, and reference to them in 18th-century laws among the Three Seals indicates the same.139 Where the brahmans are listed in the Civil Hierarchy Law it is impossible to determine whether there were 12, or over 20.140 Moreover, in three lists of the members of the lāk khun sār/sān hlvaṅ, as it is called in the laws, dated 1743, 1758, and 1783, the number of members were respectively 11, 7, and 7, not all the same, and not all brahmans.141

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lāk khun sālā</th>
<th>1743</th>
<th>1758</th>
<th>1783</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

136. RA, pp. 79-82. The Pāncāndanumāś Chronicle (Braḥ rāj baṃśāvatār kruṅ śrī ayutthaya chapāp pāncāndanumāś [cōm]), which was a source for RA, p. 32, just gives him that title without reference to Nakhon Sri Thammarat; Laws I, p. 320.


138. Q.W., Administration, pp. 74, 80-81.

139. The Sukhothai evidence is the comparison of the near bilingual Khmer and Thai inscriptions (nos. 4 and 5) of Lithai in which the officials who welcomed an important monk on his arrival in Sukhothai were called āṃṭṭya manṭṭī rāja[kula] in no. 4 and lāk cau lāk khun in no. 5. See also, Palatine Law, article 78, Laws I, p. 102; and article 80, p. 103.


141. The three lists are respectively in Kāṃhnat kau 11, dated 1743, Laws IV, p. 324; Kaṭ 36 khō, 1758, Laws IV, p. 229; and Braḥ rāja paṇṇat 2, 1783, Laws IV, p. 261.
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This does appear to have been a council of the officers in charge of the most important government departments, although only in the 1783 list was the first-named, presumably the presiding officer, the [acting] head of the 'Civil Division'. In 1743 and 1758 the council was headed by officers who are not mentioned in other contexts of the laws, although cau bañā abhāyraja is mentioned in the chronicles. The head of the kalāhom was always second or third, and was followed by the other principal ministers, though in varying order. [NOTE: in printed text this Par is before the lists, and begins "The first does..."]

lük khun sär hlvañ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1743</th>
<th>1758</th>
<th>1783</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>braḥ śri mahosath</td>
<td>braḥ rāj grā braḥ grā</td>
<td>braḥ mahā rāj grā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>biject</td>
<td>mahidhar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hlvañ nāṇapra:kāś</td>
<td>braḥ cākra:pānī</td>
<td>braḥ grā biject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hlvañ deb rāj dhātā</td>
<td>braḥ dharrmasātṛ</td>
<td>braḥ grā birām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hlvañ dharrmasātṛ</td>
<td>braḥ kṣem</td>
<td>braḥ deb rāj dhātā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hlvañ āthyā</td>
<td>khun lvañ braḥ kraisī</td>
<td>hlvañ āthyā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>khun rāj rddhānan</td>
<td>khun rāj biniccai</td>
<td>hlvañ dharrmasātṛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>khun nanda:sen</td>
<td>khun śri dharrmarāj</td>
<td>hlvañ nāṇapakāś</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>khun rājbiniccai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>khun ājñā cāk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>khun purindhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>khun deb ājñā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the list of 1743 the first title, presumably the president of the court, was the chief of the medical kram, which in the Hierarchy Law precedes the brahmans' kram. If it be argued that the
doctors were also brahmans, then that kram increases in membership to over 40 officials. The sixth and seventh of the list, khun rāj ṛddhānan and khun nanda:sen, are found in the outer section of the palace department (vāh nök) with yaśa of ḍкраh; and the last four, khun rājbiniccāi, khun ā jītā cāk, khun purindhar, khun deb ājñā, belonged to the department of the cākrī, or mah ātdai.142

In the lists of 1758 and 1783 all the names belong to the 'brahman' group in the Hierarchy Law, except the last in the 1758 list, khun śrī dharrmarāj, who elsewhere appears only in kāṃ hnat hmai, where he is described as the one who received cases to be judged in the court.143 Thus this was not just a council of brahmans, but of judicial officials from various ministries, including brahmans. There seems to be vague reference to one or another of these councils in the 17th-century European writings. Schouten noted a college of 12 councillors with one president who decided all appeals, and this is the number of the lāk khun śāḷā in 1743. Van Vliet, on the contrary, wrote that "...in [Ayutthaya] is a court of nine councillors, ...five ḍкраh, two ḍкраh (.readyState) Olāk [probably ālakṣṇa], chief secretary of the king, is one of them) and two ḍkhlaṅhān. ḍкраh yamarāj [the mōañ Minister] was president for life, and this council was the highest court of justice. The king's 'chief secretary' was probably ḍкраh śrī bhurītyprjārāj senāpati śrī sāralakṣṇa, one of the officials with 5,000 rank described above.144 La Loubère surprisingly, given his interest in and knowledge of law, had little to say about the law courts and councils in the capital, although going into some detail about provincial courts. He concurs with van Vliet that the ḍкраh yamarāj was the "President of the Tribunal of the City of Siam".145 If these 17th-century references are to the council known in the 18th century as lāk khun śāḷā, the position of the yamarāj had suffered a serious decline.

Another group of central government officials whom La Loubère considered important were four officers who commanded the forty-four mahāțlekk, and were entitled 'Meūing [hmūn] Vai,...Sarapet,...Semeungtchai,...Sīi'. "All four are very considerable Nai...and though they have only the title of [hmūn], they cease not to be Officers in chief". They are identifiable in the Hierarchy Law as respectively, the four hmūn vaivaranaī, sāra:bejbhāktī samōcairaj, and, apparently, śrī saurāk, who are not mentioned by Quaritch Wales and who in the Hierarchy Law come after the royal family, mahāțlekk, the harem, and minor palace personnel.146

Conclusions about the central government before Rama I

When the Hierarchy Law is read without prejudice it shows a table of organization different from that hypothesized on the basis of 19th-century practice as the culmination of an evolution from the government of King Trailokanāth. The evidence of 17th-century European

142. All these six are listed in the Civil Hierarchy Law, pp. 225, 238-9. The association of the first-named with the sār hlvaṅ is mentioned in Kāṃhnat kau 16, Laws V, p. 11, dated 1643; and Kāṃhnat kau 50, Laws V, p. 155, dated 1740, lists the last three as representatives of the cakrī on the sār hlvaṅ.
144. Schouten, p. 13; Van Vliet, "Description", p. 69.
145. La Loubère, pp. 82-88.
146. La Loubère, p. 10; Laws I, p. 223.
observers, moreover, demonstrates that the structure of the **Hierarchy Law** very closely approximates the existing government structure between Naresuan and Naray, with some of the differences due to revisions made in 1805. It is not possible to infer anything about the pre-Naresuan government, let alone the system which prevailed at the time of Trailokanāth, or of Rāma dhipatī I in mid-14th century.

For comparison let us view this structure in a diagram, which is a composite of the evidence of the **Hierarchy Law**, van Vliet and La Loubère, and which has been designed to facilitate comparison with other systems.
**Table One** Government Structure in the 17th-18th centuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Civilian'</th>
<th>'Military'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šaktinā 10,000</td>
<td>šaktinā 10,000 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two 'chief ministers'</td>
<td>three chief generals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>váň čákř*</td>
<td>kalāhom tejo dü ů nāṁ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four other ministers (catustambh/4 pillars)**</th>
<th>Four mahātek officers 'Brahmans'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mōaň/yamarāj</td>
<td>šaktinā 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baldeň</td>
<td>2 braň rāj grā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glāň</td>
<td>šaktinā 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>braň satec***</td>
<td>4 palāt (deputies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šaktinā 5,000***</td>
<td>šaktinā 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>four officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Royal apparel; Registrar; Elephant corps (2); Chief, Palace Guards; Treasurer, mahā sampati; Chief of scribes

*Van Vliet indicates the váň was more important, while in La Loubère the čákř/mahātdai seems preeminent, and in the Hierarchy Law both are 'chief minister', with the latter more chiefly. There appears to have been a change in their statuses between Prasat Thong and Naray which is reflected in the law.

**In the Bangkok period the 'four pillars' were the váň, mōaň, glāň, and nāţi. Van Vliet, without using that expression, said in one context that the four principal ministers were the váň, nāći, čákř, and glāň, thus showing the structural importance of '4' ministers in the information provided by his informants.

***The inclusion of the braň satec among the '4 pillars' is strictly hypothetical, for purposes of external comparison. La Loubère, who shows no awareness of '4 pillars', gives considerable importance to the braň satec, calling him "Governor of the City of Siam", a status which fits his šaktinā of 10,000 in the law, and which implies the tāṁhnēn 'braň nagarpāl', given in the Law to the yamarāj, chief of the mōaň. None of the references to 'catu stambh/stam' in the Three Seals, most of which are in laws of, or imputable to, Rama I, includes the braň satec, but they exclude the two chief ministers, in those contexts the mahātdai and the kalāhom. If this exclusion prevailed at a time when the váň and čákř were chief ministers, and the kalāhom only a general, then the braň satec was the only other central official of status to be one of the 4 pillars.

****There is no indication in the Hierarchy Law, nor in Van Vliet or La Loubère, of the hierarchical link between all of these officials and the King. The officer of the royal apparel, as La Loubère noted, was probably always of the royal household, but the others might well have been subordinate to the váň ministry.

This table of organization of the central government, based on the Three Seals together with evidence from the 17th-century Europeans Schouten, van Vliet, and La Loubère, may not be imputed to a time before 1600, nor can the laws which reflect this system be imputed to an earlier date. We might in that case hypothesize than the system, and the legislation reflecting it, were from a Sukhothai structure imposed on Ayutthaya after 1569 by Kings Dharmarajādhirāja and Naresuan.
Besides this structure, there are still a few sections of the laws which name some of the principal ministers with other titles and with the yasā of 'khun', which by the 17th century was relatively low, but which earlier had been at or near the top of the hierarchy in several old Thai societies. These contexts are not in the Hierarchy Law, nor in any of the later Decisions, so it may be inferred that they are not late innovations back-dated in a few of the laws, but parts of earlier laws.

Most noticeable of these titles is cau khun hlvañ sab l nagarpāl, the last term of which is the tāmhnēn of the mōañ minister. Evidence that he was not simply a lower-ranking officer in that ministry is his position as the principal official to whom a king Rāmādhīpān addressed his communication of a law, one of those included in Miscellaneous, at a date B.E. 1900 [A.D. 1359]. This relationship is reiterated on the next page, saying that the king spoke to cau khun hlvañ sab "and all the officials (mukkh mantrī)".

A similar context is in Crimes Against the Government, at a date lacking indication of the year, and obviously inserted within a previously existing text. There khun sab l rāj senāpatī reported to the king on offences committed by certain persons. Usually the 'rāj senāpatī' indicates a central government minister.

A third occurrence of the same title is in Theft, at a date B.E. 1910 [A.D. 1364], when khun sab l jaiy made a report to a king Dharmarājā Mahā Cākräbarī. Following this the king took counsel with the khun maldīrapāl, the khun phēn, and the khun śrī mahosath. The first of these three holds the tāmhnēn of the palace ministry (vāñ), the second is unknown in Three Seals, and the third is listed in the Hierarchy Law as chief of the medical department.

What appears here is a structure of four principal ministers ('four pillars?'), of which the Minister of the City (mōañ, nagarpāl) was premier, and was followed by the Palace Minister (vāñ, mandīrapāl), and two others of which the fourth, now listed as medical chief, might originally have been a Minister of Rites. The khun phēn, whose title suggests phēntīn, the kingdom, literally 'the surface of the land', sounds like an early version of the mahādāi Minster, that is a minister in charge of all general administration, with the duties of the nā as well. In this connection we may recall the remark made above, about the anomaly of the mōañ minister having precedence in the passage of the Annals attributing a reorganization of the ministries by King Trailokanāth, and his precedence, after the cākṛī in the Hierarchy Law, even though he did not have such precedence either in the 17th century or in the time of Rāma I. The rank of khun for ministers indicates early date, as seen in the 15th-century events described in the "2/k.125 Fragment", and as in the ranks before the reforms attributed to King Trailok, and they are ranked in the same order.

Perhaps in khun sab l jaiy nagarpāl we have a relic of a time before the 17th century, even from early Ayutthaya, when the four principal ministries were those suggested by these obscure contexts. A possible hint of earlier importance of the mahosath officer is that in the listing of his section in the Hierarchy Law he is called śrī angrākṣ, 'royal bodyguard', a title borne by no other minister in the Hierarchy Law except the cākṛī, and that right after the mahādāi section in the same law there is a peculiar inserted and partially dated (without year date) section in which the
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148. Laws IV, p. 89.
149. Laws III, p. 290.
brah śrī mahosath is the principal officer receiving royal instructions concerning messengers in the mahātāy. In a diagram it would be:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{cau khun hlvan sab ā jaiy nagarpāl (mōañ)} \\
&\text{khun manḍiarapāl (vān)} \\
&\text{khun phon (= mahātāy/nā?)} \\
&\text{khun śrī mahosath}
\end{align*}
\]

**External comparison**

Hardly anything of this structure or terminology may be related to what is known of Angkorean organization; and at Angkor there was no system of numerical ranking, such as the system of šaktinā. One surprising possible connection with Angkor is the status of heir apparent, whom both Schouten and van Vliet insisted should be a brother of the king, not a son, unless there were no brothers.

Relevant comparison, however, may be made with the Tai of northern Vietnam, Laos and southern China.

I have not found a fully detailed description of the Black and White Tai, but the available studies show comparable features. The traditional Black and White Tai political system described by George Condominas consisted of hierarchies of identically structured entities, from the household (ḫüön/ｒüön) upward through village (bān) to supravillage (mōañ), which "designates circumscriptions of different sizes" and different hierarchical importance, with the larger enclosing the smaller, and ranging from a small principality to a large state like Thailand. Above the mōañ, however, was the cu, grouping 12 mōañ, and ruled by a cau mōañ or ātā (ājñā).

Among those Tai peoples there are clear traditional distinctions between nobility, commoners, and servile categories. All of the rules of these groups are entitled khun, 'chao/ cau, ("which serves to designate the chiefs and princes and...is perpetuated...for the members of ruling

---


151. Schouten, p. 13; van Vliet, "Historical Account", pp. 32, 87. The importance of this, in principle, is seen in the identification of Trailokanāth as brother of his predecessor in van Vliet's The Short History of the Kings of Siam, p. 63, a detail in contradiction with all other sources (on the value of this source see Vickery, review article, JSS 64/2 (July 1976), pp. 207-36). Although the evidence is not perfectly consistent, it is likely that when feasible, succession in pre-Angkor and Angkor Cambodia was brother-to-brother. All Thai systems emphasize primogeniture.

152. Georges Condominas, From Lawa to Mon, from Saa' to Thai, Department of Anthropology, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, 1990, pp. 35-36, 39. See review of Condominas by Michael Vickery in Thai-Yunnan Project Newsletter, Australian National University, Number Thirteen, June 1991, pp. 3-9. Further details about the mōañ and cu levels are from Pán Phomsombat, a Black Tai living in Vientiane, "Kān pokkhǒǒo Tai Dām" ('Black Tai Administration'), Typescript in Lao (26 pp.), kindly supplied by James Chamberlain.
families and high-ranking administrative titles’), 'tao/dāv (“nobles”), or 'phia tao/bañā dāv, 'hereditary chiefs of the möań'.

The Black Tai also had a system of 'saktina' remuneration for high-ranking officials. A cau möań was entitled to rice land producing 1000 hāp of paddy along with one village or more, about 100 households, of people to cultivate his fields, care for his animals, construct and repair his buildings. As in Ayutthaya, these remunerations were attached to the function, not the person, and a cau möań who left his post lost them to his replacement. Lower levels of the hierarchy received land of 400, 50, 30, etc. hāp.

Among the Lue in southern China there was a king, the cau phèntin, a title also known in Ayutthaya and Sukhothai. There was also an uparāj who was viceroy and who was supposed to be the king’s first younger brother. As in 17th-century Ayutthaya, he was not heir apparent, the latter, unlike 17th-century Ayutthaya, being the king’s eldest son.

The next level of government was the ‘four great pillars of state’, all members of the royal family, and consisting of a president with three other ministers, "His First Lordship’...minister of the administration of government, of finances and the revenue office--actually Prime Minister", the "minister of Justice and the Recorder of Population", and the "minister of the government’s rations", which sounds very much like the ‘purveyor’ known to Van Vliet in Ayutthaya.

The business of government was conducted in two councils, Royal Outer Council (sanām nōk) and a Private Council (sanām nai), both under direct control of the king. The first included the ‘four pillars' and other officials, including a representative of the sanām nai. The second, much larger, was under the presidency of the cau hlvań pasāi [prāsāda], the Palace Minister. It included a large number of other officials who were also all members of the royal family, which itself was ranked in four grades of members.

These councils are reminiscent of the two lāk khun councils of Ayutthaya, although in Ayutthaya they did not have the same importance as organs of the central administration. As noted above, in Sukhothai the term lāk khun just meant high-ranking officials.

The highest rank of royalty consisted of eight persons, called the ‘eight pillars of state’. They may be interestingly compared with some of the high-ranking Ayutthayan officials. As noted, the first was the Palace Minister, a situation like that recorded by van Vliet for early 17th-century Ayutthaya. The second was the cau hlvań nā phèn, "supervisor of the civil administration, officer of the royal entourage", a description precisely parallel to that of the Ayutthayan cákrī, Chief Minister of the
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153. Condominas, pp. 40-44. The peculiar view of Condominas and Haudricourt (n. 28) that khun and cau are of Chinese origin would not be shared by most specialists in Thai linguistics. Note that phia/fia is from Mon bañā.


155. Jacques Lemoine, "Tai Lue Historical Relation with China and the Shaping of the Sipsong Panna Political System", in Proceedings of the International Conference on Thai Studies, The Australian National University, Canberra, 3-6 July 1987, pp. 121-34. A difficulty with Lemoine’s study is that it is entirely based on Chinese research, not on direct study of Lue documents or fieldwork; and apparently Lemoine is unfamiliar with Lue or other Thai languages. Thus many of the Lue terms are unrecognizable in his rendition, and some of his definitions, done through Chinese, seem inaccurate.

156. Lemoine, p. 122. Their Lue titles are among the most unclear in Lemoine’s exposition.

157. Lemoine, pp. 122-3. The precise number of members is not clear from Lemoine’s exposition.
mahātdaiy. His title ‘phèn’ is also like that of a khun who followed a khun mahātiarpāl (‘palace’) in a listing of officials which I have interpreted as ministers at a time preceding the raise in ranks attributed to Trailokanāth, and this coincidence points to a relationship between old Ayutthayan ranks and those of other Thai political systems. The term phèn probably refers to the surface of the land, as in phèntin, a term appropriate for a minister in charge of civil administration.158

Following these two top ministers, the other six of the ‘eight pillars’ were a cau hlvañ of the right and one of the center (the left cau hlvañ was among the second rank of royalty) with military and hunting duties, a cau hlvañ nā jān in charge of elephants, a cau hlvañ nā hòk in charge of spears and rifles, a financial officer, and a cau hlvañ who was in charge of bookkeeping and head of the palace guards. All of these functions are found in the Ayutthayan Hierarchy Law, and even almost in the same order. If the cau hlvañ of the right and center are assimilated to sections of the Ayutthayan mahātdaiy, such as the kram of the hlvañ mahā āmātyādhipati and of the hlvañ cā sènpātī with 3000 and 2400 saktinā respectively, then the elephant corps follows later in the law, preceding an important palace treasury, the glān mahāsampatī, which precedes the department of scribes.159

All Lue officials were ranked according to a numerical system of nā (‘field’), based on numbers of measures (hāp) of rice to which they were entitled. Lemoine believed that “the Lue nā: system...has probably been adapted from the sakdina system of the Central Thai after it had been established in Ayudhya by King Trailokanath in 1454”160. On the contrary, whenever this system was adopted in Ayutthaya, it was probably part of a body of administrative traditions from a more ancient background in Thai areas to the north, and, as I shall argue below, the Ayutthayan Thai, the Black Tai, and the Lue would have adopted it from a system still farther to the north.

Also of comparative interest is that in the Lue system the cau hlvañ in charge of the hān ‘soldiers’, called “Great General leading the troops to the front”, equivalent to the Ayutthayan kalāhom, was an official of the second rank, below the ‘eight pillars’, as the kalāhom appears in the Hierarchy Law when its ‘military section’ is viewed, as the text indicates it should be, as a continuing part of the main, ‘civilian’ part of the law. There were also Lue military ranks of khun hān, ‘army officer’, and phya hān, cā hān, seen hān, terms which must be compared with the Ayutthayan /thahan/ (dahār).161

This term itself is mysterious. It does not seem to be Thai, is not found in Sukhothai inscriptions or in the Black Tai chronicles, nor in the best-known White Tai dictionary, and the Indic
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158 See above, p. 37 [167] for the earlier Ayutthayan structure. Lemoine, p. 124, says that phèn (his ‘phaen’) means ‘peacock’, and the minister in question “cared for the peacock feathers...and during the great pageants...would carry the peacock feathers behind the cau phèntin”. This explanation of phèn seems most unlikely. There is a word /pheen/ (written bèn), meaning the spreading of a peacock’s (nòk yùn) tail, and in Vientiane Lao it is also glossed as an ancient military rank, but only equivalent to nòy bān, ‘chief of a thousand’.

160. Lemoine, p. 132.
161. The full title of this military officer in Lemoine, p. 123, is “Tsao-long [cau hlvañ] Tsoeng Hān”, of which I am unable to interpret the third term. In Ayutthaya-Bangkok Thai it could be construed as ‘foot’ and would be unproblematical, but it seems unlikely that this Khmer loan would have penetrated into Lue.

52 Vickery
etymologies which have been proposed are unconvincing.\textsuperscript{162} It is worth noting that in Rhade, Western Cham and Jarai, 'soldier' is \textit{kahan}, \textit{dahan}, and \textit{to\'han}, respectively, and in Malay \textit{tahan} means 'resist', 'defend'. Although the evidence is not exhaustive, I wish to propose that this is an element of the early Chamic influence on the Thai/Tai which may also be discerned in the origins of the their scripts.\textsuperscript{163}

Surprisingly, the evidence in the inscriptions of Sukhothai, Ayutthaya's nearest Thai neighbor, is not very helpful. There is little indication of the number, titles, or hierarchy of ministers, nor whether a \textit{sakita\'na} system was in use. Most of the same \textit{ya\'sa} terms were in use, and had higher status, in particular the lower ones, such as \textit{khun}, used for chiefs of major \textit{mo\'a\'n}. The term \textit{n\'a\'y} could also indicate someone of high rank, as in the title \textit{n\'a\'y in \textit{sara\'akti} in 15th-century Sukhothai.\textsuperscript{164}

One Sukhothai record with some links between more distant Thai structures and Ayutthaya is inscription no. 38 with its text of a law promulgated some time between the end of the 14th and middle of the 15th century.\textsuperscript{165}

Following the royal introduction, there is mention of a state institutional form found in no other Sukhothai or Ayutthayan text, four officials ranking just below the king and called \textit{bra\'na\'n ba\'n\'a\'n}, each followed by the name of a place, in order Sag\textit{\'a\'n p\'e\'r} (\textit{bra\'na\'n k\'e\'s\'e\'t} [fields]), \textit{si\'\ri Seja\'n lai\'p\'u\'i}, \textit{dva\'i\'n\'a\'n S\'i\'\ri Yan\'a\'n} ['double river Yom'], and Nag\'ord\'aiy, the last of whom was 'elder brother', apparently of the king. If \textit{ba\'n\'a\'n}, inexplicable in Thai, is the Mon \textit{bi\'n\'a\'n}, \textit{bu\'i\'n}, /p\'\textipa{\textacute}g/ 'surround', they were subordinate provinces surrounding Sukhothai, where Mon influence at that time would be expected.\textsuperscript{166}

Whatever their precise role, they show a generic resemblance to the four 'Phya Luang'

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{162} A Sanskrit etymology has been proposed (<Sanskrit \textit{dahana} 'reducing to ashes'), but it is unacceptable. See Robert K. Headley, Jr. "Some Sources of Chamic Vocabulary", In \textit{Austroasiatic Studies}, p. 465.

\textsuperscript{163} See Michael Vickery, "Piltdown 3--Further discussion of the R\'am Khamhaeng Inscription", Part 3, "The development of Thai/Tai scripts" \textit{JSS}, ["This is a corrected version. It was also published in \textit{JSS}, volume 83, Parts 1 & 2 (1995), pp. 103-198, but with so many typographical errors that it is unusable."] The greater difference between Ayutthayan and Sukhothai administrations than between Ayutthayan and those of the Lue or Black Tai may give support to the linguists, such as James Chamberlain, who propose that the Sukhothai and Ayutthayan Thai languages are from different sources farther to the Northeast.

\textsuperscript{164} He was author of inscription no. 49, dated 1412. See Griswold and Prasert, \textit{EHS} 1, "A Declaration of Independence and its Consequences", \textit{JSS} 56/2 (July 1968), pp. 207-250. In one section of the \textit{Military Hierarchy, Laws I}, p. 288, the same title \textit{in \textit{sara\'akti} is given to a pra\'t\'e\'n with \textit{sakita\'na} of only 300.

\textsuperscript{165} Griswold and Prasert, \textit{EHS} 4. I do not have space for a more thorough discussion of the problems in dating this law. Readers should note, however, that other Thai scholars do not subscribe to the emendations made by Griswold and Prasert to fit it into their historical reconstruction. See Dhida Saraya, \textit{Class Structure of Thai Society in the Sukhothai and Early Ayutthaya Period (B.E. 1800-2112)} [in Thai], pp. 121-127.

(bañâ hlvañ) who administered the villages of the Lue kingdom, of whom one was a 'Field Luang' and two were Luang of water courses.\textsuperscript{167}

This inscription is also important for an organization of the population which shows links between the Tai areas in Vietnam, the Lue, and Ayutthaya. The population, as among the Black and White Tai and Lue, was organized in work groups under local chiefs, called in Sukhothai lûk khun mun tvân, and lûk khun mun nây. Mun nây are familiar from the Ayutthayan laws, and tvân is Mon for 'village'.\textsuperscript{168} Griswold and Prasert wished to attribute this structure to Ayutthayan influence, on the grounds that Sukhothai society was not so strictly organized, but in this they neglected the evidence of inscription 107, from Prae, and dated by them to the 1330s-1340s. It lists lûk cau lûk khun, mun nây, brai dai, which could be interpreted 'officials' and 'group chiefs' and 'peasants', or 'officials' and 'group chiefs of peasants', or 'officials who are group chiefs of peasants', showing that the institution of mun nây, chief of a mobilized population group, was well established in the early Sukhothai period, and that Sukhothai continued the rigid social hierarchy of the northeastern Tai which was also reproduced in Ayutthaya.\textsuperscript{169}

Griswold and Prasert also saw evidence of šaktină in inscription 38, which, considering it was an Ayutthayan document, they did not fear to exaggerate. One brief but vague relevant context (Face 1, line 39) is a statement that offenders would be fined according to their šakti. This does resemble Ayutthayan practice, and I am inclined on this point to accept the interpretation of Griswold and Prasert, but as evidence that Sukhothai followed the practice of numerical ranks which was widespread in the Thai/Tai areas, not devised in Ayutthaya by King Trailok.

**The primary source of the Thai structures**

The similarities in state structures among different Thai/Tai peoples are not surprising now that it is realized that their ancestors inhabited a rather limited area of what is now northern Vietnam and southeastern China until sometime between one and two thousand years ago.\textsuperscript{170} That area at that time was under very strong Chinese influence, and the similarities are so striking that one wonders why they have not been emphasized earlier. I cite details from the Ming, but "[d]uring the 1300 years from the early Tang to 1906 the basic structure [such as the six ministries] remained the same".\textsuperscript{171}

All officials, from the emperor's sons down had a numerical rank like šaktină, based on bushels of rice. Emperors' sons had 10,000, and civil officials, ranked in 9 grades, had salaries of

\textsuperscript{167} Lemoine, p. 128, note 21.
\textsuperscript{170} In order to avoid time-wasting controversy about a matter which is of no relevance for the present subject, I shall maintain agnosticism here about more precise dating of the time of the Thai dispersal.
1044 down to 60 bushels. Besides that, officials were given two types of titles, prestige titles, and dignities, which included 'Pillars of State'.\textsuperscript{172}

The Ming central administration, largely copied from the Mongols, was divided into General Administration, Surveillance (Censors), and Military, although "the division was not a neat one, and there was much overlapping".\textsuperscript{173} At first, when the Ming Dynasty was founded there were two Chief Councillors, called 'Prime Minister', one of the left and one of the right (but the distinction was not civil/military), and six lower ministries, but in 1380 the offices of the Chief Councillors were abolished. In the original system there had been four ministries Finance, Ceremonies, Justice, and Public Works. Then in 1368 the number was increased to six, Personnel, Revenue, Rites, War, Justice, Works.\textsuperscript{174} All of these offices were present in the Ayutthayan system, although the identity of the Ayutthayan office corresponding to the Chinese Ministry of Rites might be disputed.

Note that the Chinese Ministry of War belonged to the civilian side of the administration. The military proper, paralleling the six ministries, had Five Chief Military Commissions. The population was divided into two major categories, civilian families and military families. The former paid land taxes and did corvée, while the latter had to provide sons for the army.\textsuperscript{175}

Paralleling the six civilian ministries and the five military commissions was the Censorate, consisting after 1380 of two Censors-in-Chief, two Vice Censors-in-Chief, and four Assistant Censors-in-Chief. I do not think it is a coincidence that they parallel the structure of the Ayutthayan 'brāhma' department with two top level officials of 10,000 nā, two second level of 5,000 nā, and 4 third level with 3,000 nā. Besides surveillance, which cannot be imputed to the Ayutthayan officials, the Chinese censors also performed judicial services very much like those of the šālā ḫākh khun and sār ḫlāvān. Just as La Loubère noted for Ayutthaya, Hucker says, "the Ming governmental system did not give a special autonomous status to the judiciary...[e]very local magistrate was chief justice of his territory". There was a review procedure upward to the capital, where there was a Grand Court of Revision, containing "two Courts of Review...one of the left and one of the right". This also resembles the so-called 'Brahman' department and the two šālā of ḫākh khun, which included two courts, kram bè, under the brah kašemārāj..., and the khun ḫlāvān brah krašrī..., who are seen in various laws to have been responsible for judicial review.\textsuperscript{176}

Finally, with respect to policy, the "most important court deliberations" included a "group of men called the Nine Chief Ministers...the respective functional heads of the six Ministries, the Censorate, the Office of Transmission, and the Grand Court of Revision...usually supplemented by the various Military Commissioners-in-Chief"...etc.\textsuperscript{177} This looks very much like the group of Ayutthayan officers with 10,000 šaktinā, plus perhaps some of those with 5,000, listed above.

In summary, I feel confident in concluding that the origins of the structures of the central authorities in early Tai/Thai states, including what may be deduced for Ayutthaya from the law texts, should be sought in Chinese state structures, probably going back to the Han, when the Thai must have first come into contact with Chinese officialdom, continuing through subsequent centuries of the

\textsuperscript{172} Hucker (pagination from Bishop), pp. 66, 69, 74; Wang Yü-ch'üan, "An Outline of the Central Government of the Former Han Dynasty", in Bishop, op. cit., pp. 5, 10, 19, 27.

\textsuperscript{173} Hucker, p. 85. Note that the Mongols were carrying on from the Sung.

\textsuperscript{174} Hucker, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{175} Hucker, pp. 114-5.

\textsuperscript{176} La Loubère, pp. 82-88; Hucker, p. 114; \textbf{Laws I}, p. 266.

\textsuperscript{177} Hucker, p. 123.
slow Thai movement west and southwestward, and reinforced again when close diplomatic contact was established between Sien and the Yuan (Mongol) dynasty, followed by the Ming contact with early Ayutthaya. Of course, different Thai polities preserved or modified different features of the structures adapted from China to fit their different social structures or under the influence of other neighbors such as the Khmer and the Mon.

**Territorial organization**

The Ayutthayan provincial organization is a different matter. I have been unable to establish parallels with a Chinese system, nor with the territorial systems of other Thai/Tai polities. The Three Seals Code, however, is interesting in showing different provincial structures at different times.

Quaritch Wales' view of the provincial administration, apparently based on Prince Damrong's hypotheses, was that prior to King Trailok, Ayutthaya had been surrounded on the four cardinal points by four provinces—Lophburi, Nakhon Nayok, Prah Pradeng and Suphanburi termed möa n̄ l̄ ū k hl̄ ā n̄, each ruled by one of the king's sons, a system supposedly set up by King Rāmahīdi I in 1351. If this were true it would also reflect the Lue and Tai structures, in which royalty had great administrative responsibilities, and the Sukhothai institution of four bañā bañā around the capital (above p. 40).

Then King Trailok placed these four provinces directly under central government control, that is, under the ministers in the capital, and the princes who had formerly ruled them were sent farther afield to rule newly subjected provinces called brahīyā mahānagara. The central portion of the kingdom, or váñ rājadānī, was divided into a number of minor provinces called möaṅ nòy, later fourth-class provinces, administered by officials appointed by the ministers.178

The kings' sons who governed the brahīyā mahānagara were first-class cau fa sons and their provinces, known as möaṅ lūk hl̄ ā n̄, were also called möaṅ ek. There were also möaṅ hl̄ ā n̄ hl̄ ā n̄, or möaṅ do, governed by second class cau fa princes, although it is not clear where they were. Beyond the provinces were vassal states called möaṅ prahdesarāj with their own sovereigns.179

About 130 years after King Trailok, King Naresuan abolished the brahīyā mahānagara and divided the outer provinces into three classes, ek, do, trī (one, two, three), but here Quaritch Wales introduced the odd statement that the law which provides this information, the Law of the Military Hierarchy, reflects "more particularly the condition of things in the eighteenth century".180

The next stage supposedly came about in 1691 when the two chief ministers acquired control of the northern and southern provinces respectively, a situation that prevailed in the 19th century with the exception that at the latter date a few of the gulf coast provinces had been given to the kram dā of the glān ministry. The reason for this change was surmised by Prince Damrong to have been a rebellion in Nakhon Sri Thammarat, an opinion which Quaritch Wales followed in Administration. In a later work, however, he modified his opinion as follows: "Siamese soldiers [according to La Loubère] formerly wore red, the colour of ... Mars which presided over the south, and that is why military officials were on the right (south) side of the king in audience. No doubt it

178 Q.W., Administration, pp. 105-06.
179 Q.W., Administration, p. 107.
180 Q.W., Administration, p. 109
was because of this that, when about 1691 the administration of the country was divided between the heads of the military and civil divisions, the former (kalāhom) was given charge of the southern provinces".\textsuperscript{181}

Quaritch Wales ignored the logical contradiction between his two explanations. In the first place he followed Prince Damrong in hypothesizing that the southern provinces had been given to the kalāhom because of a revolt in Nakhon Sri Thammarat, which was in the south, and this is the only reason for postulating the date 1691 for this development. If in fact the division of the provinces was due to astrological consideration there is no reason to choose the date 1691. Rather we should expect it to have occurred at the very beginning of the creation of the ministries in question, that is, in the reign of King Trailok, if we accept that he was responsible for the functional division of the ministries. Quaritch Wales was also wrong in assuming, as I shall demonstrate later, that the division of the administration into sections of the left and right corresponded either to a civil/military dichotomy, or to a geographical division.\textsuperscript{182}

When Rama I prepared a new code in 1805, responsibility in the central government for provinces was indeed divided among mahātdaiy, kalāhom, and glān, and this situation prevailed until the reforms of King Chulalongkorn. This division appears in the laws in Dharrmanūn, dated 1633 ifśaka, although Prince Damrong and Quaritch Wales said the division should have occurred in 1691. David Wyatt, apparently accepting the ostensible date of Dharrmanūn, wrote that the division was accomplished by King Prasat Thong (1629-56).\textsuperscript{183} It is certain that development outlined by Quaritch Wales, with mōaṅ lāk hlvanī at the four cardinal points, and royal princes sent farther and father afield, is to be rejected, or at least it cannot be sustained by any of the law texts. Neither can the concept of the váṅ rājadhānī, which is not mentioned at all in the laws.\textsuperscript{184} Three important, ostensibly valid, lists of dependent territories are found in the laws. The first, in the Palatine Law, is of 20 vassal 'kings' (krasār) who presented gold and silver flowers to the central government and eight chiefs (bañā) of great cities (mahā nagar). Then the Provincial Hierarchy Law lists forty-eight first, second, third and fourth class provinces; and the third, in the Law of Procedure (Dharrmanūn), lists the provinces administered respectively by the caug bañā cākrī (mahātdaiy), the kram brah kralāhom, and the kośādhipati (glān). There is a fourth list in one of the early laws of Rama I, dated 1783, indicating 16 great cities (mahā nagar), which, according to an old, perhaps then still existing, Palatine Law (Kaṭ maṇḍiaraṇā), were considered foreign polities (tāṅ mōāṅ). This is proof of one modification introduced into the new Palatine Law revised under the direction of Rama I twelve years later. The purpose of the order containing the old list is of some social interest, but which is beyond the subject of the present study. It concerned

\textsuperscript{181} Q.W., Administration, pp. 103-110; Ancient South-East Asian Warfare, p. 151.

\textsuperscript{182} He did acknowledge, Administration, p. 81, that the laws are inconsistent in this respect.

\textsuperscript{183} Quaritch Wales, Administration, p. 86, 113; Wyatt, Thailand A Short History, p. 108. Wyatt offers no source for his statement, and it is apparently based on the dates recorded in the law. Wyatt, however, in his "Kaṭa Maṇḍiaraṇā", proclaimed himself a believer in culāmaṇī era, to which the dates of Dharrmanūn belong, and he should thus impute them to 1743, the reign of King Boromakot. This illustrates the adhocery prevalent in most standard treatments of old Thai sources.

\textsuperscript{184} For the argument about mōaṅ lāk hlvaṅ see Vickery, "A New Tāmān About Ayudhya", JSS 67/2 (July 1979), pp. 158-160.
differential fines for women who were unfaithful to husbands posted in foreign territories or in the same polity.\textsuperscript{185}

Even though the Palatine and Hierarchy Laws are believed to date from the same reign, their lists are in certain respects contradictory, indicating composition at different times, while the third list in Dharmmanūn, outlining an entirely different structure, is found under a preamble dated 1555, year of the pig, which fits the \textit{cullamaṇī} pattern and is equivalent to A.D. 1743 if that hypothesis is correct, or 1633 if only \textit{saka} era is assumed. In spite of the recorded date, Prince Damrong and Quaritch Wales preferred to place the three-fold provincial division in 1691, but it is not attested in any other document until the reign of Rama I (1782-1809).\textsuperscript{186}

The territorial statements in the laws must also be compared with two lists found in the annals, a list of sixteen vassal states (\textit{pra:deśa rāja}) included in the post-1157 chronicles near the beginning of the reign of Rāmādhīpāpī I, that is, at approximately the same time at which the Palatine and Hierarchy Laws would at first glance appear to be dated, and a list of provinces assigned to the \textit{kalāhom} and to the \textit{kram dā} department of the \textit{glāhn} ministry by Rama I in 1782 and included in the chronicle of his reign.\textsuperscript{187}

An interesting feature of all these lists is that they are found in material compiled during the reign of Rama I, but at different dates, and it is legitimate to wonder to what extent the lists owe their present form to the preconceptions of that time rather than to the true situation at the dates assigned to them.

The earliest list in terms of date of composition of the extant source material is the last one cited above, that of 1782, which lists twenty \textit{mōan} assigned to the \textit{kalāhom} and nine to the \textit{kram dā}, a part of the \textit{glāhn} ministry, with the statement that "in the Ayutthaya period the southern \textit{mōan} were placed under the \textit{kram dā} because the \textit{kalāhom} had done something wrong".\textsuperscript{188} Rama I stated further that he was taking 19 \textit{mōan} from \textit{kram dā} and one from the \textit{mahātādaiy} to give to the \textit{kalāhom} while eight \textit{mōan} were left with the \textit{kram dā} and a ninth, taken from the \textit{mahātādaiy} territory was to be added to the territory of the \textit{kram dā}. The king’s explanation implies two previous arrangements, the one immediately preceding 1782 when all southern provinces would have been under the \textit{kram dā}, and an earlier one with all southern \textit{mōan} under the \textit{kalāhom}. We also know of a third, still earlier structure because La Loubère observed that the \textit{mahātādaiy}, in La Loubère’s words the \textit{Cakrī}, assuming them to have been the same, had general control over all the provinces of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{189}

\textsuperscript{185} See \textbf{Laws I}, pp. 70, 317-26, 176-7 respectively, and \textbf{Laws IV}, p. 260 for the list of \textit{mahā nagar} in an old Palatine Law. Here is another case for the new gender historians.

\textsuperscript{186} Quaritch-Wales, pp. 86, 113, 117, 153.


\textsuperscript{188} Reign I, p. 26.

\textsuperscript{189} La Loubère, p. 89. La Loubère’s list of the “State Officers”, starts with the \textit{Cakrī} (‘Tchakry’) and \textit{Kalāhom} (‘Calla-hom’). He only records the title \textit{mahātādaiy}, p. 84, as one of the provincial officials, \textit{ōkbraḥ mahātādaiy}, explaining the term incorrectly as 'Great Tai', i.e., as though it were
The two intermediate stages, if the statements in the Reign I chronicle are historically accurate, must then have been tried sometime between the reign of King Naray and 1767, and no other sources, it seems, give evidence of these changes. The provinces left with the mahāṭdaiy in 1782 are not listed, and the implication is that all other provinces were subordinate to that ministry. The only specific statement in this connection is that cha:jōn drau (Cha Choeung Sao) “in ancient times was subordinate to the brāh kalāhom [and] later fell to the mahāṭdaiy. Let it remain as in the beginning/as before (tām tōm),” which although ambiguous must have been intended to mean, “let it remain with the mahāṭdaiy”, for it is absent from the other two lists, and if the intention had been to leave it with the kalāhom as “in ancient times” it, like bej(r)apurī (Phetchaburi/Phetburi), would have been listed as taken from the mahāṭdaiy for the kalāhom. Again, one wonders what documents existed showing the change in status of this province.

The names of mōan in these lists are clear, although they are not all of equal status today, some being caṭhvāt (‘province’), others amphoe (district within a province). Note should be taken of ta:nāvṣrī and mṛt (Tenasserim and Mergui), an area which was frequently a bone of contention between Siam and Burma up to the 19th century. It is also interesting to observe that in the 1782 list Nagara Śrī Dharmarāja, which in other lists comes first among the southern provinces, is here only third, doubtless reflecting the fact that it was temporarily in disgrace in the early years of the reign of Rama I.

The next list in date of composition is that found in the 1157 [1795] chronicle at a date corresponding to 1351 A.D. It bears a good deal of resemblance to the list in the Palatine Law where the presence of mālāka has been taken as sufficient evidence for emending the law date to the reign of King Trailok. In 1350 Malacca had not yet been founded, but it was claimed as a vassal by Ayutthaya in the 15th century and was attacked by King Trailok in 1455. The list in the 1157 chronicle has not been discussed in detail as far as I know, although the inclusion of mālāka is grounds for rejecting it also as a 14th-century record. It also includes javā, which could in no period have been a Thai vassal, although La Loubère bears witness that exaggerated territorial claims, such as Ayutthayan pretensions to Johore, may always have been standard practice. This list of 16 vassals is divided into two distinct groups, seven northern and nine southern provinces. With respect to anachronistic names, the northern group may be subject to the same criticism as mālāka, for current doctrine holds that 14th-century epigraphy shows biṣnułoka designated as sōn kve, svarrgaloka as sajjanālaya, nagara svara as paṅkā or pra bān, kāmbeẖeļ as jakāhrāv, and some scholars believe that bicir was known as sra:lvān.

māhā, not mahāṭ, daiy. The parallel term, mahāṭlek, for the corps of pages, proves the point. Their etymology still requires explanation.

190 Reign I, p. 27.
191. Reign I, pp. 81-82, at date 1795. Klaus Wenk, The Restoration of Thailand under Rama I, 1782-1809, Tucson, 1968, pp. 103-4, shows Songkla detached from Nakhon Sri Thammarat and made a third class province, perhaps even promoted to first class, and in general it was the leading city of the South during the reign of Rama I between roughly 2328/1785-2334/1791 (exact dates not possible).
192. Wyatt, “Kaṭa maṇḍiarbāl”.
193 These identifications are from the EHS of Griswold and Prasert; La Loubère, on Johore, p. 82.
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Thus the insertion of this list at the place it is found in the chronicles seems clearly to be erroneous and due to a late compiler, and it is legitimate to wonder if it was not done deliberately in 1795 on orders of Rama I who wished to supply ancient authority for theoretical inclusion of certain territories under Thai suzerainty.

An interesting observation may also be made about some of the southern provinces on the list. Third in order after malāka and javā is ta:nāvsvrī, which the first Europeans in Siam found to be an important Ayutthayan port and the status of which as an Ayutthayan dependency in mid-15th century is shown by contemporary epigraphy. Fourth is nagara śrī dharrmarāja, and then we find da:vāy (Tavoy), mo:ta:ma: (Martaban), and mo:lamlö:n (Moulmein), areas which like Tenasserim were fought over by Burmese and Thai but which seem most often to have been in Burmese hands. The first mention of Tavoy in the Ayutthayan annals is found in the year of King Trailok's death, 1488, when it was taken by the Thai. Although there is no contemporary evidence, the Mon chronicles make the Moulmein-Martaban area the scene of a growing Mon kingdom in the 14th century and it is very improbable that it was an Ayutthayan dependency. Thus these names are further evidence for the anachronistic character of this list.

The appearance of these trans-peninsular ports in the various lists is interesting from another point of view, that of the date of their inclusion in the extant texts. The list of 1782 included only Tenasserim and its close neighbour Mergui, and in fact at that date Tavoy was in Burmese hands. However, before the composition of the second list in 1795 Tavoy had in 1792 been taken by Rama I, although not held very long, and troops had been dispatched northward to Martaban. I suggest then, that the inclusion of these mōah in a list composed in 1795, but dated to 1351, and which in other respects is clearly anachronistic, indicates deliberate tampering by Rama I in order to give his claims the weight of history.

The Palatine Law of 1805 presents still another type of list. Like the 1157 chronicle it contains a group of vassal states, 16 in the north, which are not mentioned in the other lists, and four in the south, about which the same judgement may be made as for malāka and javā in the 1157 list. The northern portion also contains some clear anachronisms. First is nagara hlva:n (Angkor) which, according to the best source, was not conquered until 1431. Then there is śrī satanaganahuta (Luang Prabang and/or Vientiane), which was not seriously threatened by the Siamese until the reign of King Taksin, and several other northern states which, although occasionally the object of Ayutthayan invasions in earlier reigns, remained outside of Ayutthayan control until the reign of Rama I. Of course, we could say that some, such as jia:n hmai on several occasions, and tōn ū or sen hvī in the reign of Naresuan, might have been attacked by Ayutthaya and have figured for that reason in theoretical claims, but this will not do for others such as jia:n ray, jia:n ru:n, jia:n sen and gotrapō:n (near Thakhek), which, like śrī satanaganahuta, were not objects of Siamese expansion until the reigns of Taksin or Rama I. The list is thus not a coherent whole for any period earlier than the end of the 18th century, and it is significant that just before compiling the laws, Rama I had successfully carried out campaigns which added several of these territories to his kingdom as vassals. On the other hand, when the chronicle of 1157 was being written (1795) he was entirely preoccupied with campaigns in the south and this is reflected in the territorial claims of that list.

A second part of the same Palatine Law section lists eight ba:nā of "great cities" (mahā nagara) who took the water oath and were thus more closely connected to the capital than the 16 vassal princes who merely offered "gold and silver flowers". A glance at the list shows that seven of
them, four in the north and three in the south, correspond to vassal states of the 1157 chronicle. Only nagara rajasima in the Northeast is not found in the earlier list.

Now I wish to emphasize again that both of these lists are in documents composed for Rama I, and both are placed at dates very close together in the 14th century. Some of the same anachronisms are found in both, but obviously the differences between them are such that both cannot be true for the same date whether this is held to be the reign of Ramādhīpāṭi I or of Trailokanāth. The differences must then be explained as the result of one or more stages of composition in later periods, and the only period for which it is possible to investigate this problem is the reign of Rama I. I have indicated above reasons why davāy, mo:ta:ma: and mo:amlōn would have been included in the list of 1795 but not that of 1782. Now we see that the last two have been dropped from the list of 1805. By this time Thai pretensions to these towns were being given up, although Tenasserim was still in Thai hands and Tavoy was still desired.

The absence of Songkhla from the latest list is due to its diminished status once Nakhon Sri Thammarat had been restored to its earlier position, and the inclusion of Nakhon Ratchasima among the great cities in 1805 reflects the increasing attention given by Rama I to the North and Northeast. The name sajanālai instead of savarrgalok may be due to conscious archaizing, but both names were still currently known. Only the omission of candapūr cannot be explained by reference to the events of the first Bangkok reign.

Another territorial list in the 1805 law collection is that of the Braḥ Dharmmanūn (Law of Procedure), with a date probably intended as equivalent to 1633. This list, like that of 1782, shows the three-fold division of provinces under the ministries, with the difference that those under the mahādāiy in the 1782 list are only implied. The ministerial attributions are identical. Some not included in both are small provinces subordinate at times to a larger neighbour, such as hlān suon, padiv and drai yog of the earlier list which are missing in 1805 and were probably included in jumbor and kañcanapūri as they are today. The 1805 list adds davāy, which has been discussed, and shows nagara śrī dharrmarāja restored to its prominent position. The name pāntabān is most likely equivalent to pān:sabān in the modern province of Prachuap Khiri Khan, and sāmgok is possibly the amphoe of the same name in Pathumthani.

It is clear that the date of 1633 is too early for this list since La Loubère in 1688 observed that provincial administration was entirely under the cákrī. Prince Damrong proposed 1691, not on any textual grounds, but because King Phetracha had to deal with a rebellion in Nakhon Sri Thammarat in that year and might have found such an organisation more efficient for military operations. However, the date intended by the compiler of the laws may not simply be ignored, and we must take into account the statement of Rama I implying two earlier stages after the reign of King Naray, one in which all southern provinces were under the kalāhom, and one with all of them under the glān. He did not pretend that a division such as he made in 1782 had ever existed previously. Just as 1633 is too early for this type of division so is the cuḷāmanī date of 1743 occasionally attributed to this law equally inappropriate, for at the latter date all the southern provinces, according to the 1782 statement of Rama I, should have been under either the kalāhom or the glān. Had the system he desired, and finally instituted, been in existence in 1743 his solution would most likely have been simply to adopt it on the grounds that there had been an Ayutthayan precedent for it only 40 years earlier.
Akin has noted the name *kruñ kau* (Ayutthaya in the Bangkok period) as evidence of an insertion by Rama I.\(^{194}\) I would go further and suggest that the list is entirely the work of Rama I, as is probably the division of the provinces among the three ministries. Another clue, besides *kruñ kau*, to tampering with the Dharrmanûn list is the inclusion of *bej(r)apurû* under the *kalâhom*. In 1782 Rama I said he was taking that province from the *mahâtdaiy* to give to the *kalâhom*, and if the date of the Dharrmanûn is even approximately accurate that province would have been under the *mahātdaiy*. Moreover the Hierarchy Law, even though the threefold provincial division is not mentioned, lists *bej(r)apurîy* under the *pra:tèn senāt khvā*, and all other provinces under that *pra:tèn* belonged to the *cákrî* in the Dharrmanûn law (see further below).

In fact, the statement by Rama I on the development of ministerial control of the provinces seems to be convincing evidence that the structure he finally set up had never existed before. He wished to share out provincial administration, and the perquisites thereof, among his ministers, who were also his close allies and supporters, and in searching for historical justification he hit at different times upon two different rationales.\(^{195}\) In 1782 he explained that Ayutthayan practice had been to give southern provinces to the *kalâhom*, although he himself would also let the *glâñ* retain some, but 23 years later he simply inserted his system into the laws under an Ayutthaya period date to make it appear that his system was the traditional one.\(^{196}\)

It appears then, that all of the territorial lists so far discussed were drawn up in their entirety at different times in the reign of Rama I and reflect the preoccupations of that time. They are thus of no value as source material for any earlier period, which is not to say that there were no earlier lists which in part formed the basis for those of Rama I. His use of *malāka, javā, malayū, varavari, uyòn̄ta:hna:, ton ū, jian krai, jian krān*, for example, the location of some of which may have already been entirely unknown, seems to be certain evidence that earlier lists were still extant.

Indeed, proof of the existence of earlier, and different, lists is the *Braḥ rāj paññāti* 2, of 1783, in which Rama I included a list of 16 *mahā nagar* said to have been in an old Palatine Law, and considered as foreign territories (*tān mōaṅ*). They were, in modern orthography, Phitsanulok, Satchanalay, Kampheng Phet, Tak, Nakon Ratchasima, Phichay, Phetchabun, Takuapa, Takuatung, Patthalung, Songkhla, Thlang, Chanthabun, Nakon Sri Thammarat, Tenasserim, Tavoy. Among all the lists of provinces it is the most peculiar geopolitically, and there is no evident reason why precisely those 16 *mōaṅ*, and not others, should have been considered outside the Ayutthayan polity, unless this list is an authentic ancient relic from the time before Ayutthaya and Sukhothai were fully unified, but when Ayutthaya already exerted some political hegemony over the Sukhothai area. This would have been between 1419 and the 1440s. The number 16 for the listed *mōaṅ* may indicate a relationship with the lists in the Palatine Law of Rama I and the 1157 chronicles, although the names are mostly different. Perhaps the number 16 was of traditional or ritual significance.\(^{197}\)

\(^{194}\) Akin, p. 192.

\(^{195}\) For discussion of Rama I as first among equals at the beginning of his reign, see David K. Wyatt, "Family Politics in Nineteenth-Century Thailand", *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 9/2 (September 1968), pp. 208-228.

\(^{196}\) A date which he intended as 1633. This list is evidence against *cuḷāmaṇī*.

\(^{197}\) In traditional Indian geography there were 16 great continents, *mahājanapada*. 
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The one remaining long territorial list, that of the Law of Provincial Hierarchies, shows an entirely different character and seems to be a genuine period piece, although perhaps not of the 14th to 15th centuries. Its 48 provinces cover, with the exception of the vassal states (the Chiang Mai, Lao, and southern Malay areas), the entire kingdom of Siam as it was constituted in the early 19th century. They are also divided into first, second, third and fourth class provinces, another 19th-century feature. Most of the governors, however, have yaśa ranks which fell out of use sometime towards the end of the Ayutthaya period. For example, all of the second class governors are ḍōṁā, the third class governors are either ḍōṁā or ďōbräh, and those of the listed fourth class provinces are ďōbräh, ḍōkmōaṅ or braṅ, only the last of which was still in use by the reign of Rama I. The governors of the two first class provinces, Phitsanulok and Nakon Sri Thammarat, are entitled cau bāṅā, appropriate for the time of Rama I. The ḍōk- titles are generally used as described by La Loubère, but that author believed the titles were distributed strictly according to the status of the mōaṅ, which is not the case in the law.

Furthermore the first, second and third class provinces are not distributed among the three ministries, but, along with most of the fourth class provinces, are subordinate to four different officials called praːtē. Only the very last statement of the law says that, “the fourth-class mōaṅ subordinate to the mahātdai, kraːlahom, kram dā hold śaktinā as follows: cau mōaṅ 3000...

which, for the reasons outlined above, must be an insertion of Rama I, and applies to the last 34 provinces listed without, however, specifying which provinces were under which ministry. The statement can refer only to these 34, and not to the other fourth-class provinces dependent on first, second, and third class provinces, because the latter are elsewhere given śaktinā of 1600, 1000 and 800 respectively.

Two more law contexts are relevant for the study of territorial organisation. The first, in section 8 of the Palatine Law, sets forth the order of precedence of kings' sons (lūk dhoe) administering ('eating') provinces, and then lists the mōaṅ lūk hlvan (mōaṅ of kings' sons) as bīsh nulok, savarrgalok, kāṃbeṅbej, labapūri, and sinpūri, and the mōaṅ hlān hlvan (mōaṅ of kings' grandsons/nephews) as inpūri and braṅmpūri. These statements may not be construed as indicating more than that certain princes received livings from certain provinces, like their contemporaries in Burma, situations which do not affect the classifications of the provinces in the other laws. It would seem that this type of exploitation of bīsnulok, savarrgalok, and kāṃbeṅbej could only have prevailed after 1569.

The second statement, in the preamble of the Law on Abduction/Kidnapping, speaks of slaves and members of the corveable population fleeing to jaliaṅ, sukkhodai, duṅ yāṅ, pāṅ yāṅ, sōṅ kev, sahlvan, jāvtāṅrav, and kāṃbeṅbej. It is interesting for preserving certain archaic names found in other sources, such as the Sukhothai inscriptions, but missing from the laws. These archaic names show that we are dealing with a text which may really have had its origin in the 14th century, but the Buddhist era of its date, (1899/AD 1355-56) is probably due to a later recodification. This is the Ayutthayan law text which bears some resemblance, especially in this list of names, with the law inscribed in Sukhothai inscription no. 38, and which convinced Griswold and

198 Laws I, p. 326.
199 Laws I, p. 72.
200 Laws III, p. 1
Prasert that the latter represented an Ayutthayan intervention in Sukhothai near the end of the 14th century. I have argued the contrary, that it was a Sukhothai law later adapted in Ayutthaya, with that list of names, inappropriate for the situation in Ayutthaya, maintained unchanged. There are two periods when such Ayutthayan appropriation could easily have occurred, the time of Traílok, which is reflected in that list of names, or in the new unification of Sukhothai with Ayutthaya after 1569.  

Below are the provincial lists which have been described. The names are in the order of the Hierarchy Law, with names not in that text inserted as closely as possible to their geographical location, in general from North to South. Numbers under the other headings show the order of the provinces in those lists. The list headed 'Pal' is the Palatine Law, and that entitled 'Old' is the old Palatine Law to which Rama I referred in his Paññáti of 1783.

The provincial lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hierarchy Law</th>
<th>Rama I</th>
<th>Pal</th>
<th>1157 Old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name</td>
<td>class</td>
<td>pratèn</td>
<td>Dharmmanûn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagar hîván</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śrî sáthanâganahut</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jian hmai</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tôn ü</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jian krai</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jian krân</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jian saen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jian run</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jian rây</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saen hví</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khemarâj</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brae</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai dôn</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gotrapôñ</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev kaev</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bîñulok</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>senät khvā</td>
<td>cakrī 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagar spī dh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>inpañña zāy</td>
<td>kalā 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savarrgalok</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>culādeb zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śájanâlay</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śûkchodai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>culâdeb zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambenbej</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>senät khvā</td>
<td>cakrī 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ták</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bejapûrñ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>senät khvā</td>
<td>cakrī 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

201. See footnotes 17 and 165 above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year Type</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nagarrājaśīmā</td>
<td>cakrī 2</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tahnāśrī</td>
<td>cakrī 14</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrī</td>
<td>cakrī 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davāy</td>
<td>cakrī 16</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motama</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molamlēn</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kra:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sāngok</td>
<td>kalā 17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijaī</td>
<td>cakrī 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bīcīr</td>
<td>cakrī 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagar swarrg</td>
<td>cakrī 6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candapūrṇa</td>
<td>inpaṇā zāy</td>
<td>glān 1</td>
<td>kram dā 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trāt</td>
<td>glān 2</td>
<td>kram dā 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaiyā</td>
<td>inpaṇā zāy</td>
<td>kalā 4</td>
<td>kalā 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hān suan</td>
<td>kalā 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bādaluṇ</td>
<td>inpaṇā zāy</td>
<td>kalā 2</td>
<td>kalā 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sākhhā</td>
<td>kalā 3</td>
<td>kalā 1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumbhōr</td>
<td>inpaṇā zāy</td>
<td>kalā 5</td>
<td>kalā 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padī</td>
<td></td>
<td>kalā 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bejpūriy</td>
<td>senāḥ khvā</td>
<td>kalā 6</td>
<td>kalā 20 (mahāt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaipīṁīth</td>
<td>senāḥ khvā</td>
<td>cakrī 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indpurīy</td>
<td>senāḥ khvā</td>
<td>cakrī 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brahmpurīy</td>
<td>culādeb zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singpurīy</td>
<td>culādeb zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labpurīy</td>
<td>senāḥ khvā</td>
<td>cakrī 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Srapurīy</td>
<td>senāḥ khvā</td>
<td>cakrī 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udaydhāṇīy</td>
<td>culādeb zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoromīy</td>
<td>cakrī 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An Dūn</td>
<td>śārabhāś khvā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīṣeśjaijān</td>
<td>cakrī 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kruh kau</td>
<td>cakrī 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savarrgapurīy</td>
<td>culādeb zāy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarṛgapurī</td>
<td>cakrī 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kārṇapurīy</td>
<td>inpaṇā zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāṅcanapurīy</td>
<td></td>
<td>kalā 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draiyog</td>
<td>inpaṇā zāy</td>
<td>kalā 19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subāṇḍpurīy</td>
<td>culādeb zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śṛṣavat</td>
<td>senāḥ khvā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagar jaiśrī</td>
<td>culādeb zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajpurīy</td>
<td>culādeb zāy</td>
<td>cakrī 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vīseś jaiy</td>
<td>senāḥ khvā</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chajōn drau</td>
<td>senāḥ khvā</td>
<td>cakrī 21</td>
<td>mahāt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tabahn, the meaning of which term seems to have been lost already.

The provinces were supposed to be subordinate until the very end of the law. The provinces were classified into four classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ang Thong</td>
<td>Fourth class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As noted, the Hierarchy Law contains two levels of organization, the latest being classification of provinces as first, second, third, and fourth, and an earlier, partly concealed structure in which each of the provinces is listed as subordinate to (khün) one of four pratèn entitled culādeb zāy, inpañā zāy, senāt khvā, and śārabhaś khvā, although the last included only one fourth class province, Ang Thong. There is no mention of the three territorial ministries to which the provinces were supposed to be subordinate until the very end of the law, where they are mentioned only with respect to the fourth class provinces.

A search through the various ministries reveals that all had rather low-ranking officials called pratèn, the meaning of which term seems to have been lost already in the Ayutthaya period. None

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Districts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ang Thong</td>
<td>Fourth class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These are in the Hierarchy Law, but not under a pratèn, thus probably new in the time of Rama I. They are found in the Dharmmanūn, which is further evidence linking this law to Rama I.
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of the pra:tèh in other contexts have titles corresponding to those of the provincial law. In the Registrar's department, however, we find the relevant titles given to officials who are kumr'tèn, probably Old Khmer kamrateǹ, and because of this I reconstruct pra:tèh as Khmer mratèn. The full titles of these four, plus two other kumr'tèn, who are of intrinsic interest in other respects, are as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kumr'tèn culâdeb bháktî śrî kântân bala dahār khûn fây zây} & \quad \text{[left side]} \\
\text{kumr'tèn inpra:yādhikâriy} & \quad \text{bala rōan khûn fây zây} & \quad \text{[left side]} \\
\text{kumr'tèn peñādhikâriy} & \quad \text{khûn fây zây nôk} & \quad \text{[left side outer]} \\
\text{kumr'tèn śārabbhāś jatikārī śrī kântân bala rōan} & \quad \text{khûn fây khvä} \\
& \quad \text{[right side]} \\
\text{kumr'tèn senât jātikārī śrī kântân bala dahār} & \quad \text{khûn fây khvä} & \quad \text{[right side]} \\
\text{kumr'tèn dhârmâdhikâri} & \quad \text{khûn fây khvä nôk} & \quad \text{[right side outer]}
\end{align*}
\]

These titles are obviously more complete versions of those given to the pra:tèh in the provincial law. The main term shows a difference only in the second, and here inpra:yā and inpañā are easily understood as equivalents. Since kumr’tèn/kamrateǹ is a well-attested title of known meaning, this Registrar's section of the Law of the Civil Hierarchy is certainly one which has resisted tampering, and since the ranks of these officials are fairly low it is certain that the usage is significantly later than the 14th century when kamrateǹ was still for the Thai a very high title. The inclusion of these pra:tèh/kumr’tèn in this manner in the Provincial Law shows that it is a later composition than the Registrar's section in the Civil Hierarchy Law. The change in the titles from kumr’tèn to pra:tèh shows that the former was no longer understood, and that scribes replaced it with the latter which, although not understood either, was found in several sections of the laws, and which in fact had a generic relationship to kumr’tèn when both were Khmer titles.

A comparison of these six kamrateǹ titles reveals a number of significant details. We may note in passing that some of the titles seem to be incomplete, which is of no particular relevance at this time. Of more interest is the three-fold division, (1) "forces" (bala) of the dahārl "forces" of the rōan; (2) left/right (zāy/khvā); and, (3) by inference, [inner]/outer (nôk). All four provincial kumr’tèn are inner.

Schematically the divisions appear as below:

```
    center
   /     \
left     right
    |     |

202. Laws I, p. 249. These functions and the correct etymology were noted by Jít Pumisak, Thai society, p. 185.
```
The provincial law, in addition to showing the provinces under four pra:tèn<kmraten subordinate to the registrar's department rather than the kalāhom or cākṛī, also divides them between the "forces" (bala) of dahār and "forces" of rōan, and both of those groups were divided between left and right. This is quite different from the division between dahār, under the kalāhom, and bala rōan, under the cākṛī, which was a feature of the 19th-century Thai administration, with its origins attributed to King Trailok. Moreover, there are very few cases of one-to-one correspondence between the two structures. Most of the dahār provinces of the provincial law later became mahātdaiy (bala rōan) provinces and vice versa.

Space limitations do not permit further discussion of the categories of the working and serving population, but the laws are full of references to relationships and classifications of ordinary people which do not conform to the system known from the nineteenth century. This still awaits serious study.

**Some conclusions on law recensions and development of the central government**

This does not purport to be 'final conclusions', for the problems concerning organization of the ordinary population have hardly been touched, but only further conclusions beyond what were proposed in my earlier papers.

The more detailed investigation seems to confirm--at least it does not weaken--the conclusions about dates, titles and recensions made in "Prolegomena". None of the law dates may be imputed to any time before King Trailok (1448-1488), and most of them were devised, when they are not true contemporary dates, after the reign of Naresuan (1590-1605). In particular, the very early Buddhist era dates, ostensibly from the time of Rāmaṇadhīpatī I of Ayutthaya, were recalculated in the 16th century.

To be sure, recalculation implies that there were earlier texts with some different type of date, and what was their origin? Here I would like to give more emphasis to one of my conclusions in "Prolegomena". That is, the true principal title of the king reigning 1448-1488 was rāmaṇadhīpatī, not trailokanāth, but this was no longer recognized in the 16th century. Thus laws of mid-15th century, with the royal title rāmaṇadhīpatī, along with changes in their texts, were redated to the first reign of Ayutthaya as understood from the chronicles. King Trailok was probably the reformer he is reputed to have been, and probably responsible for more legislation than is now recorded either in his name or in his reign.

Perhaps the only portions of text which reflect the time of Rāmaṇadhīpatī I are those laying claim to suzerainty over the southern part of the Malaysian peninsula, for Ayutthayan policy at that time was to control that economically strategic area, and later to compete with Malacca in the China trade. Those sections of the law, however, could also be imputed with equal plausibility to the time of Trailok, who still tried to invade the peninsula as far as Malacca.

Probably a very early text is the first section of the Abduction Law with its list of Sukhothai-area provinces, including some ancient names which could be attributed to the 14th
century. This text seems to imitate the Sukhothai law in inscription no. 38 dated between 1371 and 1433. It would be reasonable to take this law as having been adopted by King Trailok during the time he ruled in Phitsanulok over a joint kingdom of Sukhothai and Ayutthaya.

Among the hidden structures is an apparent four-minister central government with the möan minister in first place, and in which all have yaśa of khun. This reflects the time just before the reign of Trailok, as seen in the "2/k.125 Fragment", and in the statement about central government reforms imputed to Trailok in the Ayutthayan chronicles. To a certain extent that reform by Trailok may be accepted, at least the raising of rank of the möan, váñ, glán and nā ministries. The prominence of the cákrī and kalāhom, however, especially their control over two divisions of the population, must be imputed to later reforms and recensions, most probably the last, in the time of Rama I of Bangkok.

Because of the Khmer titles, kamrateñ, of the important officials over the provincial administration, this structure hidden in the Provincial Hierarchy Law may be one of the oldest layers of administration in the Three Seals. A precise date cannot be assigned, but it must predate 1569 when Ayutthaya came under the Sukhothai royalty, and it is probably at least as old as the reign of King Trailok who was still using Khmer officially. This Khmer usage does not mean recent influence from Angkor, for the Ayutthayan area was itself mixed Khmer and Mon, and a similar provincial organization cannot be identified from Cambodian records.

Van Vliet, in the early 17th century, implied a provincial division not seen in the laws, and possibly related to the kumṛtēn. He said that each of the four important ministers, respectively váñ, baldeb, cákrī, and glán, had about one-fourth of the administration of the country and received one-fourth of the revenues.203 Originally kamrateñ was high enough to be a ministerial rank, and van Vliet's remark suggests that in the oldest Ayutthayan four-department central government structure, which was maintained until Rama I, the four ministers were kamrateñ > kumṛtēn. Over time ministerial titles changed, and relative importance among the four varied, with provincial kumṛ tēn themselves becoming relatively minor officials in the Registrar's Department.

At the time when this structure was active, and the provinces under the Registrar, the latter, as the Civil Hierarchy Law still suggests, was under the Minister of the Palace (ván), whose pre-eminence was reported by van Vliet as late as the 17th century. There is obviously a contradiction here, and perhaps van Vliet was writing in a time of transition. Contradiction concerning control over provinces is also seen in the 18th-century description by Turpin, in which provinces and governors were under the cákrī, but land and corvée under the baldeb. Perhaps such contradictions were inherent throughout the Ayutthaya period, not to be resolved until the 19th century.

Before the time of Trailok, and indeed until after 1569, it is difficult to accept that the provinces of the old Sukhothai kingdom were subordinate to the degree implied in the laws, and their inclusion may have come about only in the time of Naresuan, as Quaritch Wales noted. That would have been when the Provincial Law in its present form was drawn up, with the old kumṛtēn assimilated to the lower rank of pra:tēn. An indication that this must have been after 1569 is in the titles for the governor of Phitsanulok. Until 1569 that post maintained the traditional Sukhothai royal title of Mahādharmarājadhirāj and Sukhothai royalty were governors, until the last of that rank became King of Ayutthaya following the war with Burma. With Sukhothai royalty ensconced in Ayutthaya, their old territory would have become ordinary provinces, as seen in the Provincial Law

---

203 Jeremias van Vliet, "Description of the Kingdom of Siam".
where Phitsanulok, although one of only two first class provinces, no longer has a governor with a Sukhothai royal title. The eighteenth-century description of Siam by the French writer Turpin suggests that the change in title for governors of Phitsanulok did not occur until the reign of Taksin, for Turpin, writing, apparently in 1768, said that Phitsanulok was "formerly under the rule of hereditary Seigneurs, and justice is still rendered today in the name of [emphasis added] its ancient masters, and in their palace". In that year there was an expedition against Phitsanulok, but when he wrote Turpin did not know its results. It was successful, and in 1770 Taksin "promoted the Čau [sic! Phráyă] Yomarat to Čau Phráyă Suraši and ordered him to rule in Phitsanulok", and the title of the governor of Phitsanulok in the Provincial Hierarchy Law is cau bañă suraśrí bisamādhira j. This officer was the younger brother of the Cakrī who later became Rama I. What is new in the organization of the Provincial Law is the division into four classes of provinces, with no relationship to the four kumṛtēn/prātēn.

One aspect of the structure under kumṛtēn, the division of both type of 'forces', bala rōan and bala dahār among groups of the right and of the left, still appears in an early 18th-century law, but was changed in a new version of the same law less than a decade later, as described above (pp. 14-15). Of course, the division of the population under the kumṛtēn represents a quite different order from that between dahār 'soldiers' and bala rōan 'civilians' known in the 19th century, and perhaps from the 18th. Understanding the significance of the titles of the kumṛtēn would help, but only one of them seems to have a clear meaning. That is the pra:dēn/kumṛtēn senāt. In Burmese senāt is 'firearms'; and in the Burmese administration people were divided into villages by type of service. Did the same type of service division prevail in Thailand? More discussion of this must await study of the serving population.

The overall structure of the central government, which may be excavated from the many textual layers of the Hierarchy Laws, with its clear similarities to Tai, Lue, and Chinese systems, should probably be attributed to no date earlier than 1569 when Mahā Dharmaṭajādhirāja of Phitsanulok, of the old Sukhothai royal family, became king in Ayutthaya, to be followed by his two sons, Naresuan and Ramesuon (traditionally known as 'Ekādaśaraṇī'). It was after this that Ayutthaya really became Thai. Of course, King Trailok may have begun to assimilate northern Tai/Thai practices during his reign in Phitsanulok, and absolute dating of these administrative practices may not be possible.
