

# **Asia Research Institute**

## **Working Paper Series**

**No. 27**

---

### **Cambodia and Its Neighbors in the 15th Century**

---

**Michael Vickery**

Independent Scholar  
vickery\_michael@hotmail.com

**June 2004**



The **ARI Working Paper Series** is published electronically by the Asia Research Institute of the National University of Singapore.

© Copyright is held by the author or authors of each Working Paper.

ARI Working Papers cannot be republished, reprinted, or reproduced in any format without the permission of the paper's author or authors.

**Note:** The views expressed in each paper are those of the author or authors of the paper. They do not necessarily represent or reflect the views of the Asia Research Institute, its Editorial Committee or of the National University of Singapore.

Citations of this electronic publication should be made in the following manner: Author, "Title," ARI Working Paper, No. #, Date, [www.nus.ari.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm](http://www.nus.ari.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm). For instance, Smith, John, "Ethnic Relations in Singapore," ARI Working Paper, No. 1, June 2003, [www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm](http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps.htm).

#### **Asia Research Institute Editorial Committee**

Anthony Reid, Chair

Cherian George

Geoff Wade

Jamie S. Davidson

Jennifer Lindsay

Mark Frost

Tan Ying Ying

#### **Asia Research Institute**

National University of Singapore

Shaw Foundation Building, Block AS7, Level 4

5 Arts Link, Singapore 117570

Tel: (65) 6874 3810

Fax: (65) 6779 1428

Website: [www.ari.nus.edu.sg](http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg)

Email: [arisec@nus.edu.sg](mailto:arisec@nus.edu.sg)

**The Asia Research Institute (ARI)** was established as a university-level institute in July 2001 as one of the strategic initiatives of the National University of Singapore (NUS). The mission of the Institute is to provide a world-class focus and resource for research on the Asian region, located at one of its communications hubs. ARI engages the social sciences broadly defined, and especially interdisciplinary frontiers between and beyond disciplines. Through frequent provision of short-term research appointments it seeks to be a place of encounters between the region and the world. Within NUS it works particularly with the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Business, Law and Design, to support conferences, lectures, and graduate study at the highest level.

## Cambodia and Its Neighbors in the 15th Century

Michael Vickery

If the 15th century is a difficult period for all of Southeast Asian history, it is very nearly a blank for Cambodia. There are no inscriptions, and the extant local ‘historical’ sources, the chronicles, are fiction until roughly mid-16th century (we do not even know the title or true dates of a king), except for one crucial event in mid-15th century, to be discussed below.

Not only are sources very sparse for Cambodia itself in the 14th-15th centuries, but sources from neighboring countries are also of little help. Vietnam was still too far away to be concerned with, or of concern to, Cambodia; that part of modern Vietnam adjoining Cambodia and southern Laos was still Champa, which in the 15th century was preoccupied with relations with Vietnam, although there is some slight evidence for the same type of Champa-Cambodian rivalry seen in earlier and later centuries.

Ayutthaya, to the West, was certainly in continuous contact with Cambodia, and this is seen in Ayutthayan sources, but the references are not straightforward and require careful analysis and dissection before they can be used in reconstruction of Cambodian history.

Because of the dearth of Cambodian sources, the history of the polity for the 15th century, and indeed from the early 13th to early 16th century depends entirely – even for such details as titles and names of kings and their approximate dates – on what may be gleaned from foreign documents, preeminently Chinese, concerning Cambodia itself and its close neighbors, especially those which now make up Thailand.

To make sense of the ‘Ming Factor’ in the 15th-century history of both Cambodia and the larger entity including modern central and northeastern Thailand, we must go back to what may be called the ‘Song Factor’ in the 12th century, that is the change in maritime policy of the Southern Song who encouraged active Chinese participation in foreign trade, after a long period in which it was discouraged or forbidden and during which nearly all shipping was that of Southeast Asians. Trade increased and relations between Southeast Asian ports and China changed. New ports developed and old ones declined.<sup>1</sup> The Mongols, after taking control of China, continued this active policy, and it is from that time that Chinese writings about Cambodia and neighboring coastal polities, such as *Hsien*, appear in quantity.

The most important sources for Cambodia’s 15th century are Chinese, the *Ming Shi-lu*, which have been made accessible to non-Sinologists by the work of Geoff Wade. Although scarce after mid-century, the references show a spurt of interest in Cambodia for participation in the China-led international trade from the end of the 14th century until the early 16th century. Cambodia was thus showing the same trend as many other regions of Southeast Asia for growth of maritime trade centers against inland agrarian kingdoms; and this is congruent with the nature of the single known 15th-century political event in Cambodia, a shift of the political center

---

<sup>1</sup> Wolters 1970.

from Angkor to the Phnom Penh region following a war with Ayutthaya.

The Chinese sources, however, must be studied critically, both in themselves, and with reference to local sources, inscriptions and chronicles, with which they often seem to disagree. In certain cases, such as Cambodia in the 15th century, they strongly support the analysis of the local chronicles as fiction. In others, for example Ayutthaya and Lanna, the lacunae may be simply of matters in which the Chinese were not interested, but this must be demonstrated, not assumed; and as we shall see, there too the Chinese records may force new interpretations of the local sources.

One has the impression from a first look at the titles for local rulers in the *MSL*, and its implications for dating of important events, that they must often be wrong. But in principle, as the most contemporary extant sources for important time periods in the polities under discussion here, they may demonstrate that received views about those polities are inaccurate. It is certainly wrong to take the view, espoused by certain Thai historians, that where the Chinese records disagree with the local chronicles, the former must be mistaken.<sup>2</sup>

A problem with the *MSL* for Cambodia is that the royal titles it records in connection with diplomatic missions, although credibly Cambodian, are quite different from genuine Cambodian titles found in Angkor inscriptions of less than a century earlier, and more resemble titles containing Khmer elements found as far afield in Sukhothai and Chiang Mai. Thus, it will be necessary to review original documents from those polities as well as Ayutthaya in order to try to sort out the relationships among all of these polities.

In what follows, after a review of the situation in Cambodia from the time of the Song factor through the 15th century, I shall bring in the evidence from the Menam valley polities to the West, and the evidence of Chinese records, which themselves force a critique of the standard histories of both Cambodia and its neighbors.

### **Cambodia: an overview from local sources**

Stone inscriptions, the main source for Cambodian history from the 7th to the early 14th century, are very few throughout the thirteenth century, end in the third decade of the fourteenth, and do not resume until mid-16th century, and then only sparsely. There is thus no contemporary record of even a king's name for over 200 years. New stone architecture, which could show direct evidence of skills in construction and art and indirect evidence of the ability of authorities to mobilize population groups for the work, is also not extant for the same period of time, while construction in perishable material has disappeared.

Anticipating the conclusions to be made about the 15th century, we may note that these are not necessarily signs of degeneration or decline, but perhaps of social and economic change, and are typical characteristics of maritime, not hinterland, polities.

There are historical chronicles which purport to treat this otherwise blank period, but, written in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, they have been shown to be fiction until some time in mid-16th century, with the possible exception of one incident in the 15th century discussed below.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> An example is cited in Wade 2000:261, n.36.

<sup>3</sup> Vickery 1977a; Vickery 1979a.

Perhaps because the best-known of the chronicles began its story in mid-14th century, just when inscriptions end, the first generations of western students of Cambodian history gave too much credence to these chronicles, and most of the well-known standard textbooks have treated the chronicles as continuing the country's history from the time epigraphy ceased. Other chronicle texts, however, provide a story going back to a prehistoric time and continuing through the pre-Angkor and Angkor periods known from inscriptions, but contrary in every detail and name to what is known from the inscriptions. The names of the kings, for instance, are in every case different from true names found in inscriptions, and not even of the same type. True royal names in 7th-14th-century Cambodia ended in *-varman*-type titles, but there are no *-varman* names in the chronicles purportedly for that period.<sup>4</sup> There is thus *a priori* no reason to credit what the chronicles contain for the years when there are no more inscriptions. Moreover, the clearly fictional parts of the chronicles, both ancient and post-Angkor, show contamination by sources from various regions of present-day Thailand.<sup>5</sup> This type of contamination is a problem throughout our area, and will be noted further below.

The single incident which undoubtedly reflects reality, and which is important for the 15th century, is an Ayutthayan intervention of some type at Angkor around 1431 which was related to the move of the Cambodian political center southward to the river port region of Phnom Penh. In the Cambodian chronicles, however, this event is dated to various times in the 14th century, and may only be understood correctly through comparison with Ayutthayan and Chinese sources.

The Chinese sources, from the Song, Mongol, and particularly the Ming periods show titles of Cambodian rulers in Chinese transcription, and sometimes reign changes, which may be compared with the titles and reign changes known from Cambodian inscriptions and chronicles, and the records of neighboring countries, in particular *Hsien-Ayutthaya*.

But first, what was Cambodia in the time of concern to us? It was certainly not the Cambodia of present-day borders. It included much of what is now central and northeastern Thailand; and, it is possible that the rulers of the polity of *Hsien* first recorded in the 13th century by the Chinese, and Ayutthaya, according to tradition founded in mid-14th century, were related to Angkorean royalty.

The first evidence of possible Khmer connections of lower Menam basin royalty is seen in inscription K.964, an apparently 7th-century inscription from Uthong in Ratchaburi Province, Thailand, just across the gulf from Chanthaburi. It was in Sanskrit and inscribed in the time of a Harṣavarman, grandson of a *rāja* Īśānavarman, whom Coedès felt could not have been the Īśānavarman of conventional history, whose capital was in central Cambodia.<sup>6</sup> Now that new work on the inscriptions (K.506 and K.1150) of Khau Noi in Srah Keo province shows the Īśānavarman of central Cambodia in full control of the Ta Phraya area, it is not

---

<sup>4</sup> Note that the true titles of Angkorean kings (from the 9th century) in Khmer ended in *-varmadeva*, not *varma(n)*. Moreover, as L.-C Damais 1957:608, n.2 explained, in one of his lucid efforts to clear away the deadwood from the tangled jungle of Southeast Asian orientalism, *varman* is impossible. He insisted that "there is no reason to restore a form which, even in Sanskrit, is only theoretical [*varman*], for only the forms in *-varma(m)a* actually existed". Although I fully agree with Damais, unless emphasizing the meaning and etymology of the titles, I shall continue to use the modern scholarly conventional *varman* which is familiar to readers and less confusing to students.

<sup>5</sup> See Vickery 1977a, chapter 11.

<sup>6</sup> Coedès 1958:129-131.

difficult to accept that both K.502 in Chanthaburi, and K.964 refer to him, and that 7th-century Cambodia was looking for another coastal outlet via the Wattana Gap, the only strip of lowland westward from Cambodia into the Menam Basin.<sup>7</sup> In that case the Harṣavarman named in K.964 probably represented a branch of Cambodian royalty who had established their own center in what is now central or eastern Thailand.

There are no more inscriptions from that putative offshoot of Cambodian royalty, and for 300 more years the lower Menam Basin and much of the Northeast is considered to have been part of Mon Buddhist *dvāravatī*, with, however, certainly a significant Khmer population. Angkor expansion into the central Menam area is seen most clearly from the time of Sūryavarman I (1002-1049), at a time when the *dvāravatī* culture seems to have been in decline.<sup>8</sup>

In Cambodia in the 12th century the powerful kings Sūryavarman II (1113-1145/50), builder of Angkor Wat, and Jayavarman VII (1181-1220?), expanded Angkorean power and influence to its greatest extent. These rulers, the so-called Mahīdharapura dynasty, came from outside the central area of Cambodia, from north of the Dangrek mountains, where their political center was probably Phimai. Because of their origins they probably brought what is now central and northeast Thailand even more firmly under Angkor control. For the time of Sūryavarman this is seen in the bas-reliefs of the so-called ‘historical gallery’ of Angkor Wat showing 19 high officers on elephants in a parade, and where troops from *lvo* (*lavo*, *lavodayapura*, modern Lophburi) are followed by troops of *syām kuk*, of which the first term must represent what the Chinese called *Hsien*. Another column of troops was from *cok vakula*, which although of unknown location was also recorded in the temple of Phimai, and was probably in central Thailand near the modern town of Chainat. This is seen in inscription 48 (1408) of the Thai corpus, from Chainat, issued by a local chief (*cau mo’an*) in “this *sathān* (‘place’) *pākula deb*.”<sup>9</sup> One more of the officers is the Rājendravarman named at Phnom Rung, near Phimai.

The Mahīdhara period--the 12th and 13th centuries – saw manifold changes in administration, religion, and state traditions. Their genealogical traditions were different – they no longer harked back to Jayavarman II, whom earlier kings, and an entire ruling class, had since the 9th century considered the founder of their realm and of their own fortunes; the so-called *devarāja* founded by Jayavarman II was ignored; entire classes of officialdom were degraded; succession to the throne was more strictly defined with a type of ultimogeniture and brother-to-brother or cousin-to-cousin succession; their inscriptions show an increase in royal authority compared

<sup>7</sup> Vickery 1998:198-199, 330-332, 338.

<sup>8</sup> For the history of Sūryavarman I see Vickery 1985, showing that Sūryavarman was of an elite Khmer family within Cambodia who began his campaign for power in eastern Cambodia, not an interloper from the Malay peninsula. The attempt by David Wyatt 2001:9-10 to ignore new work and revive the old misperceptions should be ignored. Wyatt 2004 has continued this type of treatment. See especially his pp. 4-5 on Coedès' version of the northern Thai chronicles and the background of Sūryavarman I and Jayaviravarman of Angkor, where he has repeated all the old misinformation, even the alleged Buddhism of Sūryavarman I, ignoring Vickery 1985, where these problems were resolved.

<sup>9</sup> This proves that *jayanāda* (Chainat) in chronicle stories of the mid-15th century was really Chainat, not another name for Phitsanulok, *pace* the epicycle of Griswold and Prasert designed to keep one of their imaginative reconstructions in stable orbit. See Griswold and Prasert 1969:63; Griswold and Prasert 1973:108; Griswold and Prasert 1976:143-144; Griswold and Prasert 1975:64, n. 22; Vickery 1978:220.

with officials; and they brought with them a type of Vajrayana Buddhism seen at Phimai.<sup>10</sup> Religion changed further, however. A different type of Mahayana was prominent under Jayavarman VII, then apparently rejected by one or more of his successors who favored Hinduism, until in 1308 the first royal support for Theravada Buddhism appears. In the last three reigns before the end of the inscriptions a new type of succession is recorded – abdication of a king in favor of a chosen successor, a custom of the contemporary Trần dynasty of Vietnam.

They also initiated a new type of external expansion, toward the East and the coast of Champa, together with attacks on Vietnam and new contacts with China.

Thus the reigns of Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII show some rather clear evidence of expansion toward the eastern coast of Indochina, credibly in the interest of participating in the growing maritime economy. After a break of several reigns, relations with China were renewed by Sūryavarman II, with missions sent from Angkor in 1116 and 1120, and in 1128 the conferral of special dignity on the king of Cambodia.<sup>11</sup> Sūryavarman also attacked Vietnam, and succeeded in subjugating Champa, which then occupied what is now central and southern Vietnam. Both areas, of course, were important for their coastal access. Unfortunately the Angkor epigraphic record is quite unhelpful for details about this aspect of state activity.<sup>12</sup>

The seaward expansionism of Sūryavarman II fits precisely into the terms of the relationship between China's commercial policy and the rise, decline, and transformation of Southeast Asian states. Sūryavarman's reign coincided almost exactly with the first years of the Southern Song, whose dependence on the sea after land routes westward had been cut, impelled them to open trade with Southeast Asia beyond the level allowed by previous dynasties. The Chinese records on Cambodia say that in the period 1136-1147 “some difficulties relating to the affairs of commerce were then examined and regulated”.<sup>13</sup>

If Sūryavarman II was indeed trying to take advantage of the new China-oriented commercial opportunities, the meager evidence available suggests that he was using the methods of an inland agrarian state, conquest and physical control of all territory between his capital and the desired coastal routes, rather than the maritime commercial methods of the states which eventually succeeded – acquisition of hinterland products by purchase, trade, or tax, shipment along well-established, mainly riverine, routes, leaving most of the hinterland at peace.

The period between Sūryavarman and Jayavarman (1150-1180) is obscure. There are few inscriptions, just enough to show internal war, one or more usurpers, and, perhaps an invasion of Angkor by Champa, after which Jayavarman returned, curiously, from Champa, with a Cham army, reconquered and reunited Cambodia, and then successfully established control over Champa for 20-some years.

The relationship between Jayavarman and Champa has not been given enough attention, and the standard treatment is certainly inadequate. His own later inscriptions indicate that Jayavarman was in Vijaya, central Champa, before he became king, and this has been interpreted as the time when some group of Cham attacked Angkor. The date given for this attack, 1177, is anything but secure. It

<sup>10</sup> Woodward 1975:128-130, where he differentiates between Phimai's Vajrayana and Angkor's Mahayana.

<sup>11</sup> Briggs 1951:189; Coedès 1964:292, 296.

<sup>12</sup> Coedès 1964:292-293.

<sup>13</sup> Briggs 1951: 189; Coedès 1964:296.

appears in Maspero, whence it was taken over by Coedès, although Maspero acknowledged in a footnote that the Chinese sources for the date were not of good quality, noting that they gave contradictory information about the fate of the Khmer king, and incorrect dates for the subsequent conquest of Champa by Jayavarman VII.<sup>14</sup>

The only Cham inscription which alludes to a Cham attack on Angkor around that time seems to place it in 1167, which is in fact just when the sparse Cambodian sources indicate a period of internal collapse and imply the absence of the future Jayavarman VII in Champa.<sup>15</sup> As presented in Maspero, the combined evidence of Champa inscriptions and Vietnamese chronicles seems to show that Champa also was in a condition of internal breakdown, which adds to the uncertainty surrounding this period. At least, the story in the Chinese sources of the Cham army being guided to Angkor by a shipwrecked Chinese is nonsense. After centuries of close contact the Cham certainly knew all the routes into Cambodia whether by land or sea. This story was accepted by the early Europeans who believed the Cham attack was by sea and upriver, and that the Cham, as remnants of an ancient overland migration of what they then called ‘Indonesians’, were unfamiliar with the sea. Now, of course, it is known that the Cham arrived on the Indochina coast by sea 2000-2500 years ago, and were one of the great Austronesian seafaring groups.<sup>16</sup>

Other peculiarities of the Jayavarman VII period are seen in language and religion. After nearly 300 years of increasing use and importance of the Khmer language in the inscriptions, Jayavarman suddenly used Sanskrit for all of the important texts of his reign, and raised a new type of Mahayana Buddhism to the state religion. The language suggests an internationalism spanning a joint Khmer-Cham coalition, and Mahayana Buddhism had been more important in Champa than in Cambodia.<sup>17</sup>

Buddhism, of course, had been more important in Jayavarman’s dynasty than previously, but it was related to that of Phimai, from which Jayavarman’s Mahayana differed.<sup>18</sup>

Angkorean expansion to both east and west continued, and increased, as a prominent feature of the reign of Jayavarman VII. Besides successfully renewing the

---

<sup>14</sup> Maspero 1928:164, nn. 6, 8.

<sup>15</sup> This is inscription C.30, A3, from the temple of Po Nagar, Nha Trang. The text has not been published. Aymonier 1891:44-45 gave a translation including the statement that King Jaya Indravarman in the year *śaka* 1097 (AD 1175), when he “set out to conquer Cambodia”, he offered a silver vase to the goddess Bhagavatī Kauthāreśvarī. Finot, 1915:50, revised that date to 1089/1167, which has been accepted by subsequent students. See Schweyer 1999:337. Maspero 1928:164, n. 6, erroneously gave the date of the inscription, 1105/1183, as the date of that event. We must keep in mind that everything based on Cham inscriptions requires restudy. Except for that of *Vō-Cānh* (see Filliozat 1969; Jacques 1969), which may not even concern Champa, they have not been studied since the 1920s. Many of the translations were done by persons who were not Austronesian specialists and who often offered *ad hoc* interpretations and dubious translations, which they sometimes admitted, but these have been taken over in a chain Aymonier>Finot>Maspero>Coedès >etc. and appear in later work as facts. Another problematic example is the evidence for connections between a Cham king Jaya Sīṃhavarman III with Java and with Vietnam (Reid 1999:32; Robson 1982:276 < Coedès < Maspero, etc, see Appendix to this paper.

<sup>16</sup> Maspero 1928: 164 ; Coedès 1964: 303; Bellwood 1992; Blust 1994.

<sup>17</sup> Mabbett 1986; Boisselier 1987-88:143.

<sup>18</sup> See Woodward 1975:128-130, where he differentiates between Phimai’s Vajrayana and Angkor’s Mahayana.



campaigns to control Champa, he increased links toward Thailand, perhaps links which had never been broken, for in contrast to the ample epigraphic record of wars in the east, there is no comparable record of martial activity in the west. Instead, there are records of road building, and these roads were straight, stone-paved, running across hundreds of kilometers, raised above the flood level, some still visible, even serving as the bed for modern roads. From the capital city, Angkor, there were at least two roads to the East and two to the West. One of the latter ran across the Dangrek Mts. to Phimai, while another went due west toward Sisophon, which means toward the only lowland pass from Cambodia into eastern Thailand in the direction of Lophburi or Ayutthaya. Toward the East one road has been traced nearly to the Mekong, and according to an inscription in which these roads are described, it may have continued as far as the capital of Champa.<sup>19</sup>

Another inscription of Jayavarman VII describes the sending of images called *jayabuddhamahānātha* to 23 cities, of which several names may be recognized as sites within Thailand, such as *lavodayapura* = Lopburi, *svarnapura* = Suphanburi, *jayarājapurī* = Ratchaburi, *śrī jayavajrapurī* = Petchaburi or Kamphaeng Phet. It also seems certain that of the three names containing *siṃha*, modern Thai *singh* – *jayasiṃhavati*, *śrī jayasiṃhapuri*, *śrī jayasiṃhagrāma* – two of them denote Singburi and Mo'ang Singh in Kanachanaburi Province.<sup>20</sup> *Lavodaya*, moreover, according to inscription K.285, "Grande Stèle de Phimeanakas", was governed by Indravarman, a son of Jayavarman VII.

There is now a new controversy on what these images represented, and to some extent, where precisely they were sent, in addition to the obvious locations named above. Until very recently there had been a fairly solid consensus that, as noted by Wyatt, they were "bearing what is thought to have been the king's [Jayavarman VII] facial likeness on a bodily form representing the Buddha", that is, "one or more Buddha images sent to the region [*sic*] which bear his [Jayavarman VII] physical likeness".<sup>21</sup>

This has been cogently contested by Hiram W. Woodward, Jr., arguing from iconography, numbers, and location of finds. First the *jayabuddhamahānātha* must have been some kind of Buddha images, but the Jayavarman VII likenesses are not. They are *adorant* or praying images. Then perhaps only four of the latter have been found, at Angkor, Phimai, and two other heads (provenance unspecified), whereas from the original set of twenty-three there should be more still extant. Woodward proposes that the *jayabuddhamahānātha* were really 'radiating Avalokiteśvara' images of which more than a dozen have been found, including two in Ratburi/Ratchaburi province, one in Lophburi, one in Phetburi/Phetchaburi province, and one at Prasat Mo'ang Singh, Kanchanaburi province, which fit very well with places named in the inscriptions.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Briggs 1951:233, citing Parmentier 1936, Lunet de Lajonquière 1902, 1907, 1912; G. Coedès 1940:347-349.

<sup>20</sup> These indentifications, transcribed as "Lophburi, Suphan, Ratburi, Phetchaburi, and Muang Sing", were accepted by Coedès 1964:320 who saw only Petchaburi in *jayavajrapurī*. But the name, however, spelled *bejrapūrī/bajrapurī*, is used explicitly for Kamphaeng Phet in two Sukhothai inscriptions, no. 46, lines 10-11 (*bajrapurī*) and no. 38, line 5, (*kāmbaen bejrapūrī*).

<sup>21</sup> Wyatt 2001:15, 18.

<sup>22</sup> Woodward 1994/95:106. Others are from Angkor Thom (2), Prasat Preah Thkol, Ta Prohm Bati, Preah Khan of Angkor, Don Tei (all within Cambodia), Tra-Kieu (Champa), and other locations not identified by Woodward--names which do not help much with the names in the inscription.

Wyatt has added a new, but rather devious, dimension to the discussion, saying that in addition to the known place names in the inscription, “The likelihood is strong that the remaining places named include several towns in northern Siam [*sic*], as one Buddha image that appears to be a *jayabuddhamahānātha* has been found at what is now Sukhothai; and in his note 37, adds “that the *jayabuddhamahānātha* images were sent to the provinces is attested by their discovery at provincial sites such as Sukhothai and Phimai. See also Hiram W. Woodward, Jr....” *op. cit.*<sup>23</sup> The “see also...Woodward” is really sly, implying that Woodward’s new work is where the new find in Sukhothai is recorded, and disguising from the reader that Woodward’s main point is that the *jayabuddhamahānātha* were **not**, *pace* Wyatt, “one or more Buddha images sent to the region which bear his [Jayavarman VII] physical likeness”.

Thus the alleged Sukhothai find is, for all we know from Wyatt, still a mystery. I have argued tentatively, however, that it may be possible to discern a reference to Sukhothai in the list in the inscription, irrespective of the form of the image.<sup>24</sup> The first name in the list is *śrī jayarājadhāni*, which literally means ‘the capital’, but it can hardly refer to the capital of Jayavarman VII which was *yaśodharapura* (Angkor). Perhaps it may have meant Sukhothai considered from Angkor as regional capital of a vassal state, since Lunet de Lajonquière reported in 1904 that the town of Sukhothai was known as *thāni*.

Probably another destination of a *jayabuddhamahānātha* was Chainat < *jayanātha*, although it cannot be recognized through any of the names on the list.

Jayavarman’s roads, according to a contemporary epigraphic description, were lined with rest houses and ‘hospitals’. Many of the latter have been located through recovery of identical foundation inscriptions, and most of those located are in northeast Thailand and Laos.

Such roads must have been for either political control, or transport of goods, and the number of rest houses and ‘hospitals’ indicates movement of either large numbers of people, or official missions entitled to state support on their journeys, either of which is consistent with the movement of goods.

Since the reign of Jayavarman VII was within the period when the Southern Song were expanding maritime trade in Southeast Asia, and his largest road network was toward the area of valuable produce, it may be inferred that he was trying to occupy, physically collect, and transport by road those products which could be sold profitably to China, through the ports of Champa. There is apparently no record, however, of diplomatic relations with China in his reign, except those from *Chên-li-fu*, which may have been more relevant for Angkor than current literature has recognized (see below).<sup>25</sup>

Jayavarman’s methods, even more intensively than those of Sūryavarman II, represented an agrarian-despotic attempt to dominate trade administratively, rather than commercially; and the reliance on expensive roads, no doubt constructed by

<sup>23</sup> Wyatt 2001:18, n.37 I have written “Siam [*sic*.]” because one of Wyatt’s purposes there was to re-smuggle Siam (Chinese *Hsien*) back to Sukhothai even now, when there is a solid new consensus that it was the coastal region.

<sup>24</sup> In my Cambodian history course in the Faculty of Archaeology, Royal University of Fine Arts, Phnom Penh, 1998-2002.

<sup>25</sup> Briggs 1951:223, and Coedès 1929:328 believed that the *Chên-li-fu* mission was from Cambodia. Coedès changed his opinion in 1964:315, n.2.

corvée labor, doomed it to failure. Following Jayavarman VII, there was little further monumental construction at Angkor.

In addition to the wars with Champa, Cambodia since the time of Sūryavarman II had also been attacking Vietnam (called *yavana* in the inscriptions). The Chinese and Vietnamese histories say the last Cambodian attacks against Vietnam in the province of Nghe An were in 1216 and 1218. After 1220 Cambodia left Champa (Vijaya), and a Cham prince who had been raised in Cambodia under Jayavarman VII became king there. According to Chao Ju-kua, who wrote around 1225, just after the end of Jayavarman's reign, Cambodia's borders included Lavo (Lophburi), *Chên-li-fu* (probably near Chanthaburi on the southeast coast of Thailand), and went as far as Pukan (Pagan, Burma).<sup>26</sup>

These comments on the new features of Jayavarman's reign are only suggestive, and require much more careful study. The purpose here is to show that Cambodia was pushing out into the international maritime world of Southeast Asia as early as the 12th century.

### After Jayavarman VII

Five kings are known from inscriptions after Jayavarman VII, in a period of religious change, continuing from the changes introduced by the Mahīdharapura dynasty and in particular Jayavarman VII. First, in the standard interpretation, was a reaction against Jayavarman VII manifested in a religious form, the defacing and destruction of Buddhist images and reliefs in his temples, while leaving some other earlier Buddhist structures untouched. This has been taken as a Hindu reaction in the time of Jayavarman VIII, a reasonable hypothesis, but in fact the time period is unknown.<sup>27</sup>

The third king after Jayavarman VII, however, instituted Theravada Buddhism as a royal cult, as seen in his inscription K.754. This inscription begins with the date 1308 and the name of the king *vraḥ pāda kamrateñ añ śrī Śrīndravarmadeva*, showing that the form of royal titles had not changed with the change in religion.

This inscription begins with 10 verses in Pali and continues with 31 lines of Khmer, and it is thus in the same form as the older inscriptions which begin with one part in Sanskrit and a second part in Khmer. The Pali part, also like the older Hinduist Sanskrit inscriptions, begins with an expression of respect for deities and religious objects, here the Buddha (Jina), the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha. The king's name is Sirisirindavamma (Pali form of Śrī Śrīndravarma), and he granted a village named Sirisirindaratanaḡāma to Mahāthera Sirisirindamoli. A statue of Buddha was set up and laborers, both men and women, were given.

The same information is in the Khmer part, but the names are in Sanskrit, not Pali. For example, the name of the village is Śrī Śrīndraratnagrāma, and the Buddha statue, named for the king, is called *vraḥ vuddha kamrateñ añ śrī śrīndramahādeva*, a name and titles (*vraḥ... kamrateñ añ*), and the practice of combining the king's name with a god, similar to Hindu god names in older inscriptions, where *mahādeva* meant Śiva.

The statements about people given to the temple to work are just like similar sections in older Hindu inscriptions. Ordinary workers are still called *si* and *tai*, and

<sup>26</sup> Coedès 1964:328-329.

<sup>27</sup> Jacques 1999.

some have derogatory names. This inscription shows no change in the structure of society, in spite of the new religion. It argues against the speculations by some modern scholars that Theravada Buddhism came to Cambodia unobtrusively via lower-class ‘subversives’, “probably prisoners, laborers, merchants, and some accompanying monks”, and would have represented a sort of “superbolshevism”, or “beggars’ democracy”. There is absolutely no evidence of an “anarchic spirit of Singhalese Buddhism”, “a revolutionary faith subverting the status quo”.<sup>28</sup>

Indeed, this inscription suggests that the ruling elite saw in the Theravada doctrine of rebirth according to accumulated merit a justification for the positions of king and ruling class in the status quo more effective than Mahāyāna, as it is in Southeast Asia today.<sup>29</sup> The next king was obviously also a Buddhist, as seen in his inscription K.144, but the last king, because of the content of the last long Angkor Sanskrit inscription, which he erected, is believed to have returned to Hindu practices.

#### Patterns of Angkor titles

Since an important element of the Chinese records, which are of great importance for Cambodia in the 15th century, is their representation of the titles of rulers and officials in the Southeast Asian polities, it is necessary to establish what genuine contemporary titles were in use, in order to judge the accuracy of the Chinese transcriptions.

For the 11th-14th centuries, with the last example around 1327, the culmination of Angkor development, royal titles were of the form *vraḥ pāda kamrateñ añ śrī... varmadeva*, with the ellipse in the place of the individual proper name, *indra-*, *yaśo-*, *sūrya-*, *jaya-*, etc. Sūryavarman I (1002-1049), for reasons not yet understood, added *kamtvan* following *kamrateñ*, and Śrīndravarman (1295-1307), perhaps in connection with his Buddhism, prefixed the above titles with *vraḥ karuna ta parama pavitra*.<sup>30</sup>

The next appearance of inscriptions at Angkor was over 200 years later--texts in 1546 and 1564--probably both of the same king, known conventionally as Aṅ Cand (Ang Chan), and they show significant changes, with the royal titles being *braḥ pāda stac (samtec) braḥ (vraḥ) rāja oṅkāra parama rājādhirāja (ta paramapavitra) [rāmādhīpatī parama cakrabartirāja]*.<sup>31</sup> There is no longer any kind of *varma* title, and the new terms *rājādhirāja*, *rāmādhīpatī*, and *cakrabartirāja*, are common in

<sup>28</sup> Briggs 1951:259, referring to Finot 1908. “Beggars’ Democracy” from Benda 1962:121-122.

<sup>29</sup> This idea was reinforced by Chris Baker’s review of Peter Jackson’s *Buddhadāsa*, whose rejection of “the whole business of acquiring merit for a future life... undermined the traditional thinking which justified the rule of the king and the existence of social hierarchy, in terms of unequal merit”, and which “laid him open to attack from conservatives who... especially feared the political implications” and who “branded Buddhadāsa as a Mahayanist Trojan horse who would destroy the Theravada tradition” (Baker 2003b; Jackson 2003) This elitist view of Theravada permeates the 16th-18th century ‘modern’ inscriptions of Angkor Wat (*IMA*), and was explicit in the political propaganda of the founders of Sihanouk’s *Sangkum* movement in 1955 (Vickery 1982b).

<sup>30</sup> Note again that the true titles of Angkorean kings in Khmer ended in *-varmadeva*, not *varma(n)*. Note also that Sūryavarman I, contrary to the traditional modern academic view, was not Buddhist (Vickery 1985). The term *karuna* will be discussed again below.

<sup>31</sup> Coedès 1962. Parentheses indicate terms found only in 1564, square brackets terms found only in 1546. These inscriptions say that two large bas-relief panels in the northeast corners of the Angkor Wat galleries had been left unfinished by a king Mahāviṣṇuloka, presumed to represent the posthumous name, *paramaviṣṇuloka*, of Sūryavarman II, were completed on the orders of the 16th-century king whose titles are recorded.

Ayutthayan titles as recorded in their chronicles, and in inscriptions in the 15th and 17th centuries, but were unknown in earlier Angkor inscriptions.<sup>32</sup> Also interesting is the appearance of *stec* and *samtec*, very rare in the Angkor inscriptions as a component of kingly titles.

Thereafter *samtec braḥ* increased in importance, appearing as the first element in royal titles in original documents in 1579, 1747, and later. Titles ending in *-varma* also reappeared, in 1579 (*tribhavanādityabarmm*), 1601 (*sūbārdibb*), a contraction of *sū[rya]bār[ma]deb[a]* for the king whose name is written in the chronicles as *suriyobārṇ*, pronounced /soriyopoa/ (1601-1618), although the deformations suggest that the original significance of *-varma* was no longer understood.<sup>33</sup>

Because of the importance of *samtec* in post-Angkor records, both local and Chinese, the rarity of this term, then written *samtac* and *saṃtac*, in Angkor should be noted. There is only one inscription in which this title has always been interpreted as belonging to a king, K.393, dated 1055 (?), with the phrase *kāla vraḥ samtacc nai vrahmaloka*, “in the time of the king (*vraḥ samtacc*) in *vrahmaloka*” (posthumous title of Harṣavarman II, 942-944). This inscription is from the temple of Nom Van, Nakhon Ratchasima in northeast Thailand, and may reflect a local tradition which later became general usage. The same inscription also shows the use of that title for someone entitled *vraḥ saṃtac narapati ta gi sūryavarmmā*, which Coedès did not translate nor identify, but in which the *vraḥ saṃtac narapati*--literally ‘king’-- was probably King Sūryavarman I, and another example of local usage. One more context probably referring to a king is *vraḥ satac stac pangam ... mān vraḥ śāsana*, ‘the king greeted...[and] issued a decree’, in K.340, 8th-9th century, from the Angkor region.

Within the Khmer area outside Cambodia proper a few titles are recorded in contemporary inscriptions. The Pali and Khmer inscription of Nakhon Sawan, of 1167, by a ruler named *mahārājādhirāja ta braḥ nāma kuruṇ śrīdharmāsoka*, includes the old Khmer title *kuruṇ*, but no *varma*, and a proper name Dharmāsoka, never recorded within Cambodia throughout the pre-Angkor and Angkor periods. Connection with a late Angkor tradition, however, is the use of *kamrateṇ jagat* for a possibly Buddha relic (*braḥ śariradhātu*) called *kamrateṇ jagat śrīdharmāsoka*. *Kamrateṇ jagat* was an Angkor title, especially important in the reign of Jayavarman VII, for special protective deities, deified ancestors and heroes.<sup>34</sup> This king Dharmāsoka’s center may not have been where the inscription was found, however, because that location seems to have been named Dhanyapura and was explicitly under the authority of a subordinate named *kuruṇ* Sunat. The efforts by Coedès and Wyatt, however, to forcibly link this polity with one or another of the well known kingdoms of the time, in particular Lavo or Haripuñjaya, does not at all inspire confidence. It is preferable to take it as evidence of the effort by a local chief to establish his own domain, and the language and titles, although not the ruler’s name, point toward Lavo and Angkor, rather than to the North, although the title *dharmāsoka* was taken up

<sup>32</sup> Vickery 1973a; and Vickery 1977a, “Annexes”: 94, number 7.

<sup>33</sup> Vickery 1977a, “Annexes”:93, numbers 12, 14. The reappearance of *varma* in 1579 was misunderstood by Jacques 1999, who thought it indicated a hitherto unknown dynasty who had remained at Angkor since the 14th century (see below). There was no further use of *varma* titles, even deformed, in Cambodia after Soriyopoa, until artificially and abusively revived for a time by Sihanouk (‘Norodom Sihanoukvarman’, with the incorrect ‘*varman*’, learned from the French, rather than ‘*varma*’) in the 1960s.

<sup>34</sup> Coedès 1958:133-139; Jacques 1983; Jacques 1985; Vickery 1998:145-147, 424-425; Wyatt 2001: 9-14.

later in Kamphaeng Phet (see below).

A few years later, in 1183, at Jaiya, ancient name Grahi, in the Kra Isthmus of southern Thailand, a ruler named in an entirely Khmer inscription was *kamraten añ mahārāja śrīmat trailokyarāja maulibhūṣanabarmadeva*, where *kamraten añ* and *barmadeva*, but not *mahārājā*, reflect Angkor.<sup>35</sup>

The early kings of Sukhothai also bore titles with notable Khmer elements, especially if their inscriptions were in Khmer, such as King Lithai's inscription no. 4 of 1347, beginning *braḥ pāda kamraten añ śrī....*, but they never used a *-varma* title (see Sukhothai inscriptions below).

A *-varma* title in royal Ayutthayan contexts, even into the Thai period, is, however, found in inscriptions in the 1460's 1480, 1681, and 1689. This is *jejabarmadebātideba*, clearly a heritage from Angkor; and the first of these contexts is an original document in what may still have been the Khmer period in Ayutthaya. The titles also include *śrī śrīndra*, title of two of the last recorded kings of Angkor, one of whom apparently introduced Theravada Buddhism.<sup>36</sup>

## Khmer titles in Chinese records

### The Song period

#### *Luo-hu*

Few records have been published showing how the Song referred to Cambodia, except for the Chinese name for the country, *Chên-la*. They knew *lavo*, *lavodaya*, modern Lophburi, as *luo-hu*. This was a place known from 12th-century Angkor inscriptions as an important provincial administrative center, governed in the time of Jayavarman VII by one of his sons (see above).

Geoff Wade confirms that the earliest Song notice of *luo-hu* was in 1115, where it is mentioned before Champa as the destination of a Chinese mission, but not as a *guo* ('country'), which was the status accorded to Champa. The next Song record of *luo-hu* was in 1155, and said, "Zhen-la Luo-hu offered tribute of two elephants", which can mean either Luo-hu under Zhen-la or Zhen-la and Luo-hu offered the tribute; and "the country of Zhen-la and the country of Luo-hu offered tribute of trained elephants."<sup>37</sup>

Thus the independent status of *luo-hu*, claimed as a subordinate center in the reigns of both Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII, is unclear, but its appearance in the Chinese record at those dates may be ascribed to the 'Song factor'. The two dates given are respectively in the very beginning of the reign of Sūryavarman II, after an apparently violent civil war, and in a time of political breakdown between the reigns of Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII.

#### *Chên-li-fu/Zhen-li-fu*

There is no name in the Angkor epigraphic record which may be identified

<sup>35</sup> Coedès 1961:29-31; and on the use of Khmer outside Cambodia Vickery 1972:402-409; Vickery 1973a.

<sup>36</sup> Vickery 1973a.

<sup>37</sup> Personal information from Geoff Wade, whom I wish to thank. The Chinese sources are *Song Hui-yao ji-gao* and *Yu-hai*.

with *chên-li-fu*, but there seems little doubt that it was part of the Angkor domain somewhere on the gulf coast. The Chinese took note of it as part of Cambodia in the beginning of the 13th century, just in the middle of the reign of Jayavarman VII; and until Wolters' study of Tāmbraliṅga modern historians did not recognize it as a possibly different polity. Wyatt, following Wolters, insists that *Chên-li-fu* must have been on the peninsula rather than on the east coast of the Gulf, but the arguments are not convincing.<sup>38</sup>

In the Song records for *Chên-li-fu* there are two titles of rulers.<sup>39</sup> The first, in 1200, following Wolters' transcription, with my interpretations in brackets, was *mo-lo-pa* [*braḥ pād?*] *kan-mu-ting ên* [*kamrateñ añ*] *ssü-li* [*śrī*] *fang-hui-chih* [?]. All except the final three syllables of a presumably personal title are typically Angkorean, and without understanding those final syllables we cannot know the status of the chief concerned. The formula *braḥ pād kamrateñ añ śrī* was indeed part of the titles of Angkor kings, but only when the personal name ended in *varmadeva*. *Kamrateñ* alone, *pace* Wyatt, is not "the key operative element" here.<sup>40</sup>

Then in 1205 the Chinese recorded the *Chên-li-fu* ruler as *hsi-li* [*śrī*] *mo-hsi-t'o-lo* [*mahīdhara*] *pa-lo-hung* [*braḥ aṅg*]. Wolters wished to interpret the last three syllables as *varman*, but this is an example of error induced by ignoring Damais, as cited above. As justification for the last syllable, Wolters wrote, "...*hung*...was a conventional rendering of *huṃ* and in this case can be presumed to provide the *-n*". But the Chinese transcribed *varma* (no final nasal) as *pa-mo*; and it is more likely that *pa-lo-hung* represents /*prah ong (braḥ aṅg)*/, a post-Angkor term of reference for royalty and religious figures.<sup>41</sup> In this interpretation *śrī mahīdhara braḥ aṅg* would not be a coherent genuine title, but a style of reference, something like "*śrī mahīdhara*, his royal highness".

In Angkor *varma* alone indicated high ranking princes and officials, but not kings, who were *varmadeva*. The title *mahīdhara* for *Chên-li-fu* may be significant, since the last Angkor dynasty, that of Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII, claimed *mahīdharapura* as their ancestral homeland. It was presumably north of the Dangrek mountains, although the location is unknown. In Angkor inscriptions several contexts show high officials, but no king, with the title *śrī mahīdharavarma*, and its use by a *Chên-li-fu* chief may indicate that he was such a *mahīdhara* local chief, and was not trying to create an independent polity.<sup>42</sup>

### The Mongol period

From the Mongol period there is one important record of Angkor, the report of Chou Ta-kuan/Zhou Da-guan, from 1296-7, a time when inscriptions are very scarce, although it is not of much help concerning royal titles, at least in Pelliot's

<sup>38</sup> Wolters 1958; Briggs 1951:189; Coedès 1964:292, 296; Wyatt 2001:19-21. Although Sinologists now prefer the *pinyin* spelling 'Zhen-li-fu', I shall continue in what follows to write *Chên-li-fu*, which has been used in the modern literature concerning it and which is most familiar to non-Sinologist historians of Southeast Asia.

<sup>39</sup> Wolters 1960.

<sup>40</sup> Wyatt 2001:20.

<sup>41</sup> Wolters 1960:5, and for the quotation, 25, note 18; Damais 1957.

<sup>42</sup> The inscriptions are K.257, K.270-1, K.353, K.373, K.380, K.848. They do not, however, prove the relationship I have implied, because they are all from the 10th and 11th centuries and from Kompong Thom and Siemreap, except K.380 from Preah Vihear and K.373 from Roi Et in northeast Thailand.

translation.<sup>43</sup>

This is also the period when the country of *Hsien/Xian*, to the west of Cambodia, makes its appearance in the Mongol records in the 1280s. Although *Hsien* represents the earliest recorded period in the history of what would become the Thai kingdom of Ayutthaya, it is also, in its beginnings, part of the history of late Angkor. It is fairly certain that the area of *Hsien* had been part of greater Angkor, and at this time of Angkorean decline was developing its own relations with China. Thadeus Flood collected some of the references to *Hsien* in an article, mistakenly thinking, as was the common view at the time, that *Hsien* was Sukhothai.<sup>44</sup> When replaced in their correct geographical context these records are of relevance for the western part of what had been greater Cambodia under Angkor.

The first Mongol reference to a ruler of *Hsien* cited by Flood was in 1292 and called him the *chü* ('chief') "of the country of Hsien". Then in 1294 both the *kan-mu-ting* "of the city of" Petchaburi sent an emissary to China, and the "King (*wang*) of Hsien", also called *kan-mu-ting*, was requested to go to China. There has never been doubt that the Chinese transcription *kan-mu-ting* represents Khmer *kamraten*, not a surprising title in that area, although it caused needless worry for those who believed *Hsien* to be Sukhothai.<sup>45</sup> In 1299 envoys of both *Hsien* and *Luo-hu* went to the Mongol court, the Mongol records again used *chü* for 'chief' of *Hsien*. In another entry of the same year *Su-ku-t'ai* was mentioned separately.<sup>46</sup> In 1314 the ruler of *Hsien* was again called 'king' (*wang*).

The use of the title *kamraten* in Petchaburi and *Hsien* indicates continuation of Khmer tradition, probably from a time when both were part of greater Angkor (Petchaburi may have been one of the cities to which Jayavarman VII sent his *jayabuddhamahānātha*). The use of *kamraten* as principal title of a king, however, was not Angkorean, and there is no example in Cambodian inscriptions of *kamraten* followed by a place name. Either *Hsien* and Petchaburi were using this Khmer title in their own way, or, an explanation which I favor, the Chinese record keepers adopted conventional abbreviated titles. Wyatt, again ignoring new research, still insists that "the Yüan Dynasty applied it [*kamraten*] to the rulers of Sukhothai [*hsien*] and Phetburi".<sup>47</sup>

Chou Ta-kuan, although writing about Angkor, included a few interesting remarks about *Hsien*. First, *Hsien*, if it had once been part of the Khmer realm, was at the end of the 13th century, at least, a rebellious district, for Chou writes of a recent war with Angkor. Chou was explicit about *Hsien's* location, southwest of Angkor, which should have prevented the useless spilling of ink in the arguments that *Hsien* was Sukhothai. Although if Chou's 'southwest' was strictly accurate *Hsien* was not the place which later became the city of Ayutthaya, on which see below. He also noted that the language of Angkor, of course Khmer, could not be understood by the people of Champa and *Hsien*. This is not surprising in the case of Champa, but *Hsien*

<sup>43</sup> Chou Ta-kuan; Pelliot 1951.

<sup>44</sup> Flood 1969; following Pelliot 1951, Coedès 1964, Luce 1958.

<sup>45</sup> Pelliot 1904:264; Coedès 1964:348; Griswold and Prasert 1975:31, 41, 42, 53; Chamvit 1976:83-85; Wyatt: 2001: 4-9; Wyatt 2002; Flood:1969:223, 244-46; Wolters 1966b:95-96.

<sup>46</sup> The separateness of Sukhothai in the North and *Hsien* on the gulf coast was studied by Yamamoto Tatsuro 1989, and has become the dominant consensus since Ishii 2002.

<sup>47</sup> Wyatt 2002:20, citing for authority Wolters 1960:24, n. 8, and Sahai:1970:19-20, both of which, as Wyatt must have heard, are obsolete on this point, and the ammunition they supply for trying to smuggle Siam back to Sukhothai is badly waterlogged.



was an area where one would expect a Khmer presence, even if not exclusively.<sup>48</sup>

Further progress toward full recognition of the new consensus on the location of *Hsien/Xian* along the gulf coast rather than far inland should not be deflected by a 15<sup>th</sup>-century entry in the *MSL* that "China's 'new province' of Jiao-zhi (the term the Chinese used to refer to Đại Việt [(northern)Vietnam] subsequent to their occupation of it in 1406) bordered Siam, Laos and Champa". This is no more an accurate description of political geography than the Angkor inscriptions which claimed, already in the 9<sup>th</sup> century, that in the North Cambodia bordered China, a "mere stylistic phrase" concerning, for the kings of Angkor, "the only great state to the north of their country."<sup>49</sup> Northern Vietnam could no more have bordered all three of those countries then than now, and the *MSL* entry must be taken as just a statement about the countries recognized by the Chinese as lying beyond Jiao-zhi in a certain direction.

### **Cambodia in the *MSL***

The conventional Chinese name for Cambodia from the 7<sup>th</sup> century until modern times was *chên-la* (old pronunciation *lap*), the meaning of which is still unknown, although Ming records occasionally use *kambuja/kamvuja*, a name apparently invented in Cambodia in the early Angkor period. Chou Ta-kuan also began his story saying that "the present dynasty [Mongol] on the basis of Tibetan religious books, calls the country Kan-p'ou-tche, which is phonetically close to Kan-po-tche", which, with respect to Tibetan books, was certainly incorrect, but probably already reflects the confusion between the names 'kamboja' and 'kambujā'.<sup>50</sup>

There is a break of nearly one hundred years between the Mongol records of *kamraten* chiefs in *Hsien* and Petchaburi and the *MSL* records for the polities of Southeast Asia, including Cambodia and *Hsien*; and during that time (1290s-1370s) the only extant original records showing titles related to those two polities, except for the last three kings of Angkor during 1295-1327, are inscriptions in Sukhothai. Then, between 1371 and 1419 there were more contacts between Cambodia and China than during the previous 500 years, as though Cambodia was continuing the initiatives of Sūryavarman II and Jayavarman VII. For Cambodia itself, the *MSL* is the only credible source for the late 14<sup>th</sup> and the entire 15<sup>th</sup> centuries, with the possible exception of certain passages in the Ayutthaya chronicles and, moreover, it shows great changes in Cambodian titles from Angkor times, with astonishing resemblance to titles in the Menam basin polities, as reflected in both local documents and in the *MSL*.

### Cambodian titles in the *MSL*

<sup>48</sup> Chou Ta-kuan on language in Pelliot 1951:19-20. See further discussion below.

<sup>49</sup> Wade 2000:260; Groslier 1981:109.

<sup>50</sup> The name *kamvuja* does not appear in 7<sup>th</sup>-8<sup>th</sup> century inscriptions; and its earliest contemporary usage is in the inscriptions of Indravarman (877-889), for example, at Phnom Bayang, K.14 and K.853, Indravarman is called "sovereign of the *kamvuja*", and at Roluos, K.713, "seigneur of the *kamvuja*". Particularly interesting is K.923 from the Bakong, in which there is reference to "the eminent countries [note the plural] of Kambu" (*kamvujadesānām*). On Chou Ta-kuan and *kamboja*, etc., see Pelliot 1951:9; Vickery 1977a:369-377.

In his study of the *MSL* Wade has listed 35 records of contact between the Ming Court and Cambodia between 1370 and 1499. Below is a selection of those records giving names and titles of rulers and showing reign changes.<sup>51</sup>

1. December 1371, a Cambodian king described as "*Chên-la* (Cambodia) Kingdom *Pa-shan* King *Hu-êrh-na*" was reigning.<sup>52</sup>
2. In November 1373, *Hu-êrh-na*, still the *Pa-shan* king of Cambodia, sent another mission to China.
3. In January 1378 there was another king entitled *can-da gan-wu-zhe chi-da-zhi*, probably *samdac kambujādhirāja*.
4. In September 1387 envoys from Hsien and Cambodia travelled together to China.
6. In October 1387, tribute was offered by a new Cambodian king called *can-lie bao pi-ye gan-pu-zhe*, or *samdac pao-p'i-yeh kambuja*.
7. There was a mission from Cambodia in October 1388, thanking the Chinese for a seal, in 1389 there were three Khmer missions and in 1390 one, but the Cambodian ruler's name is not given.
8. *Can-lie po pi-ya*, or *samtec bò bañā*, the fourth ruler mentioned by the Ming records, sent a mission in 1404. According to Wolters, the Cambodian capital was clearly described as at Angkor.<sup>53</sup>
9. In 1405 the Chinese were informed of the death of king *can-lie po pi-ya*, and in the same year his son *can-lie zhao ping-ya*, *samdac cau bañā* became king.
10. *P'ing-ya*'s own last mission was in April 1419.

After 1419 there are only four more entries in Wade's listing for Cambodia in *MSL*, in 1435, 1436, 1452, and 1499, none of them providing names or information of the country's internal situation.<sup>54</sup>

As I have showed in detail elsewhere, if the Chinese chronology is accepted, even in its incomplete state, it shows that the reign sequences of both Cambodian chronicle traditions are almost entirely wrong. Neither does the Chinese material provide any direct evidence concerning relations between Ayutthaya and Angkor, and certainly does not directly support the stories of Thai invasions of Cambodia.<sup>55</sup>

Before continuing with Cambodia in the 15th century and the significance of the Chinese documents for Cambodian history of that time, it is necessary to first review the historical and historiographic situation in some of Cambodia's neighbors in the Menam valley.

### *Hsien-Ayutthaya: inscriptions, chronicles and MSL*

*Hsien*/Ayutthaya was in the gulf coastal area of modern Thailand including the area as far inland as Lophburi. Although the major center of *Hsien* may not have been

<sup>51</sup> I have taken these from Wade 1991:28-29; Wolters 1966a:1-7, also listed some of these, with slightly different dates.

<sup>52</sup> See below for an attempt to explain this title.

<sup>53</sup> Wolters 1966a:50, 52-54.

<sup>54</sup> Wade 1991b:29.

<sup>55</sup> Vickery 1977a: 218-223. There I was particularly arguing against the thesis in Wolters 1966a, that there had been two Ayutthayan invasions of Angkor in 1369 and 1389.

where the city of Ayutthaya later developed, and *Hsien* itself may have been a loose collection of ports, *Hsien* and *Hsien-lo* eventually came to mean Ayutthaya for the Chinese, and it is legitimate to think of *Hsien*-Ayutthaya as a historical continuum. The few extant inscriptions indicate that the population was Mon and Khmer and the ruling families probably Khmer until the 16th century, although with an increasing mixture of Thai from the North from the 15<sup>th</sup> and possibly even from the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The name ‘*Hsien*/Sien/Siam’, in Cham and Khmer inscriptions *syām/syām*, was never used as an identifying term for themselves by the local peoples, only by foreigners. It is found as an apparent designation of ethnicity or geographical origin in one Cham inscription of the 11<sup>th</sup> century and two very short Khmer inscriptions in Angkor Wat from the 12th century where its referent is not certain from the contexts, although in Chinese records from the 1280s it certainly designates one or more ports on or near the Thai gulf coming into prominence via their relationship with the Mongol dynasty in China.<sup>56</sup>

Contrary to the assumptions of earlier writers, there is now a growing consensus that *syām*/Hsien did not mean ethnic ‘Thai’ nor Sukhothai, and may in origin have been a geographic, not an ethnolinguistic, designation.<sup>57</sup>

There are few local documents from the pre-Ayutthaya Hsien period of relevance for Cambodia. The area known to foreigners as *syām*/Hsien had been part of *dvāravatī*, a culturally homogenous Mon and Buddhist region, if not a unified state, in central and northeastern Thailand between, approximately, the 6th and 10th centuries, and the name of which has been preserved in the official titles of the Thai capital until

<sup>56</sup> See Coedès 1964:257, 318. In addition to the 11<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup>-century use of the term '*syām*' as a group designation, it is also found in eight Khmer inscriptions of the 7<sup>th</sup>-century only, as the proper name of commoner workers, all, except possibly one, female, and in one case a *poñ* (on *poñ* see Vickery 1998:190-196). The two types of context are probably unrelated and it is erroneous to attribute any special group characteristic to the 7<sup>th</sup>-century designations. Still now 'Siem' is a proper name in Cambodia with no intimation of ethnic origin. To date Cambodia specialists who took note of this term wished to explain it as deriving from Sanskrit *śyāma* 'dark' (Pou 1992:514, 'dark-complexioned', 'A disparaging word for foreigners, barbarians'; Groslier 1981:116). This is not acceptable. Sanskrit *śyāma* is written with the initial consonant ś, while the term in Khmer and Cham is written with initial *s*, and at a time when the Khmer, at least, still used the consonant ś, the pronunciation of which in Sanskrit differed from *s*, regularly and correctly in their rendering of Sanskrit terms (Pou 1987 [2003]:284). Eventually scribes confused the two, writing *s* where ś was required, as in K.524, where there are indubitable instances of this confusion, and where *syāmātri* in the Sanskrit part of the inscription may really have been intended as *śyāmātri*, 'dark mountain', as believed by Coedès 1951:135 and Lewitz 1974:155. It must be stated once and for all, however, that Old Khmer *syām* in Khmer inscriptions does not necessarily represent Sanskrit *śyāma*. In the 12th-century bas-reliefs of Angkor Wat there is a body of troops, dressed differently from others and called *syām kuk*. They follow troops from Lavo and thus their place of origin may reasonably be situated in the southern Menam basin area. The term *kuk* has never been successfully explained. Pou suggests that it refers to the tassles on the soldiers' headdresses (Groslier 1981:120-121; Pou 1992:101), but the argument is tortuous (*'kuk'* is a type of heron with a plumage), and if correct would suggest that the inscription was a later addition to the bas-relief. Groslier 1981 at least had the merit of being the first well-known scholar to deny that in the 12<sup>th</sup> century '*syām*' could have meant ethnic Thai, although this had already appeared in Vickery 1978:205 and 1979b:136-137. Groslier, however, believing that *syām* < *śyāma*, 'dark', felt that he had to search for an ethnic group whom the Khmer might have called 'black' (this had always been a problem for those insisting that *syām* meant ethnic Thai) and he hit on the Souei of northeastern Thailand just above the Dangrek mountains. Jit 1951:110-133 (chapter 9) was certainly wrong to identify *kuk* in that inscription with the Kok River in northern Thailand and to say that the *syām* of Angkor Wat came from there.

<sup>57</sup> Baker 2003a; Ishii 2002.

the present. Thereafter extant inscriptions, both local and within Cambodia, indicate Angkor dominance over most of what is now central and northeastern Thailand. A non-Angkor, but Khmer, center is seen in the 1167 Pali and Khmer inscription from near Nakon Sawan.<sup>58</sup> This site might be considered outside *Hsien*, but given the location, the confluence of rivers flowing from the north, and a logical place for a new port, it is tempting to see this as a first response in the area to the ‘Song Factor’, but the inscription provides no certain clue in that direction, and there is no evidence that an important port ever developed there.

The appearances of *Luo-hu* in 1115 and 1155, and *Chên-li-fu* around 1200 may be the first certain local reactions in the *Hsien* area, then still perhaps part of the greater Angkor domain, to the ‘Song Factor’. They were short-lived, however, and the coastal area is otherwise absent from Chinese records until the appearance of *Hsien* in Mongol records at the end of the 13th century.

The Chinese records for *Hsien-Ayutthaya* provide numerous royal titles and names which provide useful checks on the chronicles, both for identifications of persons, and, to some extent, political events.

It is accepted that from the 14th century there was gradual Thai influence from Sukhothai on the Khmer and Mon polities of *Hsien-Ayutthaya*, as they eventually became entirely Thai-ized. This accounts easily for certain titles from Sukhothai being absorbed in Ayutthaya and titles from the Menam Basin passing into Cambodia, as shall be described below. But can the time periods of these influences be related to specific historical events or processes?

Chris Baker has finally put together a number of details noted over the years to show convincingly that Ayutthaya arose on the basis of *Hsien* as a coastal power in the beginning and not as a hinterland power.<sup>59</sup> The rulers of early *Hsien* were apparently still very Khmerized, for the conventional title which the Mongols used for them was Khmer *kamrateñ*, also a common component of Cambodian royal titles throughout the Angkor period, although not used alone to designate a king.

When Malacca was chosen by China as its favored Southeast Asian port, *Hsien-Ayutthaya* was forced to give up its projects to control the entire peninsula, and began to look northward. According to the Ayutthayan chronicles the northward orientation had already begun in the 1370s. A new element in Baker’s work is his insistence that as land powers Sukhothai, Phitsanulok and Kamphaeng Phet were more developed than Ayutthaya, and Ayutthaya eagerly adopted cultural and political traits from them, perhaps including royal and official titles.

This must be inferential, though, because of the lack of inscriptions, and even of Chinese records, from the 1290s to the 1370s.

### *Inscriptions*

There are very few inscriptions of relevance for Ayutthaya in the 14th-15th centuries. Proof that Khmer was an important language in that polity, however, is in one set of genuine royal titles for mid-15th century, in inscriptions found in Tenasserim, for the king known traditionally as *param trailokanāth*, which show that his true titles were quite different from titles found in the chronicles, that the title ‘*trailok*’ may be fictitious, and that certain old Angkor traditions had been preserved

---

<sup>58</sup> See discussion above..

<sup>59</sup> Baker 2003a

in Ayutthaya. These titles are:<sup>60</sup>

*saṃtac braḥ rāmādhipatī śrīśrīndra parama cakrabarṭti rājādhirāja  
rāmeśvara dharmarāja/rājādhirāja tejo jayabarmmadebātideba  
tribhūvanādhipeśa paramapabitra*

They contain, as Coedès briefly noted<sup>61</sup>, elements of Angkor-period titles which disappeared in Cambodia in the post-Angkor Period, but, which were apparently maintained in the Angkorean successor state of Ayutthaya. These elements are *śrī śrīndra* and *jayavarmmadeba*. The first is found in the titles of two of the last recorded kings of Angkor, *śrī śrīndravarmadeva* (1295/6-1307) and *śrī śrīndra jayavarmma* (1307-1327); and the second was the principal title of Jayvarman VII. *Samtac* was of course a Khmer term, but very rare at Angkor. Certain other main elements of these Tenasserim titles such as *rāmādhipatī*, *cakrabarṭti*, and *rājādhirāj*, are never found in Angkor inscriptions of the classical period as part of a ruler's principal titles, but they appear at early dates in both Thai and Mon documents<sup>62</sup>. Their occurrence in the late Angkor inscriptions of 1546 and 1564 cited above shows only that by the 16th century Ayutthayan influence had made itself felt at the Cambodian court.

The same set of titles, with minor variations, is found in an inscription from Phichit dated 1480, thus probably also for 'Trailokanāth', and in the inscription of Wat Culāmaṇī in Phitsanulok, although the inscription was finalized in 1681 and the king for whom the titles were intended is not clear. The tradition followed by van Vliet would give these titles to Rāmādhipatī, founder of Ayutthaya, which is not *ipso facto* credible, but shows their importance in Ayutthayan tradition.<sup>63</sup>

Another rather mysterious, because very badly effaced, inscription, is of relevance for comparison with the chronicles and with *MSL*. It is a palaeographically 14th-15th century Khmer inscription from Angkor which is totally illegible except for two royal titles, *rājādhīpatirāja* and *dharmikarājādhīrāja*.<sup>64</sup> According to the Ayutthayan *Luang Praseut (LP)* chronicle, *parama rājādhīrāja* II, whose real title it now appears (see below) included *rājādhīpatī*, was the conqueror of Angkor in 1431, and it is tempting, even if speculative, to suggest that the inscription included a record of that conquest. Moreover, one term in the true titles of his son, seen in the Tenasserim inscriptions, and whom the chronicles call King *trailok*, was *dharmarāja*.

Even as Thai was absorbed into Ayutthaya as a major language, it was still for some time written in Khmer script, not in the Thai script of Sukhothai. Examples are inscription no. 48 (1408) probably from a district of Chainat, and set up by a local *cau mo'an*, who claimed to have performed good works in Jaiyastān, Ayodhayā, and Subarṇabhūmi. Another inscription of this type is no. 51, probably also from Chainat, although that is not certain. The last major epigraphic record of Thai in Khmer script

<sup>60</sup> Vickery 1973a.

<sup>61</sup> Coedes 1965:208.

<sup>62</sup> Their use in Ayutthaya is well known. For a Mon example see the 'Kalyānīsīma Inscriptions', *Epigraphia Birmanica*, vol III, part II, pp 236, 238, 265, where the king known to posterity as 'Dhammaceti' is entitled *Rāmādhipatī* and *Rāmādhipatī parama mahādhammarājādhīrāja*..

<sup>63</sup> van Vliet 1975; Vickery 1973a; Vickery 1976b:224-225.

<sup>64</sup> Inscription K.489 of the Cambodian corpus, found in one of the post-Angkor so-called Buddhist terraces. See Coedès 1951: 229.

is the Dansai inscription of 1563 recording a sort of treaty between Ayutthaya and Vientiane in which the Ayutthaya side is written in Thai in Khmer script and the Lao side in Lao in *Tham (dhamma)* script. The title of the Ayutthaya king there is *samtec braḥ param mahā cakkabartīsaravararājādhirāj*. A later short text of that type, the work of an Ayutthayan monk, probably from the 1580s, has been found in Cambodia on Phnom Kulen northeast of Angkor.<sup>65</sup>

### *The Ayutthayan chronicles*

There are also chronicles, like those of Cambodia written much later, and which begin with legendary stories of the city's founding in 1351. In fact, there are four different Ayutthayan chronicle traditions, with serious differences concerning relations with Cambodia.

There is first the *Luang Praseut (LP)* tradition, a chronicle consisting of very short entries, thus possibly a summary of a longer text, and dated in its preamble to 1680. This is the chronicle considered most reliable by scholars, and it says nothing about Cambodia until an event which modern historians have accepted as true, an Ayutthayan attack and occupation of *nakhon hluai*, presumably Angkor, in 1431, for an unspecified length of time, and with no further explicit mention of those circumstances.

Secondly, there are the long chronicles, which in traditional circles have had a sort of official imprimatur because they were accepted by 19th-century royalty, and which I have called the '1157 tradition' from the *cula* era date of the earliest version, equivalent to 1795 AD. Their framework derives from an *LP*-type chronicle, probably a longer, more detailed version than the one extant, but the dates have been skewed and new material of dubious reliability added. They have the most detail about relations with Cambodia starting from the very beginning of their story in mid-14th century, but all of the entries concerning Cambodia in the 14th-15th centuries have been shown inaccurate as to fact, or at least date. The invasion of Cambodia dated 1431 in *LP* is in 1421 in the 1157 tradition.<sup>66</sup>

The third Ayutthayan chronicle tradition is that of van Vliet-*Saṅgītiyavaṇś*. The text of van Vliet is from the first half of the 17th century, and although the extant versions of *Saṅgītiyavaṇś* date from the early 19th century, the striking agreement in important details with van Vliet shows that a text of that type existed in early 17th century and probably influenced van Vliet's composition.<sup>67</sup> This is the tradition which Geoff Wade has found most accurate in comparison with the early *MSL* records, but it has no mention of conflict with Cambodia until the 16th century, in agreement with the Chinese evidence.<sup>68</sup> Does that mean that there was no invasion of Cambodia in 1431? Or, does it just mean that the Chinese had no interest in such conflict if it did not disturb maritime relations with China, as did the rivalries between *Hsien* and Malacca? The troubled relations between *Hsien*-Ayutthaya and the northern cities in mid-15th century find no clear echo in the Chinese records either (but see below).

<sup>65</sup> Griswold and Prasert 1979 for Dansai; Vickery 1973a; Vickery 1982a for Phnom Kulen.

<sup>66</sup> Vickery 1977a, chapters 8-9. They include *Bāncāndanumās (co'm)*, and its direct descendants: the version of *Samtec braḥ bānrām* (Wyatt's 'Phonnarat'), the so-called 'British Museum' version, the Bradley two-volume version, and *The Royal Autograph Chronicle (RA)*, of which the edition I cite is the sixth, Chonburi, 2511 (1968). Texts BCDE in Cushman 2000 belong to this tradition.

<sup>67</sup> See Vickery 1976b.

<sup>68</sup> Wade 2000.

A fourth Ayutthayan chronicle tradition is represented by two fragments only discovered in the 1970s, and which are of special interest here because they fall in the 15th century. They are very detailed, that is, they are parts of a long chronicle, and their dates agree with the *LP* tradition. Moreover, they give particular attention to the mid-century Ayutthayan-Cambodian conflict over Angkor, but in a way which calls into question the treatment of that event in other sources. They also have more detail about relations between Ayutthaya and the North than found in *LP*. Names and titles in these texts, such as *khun* for very high-ranking official personnel, suggest that they are the oldest of the Ayutthayan traditions, although the incorrect year dates in one of them prove that it has gone through at least one stage of copying.<sup>69</sup> This tradition, which goes into most detail about Ayutthaya-Cambodia relations in mid-15th century, only begins that story in 1441, ten years after *LP* dates the Ayutthayan attack, saying that a son of the Ayutthayan king, Prince Nakon In, was governing in Nakon Luang. It does not say how he got there, and the conflicts described are between two mixed Ayutthayan-Cambodian factions.

The Ayutthayan chronicles, then, are not as fictional as those from Cambodia, but some sections of some texts, at least, are inaccurate, and they require critical scrutiny, especially for their stories of the 14th and 15th centuries.

In fact, it is obvious that some of the Ayutthayan chronicle traditions are simply wrong, but which ones? We cannot just say that events recorded in one chronicle but not in another, or in chronicles but missing from *MSL*, did not happen, for some writers may have erred, or some of those events may have been outside the fields of interest of the Chinese. The Chinese records may, however, aid in critical analysis of the chronicles.

When I was studying the chronicles some 30 years ago, I was mainly interested in Cambodia, and for the Ayutthayan chronicles the accuracy of those sections which concerned Cambodia. My conclusions then were that nothing concerning Cambodia before 1431 was factual, but I considered the attack and occupation of Angkor at that date as a true event. Now we see that it is missing from the *MSL* and from the chronicle traditions of *vV* and *Saṅgīyavanīś* which agree most of all with *MSL*.

I was not at that time concerned with other possible inaccuracies in the Ayutthaya chronicles, in sections concerning Thai history, unless they were relevant for Cambodia, but perhaps now, because of the new study of the *MSL* and the growing consensus that Ayutthaya arose from *Hsien* as a coastal power, we should cast a more critical eye on the early years of Ayutthaya as seen in the chronicles.

It is first of all clear that the stories of the founding of Ayutthaya by a prince who came with followers looking for good rice land are quite mythical, and have evolved much later on the assumption that Ayutthaya arose as a land-based polity.

The name of the founder, *ū-doi*/thong, moreover, shows absorption of a

---

<sup>69</sup> Vickery 1977b. Another related fragment, no. 222, *2/K.104*, the object of a thesis in 1981 by Miss Ubolsri Arrgabandh, then of Silpakorn University, Nakhon Pathom, was kindly supplied to me by Dr. Thamsook Numnond. Like no. 223, *2/K.125* which I published, no. 222, *2/K.104* is a folding manuscript written on two sides. Comparative study has shown that the obverse of *2/K.104* precedes the story of *2/K.125*, and the reverse follows it. Now the two have been combined and edited by Professor Winai Pongsripian and the new official designation of the whole in the Manuscript and Epigraphy Section of the National Library is 222, *2/K.104*. In this paper I shall use *2/K.104* for the new unified text, and *2/K.125* for my publication. I do not know if the combined text has been published nor how it should be cited with respect to authorship.

foreign tradition, apparently originating in Burma. The official etymology for the name ‘Uthong’ (written อุทอง: *ūdòñ*) in the chronicles is ‘cradle of gold’, but there are also alternative etymologies, ‘source of gold’, and ‘plenty of gold.’<sup>70</sup> Still another etymology is implied in the *van Vliet* chronicle, where the prince was originally named ‘Ou-e’ or ‘Ui’, simply a plausible Chinese name, and acquired the *dòñ* element through marriage to a Chinese princess named Pacham Thong, which of course is not plausible Chinese.<sup>71</sup>

As for the official etymology, *ū* is not the central Thai word for cradle, which is *ple* (เปล). In Vientiane Lao *ū* is the common word for cradle, and perhaps it is also in other northern dialects.<sup>72</sup> Although one might argue that it then fits one of the stories where he was of northern origin, the fact remains that the story is an Ayudhyan concoction in which it appears that a traditional element, *ūdòñ*, had to be explained, and chroniclers searched around for meanings, finally hitting, in one case, on the northern word for cradle. This is just the sort of thing that typically happens in the formation of a folk etymology based on a foreign term of forgotten meaning.<sup>73</sup>

In addition to the various and conflicting stories about Uthong in the chronicles of old Ayutthaya, other interesting parallels to the use of *ū* as a ruler’s personal name can be found in certain chronicles and quasi-historical tales from neighbouring countries.

In the Shan States of Burma there are *u-tòñ* creation myths. For instance, in Male it is related that a female *naga* became pregnant by the sun *nat* (Burmese spirit deity) and laid three eggs. The mountain where she laid them is called ‘U-Daung’ (*u-ton* in transliteration), literally ‘egg-mountain’ in Burmese. Later the eggs were washed away and one went to China to hatch U-Dibwa, the emperor, etc. In Lai Hka the same story is reported with some variations.<sup>74</sup>

In Burmese the etymologies are based on the common words for ‘egg’ and ‘mountain’. Thus if we follow the rules for analyzing folk etymologies we should say that the *u-ton* creation myths came to Ayudhya via the Shan States where Burmese terminology had been assimilated, and the Burmese words being incomprehensible in Ayudhya they were given new meanings while the creation theme was changed to that of foundation of a kingdom.

An alternative explanation, that the Burmese borrowed an *ūdòñ*, ‘golden cradle’, story from the northern Thai and reworked it is less likely because no such *ūdòñ* story is attested in the north, while egg-origin stories are found over the whole area. In addition to the examples cited above, the Lai Hka story is included in a truly Burmese context in the Glass Palace Chronicle.<sup>75</sup> It is obvious that when a story is spread over a wide area including different linguistic groups it may not be assumed true for any single place, and all the stories involving a man named *Ū* or *Ūdòñ*, are just that--folk tales which need much more analysis over a much wider area than just

<sup>70</sup> Wyatt 1973: 31; Griswold and Prasert 1972: 34.

<sup>71</sup> Van Vliet 1975:55-57.

<sup>72</sup> In modern spelling อุ (Thai script). See *Vācanānukram bāsā lāv khòñ ka:suòñ su’ksādikāñ* (‘Dictionary of the Lao Language of the Ministry of Education’), Vientiane, BE 2505, p 1070.

<sup>73</sup> Vansina 1961, pp 43-44, 135; Haas 1969, p 79, says that when a word lacks a clear etymology in language B, but has one in language A, then the latter is the original language, something which will be seen below as relevant for ‘*ūdòñ*’.

<sup>74</sup> Scott 1900 II, 2:134-35, 4-5 respectively.

<sup>75</sup> Tin and Luce 1923:34-36.



Thailand.<sup>76</sup>

All that emerges with any certainty from the various stories surrounding the names Ū, Uthong, etc, and the origins of the founder of Ayudhya is that (a) when the extant records were first compiled no one knew how or by whom the city had been founded; (b) these stories may not be used directly for the reconstruction of Ayudhyan history; and (c) there was probably never an Ayudhyan ruler known to contemporaries as 'Uthong'. As Chris Baker has put it, "the variety of founding myths suggest that Ayutthaya began as a trading power whose dominant figures had little interest in history, and that stories accumulated later when the city became a territorial power whose rulers needed a history and genealogy. Inconsistencies in the records of the early dynastic chronology also hint that this was reconstructed later when such matters became important".<sup>77</sup> Thus the contamination among sources noted above.

What about the reigns following *ū-dòñ*/Rāmādhīpāī?

There is a persistent theme of politico-military contacts with central Thailand running all through the old Mon sources. Their chronicles begin the history of their Martaban kings in the 1280s, just at the time when Hsien also appears in the Chinese records; and the first kings of Martaban are stated to have been subordinate to Sukhothai and related to Phra Ruong, Sukhothai's mythical hero-king.

There too, a certain Bañā Ū was ruler in Martaban and moved from there to establish a new dynasty in Pegu just about the same time as Uthong was active in Ayudhya, and in some versions this occurred in 1369, also a year of important change in Ayutthaya. Just like the Uthong of Ayudhyan history, he is supposed to have come from a provincial town, or former capital, to found what would henceforth be a new political center for his people. According to one Mon chronicle,<sup>78</sup> his reign was 19 years like that of Uthong-Rāmādhīpāī, although at slightly different dates (1364-1383), and he was also followed by a king entitled *rājādhīrāj*, although a son, rather than a brother or brother-in-law, who, like the first Param Rājādhīrāj of Ayudhya, was involved in a long series of campaigns against rivals to the north. This suggests that the foundation stories in both the Mon and Ayutthayan chronicles derive from a common origin, or have contaminated one another.

Pegu was also developing as a maritime center at the same time as Ayutthaya, and they were probably rivals. It is thus peculiar that the Mon chronicles contain much about relations with Sukhothai and even Chiang Mai in the 14th-15th centuries, but nothing about Ayutthaya. It is also peculiar that there are no records of Chinese maritime contacts with the Mon coastal polities until the late 16th century.<sup>79</sup>

In studying the *Hsien*-Ayutthaya-Martaban-Pegu-central northern Menam polities and the relations between Ayutthaya and Cambodia, it might be helpful to

<sup>76</sup> See more comment in Vickery 1979b:172-173.:

<sup>77</sup> Baker 2003a:10

<sup>78</sup> Halliday 1923:5-55. The Mon chronicle in Thai translation *Rājādhīrāj*:59, 217, however, gives him a much longer reign, from 1345 to 1387, which means his reign began almost concurrently with the king *ū-dòñ* of Ayutthaya. These are the expressed dates of his coronation and death, although on p. 217 it says he had reigned 47 years. There is much in this text which seems unreliable.

<sup>79</sup> For examples of the close, probably legendary, relations between the 13th-14th century Mon and Thai polities see Griswold and Prasert 1972:39-47, where they have been misused as a basis for factual history. On the 16<sup>th</sup> century personal information from Geoff Wade. Pegu may possibly have been the 'Bu' country, "obviously coastal... somewhere along the present Burmese coast", from which several shipwrecked Chinese soldiers were able to return to China in 1448 via Ba-bai/Da-dian, as the Chinese called Lanna (Wade 1991a:57).

bracket out entirely conceptions of modern boundaries and think rather of an area of ancient common cosmopolitan culture and constantly shifting alliances.

This is what some of the first western visitors saw. Thus Fernão Mendes Pinto in the middle of the 16th century reported, without realizing its significance, that the standard Ayutthayan word for Buddhist temple and for monks was *kyāk*, the normal Mon term, and a century and a half later the very rigorous Engelbert Kaempfer found that one of Ayutthaya's most important temples was "call'd in the Peguan language" [i.e. Mon] *cau panaen jo'n*, a name which it still carries.<sup>80</sup> There can be little doubt that Mon was at least one language of Ayutthaya throughout its pre-modern history.

Some further evidence on this point which has been given too little attention is in reports by early foreign visitors in Ayutthaya who recorded that 'Siam' was then a name used by foreigners to designate the country, but not used by the local inhabitants. This was observed by Portuguese in the 16th century; and in the 17th century Iranians in Ayutthaya wrote, "The Iranians and the Franks call the natives ... Siamese, but the natives themselves trace their stock back to Thai". The same Iranians also considered most of the inhabitants of Pegu to be Siamese, which might mean that the term was first associated with Mon, an important early population in the Menam delta as well as in Pegu.<sup>81</sup>

Another peculiar remark by the Iranians concerning ethnolinguistic differences among royalty and people in Siam and Pegu, was that in Pegu "most of the inhabitants...are Siamese but the king is an 'Abbāsīd. In Shahr Nāv the king is Siamese and most of his peasantry is 'Abbāsīd". "Shahr Ava is the king's capital" (Pegu). The full significance of this cannot be understood, however, without knowing what 'Abbāsīd' meant for those writers.<sup>82</sup>

This evidence from foreign visitors indicates that *Hsien*, which had first appeared as an offshoot of Angkor, was also part of a cultural and linguistic area covering Mon Pegu as well. This makes it easy to understand how chronicles written retrospectively could be contaminated by stories from neighboring polities, or perhaps rather chronicles from two neighboring polities derived from the same sources.

This situation seems also to be reflected in the *2/K.104* Ayutthayan chronicle, which, although Ayutthaya-centric, gives equal attention to Ayutthaya's relations with the Mon polities to the West, the north central Menam cities, and Cambodia.

It is not surprising, then, that the Ayutthayan chronicles show dubious features right into the reign of *param rājādhirāj*, and which gain in significance when we see that *MSL* does not call this king by that name but rather *samtec pao bañā śrī śrīndra*. The discordance in names may signal cyclical error, that is, displacing an event by one or more 12-year animal cycles when recopying.<sup>83</sup> Both *param rājādhirāj* I and II are said to have died in dragon years 60 years apart (1388 and 1448), and they were both followed by a prince *rāmeśvara* (ignoring an intervening 7-day reign by *doñ lan* in the first case), whereas, according to *MSL*, the *śrī śrīndra* corresponding to the first *param rājādhirāj* was followed by prince Nakon In. Moreover, both of the dragon year deaths of kings are preceded, although not in the same cyclical years, by unsuccessful Ayutthayan attacks on Chiang Mai, in which some of the wording is

<sup>80</sup> Pinto [Catz] 1614 [1989]:409, 411; Vickery 1991b:252; Kaempfer 1906. 'Cau', of course, was Thai, not Mon, but *panaen jo'n* could be understood as Mon, but also as Khmer. See Vickery 1973b:207.

<sup>81</sup> Original sources cited in Vickery, 1979b:137, n. 81.

<sup>82</sup> O'Kane 1972:198-9.

<sup>83</sup> Explained in detail in Vickery 1977a: 8-14.

suspiciously similar. Thereafter the two sections are quite different, and in the first case include one more ruler *cau bañā rām*, son of *rāmeśvara*, before *samtec brah indarājādhirāj*, who corresponds to the *nakhon in* of *MSL*. The *vV* version, closer to *MSL* than other chronicles in dates of major kings, also includes all the rulers found in *LP* but missing from *MSL*. The relevance of the *LP* story of *cau bañā rām* for events in Cambodia, will be discussed below.

The possible cyclical misplacement of events cannot be continued in the immediately following contexts, but I shall attempt to show another case below. We should note, however, the confusion over the names *nakhon in* and *indarājādhirāj* among the chronicles and *MSL*.

In *MSL* *cau nakhon in* is prince of Suphanburi and his father's heir who sent several missions to China before becoming king with the title *cau nakhon indarājādhirāj*. The *vV* text agrees with the name *nakhon in*. *LP*, however, and the Cambodian chronicles, call that king *ind(r)arājā* throughout his reign, and use the name *nakhon in* for the son of the second *param rājādhirāj* sent to govern *nakhon hluan* (Angkor) after it was conquered by his father in 1431. The name *indrarājā* comes up again in 1463 when King *trailok* attacked Chiang Mai together with a prince *indrarājā*, presumably a son, though this is not specific. There is also a prince (*smin*) *nakhon in* in the Mon chronicle *Rājādhirāj* active in the long Mon war with Ava toward the end of the 14th century.

Clearly there may be multiple instances of misplacement even in *LP*, the most reliable of the traditional chronicles, as well as contamination among stories in the Cambodia-Ayutthaya-Pegu area.

Another genuine old title preserved in *vV* is Phra Borommaracha Thibodi/*brah parama rājādhipati*, also missing from other chronicles, but occurring in *MSL* in 1462, and found in at least two 15th-century inscriptions.<sup>84</sup> In *vV* it is given to the king who corresponds to *param rājādhirāj* II, father of Trailokanāth of other texts and whose *LP* dates are 1424-1448. The inscriptions in question are number 49, dated 1418, which Griswold and Prasert have interpreted as belonging to Intharacha (*vV*'s Nakhon In), Trailokanāth's grandfather<sup>85</sup>, and a gold plate found in Suphanburi and dated 1[3]5[7]/1435.<sup>86</sup>

One must also look askance at the very name-title *trailokanāth*, in chronicular tradition the designation of perhaps the most famous of old Ayutthayan kings, but whose official titles are established by contemporary inscriptions (the Tenasserim inscriptions above) which show many auspicious vocables, but not any form of 'trailok'. Here the *MSL*, calling him *rāmesuan*, is in agreement with the inscriptions.

In fact, "the hugely dislocated accounts" to which Wade referred (see below) are squarely in the reign of *trailok* and his relations with the North.<sup>87</sup> When the Ayutthayan and Chiang Mai chronicles are compared we see two kings with the same possibly fictitious name (*trailok/tilok*) who took their thrones in the same decade (1448/1442 respectively), who both succeeded fathers originally named *sām*,

<sup>84</sup> van Vliet 1975:63. In the original text, Vickery 1976b:227, I wrote "Ayutthayan inscriptions", but I have subsequently realized that No. 49, found in Sukhothai, may have belonged to that polity instead (See Vickery 1978:233-234). Nevertheless, *vV* is evidence that the title *rājādhipati* was (also?) a royal title in Ayutthaya.

<sup>85</sup> Griswold and Prasert 1968.

<sup>86</sup> For restoration of the date see Vickery 1976b:227.

<sup>87</sup> Wade 2000: 265.

(Ay/CM) *cau SĀM bañā/SĀM fān kaen*, who in taking their thrones had evinced older brothers named *cau ÑĪ~YĪ bañā/YĪ kum kām*; and who died in the same year, 1487-88. They engaged in warfare for control of the Sukhothai-Phitsanulok-Kamphaeng Phet region, ending when each is said to have proposed peace, the *mahārāj* of Chiang Mai in 1475 and *trailok* in 1485.

These names and the folk etymologies attached to them provide clues for analyzing chronicular legends and textual contamination. The stories of the origins of the two Chiang Mai princely brothers say their names were based on the names of their birthplaces, respectively ‘Fang Kaen’ and ‘Kum Kam’, and there is no suggestion that they are number names ‘three’ (*sām*) and ‘two’ (*yī*), an explanation given great importance in another context of *CMC* (see below). In the Ayutthayan story, however, when King Indarāja died in 1424 two sons, *cau āy* [no. 1] *bañā* and *cau ñī* [no. 2] *bañā* fought an elephant duel in which both were killed, thus leaving the throne inheritance to *cau sām* [no. 3] *bañā* who became King Paramarājādhirāj.<sup>88</sup>

In this case there would seem to have been contamination from a Chiang Mai story to one in Ayutthaya. In *CMC* there are several persons with *yī* as the first syllable of their name-title, and the same is seen in *2/K.104* among the forces of *Yāt*. This would seem to be an old title, perhaps dialectal, which has dropped out of the modern language, but for later Ayutthayans would suggest ‘2’ as in *yisip* ‘20’ (in Chiang Mai 20 is ‘sao’). That is, at some stage of composition, Ayutthayan chroniclers confused the stories of the two *trailok/tilok*, and when faced with a father and uncle named *sām* and *yī* could only conceive of them as number names ‘three’ and ‘two’, and added an eldest number one, *cau āy*.

The confused details of the long war, with sometimes the same events at slightly different dates, plus similar biographies of both kings, suggest contamination of one or both chronicles in later recopying. As Chris Baker put it, “the chronicle accounts of these years are confusing because of ambiguities in the dynastic succession, as well as possible muddling of sources”.<sup>89</sup>

#### *The Chinese records for Ayutthaya*

The *MSL* records for *Hsien-Ayutthaya* are more helpful than those concerning Cambodia for comparison with the chronicles, for they contain several recognizable names of kings, even if the dating does not agree perfectly.

With respect to Cambodia, the lower Menam basin polities were probably still strongly Khmer, especially after *Hsien-Ayutthaya* combined around 1349 with *Luo-hu-Lophburi*, a truly Khmer center from Angkor times, and it is to be noted that in spite of the war with *Hsien* recorded by Chou Ta-kuan, the other Chinese sources and the best chronicle traditions mention no warfare throughout the 14th century. Indeed, at the end of the 14th century envoys from *Hsien* and Cambodia were traveling together to China, which may account for the similarity of titles given for kings of Cambodia.<sup>90</sup> It may be that the late 13th-century war was not of an international character.

Because the most abundant, and possibly reliable, details on Cambodian internal politics in the 15th century are in *Hsien-Ayutthaya* documents of *MSL*, it is necessary to look at them attentively, both the records for Cambodia and those for

<sup>88</sup> *CMC* 1998:70; *LP*:133-134.

<sup>89</sup> Baker 2003a:13

<sup>90</sup> Wade 2000: 272.

*Hsien* and *Hsien-lo*, particularly now that Wade's study of *MSL* has revealed some startling details that do not synchronize well with the chronicles.

In the 140 entries in *MSL* concerning *Hsien* and *Hsien-lo* between 1370 and 1504 there are 32 names and/or titles of kings or other royalty.

The first two references to a king are simply a title meaning 'king', *samtec cau bañā*, in 1371 and 1373, a title also common in the records for Cambodia. Then there are several entries with a similar, but different, title, *samtec bo/bao bañā*, or just *cau*, plus names which may reasonably be reconstructed as *śrī śrīndra*, *nakhon in*, later *nakhon indārājādhirāj*, and *paramarājādhirāj*, names also found in the Ayutthayan chronicles, with a chronology which, as Wade demonstrated, fits *vV* better than the other Ayutthayan chronicles, although the name *śrī śrīndra*, known from epigraphy to have been a genuine title at various times, is at dates in *MSL* contrary to all the chronicles, which call the king in that period *paramarāj* [I]. This discrepancy incites suspicion that perhaps some of the events associated with *Paramarāj* [I] have been displaced from a later period, as noted above.

Another difference between *MSL* and the chronicles is the importance given in the former to *nakhon in* while he was still prince of Suphanburi and heir apparent, with mention in 1374, 1377, 1379, 1389, before he sent word of his father's death in 1396. There is no indication in *MSL* of the Ayutthayan campaigns northward at the end of the 14th century recorded in *LP*.

Then, unexpectedly, the *MSL* records three missions in 1433, 1434, and 1438 from a *śrī mahārāj*, without having previously recorded *paramarāja*'s death. In the Ayutthayan chronicles the only ruler with the title *mahārāj* is the king of Chiang Mai, and this is not a period in which the chronicles, either *LP* or the standard Chiang Mai Chronicle (*CMC*), record wars with Chiang Mai which might have led to a momentarily victorious Chiang Mai king sending envoys as king of *Hsien* (such wars came later in the 1450s and 1460s according to *LP*).

If we read *LP* carefully, however, we see that the envoys from *śrī mahārāj* were in a period, 1431-1438, when *LP* records nothing, and when king *paramarājādhirāj* [II] may have been preoccupied elsewhere than in Ayutthaya. In 1431, *LP* says, he attacked and conquered *nakhon hluai* (Angkor) and left his son *nakhon in* to rule there. As we shall see, that operation, according to the very detailed *2/K.104* chronicles did not go off as smoothly as implied in *LP*, there are no more entries in *LP* until 1438 when another son of the king, *rāmeśvara* (pron. /ramesuan/) went to Phitsanulok on a mission the nature of which is controversial.<sup>91</sup>

Then, for 1440 and 1441 *LP* mentions only disastrous fires in the city, in 1442 *paramarāj* attacks Chiang Mai unsuccessfully, in 1444 there is a new campaign in Cambodia (see below), and the death of *paramarāj* is recorded in 1448.

If this was a time of troubles, both domestically and with neighboring polities, could the *śrī mahārāj* have been someone from the North taking advantage of Ayutthaya's weakness? As Baker remarked, "one of the odd features of the chronicle record is that the northern cities never react against Ayutthaya's attacks by sending a force down to batter the city", in spite of the fact, as Baker convincingly argues, that

<sup>91</sup> The standard view of this incident, from an Ayutthayan-Bangkok chauvinist point of view, is that the very young, hardly more than an infant, *Rameśvara*, went to Phitsanulok as viceroy after that area had come under Ayutthayan control. See Griswold 1963:215, 221; Griswold and Prasert 1976:130; Griswold and Prasert 1968:242; Vickery 1979b:165-166; Vickery 1977b:75-76; Baker 2003a:15, 16; and below.

Sukhothai, Kamphaeng Phet, and Phitsnulok were at that time probably far more powerful as land powers than Ayutthaya. Well, perhaps they did, and this is reflected in *MSL* in the 1430s. Then, again following a suggestion of Baker, the visit of the young Ayutthayan prince Rāmeśvara/Ramesuan to Phitsnulok in 1438, rather than marking Ayutthayan absorption of the northern cities, “may have been a pilgrimage”.<sup>92</sup>

The *MSL* adds further problems, however, with entries for a *kurui* Ayutthaya in 1444. *Kurui* was an old Khmer title, but had not, in Cambodia, meant a reigning king since pre-Angkor times, and this is the first Chinese record of the name ‘Ayutthaya’.

Finally, King *paramarāj* appears again in *MSL* in 1446, and his death is recorded there sometime between that date and 1453 (in *LP* 1448, *vV* 1455). I do not agree with Wade that this *paramarāj* was a new ruler and that the previously recorded *paramarāj* had died sometime between 1428 and the 1440s.<sup>93</sup> I think it preferable to see the *mahārāj* and *kurui* Ayutthaya as an intervening outsider in the first case, and as acting for *Paramarāj* in the second.

Wade is quite right to invoke “the possibility of political disturbances” and “the hugely dislocated accounts given in the various editions of the Ayudhyan annals for the period”,<sup>94</sup> and there is also the possibility of errors or incoherence within *LP* itself, an example being the event I have called a new campaign in Cambodia in 1444, which is not obviously that in *LP*.

Above, when discussing the quality of the chronicles, I noted the problem of possible cyclical errors, that is events misplaced in date by 12 years or multiples thereof because of the recurring 12-year animal year cycle. One candidate for such a revision is the *LP* entry, just after the events noted above, in 1455, when Ayutthaya is said to have attacked Malacca. The *MSL* also records Ayutthayan ‘maltreatment’ of Malacca, but in 1431, exactly 24 years, or two animal cycles earlier; and since relations between *Hsien* and Malacca, or *malayu*, had always been of concern to China, it is likely that the *MSL* date is correct, and that another attack in 1455, if it occurred, would not have been ignored. Thus the *LP* event of 1455 should be replaced in 1431.

With that in mind we might consider that the 1454 *LP* entry about a general famine should be one cycle earlier in 1442, just after the two years of severe fires.

Then the sequence of *LP* events would be (1) attacks on Angkor and Malacca in 1431, (2) 1431-1438 unknown, but according to *MSL* envoys from a ruler called *mahārāj*, (3) 1438 king’s son Ramesuan to Phitsnulok, (4) Ayutthaya ravaged by fire in 1440 and 1441, and a general famine in 1442, (5) 1444 appearance of *kurui* Ayutthaya when there was a new campaign in Cambodia. Indeed it was a period of both political disturbance and dislocated accounts.

We might note here the evidence of the *2/K.104* text which starts sometime,

<sup>92</sup> Baker 2003a:16.

<sup>93</sup> Wade 2000: 264-265.

<sup>94</sup> Wade 2000: 265; and not only in the different treatments of King Trailok’s reign as noted by Wyatt (Wade 2000: 265, n. 67), where Wyatt was only referring to the different dates for the period in the different versions of the Ayutthayan chronicles. Contrary to all other texts, *vV* says Trailok was brother, not son, of his predecessor. The dates of the *1157* traditions, however, are derivative of the *LP* dates (Vickery 1977a, chapter 9), and if the contents of the *1157* entries are replaced at *LP* dates they often make sense. The really dislocated accounts are seen within the two best traditions, *LP* and *CMC*, and in their comparison.

but probably not long, before 1439, with Ayutthayan activity in the Northeast in the Phimai-Phnom Rung area, something not mentioned in any other chronicle. In 1439, the first explicit date of the text, and with no entry in *LP*, there was a tonsure ceremony for the king's eldest son and he was given the titles Prince *Rāmeśvara param trailokanāth*.<sup>95</sup> In 1440 and 1441 this text agrees with *LP* about fires in Ayutthaya, and has more detail. Then in a period which must still be in 1441 (for the next explicit date is still in that year), there is a story of *bra:yā pālmo'an cau*, ruler of Phitsanulok coming to Ayutthaya to offer homage, and being given the title *Mahādharmarājā*, a traditional royal title of that area, which suggests, not homage by the North, but Ayutthayan acknowledgment of failure to conquer them, and acceptance of continuity of their traditional royalty. Following this, rulers of the other northern *mo'an* also came, apparently as loyal allies. All of this is missing from *LP*.<sup>96</sup> Moreover, still in 1441, conflicts start with the Mon in the western borderlands, and the chronicle's story continues with that through the explicit date 1441 until the story shifts to Angkor in 1443. This means that the Ayutthayan attack on Chiang Mai in 1442 in *LP* is missing, but it may not be arbitrarily rejected, because it is supported by both the Chiang Mai chronicles and *MSL* (see below).

Was the *kurui* Ayutthaya another interloper like the *mahārāj*? Not necessarily. *Kurui* was a title which could have been used by any Ayutthayan king, but it does not seem probable that *paramarāj* would have adopted a new title in the middle of his reign. If we look ahead at the next reign in *LP*, in 1463 King (*samtec braḥ parama*) *trailok* moved north to Phitsanulok and let "the king" (*braḥ cau phaendin*), presumably a son, reign in Ayutthaya with the title *samtec braḥ paramarāj*. This may be reflected in the *MSL* entry of 1462 recording a king *braḥ rāmarājādhipatī*. Perhaps Trailok's father took the same measure when involved in 1442-1444 (and possibly later) in wars in Chiang Mai and Cambodia. When Trailok left the throne, according to *MSL*, in 1482, and probably retired to Phitsanulok, his heir was also called *kurui braḥ nakhon srī* Ayutthaya<sup>97</sup>.

Concerning the use of *mahārāj* for the king of Chiang Mai, he is given a proper name twice, first *mahārāj dāv lūk* in 1463 when *Trailok* moved to Phitsanulok and Chiang Mai attacked Sukhothai, and second in 1468 when *mahārāj dāv puñ* seized power from *dāv lūk*, an event also recorded, but with different detail, in *CMC*.<sup>98</sup> This may be evidence that in Ayutthaya the name *tilokarāj* was not known, and that it represents contamination by later Chiang Mai copyists influenced by the name *trailokanāth* in the Ayutthayan chronicles.

#### *Titles in the MSL*

The only title which has given etymological problems, both here and for

<sup>95</sup> 'Tonsure ceremony' is the interpretation by Prof. Winai Pongsripijan of an expression of unclear meaning.

<sup>96</sup> *LP* in 1419 records the death of a *Mahādharmarājādhirāj*, causing unrest in the northern *mo'an* until the Ayutthayan king goes to *mo'an braḥ pān* and receives submission from *bañā pālmo'an* and *bañā rām*.

<sup>97</sup> See discussion in Wade 2000:267.

<sup>98</sup> This name *dāv/thao lūk* caused some confusion among early scholars. As noted in Griswold and Prasert 1976:138, n. 10, "O. Frankfurter (*JSS*, 6, 3 [1909]:6) mistakenly translates: 'the Mahārāj sent his son' [*lūk*]. They did not note that the same mistake, magnified, was made in Griswold 1963:224, "the King of Lân Nâ sent his son (? his adopted son, Yudhiṣṭhira?)".

Cambodia, is *bao/pao* or *bo/p'o* between the terms *samtec* and *bañā*.<sup>99</sup> Coedès suggested that it must have been an error for *cau*, but Wade has shown that the Chinese characters for the two terms are so different that scribal confusion was very unlikely.<sup>100</sup> A restoration as *pu b(r)añā* is unconvincing, because that title, genuine in Sukhothai, always meant a dead ancestor.<sup>101</sup>

Now, however, *samtec bō bañā* has turned up in an early fifteenth-century inscription from Kamphaeng Phet, showing *sa(m?)tec bō bra:ñā sòy*, as ruler in Kamphaeng Phet in 1420.<sup>102</sup> The term *bō* would have been understood as either ‘king’ or ‘father’.

Of course, all such titles were artificial inventions at some time. Thus why not also concoct a new title *samtec bo bañā*? The combination *samtec cau bañā* is an amalgam of terms from three languages, respectively Khmer-Thai-Mon. Its earliest occurrences in extant original documents were in Sukhothai; and, by the late 14th century, Ayutthaya, in emulation of the North, began to adopt northern titles, giving up the older Khmer style of *kamrateñ* of earlier *Hsien*. The route of cultural borrowing with respect to the title *samtec* would have been provincial Khmer>Sukhothai>Ayutthaya>post-Angkor Cambodia, also Sukhothai > Lanna (see below).

Moreover, the *Sejarah Melayu* records a king of ‘Siam’, which at that time must be understood as Ayutthaya, entitled *bubunya*, a title with which the Malays must have become acquainted through direct contact, not via Chinese, and which, given the nature of Jawi-Arabic vocalization, could just as well be interpreted as *bo bañā*.<sup>103</sup> There should then, of course, have been a difference between *cau bañā* and *bo bañā*, but I am at a loss to explain it, unless, just as a guess, the latter meant a still living ex-king who had abdicated for his son. It may be noteworthy that in the *MSL* records for *Hsien* the king in the first two entries was *samtec cau bañā*, while

<sup>99</sup> I ignore here the titles of the king’s sister in 1373, for which I can offer no explanation beyond *samtec ?*, and the *zhao bo-luo-ju (cau bo/pho ??)*, “heir of former Ming-tai prince” in 1375. Neither can I explain *bo khun* (Wade 1991a:201 and Wade 2000:278), who was merely an envoy from *Hsien* to China, but it can hardly be the title *pho/bo khun* known in Sukhothai, which was only used for supreme kings, and only in very early inscriptions. *Khun*, however (Wade 1991a:104 and Wade 2000:205, 275), would have been an appropriate rank for an envoy.

<sup>100</sup> Coedès 1964:426. Wade 2000: 258, n. 18.

<sup>101</sup> *Pace* Wade 2000:258, 261, 276, 277, all of which must now be read as *bo/bao b(r)añā*.

<sup>102</sup> *Cāru’k* 1986:167-170. The editors of the text, probably because it was so unfamiliar, did not transcribe the full title *sa(m?)tec bō bra:ñā*, but only *sa(m?)tec bra:ñā*, but the full title is quite visible on the published plate, p. 168, line 2 of the inscription. The name *sòy* interestingly confirms an element of the unusual title for the governor of Kamphaeng Phet found in 2/K.104, *saen sòy dāv*. See Vickery 1977b:45, n. 141.

<sup>103</sup> Brown 1970:55, and note 262 where he correctly related it to *bañā*, “a mid-15<sup>th</sup> c. Mon royal title”. While on the subject, we might take note of other details in Malay sources. First is an explanation of the mysterious *avi* in *avi decho* and *avi cakri* found in the *Sejarah Melayu* in relations with ‘Siam’. (Brown 1979:35, 55). It is a misreading of Arabic-Jawi *alif vav ya* (اوى) which may also be pronounced *oya*, thus the well-known Ayutthayan title *okya*; and in Ayutthaya *Okya Tejo* and *Okya Cakri* were among the highest-ranking officers. Another point is the Middle Eastern name for Ayutthaya, known in the early sixteenth century to traders from there as *Shahr-i Naw*, “Persian for ‘new town’” (Wheatley 1961:235, n3); and over 150 years later the same name was still used by Persians, but had become corrupted to ‘boat town’, ‘shahr nāv’ (O’Kane 1970:4, 88). One might speculate that in fact the oldest variant was ‘boat town’, given Ayutthaya’s origins as a port, and that the ‘corruption’, a hypercorrection, was in the other direction, for there was no reason at that time to call Ayutthaya ‘new city’. *Shahr Nāv* and *Shahr-i Naw* are Persian, not Arabic, *pace* Charnvit 1999:59; Andaya 1999:121, 136. For the Arabic translation of this Persian name, see *shahrū ’n-nuwi*, in which ‘n represents Arabic *al* before the nasal, in *Sejarah Melayu* (Brown 1970:55).



thereafter it was always *bo bañā*. But in the records for Cambodia there is no such regularity.

### Northern Thai

Under this rubric I include both the central northern Thai area of Sukhothai-Phitsanulok-Kamphaeng Phet, and the far North, often called Lanna, comprising Chiang Mai and its neighbors, Lamphun, Chiang Rai, Nan, and Phayao in particular. The Ayutthayan chronicles record interventions into the central North from the end of the 14th century, and even if no individual details may be accepted *ipso facto*, the general picture seems credible. Later on, in the 15th century, both the Ayutthayan and Chiang Mai chronicles have stories of war between themselves and involving the central northern polities.

All of these chronicle stories have problems of their own which cannot be discussed here, but since the *MSL* shows that Ayutthaya, in its royal titles, was receiving influence from the North, it may be useful to review the genuine northern titles as seen in inscriptions.

#### *Sukhothai area (Sukhothai, Phitsanulok, Chaliang-Sawankhalok, Kamphaeng Phet)*

There are no local chronicles surviving from this area, although the Mon chronicle of *Rājādhirāj* has much about their relations, sometimes legendary, with Martaban and Pegu; and the only contemporary local sources are inscriptions.

The so-called first Sukhothai inscription will not be considered because of the doubts about its origins.<sup>104</sup> Inscription no. 2, in Thai, is probably from the second half of the 14th century, but provides titles for ancestors of its author, and shows *brañā* < Mon *bañā*, *bo khun* (Thai), and *kamrateñ añ* (Khmer) used for kings, but all of whom were dead at the time the inscription was written. *Brañā* was also used for a prince who was not king, and the two kings contemporary with the author's lifetime were entitled *dharmarājā*. *Khun* was chief of a town, and the author himself, a prince, was in different contexts entitled both *cau* and *braḥ* (Khmer). This shows a cosmopolitan mixture of Khmer, Mon, and Thai, not unexpected in 14th-century Sukhothai.<sup>105</sup>

Inscriptions 3, 4, and 5 are royal inscriptions of King Lidayi dated between 1357 and the 1360s. In number 3 *brañā* is used alone for three kings, Lidayi himself, his father Loedayi, and grandfather Rāmarāj; and in another context Lidayi is called *brañā* plus other titles. *Dāv* [Thai] *brañā* were fellow rulers of other *mo'an*; and chiefs of important towns were *cau* and *khun*. We should note that *bo khun* has been dropped, even for grandfather Rāmarāj who received it in no. 2, perhaps in a conscious policy to replace lineage or clan titles with terms more strictly indicative of rank in a state apparatus. If so, they inclined to Mon usage, with purely Khmer ranks, such as *kamrateñ añ*, no longer being used in Thai-language texts.

They were still used, however, when Lidayi wrote in Khmer, as in no. 4. There both Lidayi and his grandfather Rāmarāj were called *braḥ pād kamrateñ añ*, a typical Angkorean usage for kings. In inscription no. 5, a Thai-language double of no. 4, they are called *brañā*. Other rulers who participated in the ceremonies consecrating Lidayi as king were called *ksatra* in no. 4, and *dāv* or *brañā* in no. 5.

<sup>104</sup> Vickery 1987, 1991, 1995.

<sup>105</sup> Opinions on the date of inscription no. 2 have undergone many changes. For references to the latest expert opinions of Dr. Prasert ṅa Nagara see Vickery 1995:note 21.

The first use of *cau brañā* is in inscription no. 8, probably in the 1360s, for the chief (*cau mo'arī*) of Nan and Phlua.

After Lidaiy's reign, in no. 102, of 1380, the work of a woman who has been identified as a princess,<sup>106</sup> the title *braḥ srī rāja-oras* was used for a king's son, implying that the king himself was *braḥ srī rāja*, and an important functionary named *Āy Ind* had the title *nāy*, showing its much higher status than in later times; and in no. 106 of 1384 the late King Lidaiy was called *samtec* and *mahādharmarāja*, the first use of *samtec* at Sukhothai.

Still later, in no. 46,1403, the king was called *samtec mahā dharmarājādhipatī srī suriyavaṅs*, and his mother, the author of the inscription, *samtec braḥ rājajanānī srī dharmarājamatā*, in which *janānī* and *matā* mean 'mother'. Then, by 1412 lower ranking and non-royal people were putting up inscriptions, such as no. 49, although the royalty were invoked as patrons and donors of land. Here the king's formal titles were *braḥ param rājādhipatī srī mahā cākabattirāj*, but he was also referred to in more familiar fashion as *bo ayū hua cau* 'the king', and *òkñā dharmarāja*. The possibly same *nāy Ind* as in no. 102, 32 years earlier, appears with the additional title *sarasakti*, as the inscription's author, and the inscription names another *nāy* who was *saṅghakāri*, in charge of monastic affairs. And as noted, in 1420 an inscription from Kamphaeng Phet, not far West of Sukhothai, named the ruler there *sa(m?)tec bò bra:ñā sòy*.

Also interesting for its titles is another inscription from Kampheng Phet, no. 13, dated 1510, in which the king's title is *cau brañā srī dharmāsokarāja*, perhaps continuing the tradition begun in Nakon Sawan in 1167 (see above). Peculiarly, though, the inscription with this Buddhist-type royal name is on the base of an image of Śiva. Thus, after 200 years of insistent royal Buddhism, this ruler with a Buddhist name erected an image of Śiva to protect, as the inscription says, Buddhism, Hinduism, and traditional cults (*debakarm*). It is a thoroughly royal inscription, such as had not been seen since Lidaiy, and no other ranks are mentioned until the end where the fruit of merit is offered to the 'two rulers', *samtec pabitr braḥ cau ayū hua*, suggesting that *dharmāsokarāj* was acknowledging others as his equals or superiors. But who were the other two rulers?<sup>107</sup> It is the second inscription to use *cau brañā* for a king, a title found frequently in *MSL*.

Later on, in 1536, Sukhothai inscription no. 14 also records what appears to be a royal title, or at least a very high prince, entitled *samtec...cau brañā srī dharmāsokarāj*. Possibly this was the same *dharmāsokarāj* of the inscription in 1510.

From the very beginning of Sukhothai epigraphy certain Khmer terms, such as *braḥ* and *kamraten*, were used in Thai, and *braḥ* continued in use, while *kamraten* was no longer used in Thai inscriptions after the 14th century. Early in the 15th century *samtec* began to be used, and is still seen in the 16th century. The originally Mon title *brañā* appears in the earliest texts and continues throughout.

Even in this heartland of Thai language and new Thai script, Khmer script was sometimes preferred for writing Thai, as seen in No. 9 (1301-1369-1406), no. 86

<sup>106</sup> Griswold and Prasert 1971.

<sup>107</sup> Griswold and Prasert 1974b:227-228, n. 12, offer different possibilities, all based on their belief that Ayutthaya had conquered the Sukhothai area cities in 1438 and had thereafter appointed Ayutthayan princes as viceroys. I have indicated briefly above that I do not find this tenable, but for the present I have no other proposal.

(1528), and no. 54 (1548)

*Lanna*

The events in the history of this region are of little direct interest for the study of Cambodia, but because the treatment of Cambodia in the 15th century is dependent on comparison of names and titles with surrounding regions, especially *Hsien-Ayutthaya*, and with Chinese sources, some attention must be given to those components of the Lanna records too, because of their relevance for *Hsien-Ayutthaya*. In particular, the Ayutthayan *LP* chronicle gives the title *mahārāj* to the ruler of Chiang Mai who was in conflict with Ayutthaya in mid-15th century, and the *MSL* shows the same title, apparently for an Ayutthayan ruler, in the 1430s.

In Lanna the first inscription is that of Wat Phra Yu'n in Lamphun dated 1369-70, number 62 of the Thai corpus, with the titles of the purportedly first rulers, *brañā maññrāy hluon*, *brañā gāṃ fū*, *brañā phā yū*, *cau dāv soñ saen nā ann dharmikarāj*, the last the ruler when the inscription was erected. They are designated great grandfather, grandfather, father, son, that is, Soñ Saen Nā is said to be son, grandson and great grandson of the other three.<sup>108</sup> In this genealogy there are three different types of titles (1) *maññrāy*, which was a Burmese royal title in 14th-century Ava, (2) three titles beginning with *brañā*, found in both Thai and Mon inscriptions, and of Mon origin<sup>109</sup>, but followed in the second and third by what appear to be Thai proper names, and (3) the completely Thai title meaning 'two hundred thousand rice fields' for the fourth ruler, presumably contemporary with the inscription.

Another interesting aspect of the inscription is the prominence it gives to Lamphun, rather than Chiang Mai, as the most important city of the region, whereas in the chronicles Chiang Mai had by this time been the capital for six generations. It will not do to gloss over the fact by calling Lamphun "the cultural capital"<sup>110</sup>. In the inscription Chiang Mai and Kum Kam, Chiang Mai's predecessor according to the chronicles, are mentioned as "Kum Kam Chiang Mai" and are not even called *mo'añ*, let alone *nagara*, both of which titles are given to Haripuñjaya/Lamphun. If we favoured the contemporary inscription over the chronicles we should say that Lamphun was not only culturally, but also politically, more important as late as the period of *soñ saen nā*, and that Chiang Mai only became the Thai capital of Lanna sometime after his reign, one hundred years later than traditionally believed. Until then Mon Haripuñjaya would still have been the leading city of the north.

In fact, one of the oldest chronicles, the 16th-century *Jinakālamāli*, shows some evidence of uncertainty in this respect. After Mangrai, his son Grāmarāja reigned in Biṅapura (Chiang Mai) for a short time and then passed the throne to his son, Senabhū. Then the latter's uncle Gro'n came and conquered Haripuñjaya, forcing Senabhū to flee. Then "King Gro'n...took Haripuñjaya ...and reigned

<sup>108</sup> I belabor this point because of divergent details in other sources adopted by modern commentators. Thus Griswold and Prasert 1974:124 wrote, concerning this inscription, and in violation of all rules of historical method, "In 1369 Mang Rai's great-great-great-grandson Kilana (*Gū Nā*)... decided to rebuild the [Pra Yu'n] monastery..."; and in their translation, p. 131, where the text calls *Soñ Saen Nā* 'hlen', 'great-grandson', they exclaim, n. 7, that "the word hlen, 'great-grandson' is evidently loosely used here". As I have illustrated, the inscription's author was not Kilana (*Gū Nā*), and he was great-grandson of Mang Rai. Griswold and Prasert forced details from later and less trustworthy sources onto this contemporary inscription.

<sup>109</sup> Vickery 1974:170-171.

<sup>110</sup> Griswold and Prasert 1974:124.

9 years”. The logic of the story of course, requires Chiang Mai instead of Haripuñjaya. The next usurper, Najjotthara, also reigned in Haripuñjaya, and several generations later Mahābrahma, wishing to overthrow a king in Nabbisipura (Chiang Mai), “raised a great army, marched on Nabbisipura, took Haripuñjaya”.<sup>111</sup> Later chronicles, such as that of Chiang Mai, have resolved the contradiction and substituted Chiang Mai for Haripuñjaya in each of those sections.

As I have emphasized in earlier studies, all of the chronicle stories concerning the early kings of Chiang Mai have from six to eight generations of kings in the time period of the four kings in the list from the near contemporary inscription of Wat Phra Yu’n, and not all of the names in the chronicle lists are the same. Thus, I argued, the names which do not coincide with Wat Phra Yu’n must be fictitious, inserted later on to give importance to the supposed places of origin of the fictitious persons, or to incorporate elements of old pan-Thai myth.<sup>112</sup>

There are at least half a dozen such lists of kings from Mangrai to the end of the 14th century, with some different names, including two lists in inscriptions, one 15<sup>th</sup>-century from Phayao and one 17<sup>th</sup>-century from Chiang Rai.

And these lists are not exhaustive. In his notes Coedès referred to several other names of kings in this line of descent as seen in various chronicle sources.<sup>113</sup> This means that at the very least all the kings except those in inscription 62, and the stories in which they are involved, must be rejected. In fact, there may be reason to reject the three generations before the author of inscription 62 as legendary too, particularly such names as the second and third of the Wat Pra Yu’n list, *khām fū*, ‘floating gold’ and *phāyū/hrāyū/ekasatayu* which Coedès was unable to explain at all, but which bears a family resemblance to the name of a 14th-century Mon prince, *mrāhū* in *Rājādhirāj*.<sup>114</sup> As we shall see, this seems also to be what may be concluded from the evidence of *MSL*.

If so, these multiple and conflicting lists with peculiar names would indicate that the Haripuñjaya/Lamphun, not Chiang Mai, king in 1369 was a Thai upstart who had just won a chiefdom from Mon predecessors, and who fabricated a lineage of prestigious names from neighboring polities and old legend.

Later inscriptions show other titles for rulers of Chiang Mai.

There are several inscriptions from the Lanna area for the second half of the 15th century, which confirm that *mahārāj* was in use as a title for kings of Chiang Mai, as recorded in the Ayutthaya chronicles for that time, although most of these inscriptions are after the reign of *tilokarāj*, who was the *mahārāj* in question in the Ayutthaya chronicles. Moreover, all of these inscriptions, including two dated in *tiloka*’s reign, but without the title *mahārāj*, give most importance to a queen entitled *mahārājdevī*.<sup>115</sup> Indeed, in 1488, the year after *tiloka* is said in the chronicle to have died, inscription no. 100 refers to *braḥ mahārājdevī cau phaendin* (‘the ruler’).

The first inscription mentioning *mahārāj* is one from Chiang Khong, dated 1445 near the beginning of *tiloka*’s reign, concerning construction of a *vihāra* and referring to *samtec mahārāj* and *mahādevī*, whom the editors of the collection

<sup>111</sup> Coedès 1925:29, 103.

<sup>112</sup> Vickery 1976a:371-76; Vickery 1978:198-203; Vickery 1979b:179-182.

<sup>113</sup> Coedès 1925:92-94, and notes.

<sup>114</sup> Coedès 1925:94, n. 4.

<sup>115</sup> The inscriptions (nos. 65, 67, 68, 71, 73, 99, 100, 101, 104), dated from 1466 to 1566 demonstrate the prominence of a Mahādevī, certainly not all the same person.

interpret as *tilokarāj* and his mother.<sup>116</sup> This is also the first published record of the title *samtec* in Lanna.

The first record of a *mahārāj* after *tiloka*'s reign is no. 68 of the Thai corpus, dated 1489, referring first to the *mahārājdevī*, further on in the text to “*mahārāj cau* named *braḥ śrī dharmarāj* the royal grandson”, which fits to some extent the Chiang Mai chronicle treatment in which *tiloka* was followed in 1487 by a grandson named there *yòt chiañ rai*. Another such inscription is no. 71, dated 1500, referring to the king as *samtec pabitr mahārāj cau adhipatī nai* (‘ruler in’) *śrī biṅgarāṣṭhr chiañ mai*. This somewhat different title agrees with *CMC* to the extent that the latter has a change of rulers in 1495.

The importance of the position of *mahārājdevī* seen in the inscriptions is not reflected in any chronicle.

Some other inscriptions with genuine contemporary royal titles are: (1) 1479, *cau phaendin*, ‘the king’. (2) 1491, reference to *braḥ pen cau mo’ñ biñ*, ‘ruler of Chiang Mai (*mo’añ biñ*), (3) 1495, *samtec pabitr braḥ pen cau cau mo’ñ biñ* (‘ruler of Chiang Mai’) *dāñ sòñ* (‘both’) *bò lūk* (‘father and son’), (4) 1496, *samtec pabitr braḥ pen cau* (‘the king’) *dāñ sòñ braḥ oṅ* (‘both’); and in another context, *mahārāj cau phaendin* (‘Maharāja the king’).<sup>117</sup>

It is no wonder that David K. Wyatt, in one of his recent efforts to rehabilitate old chronicle traditions, said that he had “not found the inscriptions of the period to be of much use in this current enterprise”.<sup>118</sup> Indeed, use of the inscriptions forces serious critical analysis of the chronicles.

There are chronicles of Chiang Mai, Lamphun, Nan, and Phayao, some composed as early as the 15th-16th centuries, but all, especially for the early period of interest here, with problems of date and content, and in serious disagreement with contemporary inscriptions.

Just as in Ayutthaya there is a problem with the name-title of the mid-15th century hero king of Chiang Mai, *tilokarāj*, who was involved for years in wars with the polities of the central North and with Ayutthaya. No inscriptions from his reign show the title *tilokarāj*, and the oldest, and apparently most reliable, chronicle is the 16th-century *Jinakālamālī*, which calls him *bilaka*... . Coedès, taking the position that everyone knew he was *tilokarāj*, said that there must have been an “ancient confusion between *t* and *b*”, something quite unlikely in any alphabet in use in the area; and how could there have been scribal confusion anyway over the name of Chiang Mai’s most famous king among chroniclers only 100 years removed from his time?<sup>119</sup>

<sup>116</sup> This is an unnumbered inscription in *Cāru’k* 2540 [1997]:13-24.

<sup>117</sup> *Cāru’k* I/1 2534 [1991]:40-41, 104-5, 114-5, 6-8, inscriptions Chiang Rai 33, Phayao 3, Phayao 7, and Chiang Rai 3 respectively.

<sup>118</sup> Wyatt 1997:693, n. 11. Wyatt (*ibid.*: 689-690) also slyly tried to upgrade the inherently least reliable of traditional sources, saying, “these take the form of... both the ‘dynastic’ chronicles of places like Siam [i.e., Ayutthaya] and the ‘historical legends’ (*tamnan*) of places like... Chiang Mai... .The distinction is probably meaningless, for, as I have argued in introducing the Chiang Mai ‘Chronicle’ [really a *tāmnān*], such sources surely are worthy in many cases of the appellation ‘history’”. On the relative value of chronicles (*phongsawadan/baṅśāvatār*) and *tāmnān* see Vickery 1976a and Vickery 1979b.

<sup>119</sup> Coedès 1925:107, nn. 5-6. Coedès, incomprehensibly, relied on the late compilation of legends, *Baṅśāvatār yonak* as authority for *tiloka*, as sixth son, being called first *thao lok*; and Coedès added that the correct form, *tilokarāj*, is attested by epigraphy, the inscription of Wat Chiang Man. That inscription, however, was only set up in 1581, and is no more reliable than chronicles for events far in the past, as seen in its recording of a meeting in 1296 of *Mañrai*, *Nām mo’añ*, and *brañā Rvañ*, a story

Although both the Ayutthayan *LP* and the Chiang Mai chronicle *CMC* relate nearly forty years of rivalry and warfare involving incursions by both against the central northern cities of Chaliang, Sukhothai, and Phitsanulok, neither chronicle shows much knowledge of the other polity. I have indicated the lacunae in *LP* above. The *CMC* shows even less knowledge of Ayutthaya. The Ayutthayan king is usually referred to as ‘King of the South’, but ‘South’ sometimes also means the Phitsanulok-Sukhothai area. In some contexts, such as that dated 1442, the ‘King of the South’, presumably the Ayutthayan king, is correctly called *paramarāja*, the name of *trailok*’s father in the Ayutthayan chronicles, but in another incident in the same time period he is named ‘King *bôn*’, for which I can suggest no explanation.<sup>120</sup> The name *trailok* (‘Bòrommatrailok’) is used correctly in three contexts (pp. 85, 89, 90), but in another the translators have changed an original *paramarāja* to Bòrommatrailok, which may be historically correct for the date in question, but gives a false impression of the value of *CMC*.<sup>121</sup> Some other Ayutthayan kings, both earlier and later, are called *paramatraicāk*, an absolutely mythical name.

The name *tilokarāj* is of course a Palicized version of the chronicle name of the contemporary Ayutthayan king *trailokanāth*, obviously a suspicious circumstance, suggesting contamination of one tradition by the other. The meaning, ‘king of the three worlds’, is ignored in the Chiang Mai chronicles, which together with modern histories based on them, have consecrated a Ptolemaic epicycle tradition that he was called *tilokarāj* because royal sons were given numerical names at birth and that he, as sixth son, was called *lok*. That this is special pleading for a single case is seen in the names of other persons entitled *lok* without explanations that it was a number name.<sup>122</sup>

When not thinking about damage to a chronicle tradition, however, traditional Thai scholars were not at all reluctant to treat the title *tilokarāj* as equivalent to *trailokanāth*.

For the Palicizing writer(s) of *Saigīyavanīś* ‘*tilok*~’ was the equivalent of ‘*trailok*~’, and they used *tilok* for *trailok* of Ayutthaya. Prince Damrong, moreover, although not in a context concerning Chiang Mai, considered that ‘*tilok*’ was equivalent to ‘*trailok*’, and if so, the entire conception of these names deriving from numerals is weakened. See his “Commentary to the reign of Trailokanāth”, where he remarked that some texts called Trailokanāth ‘Trailokanāyak’ or ‘Tiloka’, but “it is all the same” (แต่ก็เป็นความเดียวกัน).<sup>123</sup>

The conclusion from this is that for the mid-15th century, when the chronicles of both polities describe a 20-year period of warfare between Ayutthaya and Chiang Mai in which the central northern polities were also involved, the names of the hero kings of both Chiang Mai and Ayutthaya in their respective chronicles were identical

---

which must now be seen as entirely legendary. The Wat Chiang Man inscription has been published in Griswold and Prasert 1977.

<sup>120</sup> *CMC* 1998:81-83, at a date apparently around 1442 when *paramarāja*, according to *LP*, was still king. For some strange reason the translators of *CMC* have inserted “[Bòrommatrailokanat]” to identify ‘King *bôn*’, and in their index imply that the *paramarāja* (their ‘Bòrommaracha’) was also *trailok*, all of which is impossible.

<sup>121</sup> Such doctoring of sources in traditional historiography, both by Thai and non-Thai traditionalists, in order to make sources fit a preconceived historical narrative, is not unusual.

<sup>122</sup> *CMC* 1998:77-78; and on epicycles Vickery 1979b:179-182. ‘*Lok*’ is in fact not Thai, but Chinese. For a related argument on the inapplicability of number name etymologies see Vickery 1978:201.

<sup>123</sup> Damrong 1911:263.

(*tiloka-/trailoka-*), but fictitious.

We have seen above that *MSL* in the 1430s gives a king of *Hsien-Ayutthaya* the title *mahārāj* which the Ayutthayan chronicles do not use for any of their own kings, but only for kings of Chiang Mai, particularly in the period in which *CMC* places the reign of *tilokarāj*, although *CMC* does not use the title *mahārāj* for any of its kings either, which is surprising because that title is attested as genuine in numerous inscriptions. This is another detail which seriously weakens the reliability of *CMC*.

### **Lanna in Chinese sources, *Yuan-shih* (Mongol dynasty) and *MSL***

In some Chinese records Lanna was known as *Ba-bai xi-fu* and in *MSL* as *Ba-bai/da-dian*. It first appears in the *Yuan-shih* in 1292. Entries relevant for our purpose, with names of chiefs, are: 1326 a Chao Tai-tao and his son Chao Zan-t'ing; later the same year and in 1327 Chao Nan-t'ung; also in 1327 Chao San-chin; and in that year *Ba-bai xi-fu* requested the court to set up *Meng* (probably *mo'an*) *Ch'ing*, and Chao Nan-t'ung and his son Chao San-chin were appointed there. There is also mention of Ai Chao, son of the chief of *Ba-bai xi-fu*. In 1347 Han Pu was appointed to inherit his father's position.<sup>124</sup>

There is nothing here which fits at all either the various versions of the chronicles or the 1369 inscription of Wat Pra Yu'n. These titles, with 'chao' seem to be Thai, but they suggest either that the genealogy of the Wat Pra Y'un inscription is completely fictitious, or that *Ba-bai xi-fu* in the *Yuan-shih* was not the Haripuñjaya-Chiang Mai area.

*MSL* is a bit more helpful for comparison, and it is its entries which prove that *Ba-bai/da-dian* was by then really Lanna, presumably with Chiang Mai as its major center, something which could have been doubted on the basis of the *Yuan-shih* entries.

In the entries of relevance here, *MSL* records, in 1391, an envoy sent by "Dao Bang-mian", presumably the local chief ("native official of Ba-bai Pacification Superintendency"), and in 1394 and 1402 tribute was sent by "Dao Ban-mian" (*dāv bān-mo'an*?), probably the same person. This is hardly more helpful than *Yuan-shih*. The dates are those of *soñ saen nā/ku'nā* of inscription 62 and the chronicles, but even if the Chinese titles could be understood as *bān mo'an* ('house'/'town' + 'country'), identification hardly seems possible, unless it were proposed that the Chinese transcription 'bang/ban' should be understood, not as *bān* ('town') but as *bān* ('thousand'), and the entire title as 'thousand(s) of *mo'an*', corresponding to *soñ saen nā*, 'two hundred thousand rice fields'. It is also possible that the original title was *pāl(a)mo'an* ('protector of the *mo'an*'), pronounced in Thai as /bān mo'añ/, and known from some early sources, both legendary and apparently historical.<sup>125</sup>

Then in 1404 there is a ruler named *thao cau ni* (perhaps *ñi*) followed by his brother *thao cau san* (probably *sām*), which accords rather well with *CMC* where a prince Thao **Yi** (=ñi) Kum Kam was in 1401 excluded from the throne in favor of his younger brother Cau **Sam** Phraya Fang Kaen (spelling as in *CMC*. See also above).

<sup>124</sup> Luce 1958.

<sup>125</sup> See Vickery 1976a:375

The last mention of Cau Sam in *MSL* is in 1440, while the reign of Cau Sam Phraya Fang Kaen in *CMC* ended in 1442. Then in *MSL* in 1445 there is an implied record of a recent war with Ayutthaya, for “gold warrant and verification tally... previously conferred were destroyed by troops from Siam”, which could fit the 1442 entries in both *LP* and *CMC* concerning war between Chiang Mai and Ayutthaya in that year, but which is surprisingly missing from the detailed *2/K.104* chronicle. Might this mean that the 1442 date is wrong, and that the war was some time in 1444-1445, and missing from *2/K.104* because it ends in 1444?

Following this the next Chiang Mai ruler in *CMC* is Tilokarāj, from 1442 to 1487 when he was succeeded by his grandson Yòt Chiang Rai. In *MSL*, however, the next apparent ruler, whom *MSL* calls “pacification superintendent” was Cau Meng-Luk, who should correspond to Tilokarāj, in 1447, 1451 and 1455.<sup>126</sup> Thereafter *MSL* just refers to “chieftains sent by Ba-bai/Da-Dien”, and twice to ‘Thao Lanna’ in 1481 and 1484, until in 1489 when Thao Yòt Chiang Rai, “grandson of deceased superintendent of Ba-bai/Da-dian, offers tribute and requests permission to inherit grandfather’s post”, which puts *MSL* back in conformity with *CMC*.<sup>127</sup>

Other *MSL* entries which fit the chronicle are, in 1457, “Che-li had rebelled and joined with Ba-bai to engage in feuding”, comparable with *CMC*’s war with Chiang Rung in 1455-1457; and in 1480 a report of a threat from Annam, in agreement with *CMC*.

The ‘Cau Meng Luk’ bears some resemblance to records of Tilokarāj who in *LP* is twice called *mahārāj dāv lūk*, and in *CMC* is said to have originally been named ‘Lok’, meaning sixth son. But if *MSL* knew him as ‘Meng Luk’ in the middle of his reign, it argues against *lok* as a childhood numerical name, and supports my proposal that the name *tilokarāj* is a later fiction. A question is whether ‘Meng’ should be interpreted as *mo’an* and the entire title *cau mo’an* (‘ruler’) *luk/lūk*, or as the initial syllable of a name of the same form as *mānrāy*, in which *mān* is Burmese for ‘king’.

Thus immediately before and after the *CMC* reign of Tilokarāj *MSL* gives support to the reign names and sequence of *CMC*, but what is treated in *CMC*, and other chronicles, as a great reign in mid-15th century, merits, in *MSL* too, the remark of Wade about “hugely dislocated accounts” (see below).

There is sufficient concordance to prove that in the 15th century *Ba-bai Da-Dian* in *MSL* was referring to Chiang Mai. The 14th-century entries of *MSL* and those of *Yuan-shih*, however, do not give full support to local sources, and suggest that the early king lists, whether of four generations as in inscription 62, or of six to eight generations as in the 1410 Phayao inscription and the chronicles, are all legendary before the time of the king recorded in 1369 as *son saen nā*, which helps confirm the proposal that until that time it was Lamphun, not Chiang Mai, which was the most important center. That is, the first one hundred years of Chiang Mai history, and its founder king *Mānrāy*, whose very name has inspired complex folk etymologies, are fiction.

One peculiarity in the *MSL* sections on Chiang Mai is that, like *CMC*, it does not record the title *mahārāj*, given the ample epigraphic evidence for that title in

<sup>126</sup> There was another intervening “pacification superintendent”, “Dao Ban-ya zhe” (*dāo bañā zhe?*) in 1450, but as Wade 1991a:16 has explained, this is obviously an error; and Dao Ban-ya zhe belongs to Laos, not Chiang Mai.

<sup>127</sup> Wade 1991b:22-24.



Lanna, and the *MSL* interest in it in other polities.<sup>128</sup>

### Meaning and sources of the *MSL* titles for Cambodia

The Cambodian titles, as will be clear in the discussion below, are only that- and no names. Their near identity to Ayutthayan titles indicates either overwhelming influence from Ayutthaya in the period of less than a century before 1370, or perhaps the influence of Chinese scribes and translators who were more familiar with *Hsien*, if, as Wade writes, “the diplomatic/trade relationships between Southeast Asian and Chinese rulers were usually mediated through Chinese residing in those countries [who] ... drafted [letters] for the Thai rulers to the Chinese court”. Given this, and the circumstance that *Hsien* and Cambodian envoys sometimes traveled together in the 14th century, it may have been that Chinese intermediaries supplying information to Chinese record keepers just referred to the Cambodian rulers as ‘king’ using more familiar terms from *Hsien*.<sup>129</sup>

In the *MSL* the four most important terms in Cambodian kingly titles have become *samtec*, *cau*, *bò*, and *bañā*, all unknown or very rare (*samtec*) in inscriptions up to mid-14th century, and there are no more *varma* (*pa-mo*) or *kamrateñ* (*kan-mu-ting*) in the Chinese records.

There seems to have been agreement among Coedès, Wolters, and now Wade that *canda* and *canlie* represent *samtec* < Angkorean *samtac*. The increased importance of this title may indicate increasing influence from the Khmer milieu beyond the Dangrek mountains, since the clearest Angkor occurrences of *samtac* as a king’s title were from that region. That title was also known in the Sukhothai area in the 14th century, probably borrowed from Khmer Lophburi, and in Lanna titles in the 15th century, there also no doubt borrowed from the South.

Coedès suggested that the titles, *pao-p’i-sie*, *p’o-p’i-ya*, and *p’ing-ya* represented *bañā*, which in the last instance, at least, seems obvious<sup>130</sup>, and, as noted above, the first two, probably *bo bañā*, seem confirmed for *Hsien* by the *Sejarah Melayu*, and must have quickly been adopted in Cambodia too. Indeed, examination of all indubitably genuine titles from local sources shows that *bañā/brañā* (/ph(r)aya/) is the only possible term which could lie behind the Chinese *p’i-yeh*, *p’i-ya*, or *p’ing-ya*.

In the titlature of the third of the Cambodian rulers; between *ts’an-lie/samdac* and *p’ingya/bañā* is a character read *cau*, which by its position corresponds to *pao* and *p’o* of the preceding rulers’ titles. *Chao/zhao* is Thai, and *samdec/samdac cau bañā* was a genuine title, although not for kings in extant inscriptions.<sup>131</sup>

*Samtec cau bañā*, the first term of which is Khmer, is indubitably genuine, found, albeit rarely, in Ayutthayan and northern Thai records as early as the

<sup>128</sup> Wade 1991a:95.

<sup>129</sup> Wade, 2000:264, 272. The single occurrence of *na-da* as the title of an overseas Chinese envoy from Cambodia in 1452 should probably not be interpreted as *rāja* (Wade 1991a:113), for *rāja* does not seem to have been used that way in Cambodia. If *na-da* is a single occurrence, its meaning may be impossible to ascertain. Wade has now suggested, in a personal communication, that it may have been used for ‘*nakhoda*’.

<sup>130</sup> Wolters 1966a:48; Coedès 1964:425-26.

<sup>131</sup> Wolters 1966a:49; Coedès 1964:426; Briggs 1948:15, has impossible restorations, “*samtec Chao Siri Kamboja*”, and “*samtac Prah Phaya*”, but he was right, n. 37, in emphasizing that the names given by the Chinese were purely titles.

fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the forms *cau bañā* and *bañā* were used even earlier<sup>132</sup>. The latter are not found, however, in any of the rare contemporary Cambodian records; nor in Angkor inscriptions, and the Cambodian chronicles, whether accurate or not, use *cau bañā* only for Yāt and Dhammarājā I (15th century), Aṅg Cand (16th century), and then for several princes at the end of the sixteenth century when European reports also confirm that this was a title of princes, but not of kings<sup>133</sup>. *Samtec cau bañā*, is not found in any early contemporary Cambodian document, and when used in later compositions is never given to a reigning king. The *Nong* chronicles use it for Dhammarājā I and Ṭamkhāt (15th-16th centuries) before their coronation<sup>134</sup>, but this is just in a section of the chronicle which may be least reliable. According to the *1170 Fragment*, the title *samtec cau bañā* was given to one of four minor princes (*braḥ vaṅś nòy*) by Suriyobārṇ in his reorganization of the royal family in 1602<sup>135</sup>. Are we to conclude, nevertheless, that the Cambodian court was using this very rare combination as a reigning king's title in the late fourteenth century? And what are we to make of this use of identical titles in *Hsien* and in Cambodia--moreover titles which are not found earlier in Angkor inscriptions? The evidence of original inscriptions plus *MSL* suggests that *samtec*, in origin a Khmer title, although perhaps provincial, spread northward to Sukhothai, where it was combined with the Thai-Mon *cau bañā*, and then re-exported to Lanna, Ayutthaya, and probably from there, to post-Angkor Cambodia.

Examination of all genuine Cambodian and Ayutthayan titles shows that *samtec*, *samtec cau bañā* or *cau bañā* were never complete, distinctive titles of any king, but, when used, either preceded a distinctive title such as *srī dharmāsokarāj*, or an apparent proper name such as *ṅvva phā sum*<sup>136</sup>, or occurred alone merely in the sense of 'the king', or 'His Majesty'. What the Chinese records contain, then, is not complete, or even necessarily genuine titlature, but simply terms meaning 'the king', and in the case of the 1378 record, 'the king of Kambujā'. The same phenomenon is seen later in the European records of Cambodia which also lack distinctive titles and which merely show various terms for 'His majesty' – 'Prauncar' < *braḥ onkār*, 'Nacqui sumaday peraorachyoncar' < *nak samtec braḥ rāj onkār*, 'Prabantul' < *braḥ pandūl*, etc<sup>137</sup>.

Moreover, the terms recorded by the Europeans are such as Cambodians habitually used when speaking of the king, and it is probable that they were picked up by the Europeans aurally rather than through written communication. In assessing the significance of such titles in non-native sources, then, it is necessary to consider the mode of communication, and to ascertain whether distortion has crept into the transmission.

As an illustration take the titles recorded by Pigafetta, chronicler of Magellan's voyage, for kings of Cambodia and Siam. Although not touching Cambodia and writing from hearsay, he noted that in 1521-22 the king of Cambodia was called 'saret

<sup>132</sup> Vickery 1974:170-71.

<sup>133</sup> Vickery 1977a, annex II:13, 16, 18, 35-36, 45.

<sup>134</sup> Vickery 1977a, annex II:16, 17, 18, 20.

<sup>135</sup> *PP*. Vol. XLIV:268. The title was also given to ranking ministers in both Thailand and Cambodia in the 19th century, but this is not relevant for the discussion here.

<sup>136</sup> Griswold and Prasert 1969:105.

<sup>137</sup> Groslier 1958, Index:187-88. Note that Groslier's restorations are not always accurate, on which see Vickery 1989-1990. For explanation of *braḥ onkār* see Vickery 1977a:72-73.

zacabedera'.<sup>138</sup> Although Groslier surmised that 'saret' was for *samdec*,<sup>139</sup> it is more likely that Pigafetta had heard the base form, *stec/sdet*, often pronounced, especially by Thai, with a vowel between the first two consonants /sadet/, and that he perceived the dental as a flapped /r/. As for *zacabedera*, it probably was Pigafetta's aural impression of /cakabatirat/ <*cākrabartirāj*, which was included in the titles found in the Angkor Wat inscriptions of 1546 and 1579.<sup>140</sup> The same title, preceded by *siri* < *srī*, was also given by Pigafetta for the king of Siam, where *cākrabartirāj*, judging by chronicles and extant inscriptions, is more appropriate. Thus Pigafetta recorded plausible terms, but not necessarily full formal titles.

The principal term was one which could have been in use in either country at that time, but in real titles the terms *stec*, *samtec*, and *srī* < *śrī*, which Pigafetta placed before *cākrabartirāj*, never immediately preceded that term, and thus Pigafetta's recorded titles, although containing genuine terms, are not genuine as coherent wholes.<sup>141</sup>

Lack of knowledge about how the Chinese acquired their ideas of Cambodian and Ayutthayan titles complicates the use of Chinese records of such titles as evidence for cultural or political influence. The title *samtec cau bañā*, in the fourteenth century, although the first term is Khmer, certainly seems to be more Ayutthayan, and perhaps taken from Sukhothai, than Cambodian, and if used for reigning Cambodian kings, would represent Ayutthayan influence, but it is not yet clear whether the influence was on the Cambodian court, or on the Chinese' informants, who were using it as a loose term for 'king'. One may not discount the latter, particularly since the Chinese in the 1370s and 1380s had had much more experience dealing with Menam-basin polities than with Cambodia, and the roughly similar titles in both areas could as easily have led to confusion for the Chinese as for several generations of later historians<sup>142</sup>.

These considerations may give us a clue to the meaning of the enigmatic name of the *pa-shan* king, *hu-êrh-na*, mentioned in the first Chinese record of contact with Cambodia in the 14th century.

One explanation is that Pa-shan was Ba Phnom, downriver from Phnom Penh on the east bank, because the character 'shan' in Chinese means 'mountain', that is 'phnom' (PM). This Ba Phnom king was probably a local chief trying to establish trade with China from a good location on the river. A different explanation for the name which fits the same economic supposition is that *pāsān* was a local, not Chinese name, still known in the 19th-century across the river in the province of Treang (now in Takeo). As for *hu-êrh-na*, it was probably the Chinese perception of *karuna* which

<sup>138</sup> Pigafetta [Blair and Robertson 1973], vol. 34:130-131; Vickery 1977a: 273-274.

<sup>139</sup> Groslier 1958:144, n. 6.

<sup>140</sup> The same interpretation of 'zacabedera' was put forward in Piat 1973:119-120.

<sup>141</sup> Pigafetta [Blair and Robertson 1973], vol. 34:130-131.

<sup>142</sup> Although Wolters 1970:110, mentions the Chinese court's concern in early Ming times for qualified interpreters, the same author in his article on *Chên-li-fu*, (Wolters 1960:16), wonders if the Chinese could have understood Khmer at the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century, notes that although "Cambodian embassies had visited China ... there do not seem to be references to their memorials", and comments, that "diplomatic communications must often have been by means of oral communications ...". As dealings with Cambodia became more intense in the late 14<sup>th</sup> century, the lower Menam centers, where the Chinese had already established better contact, would have been logical suppliers--since Khmer was still an important language there--both of oral interpreters accompanying Chinese visitors to Cambodia, and translators of written material for the Chinese government.

was used in some Cambodian royal titles since Angkor times, and together with *brah/preah*, as *preah karuna* is still a polite colloquial expression for referring to the king, and often pronounced to sound like /kornaa, konaa/.<sup>143</sup>

Another matter to which Wolters alluded, and which finds mention in Wade's study of *MSL*, is the language and script of documents sent from the Southeast Asian authorities to China. In different contexts *MSL* refers to *fan* scripts in Southeast Asia, presumably of the Indic type, such as Thai and Khmer, and in 1487, following difficulties in reading a document in *fan* script from Ayutthaya, the Chinese authorities said that henceforth they would only accept documents in Arabic (*hui*) script, and "difficult-to-understand *fan* scripts were not to be used".<sup>144</sup> In that incident the Chinese believed that fraud had been attempted, but their remark about "difficult-to-understand *fan* scripts" suggests that there may have been a change in the type of *fan*. As Wade noted in another publication, the *MSL* said that "recently, there were differences between the language of the gold-leaf memorial ... and the tally-slips and dispatch note provided [and] ... The king suspects ... fraud".<sup>145</sup> This was during a time when the Ayutthayan court language, under influence from Sukhothai, may have been changing from Khmer to Thai. This seems supported by the circumstance that just ten years later, we see that the "Translators Institute did not have a department specialized in translation of Siamese script. Thus sent dispatch ... requesting... persons with knowledge of Siam's language and script", apparently meaning that the requirement to use Arabic was not enforced.<sup>146</sup>

Why should this problem arise only at the end of the 15th century after China had been receiving documents from *Hsien*-Ayutthaya for 200 years? Perhaps because the Ayutthayan court was changing to Thai script (used in Sukhothai and Chiang Mai in the 14th century) from the Khmer which had previously been in general use, or was changing its language from Khmer to Thai, even if the script used was still Khmer (see above.). Another *MSL* entry relevant to this subject is in 1578, which "noted that Siam Department has recently been established in Translators Institute in Beijing".<sup>147</sup> This was just when the final stage of Thai-ization of the formerly Khmer-Mon Ayutthaya had been completed by the new dynasty, originally of Sukhothai, who had seized the throne of Ayutthaya after throwing their support behind the Burmese invasion of 1569. Aside from finally being forced to recognize the Thai language, the Chinese seem not to have been disturbed by the war and its outcome. In 1575 the *MSL* references include "country of Siam offers tribute", and "replacement of Siam's seal and tally-slips approved".

### Fifteenth century events in Cambodia

As emphasized above, there are no extant reliable Cambodian sources for the first half of the 15th century; and the Ayutthayan sources, which reflect a close relationship with Cambodia, require careful analysis. On the East the very last Cham inscription, in Bien Hoa, just north of Saigon, seems to record a Cham invasion of Cambodia in the 15th century, although the date is not absolutely certain, and the

<sup>143</sup> For the name *pāsān* see below, and for *karuna* see Pou 1992:94.

<sup>144</sup> Wade 1991a:80-81; Wade 1991b:107; on *hui* Wade, personal communication.

<sup>145</sup> Wade 2000:268.

<sup>146</sup> Wade 1991b:107, at date 1497.

<sup>147</sup> Wade 2000:293. On language and script at that time see Vickery 1973a.

toponyms have not been identified.<sup>148</sup> Its vague details, however, are congruent with the active role of Cham in Cambodia's politics and economy reported by the first Europeans in the late 16th and early 17th centuries; and it fits a statement in the *MSL* for 1414, recording that "Cambodia complains that it had recently been repeatedly attacked by Champa".<sup>149</sup> Probably the Champa-Cambodia conflict was similar to that between Cambodia and *Hsien-Ayutthaya*, rivalry over maritime trade.

This statement of the *MSL* is unusual, for in general those records have little about conflicts within or among mainland Southeast Asian states, except between *Hsien* and *malayu*/Malacca, and between Vietnam and Champa.

The Chinese records show that in the late 14th and early 15th centuries Cambodia was an important sea power in close relations with China, not so important as *Hsien-Ayutthaya*, but perhaps important enough to be a rival, even though the two had close cultural, linguistic, religious, and traditional political affinities.

As Cambodia's maritime orientation developed, Angkor, far from the sea, would have been less important economically, and we must presume that ports farther south on the rivers, such as the *pa-shan*/Ba Phnom of *Hu-êrh-na*, gained in importance. Among those would have been the location of modern Phnom Penh, where an Angkor-style temple had already been erected in the 12th-13th century.<sup>150</sup>

We have seen that neither the *MSL* nor the Ayutthayan chronicle tradition which most agrees with it in our period is at all useful for 15th-century Cambodia. It is surprising that they do not record the mid-century Ayutthayan occupation of Angkor, dated in *LP* in 1431, and treated in detail in the Ayutthayan chronicle tradition of *2/K.104*. This event is given importance in the Cambodian chronicles, but they are not independent confirmation, given their derivation and manifold weaknesses. In fact, since the Ponhea Yat/*bañā yāt* tale is structurally similar to events at the turn of the 16th-17th centuries confirmed by European observation, and shows confusion of the names *nakhon in/indrarāja* which might seem to link it with uncertain events in Ayutthayan history, it could legitimately be argued that the entire story is one of those which I have argued as borrowed from later times and/or from Ayutthaya to fill out a fictional period in the Cambodian chronicles.<sup>151</sup>

The *2/K.104* fragments, however, show the authenticity of that mid-15th century event, at least in outline, if not in every detail. These texts deserve credence because of the way they link, and make clear, contexts from other texts, including *LP*, which, apparently through truncation, make little sense by themselves.

The noteworthy feature of *2/K.104* in this respect is that the passages which link it to other texts are not explanatory, not conjectures, not epicycles, but are simple statements of events which seem to result from mutual incorporation of elements from similar records. Although much more detailed, the fragments follow the same general outline as *LP*. I think it is safe, then, insofar as any conclusion in the study of early

<sup>148</sup> Aymonier 1891:84-85; Maspero 1928:271, n.2, who, among the various proposed dates, preferred 1421. Very few translations of Cham-language inscriptions are reliable. They were done *ad hoc* by persons who were not Chamists, and there has been no further work on them since the 1920s.

<sup>149</sup> Wade 1991a:88.

<sup>150</sup> De Bernon 2001. This is enough to show the fictional character of the foundation of Phnom Penh by Ponhea Yat/*bañā yāt* as recounted in the chronicles, and, at least in outline, accepted by modern historians (Coedès 1913), which led to neglect of the importance of the Phnom Penh area, where remnants of structures and inscriptions from the 7th and 8th centuries are scattered, showing that it was already important at that time.

<sup>151</sup> Vickery 1977a

chronicles is safe, to accept *2/K.104* as representing an entirely unsuspected old Ayutthayan chronicle tradition, more detailed than, and probably older than *LP*, and based on the same records. In fact, it could be part of the original long chronicle of which *LP* is an abbreviated version.

Its particular clues for the credibility of the Ayutthayan occupation of Angkor and the reaction by *Yāt* are in the way it shows the meaning of (1) the mysterious *LP* passage about *prāp barrg*, which the late 17th-century writer(s) of *LP* themselves would not have understood, and (2) the exile of *cau bañā rām* in 1409. The meaning I have adduced for *barrg* is confirmed by true events in Cambodia at the turn of the 16th-17th centuries.

Before the first datable passage in 1441, *2/K.104* describes hostilities against the Mon on the Western border, and the first datable event was a change of Mon kings, the death of *bañā rām* and succession of *bañā baro*, which the Mon chronicle *Rājādhirāj* places in 1441.<sup>152</sup> This is a nearly blank period in *LP*. Then *2/K.104* goes on, “after some time”. but apparently in the same year, to events in *nakhon hluai* (Angkor) where the Ayutthayan king’s son, *cau bañā braḥ nakhon in*, was ruling. For the years covered by *2/K.104*, however, and from 1431 to 1438, *LP* is blank. It records two northern campaigns in 1438 and 1442, with no political activities in between, and none in 1443; and *2/K.104* may well be supplying details for these blank periods.

According to *LP*, *braḥ nakhon in* was ruling in *nakhon hluai* because in 1431 his father had conquered that city and given it to his son to rule. *2/K.104* implies, then, that the Ayutthayan occupation of Angkor, instead of one year as in the Cambodian chronicles, lasted at least 10 years. “Later on”, but before 1443, the next explicit date in the text, “*cau yāt*, son of *braḥ rām cau*, whom the King had sent to reside in Caturmukh [Phnom Penh], persuaded all the Khmer to rebel against... *braḥ nakhon in*.”

This sends us back to a peculiar context of *LP* in 1409 when a king not mentioned in *MSL*, *cau bañā rām*, was overthrown by *braḥ indarājā* of Suphanburi and a group of officials, and sent to govern a place named *padāgūcām*, which I have explained as another name of Caturmukh-Phnom Penh.<sup>153</sup>

The preparations for *Yāt*’s revolt are detailed, with a wealth of names and titles of participants, and another feature arguing for the age of this text is the high status of the ranks *khun* and *nāy*, which in later centuries was lower.<sup>154</sup> *Yāt*’s first revolt failed, implicitly in 1442, before the next date in the text which is 1443, and he himself was captured. On the Ayutthayan side, *nakhon in* became ill soon after his victory over *Yāt*, and died. Then the text goes on at length about *Yāt*’s adventures in captivity, his escape, and further campaigns, which have still not succeeded when in [806] 1444, the next date in the text, the story in *2/K.104* switches to Ayutthaya’s relations with the North.

<sup>152</sup> Other histories of Burma place it in 1446 (Phayre 1883 [1998]:84.

<sup>153</sup> Vickery 1977b:57-59. Wyatt 1999:88 wrote, “Vickery (1977:57-60) persuasively argues that Ramaracha was sent, not to Pathakhucham, but to Cambodia”, which is not quite right. My argument, which I maintain, was that *padāgūcām*/Pathakhucham, whither Rām was exiled, was a corruption of an ancient name for the location of Phnom Penh, called ‘Caturmukh’ in *2/K.104*.

<sup>154</sup> Note *Nāy Ind* in an important post in 14th-century Sukhothai, and the status of *khun* as *mo’an* chiefs in the Sukhothai inscriptions discussed above, and as central government ministers until the so-called reforms of Trailok in mid-fifteenth century (Vickery 1996a)

After escape from captivity Yāt took refuge with, and was aided by, the *barrg* (‘group’) or *mahā barrg* (‘great group’), who are mentioned frequently throughout the text. That term also occurs in *LP*, at the date 806/1444, in the sentence *satec pai prāp barrg*, “the king went to put down the *barrg*”, which has defied the efforts of all students of *LP*.<sup>155</sup> We find in *2/K.104* practically the same phrase when King Paramarājādhirāj orders his son Nagar Indr, in the same language found in *LP* at the date 1444, to “go put down the *barrg*”, adding “in Caturmukh”, which, although a name for Phnom Penh, in this context must refer to the entire area supporting Yāt, and also in the following sentence with Nagar Indr’s move to “go put down the great *barrg*”. The implied date is 805/1443, but since there were more battles with the *barrg*, there is no real discrepancy of date, and it is clear that both *LP* and *2/K.104* are based at this point on the same records. In neither case can the statement be considered an explanation, since the passages are corrupt, and probably neither the compilers of *LP* nor of *2/K.104* had any idea of what the *barrg* were, or the location of the campaign against them, any more than Frankfurter or Wood or Cushman or Wyatt. The *barrg* and *mahā barrg* figure several more times in the story, as a group of people who were allies of Yāt.

What were the *barrg*? A clue is provided by two passages in which the *barrg* are called a race or ethnic group, *phau* (𑀧𑀸𑀓). The first comes after the campaign against the *barrg* mentioned above, in which they were defeated and Yāt was captured. He then escaped and took refuge with Khun Blapblājaiy, who sent him to the *phau barrg*, ‘*barrg* tribe’, and who was of that *phau* himself. The next such passage is just a few lines later, after mention of the date [805/1443], when the scene shifts to *bañā kaev* and *bañā dai*, who were *phau mahā barrg*, “of the tribe of great *barrg*”.

The *barrg* were thus an ethnic group. Judging from Yāt’s itinerary when he first met them, on his way from Caturmukh to Ayutthaya while in captivity, they must have been located somewhere in western Cambodia or the adjoining provinces of Thailand (to use the modern terms).

The *barrg* are not the only ethnic group associated with Yāt. In the second half of the story, between A.D. 1443 and 1444, the *jòn/Chong*, a group still living in the same area as that proposed above for the *barrg*, appear. A few lines later Yāt is said to have “organized the Khmer, Chong and Pear (*barrṇ*)” as military forces; and

<sup>155</sup> Frankfurter 1909:48, date *cula* 806, where *prāp barrg* is rendered as “suppressed the contending factions”, in which ‘contending’ was Frankfurter’s imagination, not justified by the text; Wood 1925:155, where he confessed his inability to deal with the phrase, but suggested it was a corrupted place-name. This passage would have been a chance for Richard Cushman to provide justification for the later claims made on his behalf by David Wyatt (Cushman 2000: xviii) for his “meticulous” translation, “exceptionally faithful to the original”, “work[ing] very hard to translate every single word of the texts”. Instead, p. 16, Cushman followed Franfurter in giving an imaginatively emended translation, “pacify a rebellious faction”. Of course, Cushman did not live to provide the scholarly apparatus in which explanations for such problems might have been placed. Neither did he include this *2/K.104* chronicle in his work, but Vickery 1977b was published while he was working, and it should have warned him that, even if he wished to insist that *barrg* was ‘faction’, ‘rebellious’ had no place in a ‘meticulous translation’. Perhaps Cushman was displaying fidelity to the Cornell Canon, according to which writing which is contrary to what has been produced there, if it cannot be easily refuted, is not to be acknowledged. Wyatt 2001, 2002, 2004 are examples of this. One may infer that the authors of the original *1157* chronicle also had trouble at this point, possibly with a text including a passage about *prāp barrg*, for their corresponding passage says that the Ayutthayan king “went up to attack Chiang Mai once again” (Cushman 2000:16).

that is where the explanation of *barrg* lies. The name of the ethnic group, which is still in existence and whose name is conventionally romanized as Pear, is a homonym in Khmer with the word for ‘colour’. Both are pronounced more or less as /pɔa/, although the word for ‘color’, as in Thai, preserves the Sanskrit etymology, *barṇ*, while the ethnic name is at present written *bār* in Thai.<sup>156</sup> It appears that a scribe had felt that a term understood by him as ‘color’ was corrupt as the name for a group of people, and he ‘corrected’ it to the, for him, more logical *barrg*, or ‘group’.

Geoff Wade commented here (personal communication) on the unlikely circumstance that 𑄓𑄢, the final consonant in *barṇ*, would be mistaken for 𑄓𑄣, the final consonant in *barrg*. This is true, but my argument is not that a copyist misread the final consonant, but that he did not understand the context and arbitrarily altered it.

Some additional confirmation of the explanation comes from an entirely different source, *RA*, in a passage dealing with an early seventeenth-century incident between Ayutthaya and Cambodia<sup>157</sup>. There it says that another Cambodian rebel had gone off with the *joṇ barrg*, which, when compared with the *joṇ barrṇ* whom Yāt organized, shows that the intention in both cases was ‘Chong and Pear’, two linguistically close Mon-Khmer ethnic groups who still live fairly close together in western Cambodia and southeastern Thailand. Their location, however, *saen sa:doṇ*, sounds more like Kompong Thom in the central North than in the West, but the differences in the name among the 1157 chronicles show that it may be quite garbled.<sup>158</sup>

It is also worth noting that the Cambodian *Ang Eng* chronicle, in its relation of those events, states that Khun Blājaiy, in 2/K.104 Khun Blapblājaiy, led the *bāk* (= *barrg*) *buok*, or ‘group of supporters’, to protect Yāt. In a later incident ethnic groups in the same region are called *mahā bān ka:hriaṇ*, of which *mahā bān* is a Thai phonetic rendering of *mahā barrṇ*. Of course *Ang Eng*, because of its anomalies, may only be taken as a corroboration of tradition, not of fact, but the 1170 *Fragment* written in 1808, writing of events known also to contemporary Europeans, confirms the importance of the same ethnic groups in western Cambodia (see below).<sup>159</sup>

With the region of the *barrg* situated in western Cambodia by virtue of the multiple references to these ethnic groups another mysterious term of *LP* finds explanation, that is, the *pa:dāy khṣem*, called in *LP* a *tāmpal*/tambon where the Ayutthayan king set up camp on his way to *prāp barrg*, and which one writer has placed as far afield as Malaysia.<sup>160</sup>

In 2/K.104 much of Yāt’s activity unfolds around a place called *pāsānti*, which

<sup>156</sup> These are modern, ‘correct’ spellings. In earlier times the two homonyms might have been spelled identically, and for a Thai speaker *barrṇ*, *barṇ*, and *pār* would all have the same pronunciation. Correct Sanskrit for ‘color’ is *varṇa*.

<sup>157</sup> *RA*:208, at the date 953, Hare Year, A.D. 1591, which date corresponds to the *LP* date 965/1603, on which see below. This detail, however is not in *LP*, which only says that Ayutthayan troops “were able to take *mo’an khòm*”, where Cushman 2000:190 translated *mo’an* as ‘municipality’.

<sup>158</sup> That is, in Kompong Thom province there is a river named Stu'ng Sen (*saen*), and an important town named in current romanization Staung (*stoṇ*, Thai pronunciation /satoṇ/ ), which, however, is not on the *saen* river. Thus there seems to be more than one level of confusion. See Cushman 2000:190, where he has translated *tāmpal* as ‘vicinity’.

<sup>159</sup> These details of *Ang Eng* are from the Thai text in *PP*, III:180, 183, corrected by the original manuscript in the National Library, Bangkok. Coedès 1918, in his translation of *Ang Eng*, overlooked those details. On the quality of *Ang Eng* and the 1170 *Fragment* see Vickery 1977a:chapter 5.

<sup>160</sup> Baker 2003, citing Marrison 1949:61–3.



appears as the territory of the *barrg/barrṅ*. That name consists of two elements, *pā*, which in Thai might be translated as ‘forest’, but which in Khmer, pronounced /ba/, is a common initial component of place names, and *sānti*, or ‘peace’, the same meaning as *khsem* in the *LP* context.<sup>161</sup> The name *pāsān* (modern Khmer /basan/) is found in a nineteenth-century Cambodian oath text, which, in an enumeration of local deities, combines the toponyms *pāsāk pāsān sruk trāmṅ* (Treang), the last known in the nineteenth century as a province on the West side of the Basak river south of Phnom Penh, in the modern province of Takeo.<sup>162</sup> The first term in *LP* looks very much like a corruption of the Khmer *pandāy*, or ‘fortress’, a component of other place names. It is likely that they are two versions of a single place name, consisting of an element meaning ‘peace’ preceded by one of two Khmer terms commonly found as the initial element of place names. The place itself still cannot be identified, but the context of *2/K.104* plus the oath text cited above shows that it must have been somewhere in western Cambodia.<sup>163</sup> Basan in Treang accords better with the location of Yāt’s activities than the otherwise unknown Basan located well east of the rivers in Srei Santhor in the Cambodian semi-legendary stories of Yāt, which so badly misled Wolters.<sup>164</sup>

One more unclear reference in *LP* which seems to find an explanation in *2/K.104* concerns the *bañā kaev* and *bañā daiy* whom the victorious king *paramarājādhirāj* had brought from Angkor to Ayutthaya in 1431. The title *bañā* should have left no doubt that they were persons. *Bañā kaev* and *bañā daiy* are well known from *LP* and the long Cambodian chronicles, although the stories differ somewhat. In *LP* they appear as prisoners taken to Angkor along with a number of images<sup>165</sup>, a scenario which agrees with the details of *2/K.104*, where they are also identified as ethnically Pear and seem to have been monks, astrologers, or magicians. The generally most accurate Cambodian chronicles do not mention them; and those which do include them, as officials who betray Angkor to the Thai, are late nineteenth-century compositions which could have borrowed the theme from Thai chronicles. The oldest Cambodian version, *Ang Eng*, does not have the names *kaev* and *daiy*, but relates that the Cambodian king, faced with the Thai invasion, sent two monks and two officials as a delegation to offer the city to the invader; and the name of one of the officials, *khun manorath*, if we assume a corruption of *mano-ratn*, could be a disguised pun on the name *kaev*, ‘crystal’.<sup>166</sup>

One historian has tried to interpret those two names as referring to cult objects rather than human beings; but the title *bañā*, given only to persons, precludes that solution<sup>167</sup>. In *2/K.104*, which may represent the oldest record, they are definitely

<sup>161</sup> Occasionally /ba/ in colloquial speech has been confused with /preah/ <*braḥ*>, as in ‘Bako’, the 19<sup>th</sup>-century French interpretation of the name of the Angkor temple now known as ‘Preah Ko’. See Pou 1991:205, n. 5.

<sup>162</sup> *Kruṅ kambujādhipatī* [Kingdom of Cambodia], *Saccāpranidhān* [oath], ms. No. MCC 56-036, Buddhist Institute, Phnom Penh, for which I wish to thank David Chandler for a copy. See Chandler 1974; Garnier 1871:344, n. 2.

<sup>163</sup> Cushman 2000:16 did not try to explain “Pathai Kasem”, but inexplicably translated *tāmpal* as ‘municipality’, rather than ‘vicinity’, as above.

<sup>164</sup> Wolters 1966a.

<sup>165</sup> *LP* date *cula* 793/ 1431.

<sup>166</sup> Coedès 1918:26. Such disguised puns are a feature of the *Ang Eng* chronicle (Vickery 1977a:167-200).

<sup>167</sup> Boisselier 1967:317-18. David Wyatt’s new contribution to the subject (Wyatt 2002:34), that

persons, whom the Ayutthayan king had brought involuntarily from Angkor, and who, rather than betraying Angkor, are portrayed as planning an insurrection in Ayutthaya, for which they are executed.

The long story of *Yāt* shows Cambodia divided into two competing regions, North and South, and both led by chiefs of Ayutthayan, but still no doubt Khmer, origin, the North, Angkor, under sons of the Ayutthayan king, and the South under the son of a former Ayutthayan king exiled to Caturmukh. Thus the conflict may have been seen as internal, with *nakhon hluai* the ancient ancestral home of the Ayutthayan royalty, and thus of no great interest to the Chinese. Places under *Yāt*'s control, in addition to Caturmukh, are Lovek, Pursat, Babaur, and Choeung Prey, and his main forces seem to be non-Khmer ethnic groups, especially Pear and Chong from the western borderlands.

There is now a growing consensus that the impetus for the growth of early Ayutthaya may have been the same increased trading opportunities resulting from changes in Chinese policies as were responsible for the growth of Malacca<sup>168</sup>. Just as in Malacca and the lower Chao Phraya basin in which Ayutthaya developed, the end of the fourteenth century saw a flurry of new economic activity in Cambodia. Between the 1370s and 1419 more missions were exchanged with China than during the entire Angkor period, and it is difficult to resist the inference that changes in the Chinese trading patterns were producing the same effects as in the neighboring regions. The ultimate result was an increasing importance of river ports near the junction of four river branches where Phnom Penh stands today, and a decrease in the wealth and power of Angkor. The activities of *Yāt* as described in *2/K.104* seem to show part of that process at work as he attracted people to his area and began to consolidate a new government.

The new Cambodian center would of course have been an economic rival of Ayutthaya, and the latter would naturally have tried to suppress or acquire control over it. The *2/K.104* text seems to allude to such an effort in the dispatching of a deposed Ayutthayan king to Caturmukh. The activities of *Yāt*, even though directed against an Ayutthayan encroachment as in the traditional histories, seem in *2/K.104* to have been directed against a rival Ayutthayan faction, and less inspired by a desire to hold Angkor than to establish himself solidly in the commercially more favourable region south of the Tonle Sap and in the western borderlands. The communications of the day did not permit prolonged Ayutthayan control over southern Cambodia; it was only much later, as a result of more rapid growth in a more favorable situation, that Ayutthaya was finally able to dominate its neighbor.

The *2/K.104* version of the *Yāt* story accounts for the strong *Hsien*-Ayutthaya influences in Cambodian titles in subsequent reigns, of which the first original documents are the Angkor Wat inscriptions of 1546 and 1564. That story, however, also leaves uncertainty as to the length of the Ayutthayan occupation of Angkor. The Cambodian chronicles say *Yāt* defeated the 'Siamese' within a year, yet do not claim that he made any effort to reoccupy Angkor, settling instead in the South, ultimately

---

“‘Phraya [*sic*] Kaeo’ and ‘Phraya Thai’ may simply be... petty rulers of Vietnamese and Thai ethnicity” is in even greater contradiction with all the sources. Moreover, Wyatt badly fudges on the evidence, first, following the inaccurate transcription in Cushman 2000 of *LP*'s *bañā* as *phraya*, and then in referring to “the initial reference to” the two persons, as though the story of *LP* dated 1431 and that of *RA* and other such texts dated 1421 were separate events. See Cushman 2000:15.

<sup>168</sup> Wolters 1970:67; Baker 2003a.

in *caturmukh*-Phnom Penh, which he allegedly founded, although that story lacks credibility.

Certainty over Cambodian reoccupation of Angkor only comes 100 years later with the king named 'Ang Chan' in the chronicles, presumably the author of the inscriptions of 1546 and 1564. Even he, according to the chronicles, was under strong Ayutthayan influence, took refuge there to escape a revolt, but later defeated Ayutthayan incursions at a time when Ayutthaya was preoccupied with Burma.<sup>169</sup> Although much of the chronicle story of Ang Chan may be true, and there was a flurry of architectural repair and reconstruction with new Buddha images which have been dated credibly to his reign, the only really secure date, aside from the two inscriptions, assuming they are his, is the date of his death, 1566, for which two more inscriptions, one at Angkor Wat and one at Wat Nokor in Kompong Cham, support the most reliable chronicle.<sup>170</sup>

Thereafter several inscriptions from the time of his son and grandson show that the chronicles are no longer fiction, that the royalty still had some true knowledge of Angkor, the construction of which they attribute to their ancestors, and that we may rely for the end of the 16th and beginning of the 17th century on the chronicles together with rather detailed reports by Spanish and Portuguese envoys and adventurers who were active in Cambodia from the 1580s to roughly 1600.

For the time from Yāt to Ang Chan the Cambodian chronicles are at their worst. As a heuristic device I have applied the animal year synchronisms for Yāt in the chronicles to the time period implied by *2/K.104*, and have drawn a tentative conclusion that Yāt's victory would have been in 1445 and his death in 1493 at the age of either 67 or 79, thus alive at the birth of Ang Chan.<sup>171</sup>

What exactly may be inferred about events in Cambodia during this very hazy period? Contrary to what is implied, but not clearly stated, in the Cambodian chronicles, the hero Yāt was not of Angkor royalty, but son of a deposed Ayutthayan king exiled to Cambodia, where he married into the non-Khmer population of the western borderlands who were later Yāt's allies in his struggle against the Ayutthayan occupiers of Angkor.

No chronicle provides any story about the fate of the Angkor royal family after their city was occupied by Ayutthaya. Close study of Cambodian chronicles indicates that their textual ancestor was a 'chronicle of the kings of Lovek', of whom

<sup>169</sup> The fact of a major revolt in the first half of the 16th century, and which brought 'Ang Chan' to the throne, is confirmed by the memoir of the Portuguese missionary Gaspar da Cruz, who was in to Cambodia in 1555-1557 (Boxer 1953:62-62), and was the first European to leave a personal report on the country, although he did not provide much detail. He wrote that the King was in Lovek, and that he had become king "because the people rebelled against one of his brothers who was king and he subdued them, therefore his brother gave him the kingdom". This rebellion must have been what the chronicles call the rebellion of 'Stec Kan', who is said to have killed Ang Chan's brother King Sugandhapad in 1512.

<sup>170</sup> Vickery 1977a:229-235. Mannikka 1997:173-174 contains a bizarre treatment of the inscriptions of 1546 and 1564, the sources for which are not provided, and which I have been unable to discover. According to her, the king Mahāviṣṇuloka who, according to the inscriptions, had not finished the two bas-relief panels, and whom all since Coedès' study of the inscriptions have indentified with Sūryavarman II, builder of Angkor Wat, was Ang Chan, for whom she provides the aberrant dates 1529-1546, which I have not been able to find in any chronicle tradition, and the king who had the panels finished, and whose titles are in the inscriptions, was Ang Chan's son, crowned in 1546, again an unsourced date.

<sup>171</sup> Vickery 1977a:495-496.

Ang Chan was the first; and that he came to the throne after a rebellion displaced his brother.

There are two possible ways to link the stories of Yāt and Ang Chan, (1) Yāt was the father of Ang Chan and they were not of the Angkor lineage, or (2) Yāt was not the father of Ang Chan, who descended from the Angkor kings displaced by Ayutthaya. Of course, there is also the possibility that neither of them represented Angkor royalty, who just disappeared, but Ang Chan and his grandson claimed such descent in their inscriptions, and they showed a strong interest in Angkor, renewing its temples and at certain times residing there. Even so, there may have been other princes of the old dynasty and their descendants holding out in other places, just as occurred in Thailand after 1767.

From Ang Chan onwards the main economic and political center was at Lovek, not far north of Phnom Penh, and situated favorably as a river port. Kings and high officials, however, made pilgrimages to Angkor and left numerous inscriptions from the end of the 16th to the middle of the 18th century. Although there do not seem to be Chinese records to prove it, no doubt Lovek Cambodia was pursuing the maritime vocation begun in the 14th century, and which continued into the 17th, when for a time Cambodia was more important in Japanese trade than Ayutthaya.<sup>172</sup>

Unfortunately the *MSL* records for Cambodia in the 15th century are too succinct to be of help in interpreting the other documents examined above, and it seems unlikely that any further detail will be discovered. It might be worthwhile to have the *MSL* records for the 16th century to see if they support the supposition offered here.

Cambodian development was interrupted by another invasion from Ayutthaya in 1593-1594 under the new dynasty of Sukhothai origin which had gained the throne after helping the Burmese in their invasion in 1569. Peculiarly, this does not seem to have been given notice by the Chinese. At least it does not figure in Wade's summary of entries from the *MSL*.<sup>173</sup> This new Ayutthayan polity was not interested in Angkor, and went directly for Lovek, its rival in the international maritime network. The victory was short-lived, and soon the Thai had been driven from Cambodia by a prince of obscure origin known as Rām [of] Choeung Prei, one of the important centers of Yāt's power in 2/K.104.

Moreover, just as Yāt, of obscure ancestry, in Cambodian tradition drove Ayutthayan invaders from Angkor, after the Ayutthayan invasion and conquest of the new Cambodian capital Lovek in 1593, another obscure prince Rām [of] Choeung Prei, who may have been descended from Yāt, raised forces and dislodged the invaders from Lovek, in a campaign known to and reported by Europeans. Then the Europeans, who had served the 'legitimate' king who had been dislodged by the Ayutthayan invasion and who had sought refuge in Laos, came into conflict with Rām Choeung Prei and killed him before leaving for Laos to bring the old king home.

Then, according to the oldest and most detailed chronicle fragment for the period, "a Khmer *joñ* [a Pearic group], *Kaev braḥ blo 'ñ*, made himself chief in the West, gathered Khmer, *joñ*, *la:vā*, *ka:hrien*, and forest people" and went across Cambodia to fight against the sons of Rām Choeung Prei. This is reminiscent of the *bañā kaev* who was of the *barrg/barrñ* tribe, friends of Yāt. The Europeans also knew

<sup>172</sup> Ishii 1998:153-193

<sup>173</sup> Wade 2000:293.

of a *cau bañā kaev* involved in the internecine warfare of the time, but he may have been a different person.<sup>174</sup>

Given his Chong ethnicity, the name, *kaev braḥ blo 'n*, literal meaning ‘crystal-sacred fire’, suggests one of the kings of fire and water common to many of the non-Khmer ethnic groups around the borders of Cambodia. In the local Samre/Pear languages the term for those persons is *khvay*, translated as ‘sorcerer’.<sup>175</sup> Perhaps in this case ‘*kaev*’, ‘crystal’ in Khmer, was a distortion of ‘*khvay*’, not understood by Khmer writers. This would also fit the *bañā kaev* of the Yāt story, who was reputed to be a sorcerer or magician.

The name *kaev-braḥ-blo 'n* is interesting in its own right, and its elements ‘crystal-sacred-fire’, could also easily inspire legend. They seem to derive from the Angkorean *braḥ kaev bra bhlo 'n*, ‘sacred crystal [and] sacred fire’, which has not been satisfactorily explained; and, since he was a leader of the forest peoples of the western border region, he may have some connection with the ‘fire king’, who, together with the ‘water king’, is one of the important leaders in some of these groups.<sup>176</sup>

By 1599 the complex struggles among Cambodian factions, Cham and Malay interlopers, who were no doubt involved in maritime activities, and Europeans, eliminated many of the rivals, including most of the Europeans, until the surviving Cambodian aristocracy requested the return from Ayutthaya of a brother of the king displaced in 1593. After the return of this Prince /soriyopoa/ (<*sūryavarma*) in 1601-1602, Cambodia began a new period of development which lasted until after mid-century, and in which the country was well integrated into the international maritime circuit. This period included the reign of a king Chan-Rāmādhīpatī (1642-1658) who converted to Islam, no doubt to better integrate Cambodia into the international network led by the Muslim states of Nusantara.<sup>177</sup>

In a publication in a prestigious journal just three years ago, Claude Jacques has denied parts of the story I have summarized above, arguing that kings of the Angkor dynasty never left Angkor, that the kings of Phnom Penh and Lovek known from the chronicles were an entirely different lineage, as seen in the lack of *varman* names among them, that the chronicles never mention their ‘return’ to Angkor, and that the old Angkor lineage reappears in an inscription at Angkor Wat in 1579 by a king named ‘Tribhuvanādityavarman’ (really *tribhavanādityabarm*), and in a few more inscriptions in the same period. Jacques also considers that the King Soriyopoa placed on the throne of Lovek by the Thai was of that old Angkor lineage, and not of the Lovek family.<sup>178</sup>

According to Jacques major works of construction continued long after Jayavarman VII; the Bayon was not finished by Jayavarman VII, but by Jayavarman VIII (1243-1295), and the stone bridges not constructed until the 13th century. Some

<sup>174</sup> The source is the “1170 Fragment” of 1808. The “Ang Eng Fragment” of 1795, cited above may not be considered a true chronicle because its dates and sequence of events are incoherent. See Vickery 1977a:167-200.

<sup>175</sup> Baradat 1941.

<sup>176</sup> Boisselier 1967:317-18; Baradat 1941:54-55; Phoeun 1995:75; Vickery 1996b:405-406.

<sup>177</sup> According to the Cambodian chronicles and popular belief, this King Chan converted to Islam because he fell in love with a Cham girl. The chronicles show no awareness of the economy or international relations of the time, except for statements, mostly inaccurate, about relations with Vietnam (see Chandler 2000:94, who uncritically accepted these tales).

<sup>178</sup> Jacques 1999:385-388.

of this may be true, and certainly Angkor was not suddenly deserted when its rulers stopped engraving stone inscriptions. But Jacques should have offered the results of serious archaeological and architectural study in support, rather than only his own suppositions. Concerning the stone bridges, at least, the most recent work argues against his idea that they were constructed after Jayavarman VII.<sup>179</sup>

For the rest, Jacques has not read the literature carefully. If the kings named in the chronicles in the 14th-16th centuries do not have *varman* names, it is because they are all fictitious characters created much later by writers who had no conception of ancient *varman* names. The really existing royalty of that time, of whom we know nothing, may well have used *varman* names, wherever they resided, as seen in one of the first of the later inscriptions of Angkor Wat, by a king whom Jacques believes to have been from the old Angkor dynasty and whom he wishes to call ‘Tribhuvanādityavarman’. I use this expression because *tribhavanādityabarm* (the correct spelling), unlike the *varman* names of Angkor, was not his main title, which was *jaiyajedhdhādhirāj*. The structure of royal titles had changed, and the use of *tribhavanādityabarm*, in any case a very unusual name in Angkor, does not prove descent from that dynasty.<sup>180</sup> In fact close comparison of that and other *IMA* inscriptions with royal titles for the same periods in the chronicles demonstrates convincingly that it is the Lovek kings, such as the aforementioned *jaiyajedhdhādhirāj*, who are involved in the inscriptions, and that the chronicles have become historical rather than legendary. This is corroborated by the continuation of inscriptions by Lovek-Oudong elite for the next 150 years. The Lovek kings and officials who left these inscriptions may not have been descendents of old Angkor, but they thought they were.<sup>181</sup>

As for the return of the Lovek kings to Angkor, indeed the chronicles mostly ignore this, and there was certainly no permanent return, but in 1539 they record that Ang Chan went to Angkor to meet and defeat an attack from Ayutthaya against Angkor, after which he returned to Lovek. He could hardly have done this unless he was the ruler of the Angkor region, at least not without arrangements with the supposed other dynasty, who then might well have been mentioned in the chronicle.

And with respect to Soriyopoa, Jacques forgets that the events of the 1580s to the early 17th century are among the best known of pre-modern Cambodian history because of the presence of Spaniards and Portuguese who wrote lengthy reports, and who knew that Soriyopoa was the brother of the king displaced by the Thai in 1593.

There are indeed, as Jacques also wrote, other inscriptions from the 1580s at Angkor which describe visits by high-ranking monks from Ayutthaya who met Cambodian kings there, but these, like *IMA* 3, only prove that Lovek kings were visiting Angkor, perhaps for long periods. Lack of mention of this in the chronicles proves nothing, given the enormous deficiencies in those documents.<sup>182</sup>

### On the cultural relationship between *Hsien-Ayutthaya* and Cambodia

<sup>179</sup> Bruguier 2000.

<sup>180</sup> *IMA*, inscription no. 3. The only *tribhūvanādityavarma* in the entire Angkor and pre-Angkor epigraphic record was a mysterious person, perhaps an usurper, named in two inscriptions in the time of troubles of the 1160s-70s.

<sup>181</sup> Vickery 1977a:236-238.

<sup>182</sup> Vickery 1977a:240-241; Vickery 1982a.

Above it was noted that Chou Ta-kuan said the language of Angkor, of course Khmer, could not be understood by the people of *Hsien*, which is surprising, given the evidence of a Khmer presence in the lower Menam area since Angkor times. Of course it was also an old Mon area, and confusion over language and ethnicity in the Ayutthayan area among foreign observers continued.

Khmer and Mon, however, do not exhaust the linguistic possibilities for *Hsien* in the time of Chou Ta-kuan, or in the 15th century. If *Hsien* was near the eastern Gulf coast, the population may have spoken a Pearic-type language such as is still native to parts of the Thai-Cambodian border. Pearic is the branch of Mon-Khmer most closely related to Khmer, but the two are nevertheless mutually incomprehensible.<sup>183</sup>

It seems clear, also, that the spoken Khmer of the lower Menam basin was a dialect different from standard spoken Khmer within Cambodia, both in the 13th century and now. A surviving example of a different dialect is ‘Surin Khmer’, which, when spoken in truly native fashion by remote villagers gives difficulty to Khmer from within Cambodia until they have some familiarity with it. The reverse is also true. Still another old Khmer dialect, now apparently dead, is seen in 17th-century documents from the Pathalung-Nakhon Sri Thammarat area.<sup>184</sup> Ayutthayan and modern standard Thai are replete with words which by their structure and phonology can only be of Khmer origin but which are no longer known in standard Khmer; and this is evidence that there was another Khmer *dialect*, now dead, spoken in south central Thailand.

One example, which Wyatt, in one of his recent efforts to rehabilitate ancient verities and save old phenomena, misused, is *cǎnkòp*, a type of tax. Wyatt, in a rehabilitation of the Ram Khamhaeng (*RK*) inscription, claimed that one section of it “repeatedly stresses things the king of Sukhothai does not do... . There can be little doubt that that text is an indictment of Angkor’s rule”. One of those things was that he does not “levy a toll for traveling the roads [*pò ao ckòp nai brai lū dān*], [and] the word used for ‘toll’ is the Khmer term *cangkòp* [*cǎnkòp*]”.<sup>185</sup>

Had Wyatt quoted accurately from the inscription, he would have further undermined his own position on the authenticity of *RK*, for *cǎnkòp*, although obviously Khmer in its structure and phonology, is not known in modern Khmer, nor attested at any time in the pre-Angkor or Angkor inscriptions, but was a common legal term in Ayutthaya, whence it would have come to the attention of those who in my view were the writers of *RK*, and its use would support my arguments against the authenticity of *RK*.<sup>186</sup>

The word in the *RK* inscription, however, is not *cǎnkòp*, but *ckòp*, a word known from pre-Angkor Khmer inscriptions within Cambodia, and on the basis of which Coedès was able to establish the meaning of the word in *RK*. Coedès also referred to the infixed form of *ckòp*, *cǎnkòp*, which he had seen in 17th-century Ayutthayan Thai literature.<sup>187</sup> He did not note that it is also found in the *Three Seals*

<sup>183</sup> On the location of Pearic near the present Thai-Cambodian border see Baradat 1941; Martin 1974a-b; Headley 1985; and Huffman 1985.

<sup>184</sup> Vickery 1972:402-409. Wyatt 2004 seems to be trying to take credit for discovery of the Khmer element in central and peninsular Thailand, refusing to recognize work of others on this subject dating back 30 years.

<sup>185</sup> Wyatt 2001:55.

<sup>186</sup> Vickery 1987; 1991a; 1995.

<sup>187</sup> Coedès 1923:114.

*Code*, for example in the phrases *pai kep ao cǎnkòp* ('go collect *cǎnkòp*') and *mi hai ao cǎnkòp* ('not allow collect *cǎnkòp*'), a veritable reflection of (or model for?) the phrase in RK<sup>188</sup>. The term *cǎnkòp*, which was certainly some kind of tax, is unknown in Cambodian Khmer documents from any period, and seems to be an example of a Khmer word from the old Khmer dialect of the Menam basin. Neither may *RK* be saved *à la* Wyatt, by asserting that *RK* then did use a genuine old Khmer term, for although *ckòp* is the base form of *cǎnkòp*, its pre-Angkor usage was quite different from that of the later *cǎnkòp*; and *ao ckòp*, 'take *ckòp*' is ungrammatical, for *ckòp* was used in a verbal sense, 'to bind, take, seize, etc.'<sup>189</sup>

How, then, did the writers of *RK* hit on the form *ckòp*, unknown in Khmer after the 7th century, and even then in only a few exotic contexts, not found in the *Three Seals Code*, and, to judge from the published literature on *RK*, not found in any other Sukhothai or Ayutthayan context. There is no way that 13th-century Sukhothai writers, whatever their competence in contemporary Khmer, could have known the use of the 7th-century term. This use of *ckòp* argues for scholars who, like Coedès, knew the processes of Khmer word formation and understood that the base form of Ayutthayan *cǎnkòp* was *ckòp*, and who used it to give a false sense of antiquity to their work on the *RK* inscription, as I have argued in my papers on the subject.<sup>190</sup>

---

<sup>188</sup> Respectively in *KWIC*, vol. 11, pp. 05343-05344, references to law texts 4/89/06 and 1/178/10. Other occurrences of *cǎnkòp* are 4/89/08, 4/89/16, 4/90/01, 4/90/02, 4/90/04, and 4/90/06 (references are to volume/page/line of the Guru Sabhā edition of the "Three Seals Law Code", *Kaṭhmāy trā sām dvai*). The laws in question are *Ajñā hlvāṅ* and *Dharmanūn*, on which see Vickery 1984 and Vickery 1996a.

<sup>189</sup> The genuine contexts of *ckòp* are in the 7th-century inscriptions K.44, K.940, and K.426, in a phrase in imprecations which are still imperfectly understood, *ge ta ckòp*, 'they who seize', and apparently not referring to the authorities. That is, it is never used to mean a type of tax.

<sup>190</sup> Vickery 1987, 1991a, 1995.



### Appendix to note 15

While thinking about how to approach the subject of ‘early modern Southeast Asia’, I stumbled onto Tony Reid’s *Charting the Shape of Early Modern Southeast Asia*, and while perusing it I was struck, in his Champa chapter, by remarks, on p. 32, that “Cham records... show... the marriage of King Jaya Simhavarman III... to a Javanese princess at the beginning of the fourteenth century”, and “a Cham king [took] refuge in Java after a Vietnamese attack on his capital in 1318” (source Robson 1982: 276).

‘Robson’ was S.O. Robson, “Java at the Crossroads”, *BKI* 137, pp. 259-292, where, on p. 276, he wrote “King Jaya Simhavarman... of Champa married a Javanese princess by the name of Tapasī at the beginning of the 14th century (source Coedès 1968:217 [1964:393]); and in 1318 a Cham king was defeated by the Vietnamese and took refuge in Java (source Coedès 1968:229 [1964:414])... Neither of these events is recorded in Javanese sources”.<sup>191</sup>

When we move back to Robson’s source, Coedès, we find, p. 393, that Jaya Simhavarman III “married a Javanese princess, the queen Tapasī” (source Maspero 1928 [1988], 189-90), and in 1306 married a sister of the Vietnamese king who received the title *paramēśvarī*. (source Aymonier 1911, “L’inscription chame de Po Sah”, *BCAS* 1911:15). Then on p. 414 Coedès wrote that the Cham king Chê Nang attacked the Vietnamese, and “defeated in 1318 he took refuge in Java” (source Maspero 1928 [1988]:197-98).

Moving back one more stage to Maspero we see, p. 189, Jaya Simhavarman III “avait déjà épousé une princesse de Java, la ‘reine Tapasī’” (source “Po Sah”, 22); and pp. 197-8, the Cham king was defeated, and “se retire en toute hâte... il prend la mer et va se réfugier à Java” in 1318 (source Vietnamese chronicles).

So the ultimate source for the royal marriage was the Po Sah inscription (C.22, found in the district of Phan Rang, now in South Vietnam, formerly Panduraṅga, the southern division of ancient Champa), and for the flight of a defeated Cham king to Java the Vietnamese official histories. The inscription, which was never published in its entirety, contains dates from 1274 to 1306.<sup>192</sup>

Aymonier 1891:64, translated, without showing any of the Cham text, “il est une première reine, c’est la princesse, fille du souverain premier entre les dieux, venue comme reine Paramēśvarī”, and “il est une princesse royale... portant le nom de haute dame et reine Tapasī”. Thus Aymonier in this passage saw two princesses married to the Cham king, neither of them explicitly Javanese.

Finot 1903 took up the Po Sah inscription again, with a better rubbing, and filled in some of the gaps in Aymonier’s translation; and he showed that the Po Sah inscription speaks of two princesses from two different countries. In his translation, “il est une première reine (*agrārājamahīṣī*) fille du roi suprême de Java (*javādhideva*) qui est venue pour être la reine Paramēśvarī”, and “il est une princesse, fille du roi de Yava (*yavadvīpa*) qui est venue (*marai*) du (*di*) Yavadvīpa et se nomme la reine

<sup>191</sup> Coedès 1968 is the English translation of Coedès 1964. There are no differences of relevance to this discussion. My citations are from 1964.

<sup>192</sup> This inscription was studied and partially explained at various times. According to Schweyer 1999:321-344 (see pp. 321, 342), it was given attention by Bergaigne 1888, Aymonier 1891, Finot 1903, Parmentier 1909, and Majumdar 1927. In this list, p. 342, Schweyer missed the important Aymonier 1911, although it is included in her bibliography, p. 322.

Tapasī”. “On voit par là que Java était un royaume parfaitement distinct de l’île de Java, laquelle était appelée Yava, Yavadvīpa”. [I would like to see Austronesianists take note of this interpretation of *di* as ‘come from’]

The inscription, the original source, seems to say clearly that there were two polities, Java and Yava; and the indologists agreed that Yava or Yavadvīpa was the island of Java. Then what was the ‘Java’ of the Po Sah inscription? Note that Finot’s “roi suprême de Java (*javādhideva*)” was what Aymonier 1891 had translated as “souverain premier entre les dieux”. Here is a problem of two completely contradictory translations by two of the then foremost students of Old Cham inscriptions.

Coedès, p. 393, citing on this point Aymonier 1911, ignored Finot’s Java, saying that the Cham king married a sister of the king of Vietnam and gave her the title *parameśvarī*.

Boisselier 1963:333, n. 3, took note of the situation and agreed with Finot that “*Yavadvīpa* et *Java* semblent désigner deux contrées distinctes. Le nom Java figure sur des cartes chinoises du Viêt-nam pour diverses contrées de la presqu’île indochinoise, particulièrement la région proche de Biên-Hoa et une partie de l’actuel Laos”; and, p. 333, “*Parameśvarī* ‘fille du roi suprême de Java’ ... qu’il faut, peut-être confondre avec une fille du souverain vietnamien Trân-Nho’n-tông... “. Finally, p. 351, Boisselier referred to the Cham king Che Nang who “alla se réfugier à Java (1318 A.D.)”.

Boisselier did not indicate his sources, but probably they were the same treatments by Aymonier, Finot, and Maspero as cited above. But what did he mean with the peculiar remark that “*Parameśvarī*, daughter of the supreme king of Java, should perhaps be assimilated to the daughter of the Vietnamese king Trân-Nho’n-tông”. This is hardly justified by the language of Po Sah, and Boisselier provided no justification for it. He was of course familiar with Coedès’ use of Aymonier, but perhaps was not convinced, yet did not wish to argue the point, for if *java* for the Cham meant Vietnam it might open a Pandora’s box in the historiography of the region.<sup>193</sup>

Here we must go to Aymonier 1911, cited, among our sources, only by Coedès. There we see that where Finot read *javādhideva*, ‘supreme king of Java’, Aymonier had read *devādideva*, which explains his 1891 translation, “souverain premier entre les dieux’, whom, at that date, he did not try to identify further.<sup>194</sup>

Now who was right, Aymonier or Finot? No plate or photograph of the inscription has ever been published, which makes a new interpretation impossible, but published facsimiles of other Old Cham inscriptions show that confusion between *d* and *j* was possible; and following the initial syllable, the writing of *javādhideva* and *devādideva* [really *devādhideva*?] is identical.<sup>195</sup> The syllable *ja* requires no vowel sign, only the consonant *j*, but for *de* there must be a vertical stroke, (vowel *e*) to the left of *d*. Are we to assume that Finot did not see this, or ignored it, or that Aymonier

<sup>193</sup> Although Boisselier wrote before Coedès 1964, he would have read Coedès 1948, with the same information on p. 362.

<sup>194</sup> Schweyer apparently accepted that, even though not citing Aymonier 1911 for the context, as seen in her list of proper names in the inscription, p. 342, which included ‘*Devādideva*’, but no king of ‘Java’.

<sup>195</sup> I believe that here Aymonier was mistaken in reading *d* instead of *dh* in the third syllable. The consonant *dh* is required if the interpretation is ‘supreme’.

misconstrued a vague mark on the stone?

The *Po Sah* inscription was never completely engraved. As Aymonier wrote in 1911, but not in 1891, the last 12-13 lines of the 31-line text lack either subscript signs or both subscripts and superscripts, that is, signs for some vowels, and, with respect to subscripts, the second consonants of clusters.

This, however, should not affect the terms in question, which require no subscripts or superscripts, and which, moreover, are in the beginning of the inscription which was completely engraved. Thus, pending a new study of the inscription itself, we may only wonder how Aymonier saw an *e* vowel where Finot did not.<sup>196</sup>

A problem with Aymonier's and Coedès' interpretation of the daughter of *devādhideva* as the Vietnamese princess Huyền Trân, who was given to a Cham king, is that the *Po Sah* inscription, where she, mentioned in the beginning as well established, a *parameśvarī*, literally 'top queen', ends in 1306, the year in which Cham-Vietnamese negotiations over the marriage were still being conducted.

Another unresolved question is the identity of 'Champa'. Aymonier, Finot, Maspero, and Coedès all assumed a single unified Cham 'kingdom', and that it was possible to identify kings named in Cham inscriptions with the quite different names of contemporary Cham kings in the Vietnamese histories. At present students of ancient Champa are inclined to see two or three different Cham polities, at least one in the far South, Panduraṅga, and another in the North from Qui Nho'n, old Vijaya, northward.

The new consensus is that what one may for convenience call 'Champa' was probably never a unified polity, but a collection of strategically located river-mouth centers which developed, competed with one another, and declined according to the fluctuations of international trade: "only in exceptional circumstances, if ever, was there just one large Cham *mandala*"; "Champa is a generic term for the polities organized by Austronesian speaking peoples along the central coast of Vietnam... an archipelagically-defined cultural-political space"; "the authority of a Cham monarch was concentrated within his own river-mouth plain"; it was "a political system in which separate coastal states -- based on a river catchment area -- competed with each other for commercial supremacy".<sup>197</sup>

The *Po Sah* inscription was found near Phan Rang in the far South, none of the other inscriptions of that king, Jaya Simhavarman III, was farther north than Nha Trang, while the Vietnamese histories seem to indicate dealings with a Champa located in the area between Hué and Qui Nho'n; and the negotiations concerned the districts of Ô and Lý, north of modern Hué. Thus I would propose that whatever the final decision is about *ja/devādhideva*, there is no connection with the Vietnamese princess given to a northern Cham king in 1306.

In the Vietnamese histories the king with whom they were dealing was called Che Man, of which Maspero said, "Che is the Annamite transcription of Śrī. Man represents the final sound of the name Jaya Sinhavarman". Maspero was wrong on both points. Cham 'che' is 'prince', and as I, following Damais, have explained in correcting a similar error by Wolters, *varman* is a purely theoretical form, which, in

<sup>196</sup> Unfortunately, Coedès, who accepted the reading of Aymonier, and who would have been a final authority, did not comment on this.

<sup>197</sup> Quotations respectively from Higham 1989:297; Taylor 1992:153; Hall 1992:253-4; Southworth 2001:342. See also Po Dharma 1987:56.

the nominative case would be *varmā*. Unfortunately, there are no inscriptions from north Champa during this period to support one or the other interpretation.

Aymonier's interpretation of *devādhideva* as king of Vietnam also merits discussion. He based it on the term *stec devatā*, 'king of the gods', found in some traditional Khmer literature for the king of Vietnam, and he assumed that the Cham might have had a similar conception. But all of the Cham inscriptions referring to Vietnamese called them *yavana*; and before basing further hypotheses on that Khmer tradition it is necessary to specify precisely what literature was involved and from what period. If it is something from the 17th-18th centuries it is worthless for interpreting a 13th-14th century inscription.<sup>198</sup>

Another problem in the history of these events and their treatment by modern writers is the flight of a defeated Cham king known as Chê Nang to the Indonesian island of Java in 1318. The chain of references in what I have cited goes back from Reid to Robson to Coedès to Maspero to the Vietnamese histories, one of which, *Đại Việt Su' Ký Toàn Thu'*, Tap II, Bản Ky vi, p. 35b, records the event of 1318, but only says that the enemy, the Cham, were defeated and fled, and many were captured. There is nothing about Java.<sup>199</sup> But in a later entry for the year 1327, p. 45a, following another, but unsuccessful Vietnamese attack on Champa, the king recalled the previous event, saying, "Che Năng [the Cham king] had to flee to another country", then in parentheses the text has ("Che Năng fled to Java to ask for help"), and footnotes indicate that there is some disagreement among the Vietnamese sources.<sup>200</sup>

---

<sup>198</sup> I recall having long ago seen that use of *stec devatā* in Khmer, but at this writing I do not recall where, and do not have time to try to search for it.

<sup>199</sup> A modern Vietnamese compilation, *Đàng trong*, p. 61, says that the Cham king Chê Nang fled to *qua oa* (Java), but that work has appropriated much from the standard European sources, and cannot be taken as an independent tradition.

<sup>200</sup> I am using the romanized Quoc Ngu' edition, but the parenthetical insertion must be in the original, because that is what is cited by Maspero for the refuge in Java as well as for the date 1318. See Maspero 1928:198, notes 1-2.

## Bibliography

- 1170 *Fragment. Bañśāvatār lavaek chapăp plae c.s. 1170* [‘Chronicle of Lovek, text translated in *cula* era 1170’], *PP*, Vol. XLIV, pp. 243-88 and Vol. XLV, pp. 1-58.
- Andaya 1999. Leonard Y. Andaya, “Ayutthaya and the Persian and Indian Muslim Connection”. In *From Japan to Arabia: Ayutthaya’s Maritime Relations with Asia*. Edited by Kennon Breazeale, Prefaced by Yoneo Ishii and Charnvit Kasetsiri. Bangkok: The Foundation for the Promotion of Social Sciences and Humanities Textbooks Project, 1999, pp. 119-136.
- Aymonier 1891. Étienne Aymonier, “Première étude sur les inscriptions tchames”, *Journal Asiatique*, janvier-février 1891, pp. 5-86.
- Baker 2003a. Chris Baker, “Ayutthaya Rising: From the Land or From the Sea”, *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 2003, pagination unknown.
- Baker 2003b. Chris Baker, “Rethinking Buddhism”. *Bangkok Post*, 15 March, 2003, p. E.
- Baradat 1941. Baradat, R. 1941. "Les Samre ou Pear, population primitive de l'ouest du Cambodge." *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 41:1-150.
- Barua 1930. Rai Sahib Golap Chandra Barua, trans, and ed, *Ahom Buranji* (Calcutta, 1930).
- Bellwood 1992. Peter Bellwood, “Southeast Asia Before History”, *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia* Volume I, pp. 55-136.
- Benda 1962. Harry J. Benda, “The Structure of Southeast Asian History: Some Preliminary Observations”. *The Journal of Southeast Asian History* Vol. 3, No. 1 (March 1962), pp. 106-138.
- Blair and Robertson 1973. Blair, Emma Helen and Robertson, James Alexander, eds. *The Philippine Islands 1493-1898*. 55 vols. Reprint of First Reissue. Mandaluyong, Rizal: Cachos Hermanos, Inc., 1973.
- Blust 1994. Robert Blust, “The Austronesian Settlement of Mainland Southeast Asia”, *Papers from the Second Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 1992*. Edited by Karen L. Adams and Thomas John Hudak. Tempe, Arizona, Arizona State University, 1994.
- Boisselier 1963. Jean Boisselier, *La Statuaire du Champa*. Publications de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient, LIV. Paris: École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1963.
- Boisselier 1967. Jean Boisselier, “Notes sur l’art du bronze dans l’ancien Cambodge”,

*Artibus Asiae*, XXIX, 4 (1967), pp. 275-334.

Boisselier 1987-88. Jean Boisselier, "La royauté khmère dans la seconde moitié du XIIe siècle. Les prédécesseurs de Jayavarman VII", *Indologica Taurinensia* XIV (1987-88), pp. 117-143.

Boxer 1953. C.R. Boxer, ed. *South China in the Sixteenth Century*. Hakluyt Society, Series 2, No. CVI. London: Hakluyt Society, 1953

Briggs 1948. Briggs, Lawrence Palmer. 'Siamese Attacks on Angkor before 1430'. *Far Eastern Quarterly*, VIII (1948), pp. 3-33.

Briggs, Lawrence Palmer. 1951. *The Ancient Khmer Empire*. Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, n.s. 41, Pt. 1.

Brown 1970. C.C. Brown, trans., *Sĕjarah Mĕlayu or Malay Annals*. Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press.

Bruguier 2000. Bruno Bruguier. "Les ponts en pierre du Cambodge ancien Aménagement ou contrôle du territoire?", *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 87/2 (2000), pp. 529-551.

*Cāru'k* I/1 2534 [1991]. *Cāru'k lānnā/Lanna Inscriptions*, Part I, Volume 1, "Inscriptions from Chiang Rai, Nan, Phayao and Phrae". The James S.W. Thompson Foundation, Bangkok, Amarin Printing Group Co. Ltd.

*Cāru'k* 1983. *Cāru'k samāy sukhodāy/จารึกสมัยสุโขทัย* / ['Inscriptions of the Sukhothai Period']. Bangkok, Fine Arts Department, 1983.

*Cāru'k* 1986. *Cāru'k nai pra:deś daiy* ['Inscriptions in Thailand] vol. 5. Bangkok, National Library and Fine Arts Department.

*Cāru'k* 2540 [1997]. *Corpus of Lān Nā Inscriptions*, Vol. 1, *Inscriptions in the Chiang Sān Museum*. Archive of Lan Na Inscriptions, social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University.

Chandler 1974. David P. Chandler, "Royally sponsored human sacrifices in nineteenth century Cambodia: The cult of *nak ta Me Sa* (*Mahāsūramardnī*) at Ba Phnom", *JSS*, LXII, 2 (July 1974), pp. 207-222.

Chandler 2000. David Chandler, *A History of Cambodia*. Third Edition. Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press, 2000.

Charnvit 1976. Charnvit Kasetsiri, *The Rise of Ayudhya: A History of Siam in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, East Asia Historical Monographs, Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press, 1976.

Charnvit 1999. Charnvit Kasetsiri, "Origins of a Capital and Seaport". In *From Japan*

to Arabia: Ayutthaya's Maritime Relations with Asia". Edited by Kennon Breazeale, Prefaced by Yoneo Ishii and Charnvit Kasetsiri. Bangkok: The Foundation for the Promotion of Social Sciences and Humanities Textbooks Project, 1999, pp. 55-79.

CMC 1998. *The Chiang Mai Chronicle, Second Edition*, translated by David K. Wyatt and Aroonrut Wichienkeo. Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books, 1998

Coedès 1913, G[eorge] Coedès, "Études cambodgiennes VIII, la fondation de Phnom Peñ au XVe siècle d'après la chronique cambodgienne". *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 13, 6 (1913), pp.6-11.

Coedès 1918. G[eorge] Coedès, 'Essai de classification des documents historiques cambodgiens conservés à la Bibliothèque de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient'. *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 18, 9 (1918), pp. 15-28.

Coedès 1923. G[eorge] Coedès, "nouvelles notes critiques sur l'inscription de Rama Khamheng", *JSS* 17/3 (1923), pp. 113-120.

Coedès 1925. "Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental". *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 25 (1925), pp. 1-200.

Coedès 1929. G. Coedès, "Nouvelles données chronologiques et généalogiques sur la dynastie de Mahīdharapura." Etudes Cambodgiennes XXIV. *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 29 (1929), pp. 297-329.

Coedès 1940. G. Coedès, "Les gîtes d'étape à la fin du XII siècle", *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 40 (1940). pp. 347-349.

Coedès 1951. Coedès, G[eorge]. *Inscriptions du Cambodge* Vol. 3. École Française d'Extrême-Orient. Collection de textes et documents sur l'Indochine III. Paris: E. de Boccard.

Coedès 1958. "Nouvelles données épigraphiques sur l'histoire de l'Indochine centrale". *Journal Asiatique*, CCXLVI, 2 (1958) 125-42.

Coedès 1961. *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam, Deuxième partie: Inscriptions de Dvāravatī, de Çrīvijaya et de Lāvo*, éditées et traduites par G. Coedès, Bangkok, The Siam society, 1961.

Coedès 1962. "Deux bas-reliefs tardifs d'Angkor Vat", *Journal Asiatique* 250/2 (1962), pp. 235-244.

Coedès, G[eorge]. 1964. *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie*. Nouvelle édition revue et mise à jour. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.

Coedès 1965. "Documents épigraphiques provenant de Tenasserim". *Siam Society*

- Felicitations Volumes for Prince Dhani Nivat*. 2 vols. Vol. II, pp. 203-209. Bangkok: The Siam Society, 1965.
- Cushman 2000. Richard D. Cushman, tr., David K. Wyatt, ed., *The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya*. Bangkok: The Siam Society, 2000.
- Damais 1957. L[ouis]-C[harles] Damais, Review of Prof. Dr. Poerbatjaraka. *Riwajat Indonesia*, djilid 1 (*Histoire de l'Indonésie*, vol. 1). Djakarta. Jajasan Pembangunan. *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 48 (1957), pt. 2, pp. 607-49.
- Damrong 1913. Commentaries of Prince Damrong on the Royal Autograph edition of the Ayudhyan chronicles:  
พระราชพงศาวดารฉบับพระราชหัตถเลขา, 6th printing, 2511 [1968].
- Deschamps 1964. H. Deschamps, "Traditions orales au Gabon", *The Historian in Tropical Africa*, eds, J. Vansina, R. Mauny, L. V. Thomas (Oxford, 1964).
- De Bernon 2001. Olivier de Bernon, "Le plus ancien édifice subsistant de Phnom Penh: une tour angkoriennne sise dans l'enceinte de Vatt Uṅṅālom", *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 88 (2001), pp. 249-260.
- Filliozat 1969. Jean Filliozat, "L'inscription dite de 'Vò [sic! Vō]-Cạnh'", *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 55 (1969), pp. 107-116.
- Finot 1908. Louis Finot, "Les Études indo-chinoises", *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 8, pp. 221-233.
- Finot 1915. L[ouis] Finot. "Notes d'épigraphie XIV: les inscriptions du musée de Hanoi". *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 15, 2 (1915), pp. 1-38.
- Flood 1969. E. Thadeus Flood, "Sukhothai-Mongol Relations: A Note on Relevant Chinese and Thai Sources (With Translations), *Journal of the Siam Society* Volume LVII, Part 2 (July 1969), pp. 201-258.
- Frankfurter 1909. Frankfurter, O. "Events in Ayuddhya from Chulasakaraj 686-966",. *Journal of the Siam Society*, VI, 3 (1909), pp. 3-19.
- Garnier 1871-1872. Francis Garnier, "Chronique royale du Cambodge", *Journal Asiatique*, ser. 6, XVIII, (octobre-décembre 1871), pp. 336-385, XX, (aug-sept 1872), pp. 112-144.
- Griswold 1963. A.B. Griswold, "Notes on the Art of Siam No. 6, Prince Yudhiṣṭhira", *Artibus Asiae* XXVI, 3/4 (1963), 215-229.
- Griswold and Prasert 1968. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 1", *Journal of the Siam Society* 56 (2), July 1968, pp 230-



247.

- Griswold and Prasert 1969. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 3", "The Pact Between Sukhodaya and Nan", *Journal of the Siam Society* 57, 1 (January 1969), pp. 57-108.
- Griswold and Prasert 1971. A. B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 7, "The inscription of Vat Trabāñ Jāñ Phök", *Journal of the Siam Society* 59, 1 (January 1971), pp. 157-188.
- Griswold and Prasert 1972. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 10: King Lödaiya of Sukhodaya and his contemporaries". *Journal of the Siam Society*, volume 60, part I (January 1972), pp. 21-152.
- Griswold and Prasert 1973. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies", No. 11-2, "The Epigraphy of Mahādharmarāja I of Sukhodaya", *Journal of the Siam Society* 61, 2 (July 1973), pp. 91-128.
- Griswold and Prasert 1974a. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No 13, The Inscription of Wat Pra Yün," *Journal of the Siam Society* 62 (1), Jan 1974, pp. 123-142.
- Griswold and Prasert 1974b. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No 14, "Inscription of the Śiva of Kāmbeñ Bejra", *Journal of the Siam Society* 62, 2 (July 1974), pp. 223-238.
- Griswold and Prasert 1975. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "On kingship and Society at Sukhodaya", *Change and Persistence in Thai Society, Essays in Honor of Lauriston Sharp*, ed. by G. William Skinner and A. Thomas Kirsch, Ithaca, New York, 1975, pp. 29-92.
- Griswold and Prasert 1976. "A fifteenth-century Siamese historical poem" *Southeast Asian History and Historiography*, Essays Presented to D.G.E. Hall, ed. by C.D. Cowan and O.W. Wolters, Itaca, New York, 1976, pp. 123-163
- Griswold and Prasert 1977. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara 1977. "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 18, The Inscription of Vāt Jyañ Hmāñ (Wat Chieng Man)", *Journal of the Siam Society*, volume 65, part 2 (July 1977), pp.111-144.
- Griswold and Prasert 1979. A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṅa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies no. 24, An Inscription of 1563 A.D. recording a treaty between Laos and Ayudhyā in 1560". *JSS* Volume 67, Part 2, pp. 54-69.
- Groslier 1958. Bernard-Philippe Groslier, *Angkor et le cambodge au XVIe siecle*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958.
- Groslier 1981. Bernard-Philippe Groslier, "Les Syāṃ Kuk des bas-reliefs d'Angkor Vat", In *Orients: Pour Georges Condominas*, pp. 107-26. Paris:

Sudestasie/Privat.

- Haas 1969. Mary R. Hass, *The Prehistory of Languages* (The Hague, 1969).
- Hall 1992. Kenneth R. Hall, "Economic History of Early Southeast Asia", in Nicolas Tarling, ed. *Cambridge History of South East Asia*, Volume I, *From Early Times to c. 1800*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 183-276.
- Halliday 1923. R Halliday, "Slapat Rājāvañ Datow Smin roñ - a history of kings", *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, XIII (1923), pp. 5-55.
- Headley 1985. Headley, Robert K., Jr. 1985. "Proto-Pearic and the Classification of Pearic." In *Southeast Asian Linguistic Studies Presented to André-G. Haudricourt*. Edited by Suriya Ratanakul, David Thomas, Suwilai Premsirat. Bangkok: Mahidol University, pp. 428-78.
- Higham 1989. Charles Higham, *The Archaeology of Mainland Southeast Asia: From 10,000 B.C. to the Fall of Angkor*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Hirth and Rockhill 1911. F. Hirth and W.W. Rockhill, translators, *Chau Ju-kua*. St. Petersburg 1911.
- Huffman 1985. Huffman, Franklin E. 1985. "The Phonology of Chong." In *Southeast Asian Linguistic Studies Presented to André-G. Haudricourt*. Edited by Suriya Ratanakul, David Thomas, Suwilai Premsirat. Bangkok: Mahidol University, pp. 355-389.
- IMA 1958. *Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor/ Silā cāru'k nagar vatt*. Phnom Penh, Institut Bouddhique, 1958.
- Ishii 1998. Yoneo Ishii, ed., *The Junk Trade from Southeast Asia, Translations from the Tōsen Fusetsu-gaki, 1674-1723*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1998.
- Ishii 2002. Yoneo Ishii, "A reinterpretation of Thai history with special reference to the pre-modern period". Paper presented at 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Thai Studies at Nakhon Phanom, January 2002.
- Jackson 2003. Peter Jackson, *Buddhadāsa, Theravada Buddhism and Modernist Reform in Thailand*. Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books.
- Jacques 1969. Claude Jacques, "Notes sur la stèle de 'Vò [sic! Vō]-Cạnh'", *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 55 (1969), pp. 117-124.
- Jacques 1983. Claude Jacques, "Les kamraten jagat dans l'ancien Cambodge." Paper presented at the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa, Tokyo, 31 August-7 September, 1983, and published in *Proceedings of the conference*, pp. 1025-27.

- Jacques 1985. Claude Jacques, "The Kamrateñ Jagat in Ancient Cambodia." In *Indus Valley to Mekong Delta Explorations in Epigraphy*. Edited by Noboru Karashima. Madras: New Era Publications, pp. 269- 286.
- Jacques 1999. Claude Jacques, "Les derniers siècles d'Angkor". Académie des Inscriptons & Belles-Lettres, Comptes-Rendus des Séances de l'année 1999, janvier-mars, pp. 367-390.
- Jit 1951. Jit Phumisak, *Gvām pen mā khòñ gām syām, daiy, lāv, lee: khòm* ('Origins of the terms *syām, daiy* [thai], *lāv*, and *khòm*'). Bangkok: DK Books.
- Kaempfer 1906. Engelbert Kaempfer, MD, *The History of Japan Together with a Description of the Kingdom of Siam 1690-92*. Translated by J G Scheuchzer, F R S (Glasgow, James Maclehose and Sons, MCMVI), 3 vols.
- KWIC 1981. *KWIC Index of the Three Seals Law* (1981). Museum of Ethnology, Osaka.
- Lewitz [Pou] 1967. Saveros Lewitz, 'La toponymie khmer'. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, LIII, 2 (1967), pp. 375-450.
- Lewitz [Pou] 1974. Saveros Lewitz, "Recherches sur le vocabulaire cambodgien (VIII) du vieux khmer au khmer moderne", *Journal Asiatique* 262 (1974), pp. 143-170.
- Lorillard 1999. Michel Lorillard, "Une correspondance de 1928 entre George Coedès et Paul Pelliot à propos de Sien-lo", presented to the public at the conference on "George Coedès aujourd'hui", Bangkok, 9-10 September 1999.
- Luang Praseut (LP). The Hluoñ Prasro'th Chronicle; Braḥ rāj bañśāvatār kruñ śrī ayudhayā chapāp hluoñ prasro'th aksarniti*, in *Pra:jum bañśāvatār* [Collected Chronicles], Part 1, Vol. 1. Bangkok, Guru Sabhā, 1969
- Luce 1958, 1959. G[ordon] H. Luce, "The Early *Syām* in Burma's History", in *Journal of the Siam Society*, 46, 2 (November 1958), pp. 123-214, and in *Journal of the Siam Society* 47, 1 (June 1959), pp. 59-102.
- Lunet de Lajonquière 1902, 1907, 1912. Lunet de Lajonquière. *Inventaire archéologique de l'Indochine*, Paris, Leroux.
- Mabbett 1986. Ian Mabbett, "Buddhism in Champa", in *Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th Centuries*, edited by David G. Marr and A.C. Milner, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, and Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore, 1986, pp. 289-314.
- Mannikka 1997. Eleanor Mannikka, *Angkor Wat Time, Space, and Kingship*. St. Allen & Unwin, St. Leonard's, NSW, Australia

- Marrison 1949, G.E. Marrison, "The Siamese Wars with Malacca during the Reign of Muzaffar Shah. *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 22,1 (1949), pp. 61-66.
- Martin 1974a. Martin, Marie-Alexandrine. "Remarques générales sur les dialectes pear." *Asie du Sud-Est et Monde Insulindien* 5, pt. 1:25-37.
- Martin 1974b. Martin, Marie-Alexandrine. 1974b. "Esquisse phonologique du somree." *Asie du Sud-Est et Monde Insulindien* 5, pt. 1:97-106.
- Maspero 1928. Georges Maspero, *Le royaume de Champa*. Paris: Les Éditions G. Van Oest..
- O’Kane 1972. John O’Kane (trans), *The Ship of Sulaiman* (London, 1972).
- Parmentier 1936. Henri Parmentier, *Le Cambodge, évolution de l'architecture*, Saigon 1936.
- Pelliot 1904. Paul Pelliot, "Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII siècle", *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 4 (1904), pp. 131-413.
- Pelliot. 1951 Paul Pelliot, Oeuvres Posthumes III. *Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge de Tcheou Ta-Kouan*. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Phayre 1883 [1998]. Sir Arthur P. Phayre, *History of Burma*, London, 1883, Bangkok, Orchid Press, 1998.
- Piat 1973. Martine Piat, "Note sur la première apparition de Cambodge dans la cartographie européenne", *Bulletin de la Société des Études Indochinoises* 48, 1 (1973), pp. 119-120.
- Pigafetta 1973. Antonio Pigafetta, "First Voyage Around the World", Blair and Robertson, XXXIV.
- Pinto [Catz] 1614 [1989]. *The Travels of Mendes Pinto*, edited and translated by Rebecca D. Catz. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Phoeun 1995. Mak Phoeun, *Histoire du Cambodge de la fin du XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle au début du XVIII<sup>e</sup>*, Paris, Presses de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Monographies, n° 176, 1995.
- Po Dharma 1987. Po Dharma, *Pāṇḍura ṅ ga (Campā) 1802-1835*, tomes I-II, Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Volume CXLIX, Paris, École française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Pou 1987 [2003]. Saveros Pou, "Sanskrit, Pāli and Khmero-Pāli in Cambodia", *Panels*

- of the VIIIth World Sanskrit Conference, Vol. VI, Middle Indo-Aryan and Jaina Studies and Vol. VII, Sanskrit Outside India, Leiden: August 23-29, 1987. Republished in Saveros Pou, Choix d'Articles de Khmerologie, Selected Papers on Khmerology, Phnom Penh, Reyum Publishing, 2003, pp. 282-297.*
- Pou 1991. Saveros Pou, "Les noms de monuments khmers", *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 78, pp. 201-224.
- Pou 1992. Saveros Pou, *Dictionnaire Vieux Khmer-Français-Anglais*. Paris, Centre de Documentation et Recherche sur la Civilisation Khmère.
- PP . *Pra:jum baṅśāvatār* ['Collected Chronicles'], Bangkok, Guru Sabhā, various dates.
- RA 1913 [1968] *The Royal Autograph Chronicle, Braḥ rāj baṅśāvatār chapāp braḥ rāj hātthalekhā*, พระราชพงศาวดารฉบับพระราชหัตถเลขา, 6th printing, Chonburi, 2511 [1968].
- Rājādhirāj* 1970. *Rājādhirāj* [Mon chronicles], translated by Cau bra:yā braḥ glān (Han). Bangkok, Sāṃnāk bimb glān vidayā, 2513 [1970].
- Reid 1999. Anthony Reid, *Charting the Shape of Early Modern Southeast Asia*. Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books, 1999.
- Robson 1982. S.O. Robson, "Java at the Crossroads", *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land-, en Volkenkunde (BKI)* 137, pp. 259-292.
- Sahai 1970. Sachchidanand Sahai, *Les institutions politiques et l'organisation administrative du Cambodge ancien (VIe-XIIIe siècles)*, Publications de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, LXXV, Paris École Française d'Extrême-Orient
- Schweyer 1999. Anne-Valérie Schweyer, "Chronologie des inscriptions publiées de Campā, Études d'épigraphie cam-1", *Bulletin de L'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 86 (1999), pp. 321-344.
- Scott 1900. Sir James George Scott and J.P. Hardiman, *Gazeteer of Upper Burma and the Shan States*. Rangoon: Government Printing and Stationery, 1900.
- Shorto 1971. H.L. Shorto, *A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions From the Sixth to the Sixteenth Centuries, incorporating materials collected by the late C O Blagden* (School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, London Oriental Series, Vol 24, Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Southworth 2001. William Ealred Southworth, "The Origins of Campā in central Vietnam A preliminary review", Ph.D. thesis, University of London, School of Oriental and African Studies, 2001.
- Taylor 1992. Keith Taylor, "The Early Kingdoms: Champa", in Nicholas Tarling, ed.,

*The Cambridge History of South East Asia*, Volume I, *From Early Times to c. 1800*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 153-157.

Tin and Luce 1923. Pe Maung Tin and G.H. Luce, trans, *The Glass Palace Chronicle of the Kings of Burma* (London, 1923).

Vansina 1961. Jan Vansina, *De la tradition orale*. Tervuren, Belgium, 1961.

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

Vickery 1972. Michael Vickery, Review of *Prachum phra tamra baram rachuthit phu'a kalpana samai ayuthaya phak 1* (Collected Royal Decrees Establishing Religious Foundations in the Ayuthaya Period Part 1), *Journal of the Siam Society* 60, 1 (January 1972), pp. 396 [402]-409.

Vickery 1973a. Michael Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: A Reinterpretation", *Journal of the Siam Society* 61, 1 (January 1973), pp. 51-70.

Vickery 1973b. Michael Vickery, a review of H.L. Shorto, *A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions from the Sixth to the Sixteenth Century*, *Journal of the Siam Society* 61 (July 1973), pp.205-209.

Vickery 1974. Michael Vickery, Review of Robert B Jones, "Thai Titles and Ranks, etc". *Journal of the Siam Society* 62, 1 (January 1974), pp. 160-174.

Vickery 1976a. Michael Vickery, "The Lion Prince and Related Remarks on Northern History", *Journal of the Siam Society* 64, 1 (January 1976), pp. 326-377.

Vickery 1976b. Michael Vickery, Review article on Jeremias van Vliet, *The Short History of the Kings of Siam*, *Journal of the Siam Society* 64, 2 (July 1976), pp. 207-236.

Vickery 1977a. Michael Vickery, "Cambodia After Angkor, the Chronicular Evidence for the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries", Yale University, Ph.D., December 1977. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, University Microfilms

Vickery 1977b. Michael Vickery, "The 2/k.125 Fragment, a Lost Chronicle of Ayutthaya", *Journal of the Siam Society* 65, 1 (January 1977), pp. 1-80

Vickery 1978. Michael Vickery, "A Guide Through Some Recent Sukhothai Historiography", *Journal of the Siam Society* 66, 2 (July 1978), pp. 182-246.

Vickery 1979a. Michael Vickery, "The Composition and Transmission of the Ayudhya and Cambodia Chronicles", In *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, ed., by Anthony Reid and David Marr, ASAA Southeast Asia Publications Series, 1979, pp. 130-154.

- Vickery 1979b. Michael Vickery, "A New *Tāṃnān* About Ayudhya", *Journal of the Siam Society* 67, 2 (July 1979), pp. 123-86.
- Vickery 1982a. Michael Vickery, "L'Inscription K 1006 du Phnom Kulen", *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 71, 1982, pp. 77-86.
- Vickery 1982b. Michael Vickery, "Looking Back at Cambodia [1945-1974]", in Ben Kiernan and Chantou Boua, eds., *Peasants and Politics in Kampuchea 1942-1981*, London, Zed Press, 1982, pp. 89-113.
- Vickery 1984. Michael Vickery, "Prolegomena to Methods for Using the Ayutthayan Laws as Historical Source Material", *Journal of the Siam Society* 72 (1984), pp. 37-58.
- Vickery 1985. Michael Vickery, "The Reign of Sūryavarman I and Royal Factionalism at Angkor", *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, September 1985, 226-244.
- Vickery 1987. Michael Vickery, "The Ram Khamhaeng Inscription, A Piltdown Skull of Southeast Asian History?", in *The Ram Khamhaeng Controversy*, Collected Papers, Edited by James R. Chamberlain, Bangkok, The Siam Society, 1991, pp. 3-52.
- Vickery 1989-1990. Michael Vickery, "Loan Words and Devoicing in Khmer", *Mon-Khmer Studies* XVIII-XIX (1989-1990), pp. 240-250.
- Vickery 1991a. Michael Vickery, "Piltdown Skull – Installment 2", in *The Ram Khamhaeng Controversy*, Collected Papers, Edited by James R. Chamberlain, Bangkok, The Siam Society, 1991, pp. 333-418.
- Vickery 1991b. Michael Vickery, Review of *The Travels of Mendes Pinto*, edited and translated by Rebecca D. Catz, in *Asian Studies Review* (Australia), Volume 14, Number 3 (April 1991), pp. 251-253.
- Vickery 1995. Michael Vickery, "Piltdown 3: Further Discussion of the Ram Khamhaeng Inscription", *Journal of the Siam Society*, Volume 83, Parts 1 & 2 (1995), pp. 103-198.
- Vickery 1996a. Michael Vickery, "The Constitution of Ayutthaya", in *New Light on Thai Legal History*, Edited by Andrew Huxley, Bangkok: White Orchid Press, 1996, pp. 133-210.
- Vickery 1996b. Michael Vickery, Review of Mak Phoeun, *Histoire du Cambodge de la fin du XVIe siècle au début du XVIIIe*, in *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 83 (1996), pp. 405-15.
- Vickery 1998. Michael Vickery, *Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor*

*Cambodia: The 7th-8th Centuries*. Tokyo. The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, The Toyo Bunko, 1998

Wade 1991a. Geoff Wade, “The Ming Shi-Lu as a Source for Southeast Asian History – 14th to 17th Centuries”, Paper presented at the 12th IAHA Conference, Hong Kong, June 24-28, 1991.

Wade 1991b. Geoff Wade, “The Ming Shi-Lu as a Source for Southeast Asian History – 14th to 17th Centuries”. Appendix, “Summary of MSL References to Southeast Asia 1368-1505”, Paper presented at the 12th IAHA Conference, Hong Kong, June 24-28, 1991.

Wade 2000. Geoff Wade, “The *Ming shi-lu* as a Source for Thai History – Fourteenth to seventeenth Centuries”, *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 31, 2 (September 1999), pp. 249-294.

Wheatley 1961. Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese*, Kuala Lumpur, 1961.

Wolters 1958. O.W. Wolters, “Tāmbraṅga”, *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XXI, 3 (1958), pp. 587-607

Wolters 1960. O. W. Wolters, “*Chên-li-fu*, A State on the Gulf of Siam at the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> Century”, *JSS*, XLVIII, 2, November 1960, pp. 1-36.

Wolters 1966a. O. W. Wolters, “The Khmer King at Basan (1371-3) and the Restoration of the Cambodian Chronology During the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries”, *Asia Major*, XII, 1 (1966), 44-89.

Wolters 1966b. O. W. Wolters, “A Western Teacher and the History of Early Ayudhya”. *Sāṅgamśāstr paridāśn*, *The Social Science Review*, Special Number 3 (June 2509, 1966), pp. 89-97

Wolters 1970. Wolters, O. W. *The Fall of Śrīvijaya in Malay History*. East Asian Historical Monographs. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Wood 1925. W.A.R. Wood, “The Pongsawadan of Luang Prasöt”, *Journal of the Siam Society* 19 (1925), pp. 153-157.

Woodward 1975. Hiram Woods Woodward Jr., “Studies in the art of central Siam, 950-1350 A.D.”, unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, 1975.

Woodward 1994/95. Hiram W. Woodward, Jr., “The Jayabuddhamahānātha Images of Cambodia”. *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 52/53 (1994/95), pp. 105-110.

Wyatt 1973. David K. Wyatt, trans. and ed. “The Abridged Royal Chronicle of Ayudhya of Prince Paramānuchitchinōrot”. *Journal of the Siam Society*, 61, 1 (January, 1973), pp. 25-50.



- Wyatt 1997. David K. Wyatt, "Southeast Asia 'Inside out', 1300-1800: A Perspective from the Interior", *Modern Asian Studies*, Volume 31, Issue 3, Special Issue: "The Eurasian context of the Early Modern History of Mainland South East Asia, 1400-1800", July 1997, pp. 689-709.
- Wyatt 1999. David K. Wyatt, "Ayutthaya, 1409-24: Internal Politics and International Relations". In *From Japan to Arabia: Ayutthaya's Maritime Relations with Asia*. Edited by Kennon Breazeale, Prefaced by Yoneo Ishii and Charnvit Kasetsiri. Bangkok: The Foundation for the Promotion of Social Sciences and Humanities Textbooks Project, 1999, pp. 80-89.
- Wyatt 2001. David K. Wyatt, "Relics, Oaths and Politics in Thirteenth-century Siam", *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 32 (1), February 2001, pp. 3-66.
- Wyatt 2002. David K. Wyatt, *Siam in Mind*, Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books.
- Wyatt 2004. David K. Wyatt, "Remembering and Forgetting the Past, Notes Amidst the Crystal Sands". NST Workshop Paper. "A Plural Peninsula: Historical Interactions Among Thai, Malays, Chinese and Others". Workshop organized by Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore Regional Studies Program, Institute of Liberal Arts, Walailak University and the Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University, 5-7 February 2004, Walailak University, Nakhon Sri Thammarat.
- Yamamoto 1989. Yamamoto Tatsuro, "Thailand as it is referred to in the Da-de Nanhai zhi (大德南海志) at the beginning of the fourteenth century". *Journal of East-West Maritime Relations* Vol. 1 (1989), pp. 47-58.