After the accomplishments of Prince Damrong and George Coedes\(^1\), it seemed that no more significant Thai or Cambodian chronicles were likely to be discovered, and that in spite of the mysteries left in certain periods of the history of that area, there was little chance of new records being discovered to clear them up. The only major chronicle discovered in recent years is that of the British Museum\(^2\), which has proved to be little more than a copy of a version already known. Indeed, almost all of the Ayutthayan and Cambodian chronicles are closely related variants of a small number of cognate traditions.

One text outside the major traditions is the Ang Eng Fragment, which O.W. Wolters has used in an effort to effect major revisions in the accepted story\(^4\). In the following pages I present another fragment, which, like Ang Eng, is very different from the standard histories, and which appears to have made use of some of the same material in ways providing links between Ang Eng and the Thai Hluôh Prasro’fh chronicle\(^5\).

I discovered this text, which I shall call the 2/k.125 Fragment, after its catalogue number, in the National Library at Bangkok in 1971\(^5\). So far as I have been able to determine, it has never been noticed by other students or historians.


\(^2\) Braḥ rājabhāthavātār kraḥ sayām cāk ṣa ṭa chaṭāpī dī pen sampati khō̤ phīn nitthiyam kraḥ lāmān, Bangkok, 2507 [1964].

\(^3\) O.W. Wolters, "The Khmer king at Bassam (1371-3) and the restoration of the Cambodian chronology during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries", Asia Major, XII, 2 (1966), pp. 44-89.

\(^4\) Braḥ rājabhāthavātār kraḥ śri ayudhaya chaṭāpī hlu̲h praṣrō̄ṭ (cited further as LP), several editions; the one used here is in Praṣrō̄ṭ bhaḷāvāṭār (Guru sabhā edition—cited further as PP), vol. I.

\(^5\) The full title is Bhaḷāvāṭār kraḥ śri ayudhaya, No. 2/n. 125. It is further classified at the Library as No. 223, cupboard ( Justi) 108, bunch ( mān) 27; and its provenance is given as "original holdings of the Library". My research at the time was made possible by a grant from the Foreign Area Fellowship Foundation, to which I wish to express my gratitude.
Physically the 2/k.125 Fragment is a single phuk of samut dai tam ("folding black book") torn out of its context with no beginning or end and no indication of date of composition or provenance, except that it formed part of the Library's original holdings. It consists of 37 folded leaves. The side which the Library labels as the obverse consists of 36 leaves, with a text beginning in mid-sentence. The reverse continues with 32 more written leaves, of which the first is almost entirely illegible. The obverse is written in white chalk in มณีติ script, rather difficult to read. The reverse is in วิน script, very clearly written; the first 17½ lines are in yellow ink, with the remainder in white.

From the train of events and two explicit dates, one in each half, it is easy to see that the story really begins on the 'reverse', and that what is on the obverse continues afterward with a gap of perhaps several pages, which appear to have been torn off. It is clear that this is a copy from an older manuscript, almost certainly done by two different hands.

In terms of modern usage, much of the spelling appears quite peculiar. It is not even internally consistent, a not infrequent phenomenon in old manuscripts. Most of the 'incorrect' spellings are immediately comprehensible, and there is no need to correct them in footnotes. For example, the context shows clearly that วิ and วิ of p. [1] of the text must be understood as วิ and วิ; and the frequent use of short ต for long ต, as วิ instead of วิ, also requires no comment. Neither is it necessary to note all of the instances in which consonants of the ก, เ, ผ and ร series are found in a manner opposite to their modern usage, i.e. the frequent confusion between ว/n, น/ว, ว/น, ร, and among ว/n/ว.

6) The information on script was provided by Khun Bunnag Phayakhadet at the Manuscript Section of the National Library, whose help in reading difficult passages is gratefully acknowledged and is indicated further in the footnotes below. The Thai transcription of the manuscript was done by Khun Vipachaloeum Vatanapi and Khun Vachira Tamethin, also of manuscript staff of the Library. Khun Champa Yongcharoenn of the Library and Khun Euayporn Kerdehouay of the Siam Society also provided suggestions for reading difficult passages.
One feature which might cause the reader difficulty at first is the almost universal replacement of medial \( \varepsilon \) by \( \imath \) in words such as \( \text{ม่}, \text{ว่}, \text{น่}, \text{อ่}, \). In the Thai text those words, like everything else, appear as in the original, and I believe there is no case in which a real conflict of meaning occurs.

Tonal marks, which have not been included in transliterated words but which appear in the reproduction of the Thai text, were used erratically. Some of the usage resembles that which David K. Wyatt found in the chronicles of Nakhon Si Thammarat; but again, and contrary to the latter, there is lack of internal consistency.

I intend to go no further with the question of the writing itself, since that would require special study and lengthy comparison with other old texts. Also, my main interest is in the relationship of the story to other extant chronicles, and the value of its evidence for a reconstruction of fifteenth century history, particularly with regard to the conflict between Ayutthaya and Cambodia.

Brief explanations are included in footnotes directly below the translation. Points which require lengthy discussion are referred to the commentary which follows. The translation is intended to be as literal as possible, yet remain comprehensible. Thus, there has been no attempt to write elegant English. In fact, the English has at times been deliberately distorted to facilitate comparison with the Thai.

The text is arranged with the reverse of the manuscript first, in order to preserve the continuity of the story. Page numbers have been supplied in Arabic numerals for the reverse, and in small Roman numerals for the obverse; the \( \text{знак} \) symbols (ο) of the original have been retained in the text and translation. In footnotes or cross-references, the relevant page numbers are enclosed in brackets. Transliteration accords with the graphic system, which preserves the original spelling; but modern place-names are written according to current usage, and terms discussed in the commentary have been standardized. One innovation in the transliteration used here is the rendering of \( \text{visarjanī} \) by : rather than \( \hat{h} \), except where it corresponds to the Khmer \( \text{visarga} \). Thus I write \( \text{prajum} \) (ไว้给予了), but \( \text{brah} \) (บราหี).

Translation

[0] [This page, written in yellow ink, has been almost entirely effaced. The last line is] ... The king went to take mo'ân Hansavati [? doubtful reading] At that time they waited to come give ... .

[1] see, for when [we, they?] cross over will be near to the shore, and Hmu'ûn Samarrjaiy moved luk klauh and pulled up the thwarts of the boats to attack the people of Tay Dôn. The one who held the main oar lowered himself quickly into the water and fled away. But the one who held the stern took a paddle and resisted. He struck Hmu'ûn Samarrjaiy who then struck the one who held the stern. He fell into the water and then Hmu'ûn Samarrjaiy took the boat and then came on up to Khun Nagar Jaiy, who had the oarsmen ... get on an elephant, and gave [them to] the dâv bâna of the army. But all

8) Hmu'ûn samarrjaiy is an unidentified title. Throughout this study, titles are classed as unidentified, and will not be footnoted, if they are not included in (a) Yoneo Ishii, Osamu Akagi and Shigeharu Tanabe, An Index of Officials in Traditional Thai Governments, vol. I part I, The Law of Civil Hierarchy and The Law of Military and Provincial Hierarchies (Discussion Paper No. 76, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, 1974). (b) Foures, “Le royaume du Cambodge, son organisation politique”, Excursions et Reconnaisances, V, 13 (1882); I have not come across them in other sources. Some of the unidentified titles will probably be found when a systematic search is made through the other law texts and inscriptions.

9) Luk klauh: a term which has defied explanation. Khun Bunnag suggested that the immediately preceding expression, ka yay, should be emended to kha Yay, “enlarge”, “spread”, but that does not aid in understanding of the whole phrase.

10) Tay dön, a toponym which also occurs as tai dön in the Palatine Law, in Kathmay trą sâm tuôn (“Laws of the Three Seals”), Guru Sabha edition, vol. I, p. 70. Those laws will be cited as Laws plus volume number. On tay dön, see below under “Miscellaneous toponyms”.

11) Nagar jaiy may possibly be the same as the khun lagor jaiy in the department of tây sruoc hùthi sąjy, Laws I, 288.

12) The phrase from “the oarsmen” to “gave [them to]” is highly conjectural, and assumes that “elephant” (jâh/û11) was miscopied as khên/û14, the word actually appearing in the text. The ellipsis indicates one or two illegible characters followed by wîha.

13) Dâv (b) bâna, “officials”, a more precise meaning being difficult to establish. This and other such terms indicating officials will generally be left untranslated. In the manuscript the forms bâna and bâna have been used...
[๑] ผู้ใดท้าตามส่งใส่ จึงให้โทษจับหน้า และฐานคาร์เชีย กวาดออก
มาเข้าไว้ยึดอยู่ยับบ จึงข้อมีบางท่อนแล้วกระสุนขึ้นไปเนชั่นพนักข้อง
ทั้งหลหลาคก์

[๒] ชั่วมิ่รีที่อยู่ด้านนี้ได้แล้วเอกเรียกยืมขั้นรัตติขัดใจ ขุดแล้วคาร์
เชีย และที่อยู่จับทองกลม ขุดแล้วเชิกทางพระธาตุหลบตายจากต่อออกมา
ข้อที่กล่าวได้ให้ใครนำได้บุญกิจ พระยาเสือปุณฑ์ประภามิได้ ภาพเรื่องสั้นกัน
ช่องแน่นบอ่ขั้วกล

[๓] กำลังไม่ยอมทารกต้มใส่พันหม่อมทวยประมวลอยู่

○ ขุด เข้าเมืองตามทางแยกขอนสมภูบางท้องไปถึงพันธ์เข้าชั้น
มักกาอาซิมหักเก้อในเวียดทอมมะหม้หนึ่ง ครบพันแห่งเห็นรูทมามามหัก
สายข้าวเตี้ย แล้วจึงมาทางอาเทาะข้าว
the officers all pulled back the troops and ordered, "whenever the sound of our gong is heard, then resist the enemy. If anyone does [not] follow orders, we shall have him punished severely"; and Khun Nagar Jaiy came on back and slipped into the edge of the forest. Then the ruler of Tay Doñ and the princes19, who were all the officers in the army, crossed over with

the elephants, horses and troops up to the shore on this side; and they took boat(s) up very close to the troops to pursue Khun Nagar Jaiy and all the dev bañã. Khun Nagar Jaiy and all the dev bañã retreated. The enemy was encouraged and came on strongly17. B añã Jaliññ14 and Khun Śripād did not wait to hear the important gong. They rallied to resist the enemy

who were defeated and fell into the water. The soldiers pursued and killed the meñ19, about two hundred of whom died. The ruler of Tay Doñ and all the princes went without having time to mount elephants or horses, so they took the elephants and horses back into the water and the boats surrounded and fled after them. When Băn Hanñ20 saw the disorder, he broke his bonds21 and hurried along the river to find the soldiers, our people.

interchangeably, but in the translation and commentary I have rendered all occurrences as bañã. See my comments on this term in Michael Vickery, review of Robert B. Jones, Thai Titles and Rank, etc., JSS, LXII, 1 (January 1974), pp. 170-71.

14) The emendation is required by the context.


17) Khun Bunnag offered that reading.

18) Bañã Jaliññ, the Lord of Jaliññ (Chalieng), north of Sukhothai.

19) Meñ is a term which usually designated Mon or Burmese.

20) Apparently some sort of title. His role in the action is not clear.

21) Khun Bunnag offered that reading.
[5] Our men took Bān Haṅš to Khun Nagar Jaiy, who gave him clothes and let him ride on an elephant. Khun Nagar Jaiy and all the dūr baṅa took the troops and returned for an audience with H.M. the King, and they reported all about the war to him. He made Hmu’n Samarrjaivy chief hmu’n of elephants. As for Bān Haṅš, he made him chief hmu’n of boats in their group22; and he gave royal rewards of rank and various gifts. © After about a month, Samtec Braḥ Paramarā-jādhirāj Cau23 went on a tour at the time of the solar eclipse. He had them take the female elephant “Draṅ Pun” as his transport; and he took Mahādharrrmarājādhirāj, Baṅā Jalian, and Baṅā Ramarāj24 to ride with him. [They] chased Nay Dit, the elephant master, down, but Nay Dit didn’t get down; he moved down near to the driver25 and stayed there. The King went up to the pavilion. After about five or six days all the dūr baṅa took leave of H.M. the King and went back to their towns. As for the King, he entered the city of Ayutthaya. © Whereas in mo’eḥ Haṅsāvatī Baṅā Rām died and the throne went to Baṅā Baro26. © After some time the King’s son, Cau Baṅā Braḥ Nagar Indr, who was ruling in

22) hmu’n.
23) It will be seen from the context that he was the second Ayutthayan king of that title, who reigned from 1424 to 1448 according to LP.
24) Apparently the rulers, respectively, of Phitsanulok, Chalien, and Sawankhalok. See comment below, under “Ayutthayan relations with the north”.
25) Khvaṅ (xiv) written for geśā (ṃvī), “driver”.
26) Baṅā Rām and baṅā baro are Mon rulers found in the standard histories. See below, under “The date of the story”.
[๔] ผู้คนที่ totalCount ใน ชุมชนพระวิหารนุ้ยเปลี่ยนเพื่อให้เกิดความสุข
และเพื่อปรับปรุงชีวิตของชุมชน ให้ดีขึ้นและชุมชนใน
ที่เกิดในประเทศไทยแม้ว่าจะไป

๖ อุปกรณ์เจ้าหน้าที่พวงะเจ้าได้เปลี่ยน จัดสรุปข้อมูล
กรณีเห็นต่างกัน แต่ผลการปรับปรุงบุคคลเพื่อการบริการที่
ดีขึ้นและให้ชุมชนได้รับผลเป็น

[๔] รัฐกิจพื้นที่ถ้าเปลี่ยนมาอย่างมาก จึงท้องที่แม้สุขที่ดีเข้าร่วมบ้าน
และเพื่อปรับปรุงสำหรับ ปรับปรุงผนึกกลุ่ม ชุมชนไม่ใช่
ชุมชนบ้าน ชุมชนปรับภูมิ ชุมชนพื้นที่สงเคราะห์ ชุมชนภายนอก ชุมชนภายนอก
พระวิหาร ชุมชนราชสี ชุมชนภูมิอากาศ ชุมชนชุด ชุมชนที่ภูมิ
พระวิหาร เอนกประสงค์ ๑๕,๐๐๐

[๑๐] ชั้น ๑๐๐ มัก ๑๐,๐๐๐ ยกไปยังพระวิหาร แล้วเพื่อนบ้านมุ่งผู้
เปลี่ยนไปยังพระวิหารชุมภูมิอากาศ ครั้นที่ทางความต้องการเข้าใจให้ถึง
ตลอดและการแล้วแต่ ใหม่ที่แต่พระวิหารประสงค์ให้ชุมชนที่เฉยกรีมยัง
แล้วจริงไปยังปรับปรุงชีวิตในจัดรูปนั้น จนเข้าพุทธกษัตริย์
พระวิหาร ชุมชนกิ่ง}}{{}}
LOST CHRONICLE OF

[8] Brah Nagar Hluon, [had] a mentor (biliañ), Khun Sai Drañ Brañ Indr27, who died, and word was sent to Sam [tec] Brañ Paramarâjâdhirâj Cau. He appointed Nây Bar/Bra, the younger brother, as Khun Sai Drañ Brañ Indr in replacement. Later on, Cau Yát, son of Brañ Râm Cau, whom the King had sent to reside in Caturmukh28, persuaded all the Khmer to rebel against the royal son, Brañ Nagar Indr. [Brah Nagar Indr] ordered Khun Sai Drañ Brañ Indr to move out elephants, horses, and troops to go

[9] to meet the dâv bañâ. They could not yet go in proper fashion, so he had word sent to Samtec Brañ Paramarâjâdhirâj Cau. The King had them take elephants, horses, and troops. He had Cau Bâñâ Braek29, Bâñâ Deb Mañgal, Khun Nagar Jaiy, Khun Śri Pâd, Khun Prâp Thvip, Khun Śri Bijâiy Sañgrâm30, Khun Râm Kâñphañâ31, Khun Kâñphañâ Brañ Indr, Khun Bejrañ, Khun Saly Dâv Āv, Khun Râñ, Khun Bejrañ, and Khun Bejrañ, and Khun Bejrañ, take 150,000 troops,

[10] 100 elephants, and 1,000 horses, and move out to Brah Nagar Hluon. And there was a royal order of the King to his son saying, “when the army and all the dâv bañâ have reached the capital, let Samtec Brah Nagar Indr move the elephants, horses, and troops out, set them up as an army, and then move to subdue all the barrg33 in Caturmukh.”

When Cau Bâñâ Braek and the braya, brañ, hluon, khun, hmu’n, all

27) Nagar hluon is Angkor. Brah Nagar Indr and Khun Sai Drañ Brañ Indr are individuals found in the standard Cambodian accounts of those events. See below, “Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations”.
28) Cau Yát, or Bâñâ Yát, is a hero-king of Cambodian history and legend, who drove the Thai out of Angkor following an invasion the date of which is controversial; but the story here is quite different from that in all other sources. See below, “Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations”. Caturmukh is Phnom Penh.
29) Cau Bâñâ Braek would presumably be the governor of moñ brak in modern Chainat province.
30) Khun Śri Bijâiy Sañgrâm is found in the hierarchy law as military chief (khun bañ) of the province of Phitsanulok, Laws I, p. 317.
31) Brah Râm Kâñphañâ was one of the important generals under the kalâhom, see Laws I, p. 281.
32) Apparently the same title, written bejrañ, is given to the cau moñ of kruñ jatayathan in inscription No. 48, Prañ jum Sillâ cûñî, III, pp. 75-81, dated cola era 770 (A.D. 1408), from Chaiñat.
33) Barrg, literally, “group”, occurs frequently throughout the text as a designation for certain allies of Yát. See below, “The barrg”, for an explanation.
[10] หลายคนไปถึงพระคารหลงแล้ว สมเด็จพระคารอินเกียวกองกั้น
เป็นท่านี้ ตามพระชาติภูมิ แต่ใจจะไปยังพระคารหลงหลาย จนถึง
ชีวะนั้น แล้วพระคารหลงกล่าวให้คืนเจ้าจากทั้งพระญาติทั้งหลายตอบ
แกล้งจะพระกรุฎามหาพระคารอิน ทรงพระสอน ทรงพระญา
เสนาบดีอย่าง

กรานธีพิรรหารริยันพระราชนิ 그러면ก็พระคารหลงทรง
เสบียงส้ว

ง จึงแนะนะพระริน แนะนะบางอย่าง ขอฝัญแห่งใส่ไว้ไปดุลใจ
ให้เช่าเพื่อนบ้านให้เอาไปยังแก่เจ้าอย่าง แล้วส่งให้เจ้าพันธุ์ในเจ้าทั้งบ้าน

[12] กิริย์กิจิติ เอาเขมภคัปน์ไปยังบ้านเจ้าอย่าง 2 ขั้นเดินมา
หนึ่งสิ้นหนึ่งเดือนกูรากไม่มีกันผู้เป็นเจ้า มหาวิทยาใช้ยังอยู่อย่าง

ง จึงแนะนะผู้ใส่เจ้าอย่างเขมภคัปน์ จึงจะมาจากทั้งเรื่องมีให้เจ้า
เจ้าอย่าง กรมมั่นคงกับแผนเก่า ดูหมุนที่หินคนผู้ก้ามมาเต็มอน
ครั้นทำให้เชื่องเดินมีไปยัง กบอัคเซ่ยอ จึง
ตูกบกหนึ่งสื่อ แสดงกลุ่มความรู้อยู่เป็นรุ่น มาก
เหงิ่นโจ้กไปอยู่อยู่ข้าง
ตุ้ง จูนนักใช้กลงตัว
ออก เจ้าถึงเจ้าดุนใหญ่ ถือว่าจีนติ่ง ครั้นมา
ถึงตัวบกเลย เพื่อดูยามเหงื่อกุมเข่ากามนั้น
ผมจึงให้สิ่งนักต้องออกลูกอยู่ไป ดูหนังสือพันธ
โดยกามๆครั้งสุนัข พาเข้าถึงจุ้น
พาก ชุนพิกุยกรรมถ่านพุทราพุษมาทั้งหมด
ดัง พวกต้องปากว่ารถวอโขง ม้งวาย ชุนพิกุย
พักเป็นบุญทั้งประเทศเดิ่ษ เศรษฐพิกุยทำบุญมาก
of them, had reached Brāh Nagar Hluōn, Samtec Brāh Nagar Indr moved out and set them up as an army in accordance with the royal order, and then moved to subdue all the mahā bār̓g right up to Caturmukh; and all the bār̓g were routed. They captured Cau Yāt along with all the dāv bānā as well. And at that time the royal prince, Brāh Nagar Indr, became ill. The dāv bānā, the military officers, the Brahmans,

all arranged an offering to the great planets34, and then started back with all the troops. When they reached bire35, Brāh Nagar Indr became very ill. When they reached Brāh Nagar Hluōn he died. Then Mae Nān Debdharāṇi and Mae Nān Gaṅgā36 wrote a letter, put it in a leaf of betel, put that under the rice in a basket, had it sent to Cau Yāt, and gave instructions for him to search37 in the rice basket first.

When the maid took the basket of rice to give [to him], she told Cau Yāt and he searched and found38 the letter and read it and knew that an order of the King had come saying to send Cau Yāt to Ayutthaya. So Khun Nagar Jaiy sent Cau Yāt on from Caturmukh by boat without having him locked up and bound. When they reached the district of saē błąu39 [lacuna?] Later on, at midnight, the guards who had come all slept

34) Grauḥ sārti; probably the ceremony for “propitiation of the planets”, in Sanskrit grauḥ sātī. See Monier-Williams, A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, p. 372.
35) An unidentified Cambodian toponym.
36) Mae nān is a title for one of the categories of palace women, but debdharāṇi is the earth goddess and gaṅgā, “Ganges”, also appears more appropriate for a goddess than a mortal. However, debdharāṇi is also found in Inscription 93 of the Thai corpus as a title of a queen of Sukhothai.
37) Khan (ṇu) written in place of gan (ṅu).
38) Dhap (ṇu) written in place of bap (ṇu).
39) A toponym; for explanation see below, “Miscellaneous toponyms”.
[14] หน้าไม่ถึงสิ้น แต่เข้าของคงนั้นลอยไปด้วย ดูชูพื้นหลังไข่ๆ
กล้าว้าให้มันเข้าของตกถูกเมื่อก่อน เขาอยู่กับความหลากหลายและมุ่งหมาย
ชูพื้นหลังที่เข้าไปอยู่ที่ผู้สุรทิศจริงๆแล้ว แต่ชูพื้นหลังกล้าว้า
[15] ใช้ กลางเข้าอยู่ไปอย่างยุ่งยาก แล้วปรากฏเจ้าๆออกแล้วเลย
เข้าอยู่ ทรงยิ่งนิ้วยาวขึ้น แผ่นแนวที่พวกเข้าจะเลือกไม่เรียบร้อย มีการแหก
จึงชูพื้นหลังเข้าของโฟนบอกพวกไม่แก้เข้าอย่างคนแล้ว ก่อนเข้าอยู่ในแกะ
ม้าที่เก็บมันพวกเข้า ชูพื้นหลังไข่ที่ยุ่งยาก ฉะ
[16] รุ่นคนทั้งนั้น ซึ่งราวเข้าอยู่ โทยทั้งหลายแนะนำให้ตามท้องฟ้านี้
พื้นหลังไข่ๆ กว่าเรามีประโยชน์ ถ้าให้รู้จักใส่ให้ ปรากฏชื่อของเราในขอบ
กัน

* ดูพื้นหลังชูราวก่อนถึงกันไปกันนี้ เผาะยิ่งราวกว่าเข้า
ชื่อของ นำปรับ นำทนถึงครั้งนี้ นำยิ่งใหญ่ อยาภิปราย หนึ่ง
soundly, and Cau Yāt lowered himself into the water and swam away to Khun Blapblajaiy40, who asked who he was. Cau Yāt answered, "I am named Cau Yāt, son of Braj Ram." Khun Blajaiy asked, you are the son of Braj Ram; what is the name of your mother?" Cau Yāt said, "my mother is named Nān Ambakes."41 Khun Blajaiy then said, "you are really the son of our friend." And then Khun Blajaiy said, "Khun Nagar

[15] Jaiy sent Cau Yāt to go to Ayutthaya and we shall protect you; don't you be afraid at all." And Cau Yāt said, "what you are saying now, I suspect that father will kill me in your house here."42 So Khun Blajaiy prepared food for Cau Yāt, and after he had eaten he sent Cau Yāt to mahā raḥ gaeḳ43 of the barg tribe of Khun Blajaiy in tro'an44. By

dawn those people knew that it was Cau Yāt. All the soldiers rushed to ask the troops of Khun Blapblajaiy. He said, "We are not certain. If anyone knows [him] let [him] go with our men. [They] will co-operate in looking for [him]." 45 Much later it was known that Cau Yāt had probably escaped, and Nay Dharrmaraj46, Nay Nī Jān Dōn47, Nay Prajā48, Nay Dōn Tret Sāhṣār, and Nay Nibkāy agreed49 to the Khmer fleeing

40) Khun Blapblajaiy is also found as the protector of Yāt in the Ang Eng Fragment, Coedes, "Essai...", op. cit., pp. 24-28. In the Thai hierarchy law the same title is given to an official, or a function, under the Palace (svān) Ministry (Laws I, p. 240). In addition see comment below, "Names of individuals".

41) For an explanation of the name see below, "Names of Individuals".

42) The passage makes no sense, obviously, and the text must be corrupt.

43) An unidentified toponym; see also [15], [iv], [vi] below.

44) An unidentifiable Cambodian toponym; see [15], [iv], [vi] below.

45) He is not the same person as Bāri Dharrmaraj of Phitsanulok, and appears to have been Cambodian. I am unable to offer a more precise identification.

46) Nay nī jān dōn cannot be identified, but it should be noted that in the present text there are several titles beginning with nī, and inscription no. 48, face 2, line 3 (Pra ; jām sīlā cāruḥ, III, 79), with the title yī jān, probably indicates that such titles are appropriate for the fifteenth century. One nī-type title preserved in the Hierarchy Laws is bāh jān sār sangram for governors of Singburi (Laws, I, 323), and other titles written yī sār jān are recorded in Laws, 1, pp. 229, 233, 237, 260, 271.

47) Under the hāṣhu ministry there was a khun pra; jā sebaraj (Laws, I, 279), but no identity may be assumed.

48) Yon (neu).
[16] จากความเห็นของปรึกษารับรองคำ ๆ ข้างข้างหน้าเหล่านี้

- ศักราช ๒๔๘ ปีก่อนมายาการ เซ็งพรญาณกัปพญุ ให้ แท้มาพระอง

- อนุชั่งขับนั่นแม่พระคริสต์องนั่น บริหารจากอ้อมประชากรจากท้ายทิศที่

- เสมกิจ พระบรรณาธิราชเจ้า และสรรพญาณกัปพญุประทาน จังหวัดประ

-  teşekkürิมกรุงมุขัย แสงอ่วม

[17] พรญาณกัปพญุให้ แต่เครื่องราชขับโปรดทิศกิจนั่น คืนไปยังพระ

- องค์ทรงที่ใน ครั้นเมื่อนั้นก็ เจริญท้องถิ่นเหตุเนื่องจากเหตุ เรื่องการ

- ความที่อยู่เพื่อทรงอัณฑะทรงใน โปรดขึ้นมาถึงศิริภัณฑ์ คุณทหารฝ่ายรบบกนิม

- มหาพันธ์กัปพญุ ถวายทรงประจำ น่านสราณ์สายสุริยะ น้ำศรีโพธิ์ น่าจะเห็น

- อิ่มท้องพันธ์ให้กรานนี้
[17] from Brah Nagar Huon to go to stay with Cau Yät. He organized
them as left, right, forward, and rear.  © [Cula] era 845, Year of the
Pig49, fifth of the decade, Cau Bāṅā Kaev and Bāṅā Dai50, of the tribe
of maha bāhg, whom the King had brought from Brah Nagar Huon,
were discussing with51 Jiy Prajā, the astrologer, about committing
treason against Samtec Brah Paramarājādhiraj Cau, and promised one
another that in accordance with his wish52, they would let Jiy Prajā, the
astrologer, rule the kingdom of Ayuthaya, and would send

[18] Bāṅā Kaev and Bāṅā Dai, and the regalia53 which had been taken,
back to Brah Nagar Huon. When they had made their plans, they also
discussed with Yôt Bejrāt, Bejrārāy, Bejrsaṅgām, and Bijaybej54,
who were soldiers in jaiśṛ55; with Ni Cuk, Ni Gīṭal Śri, Ni Khān
Khān Māk, Nāy Khān Śri, Nāy Śri Hvijalī, Nāy Śri Debsūk, Nāy Cet, chief of [boats]56, and other chiefs of thousands (bōn)
and chiefs of sections (pāk), Nay

49) The date, equivalent to A.D. 1483, is incoherent; see below, "The date of the
story".
50) Those two individuals are mentioned in LP at the date 793 (A.D. 1431), and
in several Cambodian chronicles; see below, "Names of individuals".
51) The yellow script ends at that point in the manuscript.
52) Prathana (prasravan) written for prārthana (prārthana).
53) Rājaprabha (rājaprabha) written for rājupabh (rājupāh).
54) Bejrāvy was a title given to a kha in the department of tāmām cēd kha (Lawis, I, 286); bejrsaṅgāma was a kha in a cavalry department (Lawis, I, 258);
and bijaybej might tentatively be identified with bijayāty, chief of the palace
guards (Lawis, I, 260).
55) Could jaiśṛ here mean "the palace"?
56) The emendation has been made here because the context below, p. [20],
shows that his proper name was Nāy Cet, and his function hua rōn, "chief of
boats".
[๑๙] วังหรูงามฉ่ำ เจ้าอยู่เย็นไม่พักผ่อน .favorite 書中名言 ทุกวันไปเข้าห้องในภูมิพล ปราสาทปท标志 เจ้าต้องอานฉ่ำเวลาอยู่เท่านั้นเมื่อถึงการเลี้ยงปิ่นเป็นพังตลดิ่งนั่งเมื่อ พา เลี้ยง กระบี่หน้าที่หยิ่ง เมื่อการเลี้ยงไปโล่งะหน้าที่หยิ่ง เมื่อพา เลี้ยงไปปราสาทอุทัย ฉ่ำเฉพาะจริณิ์หน้าที่หยิ่ง เทวชาประราชสมการ ทราบว่าทามณีตุ จึงนั่งเฉลย

[๒๐] ห้วยรอบพักทอง อันมีกั้นน้ำมีบกแก้มูเราะยาดว กังกิน ชุมชนชะอ๊ะหกอาษาเพื่อเชิญถวาย ฉ่ำบกนั้น แก่นิยมเปลี่ยน ขนาดๆกิ่งประดุ พระชาุย เทวกุ้มห้งสองซอกเข้าไปยมราชทุโตร้า้พระจรูญ สมศักดิ์พรหมุปะเจ้า ๆ ก่อนถวายพระบาททรงอาคจารอย่างพิจัง ฯ กลุ่มราชศักดิ์ แลดูนิพัฒน์กั้นแล้วทราบสังไปปรั่นร่วมกัน
[19] Vāh, and all the guards. And then they sent for a portion of the silver and gold to go and divide among themselves in the cell of Jiy Prajā, the astrologer; and they would discuss among themselves about taking the King when he went to Pān Tanim (1), when he draṇ pād (2), when he went to offer food to the monks (3), when he went to visit Ayutthaya at sanām candr (4). Because of the King's accumulated merit it didn't succeed, for Nay Cet,

[20] chief of boats, hid on his person the gold which had been divided and came to tell Khun Rāj Aśā in the middle of the night. Khun Rāj Aśā took Nay Cet, chief of boats, along with him in the middle of the night and called Khun Maldiarpāl. The latter opened the door of the palace and took both of them in to go report to H.M. the King. The King sent for all the senior and royal councillors [āmāty] and Khun Rājānklī and Khun Śrī to come and assemble; and then he ordered [them] to prepare all the elephants, horses

57) Nay vāh, literally "a man of the palace".
58) Unidentified toponym.
59) Khun Bunnaq has suggested that pād should be emended to pāt; and that the expression referred to the king offering food to the monks; but that seems unlikely since the same is repeated in the following phrase. Perhaps the verb should be interpreted as the king himself carrying the alms bowl, having become a monk for a brief period.
60) A location in the old city of Ayutthaya; see Bra:ya poran rājādhānī (Bar Tejagupta), Tīrācīk krāh kau ("Story of the old capital"), PP, part 63, vol. 37, pp. 65, 154.
61) Khun rājāśā is also found in the Hierarchy Law in the department of sātracī khaa kōthī, Laws, 1, 286.
62) Khun maldiarpāl is not listed in the Hierarchy Law but the second term is part of the rājādinnāmāntām of the Palace Minister (Laws I, p. 237). According to RA, p. 73, kau was the appropriate rank for officials of that level up to the time of Trailokanath.
63) The term āmāty occurs frequently throughout the text, and I have rendered it consistently as "councillor". Three types of āmāty mentioned in the story are khāra-āmātā- ("senior"), rājā-āmātā- ("royal"), and sena-āmātā- ("military"). Their precise function is of no relevance to the present discussion.
64) Khun rājāsh is also found in the Hierarchy Law in the department of sātracī khaa sīyā, Laws, 1, p. 288.
[๒๐] ทแยงาทำท่าวงทุ่ง ทุ่งหญ้าชีวิตอย่างละหายหมด จึงพบญา
แก้ว ญาแก้ว อยู่ ครูเห็นจึงเห็นไปข้างหน้า กระจากร้องไห้ชื่อ โยธา
ทางทั้งทุ่งภูเขาไปพราน เอาหมุนเก็บทิ้งอย่าง ไหนให้เจ้า
ฝนยาวามเป็นคันแล้ว ก่อให้เจ้า
ฝนภายในที่แท้สาหัส จึงพบเร็วว
[๒๑] ชื่นชมจั่งก็ใต้พระราชาท่านร่วม น้ำก้นเห็นที่หน้าอย่าง แล้วให้เป็นรู
อินทร์กลาง สอนแบบพระญาแบบนี้เห็นข้ามแยกแล้วะราชสมบัติอยู่ลุก อีกทั้ง
พระญาแบบนอกทุ่งภูเขาใดมับเห็นอยู่จุดกลางมาก ปรากฏแก่รู
อินทร์ระยองเป็นกระทำอะไรอยู่หนึ่ง แล้วก็ กระจำรุนนันไปใหญ่หา
[๒๒] ทรงปองคุ้ม
๑ อุปกรณ์สำหรับท่านแก่ใช้มีซึ่งพวกที่เครื่องวัน เอาพระญา
แก้ว พระญาแบบนี้เรียกประจำ แท้กระทำทั้งทุ่ง เพื่อปวงปวงไว้ให้ทุกซึ่ง
เครื่องวัน ออกก้านทั้งปวงปรารถนาสมมิตร สอนแบบพระญาแก้วที่หนึ่ง ชื่นเจ้า
แก้วผาน ปลูกขึ้นปรารถนาให้ประกอบ มีใครต้องยินดี ท่านแก่ใช้ให้แก่เสีย
[21] and soldiers, saying "at dawn [you] shall go to get the royal astrologer." But Bānā Kaev and Bānā Dai found out the secret and fled and hid. When it was near sunrise all the soldiers went to round up the traitors and got them all. As for Bānā Kaev and Bānā Dai, later in the day they were caught behind the reliquary. The King had them interrogated, and then had them locked up in a pen placed beside the flagpole. Then Brāh Paramarā—

[22] jadhirāj Cau gave royal rewards to Nāy Cet, chief of boats, and made him Khun Indmalāry. As for the palace women and also all the dāv bānā and officers, he gave them cosmetic and lime boxes, and betel and areca containers as rewards. For Khun Indmalāry there was a large basket full, and he had [them] take these gifts and go to let all the traitors

[23] see. After about three days, the King had Khun Jay Bāj/Bā and Śrī Rāṅgān take Bānā Kaev and Bānā Dai and Jiy Prajā and all the royal astrologers to impale and expose them on the mast [of ] Khun Nagar Jayi, all together about thirty or more. As for one son of Bānā Kaev, named Cau Kaev Eñ, he went to stay with his wife in Brāh Prasabha. He did not know about his father and the King did not have him killed.

65) The manuscript shows drañh (¹mmod); when compared with the contexts below, it seems to be a corruption of hōrā (¹mmod), p. [23], or hōr (¹mmod), p. [24], both equivalent to hōrn (¹mmod), "astrologer".

66) Kār (n 1), "found out", is an emendation, suggested by Khun Bunng, of what appears written as grā (n 1), "teacher", making a phrase devoid of meaning.

67) Aŋgolāy (a¹mmod) written for aŋgolāy (a¹mmod), aŋgolāy (a¹mmod).

68) That reading is by Khun Bunng.

69) Possibly the same as bhāmok inmānti of the department of gāra: bhāmok, Laws, I, 248.

70) It is not certain what the reference is.

71) The only known place with that name at the present time is in Cambodia, between Phnom Penh and Kompong Cham, which in the context of the story is not impossible (see below, "Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations"). In this case, however, the "two or three days" of the next passage is an impossibly short time, and might be the mistaken entry of a later copyist who no longer understood the story.
[24] อุปช้ำร้างด้วยความ คับ ขาด เกื้อกูลให้ความคุ้ม และเพื่อพื้นที่ ราชการจับกุมทรัพย์สิน อยู่ ปั่นนี้ เข้ามาจับกุมทรัพย์สิน และเจ้าหน้าที่ มีเจ้าหน้าที่ คนเดียวกัน เลยจับกุมทรัพย์สินจับโดยสองกอ ออกสัญญาณแจ้งทหารค่ายเขต จึงถูกจับกุมที่ศาลเจ้า ใกล้ศาลหัวเมือง เข้าจับกุมทำไปเงินเดือน ตามใจแล้วเอา

[25] สนธิรัตน์ ไกรบาง ผู้ใหญ่บ้าน

* เขาคุณทหารยุคสมัย ทหารบก เลยกันผู้เป็น ทหาร ที่มีกำลังคนใน กบฏผู้นี้ ที่มีฤทธิ์ใน กบฏหัวหน้า ทหารไม่ได้เจ้าหน้า เลยสักกัน

* ข้ามไปเมืองคนใน ทหารแต่กบฏในพื้นที่ ของบังเกอร์กบฏ

[26] แก่นทรัพย์สินถูกต้องคนนี้ได้ เขาได้ยึดทรัพย์ แก่นทรัพย์ ข้ามผู้ รัฐทรัพย์หมดใจท่วมทรัพย์ในกินเมืองสิงห์ จึงทรัพย์สินข้ามทรัพย์หมด ข้ามทรัพย์ถูกทรัพย์แก่นทรัพย์ได้สร้างขึ้น ทรัพย์ในถูกทรัพย์แก่น กบฏไว้ กรณีพวกใจ ใดๆของกันใหญ่ขึ้นกระดูกมา แล้วไถ่เอาไป จ้าวิ่ง ออกมาทรัพย์แก่นทรัพย์จรดขาดทรัพย์ ยังมี
[24] After about two or three days Cau Kaev Fa sent word to Samtec Bra∆ Pantaramajadhira∆, saying, "I, slave of Your Majesty, later on in the future will be called by people, 'son of the astrologer' and I will always be ashamed because of that; I, Your Majesty's slave, beg to die also; let's get it over with." So Samtec Bra∆ Pantaramajadhira∆ Cau had Sri Rangān take Cau Kaev Fa out and kill him as he wished and take

[25] the corpse to place it clasping the feet of Bānā Kaev, who was his father. Because the King observed the ten principles of royal conduct excellently he killed people who were traitors. Those whom he did not also consider traitors, he did not have them killed, not a single one. As for mo‘añ Nan, Dāv Bae’s and Dāv Hau’s, brothers, planned to commit treason against Bānā

[26] Kaen Dāv73. They seized mo‘añ Nan and got Bānā Kaen Dāv himself. [They] confined [him], and Bānā Ben let Dāv Hau: go to rule mo‘añ Lim74. Them Bānā Lim said to Bānā Bæ, "please have Bānā Kaen Dāv killed, that will be proper." The banā did not kill him, but had Bānā Kaen Dāv confined. When he was in a good mood, he had him brought out to eat food and drink liquor, and then had him locked up in the pen. Later on Bañā Kaev Dāv conversed with Prān dhātu75, who had

72) ขัน (Ina), "almsbowl", written for ขัน (In), "foot"; correction suggested by Khun Bunnag.

73) An incident variously recorded in the northern chronicles; see below, "The date of the story".

74) Unidentified toponym.

75) Prān dhātu (Pranadhatu) has no clear meaning. The first term, when written .getTag, commonly means "health", "life", "a living being", and the second "relic", "reliquary", "element", and also the fluids of the body, such as blood. I feel that the episode must have some connection with the Kaen Dāv story of the Nan Chronicle, in which Kaen Dāv smears his clothes with buffalo blood in order to feign dysentery and be released from prison. One then asks how an imprisoned man obtained fresh buffalo blood, and this may be what was sent by the prān dhātu in 2bk. 125. See Babamatar relah bīn, in PP, part 10, vol. 9, p. 305; and The Nan Chronicle, tr. Prasert Churatama, ed. David K. Wyatt, Data Paper No. 59, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, p. 13. Those two texts are cited respectively as NC and NCe,
ความสัมพันธ์เกิดขึ้นเมื่อผู้กระทำผิดคนละหนึ่ง ขยานทำผิดคนละหนึ่ง ทำให้ตัวคนละหนึ่งมี-
หลากหลายทาง การเลือกทางทุกด้าน การเลือกทางตนเองอากาศหายเกิดขึ้นได้ ก็จะแตกแยกกันมา
เปลี่ยนไม่ยากนี้ ประมวลสัมพันธ์

ก็เพื่อแสดงสิ่งอย่าง มากมายของอากาศหายเกิดขึ้นไม่ยากให้กับข้าวไม่

ก็เพื่อเห็นเพราะยังไม่ได้วัทถุใดใน เกิดขึ้นเพื่อผลลัพธ์ที่
ก็เพื่อเห็นเพราะยังไม่ได้วัทถุใดใน เกิดขึ้นเพื่อผลลัพธ์ที่

เกิดขึ้นเพื่อผลลัพธ์ที่
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[27] affection for him and had [?] sent [lacuna?] So Nay Sam On took Bañá Kaen Dav away and hid him in "tau hai" in a certain place. When Bañá Baeñ found out, he organized people to go search all over the country, but didn't find [him]. Bañá Baeñ then had roadblocks set up in all the districts. After this Nay Sam On took Bañá Kaen Dav and fled via sahvá77. They couldn't find any food to eat and ate only leaves, mau fruit, tree bark, and tree roots for about ten days;

[28] and they reached mo'an sahlwáh. Nay Sam On took Bañá Kaen Dav to go stay in the cell of Brah Mahá Thera Brahm, and the latter had him cared for. Then the officers of Bañá Jaliáñ went to catch elephants in/tot tron/truon78, and got about sixty elephants, both male and female. So Brah Mahá Thera Brahm had an ascetic (bá kháé) come to speak to Bañá Jaliáñ at the elephant pen, saying, "your son Bañá Kaen Dav has fled with Nay Sam On to sahváh.

[29] and is staying in the cell of Brah Mahá Thera Brahm, who had me come give word to you." When Bañá Jaliáñ found out, he was very happy and ordered the elephants and horses harnessed to go meet Bañá Kaen Dav. When Bañá Kaen Dav arrived he paid his respects to Bañá Jaliáñ, who was his father, and reported how Brah Baeñ and Bañá Lim seized mo'an Nan and Brah Kaen Dav fled. He spoke so that Bañá Jaliáñ could hear everything.

[30] Then Bañá Jaliáñ took Bañá Kaen Dav down the river to come to make obeisance to Samtec Brah Paramaräjádiráj Cau in Ayutthaya. Then Bañá Jaliáñ reported how Bañá Baeñ and Bañá Lim seized mo'an Nan and Bañá Kaen Dav had escaped. He related everything to the King. Then Samtec Brah Paramaräjádiráj Cau expressed thanks to Bañá Kaen Dav and gave rewards and gifts.

76) Does "tau hai" here mean a type of large jar (haí/în)? That would be more logical as a hiding place than a type of hearth (Tan/îi). NC, p. 305, and NCe, p. 13, say "that night be escaped to Ban Tao Hai".

77) "Sahlwáh" is probably the sathéah of Sukothai inscriptions, which has been tentatively identified as in the Sukhotai-Phitsanulok region. For further discussion see below, "The date of the story".

78) Possibly modern Tron, an amphoe (district) in Uttaradit Province.
[31] to both the bañā, who took leave of Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau to return to mo'ān Jalini. Whereas in Braḥ Nagar Hluoḥ a certain Hnā khōm79 had heard that there was an order of the King issued to have Cau Yāt sent to Ayutthaya. Hnā khōm then examined the horoscope10 of Cau Yāt and knew that Cau Yāt would have merit.

[32] [end of reverse of manuscript]

[i] [beginning of obverse of manuscript]... said, “since the royal son, Braḥ Nagar Indr, has died, now whom is it fitting to let rule in Braḥ Nagar Hluoḥ?” Then all the dāv bañā and senior councillors said, “mo’ān Braḥ Nagar Hluoḥ is a very great capital city; it is not a little place, and to let āmāty [and] mantri82 go to rule there is not proper; what all of us, slaves of Your Majesty, like, is to let Bañā Brak

[ii] stay and rule himself.” So Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau issued an order saying that all the bañā had spoken thus, and that was good, but if in the future there is any conflict [lacuna?] Then all the bañā requested, “let your servant, Khun Śri Pād, be Khun Bal83, let Khun Draḥ Braḥ Indr be mentor just the same. [As for] Khun Rājaśāk and Khun Krainingāy84, let them remain to remind that all of us have no grounds for suspicion

[iii] at all.85 Then Samtec Braḥ Paramarājādhirāj Cau gave orders in accordance with all the dāv bañā; and then he gave the seal of the braḥ Garuda [vihana]86 to all the dāv bañā in order to take Cau Bañā Brak up to rule in Braḥ Nagar Hluoḥ; and he let Cau Mac Dav Indr Puṭi be consort. Later on the King of sodhar87 let Khun Nagar Jaiy be commander and take all the troops to go to fight Cau Yāt and

79) Hnā khōm cannot be positively identified as either a title or a name.
80) Chaṭā (न्यू) written for jāṭā (जाटा).
81) jai, more properly jā (जय), used as a negative, a usage attested in standard dictionaries.
82) It is not certain from the text whether āmāty and mantri, “officers”, should be separated or not.
83) Khun bal means “khaṇ (chief?) of military forces”, and since it appears in this context to be a central government function, might refer to that which under King Trailokanātha is believed to have been changed to kalāhom. See below, “Date of the story”.
84) Khun krainingāy is a title given in the Hierarchy Laws to the second in command of the military department of the teja, Laxes, I, p. 280.
85) That reading is by Khun Bunnag.
86) Garud vihāna in the manuscript. The garuda vīhāna is the “vehicle” of Vishnu.
87) Khun sodhar, from yasodhārapura, the classical name for Angkor.
[iv] ปัจจุบัน ๒ กลุ่มจำพวกเกียรติพลเพลิง ประกอบด้วยฉันนั้นเองและวลีชื่อ ชื่อชาย
นครวชิร แปลค่อนประมาณ ๓๐๐ คน ไป ฉัน ๓๐๐ คน ถ้าไปกล่าวก็ได้
กรณีที่คนที่มาที่นั่น ก่อนหน้าอยู่ ชื่อเศร้าเกื้อกำเนิดที่นั่นไปดุส่า
กรณีที่ไปก่อนมันเจริญด้วยกันให้เกิดกรณีต่อมาด้วยสิ่ง ควร
เราฟัง เขา ก กลับมา
[v] ยังทั่วที่คนเกียรติพลๆ ก็คงไหวansom ลงเศร้าเกื้อกำเนิดกัน
๑ ชื่อเศร้าเกียรติพล กลุ่มจำพวกเกียรติพลไปปรับเจ้าที่อย่างกลมแน่นเจ้า
ยากเกือบหมดสิ่งพรานเอกสก็ยื่นช้าข้างหน้าแห่ง ชื่อเศร้าเกื้อกำเนิด
พ่ายมา แล้วบางกรุณาที่กันถึงข้างสั้นต่อไปเกิดก็ตี ข้าวภัตติ พลชมพัน
พละحتياทนั้นมากก็นั่น
The latter took elephants, horses, and troops, and went to priäh broe. That was where the Chong gaej were. Then Khun Nagar Jaiy organized about 300 men and had them go observe. The 300 men moved out in the middle of the night. When they got onto the road it was very cold and they went to sleep. Khun Nagar Jaiy designated a group to go and observe too. When he saw that those who had gone earlier were asleep, he had their weapons picked up and all brought back. When they woke up they came back.

To the army of Khun Nagar Jaiy. He had them punished and then had their weapons given back to them.

Then Khun Nagar Jaiy took elephants, horses, and troops to go fight Cau Yât where the Chong gaej were. Cau Yât had organized the Khmer, Chong and Pear to go out and lie in ambush and shoot from the left, right, front and rear. Khun Nagar Jaiy was routed, and the elephant rushed off with him without falling, and the elephant "Sâm Bliën" was lost to the enemy. The Cambodians pursued and killed the soldiers and very many died then.

---

88) On pā viset see below, "Names of individuals".
89) An unidentified Cambodian toponym.
90) See n. 43, above, and comment on "The barrg" below. Gaej and gaej are possibly the same thing, one term, or both, being corrupt. The Chong/jên are a Mon-Khmer ethnic group of western Cambodian and southeastern Thailand.
91) See comment on "The barrg" below. The Pear/barrg are a Mon-Khmer ethnic group of western Cambodia.
92) Yūn (จบ) written for yin (เข้า).
93) Proper name of the elephant; apparently the same as on p. [xxv], below. One or the other must be corrupt.
94) The term occurs only here in the text, and seems to indicate the Khmer, Chong, and Pear collectively.
[vi] เข้าถึงก็ข้ามมีทรัพยากรในปัญหาในระบบฯ กระบวนยุทธ์หนึ่ง กลับ เข้าแล้วขับสู่ต้นไม้ และ กลียมหางเกือบ ชูแกนเนื้อพรตตรักคืนแล้ว กลับกันยมาตระ เข้าถึงเอาแบบมีสกิ้งไฟ โดยยังคงไป จึงละเลย เจาะตรงพรคกรท้อง กลางชูได้กระแสน้ำใส่ปร้อยกันแห่งเพชร ด้วย เมื่อธุรกิจข้าม ขนาดใหญ่

[vii] ทั้งนี้ บาดเจ็บไป ija เข้าถึงก็ข้ามกันเนื้อพรค แล้วเริ่มตนปลายน้ำมีสกิ้งไอ แล้วให้กระแสน้ำก้านแห่งเพชร หนึ่ง รถยนต์มีกันพรคกรท้องเลื่อนเร็วค่อนข้างก้านแห่งเพชรสิน ยุทธการปฏิ พอแล้วกันเนื้อพรคท้อง เข้ากันแห่งเพชรเป็นใจค้อย เข้าถึง แล้วระบบๆ repairs

[viii] ไป จึงแตกเขาใจตามชูก้านแห่งเพชร 2 นา ถ้าเราเป็นใจก้อย เข้าถึงผู้ทรงนั้นจริง ชูได้กระแสน้ำใครอยู่

• อีกข้ามผู้ได้รับปุ่มน้ำเมาะขี้จัดรัก ผู้เป็นเขาใจให้พิจารณาดูก บางชูก้านแห่งเพชรสินแห่งเพชร ทางกลมกระยุกันไทยอีก แลมือกิน เมื่อกองย์แบ่งยา

• ยุทธเข้าชากลึกมา ชาวข้ามประวัย

[ix] กองย์แล้งแห่งเพชร วางสตรีกระโอ ชูก้านแห่งเพชร ซึ่งเจ้าพวก เข้าไปได้ เข้ากันกันที่ประเมินว่า ผู้มีโทษต่อข้าม ชูแกนเนื้อพรคในก้าน เข้าถึงกีย์ กลับอยู่ได้เห็นขอทุกวัย ชูก้านแห่งเพชร กลับอยู่ทางผู้ 2 กองชูก้านแห่งเพชรอยู่ด้วย จึงถูกยิงกัน วันนี้ผู้ให้กลับไปยึดมีปืนเล็กให้ก แต่ยังไม่ได้นำเข้าชูก้านแห่งเพชร
[vii]

[thai text]

[viii]

[thai text]
Cau Yät moved the elephants, horses, and troops and fled away to stay in troeūn[^95] for about a month; and [then] he was able to come in and take pān sūn[^96], and he moved on to caňko'ap[^97]. Khun Kāmhaen Bejr[^98], who governed that mo'ān, defended it fiercely. Cau Yät couldn’t take the mo’ān, so he employed a ruse and moved the troops back. Then the King of Brah Nagar Hluon appointed Khun Kraibal Saen[^99] to go help Khun Kāmhaen Bejr defend the mo’ān of caňko'ap. The inhabitants [vi] all believed that Cau Yät had gone back. After about seven or eight days Cau Yät took only the fast ones, rushed in and sacked that town (mo’ān) and Khun Kraibal Saen and Khun Kāmhaen Bejr fled quickly back to Brah Nagar Hluon and lost all the displaced family of Khun Kāmhaen Bejr. Later on, Khun Kraibal Saen told H.M. the King of Brah Nagar Hluon that Khun Kāmhaen Bejr was loyal to Cau Yät, and he had sent[^100] his son and wife [vii] away [to Yät]. So the King had Khun Kāmhaen Bejr interrogated. He said, “if I am really loyal to Cau Yät as [he] says, would Khun Kraibal Saen have gotten away? o Furthermore, I fought fiercely and thus escaped.” The King had Khun Kāmhaen Bejr’s wounds examined and saw that it was true. He sent him another wife and let him remain to govern mo’ān caňko'ap again. o Later on Cau Yät had someone come to have a discussion [ix] with Khun Kāmhaen Bejr to say that the son(s) and wife(ves) of Khun Kāmhaen Bejr whom Cau Yät had taken away were still being kept by Cau Yät; he hadn’t had them eliminated. If Khun Kāmhaen Bejr went to submit to Cau Yät, he would take care of him well. Khun Kāmhaen Bejr did not go along with Cau Yät, and the latter brought elephants, horses, and troops to take mo’ān caňko'ap one more time. When he arrived, he let [them] climb up into and sack that town and took Khun Kāmhaen Bejr himself

[^95]: An unidentified Cambodian toponym.
[^96]: An unidentified toponym which seems to be Thai.
[^97]: An unidentified Cambodian toponym.
[^98]: The title is given here to the governor of caňko'ap; later, p. [xxiii], he appears as governor of trahān blan.
[^99]: Kraibal saen, hluon rather than khun, appears in the Hierarchy Laws as military chief of Nakhon Si Thammarat, Laws, 1, p. 318.
[^100]: 瀵 t (drai) written for  createdBy Khun Bunnag.
[x] ไป เจ้าอา الوحيدที่ลูกชายและที่สุดที่หน้าเชื่อมแท่นได้ไปแสดงนั่น
ให้ก็สิ้น แล้วลูกชายที่หน้าเชื่อมในยี่สุด

○ อาสาเจ้าของเพื่อนรักที่หน้าเชื่อม แทนการป้ายไว้ปรับปรุง
ควมการที่หน้าหลังยินยุ่นให้ปักเต็มนั้น แทนการที่หน้าหลังยกออก
แทนการล้น

○ ซึ่งกล่าวด้วยความระดับ แทนชื่อเสรีนิยมก

[xi] รักษา แล้วจริงพระณิชนาการ ขุนราชที่กิ่งข้างมีวัตถุไปแยง ภูผ่องทอง
มหาเจรกลาหลายยินยุ่นในปักเต็มนั้น จึงภูผ่องทองแล้ว มหาเจรกลาหลาย
ออกมามานะเมืองข้างใหญ่ยิ่งข้างหลัง ๆ ท่านมาถึงจุติบุษ แล้วเสริมมาข้าง
ภูผ่องทองโดยยิ่งเล่าพระพักพันภูผ่องทอง แทนการที่หน้าหลากยินยุ่น
ภูผ่องทอง ที่รุ้นรู้

[xii] มีกระทำเจ้าแปรราชเทียบกืมหนันเจ้าธุรกิจมีพระเครื่องหลวง จึงกระจาย
เครื่องร้อยไหมสำนับในหมวดนั้นได้เรียกรูณานักจักรน้ำเย็นเรื่อง
ที่เรียกแปรราชพระณิชนาการขุนราชเทียบหน้าข้าง ชาวที่เรียกเจาะออกจาก
ขุนกับทางรุ่นรู้อย่างบนำไปรฉัล–ไป ขุนราชเทียบกืมหน้าหลา บุรอด
ย่างให้พวกกฎหมายท
away. Cau Yat sent the son(s), wife(ves), and domestic(s) of Khun Kāmpheh Bejr whom he had taken away before, and gave them all back; and he took care of Khun Kāmpheh Bejr and made him comfortable. Later on, Cau Yat had Ni Jän Don and Nāh Śri Bāra go negotiate with all the mahā barṛg who lived in pāsāntī101. All the mahā barṛg came to join Cau Yat. Then Saṃtec Bāha Bṛā102 Nagar Hluon appointed Khun Śri Māṅgal—

[rāṇa k] and Khun Draṇ Braṇ Indr and Khun Rājasākti to take elephants, horses, and troops and go take Ni Jän Don and all the mahā barṛg who lived in pāsāntī. So Ni Jän Don and all the mahā barṛg came out and fought Khun Māṅgarāṇa [and] all the troops. The latter were defeated and came to Caturmukh, and lost elephants, horses, weapons, victory gongs, and flutes. Ni Jän Don and all the mahā barṛg followed them to Caturmukh. Khun Śri

[rāṇa k] Māṅgarāṇa and Khun Rājasākti fled from Caturmukh to come to Braṇ Nagar Hluon. So Cau Yat organized a fleet and had it come to wait in ambush at Lovek103. He could then pursue and capture the slow boats and many people. Thus Nāy Nōy a boat master, held the arm of Khun Draṇ Braṇ Indr, the father of Khun Rājasākti, and he escaped. The sailors of Cau Yat got Khun Kāmpheh and his son(s) and wife(ves) and—104 Khun Rājasākti and all the lūk khaṇ105 who escaped fled on to Braṇ

101) A Cambodian toponym which also appears in other sources; see below, "pāsāntī".
102) The combination of titles saṃtec bāha bṛā is, I believe, unique; and it may be a corruption.
103) Sākap, an error for sākat, "ambush". Lovek was the sixteenth-century capital of Cambodia.
104) The term or phrase here has proven quite incomprehensible.
105) Lūk Khāṇ, a type of official. No attempt will be made here to translate or define the term.
[xiii] บทที่หนึ่ง

๑ สำนวนที่เป็นภาษา อันเป็นเจ้าหน้าที่เกี่ยวกับแมลงสาบ หน้านี้ ความรู้ ยกจากฝั่งมวลภาษาทั้งหลายที่มีการแพร่หลายถึงแมลงสาบก็ยังคงเป็นภาษาที่มีการใช้ในประเทศจีน สัน ที่ใช้ แล้วแต่ผลที่เหมาะสม กฎหมายการค้าระหว่างประเทศและกฎหมายประเทศ นั้น รวมถึงภาษาที่ต่อ ก่อนยุทธ์อักษร ๒ กฤตการณาที่รุ่นพ่อ แล้ว ชุมนุมเวียนวาย ที่ใช้

Nagar Hluon.  As for Khun Debaraj, whom the King had led go to govern mo'ah slay¹⁰⁶, when he knew Cau Yat had probably gone off with all the mahā barr, and could conquer all the country like that, Khun Debaraj and all the luk khun prepared gifts and came to offer obeisance to Samsê Bûn Nagar Hluon.  When they reached pûsânti they met a patrol¹⁰⁷ of Cau Yat.  They captured Khun Debaraj and the officers (khun hmin)¹⁰⁸ and the families of refugees

who came, all of them, that is, Mae Nān Braḥ, Mae Nān Sai, Mae Nān Potrī, Mae Nān Sañ, Mae Nān Agaraj, Mae Nān Gahrāį¹⁰⁹, who were the children and wives of all the khun hmin; and they got all of them and all went to Cau Yat.  He took all the women as wives and then distributed the possessions and silver and gold which had been obtained to all the soldiers.  A little later Pâ Viset came to Cau Yat and he gave

Mae Nān Gahrāį to Pâ Viset, and the latter performed the consecration of Cau Yat as Cau Bûn Yat at Babaur¹¹⁰.  After that Pâ Viset tabați [?]¹¹¹ the troops and took Hmu'n Treṣ Saṃsrā along with him.  But Bûn Yat got all the mo'ah: Caturmukh and Hmu'n Nařa, governor of bejrindr, mo'ah Lovek, mo'ah Kompong baṅrī, mo'ah Trapeang blañ¹¹², mo'ah Babaur, mo'ah koē, mo'ah katō;¹¹³ and he let Treṣ Saṃsrā rule mo'ah

¹⁰⁶) An unidentified toponym; see below, "Miscellaneous toponyms".
¹⁰⁷) The translation was suggested by Khun Bunnag.
¹⁰⁸) Hmin, an error for hmu'n.
¹⁰⁹) Mae Nān Agaraj and Mae Nān Gahrāį also appear in the Ang Eng Fragment; Coedes, "Essai", p. 27.  See below, "Names of individuals".
¹¹⁰) Pâpûr, modern romanization Babaur, is at the lower end of the Tonle Sap on the west side of the river.
¹¹¹) The term has not been identified.
¹¹²) Bejrindr and kambah baṅrī are unidentifiable Cambodian toponyms.  Modern gazetteers list three places named trabaṅ bhiāh (Trapeang Phlong), in Siem Reap, Kampot, and Kompong Cham.  The first two are clearly outside of the area concerned in the story.  Even the third, right on what is today the border of Viet Nam, seems too far away.  Of course the name, "pond of water chestnut", is the type of natural-feature toponym which could occur almost anywhere, only to disappear when the place was no longer important.
¹¹³) Kao: is unidentifiable, but I would suggest that kato is a scribal error for Krakor, slightly northwest of Babaur on the shore of the Tonle Sap.  In the Thai history of the Bangkok Third Reign (Braḥ rājabhānāyaṃ braḥ rājatanakasindī, Glän Vitayā, Bangkok, 2506), p. 207, it is distorted in another way, as ta: grī; the letters for t, l, g, k may easily be confused in unfamiliar terms in both languages.
[xvi] กกองพลอยากรุงเทพศรีอยุธยา พบกับเสด็จพระเจ้าอยู่หัว ช่วงทางอยู่หัว จักรีบุรุษ พระบาทสมเด็จพระจุลจอมเกล้าเจ้าอยู่หัว ขุนพระบรมวงศ์เธอ กรมหมื่นพระยาภักดีบุเรงเนิน ณ พระบรมราชวังจันทกีบบ

๑ จึงสมเด็จพระเจ้าบรมวงศ์เธอ กรมพระยาดำรงราชานุภาพ ออกเสด็จเก็บผลไม้ในอุทยาน

[xvii] ใช้ปลูกโรงโรงแค่ห้าง แค่ห้างก็คือไปเถอะพระนครหัวเหลี่ยมไปเรื่อย ทุกสถานที่ก็มี ซึ่งพ่อเจ้าทรงพระกรุณา

๑ ครบเครื่องทุกหลักหัวหน้า สมเด็จพระบรมราชินีพระเจ้าอยู่หัว ราชโองการไปแก้พระราชโอรสแห่งสมเด็จพระเจ้าอยู่หัวพระนครหัวลง แซ่ด้วน พบเจ้าทั้งหัวเรือธุรณิการพระราชลง

[xviii] ราชองครักษ์อยู่หัวชัย แล้วยุทธการอยู่หัวทิพยากรจักรทิพยากร สร้างทั่วพื้นเมืองทั่วทิศ ไทยทั่วไทยเจ้าอยู่หัวพระโองการไปถึงสมเด็จเจ้าอยู่หัวพระนครหัวลง ณ ที่ทุ่นแพร่โดย นามย่อมเจ้าอยู่หัว

๑ ขุนนครธพปิย์สมเด็จพระบรมราชินีพระเจ้า โปรดพระนามจะทรงหลักพิชิตนำไปเสด็จท่าน
[xvi] kad. Bāññ Yak stayed in Choeng Prey\textsuperscript{114}, Bāññ Viset stayed in \textit{birendhar}\textsuperscript{115}, ṇī Jān Đōn stayed in Caturmukh, Khun Šab \textsuperscript{116} stayed in Lovek, Khun Debrāj\textsuperscript{117} stayed in Babaur, Khun Kāṃhacch Bejr stayed in Trapeang Ḗlañ, Nay Dharmarāj stayed in \textit{coīko'ap}. So H.M. the King of Brah Nagar Hluoñ had Nāy Lañ Bāt arrange a ruse, had him sneak off to report to Samtec Brah Paramarājādhīrāj Cau that Khun Nagar

[xvii] Jaiy had let Cau Yāt go, and Cau Yāt had gone out and joined with all the \textit{mahā bārg} as a great traitor. “Thus I beg Your Majesty to have compassion.” When the servant had reported the situation, Samtec Brah Paramarājādhīrāj Cau had a royal order sent to his son, the King of the city of Brah Nagar Hluoñ, and all the \textit{dāv baññ}, saying that there would be a war

[xviii] in Ayutthaya, and to have Khun Nagar Jaiy and Nāy Lañ Bāt come very quickly\textsuperscript{118}. As for all the \textit{dāv baññ} and military, they were to stay with the \textit{cau baññ}\textsuperscript{119}. When the royal order arrived, H.M. the King of Brah Nagar Hluoñ had Khun Nagar Jaiy and Nāy Lañ Bāt come to Ayutthaya. [When] Khun Nagar Jaiy arrived, Samtec Brah Paramarājādhīrāj Cau had all the senior councillors confer, and [they found it] was true, and the King

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{114} \textit{Jia' brai}/Choeng Prey is a district (\textit{sruk}) northeast of Phnom Penh and west of Kompong Cham.
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Probably the same as \textit{birem}; see above, n. 35.
  \item \textsuperscript{116} The title \textit{śab} occurs in three sections of the old laws, none of which show any relationship to its occurrence here. See \textit{Laws}, III, pp. 114, 290, and \textit{Laws}, IV, p. 89.
  \item \textsuperscript{117} The title \textit{debaraj} is found in several sections of the Thai laws, \textit{Laws}, I, pp. 220, 233, 254, 265, 279, 280, but none of them shows any connection with the present context; and none of the extant lists of Cambodian officials gives such a title to governors of Babaur.
  \item \textsuperscript{118} \textit{filap} (\textit{phīl}) written for \textit{phlaph} (\textit{phāñ}) or \textit{hīnu} (\textit{hāñ}). See below, p. [xxxv].
  \item \textsuperscript{119} \textit{Cau baññ} here apparently refers to the Ayutthayan prince ruling at Angkor.
[xi] กลไกหนุนเสรีชีวิต เล่นอยาสงกัดNON ไม่ว่าผู้มีอยู่เป็นบุคคลุน

โครงการเล่น เล่นขานกันเองชี้ปั้นชุมชน เอชชูน่าเก่าเหนือชัยหนทาง

นายแพ็ค คุณงามพร วจนายกรัฐมนตรีชุมชนพิเศษ อาทิ เมื่อชุมชนโครงการ

ทุกอย่างผ่านสิ้นพื้นที่ชุมชนเป็นจานหนึ่ง วางแผนทางวิทยาศาสตร์

○ ชนหน้าจุณ

[xx] ผ่านวิถีรายชั่วอันแดงต่างมีคำให้โทษแพ็ค คืออุดมคุณพันหลาย อา

ผู้ต้องถึงข้อ ขาดเจ้าหน้าที่ไปชุมชนพื้นที่ ผู้เป็นเจ้าหน้าที่พร้อมกิจการ

ชั่วผ่านวิถีการคำให้โทษมากกว่าผู้ช่วยชุมชนพิเศษช่าง

นั้นไป เกษตรกรุยใส่ผู้เป็นเจ้าหน้าที่ชุมชนวิจัยในหลายพื้น แต่ชั่ว

ให้ความชุน

[xxi] พิเศษ แปลนขุนนิวชาระวันเมืองพื้นที่

○ ส่วนเวลาพุทธมหาสนิทแยกราช ประมาณ ๑๐๐๐๐ เป็นสาย

วิชาหน้าสั่น แล้วพุทธวิเศษสิ้นพื้นที่ ยักษ์แยกร่ำงบอกพรมด้านหล่า

กายเพื่อไทยสั่น จึงชุนที่พร้อมช่วยขี่มืองนั้นเกอกจากพุทธธาตุมาแล

พุทธวิเศษสิ้นพื้นที่เป็นชีวิตไฟ

○ อุดมคุณพัน
had Khun Nagar Jaïy killed, and Nêy Sônh Thôn and Nêy Nê Dûm, who were sons of Khun Nagar Jaïy, [were] killed [too]. Then the King appointed Nêy Lanh Bât as Khun Bai\(^{120}\) and took Khun Kânh Bôn Bût, the friend of Khun Râmâṣar\(^{121}\). As for Khun Phâ Yân, the balat, [and] Khun Brâj Śrî, when earlier Khun Nagar Jaïy asked [the King] for the male elephant, "Khun Bai," as security\(^{122}\), saying, [lacuna?] the King said it was possible. \(^{123}\) At that time Khun Phâ Yân said [to the King] that an elephant with even tusks like this should not be allowed to go far from H M. So all the luk khan [lacuna?] "If others don’t like me, Khun Nagar Jaïy, to be Khun Bai myself, the King is disgraced"; and [he] fled\(^{123}\). Khun Phâ Yân didn’t tell the King in private. Furthermore, he didn’t tell Khun Brâj Śrî, but sent that elephant to Khun Nagar Jaïy himself. The King had Khun Phâ Yân kept in a dungeon, and appointed Śrî, son of Khun

\(^{120}\) Khun bai in Ayutthaya. Above, n. 83, we saw that Khun Śrî Pâd was khun bai in Nagar Hluôn; it would appear that Khun Nagar Jaïy had been khun bai in Ayutthaya. See below, p. [xx].

\(^{121}\) Perhaps the same title as khun ramaṣra; tej, second in command of the department of bijaiy sabgrân, Laws, I, p. 280.

\(^{122}\) That interpretation is by Khun Bunnag.

\(^{123}\) The passage is admittedly anything but clear.

\(^{124}\) The titles are not found in the extant Hierarchy Laws; but the first could be interpreted as "khun of the royal betel", which would be a palace functionary, and the second contains the term "royal palace", rājavât.

\(^{125}\) Pursat (bodhi saṭv) is a town and province west/northwest of Babaur. Khun Drah Brâj Indr is apparently the same person mentioned above as bilaṣ of the Ayutthayan prince at Angkor.
[xxii] อาจารย์ผิวมีสีสกปรกลมขึ้นซึ่งจี้เจ้าฟ้าพระยาเชื้อฟ้า

๐ อาจารย์ผิวมีสีสกปรกลมขึ้นซึ่งจี้เจ้าฟ้าพระยาเชื้อฟ้า ทรงใช้คำว่าเวียงแก้ว วัน
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[xxii] ดิ้งผิวสีสกปร ชุมแห่งพระอินทรเดชชุนเทพสตรีกรมเกษมILLEซึงกิ่งมี

วิจารณาอย่างทรงพระยาเจ้า เทพสมเด็จเจ้าต่าง และวิทยาศาสตร์และนิร

ไป ขณะนั้น ชุนเทพสตรีกรมวิทยาศาสตร์มาไว้ได้ที่กัลกิ่งไปแต่ยี่หัว ที่ใน

**เทวสำเมร์** เพื่อรับถังรบถ้วย

[xxiv] รวบรวมไป เล่นตุ๋นศึกทั้งนี้ กล่ายผิวตรงนั้นบังสัตว์สมบูรณ์

**บ๊** มุคโดยไคหวังเฉยบุกกล่าว เทวดาราจึงถือว่าชุนเทพสตรีกรมกิ่ง ถ้า

**ขึ้น** กระหึ่นตามกลุ่ม ด้วยอุปสรรคบังคับชุดเทพสตรีกรม อยู่แต่ที่

**สอง** อั้นอุปสรรคกรมขาดในก่อนช่วง ขณะนั้น  นายเทวสำมาถักอิน
A LOST CHRONICLE OF AYUTTHAYA

[xxii] fl A Yat and Bana Viset took elephants, horses, and troops and came to take Pursat again. At that time Bana Viset moved the troops to set them up in tämpal borān126, [but] did not set up a base. As for Bana Yat, he came to set them up in Pursat and had them make a base, dig ditches and ramparts around it and make a fence with spikes and thorns127, securely. And Bana Yat came to surround Pursat. After about five days, Khun Deb Saṅgrām of Chanthaburi128 took elephants, horses and troops to go.

[xxiii] to Pursat, Khun Draṇ Brah Indr and Khun Deb Saṅgrām prepared the elephants, horses, and troops to go out and resist Bana Yat and Bana Viset [who] were routed and all the soldiers pursued and attacked [them]. At that time Khun Deb Saṅgrām rode the male elephant "Bhūpāl" and blocked and pursued the enemy boldly all by himself. Hmu'n Tret Saṅsār rode the male elephant "Ratnapārlān," which was much smaller than Bhūpāl. When he saw Khun Deb Saṅgrām was so bold and there was no one to resist him, he goaded the elephant Ratnapārlān and turned about to get out beside the elephant Bhūpāl129. Tret Saṅsār struck and hit the headgear of Khun Deb Saṅgrām and it fell. Nay Cakkārāt130, who was on the back of Tret Saṅsār's elephant, stabbed and hit the eye of Khun Deb Saṅgrām, and Tret Saṅsār slashed Khun Deb Saṅgrām, who died on the neck of his elephant. At that moment Nay Tret Saṅsār was struck by arrows.

[xxiv] grām was so bold and there was no one to resist him, he goaded the elephant Ratnapārlān and turned about to get out beside the elephant Bhūpāl129. Tret Saṅsār struck and hit the headgear of Khun Deb Saṅgrām and it fell. Nay Cakkārāt130, who was on the back of Tret Saṅsār's elephant, stabbed and hit the eye of Khun Deb Saṅgrām, and Tret Saṅsār slashed Khun Deb Saṅgrām, who died on the neck of his elephant. At that moment Nay Tret Saṅsār was struck by arrows.

126) A location also apparently mentioned in the Ang Eng Fragment; see below, "Miscellaneous toponyms".
127) According to Khun Bunnag the phrase has no clear meaning.
128) In the Hierarchy Law, the title does not figure as part of the titulature of governors of Chanthaburi.
129) Reading by Khun Bunnag.
[xxv] เทคนันคนที่อยู่ในท้องที่ของนักธุรกิจใหญ่ ถ่อยไปไม่เวียนกลับ

- ช่างแล้วการแบ่งร้านนั้นให้กับคนของนักธุรกิจ ทู สนิทนาท์ธุรกิจ
 สองที่ ระหว่างที่จะแยกงานเจรจาตามที่นักธุรกิจ ทู สนิทนาท์ธุรกิจ
 สองที่ ความอย่างที่เกิดขึ้นหลังจากที่นักธุรกิจ

[xxvi] แยกนั้น กรณีที่มีซ้ายมาก ข้อซ้ำที่อยู่วิเคราะห์ข้างข้างของ
 สองที่ พบว่าอยู่ในคำว่าชั่วขณะนั้น

[xxvii] แยกนั้น โมเดล ใดที่อยู่ตรง

five of them. As for Bañā Yat, he was struck by an arrow in the arm, and it was very painful, and he could not remain. He withdrew into the thuan Babaur. Later on someone came and stole the elephant “Rāṭnasīhāṭ” from Pursat but was caught by Nay Tret Saṅsār who had previously given that elephant to Cau Bañā Yat. Yat, when he knew Tret Saṅsār had gotten the elephant like that, mounted the elephant “Sablu’h” and came from Choeung Prey to Bañā Viset in Trá-

When he arrived, he said, “I have come to ask for the elephant.” Bañā Viset said, “go ahead and talk with Tret Saṅsār.” Bañā Yat had Tret Saṅsār brought to talk. Tret Saṅsār said, “I obtained this elephant to keep and mount in your service”. Bañā Yat said, “we came in order to exchange elephants, but if you do not exchange, so be it.” Bañā Yat returned to his mo’an. Later on Bañā

Yat employed a ruse to send for Tret Saṅsār, who went to tell Bañā Viset. He forbade Tret Saṅsār to go. A little later Bañā Yat sent for him again. Tret Saṅsār rushed to tell Bañā Viset. He forbade him again. Tret Saṅsār did not listen and took two hūa bān and 500 troops and went to fight Bañā Yat. He had Tret Saṅsār and the two hūa bān captured and confined. As for the 500 troops, he had them

131) Thuan seems inexplicable.
132) The name ratnasihāṭ (< ratnasīhāṣana), “jewelled lion throne”, is a near synonym with the name ratnaparli, “jewelled throne”, above, p. xxiii; and perhaps the same elephant is meant.
133) Assuming the same expression, Bāh gīy as on page xiii, above; see note 107.
134) See n. 93, above.
135) Plaein, scribal error for plian (rīḥānu).
136) Hua ban, “chief of thousand”, a level of military command.
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[xxviii] โอกาสให้ แกล้งการของตกแต่งต่างไปอย่างกว้าง purposes ไตร่ เล่า
ก้าวตามวัน เล่าจะเริ่มไปถึงจุดยุทธศาสตร์ ล่าสุดการสั่นเลือดเท่านั้น
สองสั่นเพื่อไปยังข้อผิด แต่จะเข้าถึงคราวพบทัพบ้านเข้าใจที่มุ่งไปยัง
ทุกมุมมอง

 ๑ จึงเข้าพระอนุญาตให้ขยายบรรยายเป็นทางทรัพยากร สามารถ
 وأوضحโดยใช้ข้อมูลหลัก

 ๒ จึงสมเหตุพระรัมราช

[xxix] จึงเข้าใจแบบมองของพงษ์บริทรัตน์ทรงแสดงความอย่างพินิจ
ให้ใช้ ให้รู้เกี่ยวกับข้อทุนแรก

 ๑ อยู่พระอนุญาตหมดคนนั้นเป็นผู้ยุ่งอยู่ขุนใจไปอยู่ตุ่นหิน
 ๒ จึงแจ้งให้รวมรัมราชเจ้าได้เข้าใจในบรรลุกรุณาคนที่ย่ำ
 ๓ ทุกมุมมองท่อนั้น แต่ท่านทุกคนรับพิจารณาเป็นยุทธศาสตร์

[xxx] ก่อเหตุ ความอยู่สนุนปราบデนาตุนอยู่ ทำให้ระเบิดการ
เป็นพุทธภามตุน

 ๑ ขั่วราช ๔๔ ปี บุกถ้าสำหรับ อนุภาพ สมเด็จพระบรมราชรัชเจ้า
ก็จะเข้าไปทำพุทธภามอย่าง แต่ทำทั้งเร็วพรุษพิษภามรักษ์ ผู้พิชิตเหลือเกิน

 ๒ สนุนพุทธภามอย่างใจอยู่สั่นโดยตรี ทำข้าราชการสมเด็จพระ
ผู้ทรงพระรัมราชในสมเด็จพิษภาม elevate паганы
[xxviii] put in fetters. Then Cau Bañâ Yât had Bañâ Viset brought and had him confined for three days and then taken down in a boat to Caturmukh and killed. As for Tret Sañsâr and the two hia bûn, he killed them in Choeung Prey and then went to get all the refugee families who had gone to Caturmukh, and they went to Babaur. Then Cau Bañâ Yât made Nây Dharrmarâj Hluõn Debarâjâ. As for Nî Jân Dôh, he gave him the name Cau Khun Hluõn137. Then Samtec Brah Paramarâjâ—

[xxix] dhirâj Cau gave Mae Nâñ Kôn Baeñ, daughter of Khun Deb Sañgrâm, the governor of Chanthaburi, to Nî Jai, and had Nî Jai govern mo‘añ Chanthaburi instead. Later on, Bañâ Deb Maingal, who was a senior councillor, became ill and went to stay in pun chûn138 and died. So Samtec Brah Paramarâjâdhirâj Cau had a tu139 of gold taken from the treasury to make an urn for the funeral of the deceased. Then he had Khun Sri Pâd, who was the son, brought from Brañ Na—

[xxx] gar Hluõn to receive the inheritance. As for Khun Prajâ, the younger son, he let him receive an official position as a senior councillor in his father’s place. [Cula] era 846, Rat Year140, second month, Samtec Brañ Paramarâjâdhirâj Cau sent up for Bañâ Jaliân, Mahâ Dharrmarâjâ, Bañâ Râmârajâ, and Bañâ Suen Sây Tâv141. At that time Bañâ Jaliân left mo‘añ Savarrgalok to Cau Râj Sri Yaš, who was his son, and Bañâ Dharrmarâj left mo‘añ Phitsanulok to Bañâ Hem; Bañâ

137 A title which appears in several Ayutthayan documents, but in Cambodia only as the title of the early sixteenth-century rebel, Kan. See the traditional history of the period in J. Moura, Le Royaume du Cambodge, Adhemard Leclère, L’Histoire du Cambodge, or Francis Garnier, “Chronique royale du Cambodge”, JA. octobre-novembre-decembre 1871, p. 347 (cited further as Garnier, “Chronique”). The best-known occurrence of khun hlu01 in Ayutthaya was in titles ascribed to Paramarâjâdhirâj before his reign. See RA. p. 67.

138 Literally “river village”, and unidentifiable.

139 An ancient measure; see the Royal Institute dictionary.

140 The date 846 [A.D. 1484] is incoherent; see below, “The date of the story”.

141 The title also occurs in the chronicles of Nakhon Si Thammarat (Wyatt, Crystal Sands, pp. 119-112); and in the hierarchy laws in the department of thîrûthó thrai bhuñ, Laws, I, p. 287. But in both cases it is given to relatively low-ranking hmu0n who may not a priori be identified with the individual here.
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Ramaraj left mo'ah Sukhothai to Baññá Dharmaraj and Trai suor, and Baññá Saen Sóy Táv left mo'ah Kamphaeng Phet to Baññá Sriv Bhékti\(^{142}\). Then all the baññá came down to Ayutthaya. When they arrived, the King had all the dāv baññá and military councillors (senämasty) assembled in a temple hall\(^{143}\). Then he allowed the four baññá to make obeisance, and then he addressed the four baññá, saying, "in what way can we have you go out to our borders?" Then Baññá Saen Sóy Táv and Baññá Ramaraj said to the King that, "we are being used for the affairs of mo'ah Jalian already, and Baññá Kaen Dáv has come to stay too in that mo'ah. We request Your Majesty to leave it as the responsibility\(^{144}\) of your servant, Baññá Jalian, alone; whenever there is a war, all of us, Your Majesty's servants, will ask to take elephants, horses, and troops to help." So Samtec Brah Paramarajádhírâj Cau issued

[xxxii] an order accordingly. Then Baññá Jalian said to the King, "if [we] cannot get [it/him] in a friendly manner, but take [it/him] through warfare, will Your Majesty still let us take [it]?" Then the King said, "any way you can do it is better than you not getting it at all." Then Baññá Jalian told him again that, "my forces are weak; the people of Phrae and Nan, their forces are twenty thousand, and the elephants and horses are almost ĝam [?]. If I can get it, it will be due to Your Majesty's power." Then Samtec Brah Paramarajádhírâj Cau ordered the three baññá, "if Baññá Jalian goes to take mo'ah Nan, let all of you organize 2,000 troops, 20 war elephants, and 200 horses for him; if there is royal service, all of you be faithful to us." Then all the dāv baññá took leave of the King to return to their mo'ah. But Baññá Saen still remained to serve the King in Ayutthaya. As for Baññá Jalian, when he had reached mo'ah Savarrga—

142) The titles cau raj srí yas, baññá hmai, traï suor, and baññá sriv bhakti do not occur in the Sukhothai-area inscriptions.

143) I follow here Khun Bunnag's suggestion that purian is for purán (priâ), "monastic examination". He would also emend kala to kála, but I think the old Khmer term for "enclosed area", kral'5, may have been intended. Buddhád is probably a scribal error for buddhârârâ, "dwelling of Buddha".

144) Bhândur, written for bhârdhura: (nârârú). Thanks are due to Khun Bunnag.
[xxxv] โดยทวีดีทรัพย์ แล้วมี หลวงพล 2 กันหาบังสือไปของ พัน พระองค์ไม่ยอมเงิน พัน พระองค์แบ่งใจใคร้ ทั้งนั้นหลวงพลแลกที่ หนังสือมาใหม่ให้กับเจ้าเรื่องยอ ข้ามั่วใจพลไป จงลับพลแลกพระพุทธิภพกัน มีผู้ที่เห็นตามบงบอกครุณหมื่นพร้อมอยากไปใคร่ชื่นชา

[xxxvi] พระจารึกแรกพระปฐุมประมวล 1000 และข้ามั่วจะอยู่แล้ว ให้ เอกขวางยกเหวยกับปุ๋ยไปในเมืองซี่องใหม่

○ กรณีหนังสือถึงหมื่นแห่ง 2 เมื่ออาศัยนั่นบอกถึงสิ่งเดียวกันๆ ให้เพิ่มบริหารบริหารทรงบัง แลกหาบังสือไปของทางถ้ำเกี่ยวเมื่อให้กัน เหมือนเช่นขึ้นทัศกฤทธิ์

○ หนังสือข้ามขอกบงบอกกันวิจ
lokh, he left all affairs to Hmu'n Hluoŋ Bal, who sent a letter to Ban Barkōt in mo'an Nan. Ban Barkōt was loyal to Hmu'n Hluoŋ Bal and sent a letter saying, “you hurry and bring elephants, horses, and troops and let’s go quickly together now.” All the Lao came and told Khun Hmu'n Bōn Khvān in trai tru'ātā.

Bōn Khvān conscripted troops and got about 6000 together with elephants and horses. When all were there he had all the refugee families taken to mo’an Chiang Mai. When the letter reached Hmu'n Hluoŋ' he reported on the matter to Bañā Jaliari, who prepared all the elephants, horses, and troops, and sent a letter to rush and take the forces of the large mo’an, all three mo’an, which would go as forward troops. At that time the people of gōy/gsay came and spoke to siva.

145) Bārkōt is perhaps an error for phrik'on, a name elsewhere associated with Nan, but not in the time period of 2/k.125. See NC, pp. 301-02; and A.B. Griswold and Prasert ɲa Nagara, “The pact between Sukhodaya and Nān, Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 3”, JSS, LVII, 1 (January 1969), pp. 63-65, 81, n. 15.

146) Trai Tru'āt or Trai Tru'āt'a, according to A.B. Griswold and Prasert ɲa Nagara, “King Lōdaiya of Sukhodaya and his contemporaries, Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 10”, JSS, LX, 1 (January 1972), p. 29, was located a few miles downstream from Kamphaeng Phet.

147) I have no explanation to offer for gōy/gsay or siva. The text at that point is in poor condition.
The age of the manuscript

The first critical task should be to investigate the age of the manuscript, but that seems impossible to determine beyond the probability that it is from the Ayutthaya period. Lacunae at several points show that the contents did not originate with the manuscript at hand, which must in turn be a copy of an older one.

The date of the story and its sources

The next question is what period the contents purport to cover. Two dates are found in the text: "cula era 845 [A.D. 1483], Pig Year, fifth of the decade (ms. [17])," and "[cula] era 846 [A.D. 1484], Rat Year". (ms [xxx]). Both are wrong. The year 845 was of the Hare, with the nearest Pig Years being 841 and 853, while 846 was of the Dragon and the nearest Rat Years were 842 and 854. Those dates must be emended before the contents of the text may be used in historical synthesis. Of the elements making up those dates, the "8" is virtually certain, since other sources have placed most of the events of the story in the fifteenth century A.D. Since the first date specifies, "fifth of the decade," it is also likely that "5" was the original unit figure in that date. It is therefore necessary to find a two-year sequence of dates in the ninth century of the cula era which ended in "5" and "6", and were respectively Pig and Rat Years. There are two such pairs: 805-806 and 865-866, of which the former seems initially to be preferable, since it falls within the reign of the Ayutthayan king known traditionally as Paramarajādhiraj (II), who died in 810/1448.

Testing the period 805-806 against other details of the story reveals it to be preferable from all points of view. The first detail to use as a test is the statement, following the opening battle scene and preceding the first expressed date, that Bañá Rām died in Hansavatī and was succeeded by Rāṇā Baro. In the Mon chronicle Rājādhiraj, King Sudodharmanarajādhiraj is said to have died in 803 and to have been followed on the throne by Brah Cau Ba:ro. Shortly before that time

148) Conversation with Khun Prasarn Bunprakong, June 1975, which concurs with the opinion of Khun Bunnag. In a conversation Dr. Prasert ṇa Nagarabhas said that the epigraphy of the Ayutthaya and Ratthanakosin periods has been too little studied to permit a definite statement about the date of the script.
149) Adopting the chronology of LP.
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the brother of Sudo-, Bra:ya Ram, also died in Martaban\textsuperscript{150}. Thus, although the two traditions do not seem to be exactly the same, we may conclude that they are variants of a single story which has generally been placed in 803, and the dates 805-806 for subsequent events are acceptable reconstructions.

The next episode which can easily be checked against other sources to verify dates is the incident in Nan that occurred between the two expressed dates which I have reconstructed as 805 and 806. The story is fairly complicated. According to the Nan Chronicle (NC), Kaen Dăv (called \textit{inta: kaen dăv}) succeeded to the throne in 795, but three months later his two younger brothers, Cau Pae\n and Hô Bam, overthrew him and left him in prison to die. He escaped, took refuge with Bra:ya Jalian, and in 797 returned with the aid of the latter’s troops. Later on, in 812, Inta:kaen Dăv fled to Jalian a second time in the face of an attack by King Tiloka of Chiang Mai\textsuperscript{151}.

The Chiang Mai Chronicle (CMC), says, on the other hand, that in 805 Kaen Dăv of Nan tried to usurp the throne of Chiang Mai. Tiloka sent an army commanded by Mu’n P’eng of Phayao and Khun Xang, but Kaen Dăv deceived and killed them\textsuperscript{152}.

So far the incidents of 2\textit{lk.125}, NC and CMC involve the same principal personages, Kaen Dăv and \textit{baeh/phaeh} P’eng, but their relationships are different and the outcome varies from one version to another. As to date, 2\textit{lk 125} and CMC agree against NC.

According to CMC Tiloka himself invades Nan after six years, in 810, and is victorious, whereupon Kaen Dăv flees to the south\textsuperscript{153}, which seems to be the same event recorded in NC as the second flight of Kaen Dăv. If it were not for the date of the first event in NC, it could be assumed that all three sources agreed as to the events involving Kaen

\textsuperscript{150} Rajadhiri, (Bangkok: Gliin Vitaya, 2513), pp. 633-637.
\textsuperscript{151} NC, pp. 304-08, NGe, pp. 13-14.
\textsuperscript{152} See Darppn bu’n mo’an jiah himai Bangkok, Commission for the Publication of Historical Documents. Office of the Prime Minister, p. 52; or Camille Notton, \textit{Annales du Siam, III}, 110.
\textsuperscript{153} Tamnun, p. 53; Notton, p. 111.
Dāv in Nan, even if the precise details differed from one tradition to the other. The dates of NC, however, are known to be in error. The error has been interpreted as one of two or three years: thus 795 is called ruañ kai, in northern cyclical terms, but it was really a ka pau year, while the true ruañ kai year was 793. This date is just one 12-year cycle earlier than the 805 of 2/k.125 and CMC, and given the frequency of such cyclical errors in chronicle texts, it seems legitimate to prefer 805.

The details of the (Inta:) Kaen Dāv episode also give some support for the idea that 2/k.125, or the original behind it, was a very early composition. When Kaen Dāv escaped from confinement and fled from Nan, he was hidden in tau hai, then went to sahuō/sahluō (Srālvān), and after that he was taken to Tron by his father, the Lord of Jaliai. NC only says that Kaen Dāv fled from Nan to Ban tau hai, then to mo'ah rām, and then on to mo'an tai (southern country), where he took refuge with the Lord of Jaliai.

The mention of Srālvān is interesting, a place-name occurring in Sukhothai inscriptions, but the precise location of which is no longer

154) NC, p. 16, n. b.
155) Another example of precisely such an error is the date cula 898, pok san, given in Nañjavatwar mo'ak nañ, p. 316, for the repair of a temple, vit luon klaiv vaisi; but the true date, 910, pok san, is preserved in a contemporary inscription, no. 74, in Pratu siva caru'k vol. III, pp. 202-206. This interpretation, that some if not all of the incoherent dates of NC are one cycle too early, differs from the evidence of the Chae Haeng Reliquary Chronicle, which Wyatt has recently used ("The chronology of Nan history, A.D. 1320-1598", JSS, LXIV, 2 [July 1976], pp. 202-06), and which often has dates one cycle, more or less, earlier than NC. The date of the construction of Vat Hluon, though, still agrees with the inscription. The complete consistency of the dates in the Chae Haeng Chronicle should not immediately lead to their acceptance. Such consistency is very easy to achieve, by 'correcting' either the absolute or cyclical year. The interesting feature of the NC dates is that the errors appear systematic, not random, and only discovery of the system will reveal the secrets of Nan chronology.

156) NC, pp. 305-06; NCe, p. 13.
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known\textsuperscript{157}. Thus, \textit{2/k.125}, or the records from which it ultimately devolved, would have been written when the name was still current; while at the time \textit{NC} or its source was composed, the location (and perhaps the very name) was no longer known. In the two stories, Sralvāni and mo\textit{\textcircled{a}}n rām have equivalent functions as the place where Kāen Dāv was given refuge by a monk or an ascetic; the logical location would be between Nan and Tron, i.e., probably in the present province of Uttaradit. This squares with Griswold and Prasert’s assertion that Sralvāni cannot be in Picitr, as formerly believed, but does not support their idea that Sralvāni should be placed between Sukhothai and Phitsanulok\textsuperscript{158}.

The dates suggested so far for the time of the story are also acceptable with respect to the \textit{Hluon Prasro\textit{\textcircled{t}}} (\textit{LP}) date, 793/1431, for a conquest of Angkor by a king Paramarājādhirāj; but they are much too late for the dates of that event as given in the best-known Cambodian chronicles, and as proposed in the latest revision of the history of the period\textsuperscript{159}. This is the main point on which I feel \textit{2/k.125} presents important, hitherto unsuspected details, which are discussed below.

Although the story fits the evidence of a variety of other sources with respect to dates, one could still argue that its interesting and unusual details are not a more accurate rendition of events, but simply an imaginative composition which happened to be placed in the correct time period. Indeed, the numerous conversations it includes must be imaginative. The style of the narrative together with the conversations shows that it is not a chronicle based directly on archival extracts, as \textit{LP} appears to be, but a story written at least one remove from them.

\textsuperscript{157} A.B. Griswold and Prasert \textsc{nā} Nagara, “The inscription of King Rāma Gāmheṇa of Sukkodaya (1292 A.D.), Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 9,” \textit{JSS}, LIX, 2 (July 1971) p. 218, n. 129.

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{159} Most of the Cambodian chronicles place the event in the fourteenth century; and Wolters, “Basan”, argues for 1389. See below, “Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations”. As speculation on how the erroneous dates of \textit{2/k. 125} came about, I would suggest that the original composition had \textit{Saka} era dates, 1365-66, and an error was made by a later copyist who converted them to \textit{Cula} era.
Even if the story is one in which the writer's imagination were allowed some freedom, there is further internal evidence that the story as a whole dates from soon after the time period it purports to cover, which lends more credence to its details than if its origin had clearly been some hundred years later.

That evidence lies in the titles, especially the \textit{yaś}, given to most of the characters in the story. It cannot have escaped the careful reader's attention that each grade of \textit{yaś} in 2/\textit{k.125} seems to have a much higher status than in the nineteenth century, and also higher than in the 1805 \textit{Laws}, some parts of which are believed to date from much earlier. Thus \textit{khan} and \textit{nāy} appear to be high-ranking officers; the only people entitled \textit{bañā}/\textit{brañā} (modern \textit{bra:yā}) are rulers of the Sukhothai-area \textit{mo'ān}, recently independent; and the only two \textit{cau bañā} besides Yāt, who appears to have assumed that title himself, are sons of the Ayutthayan King. Even officers who appear to be ministers of the central government are only entitled \textit{khan}.

The declining value of titles over time, and their replacement by other, newly prestigious titles, is a well-attested phenomenon in many societies, so a time must be identified when the rank structure of 2/\textit{k.125} would have been appropriate. The most useful point of comparison is the very laconic entry of \textit{RA} describing the so-called administrative reforms of King Trailokanath\textsuperscript{160}. Those reforms raised the Minister of the Capital from \textit{khan mo'ān} to \textit{brah nagarpūl}, the Minister of the Palace from \textit{khan vān} to \textit{brah dharrmādikār}, the Minister of Fields from \textit{khan nū} to \textit{brah kṣetra}, and the Minister of the Treasury from \textit{khan glā} to \textit{brah kośādhipati}. Thus four of the principal ministers of the central government had \textit{yaś} of \textit{khan} before the reign of Trailokanath; that level was raised by two steps to \textit{brah} sometime in the latter part of the fifteenth century. Later, as we all know, the \textit{yaś} of those ministers was increased still more to \textit{bañā}, \textit{dkhā}, \textit{dkhañā} \textit{cau bañā} etc. In that respect, the rank structure of 2/\textit{k.125} belongs right where its ostensible date falls, just before Trailokanath's reign. Moreover, the official who opened the palace to the loyal personnel arriving to denounce the traitors, and who took

\textsuperscript{160} These reforms are not mentioned in \textit{LP}. 
them in to see the King, is called *khun maldiarpāl*, the latter term of which is still in the 1805 Laws a part of the *tāṇmae-rajađinnām* of the Minister of the Palace.\(^{161}\) It is unlikely that anyone intending subsequently to write a fictional account, when titles had been changed, would have so carefully documented, correct, early fifteenth-century titles.

**Ayutthaya-Cambodian relations**

The basic events related by 2/k.125 are not unknown elsewhere. They are an Ayutthayan conquest of Angkor in the reign of one King Paramaratjādhirāj, followed by resistance and eventual victory under a Cambodian prince, Bañā Yāt. The entire story, conquest and resistance, is only found in the Cambodian chronicles, and at various dates, such as A.D. 1372, 1388, 1408, 1420, 1457, 1492, but never at the date 1431 given by LP. The Cambodian chronicles also relate that a son of Paramaratjādhirāj, called Indarājā, was given the throne at Angkor following the conquest, and they preserve the name, Bañā Braek, but as another title of Indarājā, not as a brother who succeeded the first Thai prince at Angkor. Furthermore, the period of Thai occupation of Angkor, ended by Bañā Yāt’s resistance, is given as only one year, whereas 2/k.125 taken together with the LP date implies a period of at least 12 years.\(^{162}\)

The structure of the story in 2/k.125—conquest of Angkor by King Paramaratjādhirāj, the placing of his son Nagar Indrā on the Angkorian throne, the involvement of two individuals, Bañā Kae and Bañā Day, the removal of valuable objects to Ayutthaya—shows that it is to

---

\(^{161}\) See my remarks on *yat* in Vickery, review of Robert B. Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks*, etc., JSS, LXII, 1 (Jan 1974), pp. 169-71; and in Vickery, review of Yoneo Ishii et al., *An Index of Officials in Traditional Thai Government*, etc., JSS, LXIII, 2 (July 1975), p. 421. I give some attention to *tāṇmae-rajađinnām*, and on pp. 426-30 I show that the Hierarchy Laws reveal an old structure in which the palace (tāṇ) may have been the most important ministry—a situation which also seems to appear in 2/k. 125.

that extent the same story as recorded in *LP* in A.D. 1431 and the long Ayutthayan chronicles in 1421. Subsequent events, however, including mention of Yát and his reconquest, are missing from all Ayutthayan chronicles, which have nothing more about Cambodia for another century.

The 2/k.125 Fragment amplifies that well-known story, and modifies it in some startling ways. Thus, when Angkor is first mentioned, sometime between 1441 and 1443, the Ayutthayan King’s son, Braññagar ñandr, had been ruling there for an unspecified period of time, which means that if the *LP* date for the conquest is true, and there is no evidence against it, Ayutthaya had occupied Angkor for 10 to 12 years when Yát’s resistance first began. Moreover, far from achieving the quick victory that the Cambodian chronicles indicate, Yát is involved in a series of both defeats and victories extending over two years; and the struggle is still unresolved, with Ayutthaya still in control of Angkor, when our fragment ends in 1444.

Another difference from the familiar story is in the identity and fate of the Ayutthayan Princes at Angkor. Nagar ñindr, whom the Cambodian chronicles call ñinda raja, is not killed by Yát, but dies of illness\(^{162a}\), to be succeeded by his brother Bana braek, which name the Cambodian chronicles give as a second title for ñinda raja.

Perhaps the most startling detail of 2/k.125 is what it seems to say about the antecedents of Banañ Yát. In the first passage where he is mentioned, he is called “son of Braññaram cau, whom the King had sent to reside in Caturmukh [Phnom Penh]”. That unavoidably recalls the *LP* episode in which a King, Cau Banañaram, was sent away in 1409 by the father of Paramarajadhiraj, but to govern (ṉ̃hūṉ̃s) a location, ñədāgucām, the identification of which has presented some difficulty\(^{163}\).

Prince Damrong, who established the hitherto accepted identification, equated ñədāgucām with gūcām, a canal just across the river from

\(^ {162a}\) The death of Nagar ñindr/ñinda raja by illness is also mentioned by Rong Syamananda, *A History of Thailand*, p. 38, but no source for the information is given.

\(^ {163}\) The date is from *LP*, and the identification is that of Prince Damrong in *RA*, p. 252.
Ayutthaya. But to explain the syllables “padā-“, he was forced to rely on a contrived etymology, which if for no other reason is not legitimate, since it is based on an entirely different language (Malay) by way of another, distant dialect of Thai, that of Songkhla. It also seems unlikely that rebellious generals, in the story of LP, could have escaped the royal authority merely by crossing to gū cām, and padāgūcām, as I propose to show, should probably be located much farther afield.

In the two oldest full Cambodian chronicles, Nong and its Thai translation, the passage concerning the establishment of Phnom Penh as capital, which is attributed to Bañā Yāt, includes among the names of the place both caturmukh, “four faces”, and crāp jhām, of which the second term means “blood”, but which as a whole has no coherent meaning and has long been unknown. Students of the chronicles are agreed that crāp jhām must be a very old title or toponym, perhaps corrupt, which must have found its way into relatively modern chronicles probably through the recopying of older and longer texts. In a somewhat

164) The gū cām canal, which flows through a district formerly inhabited by “Cochinchinos” and Malays, begins at the river just 300 meters to the east of Vat Phutthaisawan, and flows southeast to meet the river again south of the old Portuguese town. Thus it is entirely within an area which must have been fully under control of the city even in the fifteenth century. See Sumet Jumsai, “The reconstruction of the city plan of Ayudhya”, In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhorn, p. 313 and figs. 11, 12, 24; and Bra: yā porān rājadhindr, “Tāmān kruā kau,” in Pra: jam bāthācatur bhāg 63 (Guru Sabha edition, vol. 36-37), pp. 148, 188. Prince Damrong said (R4, p. 252) padāgūcām derived from plā: dābhūcām (phānīṣaṇu), and justified the first two syllables by reference to a Songkhla dialect term, plā: dā, used for districts near the sea. This can only be a southern Thai corruption of the local Malay pata, “beach”. See Thomas F. Fraser, Jr., Rusembilan, A Malay Fishing Village in Southern Thailand, p. 21 and appendix B, “The language of Rusembilan”. The syllable bhā, “territory”, of Prince Damrong’s reconstruction also contradicts the other etymology, “Cham canal”. Prince Damrong also said LP must be in error in stating that Cau Bañā Rām was sent “to eat mo’ān padāgūcām”, since there could have been no mo’ān there.


later nineteenth-century chronicle, which however includes some apparently pre-Nong detail, this mysterious name is also written prâp jham, which the close resemblance between Khmer p and e easily explains. In fact, since the meaning of the term is quite obscure, prâp could be an older variant than crâp. The pronunciation of the variant with p is today/prâp cheam/; a few centuries ago it would have been/prâp châm/, in Thai script ตั้ม. Since prâp/ ตั้ม has a common meaning, “to put down, to level”, it would be easy for a scribe to assume that the meaningless (in this context) châm/ ตั้ม should be หน/eám or “Cham”, and that the name should mean “put down the Cham”; just as the name Siemrâp/siamrâp is traditionally supposed to mean either “the Siamese put down [the Khmer]”, or “the Siamese were flattened”. Such a change could have been effected by a copyist working with either Thai or Khmer. It is perhaps also significant that the Mekong, on which Phnom Penh is situated, was known alternatively as late as the nineteenth century as the “Cham river”, and the entire phrase might have been regarded, like caturmukh, as a reference to the geography of the site.

The reader is no doubt aware of the direction in which I am moving, and perhaps fears that I shall attempt to overwhelm him with a bit of legerdemain. But no, the next step, the identification of the initial syllables of both phrases, can be demonstrated on good linguistic grounds, and from two different angles. First, a flapped/r/s/ when second member of a cluster is pronounced in both Thai and Khmer, in many languages alternates or is easily confused with a dental sound, such as /d/. In technical terms a “voiced apico-alveolar flap [r]” may be confused

---

167) That chronicle is the so-called Thiounn chronicle, named for the chief of its editorial commission, Ochā vûng juea (Thiounn). It has never been published in its entirety, but it was continued into the 1940s and acquired quasi-official status. The principal manuscript was, until 1975 at least, in the library of the Buddhist Institute, Phnom Penh, entitled ឯុប rû phûn bhum khmaer.

168) The detail is to be found in a typed manuscript in the National Library, Bangkok, catalogued as Bahâvatâr khmer, No. 102, with a notation that it was a work of King Mongkut, and entitled Rôaï tû phûn thû khâmen laûh ôk pen sthûng (“On the division of the Khmer realm into four parts”). The reference to “Cham river” is on p. 2.
with a "voiced apico-dental stop [d]". That occurs even in some varieties of English in which "[t] is not a dorsal retroflex continuant, but...a tongue-tip flap (British English "veddy")"\(^{169}\). Plainly stated, it means that people hearing either /prə/ or /pdə/, in an unfamiliar word, could confuse one with the other. The second possibility concerns the Khmer script. There the second member of a consonant cluster, i.e. for our purposes the /r/ or /d/ following /p/, is written with a special subscript form, and among certain old styles of writing the two subscripts were sufficiently similar to be confused if the word itself was unfamiliar.

Thus, we have the possible identity of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prə</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>jhäm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pdə</td>
<td>gū</td>
<td>cām(^{170})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final step is where my explanation becomes much more speculative. In their present forms there is no systematic way to identify p of Khmer and gū of Thai, and so far as I know the two symbols could not have been confused in any script which might have been in use. One paleographic explanation would be that at some point in the descent of the Khmer manuscripts prap was written prab, the pronunciation of which is identical, and the Khmer symbol for b could conceivably be mistaken for g in an unfamiliar word. Then the vowel u would have been added by an Ayutthayan scribe in an effort at comprehension since gū cām, "Cham moat", was a known toponym. Such confusion of final p and b, though rare, was not unknown. I have found one example, jrabv written for jrap, or "understand," in a Khmer chronicle manuscript in the National Library at Bangkok\(^{171}\), and Guesdon’s Dictionnaire also records the odd forms jrb, brab, "pigeon", priab, "compare", and rāb, "flat"\(^{172}\). Further evidence in favor of that explanation comes from another variant of the name in a Khmer historical manuscript\(^{173}\), Tanleh prasabv muk puon, in which tanleh is the common Khmer and Thai word

---

170) Note that pdə and pdā are the same in Thai. The difference is merely a question of conventions in transliteration.
171) Banvakistar Khmer, No. 45 ณ., w 111, p. 79.
for a "large body of water", and muk puon is a translation of the Sanskrit caturmukh, or "four faces". The term prasabv, "to meet, to face", seems to have replaced praplerap and possibly indicates that the original term, no longer understood, ended in b. Furthermore, the combination of final bv, as written in Khmer script with the v being a subscript, could even more easily be confused with gū. In any case, since padāγucām, prap jhām, and erāp jhām are all corrupt, the original from which they derived was something quite different which could be misunderstood in several ways174.

I think therefore, that even if the original cannot yet be identified, there is sufficient evidence to show that 2/k.125 provides the means for identifying the padāγucām of LP with caturmukh, Phnom Penh; because of the age of LP it indicates that in the Cambodian chronicles the variant prāp may be older than erāp. The present interpretation also means that the term was already misunderstood when LP was composed, for the latter says the generals who first rebelled against Caū Bañā Rām fled, "across to stay in padāγucām", and from there conspired with Indarāja of Suphanburi, thus implying a location close to Ayutthaya and probably indicating that the compiler or LP indeed had gū cām in mind. The original records must have had padāγucām, or prap cām (Phnom Penh) only as the place to which Caū Bañā Rām was sent, but a later scribe inserted it again earlier on in the story. Thus the phrase of LP, "govern mo'ān padāγucām", would be correct175.

174) Even Prince Damrong's pla: ḍal padā bhū cām could be a possible ancestor linguistically and paleographically, even if it were a poor etymology in the way he used it. Bhū (Sanskrit "earth") could easily account for the gū through paleographic error. Phnom Penh was known from very early times as an ethnically mixed area which included Cham and Malay elements; depending on the local dialect the whole name could mean "shore of the territory of the Cham". This explanation is of course very speculative, and cannot be taken as more than a remote hypothesis.
175) Those who might cry sacrilege at the attempt to tamper with the text of LP should remember that Prince Damrong already considered the passage corrupt, although he thought the first mention of padāγucām correct and the second one in error. My explanation is the opposite, and is based on a document which has other close affinities with LP.
This new reading of the evidence has interesting implications for the political history of the period. If an usurping king of Ayutthaya sent his rival into exile as governor of Phnom Penh, that means that Ayutthaya had already conquered part of Cambodia, or that there had long been such close ties that the two polities did not yet consider themselves separate nations. I lean toward the second hypothesis, particularly since Ayutthaya's background and fifteenth-century culture were so strongly Khmer.\(^\text{176}\)

Thus the 'conquest' of Angkor by Ayutthaya might well have been, as O.W. Wolters has already suggested\(^\text{177}\), not in the nature of an international war, but a conflict between rival dynasties for control of mutual borderlands, and I would add for control also of what both considered to be their old, traditional capital: naga kluah for the Thai, brah nagar for the Khmer of Cambodia.

The barrg

The toponym I have treated above is not the only instance in which 2/k.125 helps provide an explanation for a mysterious detail of LP.

Readers will have noticed that Yat 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 prīp barrg... , "the king went to put down the barrg", which has defied the efforts of all students of LP.\(^\text{178}\) We find in 2/k.125 practically the same phrase when King

\(^{176}\) My opinion must not be taken as support for the fourteenth-century invasions of Cambodia found in the Thai RA and Cambodian Chronicles, and it does not conflict with what I intend to argue elsewhere that all chronicular passages concerning invasions of Angkor before 1430 are fiction. I do not argue that no conflict between the two areas occurred, only that no true records have been preserved in extant chronicles. In addition, the passages I call fictitious speak of Thai conquests of Angkor, whereas the inference to draw from 2/k.125 is that earlier Ayutthayan interest in Cambodia had been in the southern part of the country.

\(^{177}\) Wolters, "Basan", p. 85.

\(^{178}\) Frankfurter, "Events in Ayudhaya from Chulaśakarāj 686-966", JSS, VI, 3 (1909), p. 48, date 806, where prīp barrg is rendered as "suppressed the contending factions"; W.A.R. Wood, "The 'Pongsawadan of Luang Prasōt'", JSS, XIX (1925), p. 135, where he confessed his inability to deal with the phrase, but suggested it was a corrupted place-name.
Paramarājādhirāj orders his son Nagar Indr to "go put down the barrg", 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.125 are based at this point on the same records.

What were the barrg? In addition to the numerous occurrences of the term in an unidentifiable collective sense, as above, a more precise clue is provided by two passages in which the barrg are called a race or ethnic group, phau (ψά). 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 Blapājaib, 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 845 [805], when the scene shifts to Bañā Kaev and Bañā Dai, who were phau maha 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, 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 jōn/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 (barrg)" as military forces; 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 "color". Both are more or less pronounced /pʰar/, although the word for "color" as in Thai preserves the Sanskrit etymology, barr, while the ethnic name is at present written bār179. 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 bārرغ, or "group".

Some additional confirmation of the explanation comes from the entirely different source, RA, in a passage dealing with an early sixteenth-century incident between Ayutthaya and Cambodia. There it says that another Cambodian rebel had gone off with the jōn bārرغ, which, when compared with the jōn bārرغ whom Yāt organized, shows that the intention in both cases was "Chong and Pear", two Mon-Khmer ethnic groups who still live fairly close together in western Cambodia and southeastern Thailand.

It is also worth noting that the Cambodian Ang Eng chronicle, in its relation of those events, states Khun Blǎjaiy led the būk (= bārرغ) buok, or "group of supporters", to protect Yāt. In a later incident ethnic groups in the same region are called maha bān kǎ:hríań, of which maha bān is a Thai phonetic rendering of maha bārرغ 181.

Basan

Another point on which 2/k.125 provides important evidence is the identification of the mysterious location of Basan, which is associated with Yāt in most of the Cambodian chronicles. Current doctrine holds that Basan was in the district of Srei Santhor, province of Kompong Cham, on the east side of the Mekong, although there has been no place which conserved that name up to modern times. In Francis Garnier’s time, Cambodian opinion placed Basan on the west side of the Bassac river in the province of Treang, in modern Takeo, and this identification is supported by a nineteenth-century oath text, which, in an enumeration of local deities, combines the toponyms pāzuk pūsān sruk trāńin

180) RA, p. 208, at the date 953, Hare Year, A.D. 1591.
181) The clarification is from the Thai text of Ang Eng, PP, III, pp. 180, 183, corrected by the original manuscript in the National Library, Bangkok.
182) No such name is revealed in the 1962 Cambodian census, which listed all inhabited sites down to hamlet level. See Royaume du Cambodge, Ministère du Plan, Resultats finals du recentement general de la population 1962, Phnom Penh, 1966.
Michael Vickery

O.W. Wolters has argued that Chinese mention of a pa-shan king in 1371 referred to the Basan of the chronicles, and proved that the Cambodian king had been driven from Angkor by the Thai shortly before that date. I would say that since the Chinese characters for pa-shan, 基山, translate precisely the Cambodian name Ba Phnom, or “ba-mountain”, the Chinese account refers to the latter place down the Mekong from Phnom Penh; and the pronunciation “basano”, as an alternative to “bapano”, was still recorded by the Portuguese in the sixteenth century. That would be a different place from the Basan of the chronicles, and the seeming identity of Chinese pa-shan with Basan would be a coincidence.

In 2/k.125 much of Yat’s activity unfolds around a place called pāṣānti, which appears as the territory of the barrgharṛa, and would thus definitely be in western Cambodia, probably farther north than Treang.

The name pāṣānti consists of two elements, pā, which in Thai might be translated as “forest”, but which in Khmer is a common initial component of place names and is considered to mean “male” or the “male principle”; and sānti, or “peace”. The corresponding toponym of LP, i.e., the place where the king went to prāp barṛg, is pā:̄dāy kh̄em, the second term of which has the same meaning as sānti. The first term looks very much like a corruption of the Khmer pandāy, or “fortress”, and a component of several other place names. It is likely that they

183) Garnier, “Chronique”, p. 344, n. 2; and Krui, kambujadhīpārī [Kingdom of Cambodia], “Saccapraṇidhān” [oath], ms. No. MCC 56-036, Buddhist Institute, Phnom Penh. For providing me with a copy of the latter text I wish to thank David P. Chandler, whose “Royally sponsored human sacrifices in nineteenth century Cambodia: The cult of nak ta Me Sa (Mahīśāsura-mardini) at Ba Phnom”, JSS, LXII, 2 (July 1974), pp. 207-222, goes into some detail about the oath text and its subject matter.


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.125 plus the oath text cited above shows that it must have been somewhere in western Cambodia, not at Srei Santhor or Ba Phnom.

The reign of Banī Yat

Although the story of Yat is quite different from the Cambodian chronicles, some of the structure of 2/k.125 may be found, disguised, in the standard histories. In Cambodian history Yat is said to have killed the Thai prince Indarāja [Nagar Indr]-Braek within one year of the invasion (A.D. 1431-32 with LP chronology), and he immediately leaves Angkor for Basan and Phnom Penh, but is crowned 12 years later. This detail fits almost precisely the story of 2/k.125, in which 12 years after 1431-32 Yat is active in the pāśanti-Pnom Penh region, and is consecrated or crowned (abhiṣeka) in 1444, although apparently not as king of all Cambodia. The structure of the story in the various sources may be shown schematically as follows:

The major difference between the Cambodian chronicles and the LP/2/k.125 scenario is in the absolute dates of those events. However, the differences among the various versions of the Cambodian chronicles themselves show that some, if not all, are artificial constructions, and until
their divergent structures and details are explained, they may not be used in argument against other sources\(^{187}\).

**Miscellaneous toponyms**

In addition to the place names discussed above, \(2\)\(k.125\) contains a number of obsolete toponyms, only a few of which are found in other documents.

The first is \(\text{tay don} (\text{tay} \text{don})\), which in the opening episode appears to be under attack by Ayuthayan forces, and which the scanty detail of the passage seems to place in the north. That name occurs in only one other text, I believe, the \(\text{Kab maydiarpal}\) \(\text{Palatine Law}\), in the form \(\text{tai don} (\text{tai} \text{don})\) and in a list of northern \(\text{mo'ae} \ldots \text{Phrae}, \text{Nan}, \text{tai don}, \text{goprapi} \ldots\)\(^{188}\) Wales ignored it in his description of that law. Griswold and Prasert, the most prolific writers on that area, have also neglected it. Wyatt, who devoted some attention to the list of place names, was unable to offer an identification\(^{189}\). Our fragment at least confirms that such a name was once in use, and that it was in the north, but does not permit any closer identification. Of special interest is that the men of \(\text{Tay Don}\) seem to have been Mon.

Another interesting name is \(\text{sae'h blau}\), where Yat's captors stopped with him on the way from Phnom Penh to Ayutthaya by boat. It was there also that Yat met Khun (Blap) blajaiy, who had been a friend of his father and an acquaintance of his mother. Since Yat was quickly sent to take refuge with the Fear, it must have been somewhere in the

---

\(^{187}\) On the Cambodian chronicles see Coedes, “Essai”; L.P. Briggs, “Siamese attacks on Angkor before 1430”, \(FEQ\), VIII, 1 (1948) pp. 3-33; Wolters, “\(\text{Basan}\)”, pp. 54 ff. The best published version of \(\text{Nong}\) is the Thai translation in \(PP\), vol. I, neglected by these scholars, and the end of Yat’s reign according to the \(\text{Liste}\) manuscript is 1457, not 1433, as Wolters believed (“\(\text{Basan}\)”, pp. 65, 67, 88). A full explanation of the Cambodian chronicles for this period will appear in my forthcoming dissertation.

\(^{188}\) \(\text{Law}, 1.70\).

southeastern Thai—eastern Cambodia borderland. Khun Blājaiy is also found in Ang Eng as an ally of Yāṭ196, and there it says that Yāṭ’s mother was daughter of the lord of Pēn Gūṅ, which, according to King Mongkut, was an old name of Prachinburi191.

In form the name saeū blau irresistibly recalls the saē jrau (saē jrau), which figures in LP at the date 734/1372 and in association with mo ‘ān nagar bāngā192. Both have hitherto been placed in the north, while bāngā has been located at Nakhon Sawan193. In an effort to determine the origin of those names, we should first note that the Khmer symbols for j and ph ( Phaser) have forms which in manuscript may easily be confused with each other and with Thai ph or b (b). These Thai letters, as the spelling of z/k.125 proves, were not always rigidly distinguished, and are phonetically identical. Thus I am arguing that both saē jrau of LP and saē jrau of z/k.125 are corrupt derivations of a common original from the time when Khmer script was still frequently used at Ayutthaya194. The alteration of l/r would have been due to scribal ‘correction’ of a name which was no longer understood. The form of the second term which I would prefer to take as the original is jrau (saē jrau) of LP, “deep” in Khmer; and I would suggest further that the whole thing is a corruption of the name presently known as Chaḥoeng-saō/cha: jo’n drau (cha: jo’n drau), which derives from Khmer chōn jrau, or

190) Coedes, “Essai”, p. 27.
194) The evidence for the use of Khmer script in Ayutthaya has been outlined in Vickery, “The Khmer inscriptions of Tenasserim: A reinterpretation”, JSS, LXI, 1 (January 1973); and in Vickery, review of Robert B. Jones, Thai Titles and Ranks, pp. 164-65.
"deep river"\textsuperscript{195}, and is within an area already identified as the scene of Yff's movements.

Although it is difficult to propose a systematic explanation for a scribal error leading to the equivalence of \textit{saeñ/chdin} (later pronunciation \textit{stu'n}), there is one other example in which a very similar error seems to have occurred. In \textit{R.A}, page 208, in a section of which the dates are 10 to 12 years too early, there is a passage dated A.D. 1591 concerning the activities of a Cambodian rebel prince in \textit{saen sdoh} (\textit{harum\textcommasi}n), of which the second term seems most likely to be Staung, in the region of modern Kompong Thom. That identification is supported by the most detailed Cambodian chronicle for the period, which also speaks of a rebellious prince who between 1596 and 1607 held out against central authority in Thma Kol (\textit{kūl}), Kompong Svay, also in Kompong Thom; and the identity of this latter prince is confirmed by contemporary European accounts. Apparently the term \textit{saen}, in this indubitably Cambodian context, can only be a corruption of \textit{stu'n}, or "river," one of which--the Stung Staung--may still be seen on modern maps to flow into Kompong Svay. (There is no problem in the identity of \textit{saeñ/saen}, since in Cambodian \textit{n̄āl} or \textit{k̄hóm} script, used for pre-modern chronicles, the two final consonants could easily be confused.) As for \textit{baŋō}, paired with \textit{saeñ frau} in \textit{LP}, it is

\textsuperscript{195} Although I have found the derivation acceptable to competent linguists of my acquaintance, I do not know if it has ever been published. King Mongkut, \textit{op. cit.}, recognized the name as Khmer, and if so, \textit{chdin crau} is the only possibility. On the correspondence of Thai \textit{dr} (\textcommasi) and Khmer \textit{jr} (\textcommasi) see Karchana Naraskul, "A study of cognate words in Thai and Cambodian", M.A. thesis, University of London, 1962, p. 171. According to conversations I have had with David K. Wyatt and Hiram Woodward, Jr., there is some opinion that Chachoengsao is a new name and thus would not go back to a Khmer source. I should say that this is impossible. New names are comprehensible in the language of the population responsible, in this case Thai. "Cha chae urz g sau" is not Thai; it must derive from some other language, which in that area could only be Khmer, Mon, another Mon-Khmer language, or Sanskrit; one of its terms fits a recognized pattern of Khmer words borrowed by Thai, and the other may be shown on acceptable linguistic grounds to derive from Khmer.
probably the Banka of La Loubère's seventeenth-century map, a bit to the northeast of Petriou/Chachoengsao, and probably corresponds to modern Bangkha/panedi (มหานคร). Our text thus enables us to replace another difficult passage of LP in its proper context.

The explanation proposed here for this toponym has important implications for the route taken by Yát and his captors. The first presumption might be that the journey by water from Phnom Penh to Ayutthaya entailed descending the Mekong and sailing around through the Gulf of Siam. In that case Chachoengsao, or any other place inhabited by the Pear, could hardly have been along the route, unless the boat made a detour up one of the rivers of the southeastern Gulf coast. I would propose rather that the route taken was up one of the rivers leading from the Tonle Sap through Battambang province to what is today the region of Aranyaprathet. Then there would be a short overland journey to the Bang Pakong River through Prachinburi and Chachoengsao to the sea. In the high-water season such a journey would be practicable for narrow river boats. It is also possible, that for reasons connected with tides or winds at the mouth of the Chao Phraya, the usual route from the mouth of the Mekong through the Gulf went up the Bang Pakong River and then through a system of khlongs to the Chao Phraya River near where Phra Pradaeng is today. In that case Chachoengsao would have been a convenient stopping place.

Most of the other strange toponyms—cañóap, kañbænañ bautśi, koe: or teca:, kañb, príah broe, biren (dhar), bejrindr, trábál bási, tämpal baráñ, pöl chdíi—defy identification. In the context of the text they all

196) The Cambodian chronicle is Ḡabāñavatār īatvæk ("Chronicle of Lovek"), in PP, part 71, vol. XLIV, see pp. 260, 281-82; and the European evidence is in Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robinson, ed., The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898, XV, pp. 144-48. The name given to the prince in RA is On (šau), whereas the one in the chronicle and the European source is called Nōn (šau); but given the extreme confusion of dates and names in this part of RA, that is not a serious objection. See Simon de La Loubère, Siam, Oxford in Asia edition, map between pp. 2-3.

197) I wish to thank David P. Chandler for checking those names in sources not available to me.
appear to be west or south of the Tonle Sap, and the first, second, and eighth sound unmistakably Khmer. I would also tentatively identify kató as a scribal error for Krakor, on the southwestern shore of the Tonle Sap, and biren is possibly pûren, mentioned in a Cambodian chronicle in 1662-3, but also difficult to locate.\textsuperscript{198}

Tānpal borāh is very likely the tānpal bolāhīv of Ang Eng, which, although not helping much with the location, illustrates again the relationship between the two texts. In 2/k.125 it appears to be near Pursat, and in Ang Eng somewhere between Rayong and Angkor, which might very well be near Pursat too.\textsuperscript{199}

Another name which occurs in both texts is mo'ān slāy (2/k.125) slai (AE)\textsuperscript{200}, and again the two passages show devolution from the same records. In 2/k.125 Yāt acquires a number of women in a victory over the chief of mo'ān slāy, and in Ang Eng the daughter of the chief of mo'āh slai is mentioned in a list of Yāt's wives, of whom two have names found in the group of 2/k.125 (see below). The place itself, though, defies pinpointing.

Names of individuals

Most individuals, wherever possible, have been identified in the footnotes accompanying the Thai text and translation. Here I wish only to discuss those which have a special significance owing to their appearance in other texts.

The first of these is khun sai drañ brañ indr, described as a mentor (billañ) of the Ayutthayan prince ruling at Angkor. It is clearly the title of a function, not a proper name, since after the first one died his brother was appointed to the same position with the same title (p. [8]). A title which may be assumed the same, khun drañ brañ indr, appears in all the chronicles of Cambodia in connection with Banā Yāt. In all but Ang Eng it is said that after Yat's final victory over the Thai at Angkor he took a daughter of khun drañ brañ indr as wife and she gave birth to

\textsuperscript{198} See the Thai translation of the Nong chronicle, in PP, vol. I, p. 212.
\textsuperscript{199} Coedes, "Essai", p. 28.
\textsuperscript{200} Ibid., p. 27.
Prince Dhammarāja, who eventually became king. *Ang Eng* also makes her the mother of Dhammarāja, but as the wife of one of Yat’s sons rather than of Yat himself. Comparison of the full story with *2/k.125* is not possible, since when it breaks off Yat has not yet achieved victory nor acquired a daughter of *khun sai drah brah in*.

*Mae nāh debdharani*, who with *mae nāh gangū* aided Yat during his imprisonment, also appears, but as the goddess, in *Ang Eng*, where she gave help to Yat’s father. There may be a cryptic reference to this in *2/k.125* with its detail that Yat’s mother was named ṣāmbakes, the literal meaning of which seems to be “mango-hair”, written ṣāmbakes (*ānān*) at the present time. Since that name has no traditional associations, we are entitled to suspect a corruption. The addition of only a subscript vowel sign turns the name into ṣāmbakes, (*ānān*) “water-hair”, the most important characteristic of the goddess ḍharanī, who protected the Buddha from the assault of Mara’s army by wringing a flood out of her hair. The intention of the writer of *2/k.125* may thus have been to suggest that the *mae nāh debdharani* who aided Yat was his own mother, and this would indicate a definitely mythical element in the story, since *debdharanī* and *gangū* are much more likely to have been names of goddesses than of humans.

*Khu n blapblajai* or *blajai*, who helps Yat escape his captors, plays the same role in *Ang Eng*. There he is called the “chief of Pan Tān Hāk” (*ūnu ūn*), which cannot be identified, but which appears to be a Thai name. Nothing more about him or his location may be inferred from *Ang Eng*, but in a comparative study the Thai name of *blajai*’s

204) That is one of the most common themes in Thai temple murals.
village in Ang Eng and the apparent location found in 2/k.125 argue strongly against the stories of the other chronicles, which place Yât’s activities east of the Mekhong and Tonle Sap.

A similar geographical association may belong with pû viset, one of Yât’s main allies until their falling out and the former’s execution. In RA, during Naresuan’s campaign in Cambodia in 1593-94 (LP dates; RA has 1583) a certain brok vises of Chachoengsao was among Naresuan’s commanders and was given the task of taking troops to hold Babaur. If the two titles, at dates 150 years apart, indicate the same function, we have another bit of evidence linking Yât with the Chachoengsao-Prachinburi region. It is also interesting in this connection to note that in the Hierarchy Laws the titles khun vises and laphlaijaiy belong to the same kram under the Palace Ministry, indicating that whatever their duties, those two officials were closely associated from early times.

Bañã kaev and bañã 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, a scenario which agrees with the details of 2/k.125, 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-rain, could be a disguised pun on the name kaev, “crystal”.

One historian has tried to interpret those two names as referring to cult objects rather than human beings; but the title bañã, given only

207) RA, pp. 174, 178.
208) Laws, 1, 240.
209) LP date cola 793.
to persons, precludes that solution. In 2/k.125, which may represent the oldest record, they are definitely persons, whom the Ayutthayan king had brought involuntarily from Angkor, and who, rather than betraying Angkor, are portrayed as planning an insurrection in Ayutthaya.

Ayutthayan relations with the north

The evidence of northern relations with Ayutthaya in 2/k.125 is much less controversial, and its information generally fits the picture provided by the other sources and accepted by specialists of the area. Some of this has already been discussed above in connection with the date of the story and the toponym "toy don." Although neither the opening episode nor its locale may be identified from other sources, the terms "smi" and "meh" used in connection with the enemy indicate that they were probably Mons from Burma, and that "toy don" may have been toward the west.

In spite of the general concordance with other sources, the administrative details of the Sukhothai-Phitsanulok area which may be inferred from 2/k.125 differ from the picture which has emerged from recent research. According to our text, the northern rulers who appear to have been in alliance with Ayutthaya were:

- Mahâ Dharrmarâjî in Phitsanulok
- Bañâ Jaliañ in Jaliañ/Sawankhalok
- Bañâ Râmarâj in Sukhothai
- Bañâ Saen Soy Tâv in Kamphaeng Phet

None of those agree with the Provincial Hierarchy Law, which is of uncertain date. In particular, Phitsanulok, in the law, perhaps due to the changes in administration effected by King Trailok and periods of direct rule by Ayutthayan princes, appears to have lost all traditional titles.

Mahā dharmarājā is known from epigraphy as a traditional title of Sukhothai rulers, and was conserved by that dynasty when the center of power shifted to Phitsanulok; but according to Griswold and Prasert, the last of that line died in A.D. 1438. After that date Ayutthayan princes ruled there, presumably with distinct titles, and a mahā dharmarājā only appears again in 1549. If Griswold and Prasert's explanation is correct, the ruler of Phitsanulok in the 2/k.125 period (1443-4) should have been Prince Rāmeśvara, who went there in 1438.

Banā Jalin is identified here only by one of the names of his mo'ān, Sawankhalok. In the Hierarchy Law the Governor of Satchanalai-Sawankhalok is called kra:sət sahgrām rāmarōj, etc., the last term of which is expected since it is an old title of the entire Sukhothai area.

In 2/k.125 this last old title is given to the ruler of Sukhothai, which is quite plausible, although the title for Sukhothai governors in the Hierarchy Law is sri dharmazokaraj, also traditional in that area, as attested by inscription 13 (found in Kamphaeng Phet and dated 1510), and inscription 14 from Sukhothai.

The only one of the four titles above which is completely unexpected is saen soby tōv, which I have found elsewhere only in the chronicles of Nakhon Si Thammarat, in a passage which is rather strange, and in the

214) RA, pp. 82-83, with date interpolated from LP.
215) Written “. . . subarōj”
Hierarchy Laws\textsuperscript{217}. In the Laws, governors of Kamphaeng Phet are entitled \textit{rām rāṣṭhāng saṅgrām}, etc.

Some further evidence on old contemporary usage comes from inscription 86, found in Sukhothai, and which apparently refers to the edification of a temple there\textsuperscript{218}. It dates from A.D. 1528, but includes information from 1506. It names three individuals who appear to be of \textit{cau mo'ān} level in the order \textit{bra:nā sri saṅgrāh saṅgrām, cau mo'ān rāmarāj}, and \textit{bra:nā sri dharm}. The last, in this context, could plausibly be understood as a short form of either \textit{dharmarāj} or \textit{dhammasokarāj}, and I am inclined to go along with the Hierarchy Law and place him in Sukhothai, and \textit{cau mo'ān rāmarāj} in Sawankhalok. As for \textit{sri saṅgrāh saṅgrām}, since the inscription indicates that he was the most important, I believe he should be identified as a high official of Phitsanulok. That question, although of considerable intrinsic interest, is not relevant to 2/fk.125, and I pursue it no further here. The importance of inscription 86 now is to show that two of the Sukhothai area titles found in the Hierarchy Law and in 2/fk.125 were in use at least as early as the first years of the sixteenth century.

The slight discrepancies in the location of the titles which are otherwise appropriate for the area pose no real problem, since the manuscript of 2/fk.125 has admittedly gone through several stages of copying and probably contains a number of errors. The main problem is the title \textit{saen sōy tār}, which I find difficult to accept as genuine in both Kamphaeng Phet and Nakhon Si Thammarat. One or another of the chronicles must contain a spurious passage, but it is impossible, with the available evidence, to push the investigation any further.

Another problem requiring some attention is the extent to which 2/fk.125 fits the Griswold and Prasert construction of Sukhothai-

\textsuperscript{218} \textit{Prajum sīlā cīrak}, IV, pp. 12-15.
Phitsanulok history of the fifteenth century. According to them, Mahā Dharmarāja IV died in 1438; seven-year-old Prince Rāmeśvara, the future King Trailokanath, was sent to Phitsanulok as viceroy and presumably remained there until his coronation in 1448; the Buddha Jinarāja wept tears of blood; and Sukhothai was taken firmly into the Ayutthayan orbit. Our fragment does no violence to the last point. All the old Sukhothai area ma‘āh seem clearly to be vassals at the beck and call of the King of Ayutthaya. Rāmeśvara as viceroy, however, could not have had the title mahā dharmarājā219, and if 2/k.125 is accurate here, we must conclude that he had returned to Ayutthaya by this time, and a member of the old Sukhothai nobility had been installed as vassal ruler. It should also be emphasized that the Griswold-Prasert story has been built to some extent on a scaffolding of assumptions. There is no statement anywhere about the death of Mahā Dharmarāja IV in 1438, and Rāmeśvara is only said to have gone to Phitsanulok, not to have been installed as viceroy. It would be equally legitimate to conclude that Mahā Dharmarāja IV, having become a vassal of Ayutthaya, is the one mentioned in 2/k.125; or that the latter, if Mahā Dharmarāja IV had really died, was Prince Yudhiṣṭhira220.

219) The statement is based on the observation that each polity had patterns of royal titles peculiar to it and distinct from others. An Ayutthayan viceroy would therefore most probably be given titles other than those which had been traditional for Sukhothai kings.

Another interesting feature of 2/k.125 is the close connection between the royal families of Nan and the Sukhothai area, with Kaen Dav of Nan portrayed as the son of Baañ Jalian; that detail, so far as I have been able to determine, occurs in no other source. Griswold and Prasert have called attention to the close connection between Sukhothai and Nan a half-century earlier221, and 2/k.125 may be evidence that the connection persisted much longer than the time of the inscriptions which first record it.

General conclusions

The history of the historiography of chronicle interpretation over the past several years has shown how dangerous it is to leap at every exotic fragment and declare it to be long-lost truth, and I do not wish to suggest that the reader should wholeheartedly embrace 2/k.125, and my reading of it, without exercising his critical faculties.

Of course there is no guarantee that 2/k.125 is not simply an imaginative construction linking obscure events which appear in the histories of Ayutthaya and the surrounding regions, and conclusions must be based on probabilities; but the noteworthy feature of 2/k.125 in this respect is that the passages which link it to other texts are not explanatory, not conjectures, but are simple direct statements which seem to result from mutual incorporation of elements from similar records. Although much more detailed, the fragment follows the same general outline as LP. Thus, before the first datable passage in 803, there is a campaign in the north, and activities in the north are an important feature of LP throughout its first two centuries. For the years covered by 2/k.125, however, LP is blank. It records two northern campaigns in 800 and 804, with no political activities inbetween, and

221) Griswold and Prasert, "The pact between Sukhodaya and Nan", cited above, n. 145.
none in 805; and 2/k.125 may well be supplying details for these blank periods. As for the reliability of the Chiang Mai chronicle with which I have compared 2/k.125 for those events, all of its entries which may be compared with the Ayutthayan chronicles, with one exception, agree with the chronology of LP.

In 805, 2/k.125 has a statement which is so close to the wording of LP that it can only be explained by the hypothesis that both derive from the same records. In neither case can the statement be considered an explanation, since the passages are corrupt, and probably neither the compiler of LP nor of 2/k.125 had any idea of what the baryg were, or the location of the campaign against them, any more than Frankfurter or Wood.

Following 806, LP has nothing more until 810. It may be presumed, however, on the basis of the otherwise good correspondence between LP and the Chiang Mai chronicle, that if the former had included the events of those years, it would have more accounts of northern campaigns in the manner of 2/k.125.

The only passages of 2/k.125 which may be classed as conjectural or explanatory are the conversations among the participants, or considerations of their thoughts and motives, which do not themselves detract from the historical accuracy of the basic events.

I think it is safe, then, insofar as any conclusion in the study of early chronicles is safe, to accept 2/k.125 as representing an entirely unsuspected old Ayutthayan chronicle tradition, more detailed than but probably as old as LP, and based on the same records.

I would like to comment on the general inferences which may be drawn from 2/k.125 about the early development of Ayutthaya and the history of post-Angkorean Cambodia. Like the traditional history of the period, 2/k.125 shows conflict between Ayutthaya and Cambodia, but
not emphatically conflict between Thai and Khmer. Yet still appears as hero of Cambodian and local Khmer resistance against Ayutthaya, but he himself is descended from Ayutthayan royalty, part of which may still have been more Mon and Khmer than Thai.

Also like the traditional history, 2/k.125 shows Ayutthaya expanding against Cambodia, and even seems to hint at a bipolar policy, with the Suphanburi faction of Ayutthayan royalty particularly interested in Angkor, while the descendants of Ramathibodi were more concerned with the Caturmukh region around present-day Phnom Penh.

Given the paucity of evidence I would not wish to argue very hard for such bipolarity, but it is quite likely that there were divergent ideas on policy both within Ayutthayan royalty and among the various factions within Cambodia. O. W. Wolters has hinted 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. 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

222) Griswold and Prasert call attention to this in "On kingship and society at Sukhodaya", loc. cit., p. 67.
223) For remarks on another bipolar theory, and further references, see Vickery, review of Jeremias van Vliet, The Short History of the Kings of Siam, in JSS, LXIV, 2 (July 1976), p. 232.
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 Yat as described in 2/k.125 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.125 text seems to allude to such an effort in the dispatching of a deposed Ayutthayan king to Caturmukh. The activities of Yat, even though directed against Ayutthayan encroachment as in the traditional histories, seem in 2/k.125 to have been less inspired by a desire to regain Angkor than to establish himself solidly in the commercially more favorable region south of the Tonle Sap. 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.