

AYUDHYA AND ITS PLACE IN PRE-MODERN SOUTHEAST ASIA

MICHAEL WRIGHT

C/O BANGKOK BANK, LTD.

All scholars tend to look back upon Ayudhya, for the very good reason that from our point of view its days of glory lie in the past.

However, I would like to take you back to protohistoric times and so look forward to Ayudhya.

No one knows when mainland Southeast Asia first became a centre of trade. The Southeast Asian peninsula contains within itself one of the most rich and diverse sources of resources on the planet, within a fairly small area: rice plains with rivers that flood annually, jungles rich in spices, medicinal products and rare animals, mountains that yielded valuable metals, and all manner of inlets and outlets.

India and China were no less well endowed, but their endowments were much more dispersed and could be exploited only at much greater expense. By the time the Europeans came upon the scene, it was found that huge populations had depleted resources to the extent that neither India nor China could feed itself on a regular basis and the remaining forests were too remote to be commercially viable, but Southeast Asia remained sparsely populated, still well forested, and could produce a surplus of rice.

It seems that Southeast Asia in pre-modern times was always self-sufficient in the essentials of life, whereas India and China must have begun experiencing shortages at early dates. For instance, the Indians certainly learnt to cast metals long, long ago, but they were poor in tin, copper and gold; the Chinese must have been building junks from time immemorial, but at one point they seem to have realized that it was more economical to build junks of tropical hardwoods in Southeast Asia rather than from pines dragged from China's interior.

Two other items must have drawn Chinese and Indians to Southeast Asia at a very early date. In the case of China the attraction would have been Southeast Asia's rich-

ness in jungle products : drugs, herbs and spices. In the case of India a big attraction (in addition to metals) seems to have been elephants. Of course India always had its own elephants, but evidence from the mid-12th to the early 19th century¹ indicates that Southeast Asia could provide high-quality elephants in huge quantities at relatively short notice and at reasonable prices, particularly when war was threatening between states in India and there was sudden demand for large numbers of the beasts.

However this may be, it is clear that Indian and Chinese shipping was drawn to Southeast Asia in protohistoric and perhaps even prehistoric times.

At some point, probably very early, a Chinese merchant met an Indian merchant, and a whole new trade emerged, carrying goods between the Far East, South Asia and the Middle East, with destinations further west in Europe. This was probably when Roman lamps and coins began appearing in Southeast Asia, and the Romans began wearing silks.

It was at this point that Southeast Asia began to play a double role: that of barrier and conduit. In terms of physical geography it was an almost impenetrable barrier to East-West trade; on the other hand, with the establishment of emporia on the east and west coasts of the Peninsula, and portage routes, Southeast Asia became a conduit for the East-West trade.

We know that by the Tang Dynasty at the latest, Persian ships were plying the sea route between Canton and the Middle East via the tip of the Southeast Asian peninsula and Ceylon, so Southeast Asia as a barrier was not insurmountable. However, these long sea journeys involved very high technology for the time in terms of ship-building and navigation, huge sums of capital and formidable risks, including piracy and tempest in that unpredictable equatorial region around Singapore.

Lest it be thought that I am overemphasizing the difficulty of rounding the tip of the Peninsula, there is the evidence of the Sinhalese mission to the Court of King Boromakot of Ayudhya in the mid-18th century. They were carried in a Dutch ship, and the Dutch knew something about

The substance of this paper was delivered at a seminar for Siam Society members and friends held at Ayudhya, *Ayudhya in Depth*, with Dr. Piriya Krairiksh, President of the Society, in the Chair.

sailing. The voyage from Trincomalee across the Andaman Sea to Malacca took thirteen days with no incident. Leaving Malacca they spent two weeks trying to tack around Riao Point but the winds were against them. They therefore returned to Malacca where they waited for six months for the wind to change before setting out again for Ayudhya, which they reached in about two weeks.

The huge difficulties and risks involved in rounding the Peninsula suggest that the greater part of the East-West trade must have been conducted in a less risky, more modest manner, with many smaller East Asian ships plying between Canton and the east coast of Southeast Asia, and West Asian ships plying between the west coast of Southeast Asia and markets in India and the Middle East.

This trading system would only work, however, if there were strong powers in the river basins of Southeast Asia, capable of controlling the interior to gather its riches of metals and forest products, and also capable of keeping open the portage routes between the east and west coasts.

In the first millennium A.D. such a power existed in the form of a confederation of city states which I should like to call Dvaravati-Sri Vijaya.

Dvaravati means "that which has gates as adornments", in other words "a city"; Sri Vijaya means "the prosperous and victorious". Neither name makes much sense alone, but together as Dvaravati-Sri Vijaya they make excellent sense as "the prosperous and victorious city". I would like to suggest that in 1350 A.D. the name was changed to Dvaravati-Sri Ayudhya, "the prosperous and unconquerable city".

The change in name was probably resorted to for magical reasons when the city was re-founded with a new horoscope in the wake of the Black Death which must have ravaged Southeast Asia in the late 1330s and early 1340s.

Foreign writers seem to have recorded one term or the other, "Dvaravati" or "Sri Vijaya", with Dvaravati (Tolopoti to the Chinese) meaning the east coast and mainland, and Sri Vijaya (Tiruvissayam to the Tamils) implying the west coast and the South.

Dvaravati-Sri Vijaya cannot have been anything like a kingdom or empire as understood in the West, but the art evidence suggests a cultural unity from Udon in the Northeast (source of gold and copper) to Songkhla in the South (source of gold and tin).

When I speak of art evidence I mean the art which we call Dvaravati, which has a character of its own that all can recognize. There is no such thing as Sri Vijaya art, which is a category invented in an attempt to explain the multiplicity of art forms found in the south of Siam: Dvaravati, Palasena, Pallava, Chola, Javanese and others.

In addition to the Dvaravati Buddha images there are the so-called Pre-Angkorean Hindu sculptures and inscriptions in excellent Sanskrit and beautiful Pallava script to be found from as far east as the mouths of the Mae Khong River, as far Northeast as the mouth of the Mun River in Ubon, as far North as Si Thep in Petchabun Provinces, and as far South as Keda.

All this evidence suggests a large Indian presence in the region, drawn here, I propose, by enormous natural resources as yet under-exploited by small Southeast Asian populations who may have been more skilled than their Indian contemporaries in the smelting of tin and copper.

The Hindu caste system, which everyone admits was very ancient, must have led in early times to great social progress and cohesion with every man assigned his place and his duty, thus putting India way ahead of Southeast Asia in terms of social organization. In terms of technological development, however, the conservatism of the caste system must have acted as a brake, as a new technology would have to await the creation of a sub-caste to handle it. It must have been much easier, in early days, for Indians to take advantage of technologies developed by the socially backward Southeast Asian peoples, free of the restraints that even today limit the activities of many Hindus to one occupation: the occupation of his forefathers, which meant repetition of established technologies. In the traditional Hindu system innovation was possible, but it was very difficult.

For these reasons it seems to me that the Southeast Asian attraction for Indian merchants is unsurprising. They found here both the raw materials that they lacked and an intellectual fluidity that fostered technological innovation.

At the same time one must not overlook the Chinese participation in the ancient history of Southeast Asia, for which there is surprisingly little evidence: a mention by I Ching of a Chinese family that emigrated to Tolopoti and had a son who became a famous Buddhist pilgrim monk; and a Dvaravati votive tablet found in the Northeast with a Chinese inscription on the back, written in quite elegant characters. Though the Chinese left little overt evidence of their presence in early Southeast Asia, I believe that their influence was considerable.

A major question that has long bothered me (and many others) is how the Indians insinuated themselves into the basic structure of early Southeast Asian societies. Working with Southeast Asian evidence I could find no answer, except the persistent legend of a Prince or Brahmin bedding a Naga King's daughter and creating a new royal line. However, early South India provided a clear picture.

Some 2,500 years ago the Dravidians had a highly sophisticated tribal culture, very similar to that which persisted until later in Southeast Asia. They worshipped gods and goddesses localized in springs, old trees, large termite mounds and other remarkable features of the landscape.

About 2,000 years ago the Dravidian tribal chieftains began to import Brahmins from North India to advise on the calendar and state affairs. These Brahmins gradually identified the old gods and goddesses of the trees and termite mounds with the classical gods and goddesses of Hinduism. Where a termite mound was proclaimed a Shiva Linga, more Brahmins were brought in to serve it, a temple was built, lands were given to the god and to his Brahmin servants, irrigation was provided and families were allocated to till the fields and feed the Brahmins and the god.

These sacred centres eventually gave rise to some of the Indian cities and villages that we see today, where wastelands became identified with the presence or activities of a god and were later developed into centres of husbandry and commerce. Tillai, for instance, a tiger-infested jungle of poisonous shrubs, was identified as the place where Shiva danced and overcame the bloodthirsty local goddess. The forest was cut down, canals were dug, families were brought in, and Brahmins were imported from the North to administer the vast temple lands in the name of the god. Thus the Tillai jungle became the famous city of Chidambaram.

The same sort of system seems to have been employed in early Southeast Asia, particularly in parts where Cambodian style culture prevailed. Angkor itself is a case in point, and places like Phanom Rung and Muang Tam in Buriram Province, where a local spirit identified with a Hindu god provided a focal point, Brahmins provided an administration, jungle was turned into arable land, and tribal folk could be settled and made to contribute their labour to Church and State.

This system was later employed by Buddhist kings to equally good effect, using relics of the Buddha in place of Hindu gods, and Buddhist monks in place of Brahmins. The Crystal Sands Chronicle tells us that at at least one point during the middle ages, Nakhon Si Thammarat reverted to jungle. But a king rediscovered the ancient Relic there, reenshrined it, called the population out from the forests and mountains where they had taken refuge, and gave them lands which they were to till in service to the Relic, under the administration of the Sangha. This system helps to explain why each of Siam's major cities is centred on a "Wat Maha That", a sacred presence from which power issued and around which organization revolved.

This long digression away from Ayudhya itself to the ways and means of city-state formation in ancient times is necessary because the process has been consistently misinterpreted in western terms of military or cultural conquest. In fact the Southeast Asian experience must have been rather similar to that of South India, in which wise indigenous rulers recognized a superior system of social organization and imported it along with the necessary administrative personnel. This situation also suited the purposes of Indian merchants who wished to exploit Southeast Asia's resources.

As a result of this creative intercourse, the Southeast Asia Peninsula ceased to be a barrier to trade and instead became a conduit, with a network of cities along the west and east coasts, while the riches of the interior were made available for trade via cities established further inland.

As far as has been established, on the West Coast, from north to south, the cities were Mergui-Tenasserim, Takua Pa, Trang and Keda. These cities corresponded to cities on the East Coast, from south to north: Pattani, Songkhla, Nakhon Si Thammarat, Chaiya, Phetburi, Khu Bua in Ratburi, U-Thong in Suphanburi, Dong Si Mahaphot in Prachinburi, Lopburi, and Si Thep in Phetchabun Province.

Most of these cities played a straightforward role as emporia and start or terminus to a portage route, but others

played more complex roles.

Thus Pattani-Songkhla provided access to Keda and vice versa, Nakhon was some eight days journey from Trang, Chaiya was even closer to Takua Pa, and the route from Tenasserim to Phetburi was long a favoured one.

Cities with more complex roles included Nakhon Pathom, which at its heyday seems to have been the largest city in Southeast Asia and may have been something like a primate city. U-Thong provided access to the upper Chao Phraya River and its tributaries. Lopburi and Si Thep led to the Northeast and to Laos, rich in metals, and Dong Si Maha Phot in Prachinburi played a triple role as port, gateway to the Northeast, and back door to Cambodia. Cambodia's front door was at the mouths of the Mae Khong in Champa, but as Cambodia was frequently at war with the Chams that route was unreliable and the overland route from Angkor to the headwaters of the Bang Pakong River must often have been the favoured route of foreign trade. Nakhon Si Thammarat, in addition to being the start of a portage route, was also the key to the east and west coasts of the whole peninsula.

I cannot name any major cities in the Northeast because despite the considerable art evidence and the inscriptions there indicating a major civilization (or civilizations), the names and forms of large cities seem to be irretrievably lost. But what we call Nakhon Ratchasima must have been a nexus for trade between the Northeast and markets and ports in the Central Region.

We might all be happier if we could establish what Dvaravati's political structure might have been. Among modern Thai scholars, the conservatives seem to be quite happy with the terms "kingdom" and "empire". Liberals abhor these terms and perceive instead a mass of independent city-states, or at most a loose federation based on dynastic marriages. I can see that both points of view have their attractions, but the terms "kingdom" and "empire" seem oversimplistic, while "a loose federation of city-states" fails to explain the immense organizational complexity needed to exploit the resources of the interior, stabilize ports on the east and west coasts, and keep open the portage routes between them.

Evidence from the Ayudhya Period and early Bangkok indicates precisely how this complex task was accomplished. Though dynastic marriages played a part, the chief instrument was military force issuing from the central rice-bowl (Ayudhya and later Bangkok) that could subdue and extract tribute from Nakhon Ratchasima (that took care of the Northeast), Phitsanulok (that took care of parts of Laos and the North), and Nakhon Si Thammarat (the key to the South and the West Coast).

These observations (with ample evidence) about how Siam functioned in the second millenium A.D., prompt me to propose that something very similar may have pertained during the first millenium, or the Dvaravati Period.

In other words, there was probably an Ayudhya (or something rather like it) long before 1350 when the Ayudhya that we know was founded. It seems possible that the older Ayudhya had existed in or around the site of the new Ayudhya (which the Persians referred to as the New City), and that

1350 marked its magical re-foundation when the population began to recover from the Black Death which, as noted above, must have ravaged Siam in the late 1330s and early 40s. This would help explain the persistence of "Dvaravati" in the full name of the later city, "Dvaravati Sri Ayudhya".

On the other hand, the Siamese have a persistent tradition of coupling names of related cities, from Si Sachanalai/Sukhothai and Sa Luang/Song Khwae, to Krung Thep/Thonburi. So Dvaravati Sri Ayudhya may be a conflation of the names of two closely related earlier cities.

Prof. Srisak Walliphodom and Suchit Wongthet propose that Dvaravati was Lopburi, and I suspect that Nakhon Pathom was Sri Vijaya because the villagers called it "Muang Si Vichai" long before Coedès rediscovered the toponym.

On yet another hand (unlike economics, but like a Hindu god, history has more than one pair of hands)—on yet another hand, the heart of Dvaravati may have been a triangular affair, with Lopburi looking after much of the interior, Dong Si Mahaphot serving the East and Cambodia, and Nakhon Pathom responsible for the control of the Peninsula and the West Coast ports.

But this is all speculation. I feel that the Dvaravati that we know from art evidence must have had some sort of centre to create the artistic and economic unity that seems to have existed at that time over a widely diverse area. But where that centre was, I am unable to hazard a guess.

Let us therefore return to the history that we know, or think we know.

In the first millenium A.D. there was an entity in Southeast Asia, perhaps called "Dvaravati Sri Vijaya", that prospered and produced great art because it controlled the East-West trade and was in a position to exploit the interior.

To recapitulate, the West Coast ports were, from North to South, Tenasserim, Takua Pa, Trang and Keda; on the East Coast, from South to North, were Songkhla, Nakhon Si Thammarat, Chaiya, Phetburi, Khu Bua, and Nakhon Pathom; other cities like U-Thong, Lopburi, Si Thep and Dong Si Mahaphot, seem to have been more oriented towards the interior.

This system of related cities seems to have functioned most profitably during the first millenium A.D. Then the situation began to change, and the old order was destroyed. The Cholas had been expanding their influence over South India and Southeast Asia during the 10th and 11th centuries. About 995 A.D. the Cholas took Northern Sri Lanka. By 1025 A.D. the Cholas had taken the whole of the west coast of Southeast Asia and must have penetrated to the east coast. Chola inscriptions claim that they took a city in Southeast Asia which they called Shri Vishayam (Sri Vijaya) and they used a door (or Dvara) to symbolize it in their seals.

At that point the whole East-West trade fell into the hands of the Cholas, which was not necessarily a bad thing as the Cholas were great merchants. They seem to have helped rather than hindered trade, sending numerous embassies to China in their own name and that of Sri Vijaya. So it must have been prosperous times as far as trade was concerned.

Then disaster struck. In the 1070s the Chola empire

imploded due to dynastic squabbling and pressure from the North. Kulotunga I, a Chola on his mother's side and an Andhra on his father's was first recorded in Chinese annals and the inscription of Canton as King of Sri Vijaya (San Fo Chi). In the early 1070s he returned to South India to ascend the throne of a much-reduced Chola kingdom, perhaps little more than the lower Kaveri basin, where he used his considerable wealth in the glorification of sacred places like Chidambaram, which he made his capital with the name "Tiru Cholamandalam".

The Chinese annals then record that the Cholas (Chu Lian) had become a tributary of Sri Vijaya (San Fo Chi), a beautiful example of how the Chinese annals tend to be factual, faithful, and totally wrong.

In the fourth quarter of the 11th century the Sinhales reestablished sovereignty over their island under Vijayabahu I. In the next century or so Polonnaruva became the most beautiful and prosperous city in the region under Vijayabahu, Parakramabahu and Nissankamalla.

In contrast, the Chola retreat from Southeast Asia seems to have left a vacuum and initiated a Dark Age. The old trading cities went back to the jungle. As the Tamnan of Nakhon Si Thammarat says: "Plague descended on the City. The inhabitants fled to the jungles and mountains, and for a long time Nakhon was a ruin". Sri Vijaya and Dvaravati disappear from the historical records. Khu Bua, U-Thong, Nakhon Pathom, Dong Si Maha Phot and Si Thep, all became deserted. The only surviving cities seem to have been Lopburi, and perhaps Phetburi.

Despite the disaster that overtook most of what had been Dvaravati Sri Vijaya and later became Siam, the Cambodians did very well in the first half of the 12th century under Suryavarman II, who built Angkor Wat, and towards the end of the century under Jayavarman VII, who built the Bayon, or Angkor Thom.

Towards the end of Jayavarman's reign, or perhaps slightly later, occurs a poignant piece of evidence pointing to how conditions had changed in those days.

The evidence lies in Prasat Muang Sing in Kanchanaburi Province. This is obviously a Khmer-inspired city and temple, the furthest west of them all. Why should the Cambodians be building so far west at that late date? The only answer I can find is that, with traditional trade routes to the west lost to the jungle and banditry, the Cambodians were trying to establish a new route further north, probably aiming for Martaban or Tavoy on the West Coast. Muang Sing was a considerable city with formidable fortifications, apparently designed as a garrison to hold the passes over the Tenasserim range.

Long ago I decided that Prasat Muang Sing was a purely Cambodian monument because of its presiding image, a beautiful Radiating Lokeshvara Bodhisattva, Jayavarman's personal god, and straight out of an Angkorean workshop, but my Thai scholar friends argued that there was something distinctly un-Cambodian about the architecture.

After a trip to South India, I began to see that my Thai friends were right: the east and west gate-towers of Prasat

Muang Sing were extraordinarily tall; in fact they were Gopurams as understood in South India, and unknown in Cambodia. (The Department of Fine Arts has destroyed this evidence; you have to look at old photographs.)

The Prasat Muang Sing evidence indicates to me that in the late 12th-early 13th century, Cambodia and South Indian merchants were attempting to open a new east/west trade route. Their efforts seem to have failed, probably because of the collapse of Cambodia after the death of Jayavarman VII, and Prasat Muang Sing, too, seems to have returned to the jungle.

The next attempt to open an east/west trade route took place in the 13th century much further north, namely at Sukhothai, and it proved a great success. As Dong Si Maha Phot in Prachinburi Province may once have been a "back door" to Cambodia, so Sukhothai now became the back door of Siam, with its port at Martaban. Sukhothai was situated in a poor, dry area, little suited to agriculture even today, but it was bang in the middle of North-South and East-West trade routes, the ideal gathering-place for gold, copper and tin from Lanna, Laos and Isan.

This explains in part (but by no means entirely) how so many huge Buddhist and Hindu bronze images came to be cast at Sukhothai. The kings of Sukhothai cannot have been buying up metals with the proceeds derived from rice or other produce; they must have been trading in the metals in order to have such a surplus available. But that surplus requires further explanation.

Sukhothai, with its port on the west coast at Martaban, could only flourish as long as ports and portage routes further south were in disarray, which brings me at last, at long last, to the subject of this paper, Ayudhya.

The foundation (or refoundation) of Ayudhya in 1350 was the beginning of the end for Sukhothai.

According to the Laws of the Brahmins (Tamnan Phram Nakhon Si Thammarat), in 1351 an Indian king (probably a Sethupati of Ramnad) entered into trade negotiations with King Ramadhipati of Ayudhya. The Indian king sent a group of Brahmins to Ayudhya, carrying bronze images of the gods (an early example of imported raw materials being reexported in manufactured form). The Brahmins and their gods arrived at Trang and crossed the peninsula to Nakhon Si Thammarat, where the image of Vishnu that they were carrying conveniently refused to budge any further. The authorities at Ayudhya therefore decided that most of the Brahmins should stay at Nakhon to serve the god. They were given lands, tax exemption and other privileges.

If the Laws of the Brahmins is to be believed (and it is a thoroughly sober collection of legal documents) then it shows how Ayudhya (in cooperation with a South Indian ruler) reestablished order in the south of Siam, with its short portage routes to West Coast ports, and attracted Indian shipping back to ports and routes in Southeast Asia that had been out of use for something like two centuries.

Even before Ayudhya established firm control over other strategic points like Nakhon Ratchasima and Phitsanulok, this reopening of the southern trade route must have

knocked the bottom out of the Sukhothai metals market. In the face of falling demand and prices, King Lithai of Sukhothai must have found it necessary to convert much of his stock-in-trade into Buddha images in order to reduce the glut and firm up prices for his gold, copper and tin, for the prices offered by the King of Ayudhya were probably an insult.

With the foundation of Ayudhya and its control of the trade routes further south, the end of Sukhothai was inevitable. Ayudhya had no need to conquer Sukhothai; indeed, Ayudhya's main efforts were directed against Kamphaeng Phet and Phitsanulok in order to gain access to the resources of Lanna, Nan and Luang Phra Bang.

Sukhothai continued to function for a couple of centuries but only as a Buddhist Athens in the shadow of Ayudhya's Rome. In a final act of desperation, in 1568 Sukhothai united its forces with the Mons of Hamsavati and overran Ayudhya. As a result King Maha Dharmaraja of Sukhothai became king of Ayudhya. His son, King Naresuan, realizing that Sukhothai was not only useless but a liability, depopulated the city, bringing the population down to till rice fields nearer to Ayudhya.

The Mons of Hamsavati and the people of Sukhothai may have wished to knock out Ayudhya in order to revive their exclusive trade route, but when Naresuan came to the throne of Ayudhya he must have realized that Ayudhya was where the big profits lay, and his ancestral Sukhothai became deserted.

The old pattern of a primate city in the Central Plain exploiting the interior while holding open ports on the east and west coasts persisted throughout the Ayudhya Period and beyond.

In the time of King Narai, Persian ambassadors and French clerics arrived at Ayudhya via Tenasserim, and we all know how Samuel White used Mergui as a pirate base to terrorise Indian shipping, make a fool of the East India Company, and pick the pocket of the king, his Master. It is also recorded that in those days hundreds of boxes of copper were exported to Madras via Mergui, along with something like 300 Siamese elephants per year.

Even after the fall of Ayudhya the old system persisted. Bangkok, the New Ayudhya, was founded in 1782. In 1787 King Rama I led an army over the Tenasserim Range in order to retake Tavoy, without lasting success, but it was a valiant attempt to reassert Siam's right to access to the west coast.

In contrast, King Taksin's efforts to regain the allegiance of Nakhon Si Thammarat persist until today, despite Burmese attempts in the 18th century to cut the South off from Siam.

As late as the early 19th Century at least one old trade route was still in use. In 1815 King Rama II learnt that the British had taken the whole of Ceylon, including Kandy. The king therefore sent off a party of Buddhist monks to worship at the holy places in Ceylon and see what was going on. From Bangkok they took coastal shipping down to Nakhon Si Thammarat, where they disembarked and crossed the peninsula on elephants in eight days. At Trang they found four

ships—three recently arrived traders from South India and one constructed by the Governor of Nakhon Si Thammarat to carry the monks and 20 Siamese elephants cross the Bay of Bengal. In addition to the 20 elephants, the ship carried a crew and passengers numbering over 60. The document gives no details as to the size or cargo of the Indian vessels.

This early 19th Century evidence may be an obscure incident, but to me it seems extraordinarily significant because it occurred at a time when Indian overseas trade had largely been taken over by the European powers and Siam had hardly recovered from the disorder created by the Burmese. If, under those circumstances, South India could send three ships to trade at Trang, and the Governor of Nakhon Si Thammarat could build a ship to carry 60 men and 20 elephants across the ocean, then the commerce in earlier times, when both India and Southeast Asia were free and prosperous, must have been much more extensive.

By the time of Rama III, however, the age of the

steamship had come. Winds no longer mattered and neither did the east/west portage routes, which brings the story of Dvaravati and Ayudhya to an end. I hope you will forgive me for having so little to say about Ayudhya itself, the subject of this seminar. At first I attempted to deal with the Ayudhyan evidence directly, but soon found that the little there was had long been squeezed dry.

Rather than say much about Ayudhya itself, I have chosen to examine the evidence of what happened before and after Ayudhya, and what happened to its north, south, east and west. By sketching around Ayudhya in terms of time and place, I hope I have been able to make it more visible: what Ayudhya was, and how it functioned, who were the players and what were the stakes, why it was at one time the key to East-West trade, and how it came to an end around the middle of the 19th century, when the steamship passed through the Malacca Straits with the greatest of ease and rendered the portage routes redundant.

SECTION VI

OTHER ARTICLES

