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Abstract

This paper analyses the administrative and social systems of Lan Na in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries with special focus on demographic factors. Tight control of manpower was crucial to this sparsely populated, mountainous region. It is argued that the nai sip system of organising the workforce was probably introduced under Chinese or Mongolian influence prior to the founding of Lan Na. The territorial administration of Lan Na was characterised by the panna, administrative units below the müang level. Lacking a centralised administration, centrifugal tendencies intensified during the first half of the fifteenth century that eventually precipitated the disintegration of the kingdom in 1558. Among several factors, shortage of manpower was decisive for the manifold problems that Lan Na encountered during her internal crisis.

1. Introduction

The Kingdom of Lan Na emerged after the conquest of Hariphunchai by King Mangrai (1292) and the founding of the new capital at Chiang Mai (1296). Lan Na survived and remained an independent polity more than two and a half centuries until the Burmese conquest of Chiang Mai (1558). In spite of considerable achievements gained through research into the regional history in Northern
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Thailand, our knowledge of Lan Na’s political and social structures is still rather fragmentary. This is especially the case for the fourteenth century, which was the early formative period of Lan Na. Though Chiang Mai is generally considered as the undisputed administrative and ritual centre of Lan Na, this was not the case during the fourteenth century when the region of Chiang Rai and Chiang Saen was in fact a largely autonomous polity. The de facto division of Lan Na is clearly documented in contemporary Chinese sources, such as the “Veritable Records of the Ming Dynasty” (Ming Shilu). This states that in June 1404 two “Military-cum-Civilian Pacification Commissions” (jun-min xuan-wei shi-si) were formed in Lan Na, namely Babai-zhenai (Chiang Rai and Chiang Saen) and Babai-dadian (Chiang Mai). Though this political division was overcome a couple of years later and Chiang Mai successfully reasserted its position as the capital of the Lan Na polity, the old divisions re-emerged in the second quarter of the sixteenth century as symptoms of a general crisis which eventually led to the downfall of Lan Na in the mid-sixteenth century.

This article proposes to analyse the administrative, social and demographic structures of Lan Na in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, based on Tai Yuan primary sources such as inscriptions and manuscripts. Such an approach might provide a better understanding of Lan Na’s later decline, which cannot be fully understood by pointing to political developments alone.

It should be mentioned at the outset that geographically and culturally Lan Na is not restricted to the eight northernmost provinces of today’s Thailand. The majority of the Tai-speaking population of Northern Thailand, who are ethnically related to the Tai Yuan (or Khon Müang), are the Tai Khün and the Tai Lü’, mostly living in Chiang Tung (eastern Shan State) and Sipsông Panna (southern Yunnan), respectively. Their languages are very similar to that of the Tai Yuan. Chamberlain

---

1 Among many others, the works of Hans Penth (e.g., 1994a, 1994b, 2003), Saraswadee Ongsakul (e.g., 1993, 1996), and Aroonrut Wichienkeeo (e.g., 1977, 1995 with D. K. Wyatt) have to be mentioned.

2 As to Ming Shilu as a historical source for South-East Asian history see Wade 1997 and 2000.

3 Taizong Shilu 31.563–64 (Yongle 2, 5th month, jisi day: July 6, 1404), see also Mingshi Gao, Chapter 189, pp. 35b–36a; Mingshi, Chapter 315, p. 8161, lieu n.d.: 12–13.

4 The Tai Yuan are differentiated from other Tai peoples by their own language and script, which is distinct from that of the Siamese. The presence of the Tai Yuan people in the territory of today’s Northern Thailand prior to the mid-eleventh century is not confirmed by historical sources. The ethnonym “Yuan” (ייש) is not a genuine native ethnic name referring to the Tai speaking population of Lan Na, but was originally a Siamese term for her northern neighbour. The term yuan, just like yun, is the Burmese name for the Northern Thai and is still in use; the Pali form yonaka (re-converted into Thai as yonok, ṭυnu) can be traced back to the Sanskrit word yavana (“foreigner”). This word was first used by the Indians to refer to the Greeks (“Ionians”), and was later also used for other foreign peoples such as the Persians and the Romans.
and Egerød classify them as “sister languages” under the rubric “Northern Thai”\textsuperscript{5}. Moreover, due to the close cultural, historical and dynastic relationships of the Tai Khün and Tai Lü with the Tai Yuan, one could perhaps overlook the modern political divisions from ethnological points of view and consider the “cultural region of the Tai Yuan, Tai Khün, and Tai Lü”\textsuperscript{6} as one large entity. Thus in a broader perspective, the whole region east of the Salween River, even including Sipsòng Panna, can be viewed as part of “Greater Lan Na”.

2. Centre and periphery

The historical frontiers of Lan Na, which at least under the reign of King Mae Ku in the mid-sixteenth century still ideally existed, are depicted in one Northern Thai chronicle as follows:

The realm of the king, the ruler of Lan Na-Chiang Mai, borders in the south on the territory of Müang Rahaeng (Tak), in the east on the Mekong, and to the west on the Salween.\textsuperscript{7}

Another manuscript records the territorial demarcations of the Tai Yuan kingdom, albeit slightly differently:

The territory of Lan Na-Chiang Mai extended in the south to the land of the Lua. [...] To the east it bordered on the Mekong. To the north it extended as far as Müang Saen Nòi Saen Luang (south of Chiang Rung, V.G.).\textsuperscript{8}

The chronicle of the Mongolian Yuan Dynasty, on the contrary, describes smaller confines of Lan Na, as given from the Chinese perspective around the mid-fourteenth century, that is still before the incorporation of the principalities of Phrae and Nan.

In the east of the land [of Babai] is Laowo (Laos), in the south Bole barbarians (Sukhothai), in the west Da Gula (Pegu), in the north Menggen Prefecture (Müang Khün or Chiang Tung).\textsuperscript{9}

\textsuperscript{5} Chamberlain 1975; Egerod 1961: 49.
\textsuperscript{6} In Thai: Khet watthanatham yuan khün lü (เขตกวีตะวันธมยุคขึ้นลุ่ย). Today this region with an area of more than 150,000 km\textsuperscript{2} has a population of roughly seven million inhabitants.
\textsuperscript{7} Tamnan phün müang lan na chiang mai, SRI 1981a: 3.
\textsuperscript{8} SRI 85.144.05.136: Tamnan lan na lan chang, ff\textsuperscript{°} 2/4–3/1. [tr. ฝ่ายด้านใต้พื้นที่เมืองลาวพะเยาต่ำตัวรัฐวรวิชัย รัฐอักษร อำเภอแม่แจ่ม อำเภอวิปุล อำเภอเมืองลาวพะเยา](7) อำเภอแม่แจ่ม อำเภอเมืองลาวพะเยา (อำเภอแม่แจ่ม อำเภอวิปุล อำเภอเมืองลาวพะเยา) (อำเภอแม่แจ่ม อำเภอวิปุล อำเภอเมืองลาวพะเยา) (อำเภอแม่แจ่ม อำเภอวิปุล อำเภอเมืองลาวพะเยา).
\textsuperscript{9} Xin Yuanshi 252.12–13 (Babai-xifu), Liew n.d.: 12.
The territory marked by the Salween (in the west), the Mekong (in the east), by Tak (in the south) and Chiang Rung (in the north)\textsuperscript{10} corresponds \textit{cum grano salis} to the main regions of settlement of the tribal relatives of the Tai Yuan, Tai Khün and Tai Lü, and also to the main regions of distribution of the Dharma script as well as Buddhist monastic culture, which certainly relies on that script. Hence Lan Na was above all, and in particular, a cultural concept rather than a firmly connected political unit. Lan Na consisted of a few large and many smaller \textit{mùang} (polities), which were connected via intricately knitted relationships with one another and with the capital. The tightness and stability of relationships depended on several factors: size of population, economic potential, geographical location, historical characteristics, and kinship relations of each individual \textit{mùang}.

The meaning of the term \textit{mùang} is associated with territorial and demographic dimensions of political rule. From the fact that a \textit{mùang} is constantly defined by its centre follow some important considerations: two or more \textit{mùang} could “overlap” with one another. The border regions and transitional regions that are defined in such a way possessed multiple loyalties and identities. However, it is also possible that a large \textit{mùang} included several smaller satellite \textit{mùang}. To take one example: “Mùang Chiang Mai” first of all indicates the urban centre of the town, the \textit{wiang}, and family units that lived within the city walls (the fortifications of the town). In the broader sense the villages in the vicinity of Chiang Mai were included. In an even larger context, the meaning of \textit{mùang} Chiang Mai included most of the other \textit{mùang} of the Ping plain (in the centre of which “Wiang Chiang Mai” was located), such as Phrao, Chiang Dao, and Wiang Kum Kam. However, less often it also included Lamphun (Hariphunchai), which was seeking to preserve its special religious and cultural role. Moreover, Chiang Mai as capital was the ritual and “cosmological” embodiment of the country as a whole. It is therefore not surprising that very often the Northern Thai chronicles use the expression “Mùang Chiang Mai” as a \textit{pars pro toto} for “Lan Na” and, at times, also the twin term “Mùang Lan Na-Chiang Mai”.\textsuperscript{11}

In the following paragraphs the territorial structure of Lan Na with regards to the relationships of its constituent \textit{mùang} to the capital will be analysed. It will be differentiated by the example of three zones. A simplified model identifies the core region, the outer zone and the vassal \textit{mùang}:

\textsuperscript{10} At the end of the thirteenth century Tak belonged to Sukhothai and after its downfall surrendered to Ayutthaya. Henceforth, Tak, which was inhabited by the Tai Yuan and Siamese in almost equal parts, became a northern outpost of Ayutthaya. The southern frontier zone of Lan Na runs along between Thoen (belonging to Lampang) and Tak. Chiang Rung, even under the kings Mangrai and Tilok, was only a vassal of Chiang Mai and not regarded as a part of Lan Na.

\textsuperscript{11} Thus for example in the chronicle \textit{Tamnan phûn mùang lan na chiang mai}, SRI 1981a.
a) The *core region* was under the direct control of the king. It included the capital Chiang Mai and her satellite *müang*, essentially the central part of the Ping River basin with Chiang Mai and Lamphun as the northern and southern corner points respectively. In this fertile and productive rice-cultivating region, one of the earliest urbanised parts of Lan Na, the population was probably the highest. The strategic importance of the Chiang Mai-Lamphun core region as commercial centres made the region even more attractive, placing it at an advantage over the other *müang*.

In the region around the capital, the king had the work force at his direct disposal. Through the state officials appointed by the king himself the ruler was able to recruit male subjects directly for construction works and enlist them for military service. Lamphun maintained her special cultural status until the end of the Mangrai dynasty. Most of the kings of Lan Na undertook pilgrimages to Wat Phrathat Hariphunchai. The Northern Thai Chronicles, in particular the religious *tamnan*, often mention Chiang Mai and Lamphun together in the same breath, as in the following passage from the Mülasasananá chronicle: “Since the king and the population knew how to accumulate religious merit, good fortune and prosperity prevailed in Hariphunchai and Chiang Mai.”

b) The outer zones adjacent to the core region consisted of *müang* that were ruled by sons, nephews, and other close relatives or confidants of the king. As for which person the king chose to place in each *müang* as governor of his confidence, viz. “Lord of the domain” (*cao müang* เจ้าเมือง), it depended on the strategic importance and the political value of the symbol of the respective *müang*. Chiang Rai and Chiang Saen, located in the old ancestral land of the Tai Yuan, were mostly ruled by the sons, preferably the eldest offspring of a king; whereas

---

12 Böriwen kaen klang (บริเวณแก่นกลาง), literally: “the central region forming the pivot”.
13 Müang böriwan (เมืองบริวาน).
14 Saraswadee 1988: 2. Deriving from Saraswadee are also the Siamese terms böriwen kaen klang and müang böriwan, which are not mentioned in Northern Thai sources.
15 King Müang Kao after paying a visit to Wat Phrathat donated to the monastery land and 86 families as kha wat. See SRI 81.066.05.062: Tamnan müang lapun, f° 42.
16 Tamnan mülasasananá 1970: 222.
17 The “aristocrat of royal blood” (*cao nai chūa phrawong* เจ้าชายพระองค์).
18 The present writer is unable to find a term in any Northern Thai source (chronicles as well as inscriptions) which adequately renders the meaning of “outer zone” or “outer *müang*”. The most likely terms that he has come across are the terms huam müang nök (หัวเมืองหน้า) [huam müang = “province”, nök = “beyond”] used in the “Chronicle of Phayao”. However, the first part, huamüang, seems to be a Siamese loan word of the late nineteenth century and is not a genuine Northern Thai term. In most of the manuscripts the term *müang* in its simple form is used indiscriminately for all parts of Lan Na, regardless of her political dependency on the capital. In some manuscripts (such as the “Chronicle of Müang Yong” the term luk müang (ลูกเมือง) [luk, here means: “descendant, offspring”] appears to be a term denoting satellite regions (müang böriwan เมืองบริวาน) or also representing a dependent *müang*. See also Udom 1991: 1144.
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the governors of Phayao, Fang and Lampang were mostly nephews or younger uncles of the sovereign. In most cases the rulers of a few distinguished mūang were not nobles descended from the line of the Mangrai Dynasty.\textsuperscript{19}

In the outer mūang the king did not exert direct control over the free communities living there. The basic administrative units of a mūang, the district (panna พานา) and the villages (ban บ้าน), were ruled by nobles appointed not by the king, but by the governor. The king depended on the co-operation of the governors when he needed labourers for public works (irrigation projects, road construction, building storehouses for provisions, etc.) or in the case of war.\textsuperscript{20} In 1296, when the old Mon rulers Yiba and Boek invaded Chiang Mai, the invaders were defeated by troops raised from the Chiang Rai region, which were commanded by Cai Songkham, a son of Mangrai and the governor of Chiang Rai.\textsuperscript{21}

c) In the vassal mūang the power of the king was even less felt.\textsuperscript{22} These mūang were ruled by local families, which were connected with Chiang Mai by kinship. A few of the respectable ruling houses—such as those from Chiang Tung and Mūang Nai—traced their ancestry even back to King Mangrai. The vassal mūang delivered tribute in natural kinds (mostly in valuable forest products)\textsuperscript{23} once every three years to the capital, and their rulers were required to come to Chiang Mai annually in order to “drink the water of allegiance” (kin nam satca กินน้ำสัตนา) in the presence of the king.\textsuperscript{24}

In the reign of King Tilok (1441–1487), Chiang Mai exercised her power as overlord over the following vassal states (from the west to the north and to the east):\textsuperscript{25}

---

\textsuperscript{19} Saraswadee 1988: 2–3.

\textsuperscript{20} Saraswadee 1988: 7–8.


\textsuperscript{22} The expression mūang khūn (ม่วนขุน), “dependent mūang”, which is also employed in Lan Na, fits the status of an autonomous vassal state less precisely than the term prathetsarat (ประทีษตราษฎ) used in Siam.

\textsuperscript{23} The most important forest products were honey (nam phūng น้ำผึ้ง), beeswax (khi phūng ข้าพู่กน), incense (kamyat ข้ามยั้ง), mushrooms (het เมือง), ivory (nga chang ยางชัน), and rhinoceros horn (nò raet น้อยเข่า). See Usanee 1988: 27–29.

\textsuperscript{24} Kham sön phraya mangrai 1976: 4.

\textsuperscript{25} See Saraswadee 1988: 3. Large numbers of Lua populations lived in nearly all of the mentioned vassal states — as in the core land of Lan Na itself. Many Lua inhabited at that time — different from today’s descendants — together with the Tai in the river valleys. On the role of the Lua during the Mangrai Dynasty, see Ratanaporn and Renard 1988.
a. Müang Nai\textsuperscript{26} and some other Shan principalities,\textsuperscript{27} whose principal population was Shan;
b. Chiang Tung, whose principal population was Tai Khun;
c. Müang Yong, whose principal population was Tai Lu;
d. Sipsöng Panna (the southern part)\textsuperscript{28}, whose principal population was Tai Yuan or “Kao”.\textsuperscript{29}

The model composed of three different categories of müang resembled the structure of state formation in Sukhothai\textsuperscript{30} that has been investigated by Nakhon Phannarong. It differs, however, not insignificantly from the more complex system of Ayutthaya.\textsuperscript{31} The affiliation of any Northern Thai müang to one of the three above-mentioned categories was not at all static and rigid, as the scheme would suggest. While the core region exhibited a remarkable stability, the borders

\textsuperscript{26} Müang Nai, the most important müang on the western frontier of Lan Na, was founded in 1318 by Khun Khua, a son of Mangrai. Its population consisted predominantly of “Ngiao”, as the Tai Yuan call the Shan with a negative connotation.

\textsuperscript{27} The CMC lists a total of eleven Shan principalities (müang ngiao เมืองเหนือ), which after 1462/63 were submitted to King Tilok. Apart from Müang/Moeng Nai (ม. นาย) were the following müang: M. Su (ม. สู), M. Lai Kha (ม. ล้ายขา), M. Cit (ม. จิต), M. Cang (ม. ฉั่ง), M. King (ม. คง), M. Lök Çök (ม. ละคอก), M. Cam Ka (ม. จักรท่า), M. Yong Huai (ม. หย่งหว้วย), M. Nông Bôn (ม. หนองบอน) and M. Si Pò (ม. สิปะ). See CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 97; CMC-TPCM 1971: 64; see also CMC-N, Notton 1932: 135; cf. PY, Prachatikitkôracak 1973: 340.


\textsuperscript{29} “Kao” (เขา) was obviously the original ethnic name which the Tai population in the valley of the Nan called themselves. This ethnonym was used in the chronicles from Nan only during the time in the fifteenth century before losing her sovereignty. See Wyatt (in NC-PMN-W) 1994: 54, fn. 3. The Ram Khanhaeng inscription mentions the “Kao”, in fact together with the Lao, as a kingdom of the Tai race subject to Sukhothai. See Prasert and Griswold 1992: 263 and 278.

\textsuperscript{30} Located beyond the capital of Sukhothai (müang luang or müang ratchathani) were the four müang ruled by close relatives of the ruling house that marked the core of the kingdom, the so-called “müang of the king’s children” (müang luk luang): Si Satchanalai, Sông Khwae, Sa Luang and Nakhon Chum. Less important, but also subordinate to the control of the ruler, were the müang of the governor of the capital (müang phraya maha nakhôn). Those having to pay tribute were the vassals (müang ëk or müang khûn), for a time Phrae and Nan among them. See Nakhon 1985: 68–69.

\textsuperscript{31} The main characteristic of the system of provincial administration that was established under King Bôrommatrailokanat in the second half of the fifteenth century was the division of provinces into four classes: ek, tho, tri, and cattawa. Moreover, the basic rule was valid: the higher the class of a province, and the less its spatial distance was from Ayutthaya, the more it was dependent on the capital. Only the province of the fourth grade, the huam müang cattawa, was under the direct control of the king; they formed a “circle around the royal capital” (wong ratchathani). Beyond the actual domain were dependent “müang (müang prathetsarat) ruled by the king”. See Tambiah 1976: 133–35.
between the outer zones and the vassal states were more fluid. The principalities of Phrae and Nan, though they had been former vassal states of Sukhothai and were at first also ruled by members of the local family during the first decade after they had been subjugated by Chiang Mai, retained a high degree of autonomy. Nevertheless, after 1460 nobles from other parts of Lan Na were appointed rulers (cao miang) of Phrae and Nan, by means of whom both principalities were administratively attached more closely to Chiang Mai. An opposite development took place in Miang Nai and Chiang Tung in the west. Both principalities were ruled by sons of King Mangrai at the beginning of the fourteenth century and maintained close relations with Chiang Mai. However, not long after Mangrai’s death they were allowed to acquire a stronger degree of independence. Under Tilok and Miang Kao their status as vassal states was explicitly recognised.

Located on the northern periphery is Sipsong Panna, whose ruling house in Chiang Rung maintained close family ties with the Mangrai Dynasty in Lan Na. On broad ethnic and cultural levels there was also a strong alliance of the Tai Lü with the Tai Yuan. But on the political level, Chiang Rung constantly attempted to...

---

32 The communication routes between Phrae or Nan and Sukhothai were considerably shorter than the corresponding routes between these two miang and Chiang Mai. Phrae and Nan could be reached from Sukhothai rather easily via the waterways, namely along the Yom River or rather the Nan River, whereas from Chiang Mai one had to cross in each case several mountain ranges. The close political and kinship relations between Nan and Sukhothai are substantiated by Griswold and Prasert 1969.


34 The “Chronicle of Nan” reports that after the death of Pha Saeng, the then Governor of Chiang Khong, Mun Soi was nominated the Governor of Nan in 1460, but four years later he was transferred to Fang. See NC-PMN-W, Wyatt 1994: 55. According to some versions of the “Chronicle of Chiang Mai”, however, King Tilok granted Yuthitthira (Yudhisthira), the ex-Governor of Phitsanulok (Miang Song Khwae) who deserted to the side of Lan Na in 1451, control over Ngao, “the Kao in the whole region of Phrae” [เนี่ยงราว กลางเมือง แพร่ทั้งเมือง] (Kao is the appellation of the Tai groups of that time in Nan and Phrae, V.G.), after he had previously been the Governor of Phayao. See CMC-TPCM 1971: 57; cf. PY, Prachakitkòracak 1973: 333. But other versions of CMC confirm that Cao Pha Song Khwae (Yuthitthira) was given the administration of Ngao and Phrae. Nevertheless they do not mention Nan in this context. See CMC-TSHR, SRI 1982: 41; CMC-N, Notton 1932: 121. The “Chronicle of Nan” also does not confirm Cao Pha Song Khwae’s rule over Nan.

35 The rulers of Miang Nai and Chiang Thong, accompanied by a large entourage, appeared in Chiang Mai in early 1517. They drank the “water of allegiance” on 27 May and took the oath of allegiance to King Miang Kao. The ruler of Chiang Mai wished both of his vassals good luck and prosperity. The English translation of JKM talks about the “two provincial rulers” (JKM, Ratanapañña 1968: 164), whereas the Siamese translation of this passage renders the text as “cao prathetsarat thang sòng” (JKM, Saeng 1958: 132). Phrathetsarat (ปราชเทศราษี), literally “King of [another, but dependent] country”, is borrowed from Siamese not from Northern Thai terminology.
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avoid having tribute relations with Chiang Mai. The proximity of Sipsong Panna to
China and to Burma, two powerful countries when compared to Lan Na, made it
more difficult for Chiang Mai to enforce a lasting claim of her suzerainty over
Chiang Rung. Only under the rule of the two energetic and charismatic kings,
Mangrai and Tilok, did Chiang Rung send tribute delegations to Chiang Mai.36

Due to its closer proximity to the northern míaңg of Lan Na (Chiang Saen
and Chiang Tung), the Tai Lü from Míaңg Yòng were more reliable vassals. Around
the year 1450 Míaңg Yòng was subdued by Tilok. “The king took his armies to
fight the Tai Lü of Ban Pung and Míaңg Yòng, and defeated them.”37 Three de-
cades later (1483/84) Míaңg Yòng fell temporarily into the hands of Lua (Lawa)
rebels. Tilok sent an army to the region of unrest and defeated the poorly organised
rebels, who fled to Chiang Rung.38 From then until the Burmese invasion in 1557/58,
Míaңg Yòng remained a vassal state of Chiang Mai.

The vassal states rendered not only important contributions to frontier
security but also promoted the economy and trade of Lan Na. Rare forest products
such as honey, wax, incense, mushrooms, ivory, and rhinoceros horns were very
coveted tribute articles in Chiang Mai. Precious metals, in particular silver, copper,
and iron ores were produced in the Shan region and in Chiang Tung. The raw
materials from Chiang Mai or from adjacent places like Höt were exported to
Ayutthaya and Lower Burma, whereby Lan Na obtained in exchange other materi-
als and utensils. As the plain of the Ping River was one of the two main areas of rice
cultivation in Lan Na, Chiang Mai exported above all rice to regions with chronic
shortages of food, notably on the western and northern peripheries. As already
mentioned, an important centre of regional inland trade was Chiang Saen. The
huge rice market in Chiang Saen supplied rice to Nan, Chiang Tung, and even to
Chiang Rung and Luang Prabang.39

36 Mangrai was the son of the beloved daughter of Thao Rung Kaen Chai (Tao Hung Kaen Cai, r.
1234–1257), the fourth ruler of the Tai Lü federation later known under the name of Sipsong Panna.
37 Quoted from CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 81; see also CMC-TPCM 1971: 53; see also CMC-
N, Notton 1932: 112. PY (Prachakitkòracak 1973: 318), recorded the subjugation of Míaңg Yòng
by the beginning of the fifteenth century. As reported, King Sam Fang Kaen conquered Míaңg Yòng,
which was completely devastated by the Chinese during their invasion of 1404/05, and
rebuilt it into a holy relic, the Maha Kesathat Cao Côm Yòng, which was sponsored by him. The
“Chronicle of Míaңg Yòng” mentions the worship of the relic as the ritual centre of the míaңg and
establishes a vague chronological context on the fighting between Lan Na and the Chinese Höt.
However, no year is mentioned that can provide a more exact order of events. See MS, SRI
79.027.05.064–064: Tamnan míaңg yöng, ff 41–43, 50–54. However, the “Chronicle of Chiang
Mai” does not report the conquest of the region around Míaңg Yòng in relation to the fighting
against the invasion of the Höt in 1404/05. See CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 73-74; CMC-TPCM
39 The trade relations between Lan Na and her vassals as well as between Lan Na and Ayutthaya are
Although the loyalty of the vassals remained uncertain and fragile, in the course of the fifteenth century there was a general tendency towards centralisation. The king strengthened his control over the outer zones and his influence on the vassals by various means: a) dynastic alliances with the most important vassals; b) rotation of governors in the outer m Ing (mostly after the enthronement of a new king); and c) the exclusive right to make monastic donations.

In particular, the importance of the last mentioned means should not be underestimated. The governors were permitted to donate land (uthit) and freemen (phrai) or their own slaves (kha or kh) to monasteries before the rule of M Ing Kaeo. Ambitious governors used this power to accumulate religious merits and concurrently to increase their political reputation. Under M Ing Kaeo,

---

40 Saraswadee (1988: 10–11) gives several examples for such rotations. In the case of, in particular, high treason, the king would liquidate a governor. Tilok had the governor of M Ing S ng executed because he delivered rice to the Siamese enemy. In less serious cases the king was satisfied by transferring the disloyal governor to a less important m Ing. In the year 1409/19 Sam Fang Kaen sent his son Tilok, until then the governor of Phrao, after a dispute, to the remote M Ing Yuam Tai. With this disciplinary transfer Tilok was in fact temporarily isolated from political events in the capital; yet in the years 1441/42 Tilok, by collaborating with Sam Dek Noi, a high official of his father, succeeded in overthrowing King Sam Fang Kaen from M Ing Yuam Tai. See CMC-TPCM 1971: 48–49; CMC-N, Notton 1932: 102–104.

Through rotating the posts the establishment of a dynasty in the important m Ing of Lan Na proper could also be prevented. Locally influential governors aimed at patronising close family members to be their successors. Thus in Phayao Governor Yuthitthira (Cao S ng Khwae) was succeeded by his widow, who like her husband obviously had the complete trust of King Tilok. After her death (1490/91) King Nt Chiang Rai appointed his stepfather Cao Si M n as the new governor of Phayao and thus ended the regional influence of the Yuthitthira family. For this, see the epigraphic evidence in Prachum car m Ing phayao 1995: 24–26.


42 Inscriptions and chronicles from Lan Na do not use the term kanlapana, which Ayutthaya had borrowed from the Khmer. See Rawiwan 1982: 12.

43 For this, there is much evidence in Northern Thai inscriptions. Wat N n Khwang was established in the year 1466 by the Governor of [M Ing?] O. Two years later the Governor of M Ing Wang Nua built the monastery (Wat) Canthara-aram and donated 20 servants to this monastery (kha war) and 300 rai (50 ha) of rice land. Likewise under the reign of King Tilok the Governor of Lampang donated four families to (Wat) Phrathat Luang. See Rawiwan 1982: 121. Several isolated monastic endowments by non-royalty are also reported for the reign of King M Ing Kaeo. For example, on 21 January 1516, several lay persons paid a total of 400 ngoen (units of silver) to redeem two families who obviously had been in debt slavery. The two families were handed over as kha wat to the monastery Wat Sips n H ng. See Inscription “Phayao 13”, Prachum car m Ing phayao 1995: 300.

44 Yuthitthira, the Governor of Phayao, whose sphere of influence extended to Phrae and Nan, had the title “Pha Asokalat, the ruler” engraved in the inscription “Phayao 45” (page 2, line 4). Obviously Yuthitthira and his supporters viewed Phayao and the adjoining regions as a domain de facto independent from Chiang Mai. See Prachum car m Ing phayao 1995: 93–98.
however, they had first to beg the king for permission. Religious donations were made exclusively in the names of kings. The water-ceremony, which originated in Sri Lanka, had to be performed so that the newly established monastery serves the agrarian prosperity of the kingdom.

Moreover, the king could donate monasteries as well as sponsor the phrai (in the core region of Chiang Mai and Lamphun) that were directly under his control, or the phrai under the administration of a governor. Consequently the king secured an effective means of increasing his religious prestige as well as his political influence beyond the region close to the capital. Through this means he profited from his defacto monopoly of religious foundations — and King Müang Kao made full use of this. The king succeeded in consolidating his role as thammikarat, protector of Buddhism, and at the same time in weakening potential rivals because the loss of workforce to the monasteries sometimes meant for the regional rulers a serious decrease in their demographic basis. The king imposed a network of loyal religious institutions on a system of potential centrifugal forces.

The foundations of monasteries could not transgress certain objective limits. Workers whose duty was to maintain the monasteries, the so-called “servants of the monasteries” or kha wat (คำวัด), were exempted from corvée. Neither the king nor the governors were allowed to mobilise these “external inhabitants of the monasteries” for exceptional cases or in time of war. For this reason the numerical strength of the kha wat probably remained small in comparison to that of the phrai mūang.

The spread of two Buddhist reform orders under the kings Kū Na and Tilok favoured the formation of a common identity among the ruling elite of Lan Na. Since the middle of the fifteenth century, the kings no longer established their power base by relying only on a far-reaching network of family relations but also on their spiritual and moral leading roles as cakravartin and dharmarāja. Under Tilok, the worshipping of relics as a cult and of consecrated Buddhist statues as the “state palladia” had achieved a previously unknown extent. Eminent Buddhist statues such as the Phra Kaeo (“Jade Buddha” in Chiang Rai) or the Phra Kaeo Can Daeng

---

45 Rawiwan 1982: 122.
46 This ceremony is called lò nam su nīa thok tok phaendin (บ่อน้ำสำนักทอกเทิน), “moisten the land with water” [Skt.: udaka, “water”]. See Rawiwan 1982: 122.
47 Documentary evidence of extensive donations to Buddhist monasteries by the Indian Shatavahana Kings of the first and second centuries A.D. has been found. As Kulke remarks, “the Shatavahana Kings were for the first time allowed to donate larger amounts of land to Brahmans and Buddhist monasteries, provided them with immunities (parihāra), such as protection against the trespassing of royal officials and soldiers. [...] In order to remove the influences of Brahmans and Buddhist monasteries on local ruling powers they were provided with rich landed properties and immunities. Quoted from Kulke and Rothermund 1982: 112.
48 This hypothesis is expressed by Saraswadee 1988: 13.
(“Red Sandalwood Buddha” in Phayao) were taken from their original monasteries and paraded throughout the whole area of the capital. With imposing ceremonial processions, they were worshipped by Tilok in important monasteries patronised by the king, such as Wat Pa Daeng Luang.\textsuperscript{49}

But Tilokarat also created an integrated cult of relic worship in order to put himself in a superior position, like that of the Buddha whose relics were enshrined. He sought to express his political power through this integrated belief system comprising the indigenous cult and Buddhism, and so his power was affirmed and legitimised. Through the practice of land and labour endowments, the king and the Sangha became interdependent, which helped to secure his throne.\textsuperscript{50}

During the reigns prior to Tilok, the kings appointed their sons and close relatives to be governors of \textit{muang} in the outer zone, whereas during the reign of Tilok aristocrats not of kingly descent were increasingly recruited for attending to governmental affairs.\textsuperscript{51} By this means, he enlarged and unified the leading administrative class that viewed Chiang Mai as the undisputed political, ritual and cosmic centre of the country. The radical administrative reforms of his Siamese opponent, King Trailok of Ayutthaya, must have been inspired by Tilok’s reform works.

In the economic sector, likewise, Lan Na achieved a high level of centralisation. At the beginning of his reign, the young Tilok felt that he was forced to comply with the “four requests” of his uncle Mùn Lok Sam Lan (also known as Mùn Lok Nakhôn) who had helped him come to power. The four requests appeared to be that the king should not only give the governor the right to levy taxes and levy them in his domain, but also cede to him the right to use them at his own discretion.\textsuperscript{52} Four decades later, at the end of his rule, Tilok had obviously rescinded the concession that was extracted against his will. In the years 1480–81 “the king Tilok entrusted Mùn Dam Phrakhot to raise from the population of Chiang Mai and the

\textsuperscript{50} Dhida 1982: 105–106. The interdependence between king and saigha had already existed since the reign of Kù Na, pointed out to the author by Prof. H. Hundius. Under Kù Na monks, in addition to representatives of the aristocrats, were nominated royal judges in civil and criminal proceedings. See Aroonrut 1977: 42.
\textsuperscript{52} CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 75; CMC-TPCM 1971: 49–50; CMC-N, Notton 1932: 105.
rest of the land gold, silver, cowry shells and taxes in natural kinds in huge amount so as to fill the public treasury.\textsuperscript{53}

One reform of Tilok turned out to be disastrous after his death: the institution of a Privy Council for electing kings. Since the reign of Nóét Chiang Rai the kings of Lan Na had been elected by the Council of the Regent, which comprised the influential aristocrats (\textit{sena-amat} เสนาแรม) from all quarters of the land and the \textit{saṅgha} as the spiritual representative. Tilok could have been following the intention that the election of a new sovereign should gain a broad consent within the ruling elite. This wish reflected objective changes in state and society. Lan Na had increased in territory and population. Between 1300 and 1500, notably during the second half of the fifteenth century, in large parts of Lan Na land under agricultural cultivation increased and human settlements expanded. The land then had a larger population to feed, a population that had probably become ethnically more homogeneous. Tilok tackled the problem of how the polity, which Mangrai had still managed as a family business, was to be transformed into a more stable institutional structure. The participation of broader aristocratic circles in the political decision-making process would reduce the power struggle within the small circle of the ruling house. So probably Tilok thought of considering his own experience, notably the disputes of his father with Sam Fang Kaen, the predecessor of his father.

Tilok’s considerations appear to be based on the premise that only a strong and charismatic personality should be elected to steer the state. This precondition affected Tilok personally as well as his grandson Müiang Kaeo, who had several buildings for central administration established around 1520,\textsuperscript{54} from which we may conclude that at least some basic structure of a central administration did exist. However, when weak kings were on the throne, the aristocrats could participate in “national” affairs by increasing their influence in the Privy Council. Factions of aristocrats could be formed along the lines of regional divisions. This threatened the long-term coherence and, finally, the very existence of Lan Na. The established historical and geographic dichotomies between Chiang Mai and Chiang Rai-Chiang Saen remained a lurking potential danger.

\textsuperscript{53} Quoted from CMC-TPCM 1971: 67.
\textsuperscript{54} CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 106–107; CMC-TPCM 1971: 71; CMC-N, Notton 1932: 149. The term \textit{kwan} ( nghệ sĩ) from Notton’s point of view is the Tai Yuan pendant of the Chinese Khuàn, “fonctionnaire, magistrat, autorité, mot tombé en désuétude, ne s’applique plus qu’à désigner un cornac”. For the year 1521 CMC-N reports the “construction du Hó Kong [tour-tambours] sur la place royale et du K’aо Sanám (bureau central administratif) à l’emplacement du Hó Yôt Nak’on.”
3. Land and population

Lan Na was a hierarchical society. Below the king and the royal family (ratchawong ราชวงศ์) were the aristocrats (nai นาถ), comprising high-ranking and low-ranking officials in the capital and in the various müang (here: provinces) of the kingdom. The mass of the population consisted of commoners (phrai พระ; NT: /phâːj/), which were also known in the Northern Thai legal (i.e. customary law) texts as “commoners/freemen of the country” (phrai müang พระม่วง). Males between 18 and 60 years old (chakan ช่าง; NT: /sakân/) could be recruited into corvée and military service. There were also serfs in Lan Na, but their number was smaller than in Siam. Within the Northern Thai society the slaves (kha ข้า) were not at all outcasts; they were allowed to marry commoners, and under certain conditions were even allowed to inherit property, which could be further inherited by their offspring.

Most of the kha were debt-slaves or former phrai who entered slavery voluntarily so as to be exempted from corvée and military service. For both the poor and those with means, it appeared that slavery was an attractive alternative — as least as a temporary refuge — for the kha as a rule could purchase their freedom from slavery. The king and aristocrats had vital interests in protecting the social class of the phrai, which formed the foundation of the state. In trying to improve the economic situation of the phrai, there was for instance a legal regulation that exempted newly-cleared land from taxes for the first three years of cultivation.

3.1 The nai sip system

Until the nineteenth century Lan Na lacked a system comparable to that of the Siamese sakdina system. In Ayutthaya the basic personal dependence of the free communities was neither subordinate to the king (as phrai luang พระหลวง) nor to a high ranking aristocrat (as phrai som พระأسر). However, in Lan Na the aristocrats, in legal texts mostly known as latcatakun (Siamese: ratchatrakun ราชตะกรุณ),

---

55 In the traditional Tai Dam society the phrai made up of about two thirds of the total population. See Condominas 1980: 289. Probably the component of other Tai people, like the Tai Yuan, was not different.
56 A detailed analysis of the social status of the phrai is provided by Aroonrut 1977: 185–87.
57 In Siam that ทะวัง which is derived from the Sanskrit word dâsa, is normal.
59 See Article 12 of mangraisat (Wat Sao Hai version), Griswold and Prasert 1977a: 152.
60 See Article 12 of mangraisat (Wat Sao Hai version), ibid; also cf. Aroonrut 1977: 211–12.
62 For a clear and comprehensive description of the Siamese sakdina system it is to refer to the work by Akin 1969 (in particular pp. 9–99).
did not have *phrai* under their direct control. Aroonrut points to the fact that, in contrast to Ayutthaya, the Tai Yuan aristocrats of Lan Na had less power and were not part of a refined *sakadina* system.63

The *phrai* in Chiang Mai and in other parts of Lan Na were organised along territorial units based on the system of *nai sip* (“master of ten”). The system, which was sometimes also called *hua sip* (“head of ten”), is described in *mangraisat* as the basic principle of organising the labour force:

> For every ten citizens, let there be one Nay Sip (*nai sip*), and one foreman to act as intermediary and make known the tasks assigned. For each five Nay Sip, let there be one Nay Ha-sip (*nai ha sip*), [and two foremen], one for the left side and one for the right side. For two Nay Ha-sip, let there be one Nay Roy (*nai ròi*). For ten Nay Roy, let there be one Cau Ban (*cao phan*). For ten Cau Ban, let there be ten Cau Hmin (*cao münd*). For ten Cau Hmin, let there be one Cau Sen (*cao saen*). Let the country be administered in this way so as not to inconvenience the King.64

In this organisation of manpower superiors and inferiors were tied together by mutual obligations. A *phrai* was not allowed to abandon his *nai sip*, a *nai sip* had to stay with his *nai hasip*, and so on; but it was also considered a crime if a superior – from a *cao saen* downwards – neglected those under his direct command. If this did occur, the culprit would be tattooed on his forehead, a punishment which the *mangraisat* considered even “more severe than the death [sentence]” (ร้ายกว่าตาย).65

A very similar system of controlling manpower, though employing a different terminology, is reported for the Shan federation of Moeng (Müiang) Mao. While in all larger and more prominent *müiang* the local rulers or governors (*cao moeng*) had control of the whole civilian and military apparatus, the so-called *cao lu* (เจ้าหลู่), directly attached to the *cao hu*, commanded more than 10,000 men. At the lower levels the *cao kang* (เจ้ากลาง), the *cao pak* (เจ้าบ้าน) 100, the *cao hasip* (เจ้าหัวสิบ) and the *cao cun* (เจ้าชุม) had 1,000, 100, 50 and 10 men under their respective command.66

---

63 Aroonrut 1977: 114.
64 Quoted from Griswold and Prasert 1977a: 147–48. We have inserted in brackets our own spelling of Tai terms. It deviates from the Sanskrit orientated transcription used by Griswold and Prasert, and is closer to the phonetic system. The translation of *nai ròi* into “master of the (sic!) hundred”, etc. by Griswold and Prasert is changed into, for stylistic reasons, “master of a hundred, etc.; cf. Mangraisat (Version Wat Mùn Ngoen Kòng) 1975: 2.
65 Toonsri 1992: 45.
The origins of the nai sip system are not explained clearly, in particular the Mangraisat surely does not reflect the legal condition which was valid during the time when King Mangrai was living, but shows a legal condition that was much later. However, Wang Ji Min argues that “the nai sip system from Müang Nai was introduced following that of Müang Babai-xifu [Lan Na].” He supports his view with the following argument: Khun Khüa, Mangrai’s youngest son, was exiled to Müang Nai (c. 1310) after he had a dispute with his elder brother, Cai Songkham. Müang Nai, an erstwhile vassal of Chiang Rung, already had an administrative system, which followed the nai sip principle; because there was a khom kwan (กษัตริย์), which on behalf of the local ruler “announced to all the nai sip the assignments that had to be performed permanently.” Wang Ji Min suggests further that the Tai Lü in Sipsön Panna had taken over this system from the Chinese during the Northern Song Dynasty (960–1127).

[At that time] there was a system in the countryside, under which, for ten families there was a “small supervisor” and for fifty families a “medium supervisor”. For one hundred families there was a “big supervisor”, apart from that an assistant of the “big supervisor”. The system was employed at that time as a precaution taken for security so that in the night no robbery and damage of property took place in the villages. If one [member of] a family was involved in stealing, the ten families [of the group] would be punished. In time of war the high officials sent an order for recruiting soldiers and labourers with this system — from top to bottom — easily and quickly.

The above description is the so-called bao-jia system introduced during the Song period, which was a system of organising the population similar to that of the li-jia system of the Ming dynasty (1368–1644). One li consisted of 110 families with a li headman; one jia consists of 10 families with a jia headman. It was a rural organisation for census registration, tax-raising, and labour service.

---

Aroonrut Wichienkeeo follows essentially the argument developed by Wang Ji Min. Jacques Lemoine traces the establishment of the nai sip system in Sipsong Panna directly to Mongolian influences. After the conquest of Dali, the capital of the kingdom of Later Dali (1096–1253)—the successor state of Nan Chao—in 1253, the Tai Lü in Sipsong Panna also came under Mongol rule. In 1292 Phañ Moeng Nai, who was the ruler of Chiang Rung recognised by the Mongols, established the so-called Ho [hua] sip system to consolidate control over the population.

The Ho sip system was a military organisation following the pattern of the Mongolian army. The [baojia] system, under which families were organised into units of ten, developed gradually during the Northern Song period, then permitted the ruler of the Yuan (1279–1368) to introduce it throughout China and improve it further. As for his thesis, the “feudal” order of society of the Mongols and (later) the Chinese exerting an impressive influence on the Tai Lü in Sipsong Panna, Lemoine quotes as evidence: The Tai Lü word “master”, nai (น้ำ), which was also used in Lan Na and Siam, derived presumably from the Mongolian word noyan. The Tai Lü word for “ten thousand” (mün) and that in Mongolian (tümén) are similar.

Amphai Doré shows that in Laos, at the latest under King Fa Ngum (r. 1353–1373), founder of the Lan Sang kingdom, titles like saen, mün and phan, borrowed from the Nai sip system, had lost their original military meaning. By around 1286, in Luang Prabang the title mün had already distinguished officials

---

72 It was in fact the Later Dali kingdom (1096–1253) which was conquered by the Mongols in 1253, and not the Nan Chao kingdom of the house of Meng. Dali was ruled by the house of Duan. The Nan Chao kingdom (contemporary of the Tang Dynasty) was much earlier than the two Dali kingdoms. During the later Song Dynasty and Yuan period there was no longer a Nan Chao kingdom.
73 Lemoine 1987: 131. As to a possible Chinese origin of the system, Foon Ming Liew points out that hua means Chinese and sip (in a Chinese dialect, such as Hakka) ten or decimal. Thus ho sip or hua sip should be interpreted as a Chinese decimal system of civil or military organisation. According to Mote (1999: 427), a tümén or myrachy, comparable to a division in modern Western armies, could also “become the territorial administration for a conquered area.”
74 For the Yuan military systems, see Hsiao 1978. As to the military organisation of the Mongols, Mote (1999: 475) remarks: “[Chinggis Khan] also undertook the difficult process of reorganizing his army into decimal units of 10, 100, 1,000, and eventually 10,000 men, and of imposing on those units a chain of command that brought his military subordinates under strict discipline.”
75 Obviously 100 families form the smallest unit. See Doré (1987: 196), who bases his account on the Chinese chronicle Manshu (Book of the Barbarians). According to Wang Ji Min there were three categories of the “unit of 1,000 families”: a) under 300 families; b) 300 to 700 families, and c) 700 to 1,000 families. An analogy was the differentiation of the “unit of 10,000 families” in three similar categories.
76 Lemoine 1987: 131–32.
with political administrative functions. Though Doré considers the introduction of the nai sip system in Lan Sang before the mid-thirteenth century unlikely, he leaves the possibility open that it was implemented in Nan Chao (to be more precise, the later Dali kingdom) prior to the conquest by the Mongolians (1253).

The nai sip system was obviously moulded for military necessities. In times of war, it enabled a quick mobilisation of eligible men for military service and organised them into military units. The system could also function well in enlisting workers for civilian undertakings. The nai sip system endured — at least rudimentarily — in Lan Na down to the nineteenth century. A legal text from Nan dated 1861 mentions a regulation, according to which cows and buffaloes were to be fenced off and kept away from the rice fields. In implementing the regulation, the hua sip was entrusted to co-operate with his subordinate, the luk sip. The Tai Lü in Sipsòng Panna (southwest China) and Chiang Khaeng (northwest Laos) kept the institution of hua sip until the late nineteenth century. In both regions hua sip also designated a territorial unit above the village level. Up to ten villages or, rather, hamlets formed one hua sip. But the number of hamlets in one hua sip could be less than ten. We find evidence that just one single large village constituted one hua sip.

3.2 The panna system

Parallel to labour force organisation along a “decimal system”, there was a territorial unit existing in Lan Na that enabled the mobilisation of human potential, namely the panna (ผันนา). Although panna means “Thousand Rice Fields”, the word should not be translated literally into one thousand rai (= 167 ha), but similar to the term “Lan Na” should be interpreted as a territorial unit. Panna was the basic administrative unit of Lan Na, between the levels of mūang and village (ban), and

77 Doré bases his thesis on an excessively large population in the late thirteenth century. A total strength of 1,000,000 men capable of bearing arms, as was justified in the “census” of Sam Saen Thai a century later, surely only had symbolical value. Thus it is not convincing when Doré (1987: 664, fn. 1) draws the conclusion: “Si l’effectif total des troupes du Lan Sang est d’une million, on peut estimer que Mun [Mūn = “10,000”] Krabong et Mun Can possèdent chacun entre 2 à 300,000 hommes.”

78 Doré 1987: 207, 664.

79 It is possible to think of military units such as a platoon (10 men), a company (50–100 men), a battalion (1,000 men) and a division of army (10,000 men). The Ming garrison called weisuo was organised like that. See Liew 1998, I, 69–71 and p. 364.

80 “Anacak lak kham (kotmai mūang nan)”, Saraswadee 1993: 79 [f° 23 the original manuscript].

81 This was the case with regards to the numerous hua sip belonging to Moeng Long (southwest of Chiang Rung). As to the institution of the hua sip in Sipsòng Panna cf. Yanyong and Ratanaporn 2001: 63–64.
is sometimes rendered as “district” in Western works. The existence of another administrative term that lies between the levels of panna and ban, the pakna (ผัน), is not certain, as the evidence in the manuscripts and epigraphic materials is too vague. The recruitment of manpower for public projects or for military service was carried out on the panna level. Taxes and tributes were levied from the panna and from there they were delivered to the respective müang, whence the revenues were eventually channelled into Chiang Mai. The panna served as a decisive connecting link between village and capital in the distribution of economic resources. The economic importance of panna for the king is reflected in a contemporary inscription. An inscription from Wat Kao Nòt (Phayao) dated 1412/13 records a donation of Sam Fang Kaen:

The king gave field produce from panna Muang [พ้านเมือง] with the value 55,000 bia. Cao Si Mùn Phayao was very pleased over the meritorious deed of the king, who donated the Buddha 500 [units] of rice from the panna Chiang Di. The king as well as Mahathewi, his mother, procured these high merits, that would continue as long as until the religion has reached 5,000 years.

The existence of the panna system can for the first time be verified with regards to the principality of Phayao. The author of the Phayao Chronicle (Tamnan müang phayao, National Library Version, PC-TMP-HSH), which was said to be compiled

---

82 The only reference in a manuscript to the term pakna that is known to us is found in the CMC. There we find the statement that in the years 1286/87 Ngam Mùang, the ruler of Phayao, was to cede to his ally Mangrai a “pakna, which had 500 houses”. Quoted from CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 33; CMC-TPCM 1971: 13. In Aroonrut’s Northern Thai Dictionary the term pakna is registered and, referring to the above mentioned passage just quoted from the CMC, is rendered as “cluster of villages under a single administration, a sub-district.” However, in Udom’s dictionary the corresponding entry is missing. The epigraphic evidence is even less conclusive. The inscription “Lamphun 22” from Wat Wisuttharam, the largest and most important monastery in Phayao, mentions three officials holding the title pak. Nevertheless, the inscription gives no visible connection with an administrative unit called pak. See Prachum carik müang phayao 1995: 265–69. According to Aroonrut (1996a: 415) pak is characterised as “a person supervising 100 persons”; later pak was transformed into pakna, “a government official in charge of agriculture”.

83 After Mangrai suppressed the revolt led by his son Cao Khun Kham (Cai Songkham), he recruited strong forces from the city of Chiang Rai (tr. คีฟื้น, “flesh, substance” + “Chiang Rai”) as well as from the luk panna (tr. ลูกพ้าน, “offspring” + panna) subordinate to Chiang Rai. See CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 46–47; CMC-TPCM 1971: 29.


85 The spelling be (บ) used in the inscription indicates a possible Tai Lü descent of the author.

under the direct auspices of King (Khun) Côm Tham (around 1100), reports that the ruler used the territorial basic unit of **panna** to carry out the taking of censuses.

[...] The ruler allowed the households to be counted. Every five households were registered in a list; they formed 19 **dikan** and 1,000 **dikan** would be put together in a **panna**.

One **panna** therefore was composed of over 263 households or about 1,315 inhabitants, supposing that the average household comprises five persons. In another version of the *Phayao Chronicle* (Wat Si Khom Kham Version, PC-TMP-WSKK), there is a different description:

There was a royal edict to register the population of the whole region of Mùang Phukam Ñao (Phayao). All military and civil officials and all the scribes went out to compile the census lists of all places in the whole land. It was ordered to investigate the entire population of [Phayao]. There were 180,000 inhabitants. The counting including the outer regions (**huamùang nòk** หัวเมืองนอก) amounted to 1,323,000 inhabitants.

Thirty-six **panna** were organised. Five people shall live from a **na** (paddy field). Five **tang** (ตาราง - 100–150 litre) or 50,000 (unit not stated, V. G.) of seed-rice are at the disposal of one person.

The total number of **panna** in Phayao was 264, as to the 36 **panna** in the core area 228 **panna** in the outer zones have to be added. The obviously highly exaggerated population figures could hardly be the result of the exact registra-

---

87 The dates of the term of office of Khun Côm Tham cannot be established exactly. Prachakitkôracak (1973: Appendix, without giving the pages) gives the period from 1096/97 to 1120/21; yet the number of years (quite plausible) given appears to be obtained from deducing the dates of various manuscripts. None of the editions of chronicles from Phayao or those in manuscripts that we have consulted give explicitly the dates of enthronement or of death of King Côm Tham.

88 “Version Hô samut haengchat” (PC-TMP-HSH), from Aroonrut et al. 1984: 30 [in original manuscript f° 43].

89 PC-WSKK, Hundius Collection, f° 21. [tr.  มีราชอาญาเทื่อจัตุบุศิในทองเขตแขวงเมืองพูกามยาว ลุกเมืองพุกาม สำนักบาลานาคทีหัวเมืองนอกสัยเมืองฝังชายฝั่งที่จามเพาะมาหัวเมืองนอกสัยเมืองชูคาย ชุมพูง ชุมพูง แล้วสิริคงพบ หัวเมืองนอกสัยเมืองนอก หนึ่งบ้าน 3 ทะนู 2 ทะนู 3 ทะนู จึงสิ้นไว้ 36 ทะนู แล้ว 5 ทะนู เป่า 1 ทะนู พี่เมืองนอก 5 ทะนู ต่อไป 4 ทะนู 36 ทะนู 21. Cf. PC-WSBR, quoted from Aroonrut 1989: 6 [f° 21 in original manuscript].

90 PC-WSKK, Hundius Collection, f° 23. One version of the “Chronicle of Phayao”, on which “Phongsawadan Mùang Ngeo Yang-Chiang Saen” is also based, gives only “altogether 124 **panna** [namely 36 **panna** in core region and 88 **panna** in the outer zones].

91 The population in the districts of today’s province of Phayao reached the mark of 100,000 at the beginning of the twentieth century.
tion, but were probably based on the following consideration: assuming that in a panna the average population was 5,000 inhabitants, that means the 264 panna in Phayao, including its 22 vassals or so-called “outer regions” (huamüang nök หัวเมืองนอก), had a population of 1,320,000 people. This number is almost exactly in accordance with the census report of 1,323,000 inhabitants mentioned in the manuscript quoted above.

The two consulted versions of the Phayao Chronicle suggest different average numbers of persons living in one panna. The numbers of persons of a panna fluctuated therefore between 1,300 (PC-TMP-HSH) and 5,000 (PC-TMP-WSKK), and as a result it is difficult to decide which of the two numbers comes closer to reality.

The Phayao Chronicle gives the impression that a panna could comprise up to ten or more villages. One version of the chronicle (PC-TMP-HSH) mentions the names of fourteen villages of panna Chiang Di and twenty-eight villages of panna Ngüm. However, most of the others out of the total ten panna that are mentioned by name comprised only six or seven villages. Hence, to derive the estimation for the total number of villages from the 102 panna (as given in PC-TMP-HSH) would be misleading. A careful study of the texts confirms that the suspicious figure “102” is not related to the panna, but the entire number of villages (106) in the total of only ten (actually available) panna of the principality of Phayao.93

Table 1: Panna and villages in Phayao (c. 1100) [a]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panna No.</th>
<th>Transcription (conventional)</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription</th>
<th>Siamese transcription</th>
<th>Number of villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Chiang Di</td>
<td>/ciaN ¹ dii¹/</td>
<td>เขียงตี้</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>/lin¹/</td>
<td>ลิน</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Kheng</td>
<td>/keeN¹/</td>
<td>เค่ง</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Khok Luang</td>
<td>/khook³ luaN⁶/</td>
<td>โคกหลวง</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Phüm</td>
<td>/pAm¹/</td>
<td>พ่อม</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Chan</td>
<td>/can¹/</td>
<td>ชำน</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Paeng</td>
<td>/pEEE⁵/</td>
<td>แป่ง</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Khom</td>
<td>/kom¹/</td>
<td>คุม</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Wiüm</td>
<td>/wiAm¹/</td>
<td>วิม</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ngüm</td>
<td>/NAm¹/</td>
<td>ึงม</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.–10. Total 109


---

92 Ngao in the south, Thoeng in the northeast and Wiang Pa Pao in the northwest also belong to the huamüang nök. These three müang obviously formed the outer corner points under the sphere of influence that Phayao claimed.

The *panna* system of Phayao

Note: The numbers in brackets correspond to the sequence of numbers in Table 3.
Phra Devavisuddhivedi, abbot of the monastery (Wat) Si Khom Kham, Phayao, arrived at a similar result. Phra Devavisuddhivedi analysed the names of the villages in the 36 panna, as they are listed in the *Phayao Chronicle (PC-WSKK)*, and, in addition, endeavoured to identify their locations as accurately as possible.

Table 2: *Panna and villages in Phayao (c. 1100)* [b]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panna No.</th>
<th>Transcription (conventional)</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription</th>
<th>Siamese transcription</th>
<th>Number of villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Chiang Di</td>
<td>/ciaN⁴ d̄īi¹/</td>
<td>เขียงดี</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Khok Luang</td>
<td>/kook³ luaN⁶/</td>
<td>โคกหลวง</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Chae Tak</td>
<td>/cEE³ taak²/</td>
<td>แซ่ตา</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Muang</td>
<td>/muaN³/</td>
<td>ม่วง</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Laeng</td>
<td>/EEEN¹/</td>
<td>ลิ่ง</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Thung Luang</td>
<td>/tuN³ luang⁶/</td>
<td>ทุ่งหลวง</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Chan</td>
<td>/can¹/</td>
<td>ชั่น</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Lò Tai</td>
<td>/l⁶o⁴ tai⁴/</td>
<td>ละโต</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chiang Khian</td>
<td>/ciang¹ khian³/</td>
<td>เขียงเชียง</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Thon</td>
<td>/ton¹/</td>
<td>ทน</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Khrua</td>
<td>/khua¹/</td>
<td>ควร้า</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>San</td>
<td>/saan⁶/</td>
<td>สาม</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Chanak</td>
<td>/ca⁴ naak³/</td>
<td>ชนะกิจ</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Haen</td>
<td>/EEEn⁶/</td>
<td>เทน</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Chiang Khoeng</td>
<td>/ciang¹ kh῭n³/</td>
<td>เขียงเชียง (= No. 9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Loeng</td>
<td>/l῭N³/</td>
<td>เหล็ก</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>/lin¹/</td>
<td>ลิ้น</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kaeo</td>
<td>/kEEw⁴/</td>
<td>เก้า</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Chang Luang</td>
<td>/saaN⁶ luang⁶/</td>
<td>ทางหลวง</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Mun</td>
<td>/muun¹/</td>
<td>มุน</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Khwae N̄i</td>
<td>/khwEE¹ noo̯j⁵/</td>
<td>เคว่าเนียะ</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Tha Khrai</td>
<td>/taa³ khai⁵/</td>
<td>ท่าไกร</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Chae Hat</td>
<td>/cEE³ haat²/</td>
<td>เชาห้า</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Paen (Paeng)</td>
<td>/pEE⁴/pEEn⁶/</td>
<td>เป็น (เปง)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Kheng</td>
<td>/keEN¹/</td>
<td>ถนน</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Pümn</td>
<td>/p̄ëEEM⁶/</td>
<td>ปิยม</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Chai</td>
<td>/cai¹/</td>
<td>ชาย</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>/kim⁶/</td>
<td>กิม</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Chao</td>
<td>/cao¹/</td>
<td>เชา</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Chuai</td>
<td>/cuaj³/</td>
<td>ช่วย</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Chiang Chi</td>
<td>/ciaN² cii¹/</td>
<td>เขียงชี</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result is by no means amazing: Only ten panna could be identified; the locations of two other panna could not be definitely ascertained; and twenty-four panna had no villages at all. Hence this latter group of panna were called panna wang plao (风筝 severed) or “empty panna”. The true panna, however, contained a total of 103 villages. As far as they can be identified, most panna were situated within a circle with a diameter of 80 km centred at the Kwan Phayao Lake. It is worth mentioning that more than two thirds of Phayao consisted of fictitious panna, whose only objective was probably to complete the total number of panna according to the formula $2^n + 1$, which is considered in Southeast Asia as auspicious.

A perusal of the Northern Thai Chronicles shows that only the most important miyang in Lan Na possessed sub-units called panna, whose number was calculated according to the above-mentioned formula. Ngoen Yang had 32 panna.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panna No.</th>
<th>Transcription (conventional)</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription</th>
<th>Siamese transcription</th>
<th>Number of villages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Chang</td>
<td>/caaN⁵</td>
<td>ช่าง</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Chae Wo</td>
<td>/cEE³woo⁴</td>
<td>แซ่โว</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Chae Hom</td>
<td>/cEE³hom²</td>
<td>แซ่หอม</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Khom</td>
<td>/kom¹</td>
<td>คอม</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Ngūm</td>
<td>/Nakām¹</td>
<td>โอม</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.–36.</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Source: Devavisuddhivedi 1991: 84–87._

95 As Shorto (1963) and Tambiah (1976) emphasise, Indian cosmology is based on the basic number “4”. The territorial structures organised according to the principle of the mandala reflect the cosmos and represent cosmological harmony. Therefore they were organised by basing on the systems whose units have the numerical sizes of 5, 9, 17, 33, 65 (and so on). “The number 33 is only the last of a series, subsumable under the formula $2^n + 1$, which recurs time and again in political contexts in South East Asia.” The Mon kingdom in Pegu (Ramaññadeśa) was divided into three provinces: Pegu, Martaban, and Bassein. Each of them comprised 33 myo (the Burmese counterpart of the Thai miyang), which means 32 myo and the capital. Sometimes the capital, centre and personification of the entirety, is not to be included. See Shorto 1963: 581. In the early period of Bangkok, Nakhôn Si Thammarat, as an elevated “province of the first class” (miyang ek) had 36 administrative departments (krom), whereas Ratburi, a “province of the fourth class” (miyang cattawa) only had 14 krom. See Rujaya 1984: 48. Consequently the 36 panna of Phayao can also be understood as a variant model “$2^n + 1$”: 36 = 25 + 4 (for the four cardinal points).
96 PY, Prachakitkōracak 1973: 225.
Chiang Rai\textsuperscript{97} and Chiang Saen,\textsuperscript{98} which was founded by King Saen Phu in 1328, had the same number of \textit{panna}.\textsuperscript{99} Later on, Chiang Saen expanded territorially and finally comprised 65 ($= 2^6 + 1$) \textit{panna}.

\textbf{Table 3: \textit{Panna} in Chiang Rai (around 1300)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Transcription (conventional)</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription</th>
<th>Siamese transcription</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Si Yong Nam</td>
<td>/sii\textsuperscript{6} n\textsuperscript{OON} \textsuperscript{1} nam\textsuperscript{5} hua\textsuperscript{6}</td>
<td>สีม่อนคำว่ากันเวียง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hua Hin Wiang</td>
<td>hin\textsuperscript{6} wiang\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>พุ่มคำว่า</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Phu Lao</td>
<td>/puu\textsuperscript{1} law\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>เชียงรายน้อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Chiang Rai Noi</td>
<td>/cia\textsuperscript{N} \textsuperscript{1} haaj\textsuperscript{3} noo\textsuperscript{O}j\textsuperscript{5}/</td>
<td>เชียงราย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Phian</td>
<td>/phian\textsuperscript{6}/</td>
<td>เยียร</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Chiang Lai</td>
<td>/cia\textsuperscript{N} \textsuperscript{1} lai\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>เชียงโลก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Tha Kong</td>
<td>/taa\textsuperscript{3} kong\textsuperscript{6}/</td>
<td>ท้ากง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Wan</td>
<td>/wan\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>วัน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Chae Liang</td>
<td>/c\textsuperscript{EE} \textsuperscript{3} liang\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>แซ่เลียง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Chae Lat</td>
<td>/c\textsuperscript{EE} \textsuperscript{3} laat\textsuperscript{3}/</td>
<td>แซ่ลาด</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Khwaen Oi</td>
<td>/kh\textsuperscript{E}E\textsuperscript{n}\textsuperscript{3} ?oo\textsuperscript{O}j\textsuperscript{4}/</td>
<td>แคววาง้อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Fai Kaeo Nam Hua</td>
<td>/faaj\textsuperscript{6} k\textsuperscript{EE}w\textsuperscript{4} nam\textsuperscript{5} hua\textsuperscript{6}/</td>
<td>ฝายแก้วคำว่า</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Tian Lô Noi</td>
<td>/tian\textsuperscript{6} loo\textsuperscript{1} noo\textsuperscript{O}j\textsuperscript{5}/</td>
<td>เตียวล่องน้อย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Chai Khru ... Phian</td>
<td>/cai\textsuperscript{1} khuu\textsuperscript{1} ... phian\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>ไชยรุ้...เกียร</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Chae Lan</td>
<td>/c\textsuperscript{EE} \textsuperscript{3} laan\textsuperscript{5}/</td>
<td>แซ่ล้าน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Chae Lung</td>
<td>/c\textsuperscript{EE} \textsuperscript{3} luN\textsuperscript{4}/</td>
<td>แซ่ลุง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Sagna</td>
<td>/sa\textsuperscript{'N}aaj\textsuperscript{5}/</td>
<td>แซ่รา</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Chang Khong</td>
<td>/caaa\textsuperscript{N} \textsuperscript{1} k\textsuperscript{OON} \textsuperscript{4}/</td>
<td>ช่างคอง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Chiang Lom</td>
<td>/ciang\textsuperscript{1} lom\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>เชียงหลอม</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Tin</td>
<td>/tiin\textsuperscript{6}/</td>
<td>ตืน</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tò Na Mai Kiang</td>
<td>/too\textsuperscript{O} naa\textsuperscript{4} mai\textsuperscript{5} kham\textsuperscript{6}/</td>
<td>ตั้นบ้านเกียงคำ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kham</td>
<td>kiang\textsuperscript{6} kham\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Tò Saeng</td>
<td>/too\textsuperscript{O} s\textsuperscript{EE}n\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>ต้นแขง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Tò Wai</td>
<td>/too\textsuperscript{O} waaj\textsuperscript{6}/</td>
<td>ต้นหวาย</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Khwaen Khong</td>
<td>/kh\textsuperscript{E}E\textsuperscript{n} \textsuperscript{3} khoong\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>แคววังสอง</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Nòi Kham</td>
<td>/noo\textsuperscript{O}j\textsuperscript{5} kham\textsuperscript{1}/</td>
<td>น้อยคำ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Khwaen Nòi</td>
<td>/kh\textsuperscript{E}E\textsuperscript{n} \textsuperscript{3} noo\textsuperscript{O}j\textsuperscript{5}/</td>
<td>แคววาน้อย</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{97} Tamnan phin m"iang chiang rai, from Rawiwan 1988: 14.
\textsuperscript{98} CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 59; CMC-TPCM 1971: 38.
Population and state in Lan Na prior to the mid-sixteenth century

Table 4: Panna in Chiang Saen and the adjacent regions (c. 1330)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Transcription (conventional)</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription</th>
<th>Siamese transcription</th>
<th>Number of panna/na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Hit</td>
<td>/hit¹/</td>
<td>หิท (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Maha Khu pak Kok Lüang</td>
<td>/ma’haa⁶ kuu¹ paak² kok¹ leuN¹/</td>
<td>มหาคุปากเดิ่ง (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Pao (“uninhabited”)</td>
<td>/paw²/</td>
<td>พลา (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Maem</td>
<td>/mEEm¹/</td>
<td>แม่ม (?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Khwaen Dong</td>
<td>/khwÉEn³ doN¹/</td>
<td>แควรงดส์</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Chiang Rung Nöi</td>
<td>/ciang¹ huN³ nOOj⁵/</td>
<td>เชียงรองหยี่</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Chan</td>
<td>/can¹/</td>
<td>ชัน</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Was the panna in all cases an administrative unit that was placed below the müang level? Müang Luang and Müang Hai had 1,500 na, which amounted to 1.5 panna, if one assumes that one panna in fact equalled 1,000 ricefields (na). According to our calculation, Müang Sat had 0.5 panna and Müang Cuat and Müang Hang only 0.1 panna, i.e., one pakna. Could one panna, as a result of this, have spread over several smaller müang, whereas a very large müang embraced numerous panna? Were müang and panna two completely different categories, which do not fit in the hierarchical scheme, but represent parallel existing administrative concepts? Whereas the müang represents the older concept, which consisted of old family organisations and units based on villages and urban settlements, the panna was obviously a later structure imposed on the network of müang. The new panna structure facilitated the political and economic penetration of the country by the royal centre.

There was thus a close connection between the panna and the local irrigation system (rabop müang fai ระบบท่ออ่างฟ้า). Many panna were named after rivers or canals. Panna Fang Kaen, one of the largest panna in Lan Na, covers 30,000 rai of rice-cultivated areas, which are irrigated by three tributaries of the Kaen River. Fang had three (according to other accounts, five) panna, which were defined by three (or five) canals and divided from one another.100 Villages, which shared water resources—rivers, streams, canals—and had common interests in utilising and maintaining them, formed a panna. Thus panna were co-operative agricultural production units. Recruiting labour forces and levying taxes and tributes on the basis of the system of panna was therefore significant.

100 See Aroonrut 1989: 9.

---

### Table: Transcription Phonetic Siamese Number of panna/na

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjacent territories:</th>
<th>Phonetic transcription</th>
<th>Siamese transcription</th>
<th>Number of panna/na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fang</td>
<td>/faaŋ⁶/</td>
<td>ฝัง</td>
<td>3 panna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Müang Sat</td>
<td>/m₄āaŋ¹ saat²/</td>
<td>ม. สัด</td>
<td>500 na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Müang Cuat</td>
<td>/m₄āaŋ¹ cwaat³/</td>
<td>ม. ขาว</td>
<td>100 na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Müang Hang</td>
<td>/m₄āaŋ¹ haaŋ⁶/</td>
<td>ม. หาง</td>
<td>100 na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,700 na</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The manuscript SRI 81.060.05.038–038: “Lamdap latcakun wongsa nai müang lan na”, f° 7. Müang Palaeo comprised 5 panna accordingly.

Sources: SRI 81.069.05.038-038: “Lamdap latcakun wongsa nai müang lan na”, f° 7; CMC-TSHR, SRI 1982: 10; Tamnan müang ciang saen, Srisakra 1984: 247.
The importance of local irrigation for the system of *panna* is obvious in the case of Sipsòng Panna. In 1570 the Tai Lü organised the *müang*, which were united under the leadership of Chiang Rung, into 30 units by taking over the *panna* that had been introduced in Lan Na several centuries before.\(^\text{101}\) A total of 12 *panna* were organised, six on each side of the Mekong. The tributaries of the river partitioned the various *panna* from one another.\(^\text{102}\) The 12 *panna* each comprised two to five of the old *müang*, which remained as administrative units under the *panna* level. The country of the Tai Lü since then is called Sipsòng Panna, “[country of the] twelve *panna*”.\(^\text{103}\)

The *panna* system of Lan Na seems to have survived the Burmese conquest. The evidence of its existence can be established in the chronicles until the early eighteenth century.\(^\text{104}\) In a later period, the term *panna* was increasingly used as an equivalent to the term *müang*. The 65 *panna* of Chiang Saen, which were mentioned in the “Yonok Chronicle”, comprising the sphere of influence of Chiang Saen after the town on the Mekong (since 1701/02), had been step-by-step upgraded by the Burmans to be the political centre of Lan Na and of the adjacent regions (but without the old core region of Chiang Mai-Lamphun). Hence, among the *panna* of Chiang Saen one finds several *panna* called *müang* — such as Müang Yong, Müang Len Nüa, Müang Len Tai, Chiang Dao and Müang Phayak — that once controlled more than one *panna*.\(^\text{105}\) A well-known literary work of the Tai Yuan, the *Khao kawila* (Poem of King Kawila, r. 1782–1816), used the term *panna* as a synonym of *müang*. The term *tang panna* (¶à”ßæ—ππ) is used here as having the

---


\(^{102}\) Thongthaem 1989.

\(^{103}\) This literal translation is, however, problematic because *panna* was here used for administrative purposes and no longer signified exactly “1,000 rice fields”.

\(^{104}\) One version of the “Chronicle of Chiang Saen” reported around 1607 on the “75 *panna* of Chiang Saen” (œž พันนาชิ้นสามสิบ). Moreover, the chronicle mentions that in 1637/38 the Burmese King Suttho Thammaracha (Tha-lun) appointed a certain Müun Luang Sulalçicai as the administrator of the “region of the six *panna* Taeng” (tr. แพร่พันนาหนึ่งANGO). See CSC-TMCS, Srisakara 1984: 277, 280.

\(^{105}\) PY, Prachakitkòracak 1973: 285–86. An undated manuscript from the monastery Si Khom Kham names eleven *panna* from Chiang Khòng, which were all indicated as *müang*, Müang Luai and Müang Ngao as well. See MS, Hundius Microfilm Documentation, No. 599, Roll 17: Tamnan ciang saen ciang hai, f° 25.
same meaning as the more colloquial term *tang mūang* (พังเมือง), which can be rendered as “foreign country”.  

It appears as if in the course of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the original meaning of *panna*, associated with wet rice cultivation, disappeared and the separation from the older meaning of *mūang* became gradually blurred. *Mūang* and *panna* became almost completely interchangeable, until the use of the word *mūang* disappeared in the first half of the eighteenth century. This might be the reason for the relatively late introduction of an administration based on the *panna* in Sipsông Panna, and why the *panna* was used there from the beginning as a political-administrative category without obvious reference to agricultural organisation. According to one source, the term *panna* is written in Tai Lü as *phara* (พารา),  

which is a Siamese synonym for *mūang*. At the beginning of this section, evidence for the existence of the *panna* system was provided. It could be demonstrated that not only the earliest, but also the most numerous and striking evidence relates to Phayao. The political centre of Phayao was located on the eastern bank of a big inland lake (Kwan Phayao), which was supported by the Ing and several other rivers. In the case of Phayao the function of *panna* within the local irrigation system becomes especially clear in manuscript sources. Perhaps an administration based on *panna* already existed in Phayao at the beginning of the eleventh century, and it was enforced in the following period on Ngoen Yang (Chiang Saen), Chiang Rai, and Fang. After the conquest of Hariphunchai, Mangrai also introduced the *panna* system in the south and west of Lan Na. In the 1340s, King Pha Yu is said to have divided Chiang Tung into 7,500 *na*.  

Although one knows the names of some *panna* in the area of Chiang Mai (e.g., the *panna* Kum Kam and Fang Kaen), the exact divisions of such important *mūang* like Chiang Mai, Lamphun, and Lampang, are given. As for Phrae and Nan, historical evidence for the existence of a *panna* system does not exist. Perhaps, the system was not implemented until after the conquest of the two *mūang* by Tilok in the mid-fifteenth century. A conclusive assessment of the *panna* system, concerning its origin as well as its historical development, is only feasible on the basis of a careful study of the extensive corpus of Northern Thai manuscripts.

---

106 *Khao kawila — chabap singkha wannasai* 1985: 18.  
107 This word, pronounced in Siamese as /phaara/, leads to the names of the holy Indian town Vārānasi, the Benares of today.  
110 The “Chronicle of Nan” and other sources originating from Nan do not mention the term *panna* at all. A vague reference is found only in the “Chronicle of Chiang Mai”. In the years 1486/87, it is said, Siamese troops attacked Mūang Hin, a *luk panna* of Nan (tr. อุทยานเมืองฮิน). See CCM-HP, Wyatt and Aroonrut 1995: 102; CMC-TPCM 1971: 69.
3.3 The demographic dimension

The political importance and economic potential of Lan Na, like that of her neighbours and rivals, depended strongly upon the composition and distribution of her population. Unfortunately no reliable statistical data, on which one could draw conclusions on the demographic situation in Lan Na before the end of the eighteenth century, is available. Censuses ought to have been carried out in early periods, as the late eleventh century census of Phayao, discussed in the previous section, demonstrates. However, the census figures, probably having a mainly symbolic character, are certainly so much exaggerated that they cannot be taken at face value for any quantitative assessment. However, some basic considerations can yet be derived from the relevant fragmentary information transmitted through chronicles and contemporary historical sources.

The census which was conducted at the beginning of Si Côm Tham’s reign showed that in the core region of the principality of Phayao there were slightly over 100 villages, which were distributed in ten (real) panna. If a village had an average of 150 to 250 inhabitants, the population of the region, where almost one seventh of today’s Northern Thai population live, ought to have been between 15,000 and 25,000 inhabitants. Even if it is problematic to project the size of the population in the other regions of Lan Na, because of considerable demographic changes over the centuries, it is probably not unrealistic to argue that the total population in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries lay in the range between 100,000 to 200,000 people. The population of Sukhothai was small as well. In the core region of the kingdom that extended in the south to Nakhón Sawan, the fourteenth century population did not exceed 300,000 people.

During the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries the population of Lan Na increased considerably (see the discussion below), though we do not know on what scale. Sun Laichen argues that the increased flow of commodities between northern mainland South-East Asia and Ming China during that period reflected that population growth. A substantial increase of population is also documented for southwestern China (modern Yunnan, Guizhou and adjacent parts of Sichuan). According to James Lee’s study, the population of that region almost doubled, from three to five million, during the period 1250–1600. In Yunnan, comprising a

---

111 In 1980 there were 4.4 million people living in the eight northern provinces of Thailand; among these about 600,000 lived in the province of Phayao and amphoe Phan and Pa Daet, which were historically under Phayao, but today belong to Chiang Rai. See Sammano phrachakôn lae kheha [...] 1980: 5–6.
112 This estimation is based on the calculation of the Thai archaeologist Phaitun Saisawang, quoted in Nakhon 1985: 23.
113 Sun 2000: 199.
territory slightly smaller than that of present-day Thailand, an estimated two million people lived at the turn of the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{114} Anthony Reed gives the population of Siam (including Lan Na but excluding Isan) at 1.8 million without providing details on how this figure was calculated.\textsuperscript{115} As to Lan Na, the first, though only partly, reliable census statistics are from the nineteenth century. We have calculated the probable population of Lan Na (without the adjacent Shan areas) at roughly 400,000 in the 1830s.\textsuperscript{116} The preceding three to four decades saw a substantial increase in population; it probably doubled, as the region gradually recovered from the ravages of the Burmese-Siamese wars in the late eighteenth century. Given the fact that the many disruptions of Lan Na society are ascribed to numerous uprisings against Burma and forced resettlements of population to Burma during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, we might conclude that the population of Lan Na as a whole was certainly higher at the beginning of Burmese rule than at the end of it.

As to the plain of the Ping River, where at present almost one quarter of the five million inhabitants of Northern Thailand live, the Japanese historian Yoneo Ishii estimates the population at the end of the thirteenth century at probably over 100,000. Ishii’s calculation is based on the consideration that the Ai Fa Canal (ไทรผักยั่งยืน) constructed under King Yiba, the last ruler of Hariphunchai, which was the prototype for the Mae Faek Irrigation Project that was completed in 1933, irrigates an area of 70,000 rai (11,000 ha) today.

If we assume that the thirty-four kilometres of canal excavated under Kun Fa allowed 10,000 hectares of new paddy fields to be developed, and that, at 80 percent of today’s level, the yield was between 2.0 and 2.4 tons per hectare, the annual production from a single rainy season crop must have been between 20,000 and 24,000 tons of paddy. With an annual per capital consumption of 225 kilograms of paddy, this area alone could have comfortably supported between 89,000 and 110,000 people, a figure clearly in excess of a village population.\textsuperscript{117}

Ishii’s assumption of the production of rice per hectare (80 per cent of today’s level) seems to be very optimistic, and he does not give a good reason for it. Ishii further argues that the construction of the Ai Fa Canal required materials and workers which were far beyond the capacity of a small community settlement. This

\textsuperscript{114} Lee 1982: 713, 715.
\textsuperscript{115} Reid 1988: 14.
\textsuperscript{116} Grabowsky and Turton 2003: 204.
\textsuperscript{117} Ishii 1978: 21.
second argument seems to be quite convincing. He concludes: “Some form of state involvement is implied” 118

Dhida Saraya sees a close connection between religious donations and the expansion of settlements in the region of today’s Thailand. The rulers of Dvaravati and Lopburi, later also the rulers of Sukhothai, had attempted to expand their territories into previously mostly unpopulated new land by means of donating land and labourers to Buddhist monasteries. The new religious centres and the supporting villages received from the rulers often generous material advantages, which gave them a quasi-model character. They could attract more settlers so as to reclaim additional land for cultivation in the region and establish more new villages. In this way the newly developed regions prospered. Since the king as “ruler of the land” (phra cao phaendin) possessed the privileges of such a donation, the founding of monasteries, the expansion of settlements and the consolidation of the royal sphere of influence developed parallel to one another. For Lan Na, Dhida shows in the paradigm of the founding of Chiang Saen (1328):

The land was donated to religion; manpower was assigned to maintain the monastery and to work the land. Craftsmen were donated. The donated land was fixed and made the domain of Wat Pasak. We can speculate that the purpose of the donation was not only religious but for community expansion, and the communities would contain people of many groups. A religious centre was founded and the lands were cultivated, contributing to the expansion of Chiangsaen. [...]” 119

Not only the saṅgha, but also the king in Chiang Mai, received land taxes from the cultivation of monastery estates, namely one tenth of the produce. 120 In the second half of the fifteenth century, donations to monasteries had taken on considerable dimensions (see Table 4). One of the most spectacular donations of land to a monastery occurred in 1402, at the beginning of Sam Fang Kaen’s reign. In a donation made by the king and his mother, rice fields comprising 21,685 units of measurement (called khao, “rice, paddy”—the size of a field was

118 Ishii 1978: 22.
120 Dhida (1982: 176) emphasises: “... the ruler of Chiangmai, associated with religious cults, could claim his rights to land. This was reinforced by land endowment. The donation of land was an effective and practical means for the king to control the expansion of land in the Chiangmai kingdom or at least ensure that rights to land were recognised. Only the king and his family were the donators of land. The king himself had authority to grant land to other individuals or officials. Thus they were bound to him.”
measured by the amount of seed-rice needed for sowing) and numerous temple
serfs (from more than 246 households) were donated to the monastery Suwanna
Maha Wihan in Phayao. The largest number of monastic endowments took place
in the years between 1476 and 1501, namely during the reigns of Tilok, Nöt Chiang
Rai, and Miang Kaeo. It was during this period that the inscription of Wat Mùn Lò,
dated 1487/88, elucidated the tax exemption for new rural settlers. However,
one has to point to the fact that King Tilok, who was an ardent supporter and
protector of the “new Sihnalese” Wat Pa Daeng sect, ordered the destruction of
inscriptions in the Chiang Mai-Lamphun region, the centre of royal power,
because all donations of land and manpower to monasteries, which had been
performed according to the rite of the Suan Dòk sect, were no longer considered
religiously meritorious (puñña). Note the hiatus of 56 years between the
donation to Wat Kao Yôt (Phayao, in 1412) and to Wat Canthara-aram (Chiang
Rai, in 1468). It seems that in the northeastern mìiang (Chiang Rai, Chiang Saen
and Phayao), Tilok’s orders were not always implemented. Thus Table 4 distorts
both the spacial and the chronological distribution of monastic endowments in Lan
Na. There is evidence that in some cases temple serfs were transferred from a
long-established monastery to a newly founded one, eventually leading to the
abandonment of the former.

At that time, therefore, the king of Lan Na pursued a policy of actively
promoting the expansion of agricultural land with the aim of increasing rice
production for a growing population. In Northern Thai customary laws much
evidence of these efforts of the king of Chiang Mai can be found. The mangraisat
(Wat Chaiyasathan version) warns that the state does not need people who are “too
comfortable to build villages and establish dams, [...] the land [consequently] was
destroyed”. The population should rather aim at building villages, canals and dams,
so that luck would prevail. In particular fallow lands were to be cultivated, “so
that they are converted to rice fields and garden lands and villages are established.”

One version of the mangraisat (from Wat Mùn Ngoen Kông) even demands:
“Do not allow that ruler, aristocrats and free communities, the entire people, to

122 Yuphin 1988a: 91.
123 Prof. Dr. Prasert na Nagara points to this fact in his preface to the new edition of the Mülasāsānā Chronicle. See Prasert and Puangkham 1994: 8. In Lamphun only the famous inscrip-
tion of Wat Phra Yūn survived, possibly because it was situated in a forest outside the town.
124 Ibid.
125 Several cases from Chiang Rai are reported by Rawiwan (1982: 155). For example, in 1468 the
governor of Chiang Rai donated 20 families, originally attached to Wat Chiang Lò, to the new
monastery Wat Canthara-aram.
126 Mangraisat chabap wat chaiyasathan, quoted from Yuphin 1988a: 92.
127 Quoted from ibid. [tr. จงลูกเป็นนาเป็นสวนเป็นบ้านไร้].
preserve [such] forests, which shall better be cleared and cultivated and turned into rice fields for them.\textsuperscript{128} The rural work force was highly appreciated by the ruling class because it was in short supply and was needed for clearing and cultivating the extensive wasteland. As for taxation, there was no lack of incentives to assure a low tax liability:

Commoners, who make an effort to clear forests and grasslands, to reclaim overgrown rice fields for cultivation, as well as to till spoiled garden land — in short, to use land for cultivation and settlements — shall have the right to earn their livelihood [without having to pay taxes for a period of] three years. Only after that are taxes raised. [This is done] so that the commoners would aim at building villages, constructing canals and dams so as to enable them to live in happiness and affluence. Those who found settlements, construct canals and dams, cultivate rice fields and work in gardens are the subjects of the land. According to the promise of the ruler, they shall receive their wages. [...]\textsuperscript{129}

Northern Thai customary law texts evoke the impression that the state was interested in converting wasteland into fertile rice fields. Those farmers who reclaimed abandoned rice fields, overgrown by grass and creepers or even turned into dense forest, were given a substantial reduction in taxes over a period up to two decades, depending on the hardships borne by farmers in cultivating or reclaiming the land.\textsuperscript{130} However, the law texts also mention tenants in more densely populated areas who had to work on rice fields which were not their own, and one third of the harvest having to be delivered as land rent to the owner.\textsuperscript{131} It seems that the expansion of agricultural land during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries took place mainly in the outer müang. The development of settlements came to a halt in the first half of the sixteenth century, which is reflected by the drastic decrease in monastery donations in the final stage of the last years of Müang Kaö’s reign. As a result of heavy casualties suffered in the campaign against Ayutthaya, natural population growth in Lan Na likewise remained stagnant. Perhaps the demographic decline began around 1515, and resulted in a vicious cycle caused by war, falling population, decreasing rice production, sinking tax revenue, economic crisis, and political anarchy.

\textsuperscript{128} Mang raisat chabap wat mün ngoen kòng, quoted from Yuphin 1988a: 92.
\textsuperscript{129} Mang raisat chabap wat chiang man, quoted from Yuphin 1988a: 91; cf. Mang raisat chabap wat sao hai, Griswold and Prasert 1977a: 152. See also Toosri 1992: 89.
\textsuperscript{130} For details see the mangraisat, Toonsri 1992: 228.
\textsuperscript{131} See Saowani 1996: 30.
However, a Chinese record, preface dated 1576, still informs the reader about the splendor of Lan Na, which deeply impressed Chinese merchants and other travellers that “[t]here are a great number of temples and pagodas in this place [Lan Na]. Each village has a temple, and each temple has a pagoda. Villages numerate as many as ten thousand, and so do pagodas.”

Table 5: Monastic endowments in Lan Na (c. 1300–1700)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription (registr.-no.)</th>
<th>Year of inscription</th>
<th>Year of donation</th>
<th>Name of monastery or donor*</th>
<th>Monastery serfs (kha wat)</th>
<th>Land / animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phrae 1</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>1339</td>
<td>Wat Bang Sanuk (Phrae)</td>
<td>1 family</td>
<td>animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 9</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Wat Suwanna Maha Wihan (Phayao), king and queen mother</td>
<td>246 households (hüan)</td>
<td>rice fields (na) of 21,685 measures of khao (seed-rice), annual paddy tax: 4,686,000 bia or cowry shells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 44</td>
<td>1411?</td>
<td>1411?</td>
<td>King and queen mother</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 27</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Wat Kao Yöt (Phayao)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rice field of 500 measures of khao annual paddy tax : 55,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 47</td>
<td>1411?</td>
<td>1411?</td>
<td>Wat Suwanna Maha Wihan (Phayao), king and queen mother</td>
<td>11 villages</td>
<td>rice field of 975 measures of khao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 12</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>Wat Kao Yöt (Phayao)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rice field of 500 measures of khao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 1</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>Wat Canthara-aram (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>20 families</td>
<td>rice field of 300 measures of khao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>Wat Ban Laeng (Lampang?)</td>
<td>donation to the monastery by the population of the village of the same name</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription (registr.-no.)</th>
<th>Year of inscription</th>
<th>Year of donation</th>
<th>Name of monastery or donor*</th>
<th>Monastery serfs (kha wat)</th>
<th>Land / animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC, Vol. 3, No. 65</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Wat Phrathat Lampang Luang (Lampang)</td>
<td>5 (4+1) families</td>
<td>2 rice fields of 300 measures of khao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 33</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Wat Ban Yang Mak Muang (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>20 monks</td>
<td>rice field of 20 measures of khao, annual paddy tax: 5,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai 10</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>Ku Wat Sao Hin (Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>20 families</td>
<td>rice field of 250 measures of khao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 21</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>1484</td>
<td>Wat Tham Phra (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rice field (old), annual paddy tax: 50,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>annual paddy tax: 82,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 28</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>Wat Pa Ruak (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>1 family (4 persons)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 2</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Wat Don Khram (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>20 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 61</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Wat Phu Khing (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>4 families</td>
<td>9 rice fields; annual paddy tax: 20,500 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 61</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Wat Pa Tan (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>1 family</td>
<td>3 rice fields, annual paddy tax: 6,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 18</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1488</td>
<td>Wat Weluwan Aram (Lamphun)</td>
<td>4 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 31</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Wat Kan Thom (Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>4 villages (a); 4 villages and 12 persons (b)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 23</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Wat Khuan Chum Kaeo (Lamphun)</td>
<td>17 (10+3+4) families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— (National Museum, Chiang Saen)</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Wat Mahawan (near Chiang Saen?)</td>
<td>6 families; 1 village (for salt production)</td>
<td>rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 9</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Wat Phraya Ruang (Phayao)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 57</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wat Klang (Phayao)</td>
<td>4 persons, purchased by 8,000 noen</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Name of monastery or donor: The names are in Thai and translated as follows: Wat Phrathat Lampang Luang, Wat Ban Yang Mak Muang, Ku Wat Sao Hin, Wat Tham Phra, Wat Pa Ruak, Wat Don Khram, Wat Phu Khing, Wat Pa Tan, Wat Weluwan Aram, Wat Kan Thom, Wat Khuan Chum Kaeo, Wat Mahawan, Wat Phraya Ruang, Wat Klang.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription (registr.-no.)</th>
<th>Year of inscription</th>
<th>Year of donation</th>
<th>Name of monaster or donor*</th>
<th>Monastery serfs (kha wat)</th>
<th>Land / animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 4</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>1492</td>
<td>Wat Wisutharam (Phayao)</td>
<td>several persons</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 6</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Wat Nang Müin (Phayao)</td>
<td>10 families</td>
<td>rice field of 4 measures of khao, annual paddy tax: 2,500 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 26</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>Wat Aram Pa Nöi (Phayao)</td>
<td>2 families (1 man, 4 women)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 7</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Wat Aram Pa Ya (Phayao)</td>
<td>13 families</td>
<td>rice fields; 2 areca trees, tax: 2,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 27</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Wat Li (Phayao)</td>
<td>10 families (for monastery), 6 villages for special services (e.g. provision of salt)</td>
<td>rice fields of 1265 measures of khao, annual paddy tax: 818,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 39</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Wat Côi Sae (Phayao)</td>
<td>20 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 3</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Wat Prasat (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>10 families</td>
<td>rice fields, annual paddy tax: 100,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lampang 6</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Wat Ban Dan (Phayao)</td>
<td>10 families</td>
<td>rice fields, annual paddy tax: 300,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC, Vol. 3, No. 70</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>Wat Pratthamaram Luang (Lampang)</td>
<td>13 (7+6) families, purchased by 5,480 (2,810+2,670) ngoen</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai 4</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Wat Kaeo Lat (Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>1 family and another 4 persons</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 63</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Wat Dusita Aram (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>17 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 8</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Wat Pa Mai (Phayao)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 8</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>Wat Pa Mai (Phayao)</td>
<td>30 families, 20 for Buddha image 5 for ubosot and hò pitok each</td>
<td>rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: Population and state in Lan Na prior to the mid-sixteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription (registr.-no.)</th>
<th>Year of inscription</th>
<th>Year of donation</th>
<th>Name of monastery or donor*</th>
<th>Monastery serfs (kha wat)</th>
<th>Land / animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 9</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Wat PhayaRuang (Phayao)</td>
<td>12 persons</td>
<td>rice field of 200 measures of khaọ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 59</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>Wat Müin Lò (Phayao)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>28 rice fields of 1984 measures of khaọ; 1 rice field of 6 rai and 12 measures of khaọ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nan 2</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Wat Muang Phong (Wat Phra Koet, Nan)</td>
<td>29 families</td>
<td>2 rice fields of 60 measures of khaọ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 26</td>
<td>1501 (?)</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Wat Mahapho (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>113 (74+39) families</td>
<td>rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 28</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1501</td>
<td>Cao Müin Lò Mongkhon (Phayao)</td>
<td>6 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.ś. 4/2539</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Wat Uthumphon Aram (Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>10 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 5</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>Wat Si Suthawat (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>12 families (45 persons purchased by 3,950 ngoen), 6 further families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 10</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>1503</td>
<td>Wat Ban Dûn (Phayao)</td>
<td>7 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 15</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Wat Phratth Hariphunchai (Lamphun)</td>
<td>12 families</td>
<td>rice fields; annual paddy tax: 2,000,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 49</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>King (via Cao Wan Mahat)</td>
<td>more than 9 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 34</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Wat Suwannaram (Lamphun), king’s grandmother (donor)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 34</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>Wat Suwannaram (Lamphun), king’s grandmother (donor)</td>
<td>10 families</td>
<td>6 rice fields, annual paddy tax: 1,000,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inscription (registr.-no.)</td>
<td>Year of inscription</td>
<td>Year of donation</td>
<td>Name of monastery or donor*</td>
<td>Monastery serfs (kha wat)</td>
<td>Land / animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 1</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Wat Nong Kwang (Phayao)</td>
<td>1 village</td>
<td>rice field of 30 measures of khao; annual paddy tax: 9,000 bia; and areca plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 1</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>1513</td>
<td>Wat Nong Kwang (Phayao)</td>
<td>2 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 13</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Wat Sipsong Hong (Phayao)</td>
<td>12 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 16</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>Phayao (?), Cao Si (donor)</td>
<td>1 family</td>
<td>1 rice field, annual paddy tax: 6,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w.u. 415/2524</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>Wat Phra Koet (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>3 families</td>
<td>rice fields, annual paddy tax: 60,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai 26</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Wat Yang Num (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>10 families</td>
<td>rice fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 14</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>1523</td>
<td>Wat Luang (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>5 families</td>
<td>rice field of 1,000 measures of khao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phrae 9</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>Wat Buppharam (Phrae)</td>
<td>15 households (huan, 20 of which were men)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 12</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>Wat Phaya Ruang (Phayao)</td>
<td>5 (3+2) families</td>
<td>rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>— (National Museum, Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>Wat Chiang Sa (Chiang Rai, on the west bank of the Mekong)</td>
<td>2 villages (487 persons listed, and 45 slave families)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Mai 7</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>1560</td>
<td>Wat Luang (Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>4 villages</td>
<td>rice field(s), annual paddy tax: 5,000 bia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2 villages (487 persons listed, and 45 slave families)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 53</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>1584</td>
<td>Wat Ban Yang (Phayao)</td>
<td>several families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 53</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>Wat Ban Yang (Phayao)</td>
<td>several families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 6</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>under Mangrai- dynasty</td>
<td>Wat Phra Luang</td>
<td>“500” families of Milakkhu background (Lua?)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The names of the monasteries and the serfs are given in their native language, followed by the year of the donation and the year of inscription. The land/animals column indicates the type of land or animals donated, along with any additional details such as measurements or taxes. The table provides a snapshot of the land and serf donations recorded in ancient Thai inscriptions.
### Population and state in Lan Na prior to the mid-sixteenth century

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inscription (registr.-no.)</th>
<th>Year of inscription</th>
<th>Year of donation</th>
<th>Name of monastery or donor*</th>
<th>Monastery serfs (kha wat)</th>
<th>Land / animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lamphun 17</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>Wat Mahathat</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>rice field of 200 rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Lae (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 7</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>1617</td>
<td>Wat Pha Khao Pan (Chiang Rai)</td>
<td>52 persons (including 25 men and 27 women)</td>
<td>Areca plantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiang Rai 10</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wat Maha Sathan (in Chiang Kham, Chiang Rai province)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 19</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Rice field of 100 measures of khao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 37</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wat Thong Saeng (Phayao)</td>
<td>18 (14+4) families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 38</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wat Thong Saeng (Phayao)</td>
<td>4 persons</td>
<td>Rice field(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 48</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wat Khwang (Phayao)</td>
<td>1 family (for Buddha image)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phayao 58</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wat Khao Ratchasathan (Phayao)</td>
<td>10 families</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanations:**
- Year of the inscription is not recorded.
- No information on this topic included in the inscription.
- Province in brackets, if not in accordance with the province indicated in the inscription register (column 1).

**Sources:**
- Carük lan na 1991 (Part 1: Inscriptions from Chiang Rai, Nan, Phayao and Phrae);
- Prachum carük mūang phayao 1995;
- Penth/Phanphen/Silao (Vols. 1, 3 and 4) 1997–2000;
- Prachum sila carük — PSC (Vol. 3) 1965.
- Penth 2003.133

133 Penth’s excellent study of rice and rice fields in old Lan Na, based on the epigraphical evidence, was consulted after this article had already been finalised. It is a mine of information on how land was donated to monasteries and taxed.
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3.4 Forced resettlement during the Mangrai dynasty

As a reaction to especially severe population losses, King Mùang Kaeo encouraged immigration from the Shan and Tai Khün regions to Lan Na. In the year 1517 alone more than 23,000 people migrated to Lan Na from the three Shan principalities, Chiang Thòn, Mùang Nai, and Mùang Kai. The immigrants, who were obviously induced by the prospect of getting fertile land and receiving other preferential treatment, arrived with 38 elephants and 250 horses, as reported by the chronicles. They found new places of settlement in all parts of Lan Na. The ruler of Mùang Kai settled with 1,200 followers in Fang. Another important region for resettlement was Phrao, located 80 km to the north of Chiang Mai. The resettlement obviously helped to cover the increasing demand for labour for the ambitious construction projects of Mùang Kaeo, such as the renovation of the city walls of Chiang Mai and Lamphun (c. 1517). However, the influx of Shan was only partially based on voluntary migration, because at the beginning of February 1520, some of the Shan who came to Lan Na returned to their homes on the Salween with the soldiers of the king in pursuit.

Half a century earlier, in 1462/63, King Tilok launched a military campaign against the Shan state of Mùang Nai, a campaign he was asked to undertake by rival Shan rulers. This campaign resulted in the subjugation of Mùang Nai and eleven other Shan mûang situated mainly on the west bank of the Salween River, i.e., beyond the sphere of influence of Chiang Mai. The pacification of these regions did not result in annexation by the victor, but in the deportation of a significant number of their inhabitants to the core region of Lan Na. In all, 12,328 war captives (khôi) were resettled in Phrao, Kao Còng and in panna Takan, located roughly 30 km to the west of Chiang Mai.

134 CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 106; CMC-TPCM 1971: 70; CMC-TSHR, SRI 1982: 61; CMC-N, Notton 1932: 148–49; see also PY, Prachakitkòrácak 1973: 366. A manuscript (Hundius Collection: Pûn wongså mahakhasat tanglai […], f° 52) mentions only 2,322 [instead of 23,220] resettlers, among them 200 [instead of 1,200] found their homes in Fang. Most probably the discrepancies in the numerical data can be traced back to errors attributed to the scribes, because another copy of the same chronicle (ibid., ff° 82/5–83/2), as far as the numerical data on the resettlers are concerned, conforms with other sources.


136 PY (Prachakitkòrácak 1973: 340) translates the Northern Thai term khôi into the Khmer-derived loan word chaloei, “prisoner of war”.

The conquered Shan müiang were not adversaries on a par with Chiang Mai. The forced resettlement of thousands of Shan turned out to be a twofold advantage for the victor. It disciplined the subjugated polities and, at the same time, strengthened the population potential in the core area of Lan Na. However, such a strategy could be counterproductive, if the adversary possessed strong socio-political structures and was far superior in terms of demographic and economic resources. Then it was considered appropriate to act with restraint, even after gaining military successes, in order to avoid devastating counter-attacks. Such awareness may have motivated Tilok to criticise the governor of Nan for his rash action taken after his victory against the “Kaeo” (Vietnamese), who had attacked the neighbouring kingdom of Lan Sang (Laos) and whose forces were also threatening the eastern parts of Lan Na. Tilok forbade the resettlement of the “Kaeo” captives in the territory of Nan, as this would have strengthened the governor’s demographic and thus political power base. Possibly in order to prevent the hitherto autonomous vassal müiang of Nan from challenging Tilok’s royal authority, the victorious governor was transferred to Chiang Rai which meant a demotion. The Nan Chronicle reports:

In the poek set year, C.S. 842 (AD 1480/81), the Kaeo attacked Nan with an army. Phaña Tilok ordered Tao Kha Kan to encounter them with a force of 40,000. He defeated the Kaeo and killed numerous enemies. He then cut off their heads and sent them to Phaña Tilok. He also captured elephants, horses and families, which he presented to Phaña Tilok. Hence Phaña Tilok spoke: “The Kiao [Kaeo] suffered a defeat and fled. This is enough, isn’t it? Why do you pursue the Kao, have them killed, and take numerous Kao families [as prisoners-of-war]? The wrath of enemies and the revenge of tigers are cruel. The Kao [families] shall not be settled in Nantaburi [Nan].” Then Tilok transferred Tao Kha Kan to Chiang Rai.

---

138 Kaeo in Northern Thai and Lao sources normally refer to Vietnam and the Vietnamese, but could also include the Tai people living in the mountainous region of north Vietnam. But in the context of the following quotation the Kaeo refers to Vietnam, as appears in the Lao sources. See Sila 1964: 45–46.

139 NC-PMN, SRI 82.107.05.043–043: Păn wongsa mahakhasat tanglai [...], f° 105/2–4. [tr. ตนatinum จุฬาภรณ์ แซ่ด้า ตัวเดี้ยนัก แต่มาล่าไม่ถูกพระยาตีโต้ในอาสาหิ้งทั้งานภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่งมีอาชีพ สร้างภูมิณัตีผู้หนึ่}
Before the mid-fifteenth century, Lan Na had already received large scale population resettlement directed by the state, either voluntary migrations or forced deportation of prisoners of war. The *Chiang Mai Chronicle* reports the transfer of “500 hand workers’ families” from “Pagan-Ava” to Wiang Kum Kam, Chiang Tung and other places in Lan Na by Mangrai. For the late thirteenth century, however, this episode holds little historical credibility, because evidence of military conflicts between Mangrai and the Mon in Lower Burma needs to be verified by other historical sources. This was probably an event that was invented or reconstructed subsequently, so as to let the fame and splendour of the Mangrai dynasty, in view of the humiliation suffered from the Burmese occupation, shine more brightly.

Siamese sources report a forced resettlement which went in the reverse direction — namely from Lan Na to Siam. Around 1385, troops from Ayutthaya invaded Lan Na. The Luang Prasoet Chronicle mentions only the futile attempt of the conquest of Lampang (1386), whereas other versions of the *Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya* mention also a successful campaign of King Bôrommaracha I against Chiang Mai (1384). While the then ruler of Chiang Mai (Kü Na) was not in the position to offer resistance and left the town with some followers, his son (Ñò Chiang Rai) surrendered and was appointed the new ruler by Bôrommatrailokanat. The Siamese king “ordered that those Lao (here: northern Thai) who had been driven down from Chiang Mai be sent on to be kept in the cities of Phatthalung, Songkhla, Nakhôn Si Thammarat and Canthabun.” Northern Thai sources mention briefly the war with Ayutthaya, but no deportation. Without giving a specific date for the event, the *Chiang Mai Chronicle* claims that the Siamese attack on both Lampang and Chiang Mai failed: “The Southerners were broken, and fled back to the South.” An indirect confirmation of the Siamese version is found in the *Chiang Tung Chronicle*, according to which around 1387 Cao Ai Ôn, the ruler of Chiang Tung, seeing it as his duty came with his military to support the exhausted “Müng Yuan” (i.e., Lan Na) army and ended up as Siamese prisoner of war at Sukhothai.

---

141 PPKSA-LP, PP 1/1 1963: 132.
142 Whereas the PPKSA-LP dates the attack on Lampang at 1386 in accordance with the CMC, according to other versions of the Ayutthaya Chronicle this took place in 1382, followed two years later by a successful war against Chiang Mai. See Cushing 2000: 12.
145 See CTC-PMCT, Thawi 1990: 35-36. However, these events are not mentioned in CTC-JSC, Sâmông 1981: 237–38.
During the fierce struggles for hegemony between Lan Na and Ayutthaya throughout the Sukhothai-Phitsanulok region, the increasingly superior strategies that aimed at persistently weakening opponents through depopulation of the frontier regions gained momentum. Vague indications in the *Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya* (Luang Prasoert version) on deportations from Lan Na to Siam around 1444/45 could not be substantiated in the Northern Thai sources. In 1461 Tilok suppressed a rebellion in Chaliang (Si Satchanalai), for a decade a southern outpost of Chiang Mai. Probably in vengeance, the inhabitants of the pottery town famous for its ceramics were deported to Wiang Kalòng (Chiang Rai) and San Kamphaeng (Chiang Mai), where they founded the “Northern Thai School” of the Sangkhalok-Sukhothai pottery.

From 1507 onwards, Lan Na under King Mùang Kaeo increased its lightning attacks deep into the territory formerly belonging to Sukhothai. The operations were not aimed at permanent conquest of the southern frontier regions then occupied by Ayutthaya, but at the deportation of the population there. Mùang Kaeo probably wanted to create a depopulated buffer zone to counteract the unrestrained long-term expansion of Ayutthaya to the north. To enlarge the impaired basis of his population was another motivation for Chiang Mai’s attacks, which are to be viewed in the context of the mass migration of the Shan around 1517, discussed above. The Siamese reacted with a similar strategy, through which they deported numerous war captives from the southern peripheral regions of Lan Na such as Phrae and Lampang. The military interventions of Ayutthaya in the conflict of succession to the throne of the Northern Thai in 1545/46 prevented further raids of the Tai Yuan on the region around Sukhothai.

4. Decline and fall (1515–1558)

The reign of King Mùang Kaeo marked the heyday of Lan Na’s political power and her cultural blooming, but at the same time the beginning of her ruin. The almost incessant military confrontations with Ayutthaya since the beginning of the sixteenth century had resulted in losses of population that seriously

---

146 PPKSA-LP (PP 1/1 1963: 135) mentions a Siamese attack on the area (*tambon*) of Pathai Kasem. A total of more than “120,000 prisoners of war” was captured. Wood (1924: 83) considers that this must have concerned an untraceable “Pathai Kasem”, a location in the vicinity of Chiang Mai.
148 On Tilok’s military expedition in 1461/62 to the region in Sukhothai and Phitsanulok see PPKSA-LP, PP 1/1 1963: 136. *Lilit yuan phai* also mentions the inhabitants of Chaliang who were deported by the Tai Yuan troops. See Griswold and Prasert 1976: 149.
weakened the power base of the king. In the year 1508, a Siamese army conquered Phrae; the troops from Nan repulsed the invaders but suffered many casualties. The embittered fighting for Lampang between the Tai Yuan and Siamese lasted seven years. In the final stage of Mūang Kaeo’s reign the war losses had reached a critical point. In 1523 the king was involved in a conflict of succession in Chiang Tung. Both local princes competing for the throne sought military help from Lan Na and Saen Wi. More than 20,000 soldiers were mobilised from various regions of Lan Na in support of the prince who was friendly to Chiang Mai. The expedition to Chiang Tung ended in a military disaster. Five high-ranking generals, including the governors of Chiang Rai and Mūang Nai, were killed. “The Tai Yuan fled to the south, numerous Tai Yuan soldiers fell, and a large number of elephants and horses were lost”, reports the Chiang Tung Chronicle, and it continues, “Saen Ñi suffered a defeat and fled to Chiang Saen. Phaña Nòt Chiang Rai had Saen Ñi executed in Chiang Saen and appointed Cao Chiang Khòng the Governor of Phañaak (Phayak).” In the period between 1515 and 1523, not less than ten high-ranking aristocrats of Lan Na lost their lives in wars. These losses certainly had consequences for the political stability of the country.

Besides the military defeats in the last decade of the reign of Mūang Kaeo, which in particular contributed to a serious lack of able-bodied men, the population suffered additional losses from natural calamities. In the year before the death of Mūang Kaeo, the Ping River flooded its banks after heavy rainfalls and inundated a large part of the city of Chiang Mai. “Countless people were drowned in the flood and died”, remarks the chronicler. As a result of unhygienic conditions perhaps many more inhabitants died in epidemics.

King Mūang Kaeo passed away leaving no son behind him. The Privy Council elected Mūang Kaeo’s younger brother Ket as successor on 5 February 1526. The new king was previously the governor of Mūang Nòi, which seems to have been a relatively unimportant frontier mūang to the west of Lan Na inhabited

152 CTC-PMCT, Thawi 1990: 44.
154 Quoted from CMC-TPCM 1971: 71; see also CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 108.
155 It was the eighth day of the waning moon in the fifth month of the dap lao year, C. S. 887. CMC-HP, Wyatt/Aroonrut 1995: 108; CMC-TPCM 1971: 71; CMC-TSHR, SRI 1982: 63. According to Notton’s translation, it was the eighth day of the seventh month of the year dap lao. It seems that there is a reader’s mistake, for the Northern Thai numbers 5 and 7 look rather similar. See CMC-N, Notton 1932: 151. JKM (Ratanapañña 1968: 184) gives “the fifth day of the month Visākha” (the eighth month of the Northern Thai calendar) of the year C.S. 888, namely April 16, 1526, as the date of the death of the monarch.
by Shan. He obviously did not have his own dynastic power base (*Hausmacht*) in Chiang Mai. His reign, as a whole weak and uneventful, ushered in an era of political crises; the control of the capital over the outer regions declined. In September/October 1535, the governor of Lampang together with two high-ranking officials plotted a coup d’etat, which, however, was discovered just in time. The king had the ringleaders of the revolt executed. Three years later his luck ran out; in 1538 Tao Cai (Tao Sai Kham), Ket’s own son, took over the throne and sent his father into exile to Mùang Nòi.156

The new king likewise did not possess a significant dynastic power base, and a controversial decision on personnel, viz. the nomination of a new governor of Chiang Saen, led to his fall. The same coalition of dignitaries who had helped the king to come to power plotted his fall in 1543. Tao Cai was accused of severe abuse of his authority: “[The king] lost his mind. He harassed the population unscrupulously”.157 The hatred for the ruler was so great that the people had him executed. Ket returned from exile and ascended the throne once again. However, in his second reign no success was achieved, and in 1545 Ket was assassinated by aristocratic conspirators in front of the royal palace. The background to this action is not reflected in the written records. With regards to the two reigns of King Ket, the chronicles mention only that the king participated in a magnificent royal barge procession on the occasion of the ordination of monks who belonged to the sect of Wat Pa Daeng.158

After the violent deaths of the last two kings, Lan Na was plunged into chaos and anarchy for five years. The aristocrats of the country were divided into two factions along the country’s east-west axis. The nobility in Chiang Mai, Lamphun and Chiang Tung formed a western group, whereas in the east of Lan Na the governors of Chiang Rai, Chiang Saen and Lampang created a united counter-coalition. At first, Saen Khao, son of the governor of Chiang Khòng and a leading head of the aristocratic conspirators against Ket Cetthalat, took the initiative. He offered the crown to the ruler of Chiang Tung, who declined to accept. Thereupon the ruler (*cao fa* เจ้าฟ้า) of Mùang Nai was asked. He in fact gave his consent, “but did not turn up in Chiang Mai on time”.159 Meanwhile, a meeting of the counter-

156 Some manuscripts mention the exile of Ket Cetthalat to Nan (see SRI 81.088.05.082: Nangsi pùn miùang ciang hai ciang saen, f. 9 [tr. พระเจ้าเมืองขึ้นเมืองชายเมืองสาม]) or to Mùang Nai (see SRI 81.069.05.038–038: Lamdap latchakun wongsa nai miùang lan na, f. 13). The *Mingshi-lu* suggests that Ket’s forced abdication occurred one year earlier, in 1537, as in November 1537 a new “ruler of Lan Na” asked the Chinese emperor for recognition as the legitimate vassal king. This request was granted. See Winai 1996: 150.


159 Quoted from CMC-TPCM 1971: 72.
coalition had been held in Chiang Saen. The aristocrats who convened there decided to offer the crown of Lan Na to Settha Wangso, the 14-year-old son of the Lao king Phothisarat. Lan Sang under Phothisarat (r. 1520–1548) had developed into the dominant political and cultural power in the upper Mekong region. Since the end of the fifteenth century, learned monks from Lan Na had spread the “orthodox” Buddhism of the “Lan Na School”, which had reached its heyday under Tilok, to Laos. The exemplary character of the Buddhist scholarship of Chiang Mai shaped Lan Sang profoundly in the first half of the sixteenth century. King Phothisarat, who took a daughter of King Ket Kao as his consort, regarded himself after the death of his father-in-law and the onset of the fall of Lan Na as the protector of those religious and cultural ideals which bound the Tai Yuan and Lao with each other.

In the meantime, the threat to Chiang Mai increased. An army from Saen Wi emerged in front of the gate of Chiang Mai and demanded vengeance for the death of King Ket Cetthalat, who obviously had many followers among the Shan. Although the assailants were repulsed, they withdrew to Lamphun and called for help from Siamese troops from the Sukhothai region. In the meantime, the troops of the counter-coalition from Chiang Saen arrived at the capital and had the conspirators around Saen Khao executed for having committed regicide. In order to prevent further anarchy the opposing alliance appointed the princess Cilapapha as regent. She was to remain in office until Settha Wangso arrived in Chiang Mai. Further attacks of the Shan were repulsed, and with the Siamese likewise a modus vivendi was found after incurring heavy losses in fighting.

---

161 The marriage of Phothisarat and Nang Nőt Khan took place around 1532/33. The dynastic connection of Lan Na with the relatively stronger Lan Sang served, from the view point of Chiang Mai, as an insurance against the attempts of the Siamese expansion, but could also, from the perspective of Ayutthaya, be regarded as an encirclement aimed against Siam. See also Doré 1987: 738.
162 Was it a surprise that a section of the political elite of Lan Na, in particular those of the border zones in the north-east adjacent to Lan Sang, looked towards Luang Prabang and saw in Settha Wangso, the grandson of Müang Kaeo, the suitable heir apparent? On the development of Lan Sang in the beginning of the sixteenth century see Sila 1964: 46–54.
163 Probably the attackers had the direct support of the Burmese king as the Lao sources claimed. See Saveng 1987: 56.
The Lao crown prince arrived on 10 May 1546 at Chiang Saen, stayed there for three weeks and travelled in triumphal procession via Chiang Rai to Chiang Mai, where he arrived on 18 June of the same year. Two weeks later, on 2 July Settha Wangso was enthroned as the King of Lan Na and married the two daughters of the late ruler. However, Settha Wangso only resided in Chiang Mai for two years, not long enough to find a decisive solution for the disrupted country with the help of his advisors. When the young ruler of Lan Na learned of the death of his father, King Phothisarat, he left Chiang Mai on 8 August 1548 and rushed to Luang Prabang, where he had to suppress a rebellion of the aristocracy. He took the Phra Kaeo, a legendary Buddhist image made of jade (“The Emerald Buddha”), with him. After his coronation in Luang Prabang, Settha Wangso ruled as King (Saita) Setthathilat [Setthathirat] in personal union over two kingdoms, Lan Na and Lan Sang. Due to his absence in Chiang Mai, the civil war in Lan Na revived. In 1549, the troops from Phrae and Laos (Lan Sang) launched an attack, without success, on Chiang Mai.
As the chronicler remarks, for three years “a period of great discord” prevailed.\textsuperscript{172} It was a period without a ruler, a de facto interregnum. Not until the beginning of 1551 did Setthathilat officially abdicate in favour of his queen Cilapapha. It is not clear whether Cilapapha indeed ascended the throne the second time and ruled until 1553 as the Lao sources claim.\textsuperscript{173} Anyhow the Northern Thai chronicles report unanimously that immediately after the abdication of the Lao ruler in Chiang Mai the Privy Council held a meeting. The Privy Council, to which also the \textit{sangkharat}, the leader of the \textit{saṅgha} of Chiang Mai, belonged, did not comply with Setthathilat’s wishes; on the contrary they elected Mae Ku, a prince of Mūang Nai, to be the new king. He was a descendant of one branch of the Mangrai dynasty which could be traced back to Mangrai’s son Khūa.\textsuperscript{174} \textit{“The Chiang Rai Chronicle”} reports that Mae Ku “had fled and entered monkhood in Mūang Nai”. Concerning the more exact circumstances of his ordination, no information is provided in the sources. Thus it would have been interesting to know from whom Mae Ku had to run away to Mūang Nai: was he fleeing from his rivals in Chiang Mai? Or did Mae Ku enter the monastery only after he had been elected king? In this rather unlikely case, one is tempted to suggest that the new ruler of Lan Na wanted to improve his royal reputation by means of the religious merit he had to acquire beforehand. Mae Ku arrived in Chiang Mai on 21 May 1551\textsuperscript{175} and on 22 December 1551\textsuperscript{176} was solemnly enthroned.\textsuperscript{177}

Despite taking the trouble to tighten up the administration of the land, Mae Ku failed to get a new start. In mid-May 1552, the rulers (\textit{cao fa} จั้งพ้า) of Mūang Nai and Chiang Thòn turned up in front of the gates of Chiang Rai with a powerful army. Reinforced by troops of the governor of Fang, the two Shan princes conquered Chiang Rai and shortly thereafter Chiang Saen as well. The motives of the attackers and their relations to the new king, who also came from Mūang Nai, are unclear. The ruler of Mūang Nai, the leader of the invasion force, could have aimed at the territorial and political expansion of his own principality.\textsuperscript{178} It is possible that a secret pact was concluded with King Mae Ku to impair Setthathilat’s supporters, who were deeply rooted in Chiang Saen and Chiang Rai. This idea seems not at all absurd in view of the background of later events. In the year 1555, Setthathilat, who could not accept being deprived of power by princess Cilapapha, once more laid claim to the throne of Chiang Mai. An army from Luang Prabang, in which

\textsuperscript{172} CMC-TPCM 1971: 75 [ถัดเป็นกล้วยสุณามันกิจ].
\textsuperscript{173} Sila 1964: 56.
\textsuperscript{174} \textit{Phūn mūang chiang rai}, Saraswadee 1993: 49 [f° 17 in original text]. The concerned text reads: tr. [...] ห้ามแก่นั้นมาแฉ่งชัยราชวงศ์ หนีไปอยู่อุปราชภูมย์.
\textsuperscript{175} On the fourth day of the waxing moon in the ninth month of the year C.S. 913.
\textsuperscript{176} On the tenth day of the waxing moon in the fourth month of the year C.S. 913.
\textsuperscript{178} First of all this very likely view is represented by Saraswadee 1988: 14.
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many Tai Lü also fought, was sent to re-conquer Lan Na. Chiang Saen fell, indeed after combats suffering heavy casualties, at the hands of the Lao, but a further advance of Setthathilat was blocked by the stiff resistance of Shan troops from Müang Nai.\(^{179}\)

The effective sphere of influence of Mae Ku did not extend far beyond the core region of Chiang Mai and Lamphun, and it is revealing that the Chinese sources called Chiang Saen, during the period of the Jiajing reign (1552–1566), the “Kingdom of the Lesser Eight Hundred [Daughters-in law] (Xiao Babai)”, namely a political unit independent from Chiang Mai.\(^{180}\) One manuscript even mentions that in the year C.S. 917 (1555/56 AD) “King Mae Ku marched with an army [out to battle], but failed to capture Lampang”.\(^{181}\) The text does not give any clue why Mae Ku launched an attack on Lampang. Was it because there was unrest, which was perhaps connected to the fighting for Chiang Saen? A year later, in 1556/57, Mae Ku must have brought the situation in Lampang under control, because the king consecrated a relic in the monastery of Phra Mahathat Lampang.

Burma under King Bayinnaung (r. 1551–1581) had set about establishing a great Buddhist empire and subjugating all her eastern and southern neighbours. Almost without resistance, Lan Na fell to the Burmese invaders. After a siege of only three days, Chiang Mai capitulated on 2 April 1558;\(^{182}\) within a few months, Lan Na was completely overrun by Burmese troops.\(^{183}\) The Burmese were surprised that they encountered in Chiang Mai — in contrast to the likewise-conquered Shan regions — almost no resistance:

> In the year C.S. 920 [1558/59 AD] the king gained victory over all the big and small lands, namely the land of the Shan as well as the land of the Lao and the land of the Tai Yuan in Chiang Mai. However, Chiang Mai did not put up a fight; her ruler came out and offered his submission.\(^{184}\)


\(^{180}\) Mingshi Gao, Chapter 189, Liew n.d.: 37.

\(^{181}\) [เข้าเมืองกู่ย์ กังวดี ใหญ่เมืองต่างๆ ได้]. See MS, Hundius Collection: Phùn wongsā mahakhasat tanglai [...], f° 57.

\(^{182}\) The siege began on Wednesday, on the eleventh day of the waxing moon in the seventh month, the New Year day of the year C.S. 920, viz. on 30 March 1558. In fact it was not on the twelfth but on the eleventh day of the month Caitra. Here we follow the tables and procedure of calculation of Eade.


\(^{184}\) Maharachawong phongsawadan phama 2002: 67.
Which were the deeper causes of Lan Na’s fall that were responsible for the loss of independence? How far can these causes be dated back? Even the contemporaries gave no rational explanation in a modern sense. They saw first of all that it was the work of the spirits and demons in taking revenge for severe violation of ritual prescriptions (NT: khiit). But economic and ecological reasons were known as well, even if they were mostly mentioned as atypical incidents. A chronicle summarises the complex causes in eleven points:

Cause 1: The corpses of the deceased would be removed from the Cang Phuak Gate and — taking a crescent — brought to the Hua Lin corner, thereby destroying the ayu muede. Moreover, no respect was paid to the two Phañ Cang Phuak and to the two Phañ Latcasi in the north of the city by sprinkling them with sacred water.

Cause 2: Around the old wiang a new wiang was built, which like Râhu encircled the [old] wiang.

Cause 3: In the city three sacrificial shrines, like the one of cedi, were constructed.

Cause 4: The [entire] population caused damage to the Nong Bua Hok Kö (pond). They scooped out the water until the pond dried up. The people went out and barricaded Huai Kaeo (a streamlet in Chiang Mai).

Cause 5: In the southern part of the town a monastery was constructed.

---

185 SRI 82.112.05.091-091: Tamnan mae ku münde lan cang taek, ff 18–20; see also SRI 85.144.05.136: Tamnan lan na lan chang, ff 20–23. Compare also with the related and already transcribed manuscript Tamnan pûn münde lan na ciang mai, SRI 1981: 17–22 (ff 15–17 in original manuscripts).


187 MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f’18/1–2: tr. เทศวรารว 1 นั้นด้วยยถึงอ่ำชนิดี ออกหัวปู่ข้ามเดือก และเกี่ยว พวกสงข์ทำรั่วอยู่ยุ่งเมื่อ และในระาชมือเดือก 2 ด้วยเวียงในพระราชี 2 ด้วยเวียงใน มันเพี้ยนที่ไหล ยมอยู่ระสวาง ได้ยแน.

188 MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f’18/3: tr. เทศวรารว 2 นั้นด้วยสั่งเวียงในอ่ำแม่เวียงแก่ที่ถึงย่องหัวตกใน เยียงนั้น.

189 Literally meaning “Lake of the six groups of Lotus plants”.

190 MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f’18/3: tr. เทศวรารว 3 นั้นด้วยถูกแม่มิ่นอ่ำดินน้ือ เก็บมิ่น 3 เชิงนั้น.

191 MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f’18/3–4: tr. เทศวรารว 4 นั้นด้วยถูกต่ำหลำไหลในพระวิรัฏหันบ้า 6 กอนนั้น ดียางในดีย ที่อ่ำน ที่ย่อมเดือก หัวแย่ง ที่ก็สอนก้าดินน้ือเดือกทัน.

192 MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f’18/4: tr. เทศวรารว 5 นั้นด้วยสั่งเวียงในอ่ำเวียงหลัง 1 มีหัวรั่วออกแจ่ง ได้ยใน เยียง นั้น.
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Population and state in Lan Na prior to the mid-sixteenth century

Cause 6: The wood for coffins was thrown away (i.e. not burned along with the corpses) and then used anew (in the country).\(^{193}\)

Cause 7: The corpses of the deceased were taken and ceremoniously burned within the confines of the city.\(^{194}\)

Cause 8: The corpses of the deceased were taken and burned by the water [bank of the Ping] on sandbanks and in the monasteries.\(^{195}\)

Cause 9: All the inhabitants were prohibited to offer sacrifices to the guardian spirits of the city as well as to sacrifice the Inthakhin stone pillars,\(^{196}\) the *six kumbhara, pu sae* and *ya sae*,\(^{197}\) as well as [the spirits] in the hills of the North and the South.\(^{198}\)

Cause 10: From the ninth to twelfth month [May/June to August/September] the inhabitants were recruited to cut down trees, from the crowns to the stumps. The [tree trunks] were to be sawn into pieces of one *wa* [c. 2 m] in length and then dragged to the river. Those who dodged [the work] would be sentenced to death. [The people] must work day and night to cut down the trees of the forests. The cutting down of the trees and transporting them lasted incessantly, that means one cut the big trees from the ninth to the new moon of the twelfth month, until the work was stopped. Between the fifth and eighth month [January/February to April/May] the forest workers rested. It was so every year. The wood drifting on the river destroyed the dams on the banks. The people had to restore [the dams]. After some time the dams eroded again. Nobody could plough the fields and transplant the seedlings. No matter in which river or in which stream, nowhere could the

---

\(^{193}\) MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f° 18/4–5: tr. เหล่าชาว 6 บันดัญไม่ใหญ่ฝั้นเอื้อฟู แล้วเพีย ร่วมกันเอาเข้า มาบ้านมาเมืองแล.

\(^{194}\) MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f° 18/5: tr. เหล่าชาว 7 บันดัญเอาซึ้งผลละแวกแล้วไปบ้านเมือง.

\(^{195}\) MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, ff° 18/5–19/1: tr. เหล่าชาว 8 บันดัญเอาซึ้งผลละแวกแล้วก้ น้ำแล้วก้ชายและยังวัฒน์แล.

\(^{196}\) They apply to the three most important sites of Chiang Mai: the relic of the Monastery Đô Suthep (พระธาตุเจ้าสุทโพ), the relics of the Phra Kaeo (พระแก้ว) and of Phra Sing (พระศิลป) and the Inthakhin pillars (เสาหินอัศจรรย์). Moreover, two albino elephants and two royal lions, which were within the city walls, are mentioned (tr. พระยาจ้างเมืองสอบด้ำหว่าเวียงและพระยачิตสงสิ่งด้ำหว่าเวียง). Further auspicious animals are the six elephants of the Maha Cedi Luang and the two Phaña Kho in the lower part [namely in the south] of the city of Chiang Mai (tr. พระยาพญาโหมด 2 ตัวใหญ่โตเวียง). See SRI 85.144.05.136: “Tamnan lan na lan canh”, ff° 4–5.

\(^{197}\) Guardian spirits of the Lua, to which the Tai Yuan inhabitants of Chiang Mai offered sacrifices.

\(^{198}\) MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f° 19/1: tr. เหล่าชาว 9 ตัวหว่าคันคนที่ห้วยสองไผ่เนิน ปริภูมิพื้นที่เมือง ยางพ์พายา ราสีต่อเนื่อง แล้วแท้งหว่ากับลูกเมืองฟ้อง 6 คนแล้ ผูและยังจะตอบลายต่อถอดคิดหา เลื้องโพธิ โทยโพธิ้งห้วย.
inhabitants find water [to irrigate] the rice-fields. Further cutting
down the trees was prohibited.\textsuperscript{199}

\textbf{Cause 11:} The king entrusted scoundrels to collect the taxes. They were
all very busy extracting money from the people of the m\textit{üang}.
Whatever they found was carried away.\textsuperscript{200}

Seven out of the eleven above-mentioned causes are related to violation of ritual
regulations, but Cause 4 and Cause 10 cite the unrestrained exploitation of natural
resources of the land as the causal factor. The drying up of the Huai Kaeo and other
waters hampered the drinking water supply of the town. Moreover, the unscrupu-
lous cutting down of trees in the forests (deforestation) in areas further away from
Chiang Mai city upset the ecological equilibrium in the plain of the Ping River and,
perhaps, also led to a reduction in rice production.\textsuperscript{201}

The construction of “a new \textit{wiang} near the old one” (Cause 2) obviously
refers to the complete renovation of the outer walls of Chiang Mai around 1517.
At about the same time, Lamphun got a new brick wall. Three years later the
monastery, which was under the patronage of the king, was renovated.

These were two extravagant religious and secular construction projects,
which were a heavy burden on the royal budget and the population of Lan Na. The
labourers and estates, which were donated for the maintenance of the monasteries,
as well as other religiously motivated taxes, were at least partially lost in the
productive sector of the economy. Damage limited to natural catastrophes also gave
rise to great deficits in the national finances. In 1530/31 a fire destroyed the new
royal palace built by M\textit{üang} Kaeo. A year later, in February/March 1532, a
conflagration broke out at Ban Ta Pae near Chiang Mai. The affected population
obtained from King Ket, the queen and the queen’s mother compensation amounting
to 20,000 \textit{ngoen}.\textsuperscript{202} M\textit{üang} Kaeo and his successor tried to solve the financial

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[\textsuperscript{199}] MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f°19/2–5: tr. เทวดาสืบบันคืนเมื่อ ล้าน 9 เดือน
สืบ ต้นสิบมืด ต้นสิบสอง
\item[\textsuperscript{200}] MS, SRI 82.112.05.091–091, f°19/5–20/1: tr. เทวดา 11 บันทึกมากรานจ้ามี อาชญาที่เสพ[Math]
\item[\textsuperscript{201}] In the manuscripts there are several indications on the outbreak of famines (NT: \textit{tupphikkhaphaya}
\item[\textsuperscript{202}] MS, Hundius Collection: \textit{Phûn wongsa mahakhasat tanglai} [...], f°53.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
problems by increasing taxes (Cause 11) as well as by monetary manipulation. The result of it was an inflationary development, which must have grave consequences for the autarkic agrarian society of Lan Na, as Hans Penth comments:

Within about 30 years, there seems to have occurred a rising of prices, an inflation of over 40% which must have been a serious problem for a ‘national economy’ that was mainly based on agriculture for local consumption but not without an ‘industry’ and internal and external trade. People at that time did not at all grasp what happened to the ‘value of their money’ and thought that the spirits were angry or that the conjunction of the stars was not good.\(^{203}\)

The empirical foundation for this thesis, which looks obvious at first glance, is nevertheless weak. Penth refers to Notton’s remark that a variant of the CMC (a manuscript differing from that on which his translation was based) mentions the manipulation of the weights and the systematic devaluation of the cowrie currency by several of the kings of Lan Na. According to Notton, Mùaŋ Kaeo (r. 1495–1526) devalued the currency from 100 units to 98 [units]. Among his successors, Ket (r. 1526–1538) devaluated it to 80, Tao Cai to 70 and Mae Ku (r. 1551–1564) finally to 58 units.\(^{204}\) We do not know which manuscript Notton relied on. However, Saraswadee Ongsakul discovered a phapsa manuscript from the monastery Pa Lan (District San Kamphaeng, Chiang Mai) that confirms Notton’s statement:

\[\ldots\] The aristocrats and the officials should not act wrongly by ruining the foundations of their country. There are three points to be mentioned: They destroyed the “Thousand Bases”. \[\ldots\] Moreover, they devalued the bia (cowrie currency) by reducing the value of 100 but issued and spent it as 100. The three reasons meant a breaking of taboos (khút). Our country will be in shambles. It happened as follows: Pha Mùaŋ Kaeo fixed [the rate] that 98 bia should be the value of 100 bia. Tao Ai Kao [Phaña Ket] decided that 80 bia should be the value of 100 bia. Tao Cai defined that 70 bia should be the value of 100 bia. Tao Upaño [Setthathilat] decreed that 60 bia should have the value of 100 bia. Pha Mae Ku fixed the value for 58 bia to be 100 bia. Because of the three reasons the

---

\(^{203}\) Penth 1994b: 23.
\(^{204}\) Notton 1932: 164, fn. 5.
rulers and the land were ruined. If less than 10,000 [bia] are raised to 10,000 [bia]; if less than 1,000 [bia] are raised to 1,000 [bia]; if less than 100 [bia] are raised to 100 [bia], this surely will lead to total destruction.205

The manuscript confirms the systematic devaluation of the cowrie currency by a total of 42 per cent within half a century.206 While analysing Northern Thai Pali manuscripts, Oskar von Hinüber came across colophons in which the prices of producing the respective manuscripts were given. Sometimes even the cost of the materials (e.g., the price for a bundle of palm leaves) and the workers’ wages were differentiated. Von Hinüber draws the conclusion that the prices of the materials between the years 1531/32 and 1588 had increased by 25 times, whereas the workers’ wages had dropped slightly.207 As the data which von Hinüber used for his calculation were taken from only eight manuscripts, four of which came from a single monastery (Wat Si Bun Rüang), his conclusion is based on weak statistical evidence. His basic idea of locating socio-economic data from the colophons of Northern Thai manuscripts, however, seems very promising. Extensive analyses of the colophons of the numerous manuscripts that are still awaiting evaluation might produce fruitful results.

As for the decline of the economy and the political disintegration of Lan Na during the three decades after the death of Müang Kaeo, the monarch’s weak successors or the selfishness of the aristocrats alone cannot entirely explain the disaster. None of the five kings who ruled Lan Na after 1526 died as a reigning sovereign. They were either deposed, forced to abdicate, or murdered. Such great turbulences at the highest level of state leadership would have shaken even the most stable society, with lasting consequences as well. On the other hand, questioning the reasons for the fragile structures of state and society in Lan Na is legitimate; these were weaknesses, evident long before the eventual fall of Chiang

---

205 The quotation is taken from f°29 of a manuscript with the non-authentic title prawattisat, kotmai boran [ประเทศไทย. คตมัยปุรน]. See Saraswadee 1996: 208. The quotation in the exact wording reads: “ตร. […] ห้าพระยาน้           ยานยที่ดิตต้สัมฉานาน  เมื่อนั้นในไทยนั้นก็มี  มี 3 ประการ คือมีหลักพ้น 1 ว่าไถ่เมื่อง 2 ที่ อันหนึ่งสิ่งเป็นสิ่ง ที่อยู่แสบเรียบร้อยไปทั้งหมด  ทศ 3 ประการนี้คือ เลื่อมิ่น แฟดื่ม แฟด็อสึ่งเมื่อง เที่ยงดี พระเมื่องกัน แต่เนื่อง 98 ที่เนื่อง 100 ดาเดิมกัน แต่เนื่อง 80 แป้น 100 ดาเดิมกัน แต่เนื่อง 70 แป้น 100 ดาเดิมกัน แต่เนื่อง 60 เซ็น 100 พระศักดิ์ แต่เนื่อง 58 ที่เนื่อง 100 ทศ 3 ประการนี้ แฟดื่มนิ่งเมื่องกับเมื่อง เดิมกันได้ทัศ ชาญ ฟีน ว่าช้ามัน ไม่น้อยกว่า 3,000 ว่า 100 พอโคก 100 ว่า 100 ย่าหนึ่งยวันไม่ขยันและ […]”.

206 Obviously the amount referred to as “100 bia” mentioned in the above quotation represents the fixed point of the beginning of each devaluation. Not completely excluded is the textual reading, that the amount referred to as “100 bia” represents the original value of the cowrie currency before the respective devaluations. In this — rather unlikely — case the total inflation rate, according to our calculation, is more than 81 per cent [= 100% - (0.98 x 0.80 x 0.70 x 0.60 x 0.58 x 100%)].
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Mai, but simmering in the “golden age” of the kings Trilok and Müang Kaeo under a splendid surface. It can hardly be treated as a mere coincidence that the rapid downfall of Lan Na was preceded by the reign of Müang Kaeo, during which ambitious religious projects (construction of monasteries, donations of Buddha images, making duplicates of the Pali canon, etc.) were promoted. Moreover, as shown in the second section of this article the political and economic control by the state centre personified by the king was by no means indisputable.

5. Conclusion

The kingdom of Lan Na was not a unitary polity. It had come into existence after the merger of two core regions: the plain of Chiang Rai and Chiang Saen in the northeast and the Ping-Kuang river basin with Chiang Mai as its centre in the southwest. The latter emerged as the “winner” at the beginning of the fifteenth century. Tight control of manpower was crucial in this sparsely populated region which was four-fifths mountainous areas. It is argued that the nai sip system of organising the workforce was perhaps due to Chinese or Mongolian influences prior to the founding of Lan Na. The territorial administration of Lan Na was characterised by the panna, administrative units below the müang level, which seemed to have been restricted to rice-growing areas. The most detailed historical evidence for the panna system is to be found in the northeastern region of Chiang Saen, Chiang Rai, and Phayao, which were its possible places of origin.

Notwithstanding attempts to centralise the administrative structure, notably during the reign of King Tilok (1441–1487), Lan Na nevertheless resembled a conglomeration of large autonomous müang rather than an empire built around a consolidated core region, as was more or less the case for Ayutthaya (Siam) and Ava (Burma). Even in the phase of Lan Na’s great expansion of power during the second half of the fifteenth century, the müang of the northeast maintained a high degree of autonomy. In the period of decline (1526–1558) the north-south division deepened. The final disintegration of Lan Na was precipitated by a combination of political, economic and demographic factors.

208 The following quotation taken from Aung Twin (1976: 231) on the thesis presented for the rise and fall of Pagan — change accordingly — may also be applied to the post Müang Kaeo era:

“[Pagan’s great King Aniruddha] had sown the seeds of self-destruction by making the sangha the main recipient for the flow of land and labour and thereby inviting the decentralisation of economic and political structures, a process which was to have serious repercussions for the state in the thirteenth century. By his actions he had created a new situation that his successors had to face — by changing — or perish.”
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Abbreviations

C.S. Cūlasakarāja (“Little Era” = Christian Era minus 638)
CMC Chiang Mai Chronicle
CSC Chiang Saen Chronicle
CTC Chiang Tung Chronicle
HP Hans Penth version
HSH Hō samut haengchat (National Library)
JSC Jengtung State Chronicle
JKM Jinakālamālipakaraṇāṃ
LP Luang Prasoet
N Notton version
NC Nan Chronicle
PMCT Phongsawadan Müang Chiang Tung
PMN Phongsawadan müang nan
PPKSA Phra-ratcha phongsawadan krung si ayutthaya
PC Phayao Chronicle
PSC Prachum silacarūk
PY Phongsawadan yonok
SN Samnak nayok ratthamontri version
SRI Social Research Institute
TMP Tamnan müang phayao
TMSC Tamnan müang chiang saen
TMY Tamnan müang yòng
TPCM Tamnan phūn müang chiang mai
tr. transcription (from Northern Thai to Siamese script)
TSHR Tamnan sip ha ratchawong
W Wyatt (translation of PMN)
WSKK Wat Si Khom Kham version
WSBR Wat Si Bun Rüang version
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