

# Some Annotations to *The Chiang Mai Chronicle*: The Era of Burmese Rule in Lan Na

Ken Kirigaya

ABSTRACT—The account of the era of Burmese rule in Lan Na in *The Chiang Mai Chronicle* includes many flaws and fictions, especially during the Nyaungyan period. As the original text is primarily a duplicate of another chronicle from Chiang Sæn, its 19th century author inserted or fabricated some episodes in order to shift the center of its narrative from Chiang Sæn to Chiang Mai, thereby distorting some historical facts. As a result, *The Chiang Mai Chronicle*'s account of this era needs to be read with the utmost caution, and scholars should always compare its narrative with other sources from Lan Na and Burma.

## Introduction

As Lan Na was endowed with a “long and rich tradition of history-writing”, there are more than a hundred extant versions of the chronicles of Chiang Mai, which, according to the late David K. Wyatt’s classification, can be largely divided into three groups: short-abbreviated, middle-length, and longer-detailed versions (CMC, xxxi-ii).<sup>1</sup> Several of the long-detailed versions have been translated into Thai, and have become an indispensable source for the study of Lan Na history by those without knowledge of the Northern Thai alphabet, locally known as *tua tham* (*tham* or *dhamma* script).<sup>2</sup> For a long time, the only translation into a Western language available to those unable to read Thai, was the work of Camille Notton, the French Consul in Chiang Mai in the 1920s and 1930s. Notton’s scrupulous text was a valuable reference work for scholarship outside Thailand for over sixty years until

---

<sup>1</sup> Abbreviations of chronicle titles are explained at the foot of this article.

<sup>2</sup> These include: *Phongsawadan Yonok* (a secondary work of the late 19th century by Phraya Prachakitkorachak, a high-ranking Siamese official in charge of the administration of Northern Thailand), edited by Sanguan Chotisukkharat in 1971; *Tamnan Sipha Ratchawong* [Chronicle of the 15 Dynasties] published by the Social Research Institute of Chiang Mai University in 1981-90, and later revised by Sommai Premchit in 1997; and *Tamnan Phiin Müang Chiang Mai, chabap Chiang Mai 700 Pi* [The 700th Anniversary Volume of the Chiang Mai Chronicle] compiled by Udom Rungruang Sri, et al. in 1995. For a concise account on the tradition of translating various texts of the Chiang Mai chronicle, see CMC, pp. xxxii-xv, and LNCH, pp. 9-10.

the publication in 1995 of *The Chiang Mai Chronicle* (CMC), meticulously translated by the late David K. Wyatt and Aroonrut Wichienkeo. With this publication, one of the most important historiographical works of Lan Na became accessible to a wider readership without access to indigenous primary materials or knowledge of Thai.

The CMC, however, contains errors and flaws because of mistakes in the Northern Thai manuscript known as the *Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai* (TPMCM), which was the source of the original text (here abbreviated as CMC/1288), on which the translation is based.<sup>3</sup> Like other classical works of history-writing found throughout the region, the TPMCM includes many later additions and revisions as well as faulty accounts of dates and events, especially during the era of Burmese rule in Lan Na which is mostly “centered on Chiang Sæn rather than Chiang Mai.” (CMC, p. xxxix) As Wyatt correctly detected, the first five folios of the sixth fascicle of the CMC/1288 are a virtual duplicate of a certain chronicle from Chiang Sæn. The unknown author of the TPMCM had not simply copied these passages but had “clearly edited them to suit his own understanding of history,” or more correctly, garbled some of the sentences to make the account centered on Chiang Mai. As a result, some references in the text during the Burmese years are irreconcilable with the context. Furthermore, these folios have only a series of simple headings, without detailed narratives of each event, thus providing only a sketchy account of Lan Na with many lacunae during the Nyaungyan era.

Following Wyatt’s wish that future scholarship would improve the “imperfect” text (CMC: xliii), this article offers a fuller account of the era of Burmese rule in Lan Na by consulting a wider range of sources, principally Burmese and Lan Na, occasionally Chinese, Siamese, as well as European, thereby setting some of the hitherto debatable and uncertain records straight, and bringing a few unknown factual matters to light.

Burmese domination of Lan Na lasted intermittently for more than two centuries, from Bayinnaung’s conquest of the region in 1558 until the final liberation of Chiang Mai in 1775 by the allied forces of local leaders and the new Siamese king, Taksin.<sup>4</sup> The two hundred-year period, despite its length and significance in the history of Lan Na and, to some extent, of Burma, has been a subject largely neglected by scholars,<sup>5</sup> in part because the Burmese era, especially the Nyaungyan period, is “only

<sup>3</sup> The late-1820s archetype of the CMC/1288 and of another transcription dated 1854 is the *Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai* [Chronicle of Chiang Mai], abbreviated as TPMCM. The 1854 version is abbreviated as CMC/1216. It is not clear whether the CMC/1216 is the master copy of the CMC/1288. There are a few minor differences in the spelling, perhaps due to scribal errors.

<sup>4</sup> The Burmese, however, would keep a hold on Chiang Sæn until 1804.

<sup>5</sup> Two notable exceptions to this academic trend are Latdawal Sænsiao’s 200 Years, a book-length study of the Burmese presence in Lan Na, and Sarassawadee Ongsakul’s *History of Lan Na*, with a whole chapter on the same topic. Meanwhile there seem to be few Burmese scholars whose research focus is on Lan Na, the territory once under Burmese monarchy but currently in a neighboring country. U Kala, a celebrated historian of the early 18th century, was also indifferent to affairs in

cursorily reflected” in the CMC and other indigenous sources. In addition, the image of a “dark age” in Lan Na under ruthless Burmese oppression, particularly when compared to the preceding “golden age” under the Mangrai Dynasty, has further deterred scholarly attention. For example, the TPMCM has very thin coverage of the Nyaungyan period compared to its rich detail on the succeeding Konbaung Dynasty, especially the anti-Burmese resistance by Kawila and his younger brothers.<sup>6</sup> This article focuses on the years of Nyaungyan rule, the period with the most fragmentary and insufficient coverage in the CMC.

### A note on Lan Na sources for the Burmese period

The TPMCM seems to have been written as an eulogy to King Kawila and his younger brothers, whose anti-Burmese struggles and close alliance with the Thonburi-Bangkok leaders are the dominant subjects in the sixth and seventh fascicles. The chronicle thus reflects the view from Chiang Mai with anti-Burmese and pro-Siamese biases. The author of the TPMCM showed far less enthusiasm about the Nyaungyan years, drawing on a single source and spending only a few pages on a period of more than a century. For the period of Burmese rule, the historian must consult records from other Lan Na domains to neutralize this Chiang Mai-centric perspective. The Burmese chronicles, renowned for their factual accuracy, are also useful to cross-check and supplement the accounts of the CMC. Chinese and Siamese records and European observations are also useful, but to a much smaller extent.

The account in the CMC up to 1706, including the era of Nyaungyan rule, is virtually a verbatim copy from a Chiang Sæn chronicle, written according to Wyatt by “a certain Suriyavamsa Bhikku of Chiang Sæn in 1741.”<sup>7</sup> Although I have so far had no access to this chronicle, known as MS1741, it was probably part of a long tradition with both earlier and later versions. Accordingly, I came across a manuscript titled *Phün Müang Chiang Rai Chiang Sæn*, abbreviated as CSC/1251, which has an account of Burmese rule that is identical to that in the CMC, and hence to that in MS1741.<sup>8</sup> The CSC/1251 was transcribed into Thai by Sarassawadee Ongsakul, a prominent historian of Lan Na, who also transcribed a chronicle entitled *Phün Müang Chiang Sæn* that provides a longer, more detailed, and somewhat different

---

the imperial periphery, and has little in his magnum opus on Burmese administration in Lan Na.

<sup>6</sup> The sixth and seventh fascicles of the chronicle that vividly depict the princely brothers’ heroic battles against the Burmese were probably compiled under their auspices (LNCH, p. 11). Wyatt was “inclined to think that fascicles 7 and 8 were written together in 1827 or 1828 by a single author.” (CMC, p. xxxvi)

<sup>7</sup> CMC, p. xxxviii. The manuscript is titled *History of the Lineage of the Kings of Lan Na Thai*, abbreviated as MS1741.

<sup>8</sup> The accounts in the CSC/1251 and CMC respectively begin to converge in the year 1564/65 and diverge in the mid-1710s.

account.<sup>9</sup> Since it is generally unlikely that the longer version was expanded from a shorter original, CSC/1251 may be an abridged version of CSC/065.<sup>10</sup> In any case, both chronicles of Chiang Sæn are valuable for deconstructing the Chiang Mai-centric perspective prevalent in the CMC.<sup>11</sup>

The chronicles of other Lan Na domains and neighboring Tai polities provide only supplemental information, as their accounts of the Nyaungyan era are minimal and very brief, but include some information not found in either the CMC or PMCS.<sup>12</sup> Other than the local chronicles, a travel poem called *Khlong Mangthra Rop Chiang Mai* is a valuable reference, as it has uniquely rich detail on the events from Bayinnaung's annexation of Lan Na in 1558 to its reconquest by Anauk-hpetlun in 1614-15, including the succession dispute in the ruling house of Chiang Mai in the late 1600s and the associated court intrigue that would eventually invite Siamese interference and ultimately the Burmese invasion. This unique source is a first-hand account by a "high-ranking" military or civil officer, who was taken to Pegu when Chiang Mai fell to the Burmese army led by Anauk-hpetlun, and was later appointed by Anauk-hpetlun as governor of Thoën on the southern frontier of Lan Na (Udom 2006: 394). As the unknown poet was an eyewitness to these events, his piece should be reliable.

### Annotations and supplements to the text

- 1) On the twelfth waxing of the seventh month, the day of the New Year beginning the pœk sanga year, s. 920 (31 March 1558), the king of Pegu moved his army to encamp on the Chang Phap, and he besieged the city for three days and three nights, until Saturday, the full-moon day of the seventh

<sup>9</sup> The Thai translation of *Phün Müang Chiang Rai Chiang Sæn* is abbreviated as CRCS, and that of Phün Müang Chiang Sæn as PMCS. The original manuscript of the latter chronicle is currently kept at the National Library, Thailand, under code number 951/3, which has so far been inaccessible to me. However, in the microfilm collection of the Social Research Institute, I found an undated manuscript titled *Tamnan Phün Müang Ngøenyang Chiang Sæn*, more or less identical to the 951/3 manuscript. This microfilmed version is numbered 81.066.05.065 by the Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University, thus abbreviated CSC/065.

<sup>10</sup> Indeed, as we shall see below, there occasionally are traces of hasty copying of the CSC/065 in the CMC and CSC/1251.

<sup>11</sup> I basically cite the published Thai versions, PMCS and CRCS, rather than the microfilmed CSC/065 and CSC/1251, for the sake of accessibility. When necessary to check the spelling, I look into the original Northern Thai manuscripts.

<sup>12</sup> These include: *Tamnan Lamphun* [Chronicle of Lamphun] (TLP), dated cs 1174 (1812/13), providing slightly different accounts on the events in the 1550s and 1560s, before and after Bayinnaung's annexation of Lan Na; *The Nan Chronicle* (NC), also translated by David Wyatt, with a more detailed passage corresponding to the Burmese one on the Nyaungyan expedition against Nan in the early 1700s; *The Chronicle of Chiang Khæng* (CCK), with its observation from afar on the affairs in the Ping River Basin, offering information which all the Lan Na texts seem to overlook.

month, a Thai *tao set* day (2 April 1558), in the morning, when he took the city of Chiang Mai (CMC: 123).

Bayinnaung left Pegu in October 1557 and went to Chiang Mai, pacifying Müang Nai, and other Shan principalities along the way (UK II: 307-12). There seems to be no difference between Burmese and Lan Na sources on the route Bayinnaung took and the dating of his conquest of Chiang Mai. The Burmese U Kala chronicle (UK) basically agrees with the CMC on these issues (UK II: 315-6). Although UK has no date for the conquest, it records that Bayinnaung left Pegu in October 1557 and arrived back in Ava in July 1558, consistent with CMC's dating of the fall of Chiang Mai to 2 April 1558 (UK II: 307; 318).

2) King Pøng Phawa Min Taya then handed over rule of all the country of Chiang Mai to King Mæ Ku to be king in Lan Na as before (CMC: 124).

The name of the Lan Na king confirmed by Bayinnaung differs in Lan Na and Burmese sources. While the former refers to him as "Mæ Ku," the latter uses "Bra Than (Phra Sam)" (UK II: 315). In Lan Na sources, Mæ Ku is described as a remote descendant of King Mangrai, and as a prince of Müang Nai across the Salween River. The Burmese source describes Phra Sam as a son of Baña Kyan, supposedly Phraya Kæo, who reigned in Chiang Mai from 1495 to 1526. One Lan Na chronicle, *Tamnan Chiang Mai*, seems to endorse the parentage between Kæo and Mæ Ku, although it has no reference to Phra Sam and Baña Kyan (TCM: 1/2).

3) On the fourth waning of the eighth month (6 May 1558), the King Min Taya took his army and returned to Pegu (CMC: 124).

According to a local chronicle, Bayinnaung went down to Lamphun to pay reverence to the Great Reliquary there on 3 May, and then left Chiang Mai on 8 May (TLP: 43/3-4). According to UK, he returned to Ava, not Pegu, in July 1558, after some military conflicts in the Shan Highlands to the west of the Salween River (UK II: 318). According to the Burmese source, Bayinnaung left behind a garrison of ten thousand at Chiang Mai, the same figure as in the CMC.

4) In the *pæk sanga*, the same year, sixth waxing of the fifth month, a Mon Friday, Thai *pæk san* (13 January 1559), King Mæ Ku, the Holy, went in procession to fight the Chawa enemy and those provincial lords who were Chawa (CMC: 125).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Chawa here means the Lao of Luang Prabang.

The CMC has no mention of Burmese involvement in this campaign. According to UK, Bayinnaung heard that the rulers of Phræ, Nan, Lampang, Thøeng, Phayao, and Chiang Khòng were threatening Chiang Mai. Bayinnaung thus appointed the *bayin* (lord) of Ava as commander, who left Ava in November 1558, and led Burmese and Chiang Mai forces against these rulers (UK II: 319-321). The Burmese account is somehow supported by at least one local chronicle, *Tamnan Lamphun* (TLP), which mentions the Lord of Ava and Mae Kue jointly commanding the northern campaign. Furthermore, UK and this Lamphun chronicle agree on the names of the Burmese generals, Baña Dala and Baña Sek (Phraya Tala and Phraya Cak in TLP), in charge of a garrison at Chiang Mai, and the name of the Lan Na minister, Baña Thenlon (Phraya Sænluang), who was assigned to govern Nan (UK II: 320-1; TLP: 43/4-44/1).

5) In the *kap cai* year, s. 926 (1564/65), King Mæ Ku rebelled against the Cao Pøeng Phawa Min Taya, king of Pegu. The king of Pegu brought up an army and took Chiang Mai, and captured Cao Thao Mæ Ku and brought him back to Pegu, leaving Lady Wisutthathewi to rule the domain in his place (CMC: 127).

Bayinnaung left Pegu in November 1564. After pacifying Lan Na and reorganizing the administration, he left Chiang Mai in April 1565 and arrived in Pegu in the following month (UK II: 356-62). The Burmese chronicle claims that Mæ Ku had neglected a Burmese order to join an expedition to Ayutthaya the previous year, resulting in the Burmese punitive expedition against Chiang Mai (UK II: 353). The TLP has a somewhat different story: first the ruler of Müang Fang disobeyed the order of some lord (Bayinnaung or Mæ Ku) to take part in an expedition against Ayutthaya in s. 925 (1563/64); escaping from the southern campaign and returning to Lamphun, the Müang Fang lord advanced on Chiang Mai where he was killed in battle; then, the next year, rulers of Chiang Sæn and Lampang rebelled against Bayinnaung, who in anger took Mæ Ku and the ruler of Chiang Sæn down to Pegu (TLP: 44/2-3). The UK and TLP agree that Mæ Ku and the ruler of Chiang Sæn were taken into custody at Pegu, while the CMC only refers to the capture of Mæ Ku.<sup>14</sup>

Both the Burmese and Chiang Sæn chronicles also refer to the appointment of Lady Wisutthathewi, but she is called “Maha Dewi” in the UK, “Ratcha Thewi” in the PMCS, and “Nang Thewi” in the CRCS (UK II: 362; PMCS: 109).

<sup>14</sup> PMCS (p. 108) notes that Mæ Ku, Phraya Kamphon (ruler of Chiang Sæn), and the ruler of Lampang together rebelled against Bayinnaung, who then came to take Chiang Mai and sent Mæ Ku and, not the ruler of Chiang Sæn, but his family down to Pegu. PY (p. 401) refers to Mæ Ku and Phraya Kramon (must be Kamphon of the PMCS) as the rebels and captives.

6) In s. 940, a *pæk yi* year (1578/79), Lady Wisutthithewi<sup>15</sup> died.... In this same year, the Prince Min Taya had his son, named Prince Tharrawaddy Nòratha Min Khoi, come to rule the domain of Chiang Mai (CMC: 127).

According to the Burmese account, news of the death was brought to Pegu in January 1579 (UK III: 50).<sup>16</sup> In their notes to CMC (p. 127), Wyatt and Aroonrut cite the suggestion by a local scholar that Wisutthathewi “may have been a queen of Bayinnaung, and a younger daughter of King Ket,” based on an account from the near-contemporary poem, *Khlong Mangthra Rop Chiang Mai*, that describes the queen as Mæ Mangthra Sri.<sup>17</sup> If this were true, when did King Ket, who reigned intermittently from circa 1526 to 1545, marry his daughter to Bayinnaung who only came to the Peguan throne in 1553?<sup>18</sup> While Ket was on the Lan Na throne, it was not Bayinnaung but Tabin-shwei-hti who was the king of Pegu and a more likely candidate to be the groom of a princess from a country of equal status. Meanwhile, according to Burmese sources, whose factual accuracy on dates, events, and genealogies is “generally reliable,”<sup>19</sup> no Chiang Mai princess is mentioned among Bayinnaung’s queens and concubines,<sup>20</sup> and the mother of Prince Tharrawaddy is described as Bayinnaung’s second (or third) queen, daughter of the Tabayin lord. Since no records in Burmese or Lan Na, except the said poem, confirm the marriage tie between Chiang Mai and Pegu, and the circumstantial evidence is fairly unfavorable to the argument, it is very unlikely that she was a queen of Bayinnaung.

Nòratha Min Khoi, called Naw-rahta-min-saw in Burmese and also known as Prince Tharrawaddy after his former appanage in Lower Burma, left Pegu in April 1579 and arrived in Chiang Mai around July 1579 (UK III: 54).<sup>21</sup>

<sup>15</sup> This lady’s name is transliterated in two ways, “Wisutthathewi” and “Wisutthithewi” in the text, while the original CMC/1288 consistently writes “Wisutthathewi.” The CMC/1216 spells the same. In the PY, however, she is called “Wisutthithewi.”

<sup>16</sup> The PY states that Lady Wisutthithewi died in October 1578 and Tharrawaddy came to Chiang Mai in s. 941 (1579/80), both of which basically correspond to the Burmese account.

<sup>17</sup> KMRC, p. 11. *Mæ Mangthra Sri* shall be rendered as Mother of the Burmese monarch (Prince Tharrawaddy in this case). This is the origin of the assumption that she was a queen of Bayinnaung. The problem with this assumption is that it rests on the single account in the KMRC, *Mæ Mangthra Sri*. No Lan Na or Burmese records available to the author, however, describe Wisutthathewi as Queen or Mother of the Burmese monarch.

<sup>18</sup> He had been crowned two years earlier at Toungoo, but had been occupied with subduing the whole of Lower Burma until the second coronation in 1553 at Pegu.

<sup>19</sup> On the accuracy and reliability of the UK, see Lieberman, *Burmese Administrative Cycles*, p. 298.

<sup>20</sup> A certain lady of Chiang Mai origin is listed among Bayinnaung’s concubines, although she was not of royal blood, as far as the Burmese text says.

<sup>21</sup> Tharrawaddy’s queen, on her way to Chiang Mai, gave birth to a son, Tulaung, named after the mountain where he was born.

7) The Min Taya had Phraya Hua Khian rule Chiang Mai, while he returned Pegu (CMC: 129).

There is no mention of Bayinnaung appointing Phraya Hua Khian in the Burmese literature. According to the chronicles of Chiang Sæn, Hua Khian was appointed to govern Chiang Sæn, not Chiang Mai (PMCS: 110; CRCS: 160).<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, the ZY asserts “Hua Khian was conferred Chiang Sæn” (ZY: 62).

8) In s. 943, a *luang sai* year, on the second waning of the second month (12 November 1581), the Min Taya died. His son, the Nòng Phak Wun Min Taya, ascended the throne in his stead in Pegu (CMC: 129).

According to the Burmese record, Bayinnaung died on 10 October 1581 (HMY III: 61; ROB II: xiv). His son, the next king, is usually known as Nandabayin; Nòng Phak Wun Min Taya must be Anauk-hpet-lun, the second king of Nyaungyan Burma, as the CMC below records that Nòng Phak Wun died in the late 1620s to be succeeded by Min Ræ Thippa, which corresponds to the biography of Anauk-hpet-lun described in Burmese chronicles.

9) In s. 947, a *dap rao* year (1585/86), the Chiang Mai army was sent to fight the South, unsuccessfully, and Nantha Kòi Tò was lost (CMC: 129).

Among regimental leaders in the Burmese expedition against Ayutthaya in this year, the Burmese chronicle lists several Lan Na nobles, namely Phraya Sænluang, Phraya Samlan, Phraya Nan, Phraya Phræ, Phraya Lampang, and Phraya Thœng.<sup>23</sup> The PMCS notes that the lord of Chiang Mai himself commanded the troops (YT II: 216; PMCS: 110).<sup>24</sup> As for Nantha Kòi Tò, records currently available do not identify him.

10) In s. 954, a *tao si* year (1592/93), the Uparaja took an armed force to the South to fight King Nare with 700,000 men (CMC: 129).

<sup>22</sup> It is not clear who issued the order. The PMCS omits the subject term, although the context may suggest Bayinnaung, while the CRCS says, “Chiang Mai had Phraya Hua Khian *come* [*ma*] to rule (Chiang Sæn).” The CMC/1216 version is identical to the CRCS, except that the former inserts *Caofa Mangthra* (i.e. Burmese king) after “Chiang Mai,” thus skillfully changing the sentence, “As for Chiang Mai, *Caofa Mangthra* had Phraya Hua Khian rule.” Further research on the MS1741 would reveal whether the author of the TPMCM intentionally changed the text, thereby effectively shifting the focus of the sentence from Chiang Sæn to Chiang Mai.

<sup>23</sup> Names of some Lan Na leaders differ in the Burmese chronicles, of which the YT seems to offer more reasonable ones.

<sup>24</sup> The Siamese source has a somewhat different and detailed story of this campaign, while a near-contemporary European account offers yet another version (Cœm, pp. 108-21; Nicolas Pimenta, “Jesuit Observations,” p. 212).



A force of 700,000 men is an obvious exaggeration, even surpassing the inflated Burmese estimate of 240,000. The Uparaja is a Burmese heir apparent, son of Nandabayin, while Nare is King Naresuan of Ayutthaya. Chronicles of Burma and Lan Na basically agree here. Although the CMC has no reference to the result of this campaign and the fate of the Uparaja, the Burmese literature states that the heir apparent died in the battle with Ayutthaya (UK III: 91).<sup>25</sup> As in s. 947 (see no. 9 above), Phraya Sænluang, Phraya Samlan, Phraya Nan, Phraya Phræ, and Phraya Thøeng again served the Burmese army that on this occasion also included the lord of Chiang Mai, Prince Tharrawaddy (YT II: 226).

11) In this reign {around 1592/93}, the Tha[rra]waddy Prince went to rule Chiang Sæn (CMC: 129).

According to the PMCS, it was not Tharrawaddy himself but his son who “came up” (*khün ma*) to rule Chiang Sæn (PMCS: 110).<sup>26</sup> Burmese chronicles state that Tharrawaddy had three sons by the queen, and another son by a concubine, whereas local sources have different numbers, including an adopted son who was appointed governor of Nan by Tharrawaddy. In any case, it is not clear which son was the new ruler of Chiang Sæn.

12) In s. 960, a *pæk set* year (1598/99), the Lao retreated from Pegu to Chiang Mai, and [then] fled back to Lan Chang (CMC: 129).

Burmese records also report a large contingent of Lao soldiers leaving Pegu, but differ on the number and the date. In the UK and HMY a little over 1,000 left in 1596, whereas the YT reports more than 10,000 leaving in 1595 (UK III: 95; HMY III: 98; YT II: 230).<sup>27</sup>

13) The people of the South attacked Chiang Mai in that year {1598/99} (CMC: 129).

This Ayutthaya attack on Chiang Mai is not found in any Burmese source.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>25</sup> The death of the Uparaja is also recorded by the chronicle of Ayutthaya (LPS, p. 18).

<sup>26</sup> CSC/065, f° 89/5, writes, *luk Phra Caofa Tharrawaddy*, “son of King Tharrawaddy,” while CSC/1251, f° 12/4, and CMC/1216, f° 6.01/3 (and of course CMC/1288) omit *luk*, “son.” This should be due to careless transcription by “a certain Suriyavamsa Bhikku of Chiang Sæn,” the author of the MS1741, or other related scribes.

<sup>27</sup> The journey from Pegu to Chiang Mai, according to Ralph Fitch who visited the old Lan Na capital in the mid-1580s, took twenty-five days (Ralph Fitch, “The Voyage,” p. 194). Therefore, the Lao who left Pegu in the mid-1590s according to the Burmese annals and those who arrived in Chiang Mai a few years later may not be the same people.

<sup>28</sup> This is probably due to the disorderliness in the Burmese homeland during these years, which

The Siamese chronicle describes a northern expedition against Lan Na led by Ekathotsarot, the younger brother of King Naresuan.<sup>29</sup> Both chronicles of Chiang Sæn agree with the CMC (PMCS: 111; CRCS: 161-2).

14) In s. 962, a *kot cai* year (1600/01), Chiang Rai rebelled against the Burmese, and the Burmese came to Chiang Rai (CMC: 129).

As might be expected, there is no Burmese account of this rebellion. Neither does the PMCS offer any reference. CRCS (p. 162) has an account that is basically the same as that of the CMC. Without finding new information in other sources, therefore, further exploration into this issue cannot be made.

15) In s. 963, a *luang pao* year (1601/02), Òkya Ram Techo went as governor of Chiang Sæn... Òkya Ram Techo fled Chiang Sæn in that year (CMC: 129).

The chronicle of Ayutthaya mentions that Phra Ram Decho, a Chiang Mai native, was sent by Naresuan to rule Chiang Sæn, though not in s. 963, but soon after the disastrous defeat of the Burmese army in s. 954 (Cœm: 142; see no.10 above for the failed Burmese campaign). Meanwhile, the PMCS offers yet another year, s. 962, for the appointment of Ram Techo, who fled Chiang Sæn in s. 965, not s. 963 as described in the CMC (PMCS: 111).<sup>30</sup>

16) In s. 965, a *ka mao* year (1603/04), M. Sat rebelled against the Burmese, and the Burmese came and swept up many captives (CMC: 130).<sup>31</sup>

The “Burmese” in the sentence must be from Chiang Mai, not Ava or Toungoo,<sup>32</sup> as the PMCS recounts that: “Müang Sat rebelled against the Mons and

---

made the correspondence between the center and outlying areas of the empire virtually impossible. Furthermore, by 1596 at the latest, Tharrawaddy severed diplomatic ties with his half-brother, Nandabayin, the successor to Bayinnaung, and established himself as a fully autonomous power (UK, III, 96). Soon after his declaration of independence, he seems to have accepted vassalage of, or alliance with, Ayutthaya.

<sup>29</sup> Cœm, p. 182. Before the northern campaign, Ekathotsarot and his royal brother were engaged in siege warfare at Toungoo. According to the Burmese record, the Siamese siege of Toungoo lasted for two months, from the end of February to the end of April 1600, and was lifted due to the disruption of supply lines by the Arakan king (UK, III, 101-2). The Burmese and Siamese accounts agree, suggesting that the year of the Ayutthaya attack on Chiang Mai should be s. 962, rather than s. 960 as described in the CMC.

<sup>30</sup> The CRCS basically corresponds to the CMC. Following No. 11 above, is this another hasty copying of the PMCS?

<sup>31</sup> Müang Sat was a trans-Salween Shan domain close to the modern Burma-Thai border.

<sup>32</sup> Both Ava and Toungoo were independent powers at the time, the former under Nyaungyan Min, the founder of the dynasty, whose eldest son would conquer Toungoo in 1610.

Burmese, soliciting Lan Sang to come and take Lan Na, unsuccessfully; waging war on Phayao, Chiang Sæn, Müang Fang, and Chiang Mai, unsuccessfully.” (PMCS: 111) According to the Burmese record, Bayinnaung had a son named Minyè-kyawdin, who was appointed governor of Müang Sat, probably by Tharrawaddy (HMY III: 71). This son, whose mother was of Lao origin, could have played a main role in the rebellion by resorting to his Lao connections.<sup>33</sup>

In early 1605, King Naresuan of Ayutthaya died in Müang Hang, a trans-Salween Shan domain about 150 kilometers north of Chiang Mai.<sup>34</sup> Curiously, the major Lan Na chronicles of Chiang Mai, Chiang Sæn, and Nan do not mention this event,<sup>35</sup> although the chronicle of Chiang Tung and even that of Burma do.<sup>36</sup>

From Siamese accounts, the story of Naresuan’s death can be summarized as follows: In either July or August 1604 when informed that King Nyaungyan, the founder of the new Burmese dynasty then centered at Ava, had pacified Müang Nai and would next advance on Hsenwi, both of which Ayutthaya considered under its suzerainty, Naresuan entertained a grand plan to march through Lan Na, across the Salween River, through the Shan Highlands, and down to Ava; after staying at Chiang Mai for a month, the royal army moved up to Müang Hang, where he died.<sup>37</sup> Had Naresuan not died at Müang Hang, his troops would have been headed for Müang Nai, whose ruler, according to a Burmese report, seems to have been in alliance with the Siamese monarch.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, the lord of Hsenwi was Naresuan’s protégé,<sup>39</sup> who would have surely followed a Siamese order to march down to the Irrawaddy Basin and attempt a pincer attack on the new Burmese capital.<sup>40</sup> In any case, after

<sup>33</sup> He might have been allied to King Nyaungyan of Ava at the time, as, after the failed attempt, he seems to have made his way down to the Burmese homeland where he was later appointed governor of Toungoo by Anauk-hpet-lun in 1613. Yet later, in 1629, he was executed by Thalun, as he was the main supporter of Minyè-deikba, who killed his own father, Anauk-hpet-lun, to seize the throne for himself.

<sup>34</sup> Cœm, p. 193. VV (pp. 232-33) also confirms that Naresuan died at Müang Hang, but states that the Siamese target was Toungoo, not Ava.

<sup>35</sup> The KMRC states that Naresuan died on his way to Ava (KMRC, p. 14).

<sup>36</sup> PMCT, p. 22; UK, III, 138. The PMCT notes that Naresuan died in Wiang Dao, probably modern Chiang Dao, eighty kilometers north of Chiang Mai, in s. 963 (1601/02), whereas the UK remarks that he died in Maing Hin, i.e. Müang Hang, in s. 966 (1604/05).

<sup>37</sup> Chronologically, the Siamese account seems correct, as the Burmese conquest of Müang Nai is supposed to have taken place in either late 1603 or early 1604.

<sup>38</sup> Soon after the death of Naresuan, the Müang Nai lord himself attempted to attack Ava, without success (UK, III, 138). Close relations between Ayutthaya and Müang Nai seem to have been even known to the Chinese, as a Yunnan official proposed that Beijing should send capable envoys to Ayutthaya and Müang Nai in order to persuade them to attack Ava together (MSL, vol. 113, pp. 7424-25, *Shenzong Shilu*, j. 394, ff° 3-4). As this proposal was made in 1604, the Chinese plan could not have affected Naresuan’s decision to march to Ava via Müang Nai.

<sup>39</sup> Cœm, p. 181. The Siamese claim seems to be supported by the chronicle of Hsenwi itself (PMSW, p. 46; PMSW-MY, p. 383).

<sup>40</sup> King Nyaungyan pacified Hsenwi in late 1605 or early 1606, after Naresuan’s death. UK, III, 134-6. The fall of Hsenwi to the Burmese even shocked the Ming. Some Yunnan officials, who did

the death of their celebrated warrior-king, the Siamese army swiftly returned to Ayutthaya, and Ekathotsarot, who immediately succeeded his brother, would never venture to “retake” the Shan domains now under Nyaungyan suzerainty, let alone attack the Burmese capital.

17) In s. 969, a *müiang met* year (1607/08), Prince Tharrawaddy Nòratha Min Khòì died.... His son, Thado Khòì, ruled in his stead for a year and a month and died. His middle son then ruled in his stead for five years. In the *ka pao* year, s. 975 (1613/14), he died. His youngest brother ruled in his stead for thirteen years, to the *rwai yi* year, s. 988 (1616/17), when he died (CMC: 130).

Burmese sources do not specify the year this prince died, while those of Lan Na agree that it was in s. 969 (PMCS: 111; CRCS: 162).<sup>41</sup> This year is generally supported by a Dutch document dated 7 May 1608, which has a reference to the death of the Chiang Mai lord (EH: 7). The CMC’s story of events after Tharrawaddy’s death is fairly confusing as shown above,<sup>42</sup> and somewhat different from those of the UK and KMRC. According to the Burmese account, Tharrawaddy had three sons and a daughter by his queen. The eldest son named Tulaung married a daughter of Naresuan, and became heir-apparent in Ayutthaya, while the daughter married Naresuan, and enjoyed the status of queen.<sup>43</sup> When Tharrawaddy died, certain Chiang Mai nobles asked the Siamese king (Ekathotsarot) to return Tulaung to be crowned in his father’s stead. While Tulaung was leading a Siamese army to the north, the Chiang Mai nobles changed their mind and installed the second son, Min-yè-deik-ba, on the throne. While camped outside the Chiang Mai city wall, Tulaung unexpectedly died and the Ayutthaya troops left for the south.<sup>44</sup> Not long afterwards, the nobles changed their mind again, dethroning Min-yè-deik-ba and crowning the third son, Thado-kyaw (UK III: 172).<sup>45</sup>

---

not help the strategically important Shan polity, were dismissed from office and sentenced to life in confinement (MSL, vol. 115, p. 7984, *Shenzong Shilu*, j. 422, f° 2).

<sup>41</sup> The NC has no reference to Tharrawaddy’s death, whereas CCK, p. 91, dates it to s. 968.

<sup>42</sup> The text has “s. 988 (1616/17)”; if it is s. 988, the year should be 1626/27. The original sentence, CMC/1288, f° 6.02/1 writes, “the *rwai yi* year, s. 988,” not s. 978.

<sup>43</sup> UK, III, 171. The author of the KMRC, who might have known Naresuan at the court of Chiang Mai, also confirms that the Ayutthaya monarch took the son as a groom for his princess and the daughter as his queen (KMRC, p. 14). Tulaung is also identified by the chronicle of Ayutthaya (Cœm, p. 196).

<sup>44</sup> Dutch records refer to the Siamese expedition to Chiang Mai in 1607-8 to intervene in the succession dispute (EH, p. 7).

<sup>45</sup> The KMRC version can be summarized as follows: When Tharrawaddy fell gravely ill, Chiang Mai officials asked the Siamese monarch to return the eldest son (KMRC offers no personal names for Tharrawaddy’s three sons) to be crowned; while he was leading a large Siamese army northward, his father died, followed by a rebellion in the Chiang Mai court by a man of Shan origin with his brother-in-law (not identified), who then crowned the third son (hereafter no reference to the eldest

18) In s. 976, a *kap yi* year (1614/15), Nakhòn rebelled against King Nòng Phak Wun Min Taya, the son. The Burmese came to take him (CMC: 130).<sup>46</sup>

According to the UK, King Anauk-hpet-lun himself commanded a Burmese army, which, as the CMC describes, advanced on Nakhòn (UK III: 173).<sup>47</sup> While the Burmese were laying siege to Nakhòn, the lord of Nan came to make obeisance to Anauk-hpet-lun.<sup>48</sup> Upon receiving the news that Thado-kyaw, the ruler of Chiang Mai, had died, Nakhòn surrendered to Anauk-hpet-lun,<sup>49</sup> who then “rounded up” the courtiers Tharrawaddy had brought from the Burmese homeland and their descendents, along with soldiers, horses, and elephants, to send to Pegu.<sup>50</sup>

19) In s. 977, a *dap mao* year (1615/16), the youngest adopted son of the king of Chiang Mai had Phraya Nan come up to be governor of Chiang Mai (CMC: 130).

As stated above (no.11), Tharrawaddy had an adopted son who was appointed governor of Nan. The corresponding sentence in the CMC/1216 reads, “the youngest adopted son of the king of Chiang Mai, that is [*khü*] Phraya Nan, came up to be governor of Chiang Mai” (CMC/1216: 6.02/5).<sup>51</sup> This is supported by the Burmese account that Anauk-hpet-lun conferred Chiang Mai upon the Nan lord (UK III: 175).<sup>52</sup>

---

and the Ayutthaya troops); not long afterwards, another conspirator of Lao origin dethroned the third son and put the second son on the throne; probably several years later, Sænluang and Caban, two of the highest officials in the Chiang Mai court, were frustrated with the second son, who favored Burmans and Mons, and who promoted Samlan higher than Sænluang, an unprecedented and humiliating act to the latter, thus ousted him from the throne with the help of Lampang troops, thereby crowning the third son again (KMRC, pp. 15-22).

<sup>46</sup> The original sentence, without a direct object, simply reads, “The Burmese came and took, successfully.” CMC/1216, f° 6.02/3; CMC/1288, f° 6.02/1. It is more likely that the object was Nakhòn (Lampang), rather than a person. As described by the KMRC, the Lampang troops played a crucial role in ousting Tharrawaddy’s second son and crowning the third in Chiang Mai, provoking the Burmese expedition.

<sup>47</sup> Anauk-hpet-lun left Martaban, which he had just pacified, in April 1614 and arrived in Nakhòn (Lampang) in July. The Burmese battle with (or siege of) Nakhòn is also mentioned by the KMRC, NC, and CCK. The CCK tells basically the same story as the Burmese one (KMRC, p. 22; NC, p. 70; CCK, pp. 91-2).

<sup>48</sup> The submission of the Nan lord is also recorded by the CCK, although the chronicle of Nan itself has no reference. According to the KMRC, it was the Nan lord who, when informed of the succession conflict at the Chiang Mai court, asked for the Burmese expedition against Lan Na (KMRC, p. 22).

<sup>49</sup> KMRC, p. 27, also refers to the death of the Chiang Mai lord during the siege at Lampang.

<sup>50</sup> The author of the KMRC was one of these captives. Anauk-hpet-lun left Chiang Mai in May 1615 and arrived in Pegu in June, as attested by KMRC, pp. 30-2.

<sup>51</sup> CMC/1288, f° 6.02/3, uses the word *hü*, “to have or make,” whereas the CMC/1216 writes *khü*, “i.e.” Both CSC/065, f° 91/1, and CSC/1251, f° 14/1, also use *khü*. The scribe of the CMC/1288 must have mistaken *hü* for *khü*.

<sup>52</sup> As stated above, the Nyaungyan monarch had reason to reward the ruler of Nan who must have

20) In s. 986, a *kap cai* year (1624/25), Chiang Khòng rebelled, and King Nòng Phak Wun Min Taya had King Suddhodhammaraja Min Ræ Cò Swa bring an army up to Chiang Mai, which then took Chiang Khòng on the ninth waxing of the twelfth month (22 August 1624) (CMC: 130).

Suddhodhammaraja was the future King Thalun, whereas Min Ræ Cò Swa (Min-yè-kyaw-swa) was his younger brother. Anauk-hpet-lun, the eldest of these brothers, sent both of them to Chiang Khòng, which fell in November 1624 (UK III: 186-7).<sup>53</sup>

21) In s. 987, a *dap pao* year (1625/26), Nan rebelled, and King Suddho went and took Nan (CMC: 130).

As stated above, the brothers had pacified Nan before marching to Chiang Khòng in s. 986, hence Suddho's action in s. 987 was a second suppression of Nan. Indeed, the original manuscript, CMC/1288 says, "King Suddho again [sam] went and took Nan."<sup>54</sup> Furthermore, chronicles of Nan refer to at least two battles in Nan involving Burmese forces in s. 985 and 986, although accounts of the NC and PTMN are somewhat different from each other.<sup>55</sup>

22) In s. 988, a *rwai yi* year (1626/27), King Suddho went and took Chiang Rung (CMC: 130).

According to Burmese records, this is the second Burmese expedition against the Lū principality, following the previous one in s. 984, when the future Thalun even advanced on Simao, a Chinese frontier station more than one hundred kilometers north from Chiang Rung (UK III: 186).<sup>56</sup> On the second expedition in s. 987-88, the royal brothers again pacified both Simao and Chiang Rung, and executed their rulers this time.<sup>57</sup>

---

cooperated with the Burmese forces in the pacification of Lan Na. NC (p. 70) confirms that the ruler of Nan assumed the governorship at Chiang Mai, although it says nothing about the parentage between the ruler and Tharrawaddy.

<sup>53</sup> According to the Burmese account, before advancing on Chiang Khòng, they first attacked Nan, which was successfully subdued.

<sup>54</sup> CMC/1288, f° 6.02/4. CMC/1216, f° 6.03/1, only writes, "King Suddho took." Meanwhile, PMCS (p. 112) and CRCS (p. 163) also use the word "*sam*," thus indicating that Nan rebelled twice.

<sup>55</sup> NC, p. 71; PTMN, ff° 143/4-144/4. Both agree that as a result of the battle of s. 986, a great many people of Nan were taken to Pegu.

<sup>56</sup> The date of Thalun's campaign in the Lū region differs in Burmese chronicles. Both UK and HMY offer s. 985, while YT dates it one year earlier, which seems more probable from the context. All agree that Thalun successfully secured allegiance from Simao and Chiang Rung.

<sup>57</sup> This campaign is also attested by a Chinese report dated 1627, which states that the ruler of

23) King Nòng Phak Wun Min Taya died in Pegu in that same year {s. 988; 1626/27}, and Min Ræ Thippha[net] ascended to rule in his stead in that year (CMC: 130).

Anauk-hpet-lun was killed by the heir-apparent, his own son, Min-yè-deik-ba, in s. 990 (1628/29), more exactly in May 1628 (UK III: 188).<sup>58</sup> The patricide and succession of Min-yè-deik-ba in Pegu are also recorded by the CCK under the year s. 990, while the PMCS dates Anauk-hpet-lun's death to s. 988 and the ascension of Min-yè-deik-ba to s. 989.<sup>59</sup>

24) In s. 990, a *pæk si* year (1628/29), [he] returned to establish [himself] in Chiang Sæn. The two brother kings did not get along with each other, and the elder brother entered into the city and dwelt in the palace of the White Crow Prince and had the Nò Kham Fa, the son of Phraya Thipphanet, rule Chiang Sæn, and then he made a royal progress back to Pegu. The ruler of Chiang Sæn went with him to send him off, as far as Fang. The governor of Chiang Mai then went up and took Chiang Sæn, and imprisoned the two, father and son, in the city of Chiang Mai (CMC: 131).

It was more than “not get along with each other”; Thalun and Min-yè-kyaw-swa, soon after learning of their elder brother's death and ascension of their nephew to the Peguan throne, fought each other in Chiang Sæn, with Thalun the victor (UK III: 192). At least two chronicles from Lan Na, the PY and NSML, mention the battle between the royal brothers, and offer the additional information that the local Sangha played a decisive role in halting the armed conflict and reconciling the two.<sup>60</sup> The two brother kings made a royal progress back, not to Pegu but to Ava,

---

Chiang Rung and his son were unable to repulse the Burmese attack and sought refuge in Simao; the Chinese frontier station fell to the Burmese, who then took away the father and son (*Ming Shi*, p. 8158). Meanwhile, chronicles of Chiang Tung and Müang Yòng share the reference to Suddho's campaign to Chiang Rung around s. 988 (PMCT, p. 23; TMY, pp. 46-7).

<sup>58</sup> Not to be confused with the other Min-yè-deik-ba, who was the second son of Tharrawaddy. According to the Burmese source, Min-yè-deik-ba made one of his father's concubines, the daughter of the Chiang Tung lord, pregnant, which surely infuriated Anauk-hpet-lun to the extent that he threatened to execute the son.

<sup>59</sup> CCK, p. 92; PMCS p. 113. The account of the PMCS includes some misunderstandings concerning the relationship between Anauk-hpet-lun and Min-yè-deik-ba, referring to the latter as the younger brother of the former, whereas the CRCS version is, as always, identical to that of the CMC. This is a rare occasion where the CMC and CRCS are more reliable than the PMCS.

<sup>60</sup> PY, p. 408; NSMR, f° 41/4-5. Furthermore, the PY states that a certain Sæn Luang Rúa Dòn, along with the ecclesiastics, persuaded the princely brothers into accepting a truce, for which he was conferred a new, seemingly Burmese epithet, Thipphanet, by Thalun. The source of the PY's account cannot be identified.

their traditional power base, arriving in January 1629 (UK III: 194).<sup>61</sup> The Burmese source has no reference to the Chiang Sæn ruler's send-off at Fang, while it remarks that the ruler of Chiang Mai, whom Thalun assigned the vanguard of the Burmese march on its way back from Chiang Sæn to Ava, fled into a fortress called Maing Khwin.<sup>62</sup> It must have been this restive Chiang Mai ruler who played a central role in the capture of Chiang Sæn mentioned in this passage.<sup>63</sup>

25) When King Suddho had reached Pegu, he took and deposed Min Ræ Thip, and King Suddho then ascended the jeweled throne in his stead (CMC: 131).

While Thalun and his brother were engaging the Peguan forces in Upper Burma, Min Ræ Thip (Min-yè-deik-ba) was toppled from the throne in October 1629 by courtiers, who then invited Thalun to assume the kingship (UK III: 197).<sup>64</sup> The new monarch rejected his nephew's plea to enter the monkhood and had him executed instead.

26) Three years later, in the *luang met* year, s. 993 (1631/32), Prince Phawa Min Taya Suddhodhammaraja again *{sam}* took Chiang Mai, capturing the king of Chiang Mai to imprison in Pegu, and appointed Phraya Thipphanet, the father of Phraya Chiang Sæn, to eat the three million rice-fields of Chiang Mai, and appointed Phraya Chiang Sæn to rule Chiang Sæn as before (CMC: 131).

Thalun left Pegu in October 1630 and took Chiang Mai in s. 993, more precisely April 1631 (UK III: 206). Meanwhile, a Dutch document reports that in 1632, King Prasat Thong of Ayutthaya led an expedition against Lampang, during which Thalun must have been quartered at Chiang Mai, although Siamese, Burmese, and Lan Na sources, very curiously, bear no reference to this expedition (vV: 307-09).<sup>65</sup> Thalun's appointment of local lords as governors of Chiang Mai and Chiang Sæn is not mentioned by the UK, which only states that after pacifying the Lan Na region,

<sup>61</sup> The CRCS does not specify where Thalun (and his brother) went back to, while PY (p. 408) and PMCS (p. 113) note that he headed for Ava. That Thalun went back to Pegu might have been a guess by the author of the TPMCM.

<sup>62</sup> Maing Khwin is supposed to be Fang, as explained in due course. As the royal brothers gave priority to hurrying back to Ava, they took no offense at Fang. PMCS (p. 113) says that the ruler of Chiang Sæn went to send Thalun off at the bank of the Salween River.

<sup>63</sup> In a few lines below, the CMC restates, "The governor of Lampang volunteered to the king of Chiang Mai to take Chiang Sæn," which corresponds to the account of the PMCS.

<sup>64</sup> CCK (p. 92) follows the Burmese account.

<sup>65</sup> The CCK (pp. 93, 189) notes that Lampang, upon learning of the coming Burmese, turned to Ayutthaya for help, although the chronicle does not specify whether the Siamese army actually came or not. A relevant sentence states that Thalun, even before going back to Pegu in early 1633, ordered the ruler of Phræ to take care of Lampang.



Thalun left a garrison at Chiang Mai and returned to Pegu (UK III: 209).<sup>66</sup> Unlike the CMC, CRCS, NC, PY and CCK, all of which agree that Thalun appointed Phraya Thipphanet as ruler of Chiang Mai and Thipphanet's son as ruler of Chiang Sæn, the PMCS claims that Thalun ordered Thipphanet and his son, Mūang Fang, to govern Chiang Sæn, while Chiang Mai was administered by Phraya Sænluang and the *sam lan* [three million].<sup>67</sup>

27) In s. 994, a *tao san* year (1632/33), King Suddhodhammaraja came to take Fang, and after three years he took it (CMC: 131).

According to the Burmese record, it was not Thalun but his younger brother, Minyè-kyaw-swa, who took Fang after an eight-month siege (UK III: 209).<sup>68</sup> Given that Thalun pacified Chiang Mai within a few months, it is very unlikely that Fang could withstand the Burmese siege for three years. A Burmese edict dated 1 March 1633 states that Thalun was supposed to visit a monastery in Upper Burma on 12 April 1633, which indicates that Thalun had successfully completed his Lan Na campaign by 1 March (ROB I: 35). Meanwhile, the UK notes that Thalun left Chiang Mai in February and arrived in Pegu in April 1633 (UK III: 209). In any case, Thalun spent approximately two years in Lan Na to pacify the region and reorganize local administration.

28) In s. 998, a *rwai cai* year (1636/37), King Suddhodhammaraja Min Taya had three thousand novices ordained and moved to establish [the city of] Ava. He issued an order to build Wat Chetawan at Chiang Sæn (CMC: 131).

<sup>66</sup> While no Lan Na records mention Thalun's order of a garrison at Chiang Mai, the chronicle of Chiang Khæng states, "He [Thalun] ordered Phaya Aphaiyalintamitta, the *cekkai* (*sitkè*) to safeguard Chiang Mai" (CCK, p. 93). This *sitkè* (a police and military commander who assisted the governor) cannot be identified by the Burmese source.

<sup>67</sup> CRCS, p. 164; NC, p. 70; PY, p. 408; CCK, p. 93; PMCS, pp. 114-5. *Sam lan*, literally meaning "three million," was traditionally the second highest-ranking official, next to *sænluang*, in the administrative system of Chiang Mai. Meanwhile, CMC's phrase, "three million rice-fields (*na sam lan*) of Chiang Mai," also recorded in the CRCS, PY, and CCK, is a "curious reference," as Wyatt once found, and indeed a puzzling expression, appearing in the text only on this particular occasion. This might have been due to a misunderstanding or miscopying of the *sam lan* by the author of the MS1741 or other related scribes. In any case, as it will turn out in due course, chronological evidence favors the account of the PMCS that Phraya Thipphanet, rather than his son, ruled Chiang Sæn, and the *sænluang* with the *sam lan* took over the administration of Chiang Mai. Furthermore, a Burmese edict issued in 1643, "concerning the traditions of customary insignia and accoutrements of Chiang Mai," was addressed not to the ruler of Chiang Mai but to the *sænluang*, *sam lan* and other local leaders, which seems to indicate that the dignitaries, rather than a governor, were in charge of the governance of the city (ZY, p. 58).

<sup>68</sup> Actually, it was not Fang but Maing Khwin to which the royal brother laid siege for eight months. As already seen above (no. 24), Fang seems to coincide with Maing Khwin from the context.

Thalun moved to Ava in s. 996, more exactly January 1635, and entered the newly established “golden palace” in s. 997, or May 1635 (UK III: 226-37).<sup>69</sup> Concerning the ordination of novices by Thalun, a contemporary Burmese inscription partially confirms the CMC’s account, saying that Thalun had one thousand novices ordained in s. 1000 (SMK V: 146).<sup>70</sup> The inscription also mentions that Thalun founded a temple in Chiang Sæn, had temples and rest-houses built in Chiang Sæn and Chiang Mai, and had the Lamphun Reliquary gilded (SMK V: 146).

29) In s. 1010, a *pæk cai* year (1648/49), King Min Taya Suddhodhammaraja died in Ava, and Phra Wanañjeyya ascended the Emerald Throne in Ava in his stead in that year (CMC: 131).

King Thalun died in Ava in s. 1010, more precisely on 17 October 1648 (UK III: 249). His son and successor, called Thakin Kyo during his youth, was later titled Min-yè-yanda-meik, and posthumously nicknamed Pindale, from which Wanañjeyya is apparently derived.<sup>71</sup>

30) In s. 1012, a *kot si* year (1650/51), the ruler of Chiang Sæn died (CMC: 131).

In s. 1017, a *dap met* year (1655/56), Phra Sæn Müang was appointed the ruler of Chiang Sæn in his stead for three years and then was sent to confinement in Ava (CMC: 132).

As seen above (no. 26), the CMC identifies this ruler of Chiang Sæn who died in s. 1012 as the son of Phraya Thipphanet, the ruler of Chiang Mai. The PMCS states that Phraya Thipphanet was the ruler of Chiang Sæn, who was succeeded in s. 1012 by his son, who in turn died in s. 1017 and was succeeded by his son, Phra Sæn Müang (PMCS: 121). The chronology of the PMCS makes more logical sense than that of the CMC, whose account, probably due to a scribal error, omits the ascension and death of Phraya Thipphanet’s son, thereby failing to identify Phra Sæn Müang’s

<sup>69</sup> The YT says Thalun moved to Ava in s. 995, while the HMY follows the UK. A Burmese inscription dated 1636/37 states that Thalun had the “golden palace” established within five months, which neatly corresponds to the account of the UK and HMY (SMK, V, 142).

<sup>70</sup> The number in the UK and HMY is 1,018 (UK, III, 251; HMY, III, 249). Meanwhile, in major Lan Na sources, namely, PMCS, CRCS, CMC/1216, and even CMC/1288, the original of the English text, the number of the novices ordained is one, rather than three, thousand (PMCS, p. 116; CRCS, p. 165; CMC/1216, f° 6.04/3; CMC/1288, f° 6.03/5). The three thousand in the text is thus somewhat doubtful. The year of the ordination differs between the PMCS and the other Lan Na sources, the former with s. 999, the latter s. 998.

<sup>71</sup> The CMC/1216 spells him “Dhanañjeyya.” As “dha” and “wa” of the *tham* script are almost identical, with a circular shape, this could be a scribal error. In either case, however, the origin of this title is untraceable. Meanwhile, both chronicles of Chiang Sæn spell him “Nañcha(ja).” (CSC/065, f° 99/5; CSC/1251, f° 16/1).

parentage, and leaving a five-year interregnum between s. 1012 and 1017.<sup>72</sup>

31) In s. 1021, a *kat khai* year (1659/60), the Lord ruler of Phræ ascended the emerald throne of Chiang Mai (CMC: 132).

The CRCS simply remarks, “The Lord ruler of Phæ (*sic*) was ordered to ascend (the throne) in his stead,” with no information on which throne and whose stead (CRCS: 165). The PMCS has a more detailed account that King Nañcha of Ava (i.e. Pindale) died and the Lord ruler of Be (*sic*) ascended the emerald throne of Ava in s. 1021 (PMCS: 122).<sup>73</sup> Though spelt differently, Phræ, Phæ, and Be all refer to Pyè, Prome of Burma, not Phræ of Lan Na, as often believed. As noticed below, the text here talks about the ascension of King Pyè in Ava, not in Chiang Mai. Therefore, the CMC’s sentence should be corrected as follows: the Lord ruler of Phræ (i.e., Pyè) ascended the emerald throne of Ava.<sup>74</sup>

32) In s. 1022, a *kot cai* year (1660/61), the Southerners brought an army up to attack Chiang Mai, but failed: Chiang Sæn fell to the Southerners in that year (CMC: 132).<sup>75</sup>

The background of this Siamese attack should be described first. In the late 1650s and early 1660s, the nuclear zone of Nyaungyan Burma was severely devastated by a series of battles with Chinese marauders, Ming loyalists who were forced by the Qing imperial army to flee into Burma from Yunnan.<sup>76</sup> The triumphant Chinese finally laid siege to the Burmese capital and almost took it in 1659. Upon receiving the news that Ava was besieged and about to fall, the Chiang Mai *sænluang* grew fearful that the Chinese would eventually attack the Lan Na region, and thus asked

<sup>72</sup> The CRCS shares the same incompleteness with the CMC.

<sup>73</sup> According to the Burmese record, Pyè usurped the throne in s. 1023, not in s. 1021. PY follows PMCS, although it later states that the Lord of Phræ (of Lan Na) ruled Chiang Mai in the early 1660s (PY, pp. 410, 412).

<sup>74</sup> This is another example where the author of the TPMCM tried to connect the context with Chiang Mai.

<sup>75</sup> The version of this sentence in the CRCS is, “In s. 1022 (Chiang Sæn) fell to the Southerners,” without mentioning the Siamese attack on Chiang Mai. Here again, the author of the CMC seems to have modified the original text so as to shift the focus of the sentence from Chiang Sæn to Chiang Mai.

<sup>76</sup> According to the UK, the Ming remnants were already active in Yunnan in 1649, demanding, in the name of the Yongli Emperor, that the Tai lords in the boundary zone between the Ava kingdom and Yunnan pay tax (UK, III, 296-7). Yongli was enthroned in 1647. At that time he was still quartered in Guangdong, fighting the Qing forces from the north. Thus, it is rather surprising that the self-claimed emperor had already envisaged the southwestern development of his realm, giving up retaking the Northern Capital and restoring the old dynasty at such an early stage of his “imperial” career.

for Siamese military aid in s. 1022 (1660/61).<sup>77</sup> King Narai of Ayutthaya quickly responded by sending an expeditionary force, which, contrary to Chiang Mai's request, attacked and seized Thøen and Lampang, and then failed to take Chiang Mai. Within a year, Narai himself led another expedition that overran Chiang Mai and rounded up the *sænluang*, his family, courtiers, elephants, horses, and firearms.<sup>78</sup> The CMC's assertion that Chiang Mai did *not* fall to the Southerners in s. 1022 accords with this account, but the CMC does not mention the second and successful Siamese attack a year or so later.

33) In s. 1025, a *ka mao* year (1663/64), Fa Sang Kung came to Chiang Sæn (CMC: 132).

Fa Sang Kung was probably a high-ranking officer in the Burmese military, but nothing certain is known about him. Neither the CMC, other Lan Na sources, nor the Burmese chronicles offer any more information.<sup>79</sup> Moreover, the year of the appointment, s. 1025, is somewhat problematic. The PMCS records that Fa Sang Kung came to Chiang Sæn as *bogyok*, generalissimo, in s. 1034 (PMCS: 122). Given that Ava was at war with Ayutthaya along the southern littoral and seems to have abandoned renewed military attempts to retake Chiang Mai from the Siamese after

<sup>77</sup> Cœm, p. 244. Note that the Thai account has no reference to the *cao*, or lord, of Chiang Mai, and describes the *sænluang* as taking administrative charge of the city. Meanwhile, the Chinese threat was no fiction to Lan Na. UK (III, 263) states that while one force was terrifying Ava and its environs, another band of the Chinese troops made their way up to Müang Nai, the gateway to the trans-Salween Tai world. According to a Chinese report, Li Dingguo, one of the trusted generals of Yongli, fled to the area around Chiang Sæn where he perished (QSL, vol. 4, pp. 106-7, 126, *Shengzu shilu*, j. 6, ff° 9-10, j. 7, f° 17). The PY mentions that the Chinese troops, escorted by the prince of Chiang Tung, came to attack Chiang Sæn in s.1020 (1658/59), while the NSML notes that Chiang Tung fell to the Chinese in s. 1022 (1660/61) (PY, p. 410; NSML, f° 29/1). PMCS (p. 122) remarks that the Chinese troops came down again [*sam*] in s. 1024 (1662/63), although it does not specify where the Chinese were headed. Probably as a precaution or counteraction against any Chinese expedition across the Salween River, two Burmese forces, one of which was led by a general called Min-yè-nara, were sent to Chiang Mai in 1659 (UK, III, 266). The PY, rather surprisingly, confirms this account by stating that Man-ræ-nara commanded a force to Chiang Mai in 1659, where he died in less than a month, and the Burmese troops returned to Ava (PY, p. 411). Unfortunately, what source the PY relied on for this account is not known.

<sup>78</sup> PPPH, II, 100. A Dutch record dated 31 March 1663 confirms that the Siamese king successfully pacified Chiang Mai (EH, p. 154). According to the Burmese chronicle, by the time Burmese rescue forces arrived at Chiang Mai in March 1663, the city was already occupied by the Siamese troops (UK, III, 280). The Nan chronicle says that in November 1662, the Ayutthaya king captured Nan, whose ruler was taken to the South, i.e. Ayutthaya (NC, p. 73). The seizure of Nan by Narai is also recorded by the Dutch, although other sources, either Lan Na, Burmese, or Thai, are silent on the event (Dijk, *Seventeenth-century Burma*, p. 104).

<sup>79</sup> Fa in Tai means "lord" or "prince," usually (but not always) followed by a toponym. Therefore he must be a lord or ruler whose fief was "Sang Kung." The only Burmese candidate I can think of for "Sang Kung" is Sagaing, which, however, is not very likely.

1663,<sup>80</sup> the appointment of Fa Sang Kung as commander stationed at Chiang Sæn is unlikely in s. 1025.

34) In s. 1034, a *tao cai* year (1672/73), King Ing Sæ Min died in Ava. The son of King Cephutraï Müang was appointed ruler of Chiang Sæn in that year. He remained for five years and died. Phra Salœm Müang ruled Chiang Sæn in his place. The Lord ruler of Phræ who ruled Chiang Mai died, and King Ingsæ ascended the emerald throne in his stead in Chiang Mai in that year.

In s. 1037, a *dap mao* year (1675/76), King Ingsæ died, and the son of King Phutraï ascended to sit in his stead in that year (CMC: 132).

This is the most confusing and puzzling passage of the CMC during the Burmese years, as it contains figures with almost identical names dying and ascending the throne at different places and times.<sup>81</sup> However, some sentences in this passage are actually redundant. The death of King Ingsæ and the ascension of the son of King Cephutraï are not part of the history of Chiang Mai or Chiang Sæn, but of Ava. King Cephutraï's<sup>82</sup> son is Min-yè-kyaw-din, who reigned in Burma from 1673 to 1698.<sup>83</sup> King Ingsæ is Naya-wayä, who succeeded King Pyè (or Lord ruler of Phræ in the text) in s. 1034 (see CMC, p. 132n). The information in this paragraph should really appear as follows:

In s. 1034 the Lord ruler of Phræ (Pyè) who ruled Ava died, and King Ingsæ (Naya-wayä) ascended the emerald throne in his stead in Ava in that year; King Ingsæ died, and the son of King Cephutra (Min-yè-kyaw-din) ascended to sit in his stead in that same year.

<sup>80</sup> Ava reestablished its suzerainty over the city at the end of 1664. However, it was not the retaliatory forces from Ava but the people of Chiang Mai themselves who drove out the Siamese, and welcomed back their old masters (UK, III, 282-3).

<sup>81</sup> The CRCS, with no reference to the Chiang Mai throne, only records: "In s. 1034...the Lord ruler of Phræ died, and King Ingsæ was appointed to ascend the emerald throne in that year. In s. 1037 King Ingsæ died, and the son of King Cephutra was appointed to ascend the emerald throne in that year." (CRCS, p. 166) Supposedly, the MS1741 corresponds to the CRCS. The addition of Chiang Mai to the sentence essentially represents the series of efforts by the TPMCM's author to shift the focus of the text from Chiang Sæn to Chiang Mai.

<sup>82</sup> Cephutraï, without "Müang," should be the correct name, as CMC/1216, f° 6.05/2, writes, "*Luk Phraçao Cephutraï müa* [to go] *pen phraçao Chiang Sæn* (The son of King Cephutraï went as king to Chiang Sæn)." And as seen above, the CRCS spells "Cephutra." The scribe of the CMC/1288 mistakenly added a letter *ng* to *müa*, making it *müiang*. Cephutraï, or Siputtya in Burmese, is a town near Shwebo in the Mu River valley, which King Pindale conferred upon one of his half-brothers called Nei-myo-yè-kyaw. Thus, Cephutraï is not really a king but a prince.

<sup>83</sup> LBHK, p. 281; YWG, p. 112. For some reason, UK and HMY are not specific about the parentage of Min-yè-kyaw-din. In Lan Na sources, he is called "Mahadhamma Phukam," King Pagan. However, no Burmese records mention that Pagan was ever conferred upon Min-yè-kyaw-din, whose only appanage in the record was Yamethin.

Regarding Phra Salœm Müang as the ruler of Chiang Sæn, the PMCS relates that in s. 1040 (1678/79), rather than s. 1034, he succeeded his father, Caofa In Müang, who had succeeded his father, Caofa Sæn Müang (Phra Sæn Müang of no. 30 above), in s. 1034 (PMCS: 122-23). Again, the account of the PMCS seems to make more logical and chronological sense.

35) In s. 1040, a *pæk sang* year (1678/79), Phra Salœm Müang died, and Rot Sang Lam was made Wun in his stead to rule Chiang Sæn (CMC: 132).

According to the PMCS, the ruler who died in this year was not Phra Salœm (Chalœm in the PMCS) Müang, but his father, Caofa In Müang, whom Phra Salœm Müang replaced as ruler of Chiang Sæn (PMCS: 123). Neither the Burmese chronicles nor the PMCS refer to Rot Sang Lam.

36) In s. 1044, a *tao set* year (1682/83), Rot Sang Lam oppressed, and Min Sa came to arrest him and sent him to Ava (CMC: 132).

Again, there is no reference to the arrest of Rot Sang Lam in the Burmese literature or PMCS.<sup>84</sup> The CMC offers no information on his successor as the ruler of Chiang Sæn. Min Sa is spelt “Mang Sam” in the CMC/1288, and might be derived from a Burmese word, *min than*, meaning “royal envoy” (CMC/1288: 6.04/5).<sup>85</sup>

37) In s. 1054, a *tao san* year (1692/93), the Prince of M. Luang came to rule Chiang Sæn.

In s. 1057, a *dap khai* year (1695/96), the ruler of Chiang Sæn died (CMC: 132).

The CMC offers no information on who ruled Chiang Sæn before this succession. The PMCS remarks that Phra Chalœm Müang, who had ascended the throne in s. 1040, died in s. 1054 and Fa Sang Kung, Burmese generalissimo, had the Prince of Müang Luang come to rule Chiang Sæn (PMCS: 124).<sup>86</sup> The CMC does

<sup>84</sup> The only relatively similar account found in the PMCS is that in s. 1055 (1693/94), Fa Sang Kung (who came to Chiang Sæn as generalissimo in s. 1034) went to Ava for good (PMCS, p. 124).

<sup>85</sup> CMC/1216, f° 6.05/5, and CSC/1251, f° 17/1, spell the same. Thus, the CMC’s “Min Sa” is probably a misspelling or printing error.

<sup>86</sup> There are at least three Müang Luang in the interior Tai-speaking world: in the Shan Highlands, in Sipsong Panna and in Northern Laos. It is entirely unclear which one, if any, is mentioned in the CMC. The Prince of M. Luang is also mentioned by the NSML, though in a different context when an epidemic spread in Lan Na in s. 1045 (1683/84), he, along with Mangræ-nôratha (Min-yè-naw-rahta in Burmese; *myo-wun* of Chiang Mai), and Phraya Dekchai, one of the four highest-ranking local officials, invited monks to chant the scriptures (NSML, f° 29/2-3). This account suggests that the prince had already been assigned a civil or military post in Chiang Mai, before

not name the ruler who died in s. 1057 or his successor, but the PMCS relates that the Prince of M. Luang died, and the eldest son of Phra Chalœm Müang was selected as successor by the native nobility (PMCS: 124).

38) In s. 1061, a *kat mao* year (1699/1700), Mahadhamma Phukam died (CMC: 132).

Mahadhamma Phukam is King Min-yè-kyaw-din, who died, according to the Burmese record, early in s. 1060, more precisely in April 1698. The PMCS says that he was replaced by his younger brother, the heir-apparent, while the UK describes a peaceful transition of power to his son, Maha Thi-hathu-ra, later known as King Sanei (PMCS: 124; UK III: 345).

39) In s. 1062, a *kot si* year (1700/01), Nò Sai became Wun of Chiang Sæn, and Rammasen became *sitkè* (CMC: 132).

The PMCS dates this promotion to s. 1057, when the Prince of Müang Luang, the ruler of Chiang Sæn, died, and remarks that in s. 1062, the Ava monarch had Nò Müang (Nò Sai of the CMC) go to rule Chiang Rai, while Nò Müang's younger brother, Rammasen, ascended the throne of Chiang Sæn in his stead (PMCS: 124).<sup>87</sup> Among the Lan Na figures in the CMC, Rammasen is probably the only individual of this era whose personal name, rather than an official title, can be confirmed by the Burmese record. Along with Burmese nobles and generals, as well as Shan princes from Mogaung, Hsipaw, and Yònghui, Rammasen attended a royal ceremony at the *byè-daik* (Hall of the Privy Council) in Ava in February 1698, where King Min-yè-kyaw-din conferred on him a golden sword (UK III: 344).<sup>88</sup>

40) In s. 1063, a *ruang sai* year (1701/02), Mahadhamma freed Chiang Sæn from dependence on Chiang Mai (CMC: 133).

---

taking over the governance of Chiang Sæn. Min-yè-naw-rahta, grandson of King Nyaungyan, was appointed myo-wun a year before (LBHK, p. 293). At that time, however, he was probably called Min-yè-yannaung, as the epithet, Min-yè-naw-rahta, was conferred upon him during Sanei's reign (1698-1714) (UK, III, 140).

<sup>87</sup> Actually, the CMC calls him Nò Müang under the year s. 1069, when he was transferred from Chiang Rai to Nan, although, unlike the PMCS, it has no account of his appointment as ruler of Chiang Rai.

<sup>88</sup> The HMY and YT, as well as Lan Na documents, skip the account of this conferment. That the gift conferred on Rammasen was meager compared to those for the Shan princes probably indicates that at the time he had yet to become lord, but was only representing the lord, his elder brother, as the account of the PMCS suggests. In any case, his attendance at the court ceremony in Ava might have made the authors of Lan Na chronicles choose Burmese titles, wun and sitkè, to describe the Chiang Sæn brothers.

The Burmese monarch mentioned here as Mahadhammamust must be King Sanei. This order to separate Chiang Sæn from Chiang Mai, despite its potential significance to local as well as imperial administration as a whole, is not recorded in any of the Burmese documents. The PMCS dates the administrative division to s. 1066 (PMCS: 126).

41) In s. 1065, a *ka met* year (1703/04), the Lao attacked Lan Na, setting themselves up at Chiang Khòng, and then fled [back] by [way of] Nan in that year (CMC: 133).

Both PMCS and CRCS mention the same date and places, only adding that the Lao fled back via Phræ. No Burmese records refer to this Lao attack. The chronicle of Nan mentions that the ruler of Nan was incited by a “Lao marauder” to rise up against the Burmese, as a result of which the city was completely devastated by the Nyaungyan forces in March 1704 (NC: 73-4; PTMN: 147/3-4).<sup>89</sup> The UK provides partial confirmation by noting that a Burmese army was dispatched from Ava to Nan via Chiang Mai in December 1703 (UK III: 376),<sup>90</sup> but provides no further explanation for the cause and consequence of this campaign.

42) In s. 1066, a *kap san* year (1704/05), the Ni Wun who ruled Chiang Sæn was brought to Chiang Mai and executed. Rak Phaya Cesu became Wun in his stead, and Phala E became *sithè* (CMC: 133).

Ni Wun is spelt “mani ngwan” in the CSC/065 and “moi wan” in the CSC/1251. The word probably derives from *myo-wun*, Burmese for viceroy (CSC/065: 104/2; CSC/1251: 17/4).<sup>91</sup> Rak Phaya Cesu is spelt by the CMC/1216 as “Lak Ya Cesu,” and presumably derives from the Burmese epithet “Lek-ya-zeithu,”<sup>92</sup> while Phala E may be another Burmese title, È Bra Yè.<sup>93</sup> Unfortunately, however, the execution of the Chiang Sæn ruler in Chiang Mai and the resultant appointments cannot be found in any of the Burmese documents.

<sup>89</sup> The Burmese attack on Nan is not mentioned at all in other Lan Na sources.

<sup>90</sup> Given the rank of Burmese officers in charge of this campaign, its size seems to have been modest. According to the NC, the Burmese had already been advancing on the city when the ruler of Nan made the risky choice in September 1703, while the PTMN has no reference to the approach of the Burmese prior to his making the final decision. The departure of the Burmese force from Ava in December 1703 and the fall of Nan in March 1704, as described in the UK, make the NC’s account less convincing.

<sup>91</sup> Both CMC/1216 and CMC/1288 write “ni wan (not wun),” which may suggest that either the author of the MS1741 or TPMCM missed an “m” in “mani ngwan,” when he copied the original manuscript(s).

<sup>92</sup> He is spelt “Mæng Læk Ya Cesung” in the CSC/065, and “Lak Ya Cesu” in the CSC/1251.

<sup>93</sup> Both CSC/065 and CSC/1251 spell him “Æ Phala Æ.” È Bra Yè is not an uncommon Burmese title.



43) In s. 1069, a *müang kai* year (1707/08), the Min Ræ Nara who ruled M. Leng came to take charge of Chiang Mai. On the sixth waning of the eighth month (22 May 1707) he appointed the man who ruled M. Rai to come to Chiang Rai, and Cao Nò Müang to go as Wun of Nan (CMC: 133).

Min Ræ Nara is an enigmatic figure. He might be Min-yè-naw-rahta, Burmese *myo-wun* of Chiang Mai, whose tenure lasted from s. 1044 (1682/83) until his death in s. 1080 (1718/19), although he had never governed, or “eaten,” a territory called M. Leng.<sup>94</sup> Neither the PMCS nor CRCS refers to the coming of Min Ræ Nara to Chiang Mai in this year, but the PMCS, CRCS, and NC all record the transfers to Chiang Rai and to Nan.<sup>95</sup>

44) In s. 1070, a *pæk cai* year (1708/09), the Khœn [named] Ai Sam Pi rebelled. King Min Sala came up by way of Chiang Mai, and Ai Sam Pi went off to the Hò. The Hò captured him and sent him back to be imprisoned and [then] incinerated, together with his whole family (CMC: 133).<sup>96</sup>

The chronicle of Chiang Tung does not mention the execution of its ruler by the Burmese, only stating, “This lord (Sam Pi) possessed supernatural power... (and) in s. 1017 (actually s. 1070) rebelled against and defeated the Burmese thrice.” (PMCT: 25) Meanwhile, accounts from Burma, Chiang Sæn, and Müang Yòng correspond to that of the CMC, even on where he escaped and how he was executed (YT III: 130; PMCS: 126; CRCS: 167; TMY: 49).<sup>97</sup> Both chronicles of Chiang Sæn credit the successful pacification of the Chiang Tung rebellion not to Min Sala but to his son.<sup>98</sup>

45) In s. 1077, a *dap met* year (1715/16), Sang Kòi La Khya Saphæk of Chiang Sæn went to consult with the King of Ava and brought back a royal order (amein-daw) stating that, since Cao In Müang who had been appointed to rule

<sup>94</sup> The only known appanage he ever had was Pan-tein, near Minbu along the Irrawaddy, granted by King Pyè.

<sup>95</sup> The PMCS and CRCS basically concur with the CMC, whereas the NC and PTMN offer more detailed accounts of Nò Müang, the new ruler of Nan, although they are somewhat different from each other (NC, p. 74; PTMN, f° 148/3-4).

<sup>96</sup> Compared to the Nan campaign just seen above, the scale of this one was far larger with thirty-nine contingents mobilized from all over the Burmese empire. The expedition was commanded by a son of King Sanei.

<sup>97</sup> No Chinese records, however, mention this incident that partially involved the Qing authorities in Yunnan.

<sup>98</sup> Min Sala (or Mæng Sara in the PMCS) is another mysterious figure of possible Burmese origin. Is he Min Ræ Nara of no. 43 above? According to the PMCS (p. 123), Mæng Sara, after subduing Müang Yòng, came to take charge of Chiang Mai in s. 1049 (1687/88). UK (p. 323) records the execution of a Müang Yòng lord in Chiang Mai in s. 1051, without providing details about its cause and consequence. It is still unclear whether the two incidents were related or not.

Nan had died, Chiang Mai and Chiang Sæn concurred in sending Phraya Tün to go and rule Nan (CMC: 133).<sup>99</sup>

“Sang Kòi La Khya Saphæk” should be two names, Sang Kòi La and Khya Saphæk. The former could be Thin-kyaw-hla, while the latter must be Bra-tha-paik, two common Burmese terms. Both CSC/065 and CSC/1251 spell the latter Phala Saphæk, who came to Chiang Sæn as *myo-wun* in either s. 1074 or 1072 (CSC/065: 106/2; CSC/1251: 18/2).<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, two Lan Na inscriptions dated s. 1088 and s. 1089 describe “Phala Saphæk” as the *myo-wun* of Chiang Sæn and also the lord of Chiang Rai (LI, pt. I, vol. II: 14-17). As always, no Burmese records mention the royal audience and appointment of the new Nan ruler. Neither does the PMCS. The CRCS dates the appointment of Cao In Müang as ruler of Nan to s. 1074, and that of Phraya Tün to s. 1077 (CRCS: 169).<sup>101</sup>

46) In s. 1089, a *müang met* year (1727/28), Thepphasing appeared in M. Yuam (Mæ Sariang). Min Ræ Nara, the ruler of Chiang Mai, appointed people to go and summon him.... Thepphasing brought up a force to enter the city (CMC: 134).

The HMY and chronicles of Chiang Sæn concur with the CMC on the year of the uprising (HMY III: 362; PMCS: 128; CRCS: 170).<sup>102</sup> However, several pages later, the CMC offers yet another year, s. 1091 (CMC: 142).<sup>103</sup> According to the Burmese accounts, Nyaungyan officials in Chiang Mai “severely oppressed the people and ground them down,” and, due to “heavy taxes and levies,” the locals rose up and eliminated them (LBHK: 293; HMY III: 362).<sup>104</sup> The Burmese materials, however, do not refer to Thepphasing or Min Ræ Nara.<sup>105</sup>

<sup>99</sup> This is the last episode the CMC and CRCS share. Hereafter their accounts widely diverge from each other.

<sup>100</sup> As “kh” and “ph” in the Lan Na alphabet share a circular form, sometimes undistinguishable in handwriting, the author of the MS1741 or TPMCM might have made a scribal error, which the scribe of the CMC/1288 followed.

<sup>101</sup> Chronicles of Nan have similar yet distinguishable stories, dating the ascension of Phraya Tün to s. 1088 (NC, p. 76; PTMN, ff° 149/4-150/1).

<sup>102</sup> PMCS (p. 128) has the precise date of the rebellion, s. 1089, on the fifth waxing of the fourth month, roughly in January 1728.

<sup>103</sup> Since the original manuscripts, CMC/1216, f° 6.19/2, and CMC/1288, f° 6.16/4, also refer to s. 1091 as the year when the revolt broke out, this is not due to a simple printing error by the CMC. It is totally unclear why the CMC has the two dates, s. 1089 and 1091. Worse yet, another Burmese chronicle says it was in s. 1092 (YT, III, 142).

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Lieberman, *Burmese Administrative Cycles*, p. 204. According to the PMCS, Min Ræ Nara was killed by the rebels, which is supported by CMC/1216, f° 6.08/4, and CMC/1288, f° 6.07/2. However, the English text of the CMC does not mention his tragic end. The translation seems to skip certain passages here.

<sup>105</sup> Thepphasing does not figure in the chronicles of Chiang Sæn either.

47) In s. 1090, a *pæk san* year, on the fifth waxing of the fourth month (4 January 1729), Sakhæng Phaya led an army from Ava (CMC: 135).<sup>106</sup>

There is no reference to this Burmese campaign in the chronicles of Chiang Sæn. However, the most contemporary Burmese record, submitted to the Konbaung monarch by the former Ava ministers in the mid-1750s, refers to Thakin Pyè (Sakhæng Phaya in the text) as the commander of a Burmese punitive expedition against Chiang Mai, although with a different date of s. 1092 (ROB III: 117).<sup>107</sup>

48) In s. 1094, a *tao cai* year, on the eighth waning of the fourth month (8 January 1733), Cao Ong Kham followed up the Burmese force of Sakhæng Phaya to Phayao. The Burmese general, Sakhæng Phaya, then fled to Chiang Sæn.... As for Chiang Sæn, the King of Ava issued a royal order appointing Sakhæng Phia as the Myo Wun named Phia Saphæk (CMC: 135-36).

Cao Ong Kham was also known to the contemporary Burmese, who correctly described him as a son of the Lao king (LBHK: 293).<sup>108</sup> Meanwhile, this Burmese campaign seems unlikely, as the CMC itself has just remarked that the Burmese force led by Sakhæng Phaya came to Chiang Mai in s. 1090, and Burmese records report that in s. 1094, Thakin Pyè (Sakhæng Phaya) was already in Ava where King Tanin-ga-nuwei conferred a princely title upon him (ROB III: 184; LBHK: 297). This Burmese evidence also makes the appointment of Sakhæng Phia (i.e. Sakhæng Phaya) as *myo-wun* of Chiang Sæn very unlikely.<sup>109</sup> Furthermore, as seen above (no. 45), the epigraphic record clearly suggests that Phaya Saphæk (Bra-tha-paik in Burmese) was already in office in the mid-1720s (LI, pt. I, vol. II: 14-17). That Sakhæng Phaya and Phaya Saphæk were the same person is not confirmed by any other sources, either Burmese or Lan Na.

49) In s. 1095, a *ka pao* year (1733/34), the Mon *sitkè* Nòi Phung was the head

<sup>106</sup> The date, “the fifth waxing of the fourth month,” is rather problematic, as it coincides with that of the PMCS just seen above (no. 46) when the Chiang Mai uprising broke out (the year is one year earlier, though). It is less likely that this is a mere coincidence: it is probably due to a misreading or scribal error by either side.

<sup>107</sup> HMY (III, 362) mentions an Ava retaliatory expedition dispatched in s. 1089, more precisely November 1727, while YT (III, 143) agrees with the ROB on the year, adding the more exact date, September 1730. Although differing in the date of the expedition, both chronicles at least concur that a Burmese commander named Min-yè-yanda-thu led the Burmese forces, as explained in CMC (p. 135n). Thakin Pyè, also known as Shwei-pyè, son of King Tanin-ga-nwei, was conferred a princely epithet, Min-yè-yanda-thu, in s. 1094 (1732/33), after returning from the Chiang Mai campaign (ROB, III, 184; LBHK, p. 297).

<sup>108</sup> Ong Kham’s Lao origin is pointed out in CMC, p. 134.

<sup>109</sup> As there is no spelling shift from Sakhæng Phaya to Sakhæng Phia in the original manuscript, “Phia” should be written “Phaya.”

of an army of ten thousand men who came to take charge of Chiang Mai and tried to scale the walls at the Hua Rin and Ku Rūang [corners], but failed, and withdrew in defeat (CMC: 136).

While most Burmese records, including the HMY, LBHK, ROB, and YT, neglect this failed military attempt, the *Mahayazawin-gyaw*, written by one of the scribes that compiled the HMY, refers to it, without mentioning the Mon *sitkè Nòi Phung* (MYG: 102).<sup>110</sup> The third and final Burmese expedition against Chiang Mai was dispatched immediately after the enthronement of Maha-dama-yaza-di-pati, the last king of the Nyaungyan dynasty, whose reign began in November 1733. After the astonishing and humiliating triple defeat, Ava could not afford to launch another punitive expedition to the highland periphery of the kingdom, due to the intensifying Manipuri raids on the Burmese heartland and the revolt of Lower Burma that would eventually lead to the fall of Ava in 1752.<sup>111</sup>

## Conclusion

The original text of *The Chiang Mai Chronicle*, presumably written in the late 1820s, is no doubt a “valid and respectable work of Lan Na history-writing,” demanding “the reader’s respect and, indeed, admiration,” but is also “by no means perfect or beyond reproach.” (CMC: xl)

This article has attempted to identify and correct some of the “mistakes and imperfections” in the text by mainly looking into Burmese documents and Lan Na chronicles, especially those of Chiang Sæn, because the CMC “cannot be understood until its sources have been fully explored.” (CMC: xxxix) While many sources still remain unexplored and unidentified, this article has at least revealed that the portion of the chronicle on Burmese rule is copied from the chronicle of Chiang Sæn, and that 19th century authors inserted, or fabricated, some information in order to shift the focus of the narrative from Chiang Sæn to Chiang Mai. Therefore, certain parts of the CMC during the Burmese era are misleading, including the ascension of fictitious rulers to the Chiang Mai throne during the second half of the 17th century.<sup>112</sup>

The CMC reveals little about Burmese administration, local economic life, or religious developments, the main concern of the people at that time and place.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Lieberman, *Administrative Cycles*, p. 205n. It is rather interesting that the MYG keeps the record of the unsuccessful expedition, while the HMY, to which the author of the MYG was a leading contributor, omits it.

<sup>111</sup> While losing Chiang Mai to the rebels, Ava still kept Chiang Sæn, another stronghold in Lan Na, where a garrison of one thousand men was sent in 1737, and newly appointed officials took office in 1740 (MYG, pp. 119, 140).

<sup>112</sup> Besides the CMC, p. 96, Wyatt’s *Thailand* and Sarassawadee’s *History* show a list of Chiang Mai rulers reconstructed from the CMC (Wyatt, *Thailand*, pp. 310-11; HLN, p. 253). As some of the rulers during the Burmese period were non-existent, the list needs to be rewritten.

In short, it offers no picture of Lan Na society under Nyaungyan rule. As a result, research on the Burmese era in Lan Na has been largely neglected by local and foreign scholars.<sup>113</sup>

The era of Burmese domination coincides with the “early modern” period, a time of intense change, during which emerged the forces that would shape the modern world (Reid 1993: 7). While study of early modern Southeast Asia has focused on the major coastal powers open to maritime commerce, the upland regions such as Lan Na were by no means immune to world trends, and were also “involved in the same sorts of global transformations.” (Wyatt 1999: 265)

The study of Lan Na under Burmese rule has the potential to present a new picture of early modern Southeast Asia seen from the interior. Scholars will need to venture beyond the CMC and examine the manuscripts of Lan Na and other Tai domains for this era. And it is genuinely hoped that these scholars will make future corrections and suggestions on this “imperfect” article.

## Abbreviations

- CCK Volker Grabowsky and Renoo Wichasin, eds. and trans., *Chronicles of Chiang Khæng*.
- CMC David K. Wyatt and Aroonrut Wichienkeeo, trans. and eds. *The Chiang Mai Chronicle*
- CMC/1216 *Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai*. Transcribed in cs 1216 (1854). Reproduced in Udom Rungruangsi, et al., comp., *Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai*, chabap Chiang Mai 700 Pi, pp. 256-320.
- CMC/1288 *Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai*. Transcribed in cs 1288 (1926). Prepared by Hans Penth.
- CSC/065 *Tamnan Phün Müang Ngøenyang Chiang Sæn*. MS. Wat Sri Khomkham, *tambon* Wiang, *amphæ* Müang, Chiang Mai; SRI 81.066.05.065, 109 ff°.
- CSC/1251 *Phün Müang Chiang Rai Chiang Sæn*. Transcribed in cs 1251 (1889). MS. Wat Methangkrawat, *tambon* Naiwiang, *amphæ* Müang, Phræ; SRI 81.088.05.082, 82 ff°.
- Cøem *Phraratchaphongsawadan Krung Si Ayutthaya chabap Phan Chanthanumat*.
- CRCS Sarassawadee Ongsakul, tr., *Phün Müang Chiang Rai Chiang Sæn*.

<sup>113</sup> I have already mentioned the two notable exceptions to this academic trend above in the Introduction.

- CS *Chulasakarat*, the “Lesser Era;” + 638/39 = AD
- EH Nantha Sutkul, tr., *Eksan khong Holanda samai Krung Si Ayutthaya*.
- f°, ff° folio, folios (page, pages)
- HMY *Hmannan Mahayazawindawgyi*.
- KMRC Singkha Wannasai, tr., *Khlong Rüang Mangthra Rop Chiang Mai*.
- LBHK Thiriuzana, *Lawkabyuhakyan*.
- LI Prasert Na Nagara et al., eds., *Lan Na Inscriptions*.
- List *List of Microfilms Deposited in the Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies. Part 8. Burma*.
- LPS *Phraratchaphongsawadan Krung Kao chabap Luang Prasøtaksonnit*.
- MSL *Ming Shilu*.
- MS1741 Suriyavamsa Bhikkhu, *Tamnan Ratchawong Phraya Lan Na Thai*.
- MYG Mon-ywe Hsaya-daw, *Mahayazawingyaw*.
- NC David K. Wyatt, tr. and ed., *The Nan Chronicle*.
- NSML *Nangsü Phün Müang Chiang Mai Nangsü Suttho Mangtha Luang*. MS. Wat Sri Phumma, *tambon Thungfai, amphæ Müang*, Lampang; SRI 81.065.05.023, 52 ff°.
- PMCT Phraya Kanglong, *Phap Nangsü Phün Müang læ Carit Ratcha Paweni Khemaratta Tungga Puri*.
- PMCS Sarassawadee Ongsakul, tr., *Phün Müang Chiang Scen*.
- PMSW U Camyi, *Phün Müang Scenwi*.
- PMSW-MY Renoo Wichasin, ed. and trans. *Phün Müang Scenwi: Chabap Høkham Müang Yai*.
- PPPH *Phraratcha Phongsawadan chabap Phraratcha Hatlekha*.
- PTMN *Prawat Tang Müang Nan*. MS. Wat Phra Køet, *tambon Wiangnüa, amphæ Müang*, Nan; SRI 82.107.05.045, 182 ff°.
- PY Phraya Prachakitkorachak, *Phongsawadan Yonok*.
- QSL *Qing Shilu*.
- ROB Than Tun, ed., *The Royal Orders of Burma*.
- s. *Sakkarat*, “year of the [Lesser] Era” (CS)
- SMK Burma, Department of Archaeology, *Sheihaung Myanma Kyauksamya*.
- SRI Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University
- TCM *Tamnan Chiang Mai*. MS. Wat Chai Sri Phum, *tambon Chang Mòi, amphæ Müang*, Chiang Mai; SRI 78.021.05.066, 27 ff°.
- TLP *Tamnan Lamphun*. MS. Wat Münlan, *tambon Sri Phum, amphæ*

- Müang, Chiang Mai; SRI 78.012.05.014, 53 ff°.
- TMY Tawee Swangpanyangkoon, ed., *Tamnan Müang Yòng*.
- UK U Kala, *Mahayazawingyi*.
- vV Chris Baker et al., *Van Vliet's Siam*.
- YT Twinthintaikwun Mahasitu, *Mahayazawinthat*.
- YWG U Kala, *Yazawingyok*.
- ZY Sithu Gamani Thingyan, *Zinmè Yazawin*.

## References

### *Manuscripts and Typescripts*

- Mon-ywe Hsaya-daw. *Mahayazawingyaw* [Celebrated Royal Chronicle]. TS. Prepared by Dr. Than Tun. List 24-25.
- Nangsü Phün Müang Chiang Mai Nangsü Suttho Mangtha Luang* [History of Chiang Mai and Suttho Mangtha Luang]. MS. Wat Sri Phumma, *tambon* Thungfai, *amphæ* Müang, Lampang; SRI 81.065.05.023, 52 ff°.
- Penth, Hans, ed. 1996. *Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai* [The Chiang Mai Chronicle]. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.
- Phraya Kanglong. *Phap Nangsü Phün Müang læ Carit Ratcha Paweni Khemaratta Tungga Puri* [History and Royal Customs of Chiang Tung]. MS. Reproduced in *Phongsawadan Müang Chiang Tung*, pp. 7-32. Chiang Mai: Crem. Cao Mæ Thipwan Na Chiang Tung.
- Phün Müang Chiang Rai Chiang Sæn* [Chronicles of Chiang Rai and Chiang Sæn]. MS. Wat Methangkrawat, *tambon* Naiwiang, *amphæ* Müang, Phræ; SRI 81.088.05.082, 82 ff°.
- Prawat Tang Müang Nan* [History of the Founding of Nan]. MS. Wat Phra Kœt, *tambon* Wiangnüa, *amphæ* Müang, Nan; SRI 82.107.05.045, 182 ff°.
- Tamnan Chiang Mai* [History of Chiang Mai]. MS. Wat Chai Si Phum, *tambon* Chang Mòi, *amphæ* Müang, Chiang Mai; SRI 78.021.05.066, 27 ff°.
- Tamnan Lamphun* [History of Lamphun]. MS. Wat Münlan, *tambon* Si Phum, *amphæ* Müang, Chiang Mai; SRI 78.012.05.014, 53 ff°.
- Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai* [Chronicle of Chiang Mai]. MS. Reproduced in Udom Rungruang Sri, et al. comp., *Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai, chabap Chiang Mai 700 Pi*, pp. 256-320. Chiang Mai: Chiang Mai Culture Center.
- Tamnan Phün Müang Ngœnyang Chiang Sæn* [Chronicle of Chiang Sæn]. MS.

Wat Sri Khomkham, *tambon* Wiang *amphæ* Müang, Chiang Mai; SRI 81.066.05.065, 109 ff°.

U Camyi. 1959. *Phiin Müang Sænwi* [Chronicle of Hsenwi]. MS. In the Possession of Prof. Tadahiko Shintani of the Institute for the Study of the Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo.

*Books and Articles*

Baker, Chris, et al. 2005. *Van Vliet's Siam*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.

Burma, Department of Archaeology. 1972-87. *Shehaung Myanma Kyauksamya* [Ancient Burmese inscriptions]. 5 vols. Rangoon: Department of Archaeology.

Dijk, Wil O. 2006. *Seventeenth-century Burma and the Dutch East India Company, 1634-1680*. Singapore: Singapore University Press.

Fitch, Ralph. 1905. "The Voyage of Master Ralph Fitch Merchant of London... Begun in the Yeere of Our Lord 1583 and Ended 1591." In *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, vol. X, pp. 165-204. Glasgow: Hakluyt Society.

Grabowsky, Volker and Renoo Wichasin, eds. and trans. 2008. *Chronicles of Chiang Khæng: A Tai Lü Principality of the Upper Mekong*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Center for Southeast Asian Studies.

*Hmannan Mahayazawindawgyi* [The Glass Palace Great Royal Chronicle]. 1967. 3 vols. Rangoon: Pyigyidaing Press.

Kala, U. 1960. *Mahayazawingyi* [Great Royal Chronicle]. 3 vols. Rangoon: Hanthawaddy Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1965. *Yazawingyok* [Concise Royal Chronicle]. Rangoon: Hanthawaddy Press.

Latdawal Sænsiao. 2002. *200 Pi: Phama nai Lan Na* [200 Years: Burmese in Lan Na]. Bangkok: Ten May Production.

Lieberman, Victor B. 1984. *Burmese Administrative Cycles: Anarchy and Conquest, c. 1580-1760*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Liew-Harres, Foon Ming, and Volker Grabowsky, in collaboration with Aroonrut Wichienkeo. 2008. *Lan Na in Chinese Historiography: Sino-Tai Relations as Reflected in the Yuan and Ming Sources (13th to 17th Centuries)*. Bangkok: Institute of Asian Studies, Chulalongkorn University.

*List of Microfilms Deposited in the Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies. Part 8. Burma*. 1976. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko.

*Ming Shi* [Official History of the Ming]. 1974. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.

*Ming Shilu* [Veritable Records of the Ming]. 1964. Taipei: Guoli Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan Lishi Yuyuan Yanjiusuo.

Nantha Sutkul, tr. 1970. *Eksan khong Holanda samai Krung Si Ayutthaya* [Dutch Records in the Ayutthaya Period]. Bangkok: Department of Fine Arts.



- Phraratcha *Phongsawadan chabap Phraratcha Hatlekha* [Royal Chronicle: Royal Autographic Edition]. 1912 (1973). 7th ed. Bangkok: Khlangwitthaya.
- Phraratcha Phongsawadan Krung Kao chabap Luang Prasætaksonnit* [Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya: Luang Prasæ Edition]. 1971. Bangkok: Crem. Nainat Krataitong.
- Phraratcha Phongsawadan Krung Si Ayutthaya chabap Phan Chanthanumat* [Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya: Phan Chanthanumat Edition]. 1971. Bangkok: Crem. Nainat Krataitong.
- Phraya Prachakitkorachak. 1898(1972). *Phongsawadan Yonok* [Yonok Chronicle]. 6th ed. Bangkok: Phræphittaya.
- Pimenta, Nicolas, et al. 1905. "Indian Observations Gathered out of the Letters of Nicolas Pimenta..." In *Hakluytus Posthumus or Purchas His Pilgrimes*, vol. X, pp. 205-222. Glasgow: Hakluyt Society
- Prasert Na Nagara et al., eds. 1991-2008. *Lan Na Inscriptions*. 4 vols. Bangkok: Amarin.
- Qing Shilu* [Veritable Records of the Qing]. 1985-86. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Reid, Anthony. 1993. "Introduction: A Time and a Place." In *Southeast Asia in the Early Modern Era: Trade, Power, and Belief*, pp. 1-19. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Renoo Wichasin, ed. and tr. 2007. *Phün Müang Sænwi: Chabap Hòkham Müang Yai* [Chronicle of Hsenwi: Golden Palace of Müang Yai Edition]. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.
- Sarassawadee Ongsakul. 2003. *Phün Müang Chiang Sæn* [Chronicles of Chiang Sæn]. Bangkok: Amarin.
- \_\_\_\_\_, tr. 2003. "Phün Müang Chiang Rai Chiang Sæn [Chronicles of Chiang Rai and Chiang Sæn]." In *Phün Müang Chiang Sæn*, pp. 149-224.
- \_\_\_\_\_, tr. 2003. "Phün Müang Chiang Sæn [Chronicle of Chiang Sæn]." In *Phün Müang Chiang Sæn*, pp. 23-148.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. *History of Lan Na*. Chitraporn Tanratanakul, tr. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.
- Singkha Wannasai, tr. 1979. *Khlong Rüang Mangthra Rop Chiang Mai* [Verse of the Burmese Monarch Waging War on Chiang Mai]. Chiang Mai: Nang Kimhò Nimmanhemmin.
- Sithu Gamani Thingyan. 2003. *Zimme Yazawin* [Chronicle of Chiang Mai]. Thaw Kaung and Ni Ni Myint, trans. Yangon: Universities Historical Research Center.
- Sunait Chutintharanon. 2000. "Historical Writings, Historical Novels and Period

- Movies and Dramas: An Observation Concerning Burma in Thai Perception and Understanding.” *Journal of the Siam Society* 88, 1 & 2: 53-57.
- Tawee Swangpanyangkoon, tr. and ed. 1984. *Tamnan Müang Yòng* [Chronicle of Müang Yòng]. Chiang Mai: Chiang Mai University.
- Than Tun, tr. and ed. 1983-1990. *The Royal Orders of Burma, A.D. 1598-1885*. 10 vols. Kyoto: Kyoto University Center for Southeast Asian Studies.
- Thiriuzana. 1958(2001). *Lawkabyuhakyan* [Treatise on Customary Terms]. 3rd ed. Rangoon: Tekkathomya Press.
- Twinthintaikwun Mahasitu. 1968-98. *Mahayazawinthat* [Great New Chronicle]. 3 vols. Rangoon: Mingala Press, et al.
- Udom Rungruangsi. 2003. *Wannakam Lan Na* [Literature of Lan Na]. 5th ed. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University Book Center.
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al., comp. 1995. *Tamnan Phün Müang Chiang Mai, chabap Chiang Mai 700 Pi* [The 700th Anniversary Volume of the Chiang Mai Chronicle]. Chiang Mai: Chiang Mai Culture Center.
- Wyatt, David K. 1982 (2003). *Thailand: A Short History*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. “Southeast Asia ‘Inside Out,’ 1300-1800: A Perspective from the Interior.” In *Beyond Binary Histories: Re-imagining Eurasia to c. 1830*, pp. 245-65. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, tr. and ed. 1994. *The Nan Chronicle*. Ithaca: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program.
- Wyatt, David K., and Aroonrut Wichienkeo, trans. and eds. 1995 (1998). *The Chiang Mai Chronicle*. 2nd ed. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.