

การศึกษาบทบาทของ “อนุชา” น้องชาย ในรามเกียรติ์และ
เปรียบเทียบกับการพรรณนาทางประวัติศาสตร์ไทย



นายเฟรเดอริก บี กออสส์

สถาบันวิทยบริการ

จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

วิทยานิพนธ์นี้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรปริญญาอักษรศาสตรมหาบัณฑิต

สาขาวิชาไทยศึกษา

คณะอักษรศาสตร์ จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

ปีการศึกษา 2550

ลิขสิทธิ์ของจุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF “*ANUCHA*”, THE YOUNGER
BROTHER, IN *RAMAKIEN* AND PARALLELS WITH THAI
HISTORICAL NARRATIVE



Mr Frederick B. Goss

สภามหาวิทยาลัยศิลปากร
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts Program in Thai Studies
Faculty of Arts
Chulalongkorn University
Academic Year 2007
Copyright of Chulalongkorn University

Thesis Title A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF “ANUCHA”, THE
 YOUNGER BROTHER, IN RAMAKIEN AND
 PARALLELS WITH THAI HISTORICAL
 NARRATIVES

By Mr Frederick B. Goss

Field of Study Thai Studies

Thesis Advisor Associate Professor Suchitra Chongstitvatana, Ph.D.

Thesis Co-advisor Dhiravat na Pombejra, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master’s Degree

Theraphan Luangthongkum..... Dean of the Faculty of Arts
(Professor Theraphan Luangthongkum, Ph.D.)

THESIS COMMITTEE

Siraporn Nathalang..... Chairperson
(Associate Professor Siraporn Nathalang, Ph.D.)

S. Chongstitvat..... Thesis Advisor
(Associate Professor Suchitra Chongstitvatana, Ph.D.)

D.P...... Thesis Co-advisor
(Dhiravat na Pombejra, Ph.D.)

Namphueng Padamalangula..... Member
(Namphueng Padamalangula, Ph.D.)

เฟรเดอริก บี กอสส์: การศึกษามบทบาทของ “อนุชา” น้องชาย ในรามเกียรติ์และเปรียบเทียบกับการพรรณนาทางประวัติศาสตร์ไทย. (A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF “ANUCHA”, THE YOUNGER BROTHER, IN RAMAKIEN AND PARALLELS WITH THAI HISTORICAL NARRATIVES) อ. ที่ปรึกษา: รศ. ดร. สุจิตรา จงสถิตย์วัฒนา; อ. ที่ปรึกษาร่วม: อ. ดร. ชีรวัด ณ ป้อมเพชร 160 หน้า.

รามเกียรติ์ ซึ่งเป็นวรรณกรรมไทยที่แผลงมาจากมหากาพย์รามายณะของอินเดีย มีส่วนสำคัญในแบบแผนของวรรณคดีไทย ตัวละครและแนวความคิดของรามเกียรติ์ปรากฏอยู่ในหลากหลายรูปแบบทางวัฒนธรรมและประวัติศาสตร์ อีกทั้งยังถูกนำมาจัดลำดับบทบาทและความสัมพันธ์ใน “อุคมคติ” วิทยานิพนธ์ฉบับนี้ หอสมุดบทบาทของพระอนุชา นาวีเคราะห์ ตัวละครที่เป็นพระอนุชาสามพระองค์ในเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ได้นำมาศึกษาโดยละเอียด ประกอบด้วย พระลักษมณ์ สุกรีพ และพิเภก

จากการศึกษา ซึ่งได้ค้นพบบทบาทของพระอนุชาโดยวิเคราะห์รามเกียรติ์ต้นฉบับภาษาไทยของพระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธยอดฟ้าจุฬาโลกมหาราชพบว่า พระอนุชาทั้งสามพระองค์ มีลักษณะพฤติกรรมที่คล้ายคลึงกันในเชิงความสัมพันธ์กับพระเชษฐา แม้จะออกได้เป็นสี่ประการ นั่นคือ จงรักภักดี เชื่อฟัง เคารพ และยอมทำตาม ซึ่งพฤติกรรมทั้งสี่ประการดังกล่าวเป็นตัวกำหนดบทบาทของพระอนุชาในเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ นอกจากนี้ อาจถือได้ว่าพระอนุชาทั้งสามพระองค์เป็นแบบอย่างของพระอนุชาใน “อุคมคติ” เพราะถูกกำหนดบทบาทให้เป็นผู้ยึดมั่นในกรอบพฤติกรรมสำหรับพระอนุชา แม้ว่าจะมีโอกาสออกนอกกรอบออกไปได้ก็ตาม และยังคงแสดงออกถึงพฤติกรรมทั้งสี่ประการในความสัมพันธ์ของตนกับพระเชษฐาได้อย่างสม่ำเสมอและเป็นรูปแบบเดียวกัน ดังนั้น การศึกษาจึงสรุปได้ว่าภาพลักษณ์ของพระอนุชาใน “อุคมคติ” ตามที่ปรากฏในท้องเรื่องรามเกียรติ์คือ จงรักภักดีอย่างเสมอต้นเสมอปลาย เชื่อฟังโดยปราศจากข้อสงสัย นับถือโดยไม่สั้นกลอน และยอมทำตามโดยแน่วแน่

ในส่วนที่สองของวิทยานิพนธ์ฉบับนี้ได้วิเคราะห์บทบาทและรูปแบบของพระอนุชาในเชิงเปรียบเทียบกับพระอนุชาในเรื่องเล่าพรรณนาทางประวัติศาสตร์ของไทย ได้แก่ สมเด็จพระเอกาทศรถ เจ้าพระยาสุรสีห์ และ สมเด็จพระปิ่นเกล้า ในสภาวะกดดันจากปัจจัยหลายด้านในรัชสมัยนั้น ๆ ลักษณะพฤติกรรมของพระอนุชาทั้งสามพระองค์ที่มีต่อพระเชษฐายังถูกบรรยายถ่ายทอด จำแนกออกมาได้ดังนี้ เป็นพระสหายที่จงรักภักดี เป็นข้าราชการที่ยอมทำตามโดยปราศจากข้อสงสัย เป็นผู้ร่วมชะตากรรมที่เคารพนบถ และเป็นผู้ติดตามที่เชื่อฟังแต่โดยดี พฤติกรรมเหล่านี้ถูกจำกัดความเป็นแบบเดียวกับพฤติกรรมของผู้เป็นพระอนุชาใน “อุคมคติ” ในเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ การวิเคราะห์พฤติกรรมของรามเกียรติ์และการพรรณนาในประวัติศาสตร์ไทยนั้นบ่งชี้ให้เห็นว่ามีคุณลักษณะที่ยังอิงวรรณคดีซึ่งเป็นอิทธิพลที่ส่งผลต่อประวัติศาสตร์อย่างเห็นได้ชัด นั้นยังสะท้อนให้เห็น “การสร้างอุคมคติ” ให้กับบุคคลในประวัติศาสตร์

นอกเหนือจากที่กล่าวมานี้ การเปรียบเทียบระหว่างรามเกียรติ์และรามายณะ ที่แต่งโดยวาลมิกิแปลโดย Makhn Sen นั้นยังแสดงให้เห็นถึงบทบาทของพระอนุชาในรามเกียรติ์ที่ถูกนำเสนอในรูปแบบของ “อุคมคติ” หรือจะเรียกได้ว่าเป็น “เหนืออุคมคติ” ในรามายณะตามฉบับของวาลมิกิก็ได้ ซึ่งสามารถหาเรื่องราวที่เป็นภาพเขียนตามจิตรกรรมฝาผนังได้ที่วัดพระศรีรัตนศาสดาราม

จากการศึกษานี้บ่งชี้ให้เห็นว่าสังคมไทยยังคงรักษาไว้ซึ่งการดำรงชีวิตตามหลัก “อุคมคติ” ที่ได้มาจากพฤติกรรมของตัวละครที่เป็นพระอนุชาดังปรากฏในเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ หรือจากการพรรณนาในบทบาทพระอนุชาของประวัติศาสตร์ไทย

สาขาวิชา ไทยศึกษา

ลายมือชื่อนิติ.....

ลายมือชื่ออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษา.....

ลายมือชื่ออาจารย์ที่ปรึกษาร่วม.....

ปีการศึกษา 2550

4880815122: MAJOR: THAI STUDIES

KEY WORDS: *RAMAKIEN* / *RAMAYANA* / *ANUCHA* / YOUNGER BROTHER / PHRA LAK (LAKSHMANA) / PHRA RAM (RAMA) / SUKHRIP (SUGRIVA) / PHIPHEK (VIBHISHANA) / LITERARY TRADITION / THAI HISTORY / EKATHOTSAROT / PRINCE SURASIH / KING PINKLAO

FREDERICK B. GOSS: A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF "*ANUCHA*", THE YOUNGER BROTHER, IN *RAMAKIEN* AND PARALLELS WITH THAI HISTORICAL NARRATIVE. THESIS ADVISOR: SUCHITRA CHONGSTITVATANA, PH.D., THESIS CO-ADVISOR: DHIRAVAT NA POMBEJRA, PH.D., PP. 160

Ramakien, the Thai rendition of the Indic epic *Ramayana*, is an important part of the Thai literary tradition. Characters and themes from *Ramakien* can be seen in many aspects of Thai culture and history and have been used to classify 'ideal' roles and relationships. This thesis selects the role of the younger brother for analysis. Three younger brother characters from *Ramakien* are examined in detail: Phra Lak, Sukhrip, and Phiphek.

This study, which explores the role of younger brother through an analysis of the original Thai language text of King Rama I's rendition of the epic, finds there is common behavior among the three characters with respect to their relationship with their older brothers, behavior which can be defined in terms of four behavior traits: **loyalty**, **obedience**, **respect** and **deference**. Accordingly, it is concluded that a role of younger brother in *Ramakien* can be defined using these behavior traits. Furthermore, these three younger brothers can be characterized as 'ideal' younger brothers because they are depicted never deviating from their younger brother behavior, even when presented the opportunity to stray, and consistently demonstrate all four traits in their relationship with their older brothers. Accordingly, this study concludes that the portrait of an 'ideal' younger brother, as represented in *Ramakien*, is one of unwavering **loyalty**, unquestioned **obedience**, unshakable **respect** and unflinching **deference** toward their older brother.

A second part of this thesis analyzes the way in which royal younger brother figures have been portrayed in Thai historical narratives, primarily the royal chronicles, but also latter-day narratives. Three royal younger brothers from Thai history are examined: Ekathotsarot, Prince Surasih, and King Pinklao. With varying degrees of intensity, these three historical royal younger brothers are portrayed in the historical narratives as consistent in their behavior of being a **loyal** companion, an **obedient** servant, a **respectful** attendant and a **deferential** follower of their older brothers, the same qualities identified as defining the 'ideal' younger brother in *Ramakien*. A parallel analysis of *Ramakien* and the Thai historical narratives indicates that the narratives have strong literature-like aspects, which has an impact on historical focus, a focus that clearly trends toward 'idealization' of historical royal figures.

In addition, a comparison between *Ramakien* and Makhan Sen's translation of Valmiki's *Ramayana* shows that the role of younger brother in *Ramakien* is presented as being more 'idealized', perhaps even 'super-idealized', as compared to this version of Valmiki's *Ramayana*. This 'super-idealization' is also seen in an examination of the pictorial depictions of *Ramakien* in the mural paintings along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha.

The findings from this study indicate that an important aspect of Thai society has been the desire to project and uphold the 'ideal', as represented by the behavior depicted in the younger brother characters in *Ramakien* and paralleled in the portrayal of the royal younger brothers in the Thai historical narratives.

Field of study: Thai Studies

Student's signature..... 

Advisor's signature..... 

Academic year: 2007

Co-advisor's signature..... 

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I was introduced as a young boy to the fascinating world of Thailand by my grandmother, Josephine Stanton, whom we called Memmem. One of the things she exposed me to, and which held my fascination, was the mural paintings of *Ramakien* at Wat Phra Kaew. So, when I came to live in Thailand, I set as a quixotic quest, perhaps an impossible dream, to read the original Thai verses of *Ramakien*, and, hence, the incentive to write this thesis. But, *Ramakien* is over 2,000 pages, with hundreds of characters and a myriad of themes. Hence, I turned to a personal matter. Having two older brothers, I would write about the younger brothers in *Ramakien*.

I first approached Ajarn Suchitra Chongstitvatana and she approved of the idea. So I must first thank her for the initial push on my quest and agreeing to be my advisor. I also have to express my appreciation for the many hours she spend helping me decipher the complex Thai text and suffering through my often naïve translations.

In addition, I must give a big thank you to my co-advisor, Ajarn Dhiravat na Pombejra. He gave me invaluable direction on navigating the arcane world of royal chronicles and other historical narratives, as well as constructive and useful advice on my analysis of the historical royal younger brothers, along with overall positive and timely feedback on my thesis.

I also have to give a special note of appreciation to Ajarn William Klausner, who was ready and available to lend me his thoughts on Thai society and culture. His numerous comments and suggestions helped immensely.

As most people find out, the thesis writing process cannot be completed without the help of many friends and family. So, first, I need to thank my many school colleagues, who were always there with a sympathetic ear or word of advice. In particular, I have to give a special mention to Rassamee Maneenin who gave me some of her valuable time to review and correct my translations of the Thai text and Ken Jengsuwan for his help translating my abstract, as well as my friend Anucha for being there. Naturally, I must also thank the entire staff of the Thai Studies Center for their help, at this time and during the years I have studied at Chulalongkorn University.

A special note of appreciation and gratitude also goes to my family who have been supportive and encouraging of my studies, especially to Mom for her superb assistance reading and editing my early drafts to correct those grammatical no-nos that can creep in during the heat of frenetic composition and Dad for his electronic help transmitting the corrections from afar.

Lastly, I want to give a deep wai to my adopted Thai aunt, Rabieb, who has made it possible for me to live in Thailand. Finally, I will dedicate this thesis to my grandmother for inspiring a love and fascination for things Thai. Thanks Memmem, I'll always remember you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT (THAI).....	iv
ABSTRACT (ENGLISH).....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Major Argument, Perspective, and Approach.....	2
B. Primary Objectives.....	3
C. Significance.....	3
D. Outline.....	4
E. Academic Literature.....	5
F. Primary Sources.....	7
CHAPTER II – BACKGROUND OF THE RAMA STORY AND <i>RAMAKIEN</i>	9
A. <i>Ramayana</i> to <i>Ramakien</i>	9
1. Valmiki’s <i>Ramayana</i>	9
2. <i>Ramakien</i> , A Southern Indian Idea.....	10
3. <i>Ramayana</i> in Southeast Asia.....	10
4. Summary.....	11
B. The Historical Importance of the Rama Story.....	11
1. Angkorian Period (8 th –13 th Century CE).....	11
2. Sukhothai (13 th –14 th Century CE).....	12
3. Ayutthaya (1351 to 1767 CE).....	12
4. Thonburi (1767-1782) and Bangkok (1782 to Present).....	13
C. Renditions of the Rama Story.....	15
1. The Rama Story in Ayutthaya.....	15
2. King Taksin Version.....	15
3. King Rama I’s Rendition.....	16
4. King Rama II’s Rendition.....	18
5. King Rama IV and King Rama V’s Contributions.....	18
6. King Rama VI.....	19
7. Modern Prose Versions.....	19
8. English Versions.....	21
CHAPTER III – SYNOPSIS OF <i>RAMAKIEN</i> AND COMPARISON WITH VALMIKI’S <i>RAMAYANA</i>	22
A. Synopsis of King Rama I’s <i>Ramakien</i>	22
1. Founding of Ayudhya and Longka.....	22
2. Birth of Phra Ram, Thotsakan and Others.....	23
3. Phra Ram Meets Nang Sida.....	24
4. Exile and Abduction.....	24
5. War and Rescue.....	25
6. More Fighting.....	26
7. Banishment of Nang Sida; Birth of Phra Ram’s Sons.....	27
8. Fight and Reconciliation.....	27
B. Valmiki’s <i>Ramayana</i> Compared to <i>Ramakien</i>	28
1. Valmiki’s <i>Ramayana</i>	28

2.	Character Comparisons.....	29
3.	Summary	42
CHAPTER IV – FACTORS AND TRAITS TO BE USED FOR ANALYZING THE ROLE OF YOUNGER BROTHER		43
A.	Hierarchy in Thai Society	43
1.	Patron-Client Relationships	44
2.	Standard Model of Behavior.....	45
B.	Kinship.....	48
1.	Hierarchy in Kinship Relationships.....	48
2.	Standard Model of Behavior.....	48
3.	Kinship Terms.....	49
C.	Language and Forms of Address	51
D.	Standard Behavior of Younger Brothers and Application to the Analysis of Younger Brothers in <i>Ramakien</i> and Thai Historical Narratives.....	54
CHAPTER V – ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF YOUNGER BROTHER IN <i>RAMAKIEN</i>		56
A.	Characters to Be Analyzed.....	56
1.	Phra Lak	57
2.	Sukhrip.....	57
3.	Phiphek	57
4.	Other Characters	58
B.	Description/Background of Younger Brother Characters.....	58
1.	Phra Lak	59
2.	Sukhrip.....	63
3.	Phiphek	65
C.	Evidence of Role Traits for Three Principal Characters.....	68
1.	Phra Lak	68
2.	Sukhrip.....	89
3.	Phiphek	94
4.	Summary	97
D.	Mural Paintings at the Temple of the Emerald Buddha.....	99
1.	Phra Lak	100
2.	Sukhrip.....	102
3.	Phiphek	102
4.	Summary	103
CHAPTER VI – ANALYSIS OF ROYAL YOUNGER BROTHERS IN THAI HISTORICAL NARRATIVES		104
A.	Prince Ekathotsarot and King Naresuan	105
1.	Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya.....	106
2.	Van Vliet – The Short History of the Kings of Siam.....	115
3.	Prince Damrong – Our Wars with the Burmese	118
4.	Other Historical Narratives	121
5.	Summary	123
B.	Prince Surasih and King Rama I.....	124
1.	The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign.....	125

2.	Other Narratives.....	133
3.	Summary	137
C.	King Pinklao and King Rama IV	138
1.	The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign	138
2.	Communications of Rama IV	143
3.	Modern Day Historical Narratives.....	147
4.	Rama IV as Younger Brother	150
5.	Summary	152
D.	Summary	153
1.	‘Ideal’ Younger Brothers	153
2.	Parallels with <i>Ramakien</i>	154
CHAPTER VII – CONCLUSION.....		155
A.	Findings and Conclusions	155
B.	Observations and Possible Further Research.....	158
C.	Final Remarks	160
REFERENCES.....		161
BIOGRAPHY.....		170

สถาบันวิทยบริการ
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Created to make merit for His Majesty, from many poets, who know various verses in khlung, kap, klon. The King's intention is to record a story of the ancient ages, these annals of Ramakien.

เกิดเพื่อสมภารบพิตร กระจวีวิธหลายหลาก รู้หลากหลายฉันท์ นิพนธ์โคลงกาพย์กลอน ภูธรคำริ
คำรัส จัดจ่องทำนองทำนุก ไตรดาคุณนิทาน ตำนานเนื่องเรื่องรามเกียรติ์¹

Thus, the introduction King Rama I's *Ramakien* starts; and what annals, what a story, what sadness and joy, what fun and satisfaction one gets from the recounting of the Rama story in this seminal piece of classical Thai literature; literature that inspires in its readers admiration, adulation and even awe, as well as anxiety for many students. It is an epic that is seemingly both a dusty volume on the shelf and living literature reflecting the face of Thailand. It is also literature, with its intricate verses and unfamiliar words, that is often remote and unapproachable to Thai and non-Thai alike. The original text, written in classical Thai poetic form of *klon bot lakhon*, uses beautiful and refined language that even many native Thai speakers find uncommon. This, combined with the sheer length and complexity of the work, makes it difficult to access, particularly for those not versed in classical Thai, similar to the way Shakespeare must appear to non-native English readers.

But, *Ramakien* is so widely represented in Thai culture and is such an important manifestation of long-established Thai social customs that it can not be ignored. From abstract ideas of 'ideal' behavior, to concrete representations of paintings on walls, *Ramakien* is a reflection of traditional Thai society. So, difficult or not, it is evident that anyone who truly wants to appreciate and understand Thailand, must try to reach inside *Ramakien* and see what is there.

¹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1* [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธยอดฟ้าจุฬาโลกมหาราช, เล่ม ๑] (Bangkok: Fine Arts Dept, 2540 BE (1997 CE)) Introduction 6.

A. Major Arguments, Perspectives, and Approaches

Inside *Ramakien* one will find time-honored themes of love and devotion, good versus evil, right over wrong, presented through intricate plots and sub-plots with a multitude of characters, all an important part of the literary tradition in Thailand. These characters have fascinated readers and researchers for ages, with many of them having been classified into conventional role models; the ‘perfect’ king, ‘ideal’ wife, ‘exemplary’ hero. But a role that has received less attention is that of the young brother, despite the fact that one of the main characters central to the action in *Ramakien* is the younger brother and devoted companion of the epic’s central figure. Thus, the role of younger brother has been selected as the subject of this thesis. The character of Phra Lak, often attributed with the label of the ‘ideal’ younger brother, will be the primary focus of this study, but attention and comparison will also be given to two other younger brothers, Sukhrip, younger brother of Phali, the Monkey King, and Phiphek, younger brother of the Demon King, Thotsakan. The scope of this study will be to explore the role of younger brother in its written form as depicted in Rama I’s *Ramakien*. Comparison to Valmiki’s *Ramayana* and depictions seen in the murals along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha in Bangkok will also be made.

The approach of this study will be to see how this literary work depicts and represents the behavior of younger brothers, particularly in relation to their older brother, in terms of devotion and obedience; and evaluate the consistency of their behavior, particularly in terms of establishing a profile of an ‘ideal’ younger brother. This is with the idea that if there is similar behavior among a number of characters in the same role, then we can define this role using that behavior.

In addition to the presentation of ‘idealized’ characters and role models in traditional Thai literature, Thai historical narratives also present many ‘idealized’ heroic figures. These narratives, particularly the state sponsored royal chronicles, primarily focus on the glorious exploits of kings and royalty, extolling their virtues and often attributing them with ‘ideal’ behavior. It is this common ‘idealization’ that invites the question of whether there are parallels between the way characters are presented in *Ramakien* and the portrayal of royal figures in Thai historical narratives.

Therefore, as a second part of this thesis, the way royal younger brothers have been portrayed in Thai historical narratives will be analyzed and parallels will be drawn between these narratives and the depiction of the 'ideal' younger brother as depicted in *Ramakien*. In order to provide focus to the research, three sets of brothers from Thai history have been selected for analysis: Ekathotsarot; Prince Surasih, and King Pinklao.

B. Primary Objectives

Accordingly, this thesis will attempt to explore these questions and issues with two primary objectives. The first is to study the role of younger brother in *Ramakien* and compare various younger brother characters to see if they are depicted having common behavior in relation to their older brothers. From that we can create a profile of the 'ideal' younger brother in *Ramakien*.

The second objective of this thesis is to examine the portrayal of royal younger brothers in selected Thai historical narratives and draw parallels between this portrayal and the presentation of the role of younger brother in *Ramakien*. After analyzing the results of this study, some conclusions and thoughts about these findings can be provided.

C. Significance

An in-depth study of the role of younger brother in *Ramakien* and the portrayal of royal younger brothers in Thai historical narratives can lead to a better understanding of *Ramakien* as a whole and the general presentation of Thai history. In addition, a comparison and analysis of the depiction and portrayal of these characters and historical figures between these two can lead to a better awareness of Thai society in general.

D. Outline

In order to set the stage, background information regarding *Ramakien* is provided in Chapter II. This includes the historical importance of *Ramakien* and the Rama story, along with its Indic cousin, *Ramayana*.

Chapter III presents a short synopsis of Rama I's *Ramakien*. In addition, a comparative analysis of *Ramakien* and Makhhan Sen's translation of Valmiki's *Ramayana* is provided. The review of Valmiki's *Ramayana*, the most widely known and often considered the 'original' *Ramayana*, is undertaken to help give a perspective to certain distinct elements of the characteristics of the role of younger brother in the *Ramakien*.

Chapter IV includes a discussion of the factors and traits identified as defining the common behavior of a younger brother with reference to certain features of Thai society such as hierarchy, patron-client relationships, kinship and language. These traits are then used to create a profile to be used in the analysis of the role of younger brother in *Ramakien* and Thai historical narratives in Chapters V and VI.

The detailed analysis of the role of younger brother is presented in Chapter V. This examination looks at three younger brother characters in Rama I's *Ramakien* through an investigation of their backgrounds and relationships with their older brothers to detect common behavior among these characters. Selected scenes and situations are detailed, with particular attention to language usage and the way the characters are depicted. From this, the profile of the role of younger brother is created and the picture of what constitutes an 'ideal' younger brother is painted. In addition, an examination of the portrayal of the younger brother characters from *Ramakien* in the mural along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha is provided.

The subject of Chapter VI is an analysis of the portrayal of three historical royal figures contained in selected Thai historical narratives. The narratives selected are primarily royal chronicles, with certain latter day texts as well. The portrayal of the three historical figures is examined through application of the behavior traits used in the analysis of the role of younger brother in *Ramakien*, to see how royal younger brother figures are portrayed in the narratives in their relationship with their older

brothers. Finally, parallels are identified between this portrayal of historical royal younger brothers and the depiction of younger brother characters in *Ramakien*.

In the final chapter, the conclusions that can be made from the research findings are set forth. In addition, a discussion is included of some possible future research that could be undertaken.

E. Academic Literature

The academic research in English on the primary roles or principal characters in *Ramakien* seems to be lacking. In fact, the body of serious academic literature in English relating to *Ramakien* in general is somewhat limited. The literature that is available, much of which has been cited where appropriate throughout this thesis, is mainly broad based in scope covering a general description of the story or focusing on social or cultural aspects. Specific titles of such literature include “A Comparative Study of the Sanskrit, Tamil, Thai and Malay Versions of the Story of Rama with Special Reference to the Process of Acculturation in the Southeast Asian Versions” and “The Rāma Story in the Thai Cultural Tradition” both by S. Singaravelu ²; Thai Customs and Social Values in the Ramakien and The Indian Influence on Thai Culture in the Thai Ramayana both by Srisurang Poolthupya ³; “Ramayana, Rama Jataka, and *Ramakien*: A Comparative Study of Hindu and Buddhist Traditions” by Frank E. Reynolds ⁴; and “Notes on the Saga of Rama in Thailand” by Christian Velder. ⁵ There is some literature on specific topics regarding *Ramakien*, although none in the nature of a literary role analysis. These include a review of historical material by Prince Dhani Nivat in “Review of Books-*The Ramakien of King of*

² S. Singaravelu, “A Comparative Study of the Sanskrit, Tamil, Thai and Malay Versions of the Story of Rama with Special Reference to the Process of Acculturation in the Southeast Asian Versions,” The Journal of the Siam Society 56.2 (July 1968): 137-185; and S. Singaravelu, “The Rāma Story in the Thai Cultural Tradition,” The Journal of the Siam Society 70 (1982): 50-70.

³ Srisurang Poolthupya, The Indian Influence on Thai Culture in the Thai Ramayana (Bangkok: Thai Khadi Research Institute, 1979); and Srisurang Poolthupya, Thai Customs and Social Values in the Ramakien (Bangkok: Thai Khadi Research Institute, 1981).

⁴ Frank E. Reynolds, “Ramayana, Rama Jataka, and *Ramakien*: A Comparative Study of Hindu and Buddhist Traditions,” Many Ramayanas, The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia, ed. Paula Richman (Berkeley: U of California P, 1991) 50-63.

⁵ Christian Velder, “Notes on the Saga of Rama in Thailand,” The Journal of the Siam Society 56.1 (Jan. 1968): 33-46.

Thonburi”⁶; “The Ramayana in the Arts of Thailand and Cambodia” by Julie B. Mehta⁷; Ramakien in Modern Performance: The Reflection of an Identity Crisis by Kittisak Kerdarunsuksri⁸; and a discussion of a specific episode in *Ramakien* in “The Episode of Maiyarab in the Thai Rāmakīen and Its Possible Relationship to Tamil Folklore” by Singaravelu.⁹

In addition, there are a few serious studies on specific episodes and sections in *Ramakien*. Theodora Helene Bofman undertakes a review of the literary aspects of *Ramakien* in The Poetics of the Ramakian [*sic*],¹⁰ in which she translates and analyzes a section from Rama I’s *Ramakien*. Bofman looks at the overall structure of the verses and analyzes the linguistic and literary devices used in the text. Klaus Wenk in Phali Teaches the Young, A Literary and Sociological Analysis of the Thai Poem Phali son nong,¹¹ analyzes a speech in *Ramakien* and corresponding texts from other sources, comparing the different versions and making observations on the sociological aspects of the speech. Finally, Pensak Chagsuchinda in Nang Loi The Floating Maiden¹² translates one scene from King Rama II’s rendition of *Ramakien*.

The body of literature regarding *Ramayana* is too vast to summarize effectively here. There are many courses of study and academic programs devoted solely to *Ramayana* research, including periodic *Ramayana* conferences, the first being held in 1984 and the most recent in 2005.¹³ A few of the anthologies of articles

⁶ Prince Dhani Nivat, “Review of Books-*The Ramakien of King of Thonburi*,” The Journal of the Siam Society 34.1 (Apr. 1943): 81-86.

⁷ Julie B. Mehta, “The Ramayana in the Arts of Thailand and Cambodia,” The Ramayana Revisited, ed. Mandakranta Bose (New York: Oxford UP, 2004) 323-334.

⁸ Kittisak Kerdarunsuksri, Ramakien in Modern Performance: The Reflection of an Identity Crisis (Amsterdam: 7th International Conference of Thai Studies, 1999).

⁹ S. Singaravelu, “The Episode of Maiyarab in the Thai Rāmakīen and Its Possible Relationship to Tamil Folklore,” The Journal of the Siam Society 74 (1986): 21-26.

¹⁰ Theodora Helene Bofman, The Poetics of the Ramakian (Detroit: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois Univ., 1984).

¹¹ Klaus Wenk, Phali Teaches the Young, A Literary and Sociological Analysis of the Thai Poem Phali son nong, trans. Volkmar Zuhlsdorff, Southeast Asia Paper No. 18 (Hawaii: University of Hawaii, Southeast Asian Studies, Asian Studies Program, 1980).

¹² Pensak Chagsuchinda, NANG LOI: The Floating Maiden, Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 18. (Denmark: University of Copenhagen, East Asian Institute, Thai Section, 1973).

¹³ “International Ramayana Conference Comes To NY,” Lokvani press release 20 Apr. 2005, Lokvani 27 Aug 2007 <www.lokvani.com/lokvani/article.php?article_id=2449>.

and writings on *Ramayana* that deserve mention are Many Ramayanas, The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia and Questioning Ramayanas, both edited by the well-known *Ramayana* scholar, Paula Richman¹⁴; The Ramayana Revisited edited by Mandakranta Bose¹⁵; Ramayana Around the World edited by Lallan Prasad Vyas¹⁶; and Ramayana in the Arts of Asia by Garrett Kam.¹⁷ Similar to the body of research on *Ramakien*, no literature in English specifically on the role of younger brother or any principal younger brother characters in *Ramayana* could be found.

F. Primary Sources

Before launching into the body of the thesis, a few background notes might be in order on the sources to be employed in this examination. In performing the analysis, Rama I's *Ramakien*¹⁸ has been selected because it is the longest and most complete rendition of *Ramakien*, thus providing the most extensive material to analyze. The entire work, covering 2,000 pages in four volumes in the latest printing available, has been generally reviewed to identify the sections specifically applicable to the objectives of this thesis; these specific sections are then analyzed in detail. In addition, in light of the nature of the literary research and analysis to be undertaken in this thesis, the original Thai text is used. Having to rely upon a translated copy, much less a condensed or digested version, would naturally mean relying upon the judgment of the translator or compiler. Given the objectives of this thesis, in depth textual analysis is deemed critical so that the exact language used by, or in reference to, the principal characters can be examined. This is also considered important because of the nature of the language employed in classical Thai literature, particularly *Ramakien*,

¹⁴ Paula Richman, ed., Many Ramayanas, The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia (Berkeley: U of California P, 1991); and Paula Richman, ed., Questioning Ramayanas (Berkeley: U of California P, 2001).

¹⁵ Mandakranta Bose, ed., The Ramayana Revisited (New York: Oxford UP, 2004).

¹⁶ Lallan Prasad Vyas, ed., Ramayana Around the World (Delhi: B.R. Publishing, 1997).

¹⁷ Garrett Kam, Ramayana in the Arts of Asia (Singapore: Select Books, 2000).

¹⁸ Ramakien by King Rama I, Volumes 1-4.

with its rich descriptive quality and depth of expression. A translated, condensed version, the only English renditions available, would clearly not be suitable. *

For the second part of the thesis, covering the examination of the portrayal of royal younger brothers in Thai historical narratives, only texts by Thai authors translated or written in English have been selected for analysis. In making such selection, particular emphasis has been placed on the royal chronicles of the late Ayutthaya and early Bangkok periods. In addition, selected historical narratives written in the modern period are looked at for comparison and consistency.



สถาบันวิทยบริการ
จุฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย

* Please note that all English translations of the Thai text taken from *Ramakien* were rendered by the author of this thesis, thus any mistranslations or misinterpretations are solely his responsibility. Quoted text has been provided in both the translated English and the original Thai language script with no transliteration into Roman script provided with respect to quoted passages. To the extent names and other selected words have been transliterated, the transliteration was rendered using the program made available by the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND OF THE RAMA STORY AND RAMAKIEN

In this chapter, background information useful to an understanding of the issues to be analyzed in this thesis will be provided. The history and origins of the Rama story and *Ramakien*, along with its various versions found in Thai literature, will be reviewed.

A. *Ramayana to Ramakien*

Tracing the origins of *Ramakien*, the Thai rendition of the Indic Rama story, is a bit like trying to trace the origins of the Thai people themselves. It is full of differing opinions, conjecture and conflicting evidence. While it is clear *Ramakien* has its roots in the Indian epic, *Ramayana*, and *Ramakien* can ultimately be traced to India, from where in India and the path followed through other countries and cultures is difficult to ascertain. Swami Satyananda Puri makes this clear by stating that the “*Ramakirti* [*Ramakien*] carries in its body Ramayanic tales popular in very many countries ... [which] ... undoubtedly shows that the passage along which the story of Rama entered Thailand lay through many a different country.”¹

1. Valmiki's *Ramayana*

The origin of *Ramayana* itself is also subject to debate. The title to Paula Richman's book, *Many Ramayanas*,² highlight the diversity of the Rama story, and what diversity there is, with *Ramayana* being represented in some version or another in almost every country and culture in Asia.³ Most would attribute the earliest written version, and thus often considered the 'original' *Ramayana*, to an Indian poet named Valmiki and dated between 200 BCE to 200 CE.⁴ It is said that he most likely

¹ Swami Satyananda Puri, *The Ramakirti: The Thai Version of the Ramayana* (Bangkok: Thammasat Univ., 1998) (8).

² Paula Richman, ed., *Many Ramayanas, The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1991).

³ Garrett Kam, *Ramayana in the Arts of Asia* (Singapore: Select Books, 2000) vii.

⁴ William Buck, *Ramayana* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1976) xv.

compiled and wrote out what existed in folk tales and legends that had been transmitted orally for generations.⁵

2. *Ramakien*, A Southern Indian Idea

A number of writers have asserted, in any event, that *Ramakien* was not taken directly from Valmiki's *Ramayana*.⁶ They have tried to show some direct connection with different versions, most particularly the Tamil renditions in southern India. S. Singaravelu makes an argument, based on a comparative analysis of certain passages and motifs, for the close relationship between the Tamil poetic version, *Rāmāvatāram* (Rama's Incarnation) of Kamban's *Ramayana* from southern India, and *Ramakien*.⁷ Garrett Kam also concludes in *Ramayana in the Arts of Asia*, that "Tamil tradition probably played an important role in the royal literary effort, for the Thai epic has many features in common with southern Indian ideas"⁸

3. *Ramayana* in Southeast Asia

Others have indicated there is a less direct connection between the Indian versions, Tamil or otherwise, and *Ramakien*, arguing that the path taken was likely more circuitous. Santosh N. Desai, in *Hinduism in Thai Life*, states that it "is not certain whether the Thai story came directly from India, or whether it is based on various South-east Asian versions ... the Thai story might have been formed out of the material on Rama's life which was prevalent in South-east Asia itself."⁹

Prince Dhani Nivat, a great lover of and frequent writer about *Ramakien*, makes the argument that the version used by the Khmer at Angkor, having come through the Javanese, is the most likely conduit between Indian versions and *Ramakien*. He states that the origin was "the old Javanese versions which doubtless

⁵ C Rajagopalachari, *Ramayana* (Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, 1962).

⁶ See: Santosh N. Desai, *Hinduism in Thai Life* (Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1980) 82; and Prince Dhani Nivat, "Hide Figures of the Ramakien at the Ledermuseum in Offenbach, Germany," *The Journal of the Siam Society* 53.1 (Jan. 1965): 62.

⁷ S. Singaravelu, "A Comparative Study of the Sanskrit, Tamil, Thai and Malay Versions of the Story of Rama with Special Reference to the Process of Acculturation in the Southeast Asian Versions," *The Journal of the Siam Society* 56.2 (July 1968): 137-185.

⁸ Kam 7.

⁹ Desai 112.

inspired the Khmer versions, from which the Thai State of Ayudhya [*sic*] inherited its tale of Rama.”¹⁰ In addition, he notes the supremacy of Phra Isuan (Shiva) in *Ramakien* as further proof since the Khmer were Saivites.¹¹ Maurizio Peleggi reiterates this point when he notes “courtly culture in the Ayutthaya and early Bangkok period was molded in the Indic stamp derived from the empire of Angkor. Its main features ... a Hindu mythology, versified in the court epic *Ramakien* and performed in court spectacles such as the *khorn* [*sic*] (a masked performance) and the *lakorn* (a danced drama)”¹²

4. Summary

Therefore, we can see that there are numerous opinions as to the origins of *Ramakien*. The veracity and soundness of each view is subject to debate. This leads one to conclude that perhaps there are any number of sources, each having some influence, although some stronger than others.

B. The Historical Importance of the Rama Story

Today, the only complete version of *Ramakien* is from the late 18th century CE. However, there is archeological and other evidence from earlier periods of the presence and importance of the Rama story in the areas that now incorporate present day Thailand. In this section, a brief review of the historical evidence of the Rama story will be presented.

1. Angkorian Period (8th–13th Century CE)

As noted earlier, connections are often put forth between *Ramakien* and the *Ramayana* tradition that existed during the height of the Angkorian Empire, which lasted from the 8th to the 13th centuries CE. While there are no written documents remaining showing evidence of the *Ramayana* story from that period, the legacy left of the existence of this literature in the Angkorian civilization can be seen in bas relief carvings at many ancient stone monuments that remain in the ancient Khmer capital of Angkor in present day Cambodia and in the northeast part of present day Thailand.

¹⁰ Prince Dhani Nivat, “Review of Books – The Ramakirti,” *The Journal of the Siam Society* 33.2 (March 1941): 173.

¹¹ Dhani, “Review of Books – The Ramakirti” 174.

¹² Maurizio Peleggi, *Thailand, the Worldly Kingdom* (Singapore: Talisman, 2007) 47.

There are a number of sites in Thailand where bas reliefs showing evidence of the Rama story can be found, although the majority of these carvings are concentrated at two temples, Prasat Phnom Rung in Buriram Province and Prasat Phimai in Nakorn Ratchasima Province.¹³ At these sites there are a large number of carvings depicting many scenes and episodes from the Rama story. The extensive use of the *Ramayana* epic as a subject for the bas reliefs attests to the importance of this literature to the Angkorian civilization and provides strong indication of the likely transmission of the Rama tradition to later settlers and kingdoms in the area.

2. Sukhothai (13th–14th Century CE)

The first indication of the possible transmission of the Rama story can be seen during the Sukhothai period, 13th–14th century CE. While there are no written pieces remaining from that period, it is evident the story was known by the use of ‘Rama’ to form the name of the most famous of the Sukhothai kings, King Ramkamhaeng, who ruled from 1277 to 1317 CE. In addition, mention is made of Phra Ram’s Cave in the well-known Ramkamhaeng Inscription No. 1.¹⁴ This would seem to indicate that the Rama story must have had some level of recognition and influence during that time.

3. Ayutthaya (1351 to 1767 CE)

The evidence for the Rama story being well known during the Ayutthaya period, 1351 to 1767 CE, is more extensive. The initial indication is the close resemblance of the name of the capital city, Ayutthaya, with the principal city in the Rama story. Charnvit Kasetsiri, in The Rise of Ayudhya, notes that Uthong, the first ruler of Ayutthaya “imitated a celestial action by building Ayudhya [*sic*]. The name he chose for his city resembled that of the city of Ayodhya ruled by the hero Rama in the great epic *Ramayana*.”¹⁵ Charnvit continues by saying:

¹³ Prof. Dr M.R. Suriyavudh Sukhasvasti [ศาสตราจารย์ ดร. ม.ร.ว. สุริยวุฒิ สุขสวัสดิ์], Prasat Khao Phnom Rung [ปราสาทเขาพนมรุ้ง] (Bangkok: Ruanboon, 2006); and Prof. Dr M.R. Suriyavudh Sukhasvasti [ศาสตราจารย์ ดร. ม.ร.ว. สุริยวุฒิ สุขสวัสดิ์], Prasat Hin and Lintels [ประสาทรหินและทับหลัง] (Bangkok: Sata Print [สตาร์ปริ้นท์], 1999).

¹⁴ The Inscription of King Ramkamhaeng the Great (Bangkok: Chulalongkorn Univ., 1984) 42.

¹⁵ Charnvit Kasetsiri, The Rise of Ayudhya (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford UP, 1976) 71.

[g]uidance for kings can be found in most of the classical literary epics such as the Mahabharata and the *Ramayana*. We can be certain that these two classical works were known in the early period of Ayudhya [*sic*], for the ... title used by Ayudhyan kings prove that the Indian epic Ramayana was highly regarded at the court of Ayudhya.”¹⁶

In this regard, he notes by example, Ramathibodi (the reigning name of Uthong, which is taken from Rama), Ramesuan (Rama-Isvara), and Ramracha (Ramaraja).¹⁷ David Wyatt also makes the connection with Angkor by stating that the “equation of a king with Rama had been asserted by a number of Angkorian kings ... the Siamese rulers of Ayutthaya were influenced by the Khmer ideas about Rama as the exemplary monarch”¹⁸ In addition, there are fragments of verse remaining from the Ayutthaya era and references to the use of the Rama story in royal ceremonies performed during then, such as part of certain water consecration rites.¹⁹

Thus we can see from the name of the capital city, the names of several kings and the use in royal ceremonies, that the Rama story must have played an important role during the Ayutthaya period. It is this legacy then that is carried forward to the Thonburi and Bangkok Era.

4. Thonburi (1767-1782) and Bangkok (1782 to Present)

There is evidence of the story’s presence and some level of significance during the Thonburi period, 1767-1782 CE. The fact that King Taksin, the ruler during that period, found time to compose several verses of the story attests to its importance.

¹⁶ Charnvit 135.

¹⁷ Charnvit 101.

¹⁸ David K. Wyatt, *Thailand, A Short History*, 2nd ed. (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2003) 153.

¹⁹ Suchit Wongthet, ed. [สุจิตต์ วงษ์เทศ], *The Story Of Ramakien During The Time Of Ayutthaya [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ สมัยกรุงศรีอยุธยา]* (Bangkok: SAC Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Center, 1997) 9; Prince Dhani Nivat, “The Shadow-Play as a Possible Origin of the Masked-Play,” *The Journal of the Siam Society* 37.1 (Oct. 1948): 27-28; and Christian Velder, “Notes on the Saga of Rama in Thailand,” *The Journal of the Siam Society* 56.1 (Jan. 1968): 34.

However, it is at the start of the Bangkok period, 1782 CE to present, under King Rama I, the first ruler of the present Chakri dynasty, that *Ramakien* took its full epic form as we know it today. Rama I directed the composition, or perhaps compilation and re-composition, of a complete *Ramakien* after the fall of Ayutthaya in 1767 CE when it was presumably lost along with the apparent destruction of much of the art and literature of that period. While some historians have tried to attribute political and other motives to Rama I's efforts,²⁰ others have seen it purely as a literary and artistic endeavor to preserve the Rama tradition: "The Ramakirti [*Ramakien*] to the Thai is noble and heroic literature which imparts aesthetic enjoyment and provides themes for the fine arts."²¹ This is perhaps reinforced, as well, by a stanza at the end of Rama I's *Ramakien* itself which says "This royal writing of *Ramakien*, only follows the story of a magical, supernatural fable [อันพระราชนิพนธ์รามเกียรติ์ ทรงเพียรตามเรื่องนิยายไสย]."²²

Although *Ramakien* appears to have received its most attention under the reign of Rama I, the importance and popularity of the story lived long after Rama I, as his successors, Kings Rama II, IV, V and VI made their own contributions to the *Ramakien* literary repertoire. In fact, King Rama VI highlighted his recognition of the significance of *Ramakien* by choosing the 'dynastic' name 'Ramathibodi' in Thai, translated as 'King Rama' in English, to designate the kings in the Chakri dynasty.²³ In addition, King Rama III made a significant contribution to the artistic depictions of *Ramakien* by his sponsorship of the bas-reliefs that surround the main chapel hall at Wat Phra Jetubon (Wat Pho) in Bangkok.²⁴

²⁰ David K. Wyatt, "The 'Subtle Revolution' of King Rama I of Siam," Moral Order and the Question of Change: Essays on Southeast Asian Thought (New Haven: Southeast Asia Studies, Yale Univ., 1982) 34-35; Srisurang Poolthupya, Thai Customs and Social Values in the Ramakien (Bangkok: Thai Khadi Research Institute, 1981) 1; and Kittisak Kerdarunsuksri, Ramakien in Modern Performance: The Reflection of an Identity Crisis (Amsterdam: 7th International Conference of Thai Studies, 1999) 6-7.

²¹ Desai 83.

²² *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 4* [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธยอดฟ้าจุฬาโลกมหาราช, เล่ม ๔] (Bangkok: Fine Arts Dept, 2540 BE (1997 CE)), 582.

²³ Walter F. Vella, Chaiyo! King Vajiravudh and the Development of Thai Nationalism (Honolulu: UP of Hawaii, 1978) 136-137.

²⁴ See: J. M. Cadet, The Ramakien, The Thai Epic (Chiang Mai: Browne International, 1982).

C. Renditions of the Rama Story

The renditions of the Rama story best known today are those composed by Kings Rama I and II. However, there also exist fragments and verses by other composers and periods. In this section, a brief review of the extant versions and verses of the epic in Thai literature will be covered.

1. The Rama Story in Ayutthaya

Although it is frequently mentioned that all the literature, including the scripts of the Rama story, were destroyed or lost when Ayutthaya fell to the Burmese in 1767 CE, a number of written pieces have survived from the Ayutthaya period. Prince Dhani, in a review of a cremation volume written by Thanit Yupho, an official at the Fine Arts Department, noted that Thanit assigned the Ayutthaya period material into two groups; that written for shadow plays, *bot phak* and those as dramatic literature, *bot lakhon*, the latter of which only exists in fragments.²⁵ A number of such pieces were gathered and recently published in a volume by the Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Center.²⁶ In addition, the Rama story is mentioned as a part of a number of poems or the subject of several other texts composed during the Ayutthaya period, including two attributed to King Narai.²⁷

2. King Taksin Version

Although not as well known today, Prince Dhani Nivat notes “that there was a version of the *Ramakien* from the pen of the King of Thonburi is a fact long since known and admitted in Thai literary circles ... the King of Thonburi wrote his *Ramakien* in C.S. 1132, that is A.D. 1770.”²⁸ In fact, there is a model of some of the scenes depicting the Thonburi version at Phra Racha Wang Derm (Thonburi Palace), the site of the palace of King Taksin inside what is today the Royal Thai Navy Headquarters on the Thonburi side of the Chao Phraya river near Wat Arun.²⁹

²⁵ Prince Dhani Nivat, “Review of Books-*The Ramakien of King of Thonburi*,” The Journal of the Siam Society 34.1 (Apr. 1943): 85.

²⁶ See: Suchit.

²⁷ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1* Introduction 5.

²⁸ Dhani, “Review of Books-*The Ramakien of King of Thonburi*” 81.

²⁹ Observed during a personal visit on January 10, 2007.

The review of the previously mentioned cremation volume explains that King Taksin wrote four episodes of *Ramakien*. The first is of a later part of the story, telling of Phra Mongkut, son of Phra Ram and the other three are of the adventures of Hanuman. Prince Dhani says that while the poetry is crude, it is noteworthy for its “frequent allusions to Buddhist metaphysics in the dialogues.”³⁰

3. King Rama I’s Rendition

The most complete rendition of *Ramakien* that we have today was compiled and composed under the direction of King Rama I, completed in the “first lunar month, 2nd day of the rising moon, in the year 1159 (equivalent to 20 November 2340, BE [1797 CE]) [เดือนอ้าย ขึ้น ๒ ค่ำ จ ศ ๑๑๕๙ ปีมะเส็ง (ตรงกับวันที่ ๒๐ พฤศจิกายน พ ศ ๒๓๔๐)].”³¹ It runs 52,086 verses,³² without chapter or section breaks, with the most recent printed version covering 2,000 pages in four volumes.³³ Given its completeness, it is this version of *Ramakien* that will be used in the analysis for this thesis.

Although it is not clear how much Rama I personally wrote or participated in its drafting, it has been pointed out that “the work clearly was completed by many hands, and is uneven in style, and repetitious”³⁴ Be that as it may, Charnvit points out it:

was usually the practice in Siam that a literary work was not autographed; if it was written by order of a king the honour usually went to the king, and the work might be called the version of such-and-such a king. This is particularly true in the early Bangkok years when a number of literary works were commissioned by the first three kings of Bangkok. Committees

³⁰ Dhani, “Review of Books-*The Ramakien of King of Thonburi*” 83.

³¹ Siriwan Yimlamai [ศิริวรรณ อิมละมัย], *Story of Thai Literature: Ramakien* [เล่าเรื่องวรรณคดีไทย รามเกียรติ์] (Bangkok: Mac Books [แม็ค], 2006) 5.

³² Velder 36.

³³ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volumes 1-4*.

³⁴ Wyatt, “Subtle Revolution” 34.

were set up to undertake the work of writing but the complete work went under the name of the relevant king³⁵

What does seem clear is that Rama I must have attached great importance to this work, as it was one of the first of many literary reconstruction endeavors he undertook. He also used his *Ramakien* as the basis for the mural paintings that decorate the galleries surrounding the newly built Temple of the Emerald Buddha and “when celebrations associated with the image of the Emerald Buddha were held, he saw to it that performances of episodes from the *Ramakien* story were included.”³⁶

Given the dearth of prior written versions, it is uncertain what sources were used to construct this rendition of *Ramakien*. Wyatt asserts that there was a “systematic collection” of all available material relating to *Ramayana*.³⁷ While J.M. Cadet points out that “is not easy to estimate the extent to which Rama I drew on vernacular versions of the story handed down through the courts of the Mon and Khmer of Ayudhia [*sic*] and Bangkok, and to what extent he was obligated to return to contemporary Indian sources.”³⁸ Singaravelu makes an argument that certain Tamil folktales were adopted into King Rama I’s *Ramakien*, thus indicated access to Tamil folk tradition.³⁹

Whatever the sources and whomever the author(s), Rama I’s *Ramakien* is a long and complex story, with many interesting characters, intricate plots and complicated sub-plots. This perhaps indicates the intent to include all the known stories of the day in one comprehensive narrative.

³⁵ Charnvit 140.

³⁶ Frank E. Reynolds, “*Ramayana*, Rama Jataka, and *Ramakien*: A Comparative Study of Hindu and Buddhist Traditions,” *Many Ramayanas. The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia*, ed. Paula Richman (Berkeley: U of California P, 1991) 58.

³⁷ Wyatt, “Subtle Revolution” 34.

³⁸ Cadet, *The Ramakien* 32.

³⁹ S. Singaravelu, “The Episode of Maiyarab in the Thai *Rāmakīen* and Its Possible Relationship to Tamil Folklore,” *The Journal of the Siam Society* 74 (1986): 25.

4. King Rama II's Rendition

Next to the Rama I's edition, the next most complete version is that written by King Rama II completed in 1815 CE.⁴⁰ It appears that one of the possible motives of Rama II, who was quite adept at literary composition, was to create a piece that was more suitable for dramatic presentation. While the Rama I rendition is the most complete, its very length and detail make it less adaptable to performance. Therefore, Rama II wrote a version aimed at being performed, and is in fact, the version used for most performances today.⁴¹

This version does not cover the complete epic, starting well into the story at the point where Phra Ram sends Hanuman off in search of Nang Sida after she has been abducted by Thotsakan. As well, Rama II's version is generally a more streamlined text, eliminating many scenes and episodes included in the Rama I rendition. As an indication, in the latest printing of each, Rama I's covers this portion of the story in 1,673 pages,⁴² while Rama II does it in 693 pages.⁴³

5. King Rama IV and King Rama V's Contributions

King Rama IV wrote a few short verses from *Ramakien* in the form of dance drama.⁴⁴ Kittisak Kerdarunsuksri notes two in particular, *Phra Ram Doen Dong* (Rama Wandering In The Forest) and *Narai Prap Nonthuk* (God Vishnu Defeating The Demon *Nonthuk*), pointing out possible motives for Rama IV to have picked these episodes as subjects:

One of King Mongkut's policies to promote the notion of a glorious country was to revive the court performances, which had been banned during the previous reign. In doing this, he deliberately selected certain episodes from the *Ramakien* for

⁴⁰ *Ramakien* by King Rama II [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธเลิศหล้านภาลัย]. (Bangkok: Silapa Banakhan [ศิลปาบรรณาคารจัดพิมพ์]) 2001.

⁴¹ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 1 Introduction 7.

⁴² *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volumes 2-4.

⁴³ *Ramakien* by King Rama II.

⁴⁴ Desai 65; and S. Singaravelu, "The Rāma Story in the Thai Cultural Tradition," *The Journal of the Siam Society* 70 (1982): 56.

recomposition for the repertoires of his royal troupe ... He for example rewrote the episode of *Phra Ram Doen Dong* (Rama wandering in the forest). This episode noticeably echoed his own renunciation of his right to the throne and his retirement from worldly pleasure to enter an ecclesiastical life He also recomposed the episode of *Narai Prap Nonthuk* (God Vishnu defeating the demon Nonthuk) as a separate prelude performance of *bot boek rong*. It was plausible that his intention of producing this episode as a short prelude was to modernize traditional performing arts to attract his audiences, foreigners who were not familiar with a long and slow-pace performance of traditional kind in particular.⁴⁵

King Rama V, while not writing any performance pieces, directed the composition of poetic commentaries which were inscribed on stone tablets opposite the murals which decorate the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha.⁴⁶

6. King Rama VI

In 1910 CE, King Rama VI wrote a number of episodes based on Valmiki's *Ramayana*, not the existing *Ramakien*.⁴⁷ Rama VI also sponsored the first complete edition of Rama II's *Ramakien*,⁴⁸ which included his long dissertation The Origin of *Ramakien* [ข้อเกิดแห่งรามเกียรติ์] setting forth his opinions about the source and origins of *Ramakien*.⁴⁹

7. Modern Prose Versions

A number of modern prose editions of *Ramakien* have been released in recent years. The most complete and well-known is the edition written by 'Premseri', a pen

⁴⁵ Kittisak 2.

⁴⁶ See: Ramakian [Rāmāyana], Mural Paintings Along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha, Advisors H.S.H. Prince Subhadradis Diskul and M.R. Saeng Suriya Ladavalayu (Bangkok: Government Lottery Committee. H.N. Group, 2004).

⁴⁷ Desai 65; and Singaravelu, "The Rama Story in the Thai Cultural Tradition" 56.

⁴⁸ Vella 237-238.

⁴⁹ Ramakien by King Rama II 706-818.

name for Seri Premruethai.⁵⁰ His version, which runs about 655 pages, follows the complete Rama I rendition and, while written in prose, incorporates numerous passages in verse from the original text.

Another relatively complete prose version is that written by Nitda Hongwiwat to accompany a publication of the mural paintings that line the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha.⁵¹ In this volume, the story of *Ramakien* is included along with a detailed description of many of the murals. Nitda also published a more condensed version to be used mainly as a teaching tool, with Thai and English summaries, covering 48 of the most significant murals.⁵²

In addition, a number of condensed and annotated prose versions are available, including: Phlai Noi [พลาญน้อย]. *Ramakien, Combined Edition* [รามเกียรติ์ ฉบับมหาชน];⁵³ Malini Phaloprakan, ed. [มาลินี ผโลประการ เรียบเรียง] *Ramakien* [รามเกียรติ์];⁵⁴ and Kowit Tangtrongchit [โกวิท ตั้งตรงจิตร] *Extolling the Story of Ramakien* [คุยเฟื่อง เรื่องรามเกียรติ์].⁵⁵ As well, a useful pocket guide to all the characters in *Ramakien*, of which over 650 are identified, is available.⁵⁶

⁵⁰ Premseri [เปรมเสรี], *Ramakien* [รามเกียรติ์] (Bangkok: Ruamsan (1977) [รวมสาส์น (1977)], 2546 BE (2003 CE)). ‘Premseri’ also wrote similar prose versions of other classical Thai literature, including, “Khun Chang, Khun Phan;” “Inao;” “Phra Abhai Mani;” and “Sang Tong,” which are often used by students assigned to read the original verse versions.

⁵¹ Nitda Hongwiwat [นิดดา หงษ์วิวัฒน์], *Ramakien with Mural Paintings From the Galleries at the Temple of the Emerald Buddha* [รามเกียรติ์ กับจิตรกรรมฝาผนังรอบพระระเบียงวัดพระศรีรัตนศาสดาราม] (Bangkok: Phuean Dek [เพื่อนเด็ก] 2547 BE (2004 CE)).

⁵² Nitda Hongwiwat [นิดดา หงษ์วิวัฒน์], *The Story of Ramakien, From the Mural Paintings along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha* (Bangkok: Sangdad, 2545 BE (2002 CE)).

⁵³ Phlai Noi [พลาญน้อย], *Ramakien, Combined Edition* [รามเกียรติ์ ฉบับมหาชน] (Bangkok: Sataporn Books [สถาพรบุ๊คส์], 2549 BE (2006 CE)).

⁵⁴ Malini Phaloprakan, ed., [มาลินี ผโลประการ เรียบเรียง], *Ramakien* [รามเกียรติ์] (Chiang Mai: Tanpanya [ธารปัญญา], 2546 BE (2003 CE)).

⁵⁵ Kowit Tangtrongchit [โกวิท ตั้งตรงจิตร], *Extolling the Story of Ramakien* [คุยเฟื่อง เรื่องรามเกียรติ์] (Bangkok: Suwiriyanon [สุวีริยาสาส์น], 2547 BE (2004 CE)).

⁵⁶ Ruenruethai Satchaphan [รื่นฤทัย สัจจพันธุ์], *Glossary of Names in Ramakien* [นามานุกรม รามเกียรติ์] (Bangkok: Suwiriyanon [สุวีริยาสาส์น], 2546 BE (2003 CE)).

8. English Versions

There are a limited number of translations of *Ramakien* into English, all abridged prose versions of Rama I's edition. The oldest appears to be that written by Swami Satyananda Puri first published in 1940 CE, although recently republished.⁵⁷ M. L. Manich Jumsai also wrote a short version published in 1965 CE.⁵⁸ Both of these versions are quite condensed with the Swami Satyananda and Manich reducing Rama I's 2,000 pages down to 142 and 98 pages, respectively.

Several more English versions have been subsequently published; with the most complete being Ray M. Olsen's, which runs 423 pages.⁵⁹ However, his version was not translated directly from the original, but was based on a German translation made by Dr. Christian Velder. Olsen's translation, although it is the most complete English rendition, is abridged and necessarily lacks the detail and richness of the Thai versions and, upon release, received quite critical reviews. Cadet, in a review of the book, says that Olsen's translation is "the most severe drubbing the *Ramakien* has received – at least since the Chalermnit summary [Manich version] ...," pointing out numerous errors and mistranslations.⁶⁰ Cadet undertook his own telling of the story based on the bas-reliefs that surround the Ubosot at Wat Phra Jetubon (Wat Pho).⁶¹ His volume gives the history of the bas-reliefs along with a narrative of the *Ramakien* story. Prince Dhani, while noting a number of errors in interpretation, praised the work as being "distinguished by its beautiful rhetoric."⁶² Finally, Maenduan Tipaya issued an English translation of *Ramakien*,⁶³ which follows the pattern of the Olsen version, making it relatively complete, but not necessarily true to the Rama I version.

⁵⁷ Swami Satyananda Puri.

⁵⁸ Manich Jumsai, *Thai Ramayana, as Written by King Rama I* (Bangkok: Chalermnit, 1977).

⁵⁹ Ray A. Olsson, M.D., *The Ramakien, A Prose Translation of the Thai Ramayana* (Bangkok: Praepittaya, 1968).

⁶⁰ John Cadet, "Book Review – The *Ramakien*," *The Journal of the Siam Society* 58.2 (July 1970):163.

⁶¹ Cadet *The Ramakien*.

⁶² Dhani Nivat, Prince, "Book Review – *Ramakien*," *The Journal of the Siam Society* 60.1 (Jan 1972): 389.

⁶³ Maenduan Tipaya, *Ramakien, The Thai Ramayana* (Bangkok: Naga Books, 1993).

CHAPTER III

SYNOPSIS OF *RAMAKIEN* AND COMPARISON WITH VALMIKI'S *RAMAYANA*

This chapter will provide a short synopsis of King Rama I's rendition of *Ramakien*. In addition, a comparative analysis of the portrayal of the younger brother characters in *Ramakien* with those in Valmiki's *Ramayana* will be covered in this chapter.

A. Synopsis of King Rama I's *Ramakien*

Given the fact that King Rama I's version of *Ramakien* runs 2,000 pages in its most recent printing, this summary necessarily will be vastly condensed with the intricate detail, complex story twists and sub-plots left out. Those scenes and episodes that are particularly relevant to the analysis in this thesis are discussed in more detail in Chapter V.

1. Founding of Ayudhya and Longka

King Rama I's *Ramakien* starts with one of Phra Narai's* incarnations as a bull to fight a demon who had rolled up the earth's surface and taken it to the underworld. After completing this task, Phra Narai goes to his heavenly abode in the Sea of Milk and, while he rests, a prince is born from his navel, whom he then presents to Phra Isuan, the supreme god in heaven. Phra Isuan decides to create a city for this young prince and orders his attendants to build Ayudhya, with the prince as its ruler, to start a dynasty of humans on the earth. This prince has a son, who has a son, who is the father of Phra Ram, a subsequent incarnation of Phra Narai.

In the meanwhile, Phra Phrom looks down upon the earth and sees that Rangka Island, where one of his cousins had lived, is deserted, so he sends his attendants to build a new city, Longka, for another cousin. This cousin, who goes to

* Phra Narai is the Thai rendering of the Hindu god Vishnu, one of the three principal gods in Hinduism, along with Shiva, Thai: Phra Isuan, and for Brahma, Thai: Phra Phrom. The Thai rendering of the names of the gods, along with Phra In for Indra and Phra Athit for Suriya, will be used throughout this thesis.

rule in Longka to propagate and preserve Phra Phrom's demon race, has a son, who is the father of Thotsakan.

2. Birth of Phra Ram, Thotsakan and Others

One of Phra Isuan's attendants, Nonthok, assigned to wash the feet of those who go to see Phra Isuan, is constantly harassed by the angels and gods. Unable to stand the abuse, Nonthok asks Phra Isuan for a reward for all the good deeds he has performed. Accordingly, Phra Isuan gives him a diamond finger that will kill anyone to which it is pointed. Nonthok, although warned by Phra Isuan to use it properly, takes revenge on those who next abuse him, killing many angels and demi-gods with the diamond finger. When Phra Isuan learns of this, he sends Phra Narai to fix the problem. Phra Narai changes himself into a beautiful woman and induces Nonthok to follow him in a dance, eventually getting Nonthok to point his finger at himself. When he sees that Phra Narai had tricked him, Nonthok complains that Phra Narai did not act fairly. Phra Narai then proclaims that Nonthok will be reborn on the earth with ten heads and twenty arms and he, himself, will be born as an ordinary man, but will still be able to defeat Nonthok. Nonthok then dies and is reborn in Longka as Thotsakan.

Thotsakan eventually becomes the ruler of Longka and, along with the other demons, grows in strength. When Phra Isuan sees the trouble and destruction the demons are causing, he decides it is time for Phra Narai to incarnate on earth to overcome the demon race. Phra Narai asks that his consort, Phra Laksami, his throne in the Great Milky Sea, Naga Ananda, and his disc, conch and club attributes be incarnated along with him to help him in his efforts. The incarnation is by way of a ceremony whereby four balls of celestial rice are created by the intoning of incantations, the rice is then to be consumed, causing the pregnancy of the four queens of King Thotsarot in Ayudhya. Phra Narai is born on the earth as Phra Ram, with Naga Ananda and his attributes being born as his younger brothers, Phra Phrot, Phra Lak and Phra Satarud. Phra Laksami is born as Nang Sida in Longka, as the daughter of Thotsakan.

In anticipation of Phra Ram's arrival and, knowing Phra Ram will need help in defeating the demons, the gods, Phra In and Phra Athit, create offspring, Phali and

Sukhrip, to form and lead an army for Phra Ram. They do this by seducing the wife of a rishi, who bears two sons. When the rishi has doubts about whether they are his sons, he creates a curse causing them to turn into monkeys, after which Phra In and Phra Athit create a kingdom with a monkey army for them to rule. In addition, Phra Pai, the god of wind, creates a powerful monkey soldier, Hanuman to serve as Phra Ram's loyal soldier. * Phra Isuan sends one of his demi-gods to be born as Phiphek, the younger brother of Thotsakan, a skilled astrologer, fortune teller and clairvoyant.

3. Phra Ram Meets Nang Sida

When Nang Sida is born in Longka, she proclaims she will be the destruction of the demon race. When Thotsakan hears this, he has her thrown in the ocean, but the gods protect her and she is rescued and raised by King Chanok, a king practicing penance as a hermit. He buries her in the ground and, sixteen years later, digs her up as a fully grown beautiful young woman.

King Chanok takes her back to his city, Mithila, and calls for a bow-lifting contest, the winner of which will get Nang Sida as his wife. Naturally, Phra Ram goes to Mithila, wins the contest and Nang Sida and Phra Ram are married.

4. Exile and Abduction

After a number of years, King Thotsarot decides to turn over his kingdom to Phra Ram. However, one of his consorts, the mother of Phra Ram's younger brother, Phra Phrot, redeems a promise that King Thotsarot had given her and asks that Phra Ram be exiled to the forest for fourteen years and that her son rule Ayudhya in the meanwhile. In order to preserve his father's duty to honor the promise, Phra Ram agrees to go to the forest, and Phra Lak, another of his younger brothers, and Nang Sida, decide to go with him.

After a number of adventures, they settle at a hermitage to do penance. One day Thotsakan's sister, Samanakha, in search of a husband, comes upon Phra Ram while he is bathing. She falls in love with him, but is rebuked, causing her to abuse Nang Sida in a jealous rage. This prompts Phra Lak to beat and maim her and she

* Although Hanuman is a central character in *Ramakien*, he is not important to the analysis in this thesis, and thus will not be focused on in detail in this synopsis.

flees to Longka where she extols the beauty of Nang Sida to Thotsakan, causing him to fall in love with Nang Sida. Thotsakan devises a plot to abduct Nang Sida by getting a cousin to disguise himself as a golden deer, inducing Phra Ram and Phra Lak to leave Nang Sida alone while they pursue it. This gives Thotsakan the chance to steal her away to Longka, thus setting the stage for the long war for her rescue.

5. War and Rescue

Shortly after Phra Ram and Phra Lak start their search for Nang Sida, they meet Hanuman, who introduces them to Sukhrip. Sukhrip, unjustly expelled from his city by his older brother, Phali, asks Phra Ram to help him avenge Phali, which he does. As Phali is dying, the two monkey brothers reconcile. Sukhrip then assumes the leadership of the monkey troops and offers them to Phra Ram to help in his efforts to rescue Nang Sida. With this army, they start the preparations for the march to Longka, where Hanuman has been previously sent to find Nang Sida and tell her that Phra Ram is coming to fight and rescue her.

In the meanwhile, Phiphek is banished from Longka and joins Phra Ram's forces to fight, not necessarily against his older brother, but on the side of justice and truth. Before the actual fighting starts, Thotsakan tries several tricks to get Phra Ram to turn back, including the famous episode in which Thotsakan has Benyakai, the daughter of Phiphek, assume the form of Nang Sida and float down the river as if Nang Sida were dead. Phra Ram is convinced and laments, but Hanuman is suspicious and manages to uncover the ruse and foil the plot.

All these ploys, of course, do not work, and Phra Ram and his monkey army reach the ocean opposite Longka, where Hanuman leads the army in building a causeway so they can pass over to the island. Thotsakan employs more wiles to try and stop the building of the causeway, but Hanuman is successful in completing the task and Phra Ram and the monkey army reach Longka.

The first series of battles in the war are with Khumpakarn, another younger brother of Thotsakan. During one of these battles Phra Lak is struck down for the first of many times and Hanuman comes to the rescue by locating certain medicinal herbs and ingredients to save him. Khumpakarn is quite a clever demon and creates a

number of stratagems to avoid fighting, all of which are eventually overcome and he is finally forced to fight and is eventually killed in battle.

The next series of battles are with Inthorachit, Thotsakan's son. He is a mighty warrior with great powers, having previously fought and beaten Phra In. He manages to strike down Phra Lak twice in battle, once with his Nagabat arrow and once when Inthorachit is disguised as Phra In, prompting Hanuman to come to the rescue again to save Phra Lak. Inthorachit, after trying more ploys, such as bringing a false Nang Sida to the battlefield and cutting off her head, is finally overcome by the arrow of Phra Lak.

The final series of battles is with Thotsakan, who is helped by a few of his friends, including the thousand faced Sahasadecha. Thotsakan himself engages in five battles, in one of which he manages to strike down Phra Lak once more, who only can recover once again with the help of Hanuman. Previously, Thotsakan has tried to ensure his immortality by removing his soul and placing it in a crystal box kept safe by a hermit. Hanuman discovers this secret and tricks the hermit into giving him the box. In the final battle, when Phra Ram shoots Thotsakan with his arrow, Hanuman crushes the box and Thotsakan dies. Phiphek, who assumes the throne of Longka, then laments his passing and gives him a grand funeral.

Nang Sida is thus rescued and reunited with Phra Ram, although he first makes her walk through fire to demonstrate her purity, which of course she does safely with the help of the gods. Phiphek is made the ruler of Longka and Phra Ram, Nang Sida and Phra Lak return to Ayudhya after fourteen years in exile.

6. More Fighting

Although the first war and many battles have eliminated the major demon forces, there are still a number of minor demons left to eliminate, prompting a series of subsequent battles. This time, however, Phra Ram sends his two younger brothers, Phra Phrot and Phra Satarud to do the work. The majority of the battles are with King Chakkrawat, another underworld ruler, and his sons and accomplices. These battles mirror, in many aspects, the previous battles with Thotsakan, including one instance when Phra Satarud is struck down, similar to Phra Lak, and Nilarat, another monkey

general, comes to the rescue, much as Hanuman did before. All the battles are eventually won and Phra Phrot and Phra Satarud return safely to Ayudhya.

7. Banishment of Nang Sida; Birth of Phra Ram's Sons

One day, the daughter of Samanakha goes to Nang Sida, in the guise of a court lady, and asks Nang Sida to draw a picture of Thotsakan. Phra Ram discovers the picture, and, thinking Nang Sida has been unfaithful, orders Phra Lak to take Nang Sida and execute her. Phra Lak leads her to the forest and tries to do as ordered, but, unable to kill her, lets her go.

Nang Sida, who is pregnant at the time, goes to a hermitage and delivers a son, Phra Mongkut. One day, she takes this son with her while she is out gathering water, and the hermit thinking the son is lost, creates a new identical boy. When Nang Sida returns, she asks to keep this second son and thus, Phra Lop, is born.

8. Fight and Reconciliation

These two sons, given their divine blood, have great power and skill, which eventually comes to the attention of Phra Ram. At first, he does not know they are his sons and sends Phra Phrot and Phra Satarud, along with Hanuman to catch them. Although Phra Mongkut is caught at one point, he manages to escape with the help of his brother, Phra Lop. Finally, they fight directly with Phra Ram but, since none of his arrows have any effect, Phra Ram realizes they are his own sons. He has them take him to Nang Sida, with whom he is no longer angry, to try to reconcile with her.

At first Nang Sida completely rejects his efforts but Phra Ram, perseveres, finally fooling her into coming to see him by having Nang Sida believe he is dead. When she learns of his trick, she flees to the underworld. After spending a year wandering in the forest, Phra Ram decides to go to see Phra Isuan to get him to mediate, which he does successfully and finally Phra Ram and Nang Sida are reunited.

Before the story ends, there is one last battle, this time involving Phra Ram's sons, Phra Mongkut and Phra Lop. They successfully defeat this last demon, return to Ayudhya, where everyone is given praise and glory and lives happily thereafter.

B. Valmiki's *Ramayana* Compared to *Ramakien*

The analysis in this section will attempt to show how the portrayal of the younger brother characters in Valmiki's *Ramayana*, specifically Lakshmana, Sugriva and Vibhishana, compare to the corresponding characters in *Ramakien*, Phra Lak, Sukhrip and Phiphek, that are the subject of the analysis to be undertaken in Chapter V. The comparison with between these two renditions of the story will help highlight certain distinct elements of the depiction of the characteristics of the role of younger brother we will see in *Ramakien*. Naturally, in order to make this comparative analysis meaningful, it will be limited in scope, to focus only on the depiction of the role of younger brother in Valmiki's *Ramayana* and, then, just on the three principal characters corresponding to the younger brothers to be analyzed: Lakshmana/Phra Lak; Sugriva/Sukhrip; and Vibhishana/Phiphek.

The Valmiki rendition of *Ramayana* was chosen for comparison as it is the most widely known and often considered 'original' version of *Ramayana*. Therefore, comparison with this version provides the best analysis, short of a long and complicated examination of the many hundreds of *Ramayan*s.

1. Valmiki's *Ramayana*

The edition of Valmiki's *Ramayana* ("VR") selected for this comparative review is the work translated into English from the original Sanskrit version by Makhan Lal Sen.¹ It should be noted that the origin of *Ramayana* is subject to debate by *Ramayana* historians. Although Valmiki is often attributed with writing the 'original', there are many who would doubt this. Robert Goldman makes the statement that "a text like the *Valmiki Ramayana*, concerning whose authorship virtually nothing of a genuinely historical nature is known and which is, in any case, a

¹ Makhan Lal Sen, *The Ramayana of Valmiki* (Calcutta: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1976). Note: Valmiki's *Ramayana* will be referred to as "VR" throughout this chapter.

text that cannot be confidently ascribed to a single author or even a single historical period.”²

Sen, however, in his introduction to this work, seems to have no doubts himself about attributing the authorship to Valmiki, although, even he will admit that VR “...from time immemorial, invited many literary intruders to come with their countryside tales and weave them into the main texture of the poem,—a fact which has rendered the original an arduous reading to most of the modern readers.”³

2. Character Comparisons

a. Lakshmana and Phra Lak

Similar to *Ramakien*, Lakshmana is the most prominent character in the role of younger brother in VR. From the beginning, Lakshmana is shown in VR as the ever devoted companion of Rama. They are consistently spoken of in the same breath as “Rama and Lakshmana” in the early part of the story in connection with almost all their activities; their early education, traveling through the countryside, learning to fight demons.

Lakshmana’s devotion and service to Rama as depicted in VR is made very explicit. In fact, VR makes Lakshmana appear more a dedicated servant, than an exiled prince accompanying and helping his older brother, as we will see seems to be the portrait of Phra Lak in *Ramakien*. These quotes from VR give a flavor of this:

Lakshmana brought drinking water for Rama ... Lakshmana then after washing their feet ... finding Lakshmana keeping up the night for protection of Rama⁴

Rama asked Lakshmana to build a cottage with strong woods.

Lakshmana thereupon erected a beautiful hut⁵

² Robert P. Goldman, “Resisting Rama: Dharmic Debates on Gender and Hierarchy and the Work of the *Valmiki Ramayana*,” *The Ramayana Revisited*, ed. Mandakranta Bose (New York: Oxford UP, 2004) 21.

³ Sen ix.

⁴ Sen 102-103.

⁵ Sen 107.

Lakshmana brought water from the Ganges, and after drinking that he fasted with Sita, and Lakshmana drank the remnant left after Rama's drink ... Lakshmana gathered Kusha grass: and prepared bed for Rama, and when Rama and Janaka [Sita] lay down, he retired from the place after washing their feet.⁶

Another noticeable difference in the way Lakshmana is presented in VR, as opposed to Phra Lak in *Ramakien*, is how he is described. In *Ramakien*, Phra Lak is frequently attributed with physical beauty, having golden skin and woman-like qualities, perhaps befitting a heroic prince in Thai literature. (See Chapter V.C.1.d) In VR, Lakshmana's physical beauty is rarely extolled, but adjectives regarding his character, such as "auspicious,"⁷ "gentle,"⁸ "heroic,"⁹ "self-possessed,"¹⁰ "virtuous,"¹¹ "powerful,"¹² "humble,"¹³ "eloquent,"¹⁴ and "obedient,"¹⁵ are frequently used.

Lakshmana is also given the opportunity in VR to display his intelligence, rather than just his warrior and devotional qualities. At several points he is shown delivering thoughtful and learned dialogue, which we will see is rarely, if ever, done with respect to Phra Lak in *Ramakien*. This can first be seen in a speech in which he waxes eloquently on the change in seasons and the beautiful scenery:

'O sweet one! The season that is dear to you had come ... the skin has become rough with dews, the earth full of crops, water is difficult to touch, fire is agreeable ... golden paddy with their

⁶ Sen 129.

⁷ Sen 20.

⁸ Sen 169, 198, 222.

⁹ Sen 61, 76, 183, 234, 434.

¹⁰ Sen 110.

¹¹ Sen 135.

¹² Sen 170, 173.

¹³ Sen 170.

¹⁴ Sen 173, 236.

¹⁵ Sen 276.

ears slightly bent with grains have grown brownish-yellow like dates. Its rays being diffused through mists, the midday sun appears like the moon.’¹⁶

When Rama laments in grief and rage after Sita has been abducted, Lakshmana first consoles him, before he gives advice in a level-headed manner:

‘Oh hero, do not be overwhelmed with grief. Let two of us now carefully search for her ... As Vishnu rules the world by subduing Vali, so you will recover Sita ... *Arya*, banish your despair, let us be up and doing in her search. Energetic people are never borne down by arduous task.’¹⁷

In another other scene, Lakshmana is seen giving Rama a kind of pep talk:

‘Oh hero! Don’t be overwhelmed with grief. It is not unknown to you that too much grief destroys everything. You are decent, energetic and have regard for everyday duties ... banish your sorrows, retain your energy ... I am only trying to rouse your talent valour, as at the time of sacrifice people rekindle the sacrificial fire covered with ashes by offering oblations to it.’¹⁸

Finally, Lakshmana is erudite and philosophical in this passage when consoling Rama after Rama thinks Sita has been killed:

‘Happiness of created beings is something tangible, and since piety or virtue is not so, virtue cannot be the means of happiness. Nature is happy without any morality: so created beings can also be happy without any religion whatsoever. Thus religion cannot lead to happiness ... O worshipful lord! Religion or virtue is an insensate thing, it has no reason or speech. Even if you admit its existence, how can it find out its object of revenge? In fact, if

¹⁶ Sen 170-171.

¹⁷ Sen 215-216.

¹⁸ Sen 268.

there were any religion at all, then you would not have been unhappy; since you are suffering, there is no such thing as religion or virtue ...'.¹⁹

Thus, while the basic overall character traits of Phra Lak and Lakshmana are quite similar, there are differences in their manner. Lakshmana is shown as a more rounded person, at times even taking a leadership role, rather than the portrait of Phra Lak being merely a devoted companion or fierce warrior.

To further the comparison, a few specific scenes from VR will be examined to help in this comparative analysis of Lakshmana and Phra Lak. Throughout the discussion, the names of the characters in VR will be provided first with their corresponding name from *Ramakien* immediately following, in parenthesis, the first time used.

(1) Birth of Lakshmana²⁰

Lakshmana is born as one of four sons to Dasaratha (Thotsarot) after Dasaratha asks the Brahmins to perform a ceremony so he can have offspring to help in the fight against Ravana (Thotsakan). As a result of this ceremony, the gods appear before Brahma (Phra Phrom), who knows that Ravana was given a boon making him indestructible to gods and other creatures. However, he also knows that Ravana is not protected against humans, and, thus, Vishnu (Phra Narai) is asked to divide into four parts to be born as sons to Dasaratha's three queens.

The means of conception is by "Payasa-Rice or grains boiled with sugar and milk, akin to porridge."²¹ Half of the Payasa is given to Kausalya (Nang Kaosuriya) and one quarter is given to Kaikeyi (Nang Kaiyakesi) and Sumitra (Nang Samut Thewi). In due course, the three queens give birth in the following order, Kausalya to Rama (Phra Ram), Kaikeyi to Bharata (Phra Phrot) and Sumitra to twins, Lakshmana and Satrugna (Phra Satarud). While Rama, at his birth, is described in some detail

¹⁹ Sen 506.

²⁰ Sen 16-18, 19-20.

²¹ Sen 18.

having “mighty arms, rosy eyes, and scarlet lips...all auspicious marks on his fair body,” and Bharata as “truthful—the fourth part of Vishnu”, neither Lakshmana nor Satrugna are described, other than “...Sumitra delivered twin sons.”²²

While there is little of the foreshadowing of the role Phra Lak is to play as we will see in *Ramakien*, VR very quickly sets up the older–younger brother relationships of loyalty and devotion by noting shortly after their birth that:

Auspicious Lakshmana was deeply attached to Rama even from his early infancy. He was always attentive to the wishes of Rama. He never ate anything unless Rama partook of it first. He could not even sleep without Rama’s company. When Rama went hunting, Lakshmana always followed him with bow in his hand. Lakshmana’s younger brother Satrugna was likewise devoted to Bharata and was dearer to the latter than life.²³

Thus, the means and reason for their births, along with the early pairing of the brothers, is quite similar in VR as in *Ramakien*, although with the variation that Vishnu divides into parts to become the four sons, as opposed to having him and three of his attributes incarnate as Phra Ram and his brothers in *Ramakien*. Lakshmana is born as the third son of Dasaratha and younger brother of Rama.

(2) The Great Bow and Marriages²⁴

The scene in which Rama first meets Sita (Nang Sida) shows some difference in story line between VR and *Ramakien*, although not necessarily a divergence in character portrayal. In VR, Rama wins Sita’s hand in marriage as a result of demonstrating his prowess with a great bow, although not through a contest as in *Ramakien*. This, of course, means that there is no specific chance for Lakshmana to show his obedience and deference to Rama as we will see Phra Lak does with Phra Ram during the bow lifting contest. However, in VR the hierarchy imposed by the

²² Sen 20.

²³ Sen 20.

²⁴ Sen 44-52.

birth order is reinforced by the fact that Sita has a younger sister who is wed to Lakshmana, thus showing a conformity with tradition of older marrying older and younger with younger.

(3) Exile of Rama ²⁵

The circumstances whereby Rama is exiled are similar in VR as in *Ramakien*. On the eve of Rama's coronation to the throne, Kaikeyi, induced by a servant, redeems a vow made to her by Dasaratha. She asks that her son, Bharata, be made king instead of Rama with Rama to be exiled for fourteen years. When Lakshmana hears of this, and seeing that Rama will honor the vow, he pledges his **loyalty** and **obedience** to help him retain the kingdom. When he sees Rama intent on leaving, Lakshmana, naturally, pledges to follow and protect him. At this point, Lakshmana, in a long speech with perhaps more dialogue in this one scene than attributed to Phra Lak in all of *Ramakien*, berates his older brother, telling Rama he should fight for his right to the throne:

'[Y]ou are labouring under a delusion ... You can easily overcome your fate, then why do you sing hymns of praise to worthless and wretched Destiny? ... I can't brook this heinous affair ... I hate that religion that has fascinated you so much and produced this vacillation. You are capable of action, then why should you obey the words of the luxurious king? ... This virtuous tendency in you is certainly reprehensible ... I entreat you to give up this evil faith ... those who are weak and powerless follow destiny, but those who are heroes and whose valour is praised by the people, never pay any heed to destiny. He who can conquer fate by his manliness is never cast down by suffering or loss ... Now get yourself initiated with auspicious rites ... I shall guard your throne ... these arms of mine are not intended only to contribute to the beauty of my person, this bow

²⁵ Sen 54-98.

is not meant as an ornament, this sword and shafts are not meant for felling and carrying woods. Don't think it to be so.'²⁶

Thus, while the circumstances of Rama's exile, and Lakshmana's following him to the forest, are similar, Lakshmana speech to Rama, in which he exhibits very non-deferential behavior, is quite different from Phra Lak's manner in *Ramakien*. In telling his older brother how he is wrong and what he should do, Lakshmana is shown talking to his older brother in a manner never seen with Phra Lak and Phra Ram.

(4) Lakshmana Mutilates Surpanakha²⁷

The set up and development of the scene in which Ravana's sister, Surpanakha (Samanakha), meets Rama and Lakshmana is quite similar in VR and *Ramakien*, although the reason she is wandering in the forest is not specified in VR. However, whereas in *Ramakien* Phra Lak takes it upon himself to mutilate Samanakha, in VR Rama explicitly orders Lakshmana and he obediently carries out the dirty deed: "Thereupon heroic Rama, preventing the Rakshasi, terrible as the noose of death, spoke to Lakshmana in wrath, '... Punish her immediately by deforming this hideous and infuriated Rakshasi.'"²⁸ Lakshmana then cuts off her ears and nose, although, in this case, leaves her hands and feet.

(5) The Abduction of Sita²⁹

The scene in which Sita is abducted by Ravana is very much the same in VR and *Ramakien*, and, in fact, in most renditions of the Rama story. In VR, Ravana's pretext for taking Sita is initially for revenge against Rama, rather than out of infatuation with Sita, however, the means he devises to abduct her are the same; that is, using a golden deer to lure Rama away and then having the deer call out in Rama's voice to induce Lakshmana to leave Sita alone for Ravana to capture.

²⁶ Sen 81-82.

²⁷ Sen 172-173.

²⁸ Sen 173.

²⁹ Sen 187-202.

The arguments put forth by Sita in VR to get Lakshmana to follow Rama read much the same as in *Ramakien*. However, Lakshmana's response and reason for leaving her alone is different. When Sita accuses Lakshmana of being unfaithful to Rama, as we will see Nang Sida does with Phra Lak, Lakshmana answers that:

‘[I]t is not at all strange for a woman to use unjust and improper words, it is rather the nature of woman, and it is everywhere to be found. They are fickle, irreligious and crooked, and they bring about the family dissensions ... I was behaving properly toward you, but you have abused me in extreme. Shame upon you ... your ruin is nigh. I was simply obeying the mandate of my eldest brother, but you have accused me on account of your womanly nature. May good betide you, I am going where Rama is.’³⁰

Thus, Lakshmana is seen rebuking Sita, talking back to her in rather harsh and not very respectful language. He attributes her accusations against him on her being a woman, and, therefore, she deserves what might be coming to her. This is quite in contrast to the reaction we will see that Phra Lak has to the accusations of Nang Sida, in which he is shamed into following Phra Ram. It is also inconceivable Phra Lak would talk to Nang Sida in such a manner as Lakshmana does with Sita. Interestingly, Sen includes an editorial aside, defending Lakshmana and blaming Sita: “Sita was no doubt mad with anxiety ... yet such a base insinuation against a brother like Lakshmana who had denounced his happiness and future and followed Rama like a devoted servant is at least unworthy of Sita.”³¹

When Rama sees that Lakshmana has come to him and left Sita alone, he castigates him thoroughly, blaming him for having done a great wrong and for being careless. However, Lakshmana is not apologetic nor does he ask for forgiveness, as would most likely be the response of Phra Lak, but tries to explain why he left Sita alone, laying the blame on her for her harsh manner.

³⁰ Sen 198.

³¹ Sen 197-198.

So, while this scene shows Lakshmana's loyalty and devotion to his older brother, it also shows a rounded nature to Lakshmana. He is someone who thinks and acts with reason, rather than just proceeding with unquestioning obedience and deference, the way Phra Lak is generally depicted.

(6) Banishment of Sita ³²

Rama hears that the people have been spreading rumors of Sita's infidelity when she was Ravana's captive. In order to dispel these rumors, Rama orders Lakshmana to take Sita and leave her in the forest, although not execute her as in *Ramakien*. Lakshmana leads her away under the pretext they are going for a visit to a hermitage, but reveals the true reason once they have arrived at the shores of the river. While Lakshmana dutifully follows the orders of Rama, he, nonetheless, displays a certain level of offense at being used for this task. He says, “ [w]orthy Rama is wise no doubt, but since he has employed me in this affair, I shall surely be odious to the people. This day, I would prefer death. It is not at all proper for me to have any hand in this ignominious deed.’ ” ³³

Since Lakshmana has not been ordered to kill Sita, he does not have to go through the recriminations nor consider being disobedient as we will see is the case with Phra Lak. However, Lakshmana does seem to exhibit some resentment toward Rama for being put in the position of having to abandon Sita in the forest, a sentiment that Phra Lak never shows in the similar situation.

b. Sugriva and Sukhrip

In VR, the birth of Sugriva, along with his older brother Vali (Phali), is described in simple terms near the beginning of the story. It merely says that to help Vishnu when he is born as a man on earth, “the Gods began to procreate sons in the forms of monkeys ... Indra procreated Vali tall as the Mahendra's peak, the Sun, Sugriva” ³⁴ At this point, the text does not state that Vali and Sugriva are brothers,

³² Sen 590-592.

³³ Sen 591.

³⁴ Sen 19.

although at a later point this is made clear when Sugriva relates his problems with his older brother to Rama.³⁵ Some foreshadowing of the rivalry between Sugriva and Vali is provided at the beginning of the text, though, when it says that after the “millions of Vanaras came into existence ... some of these monkeys took Vali as their leader; some, Sugriva”³⁶ So we can see that, although Sugriva is born of the Sun god to help Rama, as in *Ramakien*, the circumstances of his birth are quite different as he is born directly as a monkey rather than being cursed to become one as in *Ramakien*.

In another variation between VR and *Ramakien*, Sugriva is first recommended to Rama as a potential ally in his quest for Sita by a demon named Kavandha, whom Rama has released from a curse imposed by Indra. Before ascending to heaven, Kavandha tells “ ‘Rama, there is a mighty monkey named Sugriva ... he is modest, intelligent, gentle, capable, effulgent, and of firm determination ... he now roams near the bank of the Pampa in fear of Vali who has driven him away.’ ”³⁷ When Rama and Lakshmana arrive there, Sugriva spies them and becomes frightened, thinking they are agents of his older brother. Hanuman, sent to investigate by Sugriva, then brings Rama and Sugriva together.

At this point, Sugriva relates his troubles with Vali, saying “ ‘I have great enmity with Vali ... Vali is my mortal enemy ... that wicked fellow ...’ ”³⁸ Thus, Sugriva starts out showing greater disrespect for his older brother, using harsher language than we will see Sukhrip uses with respect to Phali in *Ramakien*. However, when he goes on to explain the circumstances of his break with his brother, he explains:

‘Vali is my elder brother. He was highly esteemed by my father and I too greatly honoured him. After father’s death, the counselors conferred the Vanara Kingdom on Vali, for being the

³⁵ Sen 225.

³⁶ Sen 19.

³⁷ Sen 225.

³⁸ Sen 240-241.

eldest son ... I obeyed him like a slave ... when he rushed forth in great wrath for the destruction of the Asura, I bowed to him...then I followed him out of brotherly love ... [after he thinks Vali has been killed and has been crowned as king, when Vali returns] ... I could have chastised him, but thinking of the dignity of brotherly relation I restrained myself ... I greeted him with due honour ... I humbly said ... “I shall be your obedient servant...I bow down to you.” ,³⁹

After hearing Sugriva’s tale of woe, Rama offers to kill Vali, which he does in due order. Upon his death Vali, as with Phali in *Ramakien*, repents his sins and asks forgiveness from Sugriva. Thereafter, “the fire of enmity was extinguished in Sugriva ... he became extremely sad ... he began to nurse his elder brother.”⁴⁰ Then Sugriva laments: “ ‘in fact Vali all along maintained his brotherly love, honesty and piety, but I have betrayed lust, anger and my apish nature ... I have committed unthinkable, unexpiable, undesirable and most reprehensible sin by killing my brother ... I do not deserve any respect from my subjects ...’ .”⁴¹ So, we can see in the end, Sugriva, as Sukhrip does in *Ramakien*, retains his loyalty and respect for his older brother.

c. Vibhishana and Phiphek

The birth of Vibhishana⁴² is not described in VR until near the end of the text in *Uttarakanda*, the Seventh Kanda, which most *Ramayana* historians acknowledge, including Sen, is likely a later day addition by other poets.⁴³ In any event, Vibhishana is identified as being the last sibling of Ravana, after Kumbhakarna (Khumpakarn) and Surpanakha, a slight change in the birth order as seen in *Ramakien*. The text in VR also explains that when they are young, each ask for a boon from Brahma for practicing penance. Vibhishana, who is described as being ‘pious’ at birth, “expressed

³⁹ Sen 241-242.

⁴⁰ Sen 260.

⁴¹ Sen 262.

⁴² Sen 572-573.

⁴³ Sen x.

his thankfulness for that and said that his heart and soul might ever remain devoted to religion, so that he might always lead a virtuous life.”⁴⁴

Another difference between VR and *Ramakien* is that Vibhishana is not the incarnation of a demi-god, specifically sent with special powers to help Rama. No specific mission is ascribed to him in VR, although at an relatively early point in the story, before he has left Ravana, his sister, Surpanakha refers to him as “pious Bhibhishana [*sic*], inimical to the Rakshasas,”⁴⁵ thus foreshadowing the role he will later play.

In the first scene in which he appears in VR, Vibhishana is shown exhibiting praising his older brother. He says, “ ‘O Lord! ... You are virtuous, wise and well-versed in politics ... O hero! You are, in truth, the foremost amongst the Gods and Asuras.’ ”⁴⁶ Later, a council of war is called and Vibhishana, continuing to show respect, “bowed to him [Ravana] and showing his honours to the king,”⁴⁷ advises Ravana to return Sita. Ravana, in a fit of anger, accuses him of treachery with very harsh words, to which Vibhishana replies, “ ‘Oh king! You are my elder brother, and so respectable like father ... you are my superior. Please forgive me for what I have said for your own good ... I leave you now, may you be happy without me.’ ”⁴⁸

Then, without formally being exiled or banished by Ravana, or even taking leave of his wife and children, Vibhishana immediately decides to offer his services to Rama, saying to Rama that Ravana “ ‘abused me and insulted me. Now having abandoned my wife and children, I have sought your shelter.’ ”⁴⁹ Thus, in a significant difference between *Ramakien* and VR, Vibhishana leaves his older brother on his own volition and goes to Rama in order to help Rama fight Ravana. In addition, in the ensuing fight, Vibhishana is a more active participant than will be seen by

⁴⁴ Sen 573.

⁴⁵ Sen 172.

⁴⁶ Sen 374.

⁴⁷ Sen 401.

⁴⁸ Sen 408.

⁴⁹ Sen 408.

Phiphek in *Ramakien*. This depiction of Vibhishana is exhibited throughout the battle scenes:

[Upon the return of one of Ravana's spies, he reports] ... 'Rama has invested him with the kingship of Lanka. He [Vibhishana] has come to fight against you out of pique.'⁵⁰

In the meantime, Vibhishana appeared on the scene to witness the fight and after stretching his bow he began to strike the opponents with sharp arrows.⁵¹

At that time, Vibhishana too jumped forward and killed his huge horses like the hills. Then Ravana in anger hurled a Sakti lightning against him.⁵²

Thus, we see that Vibhishana is involved in the battle with Ravana, not just in the role of seer, consultant and advisor, as in *Ramakien*, but as an active participant in the fighting. In VR, Vibhishana is portrayed as being more intent on getting revenge against his older brother, rather than merely being on the side of truth and justice, as we will see is repeatedly made clear about Phiphek in *Ramakien*.

Upon the death of Ravana, Vibhishana is said to "lament with a sorrowful heart: 'O hero! ... my heart rends with sorrow ... we are stricken with sorrow.'"⁵³ However, during his lamentations, he never asks for forgiveness nor regrets his taking place in the fight resulting in the death of his older brother. In fact, he never even refers to Ravana as his older brother. Then at the time of Ravana's funeral, Vibhishana says " '... this king of Rakshasas, bent on evil, was my enemy in the form of a brother. Though in position and age he was to be honoured by me, he was not

⁵⁰ Sen 424.

⁵¹ Sen 513.

⁵² Sen 527.

⁵³ Sen 539.

worthy of my respect.’ ”⁵⁴ Thus, Vibhishana refuses to show respect and deference to his older brother, even after his death.

3. Summary

From this comparative analysis of the three characters examined, while we can see that Sukhrip and Sugriva appear to have much in common, the comparison between Phiphek and Vibhishana reveals they are quite different characters. The reasons for opposing their older brother, Thotsakan and Ravana, respectively, and subsequent actions in the battles, are quite different. Also, Vibhishana, unlike Lakshmana and Sugriva, as we will see as well with respect to the three younger brother characters in *Ramakien*, is the only one to have an irreconcilable break with his older brother.

When coming to the case of Phra Lak and Lakshmana, they have many similarities, but also some significant differences. They are both shown exhibiting total devotion to their older brother, Phra Ram/Rama. However, Phra Lak’s devotion is shown more in terms of being the faithful follower and companion, while Lakshmana is often cast as the devoted servant. On the other hand, Lakshmana is also one that is more willing to lecture his older brother and let him know what he thinks is right and wrong. In this regard, Lakshmana shows more roundness of character, often even showing signs of leadership, something never seen in Phra Lak.

⁵⁴ Sen 544.

CHAPTER IV

FACTORS AND TRAITS TO BE USED FOR ANALYZING THE ROLE OF YOUNGER BROTHER

In this chapter, the factors and traits to be used to analyze the role of younger brother in *Ramakien* and the portrayal of royal younger brothers in Thai historical narratives will be identified. In doing so, reference is made to various aspects of hierarchy in traditional Thai society, starting with the concept of patron-client relationships, followed by a discussion of a standard model of conduct within the hierarchical structure and how these are exhibited in terms of kinship and language. Finally, we will see how these various factors and traits can be used to construct the model behavior of an 'ideal' younger brother. Lastly, we will see how this model behavior for 'ideal' younger brothers can be applied to the analysis of the role of younger brother in *Ramakian* and to the portrayal of royal younger brothers in Thai historical narratives.

A. Hierarchy in Thai Society

It has often been observed by those studying traditional Thai culture and social aspects of Thailand, that Thailand is “a highly hierarchically structured society, in which each member ranks the other in terms of superiority and inferiority ...”¹ Amara Prasithratsint points out that Thai people see most things in the world with some sort of ranking, whether it is people or objects.² William Klausner, a well-respected analyst of Thai society and culture, writes that “observers of the Thai social and bureaucratic scene have often remarked on the acute sense of hierarchy that so pervades all Thai personal relationships ... [t]here are well defined patterns of patron-client, teacher-pupil, *elder-younger*, boss-worker, master-servant.” (emphasis added)³

¹ Hans-Dieter Bechstedt, “Identity and Authority in Thailand,” National Identity and Its Defenders, ed. Craig J. Reynolds (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2002) 241.

² Amara Prasithratsint, “Hierarchy of Diverse Languages in Thailand” (Bangkok: Paper for “Multilingualism In Thailand”, Thai Studies Center, Chulalongkorn Univ. 2007) 5.

³ William J. Klausner, Reflections on Thai Culture (Bangkok: Siam Society, 1993) 272.

There are, of course, many factors that come into play in establishing hierarchy, such as birth situation, social status, profession, rank, reputation, power, wealth, gender, and, of course, kinship relationship and age: “An old person is automatically respected by a younger person if both are equal in other things.”⁴ These last two are often defining elements, and, naturally, ones that are of principal concern to establishing the behavior traits to be used for the analysis in this thesis.

In contrast to the characterization of Thai society as being highly hierarchical, John F. Embree, writing in the 1950s, famously described it as being a “Loosely Structured Social System.”⁵ However, the hierarchical model has become largely accepted in academic circles⁶ and Klausner noted that “such individualism, [an important part of Embree’s analysis], as occurs is principally directed at avoiding or bypassing, directly or indirectly, the strictures imposed by hierarchy.”⁷

1. Patron-Client Relationships

The concept of patron-client relationships has been identified as an important aspect of traditional Thai social structure, both formal and informal, since ancient times.⁸ Akin Rabibhadana provides a detailed description in The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period 1782-1873,⁹ of the formal model of patron-client relationships, in the form of *nai* (boss/patron) and *phrai* (servant/client). While these formal historical relationships have essentially disappeared, the informal modes of patron-client behavior remain firmly rooted in Thai society. In this regard, Lucien Hanks states that “every liaison between people in this society takes on some forms of this patron-client relationship. Parents are patrons of their children, *older, of younger siblings*, captain, over the men in the troop ... the relationship is not just the mortar

⁴ Amara 5.

⁵ John F. Embree, “Thailand – A Loosely Structured Social System,” American Anthropologist 53, No 2 (Apr.-Jun. 1950): 181-193.

⁶ See: Hans-Dieter Evers, ed., Loosely Structured Social Systems: Thailand in Comparative Perspective (New Haven: Yale University, Southeast Asian Studies, 1969).

⁷ William J. Klausner, personal interview, 23 May 2007.

⁸ David K. Wyatt, Thailand, A Short History, 2nd ed. (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2003) 60.

⁹ Akin Rabibhadana, The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period 1782-1873 (Bangkok: Amarin, 1996) 13-47.

but the rocks and rivets that hold Thai society together.” (emphasis added)¹⁰ Barend Terwiel, in describing such relationships says, “patron-client relationship ... is always a hierarchical one in which the patron occupies a superior position and the client is subservient.”¹¹

What is interesting in these observations is that patron-client relationships are not restricted to the usual superior-inferior interactions, such as supervisor and subordinate or politician and supporter, but can also be extended to normal family relationships. Thus, in terms of our interest in this thesis, the concept of a hierarchical, patron-client relationship can be extended to the relationship between a younger and older brother.

2. Standard Model of Behavior

Many academics have noted that one of the characteristics of the patron-client relationships are that they are governed by a standard model of conduct. Hans-Dieter Bechstedt states that this can be defined as conduct which “appears to be strongly influenced by the set of ‘unwritten rules of behavior’, i.e. an elaborate role-play between superior and inferior ...,”¹² which “conforms to the numerous, culturally provided practices of etiquette.”¹³ In fact, in countering Embree’s description of Thai society as being ‘loosely organized,’ it has been noted “that strict, i.e. ‘tightly prescribed,’ role requirements are more the rule than the expectation in social conduct among the Thai.”¹⁴ Niels Mulder makes clear the importance of this standard model of conduct by stating “[w]hen everybody presents his role according to expectations,

¹⁰ Lucien M. Hanks, “The Thai Social Order as Entourage and Circle,” Change and Persistence in Thai Society, Essays in Honor of Lauriston Sharp, eds. G. William Skinner and A. Thomas Kirsch (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975) 200.

¹¹ Barend J. Terwiel, “Formal Structures and Informal Rules: An Historical Perspective on Hierarchy, Bondage and the Patron-Client Relationship,” Strategies and Structures in Thai Society. Eds Han ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp (Amsterdam: Anthropological Sociological Centre, University of Amsterdam, 1984) 19.

¹² Bechstedt 253-254.

¹³ Bechstedt 241.

¹⁴ Boonsanong Punyadyana, “Social Structure, Social System, and Two Levels of Analysis: A Thai View,” Loosely Structured Social Systems: Thailand in Comparative Perspective, ed. Hans-Dieter Evers (New Haven: Yale University, Southeast Asian Studies, 1969) 82.

life will be calm and predictable, without unrest and stir, and society and individuals will be contented.”¹⁵

Obviously, given the nature of human relationships, defining a standard model of behavior in traditional hierarchical, patron-client relationships can be quite complex and difficult. However, using the various findings by leading researchers on Thai society, we can construct a standard model of behavior that can be defined in terms four primary traits, **loyalty**, **obedience**, **respect** and **deference** (emphasis added throughout):

a. Loyalty

Lucien Hanks: An entourage is a group focused on a single person ... [and] ... arises out of personal **loyalty** to the patron.¹⁶

William Klausner: The superior is always conscious of the need to strengthen and expand the web of his faithful and dependent subordinates. **Loyalty** is maintained as long as the respective positions of power, status and rank remain stable.¹⁷

b. Obedience

Hans-Dieter Bechstedt: **[O]bedience** to authority of elders and trust in their wisdom, protection, mutual dependence and reciprocity, moral indebtedness and a sense of obligation – all these seem to be significant aspects of Thai culture.¹⁸

Niels Mulder: Hierarchy implies consciousness of status, that is, of one’s relative station vis-à-vis other. Status obligates: the relative superior should provide protection and guidance, the inferior should accept this and render honor and **obedience** in return.¹⁹

¹⁵ Niels Mulder, *Everyday Life in Thailand* (Bangkok: Duang Kamol, 1985) 66.

¹⁶ Hanks, “The Thai Social Order” 200.

¹⁷ Klausner, *Reflections* 272.

¹⁸ Bechstedt 247.

¹⁹ Mulder 78.

c. Respect

Han ten Brummelhuis: The respect owed to one's superiors implies an enormous emphasis on the correctness of outer forms of behavior, whatever one's inner intentions may be.²⁰

Barend Terwiel: Ideally, a patron should be benevolent, protective and warm-hearted toward his clients, and they ought to respect and obey their patron and help him unstintingly²¹

d. Deference

Lucien Hanks: Each Thai regards every other person in the social order as higher or lower than himself. The elder ... tend to be higher ... a hierarchy arises where each person pays deference to all who stand above and is deferred to by all below.²²

Jane Bunnag: [T]he junior partner should in turn pay heed to this advice, and give more tangible evidence of his deference by action as general factotum for his superior.²³

Naturally, there are other elements that can be used to define the standard model of behavior in patron-client relationships and a long list could be created, however, that would be beyond the intent and scope of this thesis. The only other element that will be mentioned relates to responsibility in the relationship. As the client is expected to exhibit **loyalty** and **obedience** to the patron, the patron is expected to be responsible for the protection and welfare of the client. Mulder explains that in Thai society "superiors have to lead, to teach, to protect, to be responsible"²⁴ Sulamith Heins Potter, in a study of a Northern Thai family, had this observation about the various family members: "seniors take responsibility for the welfare of juniors ... [and, that the youngest child had] ... a childhood during which

²⁰ Han ten Brummelhuis, "Abundance and Avoidance: An Interpretation of Thai Individualism," *Strategies and Structures in Thai Society*, eds. Han ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp (Amsterdam: Anthropological Sociological Centre, University of Amsterdam, 1984) 44.

²¹ Terwiel 19.

²² Hanks, "The Thai Social Order" 198.

²³ Jane Bunnag, *Buddhist Monk, Buddhist Layman* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973) 13.

²⁴ Mulder 199.

she was constantly at other people's beck and call, and rarely required to take responsibility.”²⁵

B. Kinship

1. Hierarchy in Kinship Relationships

As was previously mentioned, in traditional Thai society, family relations and kinship have well established hierarchical characteristics. Brummelhuis and Jeremy Kemp make this clear when they note that kinship is also a system of hierarchy, which fits in the larger hierarchy of Thai society.²⁶ Hanks and Herbert Phillips, in a study of a rural Thai family, observed that “each family member has both superior and inferior positions. Dang is subordinate to his father but superior to his younger siblings. Even the last born shares these dual roles: he is subordinate to his older brothers and sisters but rules it over the family buffalo.”²⁷

The hierarchy within the immediate family unit is usually based on age and relative age difference is critical.²⁸ Thus, the older sibling is in a superior/patron position with the younger in a subordinate/client position. Therefore, the older brother can be considered as patron to his younger brother, his client.

2. Standard Model of Behavior

As with patron-client relationships, a standard model of behavior can also be applied to conventional hierarchical family relationships. Kemp, in a paper entitled “The Manipulation Of Personal Relations: From Kinship To Patron-Client,” states that “[i]n kinship we thus have a field of social obligation where the individual actor is supposed to perform according to normative expectations of right and wrong”²⁹

²⁵ Sulamith Heins Potter, Family Life in a Northern Thai Village (Berkeley: U of California P, 1977) 99-102.

²⁶ Han ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp, eds. Strategies and Structures in Thai Society (Amsterdam: Anthropological Sociological Centre, Univ. of Amsterdam, 1984) 15.

²⁷ Lucien M. Hanks, Jr. and Herbert P. Phillips, “A Young Thai from the Countryside,” Studying Personality Cross-Culturally, ed. Bert Kaplan (New York: Row, Peterson, 1961) 642.

²⁸ Jeremy H Kemp, “The Manipulation of Personal Relations: From Kinship to Patron-Client,” Strategies and Structures in Thai Society, eds. Han ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp (Amsterdam: Anthropological Sociological Centre, Univ. of Amsterdam, 1984) 61.

²⁹ Kemp 60.

Klausner also makes this clear when he explains “[i]deal forms of conduct within the family unit are well defined. The intellectual, as well as moral, basis for the duties one performs toward society and family is drawn from the explicit injunctions laid down in the *Singhaloka Sutra*.”³⁰

Therefore, it appears evident that we can apply the standard model of behavior in terms of the four traits outlined above for patron-client to traditional hierarchical kinship relationships. The older relatives should be accorded a higher level of **respect** and **obedience**, with the younger showing **loyalty** and **deference**. The younger is treated with more nurturing and care, with the older taking on the responsibility for the welfare of their younger relations.

3. Kinship Terms

Kinship terms and the forms of address one uses with one’s family members are very important in traditional Thai society and such terms are quite well defined by the relative position in the relationship. Bechstedt notes the “remarkably elaborate system of hierarchically ordered kinship terms” in the Thai language.³¹

Kemp, in his previously cited paper, makes clear the significance of the hierarchical nature and standard model of behavior embodied in kinship terms by stating that “[k]in terms are a kind of coded reference to certain qualities which may already exist in a relationship or indicate an attempt to imbue it with them;” he then goes on to say, “[p]lacing relations within the arena of kinship can thus be an effective means of manipulation. It represents the imparting to a relationship of socially significant qualities which are best expressed in the ideology of kinship and backed by the moral axiom of amity” and finally notes that an “important factor in the use of kin terms is their expression of **respect**.” (emphasis added)³²

Age is particularly important with respect to kinship terms. Joseph R. Cooke states that “[r]elative age is particularly important in addressing kin. In fact, all kin

³⁰ William J. Klausner, *Further Reflections on Thai Culture* (Bangkok: Institute of Security and International Studies, Chulalongkorn University, 2006) 79-80.

³¹ Bechstedt 488.

³² Kemp 60-62.

terms have relative age implications.”³³ This is highlighted by the fact that there are more terms to characterize older relations in Thai. Thus, while there is only one term for grandchild, whether male or female, there are four terms for grandparent, to distinguish whether they are a maternal or paternal grandmother or grandfather. Certain terms, such as for aunt or uncle, defined in terms of their relationship to one’s respective parent, also show age bias in their application. For example, there are separate terms for older siblings of one’s parents, ‘*pa* [ป้า]’ for a sister and ‘*lung* [ลุง]’ for a brother; but only one term for younger sibling either male or female, for one’s mother, ‘*na* [น้า]’ and father ‘*eh* [อา]’.

a. Kinship Terms for Siblings

With respect to one’s siblings, birth order and thus age, not gender, defines which term to use for brother or sister, the older sibling is always ‘*pi* [พี่]’, and the younger, ‘*nong* [น้อง]’, whether male or female. The use of these terms is set at birth and is strictly followed, even applying to twins; they are never considered equal even if born just one minute apart and will call each other as *phi* or *nong*, respectively.³⁴

For purposes of this thesis, it is also useful to note some of the more formal terms for younger and older brother. Another term for younger brother, evident in the title of this thesis, is the Sanskrit derived words ‘*anucha* [อนุชา]’ and corresponding term for older brother, ‘*chetta* [เชษฐา]’.³⁵ Today, both are primarily used with poetic references to royalty or perhaps as a formal given name.

³³ Joseph R. Cooke, *Pronominal Reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1968) 58.

³⁴ Bechstedt 242.

³⁵ Thianchai Iamwonmen, *Thai-English Dictionary of 88,000 Words* (Bangkok: Ruamsan (1977) [รวมสาส์น (1977)], 2537 BE (2004 CE)) 6, 113. Thianchai also provides an alternative spelling, ‘*chetta*’ [เชษฐ] (เชดต๓), with an English translation of “elder brother” although adds in Thai “พี่ผู้เป็นใหญ่” which would literally translate as “older brother, big person” and seem to imply some greater level of importance. Thianchai 317. This alternative spelling appears to correspond more closely to the Pali form of this word, which the *Dictionary of the Royal Institute* sets forth as [เชษฐา] along with, interestingly, a second definition, “...a constellation of 14 stars have the shape of an elephant tusk or the neck of a naga [ดาวฤกษ์ที่ ๑๘ มี ๑๔ ดวง เห็นเป็นรูปงาช้างหรือคอนาค].” *Dictionary of the Royal Institute, 1999 [พจนานุกรม ฉบับราชบัณฑิตยสถาน ๒๕๔๒]* (Bangkok: Royal Institute, 2003) 370.

Other Sanskrit based words used for younger sibling are ‘*kanittha* [กนิษฐา]’ or ‘*kanit*’ [กนิษฐ] and its variation ‘*khanittha* [กนิษฐ OR กนิษฐา]’.³⁶ Although there is not total uniformity in the translation of this word between younger brother or sister, generally ‘*kanittha* [กนิษฐา]’ is used for younger sister and ‘*khanittha* [กนิษฐา]’ for either younger brother or sister.³⁷ With respect to usage in *Ramakien*, we will see that both ‘*kanittha*’ and ‘*khanittha*’ are used interchangeable for younger brother.

C. Language and Forms of Address

As with kinship terms, language and other forms of address are an important aspect of the standard model of behavior in conventional hierarchical interactions. Bechstedt states that “[a]ll Thai people, whatever the situation, are fully aware of their own as well as everyone else’s position in the social hierarchy, and will reinforce this by appropriate manners and speech ... [which means]... paying **respect** to elders and speaking politely.” (emphasis added)³⁸ Mulder points out that “awareness of relative position is—and should always be—expressed in manners and choice of words.”³⁹

Therefore, we can see that language is a significant marker of hierarchy, and thus can convey one’s sense of **loyalty, obedience, respect** and **deference**. Also, in a literary setting, particularly Thai literature, this language hierarchy is an important indicator of mood, feeling and attitude, and a shift in language use can be a useful signal of a change in the sentiment of a particular character.

a. Personal Pronouns

Personal pronouns, which are particularly well developed in the Thai language, are a good example of language hierarchy and can serve as a means of

³⁶ Dictionary of the Royal Institute, 1999 8. Interestingly, ‘*kanittha* [กนิษฐา]’ also means ‘pinkie finger [นิ้วก้อย]’ in royal usage.

³⁷ Thianchai 6. The word ‘*kanittha* [กนิษฐา]’ can be made clearer by the use of the suffix ‘*phakhini* [ภคินี]’, meaning ‘sister’, for females and ‘*phada* [ภาดา]’, meaning ‘brother’, for males, thus, for younger sister, *kanitthaphakhini* [กนิษฐาภคินี]’ and, for younger brother, ‘*kanitthaphakini* [กนิษฐาภาดา]’.

³⁸ Bechstedt 242-243.

³⁹ Mulder 199.

establishing one's relationship with others. Upon meeting, it is important to determine who is older and younger, so that the proper forms of address and manners of speech can be used. There are many ways one can refer to themselves and others in Thai, all involving some sort of hierarchical element. The pronoun one chooses to apply can be very important in displaying one's mood, temperament, and feelings toward the other person, as well as the perception of status vis-à-vis the other person.

Personal pronouns have no doubt changed over the many years. Klausner sums this up very well:

Ku [กู] and myng [มีง] are old Thai words for 'I' and 'you' which were in use as far back as the Sukhothai period. These terms were used reciprocally among equals. At present, ku [กู] and myng [มีง] are mostly limited in use to close male friends. Kha [ข้า] and eng [เอ็ง] are old Thai words, used during the Ayutthaya period, that expressed differential status and power. However, in a seeming deliberate parody, they have been transformed into terms of familiarity that are now used primarily among close male friends. Nevertheless, eng [เอ็ง] is sometimes still used instead of more formal terms for 'you' by parents when speaking to their children. [Spellings in Thai script added]⁴⁰

Today's usage of pronoun can be extraordinarily complex, and many pronouns generally have different applications and pejorative meanings than when used in *Ramakien* over 200 years ago. However, such pronouns can serve in certain settings to convey a message, particularly when there is a shift in the pronoun use by a character, that is from a term that is more 'respectful' or 'formal' to one that is less.

⁴⁰ William J. Klausner, *Thai Culture in Transition* (Bangkok: Siam Society, 2002) 107.

Set forth below is a table of some pronouns used in Thai, listed in relative order of respect and deference:

Table 1 – Selected Thai Pronouns ⁴¹

First Person	
<i>khaphachao</i> (ข้าพเจ้า)	Formal term used in public address
<i>krathom</i> (กระผม)	Highly deferential by male to high rank or very formal situation
<i>dichan</i> (ดิฉัน)	Deferential by female to superiors or formally to equals
<i>phom</i> (ผม)	Male to equals or superiors
<i>chan</i> (ฉัน)	Female to intimate equals or inferiors; Male to inferiors
<i>phi</i> (พี่)/ <i>nong</i> (น้อง)	To intimates, older to younger/younger to older
<i>kha</i> (ข้า)	To inferiors; Assertive by male to express anger; general literary term used with superiors, equals or inferiors
<i>rao</i> (เรา)	King speaking; Superiors to inferior; General term among intimates
<i>khao</i> (เขา)	Young woman to intimates or to express anger
<i>ku</i> (กู)	Male to intimates; assertive to express anger
Second Person	
<i>phra-ong</i> (พระองค์)	Royalty to equals
<i>than</i> (ท่าน)	Highly deferential to superiors or low rank royalty
<i>khun</i> (คุณ)	General polite with equals or superiors
<i>phi</i> (พี่)/ <i>nong</i> (น้อง)	To intimates, younger to older/older to younger
<i>chao</i> (เจ้า)	Affectionate to inferiors or equals
<i>thoe</i> (เธอ)	Female to inferiors, Female to intimates or equals
<i>kae</i> (แก)	Superior to inferior; Mildly assertive by female
<i>tua</i> (ตัว)	Affectionate to equal or inferior; Woman to intimates in anger
<i>eng</i> (เอ็ง)	Superior to inferior; Male to intimates or assertive in anger
<i>mueng</i> (มึง)	Male to intimates; Assertive to express anger
Third Person	
<i>phra-ong</i> (พระองค์)	Referring to high rank royalty
<i>than</i> (ท่าน)	Highly deferential of superiors or low rank royalty
<i>khao</i> (เขา)	Neutral term
<i>kae</i> (แก)	Referring to superiors; Informal to superiors or inferiors
<i>man</i> (มัน)	Mildly assertive of intimates or inferiors; derogatory

⁴¹ Adapted from: Cooke 11-19, 38-39.

b. Other Language Indicators

There are many other language indicators that could be discussed, but one that is relevant to the analysis in this thesis because of its frequent use in *Ramakien* is the use of the prefix ‘*ai* [ไอ้]’. The Dictionary of the Royal Institute, 1999 defines ‘*ai* [ไอ้]’ as: a “word used before a name of a male who is lower in status [คำประกอบหน้าชื่อผู้ชายที่มีฐานะต่ำกว่า]” or a “word used before a name of a male to look down upon with contempt [คำใช้ประกอบหน้าชื่อผู้ชายแสดงความดูหมิ่นเหยียดหยาม]”.⁴² While, today, this term can be used in a familiar way, between close friends, it is generally considered quite crude, often used to convey a strong feeling of hate or anger, potentially leading to a serious confrontation depending on the situation. However, given the way it is used in *Ramakien*, it more than likely was not considered such a serious term as it is today and was used more in conveying a feeling of contempt and lack of **respect**. In this regard, in translating section of *Ramakien*, it is translated as ‘damned’, whereas in today’s usage it might be translated with a much stronger and more offensive curse word.

D. Standard Behavior of Younger Brothers and Application to the Analysis of Younger Brothers in *Ramakien* and Thai Historical Narratives

From the above discussion, we can construct a standard model of behavior for a younger brother with respect to his relationship with his older brother. Using the factors that have been identified above from the various readings that define the main traits for standard behavior in conventional hierarchical relationships: the younger brother would show **loyalty** by supporting and defending his older brother; he would be **obedient** by following his orders and demands; he would treat him with **respect** by using polite language; and he would show **deference** by yielding to his older brother’s wishes and desires. He would also let his older brother take responsibility for his welfare and give him credit and praise whenever possible.

⁴² Dictionary of the Royal Institute, 1999 1403.

In looking at how to evaluate whether such behavior might be considered ‘ideal’, one needs to consider the characteristics of a familial relationship, with its concomitant elements of companionship and emotional attachment, as opposed to other types of relationships. It has been pointed out that “the sibling relationship is perhaps the most long-lasting and most influential relationship of a person’s life,”⁴³ and “brothers and sisters may be best friends, a source of support and advice in times of trouble or alternatively a cause of irritation and conflict.”⁴⁴ Therefore, it would reason that a younger brother would have more opportunity to deviate from the normal behavior expected by and imposed on those merely in a societally imposed relationship, such as king and subject. In other words, the younger brother would be in a better position to be able to have divided loyalties, exhibit a lack of obedience, have lapses of respect, and show less deference. On the other hand, to the extent he exhibits constant **loyalty**, continual **obedience**, unwavering **respect** and total **deference** to his older brother, particularly when given the chance to deviate, he would then be considered an ‘ideal’ younger brother.

Accordingly, the identified traits of **loyalty**, **obedience**, **respect** and **deference** will be used as the basis for the analysis of younger brothers in *Ramakien* and the portrayal of royal younger brother figures in Thai historical narratives. That will be the task in Chapter V with respect to three principal younger brother characters in *Ramakien*, Phra Lak, Sukhrip and Phiphek; and in Chapter VI with respect to three historical royal younger brothers, Ekathotsarot, Prince Surasih and King Pinklao.

⁴³ Thomas H. Powell and Peggy Ahrenhold Gallagher, Brothers & Sisters-A Special Part of Exceptional Families (Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes, 1993) 16.

⁴⁴ Robert Sanders, Sibling Relationships, Theory and Issues for Practice (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004) xiii.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF YOUNGER BROTHER IN *RAMAKIEN*

In this chapter, an analysis of the role of younger brother in *Ramakien* is undertaken. Three characters are looked at to see how the four behavior traits of **loyalty, obedience, respect** and **deference**, identified in the previous chapter characterizing the traits and behavior of the younger brother, apply to the common depiction of younger brother characters in *Ramakien*. In this way, we can see how the role of younger brother can be defined and can create the profile of an ‘ideal’ younger brother.

In undertaking this research, the method of analysis is a textual-based approach, primarily using the original Thai language text of Rama I’s *Ramakien*. Those sections and situations in which the three characters are involved are examined for a common depiction of their behavior, primarily through their actions and manners, as well as language usage and dialogue attributed to the characters.

In addition, to help see whether this portrayal remains consistent in another media, a review of the pictorial representation of *Ramakien* seen in the mural paintings on the walls of the Galleries at the Temple of the Emerald Buddha in Bangkok will be undertaken. This is the most comprehensive collection and readily accessible pictorial renditions of *Ramakien*.

A. Characters to Be Analyzed

Although there are many younger brother characters in *Ramakien*, this analysis is focused on just three; Phra Lak, the younger brother of Phra Ram; Sukhrip, the younger brother of Phali; and Phiphek, the younger brother of Thotsakan. These three characters were chosen because they play principal roles in the overall story, thus, providing ample material to analyze to get a picture of the role of younger brother in *Ramakien*.

1. Phra Lak

Phra Lak was selected because he has the largest role being the younger brother of the central character and hero of the epic, Phra Ram. He also provides the most material to analyze, as he appears in the most scenes of any of the younger brother characters. In addition, it might be noted that Phra Lak has been frequently identified as the ‘ideal’ younger brother “ready to fulfill any wish of the elder, ready to accept and execute orders.”¹ This examination can confirm and verify the validity of this claim.

2. Sukhrip

Sukhrip’s representation as a younger brother is much more limited than Phra Lak’s, although he plays an important part in the overall story as Phra Ram’s principal general in the war with Thotsakan. Notwithstanding, his relationship with his older brother, Phali, is well represented in *Ramakien* and the conflict and resolution between the two provides interesting material for analysis.

3. Phiphek

Phiphek, the third character to be reviewed, also plays an important role in the overall epic given his capacity as advisor to Phra Ram in the fight with his older brother, Thotsakan, but with a somewhat limited appearance as a younger brother. However, there are a number of scenes and situations providing material for analysis of his depiction as younger brother.

¹ Christian Velder, “Notes on the Saga of Rama in Thailand,” *The Journal of the Siam Society* 56.1 (Jan. 1968): 34. See also: Srisurang Poolthupya, *Thai Customs and Social Values in the Ramakien* (Bangkok: Thai Khadi Research Institute, 1981). Interestingly, Velcheru Narayana Rao describes one version of Ramayana depicting a role reversal, where Rama is shown in one scene waiting on Lakshmana as a sort of punishment to Rama for threatening to kill Lakshmana: “So a bed is made for Lakshmana [*sic*], and like a dutiful servant, Rama massages his feet as Lakshmana [*sic*] sleeps comfortably.” This author also notes yet another version that relates how in the next incarnation of Vishnu after Rama, when he becomes Krishna, Lakshmana is born as Krishna’s older brother, Balarama, and is waited on by his younger brother. Velcheru Narayana Rao, “A Ramayana of Their Own: Women’s Oral Tradition in Telugu,” *Many Ramayanas, The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia*, ed. Paula Richman (Berkeley: U of California P, 1991) 126.

4. Other Characters

In addition to these three principal younger brother characters, there are a myriad of other characters in *Ramakien* who can be classified in this role as well. The most obvious are the other two younger brothers of Phra Ram, Phra Satarud and Phra Phrot. In fact, the relationship between these other two brothers very much mirrors at times the relationship between Phra Lak and Phra Ram.

In addition to Phiphek, Thotsakan has another younger brother, Kumphakan, who is also the older brother of Phiphek. Some limited discussion will be included showing the relationship between Phiphek and Kumphakan, although not necessarily between Kumphakan and Thotsakan, even though the scene in which Thotsakan asks Kumphakan to fight on his behalf would provide some interesting material regarding the role of younger brother. Thotsakan also has a number of other younger brothers who figure in the story, specifically Korn and Toot, who fight to defend the honor of their younger sister, Samanakha, after she has been maimed by Phra Lak, and Tresian, who comes to fight at the request of his older brother. In fact, Thotsakan, himself, is also a younger brother to Kuperan, and his decidedly 'non-ideal' actions against his older brother in stealing his older brother's Busabok chariot, lead Thotsakan to get punished by Phra Isuan, which is perhaps a comment on the consequences of deviating from model younger brother behavior.

A few of the other younger-older brother characters who are notable in the epic include: Lop and Mongkut, the sons of Phra Ram, Sadayu and Sambadi, the giant birds who help Phra Ram; Marit and Sawahu, who fight with Phra Lak and Phra Ram early in the story, with Marit coming back later in the guise of the golden deer used in the plot to abduct Nang Sida; and Mulapalam and Sahatsadecha, brothers and demon friends who fight at the request of Thotsakan.

B. Description/Background of Younger Brother Characters

Before looking at specific scenes in *Ramakien*, some background and description of the three principal characters is provided. This will include the circumstances of their birth, as well as events in the story which are important to understanding the relation with their older brothers.

1. Phra Lak

a. Birth of Phra Lak

As noted in the synopsis in Chapter III, Phra Lak is incarnated on earth at the same time as Phra Ram a son of King Thotsarot of Ayudhya. Thotsarot, who has three beautiful queens, but no sons, asks some rishi for help, prompting them to go to see Phra Isuan. At the same time, Phra Isuan sees that it is the right moment for Phra Narai to be incarnated on earth to wipe out the demons; so he calls for Phra Narai to be incarnated as Phra Ram, son of King Thotsarot. Phra Narai requests that his consort, Phra Lakshmi, and his various attributes also be incarnated to serve as his retinue on earth to help in his efforts. Phra Isuan agrees and declares that his naga throne [บัลลังก์นาคา] (also known as *Ananta Naga*) in *Kasian Samut*, [เกษียรสมุทร], the Great Milky Sea,² and his conch shell [สังข์] will be incarnated as Phra Lak.³ So it is apparent right at the beginning, Phra Lak has a special place in relation to Phra Ram, having been both his support in heaven in the form of his throne and his conch shell.

The incarnation of Phra Narai and his retinue is by way of a ceremony whereby four balls of celestial rice are created by the intoning of incantations, the rice is then to be consumed, causing the pregnancy of the queens. During the ceremony, the aroma of the celestial rice is carried to Longka, and Nang Montho, wife of Thotsakan, smelling it, demands that she have some. Thotsakan sends Nang Ka Kanasun to get some, and she steals half of one of the four balls of rice, which is eaten by Nang Montho causing the incarnation of Phra Lakshmi as Nang Sida. The remaining three and one-half balls are then consumed by the three queens of Thotsarot; one by Nang Kaosuriya causing the incarnation of Phra Narai as Phra Ram, one by Nang Kaiyakesi, causing the incarnation of Phra Narai's disc as Phra Phrot, and one and one-half by Nang Samut Thewi causing the incarnation of *Ananta*

² *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 1, 4.

³ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 1, 227 notes that the Thai palm leaf edition makes reference only to Phra Lak being the incarnation of naga throne and not the conch: [ต้นฉบับหนังสือสมุดไทยเป็น “ฝ่ายบัลลังก์นาคา”]. It also states that the Thai palm leaf edition indicates that Phra Satarud is the incarnation of the conch and club: [ต้นฉบับหนังสือสมุดไทยเป็น “อันสังข์คทาอาวุธ”].

Naga/Phra Narai's Conch as Phra Lak and Phra Narai's club as Phra Satarud. The birth of the four sons of King Thotsarot all occur at the same time, but in strict order defining their hierarchy. Thus Phra Ram is born first, Phra Phrot is born second, Phra Lak is born next and Phra Satarud is born last.

b. Phra Lak's Destiny

When Phra Isuan declares that Phra Narai's retinue will be incarnated, he gives them names to be used when they are on earth. Interestingly, at this point, Phra Lak is the only one to be described as “*anucha* [อนุชา],” the royal form of younger brother: “The Conch and Naga Throne, is to be Phra Lak, *anucha* with great power [ฝ่ายสังข์บัลลังก์นาคา เป็นพระลักษณ์อนุชาฤทธิรอน].” Phra Phrot is described as being of “exalted position/rank [ยศขง]”: “The disc is to be Phra Phrot, of exalted position/rank [จักรเป็นพระพรตยศขง].” Phra Satarud is described as “skilled at fighting [ชาญสมร]”: “the club, a superior weapon, is to be Phra Satarud, one skilled at fighting [คทวาราวุธ เป็นพระศัตร์ดุชาญสมร].”⁴ This, perhaps, is intended to be the first indication that Phra Lak is in a special position as the model for the role of the younger brother.

Phra Lak's role as the younger brother is again emphasized when it comes time to formally name the sons after they have been born. Phra Ram is called “Phra Ramet, the one who carries the arrow [พระรามศทตรงศร]” and Phra Phrot and Phra Satarud are merely called “young princes” [พระพรตกุมารา and พระศัตร์ดุกุมาร, respectively]. But, the poetic form of younger brother, “*kanittha* [กนิษฐา],” is used when Phra Lak is named: “Phra Lak, *suriwong kanittha* [the royal younger brother] [พระลักษณ์สุริยวงศ์กนิษฐา].”⁵

At another point when the four brothers are showing off their newly bestowed arrows created by Phra Isuan, Phra Phrot is the one given the younger brother epithet,

⁴ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 1, 227.

⁵ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 1, 250.

being called “Phra Phrot, *kanittha* [royal younger brother] [พระพรตกนิษฐา].” Phra Satarud is referred to with the same name as before, “Phra Satarud, skilled at fighting [พระศัตรุคชาวุธสมร],” but Phra Lak is given quite an exalted moniker “Phra Lak, brilliant heavenly creation [พระลักษมณ์รุ่งฟ้านราสวรรค์].”⁶ Interestingly, when describing what happens when they shoot off their newly bestowed arrows, Phra Lak’s arrow is said to “reverberate [สั่น]” and cause the earth to “tremble [ครั่นครื้นพสุธา].” Phra Lak: “His arm held the bow up, and shot causing the earth to reverberate and tremble [พระกรนี้วศรขึ้นยัน แผลงสั่นครั่นครื้นพสุธา].” This is similar to Phra Ram: “He raised the bow, shot with might, booming throughout the great mountain [ขึ้นศรแผลงไปด้วยฤทธา สะเทือนทั่วมหาบรรพต].” For the other two younger brothers, they are merely described as picking up their bows and shooting off their arrows; Phra Phrot: “Lifted his bow and shot [ขึ้นศรเงื้อง่าแล้วแผลงไป]” and Phra Satarud: “Raised his bow, pulling on the string and with a flourish of his arm, he showed great might and shot [ชักศรพาดสายกรายกร สำแดงฤทธิรอนแล้วแผลงไป].”⁷ This perhaps foreshadows the more prominent role that Phra Lak will play in the efforts to subdue the demons and shows his greater power; power almost equal to Phra Ram.

c. Young Phra Lak as Companion to Phra Ram

At a certain point, King Kaiyaket realizing he is getting old and knowing of the great skill and courage of Phra Phrot, born to his daughter, Nang Kaiyakesi, asks King Thotsarot if he can have Phra Phrot come to help protect and govern his kingdom since he had no sons. King Thotsarot agrees and, when Phra Phrot laments being separated from his family, Phra Satarud is sent along to be his companion.⁸

⁶ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 266-267.

⁷ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 266-267.

⁸ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 268-270.

Thus the older-younger brother pairings of Phra Ram/Phra Lak and Phra Phrot/Phra Satarud is set at this point.

Later, when they are still young princes, Phra Ram and Phra Lak are sent to fight Nang Ka Kanasun, who was ordered by Thotsakan to harass some hermits. Phra Ram kills Nang Ka Kanasun, causing her two sons, Sawahu and Marit to fight the two princes. In this scene, Phra Ram fights the older demon brother, Sawahu, and Phra Lak fights the younger demon brother, Marit, following the prescribed birth order. Phra Ram kills Sawahu and, Marit, seeing his older brother die, realizes that Phra Ram is the incarnation of Phra Narai, frightens and flees.⁹

d. Descriptions of Phra Lak

Throughout the epic, Phra Lak is extolled for his beauty, often in woman-like terms. When Phra Lak is born he is described as being “resplendent [พรรณราย]” with “a body the color of yellow, like painted with gold [สีกายนั้นเหลืองดั่งทองทา].”¹⁰ Other references that highlight and emphasize his beauty and appearance, and, perhaps, also his ‘ideal’ qualities, include:

Beautiful as the radiant moon [งามดั่งพระจันทร์อำไพ].¹¹

Beautiful as the sun [งามคล้ายพระสุริยัน].¹²

Brilliant and radiant appearance, fair complexion, soft and fine as if pure gold [มีโฉมเลิศลักษณะอำไพ นวลละอองดั่งทองพมาศ].¹³

Resplendent, delicate skin, soft yellow as if painted with gold [ผิวพรรณอรชร เหลืองอ่อนดั่งหนึ่งทองทา].¹⁴

⁹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 384-385. This is also an interesting foreshadow of when Marit is called upon later to change into a golden deer in the plot to abduct Nang Sida, as at that time, Marit knows he will die since he has to tangle with the incarnation of Phra Narai.

¹⁰ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 246.

¹¹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 392.

¹² *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 464.

¹³ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 491.

When Maiyarab, a demon friend of Thotsakan, sees Phra Lak he says “his face is like a god, radiant yellow skin as if painted gold, all his body was beautiful and lovely [ดวงพระพักตร์เพียงเทพเลขา ผิวเหลืองเรืองรองตั้งทองทา โสภภาพริ่มพร้อมทั้งกาย].”¹⁵ When he goes to battle with Mulaphlam, another demon friend of Thotsakan, Phra Lak is described as having “a beautiful appearance as if an angel [ทรงโฉมวิไลดั่งเทวัญ].”¹⁶

2. Sukhrip

a. Birth of Sukhrip

Phra In and Phra Athit know that Phra Narai, when he incarnates as Phra Ram, will need soldiers to help in his battle with the demons. Therefore, they seduce the wife of Rishi Khodom with whom Rishi Khodom already has a daughter, Nang Sawahu, the future mother of Hanuman. Two sons are subsequently born, first a boy with green skin being the son of Phra In and then a son with red skin being the offspring of Phra Athit. At first Rishi Khodom thinks they are his children, but one day while carrying them, Nang Sawahu, walking behind, complains that it is not fair that she, his real child, is not being carried while he carries the two who are not his real children. Rishi Khodom, in a fit of anger, throws the three children in the river with a curse that only his real offspring will be able to swim back and the others will turn into forest monkeys. Of course, Nang Sawahu swims back and the other two run off into the forest as monkeys. Phra In and Phra Athit see their sons in this state and decide to create a city for them, Khit Khin, giving the name of Kaket (later changed to Phali) to the son of Phra In and Sukhrip to the son of Phra Athit.

b. Phali Steals Nang Dara Away From Sukhrip

At one time, because of their great strength and prowess, Phali and Sukhrip are called to help straighten Mount Sumeru which had been thrown off kilter. They enlist the help of a great naga serpent, which they wrap around the mountain to use as

¹⁴ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 13.

¹⁵ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 319.

¹⁶ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3*, 52.

leverage to strengthen the mountain. When this does not work, Sukhrip tickles the naga on its belly, causing the serpent to startle, straightening Mount Sumaru. For this great deed, Phra Isuan gives Sukhrip a beautiful woman to be his consort, Nang Dara, but has Phali deliver her to Sukhrip. Phra Narai warns that this is not such a good idea since he suspects that Phali can not resist the temptation of such a beautiful woman. Phali swears that if he does not deliver Nang Dara as promised, then he will die by the arrow of Phra Narai. Phra Narai is right, as Phali can not resist the temptation and takes Nang Dara as his own consort.

c. Exile of Sukhrip

An arrogant bull named Torapi, who thinks his power is so great he can challenge the gods in heaven to fight, is sent by Phra Isuan to fight with Phali, knowing that Phali has the strength and guile to defeat Torapi. Phali tricks Torapi to fight in a cave, knowing it is the only way he can defeat him. Before going to fight, he instructs Sukhrip that, if after seven days he has not returned, Sukhrip should go to see if there is blood flowing from the cave. If the blood is thin, it means Phali has been killed and Sukhrip should close up the cave so no one can see his dead body. Phali is successful in killing Torapi causing the angels, in their glee, to create rain which thins out the blood of Torapi, making it look like the blood of Phali. When Sukhrip sees this, he thinks Phali has been killed and closes up the cave as instructed.

Phali manages to unblock the cave and goes back to Khet Khin, where he accuses Sukhrip of being deceitful and disloyal in blocking the entrance to the cave so that he can take the kingdom for his own. Phali refuses to listen to Sukhrip's explanation of seeing the thin blood and banishes him from Khet Khin.

d. Death of Phali

Sukhrip wanders in the forest where he meets Hanuman, who has been practicing penance. Hanuman leads Sukhrip to see Phra Ram and, learning that Phra Ram is the incarnation of Phra Narai, knows it is time for Phali to pay for breaking his promise to deliver Nang Dara, thus, he enlists Phra Ram's help in killing Phali. Sukhrip goes to challenge Phali and Phali is eventually killed, as he swore he would

be, with the arrow of Phra Ram. Sukhrip then becomes the king of Khit Khin and offers his troops to Phra Ram to fight Thotsakan.

3. Phiphek

a. Birth of Phiphek

Phra Isuan, when he sees that Thotsakan has been born on earth, realizes he has great power and will be a formidable opponent for Phra Narai when he incarnates as Phra Ram. Therefore, he decides to send one of his attendant demi-gods, Wasasuyan, to be born in the same family as Thotsakan, so that later during the war Phiphek can “be a hidden traitor from the city of the demons [เป็นไส้ศึกอยู่ในเมืองยักษ์]” and Phra Ram can “ask what is happening [จะได้ตามเหตุเบาหนัก].”¹⁷ Phra Isuan tells him to learn astrology and occult sciences and gives him a “magic crystal, to be his right and left eyes, able to see all three worlds, similar to the magic eyes of a god [แว่นแก้วอันวิเศษ ไปเป็นนัยน์เนตรซ้ายขวา จะได้ดูทั้งไตรโลกา ให้เหมือนตาทิพย์แท้วญ].”¹⁸ Wasasuyan is then incarnated as Phiphek, the third child born to King Latsatian and Nang Ratchada of Longka, thus making him the full younger brother of Thotsakan. He also has another full older brother, Kumphakan and a younger full sister, Samanakha, four half older brothers and three half younger brothers. When Phiphek is born he is said to have “sharp intelligence, but weak power [มีสติปัญญาแหลมหลัก แต่ฤทธิ์นั้นอ่อนอ่อนนั้ก].”¹⁹

b. Phiphek Reads the Horoscope of Baby Sida

The first time Phiphek is shown exhibiting his special powers is when Thotsakan calls for him to predict the fortune of a daughter born to Nang Montho. This child is the incarnation of Phra Lakshmi, Phra Narai’s consort, incarnated in Longka after Nang Montho has eaten the celestial rice that Ka Kanasun stole when Phra Narai and his retinue were also incarnated on earth. Phiphek predicts that the

¹⁷ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 54.

¹⁸ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 55.

¹⁹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 55.

child will be the destruction of the demons and must be thrown away in the water, much to the consternation of Nang Montho. Thus, from the beginning, Phiphek shows his trait of always telling the truth, no matter how much it might upset others.

c. Exile of Phiphek

Thotsakan has a bad dream and calls Phiphek for an interpretation. Phiphek tells Thotsakan that the dream foretells that Nang Sida, whom he has already abducted, and is being kept in Longka, will be his destruction, so he should return her to Phra Ram. When Thotsakan hears this, he flies into a rage and banishes Phiphek from the city, saying that he is formally “cutting off their brother relationship from this day [ขาดพี่น้องกันในวันนี้].”²⁰

Phiphek then goes to Phra Ram and offers his allegiance. Thereafter, as per Phra Isuan’s design, he helps Phra Ram see what the demons are doing and gives him advice on how to overcome their tricks and stratagems. It is also at this time that Phiphek and Sukhrip realize the common ground they have in being ill-treated by their older brothers and form a bond of friendship.

d. Thotsakan Tries to Kill Phiphek

When Thotsakan learns that Phiphek has allied himself with Phra Ram, he decides to try to kill him. Thotsakan disguises himself as a rishi and goes to see Phra Ram. Knowing full well that Phiphek will be able to see through his disguise, Thotsakan puts a spell on Phiphek so he can not speak. Thotsakan then tries to get Phra Ram to expel Phiphek so that Thotsakan can kill him. He says that both Phiphek and Sukhrip are really Phra Ram’s enemies and should not be trusted. Of course, Phra Ram does not buy this and when things start to get dicey, Thotsakan takes off.

e. Phiphek and Kumphakan

Thotsakan enlists Kumphakan, his other younger brother, to fight Phra Ram, although at first Kumphakan is reluctant to help saying that Thotsakan is wrong for

²⁰ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2, 166.*

abducting Nang Sida and should give her back. However, Thotsakan gets angry, accuses him of being a coward and finally says “we were born from the same womb, don’t you feel this indignity along with me [เกิดร่วมครรภ์ จะเจ็บร้อนด้วยกันนั้นหาไม่].”²¹

Kumphakan then, seeing the anger of Thotsakan and apparently convinced by the argument that he should be loyal to his older brother, agrees to fight. Thotsakan thus successfully appeals to Kumphakan’s obligation of loyalty to him as his younger brother, that is, Kumphakan should follow him no matter what he thinks. This is an interesting contrast to the similar situation when Phiphek gave him the same advice, but suffers the fate of being banished. Thotsakan perhaps knew Phiphek would be of little use in the actual fighting, but does not necessarily figure Phiphek will defect to the enemy, where he proves to be very useful in the ensuing war.

Phra Ram sends Phiphek to talk with Kumphakan before the actual fight begins. Kumphakan accuses him of violating the standards of brotherly relations, to which Phiphek tries politely to defend himself. Then Kumphakan, in a display of his wit and intelligence, gives Phiphek a riddle to answer, part of which characterizes Phiphek as a traitor. He says, if Phra Ram can answer correctly, he will give up his fight. Of course, they can not answer the riddle and the fight with Kumphakan ensues. Kumphakan is eventually defeated, although it takes many battles and tricky ploys by Kumphakan before he is overcome. At his death scene, Phra Ram reveals himself as Phra Narai, and Kumphakan sees the error of his ways, confesses his sins and Phra Narai allows him to be reborn in heaven.

f. Death of Thotsakan

The final scene in which Phiphek shows his qualities as younger brother is when Thotsakan is dying, having finally been defeated by Phra Ram. In this scene he gives a speech of advice to Phiphek, similar to that which Phali gave to Sukhrip when he died, and Phiphek follows with a speech of recrimination and lament.

²¹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 349.

C. Evidence of Role Traits for Three Principal Characters

In this section, selected scenes and situations in *Ramakien* will be reviewed to show the three principal characters exhibiting the behavior traits of a younger brother. In this regard, specific text and dialogue is presented, to the extent possible.

1. Phra Lak

a. Selected Scenes and Situations

Phra Lak appears in a large number of the scenes and sections of *Ramakien*, primarily as the devoted companion of his older brother, Phra Ram or as a fierce warrior in battle. He is also involved in nearly every scene in the war with the demons, either fighting on his own or along side Phra Ram. For this analysis, only those scenes in which Phra Lak is central to the action or in which he exhibits some behavior showing him in the role of younger brother have been selected for review.

(1) Bow Lifting Contest

King Chanok, who, during the time he was doing penance as a rishi, rescues the baby girl who was thrown into the water by Thotsakan. He initially buries her in the ground and sixteen years later, digs her up to discover a beautiful woman, whom he names Nang Sida. He decides to go back to his kingdom and then calls for a bow-lifting contest, the winner of which will win the hand in marriage of Nang Sida. Phra Ram, accompanied by Phra Lak, naturally goes to the contest. On the way to the contest, Phra Ram meets the eye of Nang Sida and instantly falls in love. Phra Lak apparently has observed this because he has to warn Phra Ram to move along when Phra Ram becomes transfixed looking at Nang Sida: “Phra Lak warned him to move along, only then did his mind return [ต่อพระลักษมณ์นั้นหลุดเดือนไป จึงได้สติกลับมา].”²² After all the other potential suitors have failed to lift the bow, and it comes to Phra Lak’s turn, he is given a word of advice by Phra Ram to just try to go see how heavy the bow is: “Look here, *phra anucha*, my young brother...just try to lift the Molee Bow,

²² *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 1, 296.

see how heavy it is [ดูกรองค์พระอนุชา...จงลองยกธนูโมลี ดูทีจะหนักสักเพียงใด].”²³ Naturally, given his great power, Phra Lak could lift the bow if he wanted, but he merely follows Phra Ram’s words and moves the bow ever-so slightly to show Phra Ram that it can be done and then returns to his seat, allowing Phra Ram to go up, lift the bow and win the contest and the hand of Nang Sida:

Then	Phra Lak
Lowered his head in obedience and went	Following the royal order
He reached out his hand	To grab the bow of Phra Isuan
Moving it just a bit, he knew in his heart	And returned to Phra [Ram]
[เมื่อนั้น บังคมก้มเกล้าแล้วออกไป ครั้นถึงจึงยื่นพระกร แต่เขยื้อนก็แจ้งในวิญญาณ์	พระลักษมณ์ผู้มีอิทธิมาสัย ตามในพระราชบัญชา จับศรพระศูตินาถา กลับมาเฝ้าองค์พระจักรี] ²⁴

This is one of the first instances where Phra Lak clearly shows **deference** and **obedience** to his older brother, in this case through his actions. He knows he is perfectly capable of lifting the bow and winning the contest, but he also knows that it is not his place to do so. He has already observed the instant love between Phra Ram and Nang Sida. Furthermore, Phra Ram has ordered him merely to test the bow. Phra Lak, as the dutiful younger brother, follows this order, knowing what to do.

‘Premseri,’ in his prose version of *Ramakien*, states this a bit more succinctly, when he says “Phra Lak went to the Molee Bow and tested it by moving it just a bit. But he knew where Phra Ram stood, so he pretended as if he could not lift it and returned:

[พระลักษมณ์มาถึงที่วางธนูโมลี ก็ลองขยับจับศรนั้นเขยื้อน แต่รู้ในที่พระรามอยู่ จึงทำเป็นยกไม่ขึ้นแล้ว กลับมา].”²⁵

²³ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 1, 300.

²⁴ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 1, 300.

²⁵ Premseri [เปรมเสรี], *Ramakien* [รามเกียรติ์] (Bangkok: Ruamsan (1977) [รวมสาส์น (1977)], 2546 BE (2003 CE)) 111.

(2) Exile of Phra Ram

When King Thotsarot decides it is time to turn his kingdom over to his son, he decrees that Phra Ram will become king and arranges for a grand ceremony. However, Queen Kaiyakesi, induced by the long simmering resentment of one of her attendants, a hunchback who was earlier humiliated by Phra Ram, calls in a promise for anything she wants that King Thotsarot made to her many years before for helping him in a fight. Her request is that her son, Phra Phrot, be made king and Phra Ram be exiled to the forest for fourteen years. When Phra Ram hears this, he readily accepts the order, realizing that it is his duty to fulfill the promise made by his father. However, when Phra Lak hears the news, he is described as being “furious with anger like the eternal fire [ก็กริ้วโกรธพิโรธตั้งอักษิติ]”²⁶ and grabbing his bow, he rushes out to proclaim the injustice in a loud voice, declaring he will kill Nang Kaiyakesi. When Phra Ram explains that he must go into exile as it is his duty to carry out the promise of his father, Phra Lak offers to fight for Phra Ram on his behalf. Finally, after Phra Ram convinces him that this is not the right thing to do, Phra Lak insists to follow Phra Ram in exile.

This scene illustrates Phra Lak’s supreme **loyalty** to his older brother by first showing that he will fight to defend him, even if he has to kill a queen and the mother of his older brother, and then in his decision to follow Phra Ram to the forest. It is interesting to note that Phra Lak’s reason for going is not necessarily to honor the promise of their father, which is Phra Ram’s, but so that he help his older brother in the difficult times ahead:

Then	Phra Lak
So sad and heartbroken	Bemoaning
Oh, alas, [Phra Ram]	Will be exiled and alone in the forest
Me, his young brother in life	Can I abandon [Phra Ram], who was cheated
Can I hope to stay in the city	To see what evil will come
If I lose my life, I won’t grieve	I will follow, be a friend to my beloved brother
We will face difficulties together	In the wild forest
Thinking this he left quickly	To the great palace

²⁶ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1, 370.*

[เมื่อนั้น	พระลักษมณ์ทรงสวัสดีศรีศมี
แสนทวยแสน โศกแสนทวิ	โศกีรวญคร่ำรำพัน
ไอ้อนิจจาพระทรงเดช	จะทูลรสองค์เดียวในไพรสณฑ์
ตัวกูผู้น้องร่วมชีวิต	จะทิ้งพระทรงธรรมเสียกลใด
ถึงมาตรจะอยู่ในธานี	จะดูหน้ากาลิกระไรได้
แม่นจะเสียชีวาไม่อาลัย	จะตามไปเป็นเพื่อนพระพี่ยา
ยากไรจะได้เห็นกัน	ที่ในอรัญแนวป่า
คิดแล้วก็รีบเสด็จมา	ยังมหาปราสาทูจี] ²⁷

(3) Phra Phrot Comes To See Phra Ram

After Phra Ram, along with Phra Lak and Nang Sida, have been in the forest for a while, Phra Phrot, Phra Satarud and the queen mothers come to find them to ask Phra Ram to return to Ayudhya. Phra Lak sees them when he is out picking fruit, “waiting on and taking care of Phra Chakri ... as his continual duty [ปรนนิบัติรักษาพระจักรี ... เป็นนิจนิรันดรทุกวันมา].”²⁸. When he sees them “he is greatly alarmed and in a great tumult, falling and stumbling over himself, the thorny bushes catching all over his body: [ตกใจวิ่งอิงคะนี่งมา บ้างล้มบ้างลุกคลุกคลาน ... หนามไหนดเกี่ยวขังทั้งกายา].”²⁹

Phra Lak’s his first reaction is to stand in harms way and shoot Phra Phrot and the soldiers to protect Phra Ram. When Phra Ram realizes what is going on, he rushes to Phra Lak and asks what he is doing. Phra Lak explains that he is still upset with Phra Phrot and Nang Kaiyakesi and, fearing that they are coming to do harm, he is ready to protect Phra Ram from any danger. Phra Ram explains to Phra Lak that killing them is the wrong thing to do, because all four brothers were called by Phra Isuan to incarnate on earth to suppress the demons, “We, brothers, all four of us, the gods and the rishi invited the incarnation of Phra Narai, to eliminate the group of evil demons [อันเราพี่น้องทั้งสี่ เทเวศร์ฤาษีพร้อมหน้า ประชุมเชิญให้ไวภูณัฐมา ปรามหมู่สุราสาธาร์ณ].” He also points out that Phra Phrot and has come with four rishis, carries no weapons

²⁷ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 372.

²⁸ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 430.

²⁹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 430.

and is walking in a sad manner. Phra Lak, seeing immediately that Phra Ram is right, “raises his hands in obeisance [จึงขอรื้อนถวษบงคม]” saying he will follow his advice.³⁰

This is an example of Phra Lak’s nature to take action without thinking out the right or wrong consequences, whereby he needs and accepts the teaching of his older brother. This scene also shows his overwhelming **loyalty** in that his first reaction is to kill the perceived enemy, even if it is his own brother, in order to protect Phra Ram. Phra Lak’s **respect** is exhibited by his display of obeisance and his **obedience** and **deference** is shown by him in his unquestioned acceptance of Phra Ram’s guidance.

(4) Phra Lak takes the Sword from Khumpakat

In this scene, Khumpakat, the demon son of Nang Samanakha, is sitting in meditation so he can receive a reward of a celestial weapon from heaven. Phra Phrom sees this and throws down a sword, which Khumpakat refuses to take unless offered directly to his hand by Phra Phrom. In the meanwhile, Phra Lak, in his continuing duty to his older brother, has gone into the forest to gather fruit for Phra Ram and Nang Sida. He comes upon the sword, picks it up and waves it around. This wakes up Khumpakat, resulting in a fight in which Phra Lak kills Khumpakat. When Phra Lak returns to Phra Ram, he offers the sword to Phra Ram, instead of keeping it himself, but Phra Ram turns around and gives it back to him.

The signs of **loyalty** are quite evident in this scene. First, the description of Phra Lak performing his duties is, again, that of eternal devotion. As he is going off into the forest, he is said to perform his “loyal service to his loving brother, along with moon-like Nang Sida, who are like a father and mother, with never a complaint or disliking [ภักดีปรนนิบัติพระพี่ชษ กับนางสิดาดวงจันทร คั้งองค้บิตุเรศชนนี ไม่มีรังเกียจเดียดจันท์].”³¹ Then Phra Lak’s **respect** and **deference** is shown when he offers the sword to Phra Ram, assuming it should belong to his older brother, even though he had found and fought for the sword himself. When Phra Ram returns the sword, Phra Lak “felt delight and joy, like he had received a gift from heaven [มีความชื่นชมโสมนัส คั้งได้สมบัต]

³⁰ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 431-432.

³¹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 472.

สรวงสวรรค์],”³² perhaps because he had just received a nice sword or perhaps because he was being given a reward from his older brother.

(5) Phra Lak Mutilates Nang Samanakha

After Nang Samanakha loses her husband, Chioha, whom Thotsakan accidentally has killed while Chioha is protecting Longka, she goes out searching for a new lover. She comes upon Phra Ram and instantly becomes infatuated. Naturally, Phra Ram refuses her advances, explaining he already has a wife and rebukes her for trying to tempt him while he is practicing penance as a rishi. When she follows Phra Ram back to their hut, she sees Phra Lak and falls in love with him. She then sees Nang Sida and, in a jealous, love-induced rage, beats her, blaming Nang Sida for Phra Ram’s rejection. When Phra Lak sees Nang Sida being beaten, before listening to any defense from Nang Samanakha, he rebukes and severely mutilates her, cutting off her hands, feet, nose and ears, then repeatedly beats her before driving her away.³³

These actions by Phra Lak illustrate his **loyalty** in that his central purpose is to protect and serve Phra Ram. One might wonder why it is not Phra Ram that does the beating and maiming, given that it is his wife that is being accosted. However, it is apparent that protecting Nang Sida is tantamount to protecting Phra Ram, and thus, Phra Lak undertakes this duty in a display of faithfulness to Phra Ram. It could also be argued that, even though Phra Ram did not explicitly direct Phra Lak to mutilate Samanakha, he did not stop him or council him otherwise, thus in effect giving Phra Lak permission to do so. Therefore, this could be seen as an act of **obedience** by Phra Lak, carrying out the punishment that he thinks Phra Ram would have ordered.

(6) The Abduction of Sida

Nang Samanakha, after getting maimed, convinces two of her brothers to fight Phra Ram, who kills both of them. She then goes to Thotsakan and describes the beauty of Nang Sida, instantly causing Thotsakan to become infatuated with Nang Sida and he plots to abduct her. Thotsakan induces Marit to change into a golden deer

³² *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 474.

³³ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 492.

to enchant Nang Sida. When Nang Sida sees the beautiful deer, she implores Phra Ram to catch it for her, which he does, leaving Nang Sida in the care of Phra Lak. When Phra Ram shoots the golden deer, Marit carries through with the plan and as he is dying, he calls out in a voice like Phra Ram that he is in trouble and needs Phra Lak to come and help him. Nang Sida, hearing this, is tricked into believing Phra Ram is in trouble, and insists that Phra Lak go help. Although he initially refuses, Nang Sida uses her wiles, resulting in an interesting interchange between them, which finally convinces Phra Lak to go, leaving her alone. Thotsakan then comes, abducts her, and takes Nang Sida back to Longka.

When Nang Sida first asks Phra Ram to catch the deer, Phra Ram refuses, saying this is likely just a plot by the demons. Phra Lak, naturally, agrees with him, causing Nang Sida to turn on Phra Lak and say, in a somewhat sarcastic manner, “Thank you, Thee Lak, pledging loyalty to your older brother, I am just the wife, his servant [จึงว่าชอบใจเจ้าลักษมณ์ ก็คิดต่อองค์พระเชษฐา ตัวพี่เป็นบาทบริจา].”³⁴ Nang Sida is thus emphasizing Phra Lak’s undivided **loyalty** to his brother over her.

After Nang Sida convinces Phra Ram to go after the deer, she hears the voice of Marit as Phra Ram calling for Phra Lak to follow. The conversation that ensues between Nang Sida and Phra Lak is particularly revealing of Phra Lak’s nature. At first, Nang Sida continues to play to Phra Lak’s **loyalty** and devotion to his older brother. She says: “Oh Thee Lak, Don’t you love your older brother? ... Will you desert [Phra Ram] to die? [จึงว่าอนิจจาเจ้าลักษมณ์ นี่หรือว่ารักพระเชษฐา ... จะละให้พระองค์ บรรลัย].”³⁵ He counters that he has been ordered by Phra Ram to stay and protect Nang Sida, so he dare not violate the royal order, thus showing his **loyalty** and **obedience**. But Nang Sida, indicating that Phra Lak would not necessarily be disobeying Phra Ram if he goes, continues by questioning his fidelity and intentions:

³⁴ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 528.

³⁵ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 531.

Even if he said stay to protect me	When something happens, what will you do?
There will be no punishment if you go	But if you stay, pretending to use tricky words
Then your mind is twisted	You will be betraying your older brother
Because just two of us stay in this sala	Feigning, twisting and distorting everything
Hoping I will be a widow	Your intention to get me will not work
I will end my life	Die and follow [Phra Ram]

[ถึงพระองค์ให้ผู้รักษาที่	เมื่อมีเหตุมาจะทำไฉน
จะเป็นโทษทัณฑ์ด้วยอันใด	หากแก่งใส่ไคล้เจรจา
ทั้งนี้เพื่อจิตเจ้าคิดคด	ทรยศต่อองค์พระเชษฐา
เพราะอยู่แต่สองในศาลา	แสร้งบิดเบือนว่าทุกสิ่งไป
ถึงมาตรตัวเราจะเป็นม่าย	ที่จะหมายพึ่งเจ้านั้นหาไม่
ผู้เสียชีวิตชีวลัย	ตายไปตามองค์พระสี่กร] ³⁶

This accusation of “betrayal [ทรยศ]” is too much for Phra Lak and he is unable to resist the manipulation by Nang Sida. Her questioning of his **loyalty** and accusing him of betraying Phra Ram finally convinces Phra Lak to go follow Phra Ram and leave Nang Sida alone. He is obviously torn between **loyalty** and **obedience**, whether to follow Phra Ram’s original order to stay and protect Nang Sida or go to help Phra Ram when he appears to be in trouble.

This scene gives quite a good insight into the character of Phra Lak, showing many aspects of his nature and his characterization as a model younger brother. Although Phra Lak seems to understand the whole plot devised by Thotsakan and Marit, Nang Sida is able to sway him when his **loyalty** is questioned.³⁷ This is an example of how Phra Lak often thinks with his heart and lets his devotion and sense of duty get in the way of doing what is really correct. Furthermore, in this case, his older brother is not there to give him direction, so he must think on his own, ultimately making the wrong choice for the right reasons.

Afterwards, when Phra Lak meets Phra Ram and explains why he has left Nang Sida alone, he displays his uncertainty about whether he has shown the proper level of **obedience** in not following Phra Ram’s original order. He says, rather

³⁶ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 532.

³⁷ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 531.

melodramatically, “as I have gone beyond your royal order, there should be punishment by death [ซึ่งข้าล่วงพระราชวาทิ โทษนี้ถึงสิ้นชีวิต].”³⁸

(7) Fight with Atsamukhi

Shortly after Nang Sida is abducted and Phra Ram and Phra Lak go in search of her, they come across a demoness named Atsamukhi. She quickly falls in love with both of them and, causing darkness to fall, she grabs Phra Lak and flies off with him in her arms. Phra Ram shoots an arrow to create light, causing Phra Lak to recover so that he can invoke an incantation making Atsamukhi fall from the sky. Then, Phra Lak “jumped on her chest; pulled his sword, severed her two arms... thrashed her with his bow ... sorrowfully she begged for her life, rose up and ran off [พระอนุชาเหยียบบอกลงได้ ชักพระขรรค์นั้นกรทั้งสองขาด ... โบยรันด้วยคันธนูชัย ... โสกีร์ร้องขอชีวิต ผุคลูกขึ้นวังหนีไป].”³⁹

Perhaps emboldened by the positive feedback he got from Phra Ram when he previously mutilated Nang Samanakha, he apparently feels justified in doing so again to Atsamukhi. It might also be that he is demonstrating **obedience** and doing what Phra Ram would order. Given that her actions were really out of love, as in the case of Samanakha, one might question the basic fairness of Phra Lak’s reaction. Although, one can only suppose that, given his power, Phra Lak could have killed her on the spot, but, instead, spared her life and ‘allowed’ her to escape, which, even though not explicit, the text seems to imply.

When Phra Lak rejoins Phra Ram, he, in a somewhat overly emotional reaction, “lowers his head, falls to his feet, with tears in his eyes, explains what happened [น้อมเศียรกราบลงกับบาทา ชลนาคลอนนครแล้วทูลไป] ... [ending by saying] ... I was going to put her to death; she imploringly begged for forgiveness; I then cut off her

³⁸ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2, 1.*

³⁹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2, 10-11.*

arms, right and left; beat and chased her into the forest [จะประหารชีวีให้มรณา มั่นร้องขอ
โทษวิงวอน ข้าจึงตัดกรซ่ายขวา ตีไล่เข้าในรณาวา].”⁴⁰

A close reading of the text seems to indicate that Phra Lak’s description of the events as related to Phra Ram is somewhat different from what actually happened. Phra Lak appears to changing the sequence of events to make it seem as if he gave her time to beg for her life, then cut her arms off and drove her go off into the forest, rather than just cutting her arms off before she could plead her case and then watching her escape. It seems possible he does this to make it appear to his older brother that he is fair and just, as he must perceive his older brother to be, and as Phra Ram has counseled Phra Lak to be in the past. This could also be a sign of **respect** and **deference** to Phra Ram, whom Phra Lak might think would act in this way.

In addition, Phra Lak’s overly emotional reaction when they rejoin is in striking contrast to his display of bravado in beating the demoness. Phra Lak seems almost apologetic that he has caused some trouble to Phra Ram, again a sign of **respect** and **deference**.

(8) Phra Ram Is Abducted By Maiyarab

Maiyarab, a demon friend of Thotsakan, has been enlisted to help in the fight with Phra Ram. He uses his magic powers to put Phra Ram and his army to sleep, whereupon Maiyarab abducts Phra Ram, taking him to his underworld kingdom where he plans to kill him. When Phra Lak wakes to find Phra Ram missing, Phra Lak, of courses, laments and, since he is a follower and not a leader, generally displays his inability to think independently and take charge of the situation. It is then up to Phiphek to bring him to his senses and order Hanuman to go in search and rescue of Phra Ram, which Hanuman does in due order.

In Phra Lak’s speech of lament, he shows his unwavering **loyalty** to his brother. He can not conceive of living without him and would follow him in death. He says:

⁴⁰ Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2, 11.

If you [Phra Ram]	Have passed away
How can I stay, suffering	I will end my life and follow you to heaven
To pass this shame and ignominy	Toward the three worlds

[แม้พระหริรักษ์จักรแก้ว	ล่วงแล้วสุดสิ้นสังขาร
น้องจะอยู่ไปให้ทรมาน	จะวายปราณตามเสด็จไปเมืองฟ้า
ให้พันอัปยศอดสู	แก่หมู่ใครโลกถ้วนหน้า] ⁴¹

(9) First Battle With Kumphakan

In the first battle with Kumphakan, another of Thotsakan's younger brothers, upon first seeing Phra Lak, Kumphakan says, in a somewhat mocking manner, he is "like a woman with a beautiful appearance ... [who] ... is adorable [ตั้งสตรีมีลักษณะโสกา ... เป็นเอ็นดู]." ⁴² This makes Phra Lak respond in a boastful way, saying he is "brave and courageous, with superb and unrivaled power [ชาญชัย ฤทธิไกรเลิศลบลอกา]." ⁴³ This indicates how easily Phra Lak can get angry and which leads to his getting struck down many times during the course of the battles as he is prone to fight with reckless abandon, the first coming in this initial battle with Kumphakan.

During the course of the battle, Phra Lak is hit by Kumphakan's Mokkahasak Spear and is laid unconscious. When Phra Ram sees him, he falls into a state of shock and sorrow. Phiphek has to explain that Phra Lak is not dead and can be cured by getting certain medicinal herbs and other articles, which Hanuman is ordered to find. When Phra Lak recovers, assuming it was Phra Ram that saved his life, he bows to Phra Ram's feet and sings his praises for his brother's help, notwithstanding the fact that the real credit should go to Phiphek and Hanuman: "Rising and bowing his head in obeisance, he fell to the feet of [Phra Ram's] ... But for your help, I would lose my life, Your kindness is unbounded, nothing can compare ... I will answer to your majesty, until I die [ลุกขึ้นน้อมเศียรอภิวาหน ... หากพระองค์มาช่วยชีวา หากไม่จะมีวชิรบรรลีย์ พระคุณล้ำฟ้าชาติ ไม่มีสิ่งที่จะเปรียบได้ ขอสนองรองบาทพระทรงชัย ไปกว่าจะม้วยชนมาน]."⁴⁴ This

⁴¹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 321.

⁴² *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 379.

⁴³ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 380.

⁴⁴ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 394.

illustrates the tremendous **respect** and **deference** Phra Lak has for his older brother, giving him the praise and credit even where it might not be totally due. He then pledges his everlasting **loyalty** and **obedience**. As we will see, this pattern of honor and glory for his older brother repeats each time Phra Lak falls and then recovers.

(10) Phra Lak Fights Inthorachit

After Kumphakan is finally killed, Thotsakan calls on his son, Inthorachit, to fight. In the first battle with Inthorachit, Phra Lak manages to hit him with his arrow, but Inthorachit does not die. This induces him to do penance in order to strengthen his dreaded Nagabat Arrow, which, when shot, changes into thousands of poisonous nags. Phra Ram learns that Inthorachit is doing this and sends some soldiers to disrupt the ceremony, resulting in the Nagabat Arrow not attaining its full strength. All the same, Inthorachit uses it in the next fight, binding Phra Lak and most of the monkey army in deadly nags. When Phra Ram comes to the battlefield, he laments in great sorrow, but then Phiphek tells him to shoot his arrow to call Garuda, enemy of the nags, which will chase them away. Phra Ram does, and Phra Lak and the troops recover.

Again, Phra Lak gives the credit to Phra Ram for his recovery, a bit more deserved in this case since Phra Ram was actually the one to shoot off the arrow calling the Garuda to come, albeit only after the prompting of Phiphek. Phra Lak adds he “will offer to fight anytime, without regard to danger or wickedness [จะขออาสาพระทรงฤทธิ์ ไม่คิดเกรงพวกภัยพาล],”⁴⁵ thus, again showing his continued **respect** and **obedience**.

Inthorachit’s next ploy is to disguise himself as Phra In riding on Erawan, his great elephant, and go to the battlefield where Phra Lak is waiting. Even though Hanuman is suspicious of seeing Phra In come like this and gives a warning to Phra Lak, Phra Lak, along with the monkey troops, are enchanted by the false Phra In. This gives Inthorachit the chance to hit Phra Lak again, this time with his Phrommat Arrow.

⁴⁵ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 481.

Phra Ram, when he sees Phra Lak has fallen, laments and takes the responsibility. As in the previous case, Phiphek instructs Hanuman to collect certain medicines, which revive Phra Lak, and, as before, Phra Lak shows his **respect** and **deference** by giving the credit to Phra Ram: “If you, the one with power, did not come to fix things in time, I would then have to take leave, and continue this fight in heaven [หากพระทรงฤทธิมาแก้ทัน ความแค้นจะขอยกไป ชิงชัยให้ถึงเมืองสวรรค์].”⁴⁶

In the fourth battle with Inthorachit, Inthorachit has devised a trick to have one of his soldiers change to appear as if he were Nang Sida. Before going out to battle, Phra Ram gives Phra Lak a pep talk, telling him “don’t be careless like last time, be extra careful with yourself [แต่อย่าประมาทเหมือนหนหลัง เร่งระวังพระองค์ให้จงหนัก],”⁴⁷ which Phra Lak readily accepts as the **respectful** younger brother getting advise and counsel from his older brother.

At the battlefield, Inthorachit has the false Nang Sida talk to Phra Lak in such a manner that Inthorachit can use it as a pretext to cut off the head of the false Nang Sida. Phra Lak thinks that the real Nang Sida has been killed, and, when he returns to Phra Ram, he swoons, perhaps thinking that he has caused her death. Phra Ram comforts him in a touching scene and when he recovers, Phra Lak confesses that could not protect Nang Sida who has been killed by Inthorachit, causing Phra Ram to swoon. But Phiphek comes to the rescue and suggests that they go check the body first, which they do, to discover it is just a false Nang Sida that has been killed and everyone is happy once again.

This again shows Phra Lak’s nature and character. If Phra Lak had more presence of mind, it seems that it would have been relatively easy to figure out the situation, either by checking the body himself or asking Phiphek, before jumping to conclusions. However, his emotional nature, especially when it comes to matters of Nang Sida, overwhelms his ability to think clearly. In essence, Phra Lak is showing his **deference** and **loyalty** to Phra Ram in his treatment of Nang Sida, knowing the deep love that Phra Ram has for her. In many cases, Phra Lak loses perspective when

⁴⁶ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 527.

⁴⁷ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 538.

it comes to matters of Nang Sida and, in an effort to show **loyalty** to Phra Ram, can not think clearly.

In the final battle with Inthorachit, Phiphek advises Phra Lak to go disrupt another weapon strengthening ceremony being performed by Inthorachit. Phra Lak **obediently** accepts this task saying, “I willingly offer myself, to destroy the demon as you are thinking, so it will not cause you any more trouble [น้องรักจะอาสา ตั้งเสียให้ได้อั้งจินดา มิให้เคื่องบาทาพระทรงฤทธิ์].”⁴⁸ Phra Ram has another counseling session with him, telling him “this time don’t be careless with your life [ครั้งนี้อย่าประมาทวิญญูณณ์].”⁴⁹ Phra Ram, given the last several battles with Inthorachit, realizes that perhaps Phra Lak is not totally equal to the task and sends Phiphek to help him. With Phiphek’s advice and Phra Ram’s counseling, Phra Lak is successful this time and kills Inthorachit.

(11) Battle With Mulaphlam

In this scene, Phra Lak fights Mulaphlam, the younger brother of Sahatsadecha, the thousand-faced demon friend of Thotsakan. Once again, Phra Lak fights with reckless abandon, and gets struck down by the weapon of Mulaphlam. In this case, he recovers easily when Hanuman utters a chant. Hanuman then provides his shoulder for Phra Lak to ride on so he can battle the giant and eventually kill Mulaphlam. This passage, once again, shows Phra Lak’s rather reckless bravery, not really being responsible for his own safety, thus making him vulnerable and needing to rely upon the help of others, Hanuman in this case, to save him.⁵⁰

When Phra Lak goes back to Phra Ram and relates these events, he once again shows his **deference** and **respect** by giving the credit for his success to Phra Ram, saying “I killed and destroyed him, with the great power of Phra Chakri [Phra Ram] [สังหารผลาญมันมรณา ด้วยศักดาเดชพระจักรี].”⁵¹

⁴⁸ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2, 551.*

⁴⁹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2, 551.*

⁵⁰ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3, 52-59.*

⁵¹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3, 58.*

(12) Thotsakan's Kabinlaphat Spear

In the course of the war between Phra Ram and Thotsakan, at one point Thotsakan performs a ceremony to harden his Kabinlaphat Spear in order to make himself invincible. Phra Isuan has heard about this and sends Phali, at this point one of his celestial attendants, to disrupt the ceremony, rendering the spear less effective. Thotsakan thinks that Phiphek was behind this effort and sets out to kill him with the spear. Phiphek appeals to Phra Ram, who assigns Phra Lak to “protect Phiphek, don't let there be some misfortune [จงระวังพิเภกอสูริ อย่าให้มีเหตุเภทพาล].”⁵² Phra Lak's sense of **obedience** to Phra Ram leads him to take his orders to protect Phiphek to heart. When he sees the Kabinlaphat Spear coming their way, “afraid that it will hit Phiphek, [Phra Lak] uses his bow to ward off the spear, the Kabinlaphat Spear missed its target and struck Phra Lak [กลัวจะต้องพิเภกอสูริ ภูมิก็ปิดด้วยศัลป์ชัย กบิลพัทพลัดมาต้ององค์].”⁵³ Phiphek explains the medicines needed to remove the spear and Hanuman is sent off again to collect them, which he does in due course, resulting in Phra Lak's recovery.

After Phra Lak is struck down, a similar pattern of remorse and recovery ensues, with Phra Ram initially bemoaning the loss of his young brother, taking the blame on himself, “should you die, the three worlds will speak ill and reprimand me, since I have been careless to let you die [ควรหรือแก้วตามาบรรลัษ ไตรโลกจะชวนกันติณิน ล้วงมาดูหมิ่นประมาทได้].”⁵⁴ Similar to other situations, when Phra Lak recovers, he expresses his **respect** for Phra Ram, saying, “your majesty has helped protect my life, your kindness is boundless, I offer to fight, I do not fear the power of the demons [ซึ่งพระองค์โปรดช่วยชีวัน พระคุณนั้นหาที่สุดไม่ จะขออาสาชิงชัย ไม่เกรงฤทธิ์ไทรอสูริ].”⁵⁵

It is interesting that in each of these cases, Phra Lak does not seem to take responsibility for getting struck down which is staying within his role as younger brother in that it is the responsibility of the older brother to protect him, a role which

⁵² *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3, 247.*

⁵³ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3, 251.*

⁵⁴ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3, 253.*

⁵⁵ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3, 262.*

Phra Ram readily plays. In each case, Phra Lak gives the credit for his recovery solely to Phra Ram, without acknowledging the others, showing his overwhelming **deference** and **respect** to Phra Ram, his older brother.

(13) Nang Sida Gives Her Blessing

After the war with Thotsakan is over and Nang Sida has been reunited with Phra Ram, she gives a form of testimonial, ending with praise and blessing for Phra Lak. In it she acknowledges his **loyalty** to her and Phra Ram and even goes so far as to call him a “real young brother [น้องร่วมครรรค์]”:

She then addressed Phra Lak	Dear young brother, sufferer with [Phra Ram]
You were on near dying many times	You are like as a real young brother to me
You never disappoint, a best of friends	Through many hardships in the forest
Together in happiness, adversity and life	Your kindness is unsurpassed

[ทุกแล้วจึงตรัสแก่พระลักษมณ์ ปี่มีชีวิตจะตายหลายที มิเสียทีที่เป็นเพื่อนยาก ร่วมสุขร่วมทุกข์ร่วมชีวัน	น้องรักได้ยากด้วยพี่ เจ้านี้เหมือนน้องร่วมครรรค์ แสนทวยลำบากในไพรสัณฑ์ คุณของเจ้านั้นพันทวี] ⁵⁶
--	---

Phra Lak then answers Nang Sida with his usual **respect** and **deference**, naturally including Phra Ram in his praise:

Then	[Phra Lak]
Heard these beautiful words	Paying obeisance, he answered
[Nang Sida]	Along with [Phra Ram]
Have benefited me, your young brother	Just like a mother and father
Along with honest affection	Even though I make mistakes, you teach me
We share happiness, sorrow and troubles	Leaving from the city
I went with you	To battle the demons
I never thought about my own life	I will honor you until I die

⁵⁶ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 3, 425.

[เมื่อนั้น	พระลักษมณ์ทรงสวัสดิ์ศึมี
ได้ฟังพระราชเสาวนีย์	ชูลีกรสนองพระวาท
อันพระพี่นางผู้ทรงลักษณ์	กับพระหริรักษ์นาคา
มีคุณข้าบาทอนุชา	ตั้งองค์บิดามารดร
ด้วยทรงพระเมตตาสุจริต	มาตรถึงทำผิดก็สั่งสอน
ทั้งร่วมสุขร่วมทุกข์ร่วมร้อน	แต่จรงจากราชธานี
ตัวข้าโดยเสด็จพระหริวงศ์	มารณรงค์ด้วยยกย
มิได้อาลัยแก่ชีวี	จะฉลองคุณพื้จนวายปราณ] ⁵⁷

Thus, Phra Lak reconfirms his role as **loyal** attendant, **obedient** assistant, **respectful** supporter, and **deferent** sibling. Phra Lak has ample reason to take issue with Nang Sida for not listening to him way back when the golden deer tempted her, but, of course, that would not be fitting with his role as faithful younger sibling.

(14) Phra Ram Gives Out Rewards

After all has been settled with the war, Phra Ram decides to reward all of those who performed meritorious deeds during the long battle with the demons. He entrusts his assistant to draw up recommendations for his approval. On first draft, it is recommended that, because of his **loyalty** and devotion [ภักดีไม่ลิดชีวา], Phra Lak be awarded Romakhan, the former kingdom of Korn, one of Thotsakan's brothers, as his own kingdom to govern, with royal adornments, and 100,000 concubines, maids of honor and attendants.⁵⁸

However, Hanuman advises that it would be better to let Phra Lak stay in Ayudhya to serve Phra Ram.: “I have some comment about Phra Lak, he is honest and loyal, toward his older brother ... should let Phra Lak, stay near [Phra Ram], at the capital, to be the *Uparat* of the Front [ข้าคิดใจด้วยพระลักษมณ์อนุชา ชื่อตรงจงรักภักดี ต่อพระจักรีผู้เชษฐา ... ควรให้พระลักษมณ์ภูวนาย อยู่ใกล้เบื้องบาทพระจักรา ในกรุงทวาราวดี เป็นที่อุปราชฝ่ายหน้า].”⁵⁹ Thus, Hanuman acknowledges Phra Lak's **loyalty** and **devotion** to Phra Ram in making this recommendation. Phra Lak's answer is as one would expect, he heartily agrees with this recommendation saying:

⁵⁷ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3*, 425.

⁵⁸ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3*, 516.

⁵⁹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3*, 518-519.

Then	(Phra Lak)
Hearing and considering everything	Immediately said
The meritorious service rewards for the troops	Have been arranged as should be
But, for me	Going to stay in Romakhan
Where there are riches	Magnificent like Daowadueng Heaven
Along with concubines	And countless beautiful ladies
If I am far from [Phra Ram]	I don't see any purpose
As for the matter raised by Hanuman	It is like celestial water flow over me
Sumantan will report	As Hanuman has advised
I will ask to stay to serve [Phra Ram]	Until I die

[เมื่อนั้น ได้ฟังถ้อยคำทุกประการ อันบำเหน็จความชอบโยธา แต่ซึ่งจะให้เรานี้ ถึงจะมีสมบัติพิสดาน ประกอบด้วยสนมกำนัล แม้ไกลเบื้องบาทพระจักรี อันซึ่งหนุมานทัดทานไว้ สุมันตันจะพูดที่ชื่อเรา จะขอยู่สนองรองบาทา	พระลักษมณ์ผู้ปรึกษาหาญ จึงมีพจมานไปทันที ปรึกษาเรียงมาก็ต้องที่ ไปอยู่บุรีโรมคัล โอรพารตั้งดาวดิงส์สวรรค์ แสนมื่นหกพันองค์ใน เรานี้หาเจตนาไม่ ตั้งได้อมฤตชโลมทา เอาคำวาญูตรปรึกษา ไปกว่าจะสิ้นชีวิต] ⁶⁰
---	---

Thus, in this act of great sacrifice, Phra Lak continues to display behavior in his role as the **loyal, obedient, respectful** and **deferent** younger brother. It is almost inconceivable that he would be willing and able to rule his own kingdom, given his character as a follower and assistant. As has been seen throughout the story, he shows little ability to think and act independently, but with a great ability to be **obedient** and follow orders. With that in mind, it might also be noted that Phra Lak really had little choice in the matter. Once Hanuman made his recommendation, Phra Lak could hardly say that he did not want to stay close to Phra Ram. That would be a sign of utter lack of **loyalty** and **respect**. Notwithstanding, one cannot help but detect a slight note of wistful regret when Phra Lak notes that he is forsaking “riches, magnificent like Daowadueng Heaven” along with the “concubines and countless beautiful ladies” in Romakhan.

⁶⁰ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3, 519-520.*

(15) Phra Ram Orders Phra Lak to Kill Nang Sida

The last major scene in which Phra Lak displays his role as younger brother is when Phra Ram discovers a picture of Thotsakan. Nang Sida admits to having drawn the picture, although under the deception of the wicked Adun, daughter of Samanakha, who was intent on exacting some revenge on Phra Ram. In a jealous rage, and without listening to any explanation, he orders Phra Lak to take Nang Sida, kill her and bring back her heart for him to see.

This scene, similar to the abduction episode with the golden deer, offers significant insight into Phra Lak's character. It is interesting, that both these scenes involve close interaction between Phra Lak and Nang Sida. They also show Nang Sida ability to manipulate Phra Lak through understanding his true nature as the devoted younger brother.

In the episode, Phra Lak's character immediately shows itself with respect to his **obedience** and **deference**. He is unwilling, or perhaps unable, to say anything to Phra Ram, thinking to himself "he would ask for a pardon from this punishment, but seeing the terrible rage, it was necessary to just take the royal order [กรั้้นจะขอโทษทั้ฉั้กัถยา เห็นว่าชั้งทรงพระโกรธหนัก จั้เป็นจั้รับพระโองการ]." ⁶¹

Phra Lak takes Nang Sida to the forest, where they have a long scene of recrimination and remorse, with both seemingly resigned to carry out Phra Ram's order because it is Nang Sida's 'fate [เวร]'. What is interesting is that Phra Lak does not seem to blame Phra Ram for his rash, irrational order to kill Nang Sida, but instead places the blame on some prior action of Nang Sida, thus showing his continued **deference** to Phra Ram, that is, Phra Ram could not do something wrong, so it must have some other cause.

Phra Lak then ruminates as to whether he should carry out the order to kill Nang Sida, seemingly ready to openly defy Phra Ram and let her go free. Nang Sida, using her skills of manipulation, tries to "create some ploy, with rude, crude words,

⁶¹ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 4, 305.

lies, to trick him by some complaint, make him angry, indignant and ashamed [จำจะเสก
 แสร้งอุบาย ด้วยถ้อยคำหยาบคายมารยา ตัดพ้อว่ากล่าวเป็นมารยา ให้โภรชาซัดแค้นละอายใจ]”⁶² to get
 him to carry out the task, a ploy, naturally, for which Phra Lak falls.

Having thus been ‘tricked’ by Nang Sida into carrying out Phra Ram’s execution order, Phra Lak attempts to kill her. He “thought of the fear of Phra Ram [แล้วคิดเกรงองค์พระทรงจักร]”⁶³ and raises his sword to go through with the execution. However, in a moment of divine intervention, his sword turns to a flower garland which floats down around her neck, thus saving Nang Sida while Phra Lak faints thinking he has killed her. These actions by Phra Lak seem particularly telling of his unshakable **loyalty** to Phra Ram. In the end, despite his own reservations and doubts, he only thinks of the ‘fear [เกรง]’ of Phra Ram and, in his steadfast **obedience** to his older brother, is willing to carry out Phra Ram’s dictate and kill Nang Sida.

When Phra Lak regains consciousness, he sees that Nang Sida has not been killed. He realizes there is no way to carry out Phra Ram’s order and tells Nang Sida to go off into the forest. He then heads back to the city without Nang Sida’s heart to bring to Phra Ram, seemingly ready to openly disobey his older brother. However, in an act of *deus ex machina*, Phra In creates a dead deer by the side of the path and Phra Lak cuts out the heart to give to Phra Ram as a substitute for Nang Sida’s heart. Phra Lak thus continues to demonstrate his **obedience** and **deference** to his older brother in not having to openly confront him with his act of disobedience for not killing Nang Sida and letting her go. When he reaches the city, he “then offers the heart [ทูลถวายซึ่งดวงชีวี]”⁶⁴ to Phra Ram, who assuming it is the heart of Nang Sida, remarks that “this heart is abnormal, like the heart of a beast in the forest [แต่หัวใจมันยังวิปริต เหมือนจิตเด็ขร้งฉานที่กลางป่า].”⁶⁵ The heart, of course, is the ‘heart of a beast’, but Phra Lak

⁶² *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 4, 308.

⁶³ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 4, 309.

⁶⁴ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 4, 313.

⁶⁵ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 4, 314.

continues his act of deception and says nothing, letting Phra Ram continue to think it is the heart of Nang Sida. While ‘*thun* [ทุณ] ⁶⁶ could be read to say ‘he told Phra Ram that here is the heart of Nang Sida’, as combined with ‘*thawai* [ถวาย], ⁶⁷ it seems more likely it means he just ‘presented’ the heart without saying anything. It would be more in Phra Lak’s nature, as well in showing his **respect** and **deference** to Phra Ram, to lie by omission, rather than tell an outright falsehood. In any event, this is perhaps the one and only time that Phra Lak displays any sort of disobedience and is not completely faithful to his older brother.

This whole scene serves to sum up Phra Lak’s character. It shows his **loyalty** to Phra Ram in actually trying to go through with the terrible act despite his doubts as to whether it is right; his **obedience** in accepting the order even though he does not agree with it; his **respect** for his older brother by not blaming him for this irrational act; and his **deference** by not openly confronting him with the fact that he let Nang Sida go free, slyly deceiving him with the deer heart, thus, letting Phra Ram think she has been killed. It also shows his nature that he is easy manipulated and weak of will, particularly when he comes between Nang Sida and Phra Ram, torn between **loyalty** and **obedience** to both. Interestingly, this episode contains perhaps the only scene in the whole story when he plays a solo part, that is, when Phra Lak is on his way back to the city after letting Nang Sida go free. This is, correspondingly, also the one and only time that he acts out of character and shows any level of defiance of his older brother.

b. Summary

All of these scenes and situations show Phra Lak exhibiting constant **loyalty**, unquestioned **obedience**, total **respect** and unwavering **deference** toward his older brother. In his manner, action and words, he is consistent in his behavior as the ever devoted companion, following Phra Ram into exile and battle in order to serve and protect his older brother. He is depicted fulfilling Phra Ram’s every order and wish;

⁶⁶ Thianchai Iamwonmen, Thai-English Dictionary of 88,000 Words (Bangkok: Ruamsan (1977) [รวมคำสั้น (1977)], 2537 BE (2004 CE)) 518: ‘inform, report, tell’.

⁶⁷ Thianchai 455: ‘(1) dedicate, devote, offer (2) present, submit’.

fighting and maiming demons; going to battle on his command; standing in the way of danger; carrying out even irrational decrees on his older brother's behalf. He is also shown always thinking of his older brother first, showing **loyalty** and **obedience** to him over others, including Nang Sida.

Furthermore, there is hardly a scene or instance where he is not seen demonstrating these younger brother qualities, notwithstanding the fact that he is presented with a number of situations where he could deviate. For example, given the chance to castigate Nang Sida after she is rescued for her wrongful words to him before she was abducted, he instead gives her, and Phra Ram, **respect** and honor; when offered his own kingdom with untold riches, he declines in a show of **loyalty** and **deference** in order to remain by his older brother's side; and when ordered to kill Nang Sida, he does not tell Phra Ram how he is wrong, nor openly defy him, but attempts to carry through with the evil order with **obedience**.

In addition, Phra Lak demonstrates those younger brother qualities of reliance and trust in his older brother. He is often seen relinquishing responsibility for his actions, letting Phra Ram assume such duty and relying upon the counsel of his older brother. This can be seen in the many times Phra Ram gives him advice before sending him into battle, combined with by the many times he is then struck down in battle, causing heartache and anguish for Phra Ram, as well as considerable trouble to others in order to effect his recovery. In such cases, Phra Lak is never seen taking responsibility for causing confusion or asking for forgiveness for creating trouble.

Given the overwhelming weight of evidence, it is, thus, easy to conclude that Phra Lak is the 'ideal' younger brother. In the next two sections of this chapter, the other younger brother characters will be examined, to see if they also demonstrate these same qualities.

2. Sukhrip

a. Selected Scenes and Situations

There are many scenes in which Sukhrip appears in *Ramakien*, but only a relatively few in which his relationship with his older brother, Phali, is demonstrated

Notwithstanding, those scenes, which are examined in this section, are sufficient to be able to evaluate Sukhrip's character with respect to the qualities of a younger brother.

(1) Sukhrip as Uparat, Second King

In the early part of the story, Sukhrip exhibits the qualities of a young brother in exhibiting his **obedience** and **deference** to Phali. While the text does not provide specific language or scenes at this point in the story, one gets the clear impression that Sukhrip is an obedient *Uparat*, second king/viceroy [อุปราช], following along and supporting Phali in making their monkey kingdom powerful. Sukhrip's **deference** is also implied by the fact that Sukhrip is not shown raising any objection at the time Phali breaks his promise and takes Nang Dara, intended for Sukhrip, to be his own consort, even though this is to be the source of conflict later between the two brothers.

(2) Phali's Battle with Torapi

Sukhrip also shows his **obedience** by strictly following Phali's orders to close up the cave when he thinks Phali has been killed in his battle Torapi inside the cave. Sukhrip also displays his deep **loyalty** and **respect** for his older brother when he thinks that Phali has been killed by Torapi; he "is shocked and sadly bemoans ... like he will lose his mind [ตกใจที่รู้ว่าโศกา ... ตั้งว่าจะสิ้นสมประดี]." ⁶⁸

(3) Banishment of Sukhrip

When Phali comes back to Khit Khin, he accuses Sukhrip of treachery using rather base language. Phali refers to Sukhrip as a "damn traitor [ไอ้ทรยศ]" and "damned evil one [ไอ้ทรลัทธิ]" as well as using the relatively prerogative forms of 'I' and 'you': 'ku', 'mueng' and 'eng' [กู, มึง, and เอ็ง]. Notwithstanding this condemnation, Sukhrip professes his **loyalty**, "I must have love and loyalty for your majesty, my royal older brother [อันตัวของข้านี้จงรัก รักดีต่อองค์พระเชษฐา]." He also shows that he has not lost his **respect** for his older brother evidenced by his actions, Sukhrip "raises his arms in obeisance and bows down to his feet [ชูลีกรกราบลงกับบาทา]" and the

⁶⁸ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1, 344.*

way he addresses Phali, using terms of **respect** such as “*phra chettha* (royal older brother) [พระเชษฐา]” and “Your Majesty [พระองค์].”⁶⁹

After Sukhrip has been exiled and is wandering in the jungle, he laments his situation saying he “had placed himself in the care of his cherished loving brother [รักพี่ฝากตัวถนอมใจ]”⁷⁰ and when he meets Hanuman, he still does not use disrespectful terms when referring to Phali, calling him “king [ท้าว].” He generally laments his situation rather than complaining about or condemning Phali, despite the ill treatment he has received from his older brother.⁷¹ When he meets Phra Ram for the first time, Sukhrip continues to speak of his older brother in relatively **respectful** terms. He refers to Phali as “*phi* (older brother) [พี่]”; a “great monkey [กระบี่ศรี]”; “Phaya Phali, the strong hearted [พญาพาลีใจฉกรรจ์]” and “the monkey leader [ขุนกระบี่].”⁷²

(4) Fight with Phali

When Sukhrip goes to kill Phali, with Phra Ram’s help, and addresses him directly, he continues using **respectful** language, calling him “Son of Indra [ลูกท้าวหีสน์],” although he also calls him a “high-handed bully [ข่มเหง].”⁷³ Phali replies with even worse language calling Sukhrip a “damn evil deluded one [ไอ้อุบาทว์โหมหันซ์]” and a “damn silly young one [ไอ้พาลา].”⁷⁴ After Phali has thrown him against a mountain and Sukhrip goes back to Phra Ram to complain about why Phra Ram did not help him kill Phali, Sukhrip calls Phali “*chettha* (older brother) [เชษฐา]” and then when he addresses Phali again, he calls him “Lord of Khit Khin [เจ้ากรุงขิดขิน].”⁷⁵

⁶⁹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 345-346.

⁷⁰ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 346.

⁷¹ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1*, 347-348.

⁷² *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 18-20.

⁷³ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 23.

⁷⁴ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 23.

⁷⁵ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 25-26.

So, we can see by the language that Sukhrip uses with his older brother, he generally uses language of **respect** for Phali. This is despite being in the heat of a fight and argument and the fact that Phali treats Sukhrip disrespectfully and unjustly, using some relatively rude expressions.

b. Death of Phali

Once Phra Ram (Phra Narai) has shot his arrow at Phali, Phali realizes his error and that the punishment for his broken pledge is to be fulfilled. Before he dies, Phali gives his well-known speech in which he instructs Sukhrip on how to be a good person and govern the kingdom.⁷⁶ Sukhrip follows with a speech of lament showing his **loyalty** and **respect** for his older brother. Sukhrip, in fulfilling his role as the younger brother, does not display resentment toward Phali, but instead expresses regret for causing his death, bemoaning his passing with genuine remorse:

Then	[Sukhrip]
Saw his older brother die	Pitifully, he hugged Phali's feet with sorrow
Oh, [Phali]	Your name has spread out, shaking the world
You loved me, never holding resentment	You took care and nurtured me
With kindness like a father	You gave me my life
There were difficult times	Wandering in the forest
Until coming to govern Khit Khin	Then there were times of joy and happiness
You were the leader of the monkey army	Your power spread out over the lands
After you broke your pledge	About Dara, the young lovely
You then must suffer [Phra Ram's] arrow	Because you promised
Such a waste of your celestial power	Deceit over a lady, should not have been
He bemoaned, sobbing in great sorrow	Crying until he lost consciousness

⁷⁶ See: Klaus Wenk, Phali Teaches the Young, A Literary and Sociological Analysis of the Thai Poem Phali son nong, trans. Volkmar Zuhlsdorff (Southeast Asia Paper No. 18, Hawaii: Univ. of Hawaii, Southeast Asian Studies, Asian Studies Program, 1980) for a complete discussion and analysis of this speech from Ramakien by King Rama I as well as all other extant versions,

[บัดนั้น เห็นพี่สิ้นชีพวายปราณ โธ้วาพระองค์ผู้ทรงภพ รักน้องมิให้ข้องเคืองใจ พระคุณนั้นเหมือนบิดุเรศ ได้ยากลำบากเวทนา จนได้ครองจิตชินธานี เป็นเจ้าแก้วมู่วานร ครั้งนี้มาเสียสัตยา จึงต้องศรมเด็จพระอวตาร เสียแรงเป็นวงศ์เทวีญ รำพลางสะท้อนถอนใจ	สุกรีพลุกพระสุริย์ฉาน สงสารกอดบาทรำไร เลื่องชื่อลือลบแผ่นดินไหว ภูวนายบารุงเลี้ยงมา อันบังเกิดเทศเทศา เที่ยวอยู่ในป่าพนาดร ค่อยมีความสุขสโมสร พระเดชจรรทั้งไตรศาล ด้วยคาราเขยยอดสงสาร เพราะได้สาบานแต่ก่อนไว้ มาเสียธรรมด้วยหญิงหาควรไม่ สะอื้นให้เพียงสิ้นสมประดี] ⁷⁷
---	--

c. Summary

These episodes and incidents, although much less than in the case of Phra Lak, all show Sukhrip exhibiting the characteristics that define a younger brother. He shows **loyalty** and **obedience**, not losing his general **respect** and **deference**. Even as Sukhrip is trying to kill Phali, he still shows him **respect** and **deference**. This is first evidenced somewhat by the language he uses with Phali and then illustrated by the sorrow and lament that Sukhrip exhibits after Phali's death, giving him praise and honor and not showing any lingering resentment.

As was noted with respect to Phra Lak, Sukhrip is also presented with many situations where he can deviate from the prescribed behavior of a younger brother. When Phali breaks his promise and takes his wife, Nang Dara, Sukhrip does not fight back, but continues to serve his brother with **loyalty**, **obedience** and **deference**. Likewise, after they have fought, and Sukhrip is banished, Sukhrip could talk about him with contempt, but his language indicates he continues to show **respect** for his older brother. Finally, when Phali dies, and their conflict is resolved, he does not show hatred, but returns to the role of 'ideal' younger brother. Thus, based on the information, we can conclude that Sukhrip also can be classified as the 'ideal' younger brother.

⁷⁷ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2, 30.*

3. Phiphek

a. Selected Scenes and Situations

As with Sukhrip, there are only a few scenes in which Phiphek's relationship with his older brother, Thotsakan, is demonstrated, even though he appears in many scenes in *Ramakien*. Nevertheless, the scenes examined in this section are sufficient to be able to evaluate Phiphek's qualities as to whether he fits into the role of 'ideal' younger brother.

(1) Banishment of Phiphek

When Thotsakan first talks to Phiphek, as he is relating his terrible dream, he uses quite respectable terms such as “You, whom share our name and life [เจ้าผู้ร่วมวงศ์ชีวิต]” and refers to himself as “*phi* (older brother) [พี่].”⁷⁸ However, when Phiphek tells him that he should return Nang Sida to Phra Ram, Thotsakan gets angry and shifts to use base language, calling Phiphek a “damn despicable one [ไอ้สาหรณั]” and reverting to the relatively crude pronouns ‘*ku*’, ‘*mueng*’ and ‘*eng*’ [กู, มึง and เอ็ง].⁷⁹ Notwithstanding, Phiphek replies with **respect**, referring to himself, when addressing Thotsakan, as “*nong* (younger brother) [น้อง]” and “*kha* (I) [ข้า],” and calling Thotsakan, “*phi* (older brother) [พี่]” and “king [บพทมาลย์ and ภูมิ].”⁸⁰

When Phiphek tries to defend himself against his older brother's wrath, he professes his **loyalty** to his older brother, saying “I am boundlessly loyal [น้องนี้จงรักภักดี]” and “I am not being traitorous to you, the king [มิได้ทรยศต่อบพทมาลย์],” even going so far as to say that Thotsakan is “like a great father [หมายเหมือนบิดูรงคั้เรื่องซัย].”⁸¹ In addition, Phiphek exhibits a degree of **respect** and **deference** to Thotsakan as can be seen in his response to Thotsakan's outburst of anger and order of expulsion. When

⁷⁸ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 2, 163-164.

⁷⁹ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 2, 164.

⁸⁰ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 2, 165-166.

⁸¹ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 2, 166.

he is initially accused by Thotsakan of being traitorous and deceitful, he does not try to argue with him, but quietly leaves his brother's presence as ordered.

Even after Thotsakan has formally cut their relationship and expelled him from the city, Phiphek continues to show his **respect** in the language he used to refer to Thotsakan. While he is taking leave from his wife and when he is relating his plight to Sukhrip and Phra Ram, he refers to Thotsakan using the royal form of older brother “*chettha* (older brother) [เชษฐา]” and calls him “King of the Demons [พญาชกษา and พญา มาร].”⁸² So we can see by the language, Phiphek does not show that he has cut off his **respect** for his older brother, notwithstanding the ill treatment he is receiving.

(2) Phiphek Talks with Kumphakan

Before the fight with Kumphakan, Phiphek is sent to talk him. In their interchange, Phiphek exhibits his **respect** for this older brother as well. Kumphakan addressed Phiphek first in quite a rude way by calling him “damn evil one [ไอ้ทรลักษณ์]” and “damn wicked one [ไอ้อัปรีชย].” He then accuses Phiphek of violating the standards of brotherly relations, saying “Usually, brothers who have a conflict, in not too long, they will be okay and get back together, even if your older brother, is angry and drives you to escape, you still have your family and lineage [ธรรมดาพี่น้องผัดกัน ไม่ช้าพลันก็จะกลับคืนดี ถึงมาตรถ้องค์พระเชษฐา โกรธาขับไล่มีงหนี ญาติวงศ์พงศาที่ยังมี].”⁸³ Phiphek answers Kumphakan, first showing him honor and **respect** by raising his hands in obeisance [ขอกรถวายอัญชลี] and then using polite terms like “honored older brother [องค์พระเชษฐา].”⁸⁴ Again, when talking to Kumphakan, Phiphek professes that he still has **loyalty** to his older brother, “as for myself, I should cherish loyalty toward my honored older brother [อันตัวของฉันนี้จงรัก รักดีต่อองค์พระเชษฐา].”⁸⁵

⁸² *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 167, 172.

⁸³ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 352.

⁸⁴ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 352-353.

⁸⁵ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2*, 353.

Furthermore, when Phiphek is accused of being a traitor by both by Kumphakan and Inthorachit, he defends himself by explaining that he is not being disloyal, but that he is fighting on the side of honesty and justice. In response to Kumphakan, he says “I stay in the side of justice and fairness [ตั้งอยู่ในธรรมทศพิธ].”⁸⁶ Then, when talking to Inthorachit, he says “I will stay on the side of the right [จะตั้งอยู่ในที่ที่ทางธรรม].”⁸⁷ Thus Phiphek is saying that his siding with Phra Ram is not an act of disloyalty and that if he Thotsakan was acting in a fair and honest manner, he would clearly defend him.

(3) Death of Kumphakan and Thotsakan

In the death scene of Kumphakan when Phra Ram reveals himself as Phra Narai, Kumphakan sees the errors of his ways. He then calls Phiphek to his side and gives him words of teaching, and at this point shifts to using terms such as ‘*phi* (older brother) [พี่]’, ‘*chao* (you) [เจ้า]’ and ‘*anucha* (younger brother) [อนุชา].’ Phiphek shows genuine remorse and sadness, holding Kumphakan’s body and sobbing, giving him praise and honor, thus showing his **loyalty** and **respect** toward this older brother.⁸⁸

Similarly, when Thotsakan is dying, he gives a speech of advice to Phiphek, much as Phali does with Sukhrip. We see that Thotsakan has reconciled himself to his younger brother. He uses terms like ‘*phi* (older brother) [พี่]’, ‘*rao* (I or we) [เรา]’ and ‘*than* (you) [ท่าน]’ and generally gives forgiveness to Phiphek, offering for him to take over the rule of Longka and to have his queens as his own.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 2, 353.

⁸⁷ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 2, 473.

⁸⁸ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 2, 418.

⁸⁹ *Ramakien* by King Rama I, Volume 3, 400.

Phiphek then gives a speech of recrimination, heaping praise and showing his **loyalty** to Thotsakan. He says “I didn’t feud like bearing some grudge, with the intention to kill my older brother, that would be shameful, toward all the three worlds [ไม่ผูกเวรเหมือนผูกเวรมา แกล้งฆ่าเชษฐาให้จำตาย เป็นน้าอภัยสอดดู แก่หมู่ไตรโลกทั้งหลาย].”⁹⁰

b. Summary

Thus, Phiphek shows through his language and actions that he never loses **respect** for his older brother. In the end, Phiphek says that if he had intentionally tried to have his older brother killed, that would be worse than what Thotsakan did to him. This shows that Phiphek retained his **respect** and **loyalty** for his older brother, despite the other emotions they exhibited and actions they may have undertaken. While there is little opportunity for Phiphek to show his obedience and deference to his older brother, one could say that Phiphek is not being disloyal or disobedient in going to the side of Phra Ram, in that his actions are not against Thotsakan personally, but in order to uphold justice and honesty.

Finally, as was noted with respect to Phra Lak and Sukhrip, Phiphek has ample opportunity to deviate from the model behavior of a younger brother. After Phiphek has been unjustly banished for telling his older brother the truth, and even when Thotsakan tries to kill him, he continues to treat him with **respect**. Finally, when Thotsakan dies, and shows repentance, Phiphek does not show resentment, instead he exhibits his **loyalty** to his older brother.

Phiphek, thus, demonstrates that he stays within definition of the ‘ideal’ younger brother, showing **respect** and deference toward his older brothers, and in the end, **loyalty** despite being unfairly treated. Thus, we can put Phiphek in the role of ‘ideal’ younger brother as well.

4. Summary

As seen from the analysis in this chapter, all three principal younger brother characters are seen demonstrating common behavior of **loyalty, obedience, respect**

⁹⁰ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3, 403.*

and **deference** toward their older brothers. Furthermore, all maintain these qualities despite many opportunities to deviate from that prescribed behavior.

Phra Lak, being the devoted companion and younger brother of the central hero of the epic, is given the most opportunity to display model behavior as a younger brother, which he does with unwavering **loyalty**, unquestioned **obedience**, unshakable **respect** and unflinching **deference**. He also is seen demonstrating other younger brother qualities, such as relinquishing responsibility and reliance on his older brother. He truly displays the most consistent and unquestionably 'ideal' behavior of a younger brother.

Sukhrip and Phiphek, on the other hand, are faced with quite different situations than Phra Lak. Both of these younger brothers have some conflict with their older brothers, experience unfair treatment resulting in banishment. Notwithstanding the fact that the younger brother takes action to fight with the older, it is done in the name of righteousness, honor and truthfulness, not disrespect, disloyalty, or disobedience. Finally, at the death of the older brother, the younger brother's **loyalty** is evidenced in their sorrow and lament, both honoring the older brother after their death in the manner expected of a younger brother. In fact, it is the older brother who is the one who breaks the proper model of behavior to be nurturing and responsible toward their younger brother. The younger brother is the one who maintains correct behavior in keeping **respect** for their older brother. In essence, the younger brothers have upheld their end of the relationship, while the older has violated that contract. Both Sukhrip and Phiphek are able to display continued **loyalty**, a desire to show **obedience**, deep held **respect** and the ability to exhibit **deference** toward their older brothers. They are both able to demonstrate 'ideal' younger brother qualities, despite the contemptible behavior of their older brothers.

D. Mural Paintings at the Temple of the Emerald Buddha

When King Rama I came to power, he almost immediately ordered the construction of a temple next to the newly built Grand Palace, to house the important Emerald Buddha image that he had taken from Vientiane.⁹¹ Surrounding this temple is a gallery, upon the walls of which Rama I had painted murals depicting the new rendition of *Ramakien* that had been finished in 1797 CE. Over the years, these mural paintings have been renovated and completely repainted approximately every semicentennial celebrate of the founding of Bangkok.

The mural paintings are separated into 178 panels that run continuously along the walls. The panels starts with the unearthing of Nang Sida by her adopted father, King Chanok when he is living as a rishi, and then carry through to the end of Rama I's *Ramakien*. Many of the episodes that occur before the unearthing of Nang Sida are painted on side panels and above doorways, thus essentially the complete story can be seen along these galleries.

Although many historians have attempted to explain why Rama I chose *Ramakien* to have painted along the galleries, no complete explanation has been found. Theories of political motives have been put forth, but without much evidence to support them. Charles Keyes makes the connection with the Khmer influence regarding the ideas of Rama as the 'ideal' king on the Siamese rulers, including Rama I. In this connection he states that "the mural paintings depicting the *Ramakien*...have their prototype in the bas reliefs of Angkor Wat."⁹² In any event, we can see from the murals a pictorial depiction of the complete story from a purely Thai perspective.

These paintings provide an opportunity to see how the role of younger brother is depicted in a pictorial media which can then be compared with the written version. For this examination, the reproduction of the murals, contained in the large size

⁹¹ M.C. Subhadradis Diskul, *History of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha* (Bangkok: Bureau of the Royal Household, 1982) 17.

⁹² Charles F. Keyes, "The Case of the Purloined Lintel: The Politics of a Khmer Shrine as a Thai National Treasure," *National Identity and Its Defenders*, ed. Craig J. Reynolds (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2002) 216. Keyes' theory, however, might be questioned given the fact that it seems unlikely there was knowledge, much less detailed understanding, of Angkor Wat at the time of Rama I.

volume created in celebration of Bangkok's Bicentennial, Ramakien [Rāmāyana], Mural Paintings Along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha⁹³ were used. In addition, Ramakien with Mural Paintings From the Galleries at the Temple of the Emerald Buddha⁹⁴ by Nitda Hongwiwat, was consulted.

As noted earlier, the murals have been repainted many times since they were originally created. While the most recent renovations have taken painstaking effort to maintain the look and feel of the painting being renovated, it is unclear whether the earlier repairs did the same. Therefore, it is difficult to determine with certainty whether the depictions in the original paintings are exactly the same as those seen today. Be that as it may, given their well known nature and completeness, selection of these paintings for review is obvious.

1. Phra Lak

Attesting to Phra Lak's central role in the story, he appears in 82 of the 178 mural paintings and one side panel. In almost every depiction, he is shown right at the side of Phra Ram. The only instances where he is not next to his older brother are when he has been sent out to fight and in the scenes where Phra Lak is alone with Nang Sida.⁹⁵ As a further indication of the consistent pairing of the two brothers, there are only a few murals where Phra Ram appears without Phra Lak at his side.⁹⁶

In these depictions, Phra Lak is almost always shown seated behind or below Phra Ram, generally with his hands raised in obeisance, or walking behind either Phra Ram or Phra Ram and Nang Sida.⁹⁷ When shown seated below Phra Ram, who is

⁹³ Ramakian [Rāmāyana], Mural Paintings Along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha, advisors H.S.H. Prince Subhadradis Diskul and M.R. Saeng Suriya Ladavalayu (Bangkok: Government Lottery Committee. H.N. Group, 2004).

⁹⁴ Nitda Hongwiwat [นิดดา หงษ์วิวัฒน์], Ramakien with Mural Paintings From the Galleries at the Temple of the Emerald Buddha [รามเกียรติ์ กับจิตรกรรมฝาผนังรอบพระระเบียงวัดพระศรีรัตนศาสดาราม] (Bangkok: Phuean Dek [เพื่อนเด็ก] 2547 BE (2004 CE)).

⁹⁵ Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals 24, 60, 66, 72, 75, 78, 80, 105, 158. (Note: this volume has no page numbers, thus reference will be to mural numbers.)

⁹⁶ Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals 89, 112, 156, 165.

⁹⁷ Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals 9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 27, 64, 70, 166, 170.

usually on a raised pavilion, Phra Lak is either on a small platform or mat.⁹⁸ This is most likely to indicate his position in the social hierarchy, that is, lower than Phra Ram, but higher than the others who sit on the bare ground. If they are depicted seated on the same level, he is seen either behind Phra Ram or in a separate pavilion.⁹⁹ When riding on a chariot with Phra Ram, Phra Lak is positioned just in front on a lower seat¹⁰⁰ or in a second chariot behind Phra Ram.¹⁰¹ Interestingly, other than when he is going out to fight, he is most often shown without holding any weapons. When he is shown with a weapon, it is usually a short sword and not the bow with which he is often associated.¹⁰² Phra Ram, on the other hand, is most often shown holding a weapon, always a bow.

As noted previously, Phra Lak is often extolled in *Ramakien* for his beauty, often in woman-like term, and his depiction in the mural paintings follows these descriptions. He is either shown with white or pale yellow-golden skin, very often without any obvious sign of the usual small mustache so often seen on the face of heroic warriors in Thai paintings.¹⁰³ In fact, in one of the murals, it is hard to distinguish Phra Lak from Nang Sida!¹⁰⁴

Thus, we see that the depiction of Phra Lak as the ‘ideal’ younger brother holds true in the way he is depicted in these mural paintings, perhaps even more so than in the text. His **loyalty** is illustrated by his constantly being at Phra Ram’s side; his **obedience** is portrayed through dutifully following his brother, along with depictions of actions from the story, that is, going to battle on command, taking Nang Sida to the forest; his **respect** is represented in his usual hand and body posture of obeisance; and his **deference** is shown by always being behind his brother whether in battle, while talking with some rishi, or merely walking through the forest.

⁹⁸ Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals 4, 39, 41, 43, 45, 46, 57, 63, 82, 98, 111, 121, 155, 162, 163, 178.

⁹⁹ Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals 15, 29, 50, 53, 86, 92, 161, 167, 171, 174.

¹⁰⁰ Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals 49, 69, 73, 84, 93, 94, 100, 103, 109, 115, 164.

¹⁰¹ Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals 87, 118, 120.

¹⁰² Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals 28, 55, 71, 169.

¹⁰³ Ramakian, Mural Paintings murals, 25, 157.

¹⁰⁴ See in particular Ramakian, Mural Paintings mural 19.

2. Sukhrip

The depictions of Sukhrip, while numerous in that he is integrally involved in the war with Thotsakan, are limited in terms of showing him interacting with his older brother, Phali. Other than two side panels, one showing Sukhrip and Phali as young children, before they have been changed into monkeys, and one showing Phali stealing Nang Montho from Thotsakan, there are only three numbered murals with the two brothers together.

The first is when Torapi challenges Phali to fight and the subsequent banishment of Sukhrip.¹⁰⁵ In this scene, Sukhrip is seen sitting, along with several others, in attendance to Phali who is in a raised pavilion. Another part of this panel shows Sukhrip being banished by Phali, although, as is usual in the often circuitous depiction of the story in these murals, the circumstances leading to his banishment are not shown until the next panel. The next panel shows Phali fighting Torapi with Sukhrip dutifully waiting outside the cave, as directed by Phali, watching to see what kind of blood will run out of the cave.¹⁰⁶ The last panel depicting both Phali and Sukhrip, shows Sukhrip challenging Phali to fight. Then, in a small illustration in the very upper left-hand corner of the mural, the fight between the two brothers flying through the air is seen, showing Phali in a superior position, above Sukhrip. This is followed by Phali, with Sukhrip dutifully seated behind him, dying before Phra Ram and, finally, in a much larger depiction, Sukhrip before the funeral urn of Phali.¹⁰⁷

From these few scenes, we can see Sukhrip exhibiting the traits of younger brother. His **loyalty**, **respect** and **deference** are depicted in his kneeling in obeisance when in Phali's presence, sitting politely behind his older brother as he is dying and then being shown mourning before Phali's funeral urn. His **obedience** is portrayed by showing his following Phali's orders and waiting as he fights Torapi in the cave.

3. Phiphek

As with Sukhrip, there are only a few murals that show Phiphek with his older brother, Thotsakan, although Phiphek is seen in many other murals assisting Phra

¹⁰⁵ Ramakian, Mural Paintings mural 12.

¹⁰⁶ Ramakian, Mural Paintings mural 13.

¹⁰⁷ Ramakian, Mural Paintings mural 27.

Ram in the war. Along with one side panel depicting the birth of Nang Sida to Nang Montho, there are only two numbered murals with both Phiphek and Thotsakan, and one with Phiphek and Khumpakarn, his other older brother.

The side panel depicting the birth of Nang Sida shows Phiphek sitting in proper respectful form reporting the horoscope of the new born baby to Thotsakan, who is seated in a raised pavilion. The first mural painting with these two brothers is when Phiphek is banished from Longka.¹⁰⁸ He is seen kneeling in front of Thotsakan with his hands raised in obeisance, after which he is seen taking leave of his wife and daughter, followed by him traveling across the water to meet Phra Ram. The other mural painting with these two brothers shown together is at the end of the war when Thotsakan is lying on the ground dying. Phiphek is seen kneeling at his side with a mournful posture.¹⁰⁹ One other mural that shows Phiphek with an older brother is when Khumpakarn has come to the battlefield. It shows Phiphek kneeling with his hands held in obeisance in front of his older brother.¹¹⁰

Thus, as with Sukhrip, these few paintings of Phiphek show him exhibiting some of the ‘ideal’ younger brother traits. He can be seen exhibiting **loyalty, respect and deference** when shown kneeling in obeisance when in Thotsakan’s or Khumpakarn’s presence and mourning before the dying Thotsakan.

4. Summary

Thus, we can see that the murals along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha provide many depictions of Phra Lak, Sukhrip and Phiphek showing the traits of being ‘ideal’ younger brothers. While this portrayal is particularly true for Phra Lak, perhaps overwhelmingly so, the depiction of the other two characters also stays true in these paintings. The constant pairing of Phra Lak and Phra Ram, the position of the younger brothers when in the presence of their older brothers and the expressions of obeisance all help to reinforce this image of **loyalty, obedience, respect and deference**.

¹⁰⁸ Ramakian, Mural Paintings mural 40.

¹⁰⁹ Ramakian, Mural Paintings mural 109.

¹¹⁰ Ramakian, Mural Paintings mural 57.

CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF ROYAL YOUNGER BROTHERS IN THAI HISTORICAL NARRATIVES

In this section, Thai historical narratives will be reviewed to see how royal younger brothers in Thai history are portrayed. An attempt will then be made to draw some comparisons and parallels between this portrayal and the depiction of the role of the younger brother in *Ramakien*. Particular reference will be made to the traits used to analyze the role of younger brother as outlined in previous chapters.

In order to frame this analysis, three royal younger brothers have been selected for examination: Prince Ekathotsarot, younger brother of King Naresuan; Prince Surasih, younger brother of King Rama I; and King Pinklao, younger brother of King Rama IV. These brothers have been selected because they are among the best known younger-older brothers in Thai history. There is also a comprehensive source of material on which to study these historical royal younger brothers.

Another factor framing this analysis is that only certain historical narratives have been chosen for review, namely those by Thai authors written in or translated into English. This was done because the intent of this analysis is to see how historical royal younger brothers are portrayed from the Thai point of view, which can then be compared with the depiction in the Thai originated *Ramakien*. Therefore, information and data from western sources have not been included, other than in a few isolated circumstances. In addition, it should be noted, that emphasis in this examination is on how the relationships are portrayed in the narratives, with less concern as to the accuracy of the representation.

The primary narratives used for this review are the royal chronicles, along with certain modern day historical narratives. Charnvit Kasetsiri explains that royal chronicles “can best be described as that of a dynastic chronicle. Its emphasis is mainly on the activities of kings and kingdoms.”¹ While it is generally thought that

¹ Charnvit Kasetsiri, *The Rise of Ayudhya* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford UP, 1976) 8.

the tradition of chronicle writing was started during the reign of King Narai, 1657-1688 CE, most of the royal chronicles extant today covering the late Ayutthaya era were compiled during the early Bangkok period, mainly during the reign of Rama I, with Rama IV adding an important version during his reign.² In addition, chronicles covering the first four reigns of the Bangkok era were compiled during the reign of King Rama V.

Charnvit, and many other historians, have long noted the influence of the chronicles on modern Thai historical narratives. Dhida Saraya notes that “*phongsawadan* [chronicle] writings reflect idea which subsequently becomes the Thai historical ideology.”³ As we will see, this seems to be quite evident in the case of how the royal younger brothers are portrayed in the modern day historical narratives.

A. Prince Ekathotsarot and King Naresuan

Prince Ekathotsarot was the full younger brother of King Naresuan, both sons of King Maha Thammaracha, the 20th king of the Ayutthaya era. He served as Naresuan’s Uparat, crown prince, or, as we will see, sometimes called ‘second king’, from when Naresuan succeeded to the throne in 1590 CE until he himself became king in 1605 CE upon the death of Naresuan. Ekathotsarot, ruled as king for five or six years, depending on which historical narrative is read. His reign is often described as being one of peace and commerce with foreigners, particularly in comparison with Naresuan’s constant warfare.

King Naresuan, often given the label “the Great”, became the 21st king of Ayutthaya in 1590 CE upon the death of his father Maha Thammaracha. He ruled for fifteen years, during a period when Ayutthaya was often at war over the supremacy and control of territory with surrounding kingdoms, particularly Burma. He is noted for leading the fight for the resurrection of Ayutthaya after their defeat by the

² Charnvit 9.

³ Dhida Saraya, *Tamnan & Tamnan History: A Study of Local History* [ตำนานและตำนานประวัติศาสตร์กับการศึกษาประวัติศาสตร์ท้องถิ่น] (Bangkok: Office of the National Culture Commission, Ministry of Education, 1982) 86.

Burmese in 1569 CE. In these efforts, Naresuan is credited in many of the historical narratives, both ancient and modern, with many heroic deeds, such that the actual Naresuan and the legendary Naresuan are often blurred.

1. Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya

The Ayutthaya chronicles that we have today were compiled, then revised and re-written, over many hundreds of years and, for the most part, long after the Ayutthaya period. Richard Cushman undertook a review of all the known chronicles and put together a synoptic translation, which was then edited by David Wyatt for publication.⁴ The dates of the various versions of the Ayutthaya chronicles run from the earliest known chronicle, and the only existing one written during the Ayutthaya period, the Luang Prasoet version written in 1681 CE, to the Royal Autograph version compiled during the reign of Rama IV in 1855 CE. In between there are a number of other versions, mainly from the time of Rama I, written between 1795 and 1807 CE.⁵

The Luang Prasoet Chronicle is the shortest, with only limited detail relating to Naresuan and no mention, by name or reference, in this version to Ekathotsarot. However, in the editions that followed, starting with those written in the earliest Bangkok period, the material regarding both Ekathotsarot and Naresuan was greatly expanded, particularly in showing the close relationship between the two brothers and in portraying Ekathotsarot as the ever **loyal** and **obedient** younger brother.

a. Luang Prasoet Chronicle

The Luang Prasoet Chronicle, named after the person who discovered this chronicle, was compiled in 1681 CE by the court astrologer *Phra Horathibodi* under the direction of King Narai and “is widely recognized by historians as the kingdom’s first dynastic history.”⁶ This chronicle is considered to be an abridged or concise

⁴ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya, trans. Richard D Cushman, ed. David K. Wyatt (Bangkok: Siam Society, 2000).

⁵ See: The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya. There is one additional chronicle included in the Cushman work that was written during the Thonburi period, dated to 1779 CE, but it does not contain any material relevant to the study in this thesis.

⁶ Ian Hodges, “Western Science in Siam: A Tale of Two Kings,” *Osiris, Beyond Joseph Needham: Science, Technology, and Medicine in East and Southeast Asia* 2nd Series, 13 (1998): 91.

version of chronicle versus the unabridged, lengthier versions that were created by the recensions made during the early Bangkok period.⁷ Notwithstanding, it is interesting to note that, although the Luang Prasoet Chronicle was written only 75 years after the death of Naresuan and 70 years after Ekathotsarot's reign, there are just nine relatively short sections about Naresuan and no references, by name or inference, to Ekathotsarot.⁸ For example: “**A:** *the King* took possession of a palace. At that time *the King* was enraged with the Mons and had about one hundred Mons taken and burned to death ... *the King* advanced with *his* army ...” (emphasis added)⁹ and “**A:** after daybreak, *the King* set out with *his* army” (emphasis added)¹⁰

b. Early Bangkok Period Versions

This is in striking contrast to the versions from the early Bangkok period, written several hundred years later, which not only provide a greatly expanded description of the exploits and heroics of Naresuan, but now also include Ekathotsarot as an integral part of the narrative. This can generally be seen by comparing the number of lines of text devoted to Naresuan, being merely 65 in the Luang Prasoet version, versus approximately 3,450 lines in all the other versions.¹¹

A comparison of a few specific sections can illustrate these changes (emphasis added throughout):

1. Ayutthaya Army Marches Against Toungoo: **A:** *the King* set out with *his* army in procession ... on Wednesday, the tenth day of the waxing moon in the fourth month, *the King* reached ...

⁷ Nidhi Eoseewong, “The History of Bangkok in the Chronicles of Ayutthaya,” trans. Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit, Pen & Sail, Literature and History in Early Bangkok, eds. Chris Baker and Ben Anderson (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2005) 292-293.

⁸ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya. The sections containing the material from the Luang Prasoet Chronicle can be seen on pages: 123, 142, 155, 168, 189, 190, 190, and 192.

⁹ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 142, lines 22-36. Note: In the Cushman synoptic translation, he used letters to refer to the various editions of the Ayutthaya chronicles. “**A:**” refers to the Luang Prasoet version, “**BCDEF:**” refers to the other versions.

¹⁰ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 155, line 6.

¹¹ See: The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 122-195. This was calculated based on an average of 48 lines of text per page of the 74 pages in Book Four of The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya relating to Naresuan.

... [versus] ...

BCDEF: Meanwhile the Supreme-Holy-Buddhist-*Lords-Over-All* ... issued a holy royal directive ... ‘Have the army completely readied. *We* decree that the main army will move ... send all of the brigades of the land army on ahead to receive *Us* together.’¹²

2. A: In...a year of the tiger, *the King* went to visit Lopburi.

... [versus] ...

Events in Lawaek: **BCDEF:** In...a year of the tiger...*both of Their Highnesses*, the Holy-Feet-of-the-Supreme-Paramount-Reverences-and-Holy-Buddhist-*Lords-Omnipotent*, had advanced the main army to suppress *Their* royal adversary in the Municipality of Lawaek...Both of *Their Highnesses*, the Holy-Feet-of-the-Supreme-Paramount-Reverences-and-Holy-Buddhist-*Lords-Omnipotent*, in *Their* holy compassion made a holy royal gift...and *the Kings* ordered...three thousand soldiers...to the Municipality of Lawaek¹³

A further comparison of the number of sections that mention both Ekathotsarot and Naresuan also shows how integral Naresuan’s younger brother became in these chronicles. There are 48 separate sections in Cushman’s Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya covering the reign of Naresuan, nine from the Luang Prasoet Chronicle and 41 sections added by the versions from the early Bangkok period. Of these 41 added sections, just five fail to mention Ekathotsarot, and only three of these are of some activity in which Ekathotsarot could have been involved, that is two of the sections discuss activities of the Burmese without mentioning Naresuan as well.¹⁴ In

¹² The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 168, lines 5-18.

¹³ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 189-190, lines 21-47, 1-6.

¹⁴ See sections entitled “Hongsawadi Sends An Army to Siam”, The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 122-123, and “Ill Omens Forebode Ill for the Hongsawadi Army” The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 124. The other three sections in which Ekathotsarot is not mentioned are “Naresuan Prepares to Send An Army Against Lawaek But Has To Use It In the West,” The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 123-124; “A Dream Foretells Naresuan’s Victory,” 126; and “Survivors Return to Hongsawadi,” The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 133-134.

other words, after Ekathotsarot has been introduced to the narrative in the early Bangkok versions, there are only three short sections in which he is not mentioned by name or implication. This constant pairing of the two strongly reinforces the impression of the two brothers as a devoted team and Ekathotsarot as the **loyal** and **obedient** younger brother. This also creates a striking parallel with depiction of the younger-older brother team of Phra Lak and Phra Ram in *Ramakien*, in which the two brothers are constant companions with Phra Lak playing the role of the **loyal** and **obedient** younger brother.

The initial reference in the Ayutthaya chronicles to Ekathotsarot is in the very first sentence with an addition made by the Royal Autograph version stating that Naresuan “appointed his younger brother to be the Uparat.”¹⁵ From that point on, Naresuan and Ekathotsarot are spoken of in the same breath, with phrases such as (emphasis added throughout): “King Naresuan and his younger brother;”¹⁶ “the two Kings;”¹⁷ “Their Majesties;”¹⁸ “both of the Kings;”¹⁹ and then, as the chronicle progresses, with increasingly complex titles such as, “their *Highnesses*, the Supreme-Holy-Buddhist-*Lords-Over* all;”²⁰ “the Holy-Excellent-Golden-Lotus-Foot of the Supreme-Holy-*Ones-Who-are-the-Superlative* Crowns of *Kings*;”²¹ “both of *Their Holy Graces* and Royal *Highnesses*, the Holy-Foot-of-the-Supreme-Paramount-Reverences-and-Holy-Buddhist-*Lords-Omnipotent*;”²² and so forth with variations on these.

¹⁵ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 22, line 51.

¹⁶ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 124, line 38.

¹⁷ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 125, line 16.

¹⁸ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 130, line 47.

¹⁹ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 36, line 81.

²⁰ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 153, lines 35-36.

²¹ The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 160, lines 9-10.

²² The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya 190, lines 19-20.

The reference to them performing as a team is then continued with many allusions to them acting in consort. The chronicles provide quotes, actions and feelings that are attributed to them jointly, such as (emphasis added throughout):

When the *two Kings* heard their chief ministers answer thus ... with smiles *they* said ...; ²³

Both of the *Kings*, having listened to such, opened *Their* mouths and then said ...; ²⁴

The *Kings* thereupon had a message written which said ...; ²⁵

The Supreme-Holy-Buddhist-*Lords-Over-All*, having listened, were greatly moved with compassion ... and ordered the holy royal epistle to be answered as follows ... ²⁶

The Supreme-Holy-Buddhist-*Lords-Over-All*, having been informed of the contents of such written messages ... were rejoiced at heart, ordered rewards bestowed ...; ²⁷

The Holy Feet-and-Supreme-Holy-Buddhist-*Lords-Over-All*, being informed, were enraged and said ...; ²⁸

Since Naresuan is, in actuality, the king and Ekathotsarot the Uparat, the references to them speaking, thinking and acting as one are interesting. This would seem to emphasize the **loyalty** of one for the other, particularly Ekathotsarot, since presumably he could not act on his own. Also, given his slightly lesser status, his following along with his older brother shows a certain level of **obedience** and **deference**.

²³ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 125, lines 16-17.

²⁴ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 146, lines 13-14.

²⁵ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 150, line 23.

²⁶ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 160, lines 31-33.

²⁷ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 162, lines 11-13.

²⁸ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 167, lines 10-11.

There is only one reference to Ekathotsarot not being totally obedient. In this instance, an official makes an apparent blunder in an attack, which angers Naresuan:

King Naresuan was furious...and ordered the death penalty administered. King Ekathotsarot, who was the royal *younger brother*, petitioned, saying ‘... he has accompanied *the King* to war on many occasions ... We request his sentence be suspended and he be allowed ... to redeem himself.’ *King Naresuan*, having ordered as His royal *younger brother* had requested
(emphasis added) ²⁹

What is interesting to note in this section in which Ekathotsarot is portrayed playing the ‘soft’ role, sometimes played by important female members of the court, is that twice he is referred to as the “younger brother,” while Naresuan is called “King Naresuan.” This is perhaps done as a reminder that, while they are often shown as equals, in reality a hierarchy still exists, with the younger needing to show **respect** to the older.

This hierarchy, which, although perhaps a dynamic one might expect as a normal part of this court relationship, is made evident throughout the chronicles. For example, when the two are referred to separately, Naresuan is always described first, and often with a greater title: “King Naresuan, with King Ekathotsarot, his younger brother, advanced ...;” ³⁰ “King Naresuan, having taken His seat on the royal bull elephant ... and King Ekathotsarot, having taken His seat on the royal bull elephant ... set forth ...;” ³¹ “The Supreme-Holy Naresuan, the Paramount-Reverence-Who-Was-Lord, mounted the cow elephant ... and the Holy-Feet-Supreme-Holy Ekathotsarot mounted the cow elephant ...;” ³² “The Supreme-Holy-Naresuan-Paramount-King-of-Kings-and-Reverence-who-is-Lord and the Supreme-Holy-Ekathotsarot ...” ³³

²⁹ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 139-140, lines 39-48, 1-2.

³⁰ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 134, lines 5-6.

³¹ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 141, lines 17-22.

³² The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 154, lines 15-17.

³³ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 162, lines 33-34.

In addition, when describing the elephants or horses the two ride into battle, Naresuan's is always described in intricate detail as being just a little bit bigger than Ekathotsarot's: "The bull elephant Phukhao Thong ... stood six *sok*, one *khup* and two *niu* tall ... was outfitted for King Naresuan ... the bull elephant Bun Ruang, the royal elephant for the younger brother ... stood six *sok* and one *khup* tall;"³⁴ "King Naresuan mounted the royal horse Caophraya Ratcha Phahana standing three *sok*, one *khup* and two *niu* high. King Ekathotsarot mounted the royal horse Phalahok standing three *sok* and one *khup* high;"³⁵ "the Supreme-Holy-Paramount-Elder-Brother-of-the-King took His seat on the bull elephant Phlai Phanom Cak, standing five *sok* and three *niu* high ... the Supreme-Holy-Younger-Brother-of-the-King took His seat on the premier bull elephant Kaeo Udon standing five *sok* high"³⁶ While perhaps insignificant, this is a subtle reminder of the ranking between the two.

Finally, in the famous elephant duel in which Naresuan kills the Burmese Uparat, Ekathotsarot, right by Naresuan's side, has his own elephant duel and kills a lower ranking officer. Thus each duels, and wins, in the prescribed hierarchical order, Naresuan the high ranking prince and Ekathotsarot a lesser official.³⁷

The depiction of the two brothers as constant and devoted companions, although within a hierarchical relationship, is quite analogous to the relationship between Phra Lak and Phra Ram in *Ramakien*. In addition, the scene of fighting in prescribed hieratical order is reminiscent of the scene in *Ramakien* when Phra Ram fights with Sawahu, the older brother, and Phra Lak fights with Marit, the younger. (See Chapter V.B.1.c)

c. Rebellion of Tenasserim

The section describing a rebellion in Tenasserim, a vassal state, is interesting in showing the many facets of the relationship between the two brothers.³⁸ The

³⁴ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya, 128-129, lines 42-49, 1.

³⁵ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 153, lines 37-39.

³⁶ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 172, lines 29-33.

³⁷ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 131.

³⁸ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 155-158.

narrative begins by explaining how the senior official of Tenasserim was suspected of being in revolt. When he fails to appear to a summons, Naresuan sends Ekathotsarot to put the official in line. This immediately shows the nature of their relationship, with Naresuan being able to order Ekathotsarot to go forth at his will, and Ekathotsarot readily following the order, which, while might be expected given their respective ranks, also shows Ekathotsarot's **loyalty** and **obedience**. This scene is similar to the many times that Phra Ram sends Phra Lak to fight in *Ramakien*.

The hierarchy relationship is then reinforced by the names used in referring to Naresuan and Ekathotsarot in this section. Ekathotsarot is called the "Supreme-Holy-Younger-Brother-of-the-King" six times, while Naresuan, while referred to as "Supreme-Holy-Paramount-Elder Brother-of-the-King-and-Lord" twice, otherwise is called "The Supreme-Holy-Lord-Over-All" or "Supreme-Holy-Naresuan-Reverence-and-Present-Lord". This emphasizes the familial relationship between the two and Ekathotsarot's role as younger brother. This also, as noted above, continues the portrayal of the two brothers as Phra Lak and Phra Ram are always depicted in *Ramakien*, within a hierarchical relationship, younger-older, king-subordinate.

In this section, Ekathotsarot shows his recognition of his role in the relationship. In a message sent by Ekathotsarot to the recalcitrant official, he says:

Phraya Tenasserim was *Our* Crown official (before *We* ascended the throne) ... news went in to *Us* that Phraya planning a revolt, the Supreme-Holy-Buddhist-*Lord-Over-All* still did not believe it ... *the King* ordered *Us* to come out ... *We* would that he come forth to see *Us*! *We* will prostrate *Ourselves* and ask *the King* to suspend punishment one time ... If he does not come, thinking he will be able to meet *Our* army, he should prepare to defend the municipality securely. (emphasis added).³⁹

As seen in the language of the message, he talks in the royal 'we' or 'our', not 'me' or 'I', properly speaking not just for himself, but also for his older brother. However, he then refers to Naresuan as 'the King' and 'the Supreme-Holy-Lord-

³⁹ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 155-156, lines 42-48, 1-15.

Over-All’, saying he will ‘prostrate’ himself to Naresuan, thus showing his **respect** and **deference** for his older brother.

In the end, the official does not relent and when Ekathotsarot captures him, he merely has the official flogged for his recalcitrance. However, when Naresuan hears of this, he orders the official to be executed, and, “The Supreme-Holy-Younger-Brother-of-the-King-and-Lord followed the holy directive of the Supreme-Holy-Paramount-Elder-Brother in every detail,”⁴⁰ demonstrating his **obedience**. Thus, this scene gives a clear picture of Ekathotsarot’s role as younger brother in his display of **loyalty, obedience, respect** and **deference** for his older brother.

d. The Royal Autograph Version

The Royal Autograph version of the Ayutthaya chronicles, written during the reign of Rama IV, made additions at two points that seem enhance the role of Ekathotsarot in a striking way, further enhancing the portrayal of him as a **loyal** and **respectful** younger brother. The first, as was previously mentioned, was made in the addition of the phrase at the very beginning of the narrative, “**F:** and appointed his younger brother to be the Uparat.”⁴¹

The second is even more striking and it occurs at the end of the narrative when describing the death and funeral of Naresuan. The Royal Autograph version added the statements:

F: The Holy-Feet-of-the-Supreme Holy-Younger-Brother-of-the-King was grieved and spoke incessantly of His love for the Holy-Paramount-Elder-Brother-of-the-King to the point of engaging in various hysterical actions;⁴² and

F: In His grief murmured and wailed incessantly and lovingly of this and that concerning His holy paramount older brother.⁴³

⁴⁰ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 157-158, lines 47-48, 1.

⁴¹ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 122, line 5. “**F:**” in this case refers to the Royal Autograph edition.

⁴² The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 194, lines 42-44.

⁴³ The Royal Chronicle of Ayutthaya 200, lines 26-27.

These later additions seem to have been made with particular intent to emphasize the tremendous amount of **loyalty** and **respect** Ekathotsarot had for his older brother. They also read similar to the scenes in *Ramakien* in which Sukhrip and Phiphek grieve the deaths of their older brothers, and perhaps, how one would imagine Phra Lak would lament at the death of Phra Ram.

e. Summary

As we can see, the Ayutthaya chronicles portray Ekathotsarot as almost the ‘ideal’ caring younger brother and companion-in-arms. He is shown exhibiting constant **loyalty**, **respect**, **obedience** and **deference** for Naresuan, his older brother, all the behavior traits noted earlier in defining the role of an ‘ideal’ younger brother.

We can also see quite a number of parallels between the portrayal of Ekathotsarot in the Ayutthaya chronicles and the younger brothers in *Ramakien*. As noted, Ekathotsarot is shown exhibiting the behavior traits identified in *Ramakien* as defining the role of younger brother. In addition, the reminder of the hierarchy between the two brothers is in line with the way Phra Lak and Phra Ram are always portrayed in *Ramakien*, constant and devoted companions but always within a hierarchical relationship. Finally, there are several scenes in the narrative that are reminiscent of scenes in *Ramakien*: the constant pairing of the two brothers; the fight scene with each brother engaging the enemy in hierarchical order; the older brother sending the younger to fight on his behalf; and the death scene expression of grief.

2. Van Vliet – The Short History of the Kings of Siam

A non-Thai originated source that is useful in this exploration of the portrayal of royal younger brother in Thai historical narratives is The Short History of the Kings of Siam written by Jeremias van Vliet in 1640 CE. This is said to be perhaps the earliest account of the history of Ayutthaya yet to be uncovered and is sometimes called the “Van Vliet Chronicle”.⁴⁴

Van Vliet, a Dutch merchant employed by the Dutch East India Company (VOC), was assigned to work in Siam off and on from 1633 to 1642 CE, eventually

⁴⁴ Jeremias van Vliet, The Short History of the Kings of Siam, trans. Leonard Andaya, ed. David K. Wyatt (Bangkok: Siam Society, 1975) 1.

rising to the post of Director of the Ayutthaya factory of the VOC.⁴⁵ He is said to have been “closely involved in Siamese affairs [and] to have learned the Siamese language”⁴⁶ and that he “revealed a lively curiosity and genuine scholarly interest in Siamese politics and history.”⁴⁷ Dhiravat na Pombejra explains that Van Vliet “relied a lot on oral tradition when he collected the necessary data for writing his history ... this would explain why Van Vliet was able to assemble a text which was, in shape and content, very much like a Siamese chronicle.”⁴⁸ Wyatt comes to the conclusion, in his introduction to the English translation of this work, that “Van Vliet’s account must be taken seriously, as least as representing the earliest known report as to what some Siamese (and not just Van Vliet) *thought* the earlier history of Ayudhya [*sic*] had been.”⁴⁹ Interestingly, the sources used by Van Vliet seem to indicate that there were perhaps chronicles compiled before the period of King Narai. Thus, because of its relatively contemporaneous nature, composed just a few years after the period of Naresuan and Ekathotsarot, and the manner in which it was compiled, this narrative, although composed by a foreigner, provides interesting insight to this analysis.

The most noteworthy aspect of the Van Vliet Chronicle, as it relates to Ekathotsarot and Naresuan, is how little attention it gives to Ekathotsarot’s relationship with Naresuan. This is similar to the Luang Prasoet version of the Ayutthaya chronicles, although in this narrative, Ekathotsarot does get some brief notices. The section of the chronicles relating to Naresuan begins by explaining how, when Naresuan came to the throne, “he wanted his brother Phra Anut [Ekathotsarot], who was *fai lang*, or second prince, to be crowned king.”⁵⁰ The narrative describes how Ekathotsarot did not fall for this apparent ploy as he knew it was just Naresuan’s way of testing his **loyalty** and **deference**, a test he passes as Naresuan is eventually

⁴⁵ Chris Baker, Dhiravat na Pombejra, Alfons van der Kraan, David K. Wyatt, Van Vliet’s Siam (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2005) 25-32.

⁴⁶ Van Vliet 4.

⁴⁷ Dhiravat na Pombejra, Siamese Court Life in the Seventeenth Century as Depicted in European Sources (Bangkok: Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn Univ., 2001) 194.

⁴⁸ Dhiravat 200-201.

⁴⁹ Van Vliet 10.

⁵⁰ Van Vliet 82. Note: the following footnote provided in reference to “Phra Anut”: “i.e. anucha (อนุชา), ‘younger brother,’ in this case the prince who was to succeed Naresuan ... where the full form of his name is given as Anuchathirat Phra Ramesuan [อนุชาธิราชพระรามสาร].”

persuaded to take the throne. Ekathotsarot is then not mentioned again until the death of Naresuan when Van Vliet writes:

before his death the king wanted his older [*sic*] brother (who was in the wars with him) to swear that he would not leave Thong Hauw until he had conquered it, and that his body would not be burned ... the king's brother was so little bound by the oath (which he should have carried out) that as soon as His Majesty was laid to rest he disbanded the army ... brought with him the dead body of the king, which he burnt in a royal manner according to the custom of the land.⁵¹

Thus, Van Vliet gives quite a different portrayal of the relationship between Ekathotsarot and Naresuan than that of the full Ayutthaya chronicles. In the first part, when he relates how Ekathotsarot discerns Naresuan's real motive when offered the crown, and defers to Naresuan, he shows Ekathotsarot's **loyalty** and **deference**. However, in the last part, Van Vliet implies a certain disloyalty and disobedience on the part of Ekathotsarot in not carrying out Naresuan's wishes, especially by adding the editorial parenthetical comment "(which he should have carried out)." This level of disloyalty and disobedience on the part of Ekathotsarot, implied or otherwise, is not seen in any of the royal chronicles or other historical narratives.

In further contrast to the Ayutthaya chronicles and other narratives, most of Van Vliet's account of Naresuan is about his cruelty, i.e. burning alive a boatload of rowers for making a small error in landing; having mandarins eat pieces of their own flesh or feces for minor infractions; and other stories of his unusual nature.⁵² The few descriptions of his martial exploits do not speak of Ekathotsarot's participation and Ekathotsarot is not referred to as 'king', 'second king' or 'Uparat'. Furthermore, when describing the reign of Ekathotsarot, Van Vliet states that "in view of the severe rule of the former king, the new ruler [Ekathotsarot] was a good king of great wisdom and

⁵¹ Van Vliet 87. Note: the reference to "older brother" is likely in error as it clearly is referring to Ekathotsarot, the younger brother.

⁵² Van Vliet 83.

judgment, but not warlike. In his lifetime he carried out neither offensive nor defensive wars, although both possibilities arose at different occasions.”⁵³

3. Prince Damrong – Our Wars with the Burmese

Prince Damrong Rajanubhab provides an interesting and illuminative portrayal of the relationship between Ekathotsarot and Naresuan and of Ekathotsarot’s role as younger brother in The Chronicle of Our Wars With the Burmese: Hostilities between Siamese and Burmese when Ayutthaya was the capital of Siam.⁵⁴ Prince Damrong, the fifty-seventh child of Rama IV, was the younger half-brother of King Rama V and played an important part in the reign of his older brother. He is also often championed as the ‘father of Thai history’, said to be the first to present history with a western flavor, although, as can be seen by this work, much in the manner of a royal chronicle.

Our Wars With the Burmese, which was translated into English by the Burmese scholar, Phra Phraison Salarak Thien Subindu, alias U Aung Thein, is an attempt to provide a narrative of all the wars between Ayutthaya and Burma, of which Damrong lists 24 in total, starting in 1539 CE until 1767 CE. The ones of interest to this discussion are Wars Numbers 5-15, which involve Ekathotsarot and Naresuan. Chris Baker’s Editor’s Preface to the work states that:

Prince Damrong’s *Thai Rop Phama* [the name of the narrative in Thai] can lay claim to be Thailand’s most famous history book. First published in 1917, it was possibly the first Thai history book in the western sense of an analytical work ... specific events are now so familiar that they ... have become the stuff of the Thai national story.⁵⁵

Damrong, at the very beginning of his narrative, sets up the relationship between the two brothers as one of ‘ideal’ brothers, with all the attributes of **loyalty, obedience, respect** and **deference**. He makes Ekathotsarot’s **loyalty** quite explicit when recounting the first war in which the two brothers participated by stating,

⁵³ Van Vliet 87.

⁵⁴ Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, The Chronicle of Our Wars with the Burmese, trans. Phra Phraison Salarak Thein Subindu, alias U Aung Thein, ed. Chris Baker (Bangkok: White Lotus, 2001).

⁵⁵ Damrong ix.

“Somdet Phra Ekathotsarot, looking on, thought his brother very bold and was afraid that he would meet with danger. He therefore brought his own boat forward as a shield to his brother’s boat.”⁵⁶ Damrong then goes on to further champion the brotherly relationship between them by stating “Yet another thing which could be seen from this incident was how the two brothers loved each other and how each held the other in respect. Therefore they were partners in weal and woe in the fight against the enemy in all the wars fought by them.”⁵⁷ This description of the relationship between Ekathotsarot and Naresuan reads comparable to the relationship between Phra Lak and Phra Ram in *Ramakien*.

Damrong carries this theme of **loyalty** and companionship throughout the description of the twelve wars in which Naresuan was involved, seven of which have Ekathotsarot described as being close by Naresuan’s side:

War No. 5: When Somdet Phra Naresuan heard of it, he summoned his followers who had come down with him from Phitsanulok, got into a boat and chased the runaway together with his younger brother Phra Ekathotsarot in another boat.⁵⁸

War No 6: “Somdet Phra Naresuan and his brother Ekathotsarot left the capital with boats to perform the ceremony of treading the ground of victory ... When Somdet Phra Naresuan knew that the viceroy of Chiang Mai had come down, he went up with his army in company with his brother, Prince Ekathotsarot.”⁵⁹

War No. 7: When Somdet Phra Naresuan came to know of it, he and his brother Somdet Phra Ekathotsarot took out a force and fought the enemy ... As soon as he received the news, he and his brother together with his bodyguard went with a force of quick river boats ... he and his brother then landed and fought the enemy

⁵⁶ Damrong 77.

⁵⁷ Damrong 77.

⁵⁸ Damrong 77.

⁵⁹ Damrong 96-97.

most ably ... Somdet Phra Naresuan and his brother, each armed with a gun, shot at the enemy from their boats in company with the forces in the boats.⁶⁰

War No. 8: In consequence he immediately issued orders to prepare a force, and he and his brother got into the same boat and went out to meet the enemy at once...while he and his brother led the boat force to attack the main force of the King of Hongswadi as far as Pa Mok.⁶¹

War No. 10: When the main army was ready, Somdet Phra Naresuan and his brother Somdet Phra Ekathotsarot came by boat from the capital ... the third division was the royal main army, Somdet Phra Naresuan was himself the marshal of the army together with his brother, Somdet Phra Ekathotsarot ... Somdet Phra Naresuan and his brother dressed themselves in the dress of victory in warfare.⁶²

War No. 14: When news of the rising of the Mons reached the Siamese capital, Somdet Phra Naresuan in company with his brother Somdet Phra Ekathotsarot marched from the capital....⁶³

War No 15: King Somdet Phra Naresuan and his brother, Somdet Phra Ekathotsarot, left the capital ... they went by boat as far as the locality known as Phra Lo where they and the army landed⁶⁴

Thus, Damrong, much as the Ayutthaya chronicles, effectively paints the picture of Ekathotsarot as a constant **loyal** and **obedient** companion of his older brother. This also reinforces the parallel impression, as noted with respect to the

⁶⁰ Damrong 101-102.

⁶¹ Damrong 111.

⁶² Damrong 125-128.

⁶³ Damrong 159-160.

⁶⁴ Damrong 177.

Ayutthaya chronicles, of Ekathotsarot and Phra Lak in *Ramakien* as the ever **loyal** and **obedient** younger brother willing to follow and support their older brother into battle.

Interestingly, in comparison to the Ayutthaya chronicles and other narratives, Damrong appears to give greater force to the impression of the superior-subordinate relationship between the two brothers. He never refers to Ekathotsarot as “King” or “Second King”, always as “His Royal Highness, Prince Phra Ekathotsarot,” “younger brother Somdet Phra Ekathotsarot” or just “Prince Ekathotsarot,” while Naresuan is referred to as “King Phra Naresuan,” “Somdet Phra Naresuan” or “His Majesty”. Thus, Damrong appears to make more effort to show the hierarchy between Ekathotsarot and Naresuan. This also brings his portrayal of the two brothers even more in line with the way Phra Lak and Phra Ram are always portrayed in *Ramakien* within a hierarchical relationship, younger-older, king-subordinate.

4. Other Historical Narratives

The portrayal of Ekathotsarot as the ever faithful younger brother is taken up in several historical narratives written during the more recent period. The characterization of Ekathotsarot as the ‘ideal younger brother’ and portrayal of the close relationship between Ekathotsarot and Naresuan appears to have become the accepted norm. In addition, in contrast to Damrong, the labeling of Ekathotsarot as a “Second King” also appears to have become the standard.

Prince Dhani, in his article “The Reconstruction of Rama I”, states that “there have been only two “Second Kings” in our history. One was the younger brother of King Naresvara [*sic*], who had been his royal brother’s constant companion and comrade in arms”⁶⁵ Thus, Prince Dhani not only is emphatic that Ekathotsarot was a “Second King,” but also reinforces the picture of **loyalty** and **obedience**.

Rong Syamananda’s “A History of Thailand” takes up this theme as well. He states that “He [Naresuan] took the unprecedented step of bestowing the highest honors in the realm upon his brother, Ekathotsarot [*sic*] who had been through thick

⁶⁵ Prince Dhani Nivat, “The Reconstruction of Rama I,” *The Journal of the Siam Society* 43.1 (Aug. 1955): 41.

and thin with him. He appointed him as Maha Uparat or Second King with all the kingly distinctions.”⁶⁶ Rong goes on to give some detail of Naresuan’s heroic activities, but, interestingly, similar to Van Vliet, makes no more mention of Ekathotsarot until Naresuan’s death.

Manich Jumsai also includes this theme in his “Popular History of Thailand”. Manich begins his narrative, similar to Damrong, with a characterization of Ekathotsarot and his relationship with his older brother as one involving **loyalty** by relating the episode that “His brother Ekathotsarot had to step in between and shield him off from being shot.”⁶⁷ He states that “Naresuan had only one brother Ekathotsarot [*sic*] who had always been fighting with him by his side. Ekathotsarot was appointed Uparaj or viceroy with higher honours than all preceding ones, because he was always referred to in Thai history as the second king.”⁶⁸ However, he goes on to devote most of the discussion of Naresuan, which runs sixty pages, with little mention of Ekathotsarot. Nonetheless, at the end, he comes back to the ‘ideal’ brother theme and tries to demonstrate Ekathotsarot’s **respect** when he relates Naresuan’s death:

Prince Ekathotsarot [*sic*] who was still in Muong Farnng, hastened to his brother’s side, but unfortunately the king succumbed to his illness and died on 16th May 1605. Ekathotsarot succeeded his brother and brought down his dead body to Ayudhya for cremation. Although Ekathotsarot had always stood by the side of his brother in all his campaigns, he was a peace-lover, and at once called off the expedition to Ava started by his brother.⁶⁹

Finally, Prince Chula Chakrabongse, in “Lords of Life”, although mainly devoted to the narrative of the kings of the present Chakri dynasty, includes a brief description of the time of Naresuan. Chula Chakrabongse’s narrative makes clear the

⁶⁶ Rong Syamananda, A History of Thailand (Bangkok: Thai Watana Panich, 1986) 58.

⁶⁷ Manich Jumsai, Popular History of Thailand (Bangkok: Chalermnit, 1977) 176.

⁶⁸ Manich 209.

⁶⁹ Manich 233.

‘ideal’ relationship between the two brothers, which is evident in two passages, at the beginning of Naresuan’s reign and at the end:

In July, 1590, King Maha Tammaraja died aged 75, and Naresuan, who had been King in fact, now became King in name also at the age of 35. The new monarch so loved his brother that he was not content with appointing him Uparaja, and Ekatsarot [*sic*] was made the Second King, and was, in accordance with custom, responsible for the northern provinces. But such was the close bond between the two brothers that they were inseparable and Ekatsarot resided in Ayudhya [*sic*] instead of Bisnalok.⁷⁰

[O]n April 1st, 1605, he [Naresuan] crossed the River Salween, but had not marched much further when he fell seriously ill with a carbuncle on the neck. For once his brother was not by his side, and Ekatsarot hurried along to meet Naresuan, but only to be in time for a last farewell. Naresuan died on May 16th and was duly succeeded by Ekatsarot, already the Second King, who brought the hero’s body back to Ayudhya.⁷¹

Thus, Chula Chakrabongse attempts to show the **loyalty** and **obedience** of Ekathotsarot, being “inseparable” and “by his side” of Naresuan, and his **respect** and **deference**, hurrying to meet him and giving him a hero’s farewell.

5. Summary

Thus, we see that the portrayal of Ekathotsarot as the ‘ideal’ younger brother Ekathotsarot is well established in these historical narratives. The Ayutthaya chronicles contain constant reminders and references to the **loyalty**, **obedience**, **respect** and **deference** that Ekathotsarot had for his older brother, Naresuan. Prince Damrong carries this theme forward in his narrative of the wars with Burma, which

⁷⁰ Prince Chula Chakrabongse, Lords of Life, A History of the Kings of Thailand (Bangkok: DD Books, 1982) 46.

⁷¹ Chula Chakrabongse 50.

may have played an important part in firmly implanting this representation of Ekathotsarot and Naresuan's relationship into the Thai historical discourse and in the minds of most Thais today, an impression that is clearly evident by the modern day narratives of Rong, Manich and Chula Chakrabongse.

In addition, there are a number of parallels between the portrayal of Ekathotsarot in the Ayutthaya chronicles and other historical narratives and the depiction of the role of the younger brother characters in *Ramakien*. Ekathotsarot is shown exhibiting the behavior traits identified in *Ramakien* as defining the role of younger brother, specifically in terms of **loyalty, obedience, respect and deference**. In addition, many of the narratives portray the devoted companionship between the two brothers, although with Ekathotsarot maintaining recognition of the hierarchy in the relationship, which is in line with the way Phra Lak and Phra Ram are always portrayed in *Ramakien*. Finally, there are several scenes in the narratives that are reminiscent of scenes in *Ramakien*: the constant pairing of the two brothers; willingness to get in harm's way to protect the other; fight scenes, where in each brother engages the enemy in hierarchical order; the older brother sending the younger to fight on his behalf; and the death scene expression of grief.

B. Prince Surasih and King Rama I

Prince Surasih, the full younger brother of King Rama I, was born into an Ayutthayan noble family in 1743 CE. He was an active participant in the wars with Burma under King Taksin, whereby Taksin was able to reestablish the kingdom centered in Thonburi after the defeat of Ayutthaya in 1767 CE. When Taksin's reign ended and Rama I become king, Surasih became Uparat, a position he held until his death in 1803 CE.

King Rama I, the founder of the present Chakri Dynasty and first king of the Bangkok Era, was born in 1736 CE and became king in 1782 CE, succeeding King Taksin. He is often given the designation "the Great" for his efforts at founding Bangkok as the new capital of the kingdom and building many important structures such as the Grand Palace and the Temple of the Emerald Buddha, as well as rewriting

many laws, Buddhist treatises, and literature, including *Ramakien*, as noted in a previous chapter. Rama I served as king for 27 years until 1809 CE.

1. The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign

Similar to the Ayutthaya chronicles, chronicles were also written covering the first four reigns of the Bangkok Era, starting with the founding of Bangkok by Rama I until Rama IV. Chaophraya Thiphakorawong, the compiler of these narratives, was born in 1812 CE into the Bunnag family and he held top-ranking positions in the government under Rama III and Rama IV. After his retirement, he undertook the compilation of these chronicles under the patronage of Rama V, completing them in 1869 CE. Prince Damrong and other government officials subsequently reviewed them, made some revisions, and prepared them for publication. Two of the chronicles, those covering the First and Fourth Reigns, have been translated into English by Thadeus and Chadin Flood.⁷²

a. The Two Brothers Acting as One

The first chronicle, covering the reign of Rama I, is very similar to the earlier Ayutthaya chronicles in presentation. Although primarily focused on Rama I, Prince Surasih, his younger brother, plays a prominent role in the narrative. In fact, many of the features noted in connection with the portrayal of the relationship between Ekathotsarot and Naresuan, are also present in this narrative. In particular, the parallel between this chronicle and the earlier one, in how the narrative makes reference to both of them acting, thinking or speaking as one, is noteworthy. The following are some examples:

Both the king and the Heir Apparent Kromphraratchawang Bawon Sathanmongkhon [Surasih] praised the three monks publicly,

⁷² The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Chaophraya Thiphakorawong Edition, Volume One: Text, trans. and eds. Thadeus Flood and Chadin Flood (Tokyo: Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1978); The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, B.E. 2394-2411 (A.D. 1851-1868), by cāwphrajaā thíphaakorawong, Volume One: Text, trans. Chadin (Kanjavanit) Flood (Tokyo: Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1965); The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, B.E. 2394-2411 (A.D. 1851-1868), by cāwphrajaā thíphaakorawong, Volume Two: Text, trans. Chadin (Kanjavanit) Flood (Tokyo: Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1966).

saying that they were honest ... the king and the heir apparent went on to say ... a meeting ... would be called ... In such a meeting, said the king and the heir apparent⁷³

The king and his younger brother, the heir apparent, upon learning of what happened from the message, became angry. They commanded⁷⁴

The king and his brother, the heir apparent, became greatly angered and sent an order for the Thai troops to return to the capital.⁷⁵

The king and his younger brother, the prince heir apparent, upon hearing this detailed explanation by the rachakhana monks, said: “At this time, *we* beg all of you to undertake the work ... as for the temporal part, leave it to *us* ... all *we* want is the sacred science be perfected ... ” (*emphasis added*)⁷⁶

In addition, there are numerous examples of the two of them undertaking activities and acting in consort on many matters, thus the demonstration of **loyalty**:

One day, while the construction of the walls of the capital was going forward, the king and his brother, the heir apparent, went around inspecting the work. They decided to have a bridge built ... Phra Phimonlatham from the Photharam Temple thereupon approached the king and the prince and advised them ... the king and the heir apparent agreed to this counsel and canceled the order for the elephant bridge.⁷⁷

⁷³ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text15, lines 21-31.

⁷⁴ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 57, lines 27-29.

⁷⁵ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 62, lines 24-26.

⁷⁶ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 159, lines 1-8.

⁷⁷ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 59-60, lines 25-32, 1-7.

[T]he king consulted with his younger brother, the heir apparent. At their order, the remains of the late King of Thonburi were exhumed and cremated ... both the king and his younger brother, the heir apparent, went to personally light the cremation fire.⁷⁸

The king and his younger brother, the heir apparent, went to the temple twice every day. In the morning, they presented food ... in the late afternoon, they came out again⁷⁹

[W]hile the remains [of their late father] were being cremated, both the king and his younger brother, the heir apparent, held up their hands the platform on which the remains were placed.⁸⁰

The king and his younger brother, the heir apparent, consulted together on governmental affairs and agreed that in regard to the Burmese armies⁸¹

b. Younger Brother Behavior

The hierarchy between the two, although a natural part of their court relationship, is given more emphasis than with the portrayal of Ekathotsarot and Naresuan, who, even though the hierarchical order was evident, were often referred to collectively as ‘the kings’ or ‘lords’. In this narrative, only Rama I is called the ‘king’ and his younger brother is always referred to using the lesser title of ‘heir apparent’. Thus, the many incidences noted above of them working in consort also portray a level of **obedience** on the part of Surasih in following his older brother. This, therefore, provides perhaps an even better parallel than that of Ekathotsarot, in the portrayal of the relationship between the younger and older brothers in *Ramakien*, where the younger is never portrayed as being on an equal level with the older.

⁷⁸ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 71, lines 12-17.

⁷⁹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 16, lines 8-111.

⁸⁰ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 215, 217, lines 18-20, 2-4.

⁸¹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 101, lines 21-23.

In this regard, the examples set forth below show Surasih exhibiting his **obedience, respect and deference** for his older brother:

He [Surasih] then sent a message to the king, his elder brother, asking permission to execute the two commanders. The king sent back a reply that he would like to have their lives spared ... the prince heir apparent, after receiving the king's answer, ordered ... their hair shaved off, forming three lines on their heads ... After this the prince withdrew the army and returned to the capital city, where he went to see this royal brother and reported to him on the military mission;⁸²

The prince heir apparent asked to have a report drawn up ... carried by a member of the prince's own personal retinue to the king at Bangkok ... he asked his younger brother to return with the army ... the prince arrived in Bangkok ... he went to pay respects to his elder brother, the king, and presented him with the two cannons;⁸³

Now the king asked his younger brother ... to go and take charge of the construction of Phra Phutthabat Mondop. The prince went ... the heir apparent returned to Bangkok, where he went to see his elder brother, the king. The prince offered to the king any merit he might have accumulated ...;⁸⁴

[T]he king's younger brother ... heard that his elder brother had withdrawn the army from Tavoy ... went to have audience with his royal brother and said to him: 'I beg you to return to the capital city. I myself will set up my army here, watch for

⁸² The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 101, lines 5-19.

⁸³ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 116-117, lines 21-30, 2-23.

⁸⁴ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 130-131, lines 23-26, 27-30.

whatever the Burmese might do, and will look to the defense and protection of the kingdom.’ / The king agreed to this proposal;⁸⁵

[T]he king’s younger brother ... came to see the king and pay his respects on the occasion of his departure for the Buddhist monkhood. On this occasion, the heir apparent also begged for the king’s favor in granting amnesty to Chao Nanthasen, the ex-king of Lanchang who was then in prison⁸⁶

These examples all serve to show Surasih acting with the traits of a model younger brother, similar to younger brothers in *Ramakien*. His **obedience** is quite evident in following orders and commands given by his older brother, notwithstanding the fact that he most likely had the power and wherewithal to act on his own. In addition, he is shown acting with **respect**, for example, taking leave, asking permission and reporting his movements and actions. Finally, he exhibits **deference** to his older brother in changing his intended actions upon the order of his older brother.

Surasih’s **obedience** is also portrayed by the many references to him following the orders to go to battle on the king’s command, references that also bring to mind the many times that Phra Lak is sent to fight by his older brother Phra Ram in *Ramakien*:

The First Battle with the Burmese: The King commanded his younger brother...to take charge as commander in chief of the main force...;⁸⁷

The Prince Heir Apparent’s Journey to the Malay Peninsula: ... the king would ask his younger brother, the heir apparent, to take some

⁸⁵ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 146, lines 9-21.

⁸⁶ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 213, lines 15-20.

⁸⁷ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 90, lines 113-115.

ships and move the royal army by sea to go and restore order in the southwestern territories;⁸⁸

The Third Burmese Campaign: ... Phraya Chiangmai sent a message to Bangkok requesting military assistance. The king asked that his younger brother ... lead an army up there ...;⁸⁹

Reports of Burmese Military Operations: The Heir Apparent Journeys to Chiangmai: ... The king had his younger brother, the Heir Apparent ... take command of an army to march north and assist Chiangmai.⁹⁰

c. Dissension and Deviation

This narrative, and others as we will see, also contains reports of dissension between Surasih and his older brother and shows how Surasih perhaps deviated at times from the role of younger brother. However, it is interesting to see how these situations are characterized in the narratives. The events are related as follows in the Thiphakorawong Chronicle:

Dissension Arises between the King and the Heir Apparent: ... arrangements were made for a race between a boat for the Grand Palace called the Tongpliu and one from the Front Palace called the Mangkon. The oarsmen for each side were compared for size and agreed upon. But the heir apparent selected another set of strong oarsmen for his boat and kept this a secret ... officials from the Grand Palace learned of the heir apparent's plans and informed the king ... he ordered an end to the boat race at that point. The heir apparent was very hurt and he stopped coming to have audience with the king

⁸⁸ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 102, lines 1-3.

⁸⁹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 209, lines 24-26.

⁹⁰ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 221, lines 21-23.

Subsequently ... the heir apparent came to have audience with the king and told him that the funds currently sent to the Front Palace ... was not sufficient ... the heir apparent did not obtain what he wanted and was offended. From that point on he no longer came to have audience with the king ... preparations for fighting were being made at the Front Palace ...

The situation was brought to the attention of two elder sisters of the king. They both went to the palace of the heir apparent and calmed him down by speaking in tears of the old times when they had all endured great hardship together ... the heir apparent was mollified and his anger disappeared ... from that day on, relations between the king and the heir apparent returned to normal.⁹¹

This is notable because it relates two separate incidents in which Surasih is acting out of his role as model younger brother, but they are presented in the chronicle as if one event and thus made to appear as isolated behavior. The narrative ends up by saying that everything returns to normal, implying that Surasih resumes his role of younger brother. This appears to be an attempt to portraying his actions with respect to his older brother as a temporary aberration in character. As these events are related, although Surasih does not act with **obedience** and **deference** to his older brother, he does act with **respect** and **obedience** to his older sisters when they appeal to his **loyalty**.

The other section of the chronicle that speaks of less than 'ideal' younger brother behavior on the part of Surasih occurs when relating his death. A summary of the narrative is as follows:

When the king heard that his younger brother was seriously ill, he prepared to go to the Front Palace and nurse him. But ... the reaction of the officials of the Front Palace was one of hostility and suspicion. It appeared that a clash might occur between the two

⁹¹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 217-218, lines 9-29, 7-30.

sides. The king's son, Chaofa Kromluang Itsarasunthorn [the future Rama II], was obliged to go personally ... then the situation returned to normal. The king stayed over at the palace of the heir apparent for six nights in order to be with his younger brother.

On Thursday ... the Heir Apparent ... died ... [and] ... the king ... went to sprinkle water on the remains ... a royal proclamation was issued ordering everyone in the kingdom to shave their heads⁹²

While the prince heir apparent was gravely ill, it was learned that he had earlier suggested to ... his two elder sons, to consider a political plot. ... from that time on ... [his two sons] ... became very bold. They went and conspired ... soon the rumors reached the king ... the whole truth was then revealed and laid bare ... the order was given to arrest [the two sons] ... they admitted their guilt ... stripped of the honors and princely titles ... were executed with sandalwood clubs ... along with [another retainer] who was the one that had incited the heir apparent earlier to put guns on the battlements in preparation for a civil war.”⁹³

What is interesting in this recounting, and as we will see is done with even greater emphasis in other narratives, is that it appears to try to shift the blame to Surasih's illness as the cause of his aberrant, less than model behavior, not necessarily a flaw in his character of being a younger brother. It also attempts to shift the blame for the incidents, which in reality seem to show Surasih more as a potential rebel than 'ideal' younger brother, from Surasih to his sons and retainers.

d. Summary

As we can see, there are quite a number of parallels between the portrayal of Surasih in the Thiphakorawong Dynastic Chronicles of the First Reign and that of Ekathotsarot in the Ayutthaya chronicles, along with the younger brother characters in

⁹² The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 260-261, lines 10-28, 2-21.

⁹³ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Volume One: Text 266-268.

Ramakien. Surasih is shown exhibiting **loyalty, obedience, respect** and **deference** for his older brother, similar to the behavior traits identified as defining the role of younger brother. In addition, the clear reminder of the hierarchy relationship, while still showing a close relationship between the two brothers, is in line with the way the relationship between Phra Lak and Phra Ram is portrayed in *Ramakien*. Finally, the many incidents of the older brother sending the younger to fight on his behalf brings to mind the way Phra Lak is often sent into battle by his older brother.

2. Other Narratives

Modern day historians have also generally portrayed the relationship between Surasih and Rama I as close and intimate, with Surasih serving as the **loyal** younger brother. While the extent of coverage Surasih receives in these historical narratives is not nearly as extensive as in the Thiphakorawong Chronicle, he does receive quite a bit of recognition for his role in the wars with Burma.

Chula Chakrabongse's *Lords of Life* gives the credit to Surasih for extolling Rama I's abilities and promoting his older brother to King Taksin, thus leading to Rama I's ascendancy in the military. He makes this clear when he quotes Sir John Bowring talking about Taksin "He [Surasih] was so brave and able that he soon became a favourite of his chief. As Bowring later related of P'raya Taksin: 'the general [Surasih] told him [Taksin] that he had an elder brother [Rama I] superior to himself in every noble quality, brave, bold, and wise.' " ⁹⁴ Thus, Surasih is seen showing **respect** and **deference** to his older brother in endorsing his older brother to Taksin, apparently over himself.

Surasih's **loyalty** to his older brother is a constant theme in these modern day historical narratives as well, as can be seen in these quotes:

Chula Chakrabongse: Soon the two brothers were in P'raya Taksin's service and they fought by his side in almost every

⁹⁴ Chula Chakrabongse 73.

campaign until P'raya Taksin had himself proclaimed King of Siam;⁹⁵

Prince Dhani: The most intimate and constant companion who had shared with him from the earliest years his military and administrative careers was his brother Bunma who served in the Dhonburi regime until he was created Chaophya Surasih;⁹⁶

Manich: King Taksin was dead, but the spirit of tough resistance still lived on in King Yodfah [Rama I] and his brother, the Second King [Surasih], who both had always fought the Burmese along the side of King Taksin⁹⁷

Thus, similar to the Thiphakorawong Chronicle, these narratives also pick up the portrayal of the close relationship between the two brothers. The depiction of the two brothers going to battle together and in close companionship seems intent on showing the 'ideal' behavior of Surasih in their relationship.

The importance of Surasih seems to be enhanced in many of the modern day narratives by the reference to him as 'Second King or 'Deputy King', a reference, as previously noted, never made in the Thiphakorawong Chronicle. While Prince Dhani makes clear that he was not a "Second King,"⁹⁸ Manich, Rong and Abha Bhamorabutr all use this title for Surasih (emphasis added):

Manich: He [Rama I] had altogether three brothers ... one was Chao Phya Surasee [*sic*], who became the *Second King* ...;⁹⁹

Rong: King Rama I raised his brother, Chao Phraya Surasih, to the exalted position of the Maha Uparat (*Deputy King*), commonly known as the Wang Na–The Prince of the Front Palace...;¹⁰⁰

⁹⁵ Chula Chakrabongse 73.

⁹⁶ Dhani, "The Reconstruction of Rama I" 40.

⁹⁷ Manich 418.

⁹⁸ Dhani, "The Reconstruction of Rama I" 41.

⁹⁹ Manich 411.

¹⁰⁰ Rong 100.

Abha: Rama I ascended the throne in 1782. He appointed his younger brother (Chao Phya Surasih) as Maha Uparaj (*second King*).¹⁰¹

The use of this title brings to mind the earlier ‘ideal’ younger brother, Ekathotsarot, who has normally been accorded the title of ‘Second King’. The use of this title with respect to Surasih could be an attempt to make a comparison between the two and thus further portray Surasih as the ‘ideal’ younger brother. In fact, Chula Chakrabongse makes this explicit when he states: “The T’ai armies which drove them back were more than once personally commanded by the King [Rama I] accompanied by his brother, like Naresuan and Ekatotsarot [*sic*].”¹⁰²

Notwithstanding this effort to portray Surasih and Rama I as having a close relationship, with Surasih as the ‘ideal’ younger brother, the dissension and conflict between the two has also been frequently raised in the modern narratives. However, as with the Thiphakorawong Chronicle, the matters are handled with delicacy.

Prince Dhani, in his article “Reconstruction of Rama I,” tries to explain the issues with sensitivity and tact. He describes Surasih as being “an impetuous character with a strong will but he was not always fair-minded”¹⁰³ and goes on to state that “though he exerted every energy to cooperate with his brother in the great reconstruction work. It is in fact on record that the two brothers even quarreled very seriously on one occasion and could only be reconciled with some difficulty by the joint mediation of their two sisters.”¹⁰⁴ So, while Prince Dhani raises the issue of Surasih acting as less than the model younger brother, he then concludes by saying:

He [Surasih] nevertheless had his own court and in most cases wielded tremendous power. In the days of Ayudhya [*sic*] this led in many instances to serious rivalry. In the case of Prince Surasih

¹⁰¹ Abha Bhamorabutr, *Thai History* (English Version) (Bangkok: Somsak Rangsiyopas, 1988) 49.

¹⁰² Chula Chakrabongse 97.

¹⁰³ Dhani, “The Reconstruction of Rama I” 41.

¹⁰⁴ Dhani, “The Reconstruction of Rama I” 41.

fraternal ties prevented such a possibility though their differences of opinion were now and then no doubt taken advantage of by their ambitious followers. Nothing serious, however, developed.¹⁰⁵

Prince Dhani, in excusing away Surasih's actions and manners, attributes him with the characteristics of **loyalty** and **obedience**, and places him in the role of 'ideal' younger brother.

While Manich Jumsai in his "Popular History of Thailand" has quite a bit of discussion of Surasih and his role in the reign of Rama I, the narrative is mainly focused on his military exploits. The dissension and quarrels with his other brother are not mentioned, until he describes the end of Surasih's life. In an apparent attempt to find an excuse for his actions, he states that "the Second King seemed to be disturbed in his mind just before his death."¹⁰⁶ He appears to be trying to discount Surasih's actions, attributing his actions to mental illness and, therefore, his disrespectful or disloyal behavior toward his older brother should be excused.

Chula Chakrabongse also tries to lay the blame for the dissension either on the retainers, similar to the Thiphakorawong Chronicle, or Surasih's ill health. He first downplays their disagreements by stating that "[a]lthough Rama I and the Uparaja were devoted brothers, often there were clashes of temperament which led to their entourages also being unfriendly rivals ... fortunately, these public displays of disunity were more rare than frequent."¹⁰⁷ Then, in a somewhat apologetic manner, he attributes the more serious troubles between the two to mental illness on the part of Surasih:

"As Rama I and his only surviving brother had been working together for so long, faced common adversaries, fought side by side, shared in great joy and glory, it is sad to record that they so seriously fell out toward the close of the Uparaja's life. One possible explanation is that his was a schizophrenic nature, one

¹⁰⁵ Dhani, "The Reconstruction of Rama I" 41-42.

¹⁰⁶ Manich 429.

¹⁰⁷ Chula Chakrabongse 96.

moment violently severe, at another kindly and compassionate ... the trouble was finally settled through the good offices of the two elder sisters as all troubles between the brothers always were.”¹⁰⁸

Once within the precincts he [the Uparaja] bemoaned the fact that he had done as much as his brother to save the country...it was obvious that his mind was going or already gone¹⁰⁹

So we can see that Chula Chakrabongse tries to make the case that Surasih’s behavior is not because he has lost his **loyalty** or **respect** for his older brother, but because of illness. It is interesting to note the role the ‘two elder sisters’ are given in these narratives, being presented as the persons who can bring their younger brothers in line. This clearly is an attempt to portray the **respect** and **deference** the two younger brothers, Surasih and Rama I, had for their elder siblings.

3. Summary

The attempt to portray Surasih as the ‘ideal’ younger brother of Rama I is quite evident from these historical narratives. He is shown exhibiting **loyalty**, **obedience**, **respect** and **deference** for his older brother throughout the narratives, particularly in the Thiphakorawong Chronicle, which has many close parallels with the portrayal of Ekathotsarot in the earlier Ayutthaya chronicles. Even in the face of evidence that Surasih may not have always exhibited model behavior, the narratives try to continue the portrayal of him as being ‘ideal’ by attributing his actions to illness or his followers, not to any fundamental flaw in fulfilling his role as the ‘ideal’ younger brother. There also appears to be an attempt to draw a parallel between Ekathotsarot, the model younger brother, and Surasih, either explicitly or by implication, thus further enhancing the portrayal of Surasih in the role of ‘ideal’ younger brother.

As with Ekathotsarot, the parallels between the portrayal of Surasih and the role of the younger brothers in *Ramakien* are clear. As stated above, Surasih is shown

¹⁰⁸ Chula Chakrabongse 109.

¹⁰⁹ Chula Chakrabongse 111.

exhibiting the behavior traits identified in *Ramakien* as defining the role of younger brother. In addition, the many incidents of Rama I sending Surasih to fight on his behalf, brings to mind the many times Phra Lak is sent into battle by Phra Ram. Finally, the portrayal of the close, but hierarchical, relationship between the two brothers parallels the relationship between Phra Lak and Phra Ram. Furthermore, the explanation of the sometimes troubled relationship between Surasih and Rama I invites comparison with the relationship that Sukhrip and Phiphek had with their older brothers, who fight but ultimately reconcile.

C. King Pinklao and King Rama IV

King Pinklao, the full younger brother of King Rama IV, was born in 1808 CE as a prince with full title being the son of a queen of King Rama II. Pinklao became *Uparat* when his older brother, Rama IV, became king in 1851 CE, and stayed in that position until his death in 1865 CE. Pinklao was awarded higher honors than merely a crown prince and thus has often been given the designation ‘king’ or ‘second king’.

King Rama IV, the eldest full royal son of Rama II, was born in 1804 CE. At the time of the death of his father in 1824 CE, Rama IV was an ordained monk and, when his elder half brother, Rama III, was chosen as king, he remained in the monkhood until 1851 CE when he became king after Rama III’s death. Rama IV is often credited with significantly advancing the exposure of the country to western influences and starting it on the way to modernity. Rama IV ruled for sixteen years until 1868 CE when he was succeeded by his eldest son, King Rama V.

1. The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign

Chaophraya Thiphakorawong also wrote a chronicle covering the reign of Rama IV.¹¹⁰ While this chronicle reads much the same as the Ayutthaya chronicles and the chronicle of the First Reign, its portrayal of the relationship between the two brothers, King Pinklao and King Rama IV, is much different.

¹¹⁰ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text and The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume Two: Text.

This chronicle begins by relating how, upon the death of Rama III, Prince Mongkut [the soon to be Rama IV] and “another of the late King’s brothers, [Pinklao], was also invited to rest on the pavilion in front of the royal arsenal ...”¹¹¹ It then goes on to explain how the two brothers, together, were invited to ascend the throne, and the “princes felt that the members of the royal family and the government officials were all sincere in this request ... the princes therefore, accepted the invitation to reign ...”¹¹² The narrative, thus, starts out portraying the relationship between the two as being very close.

The narrative then goes on to explain Rama IV’s feelings about his younger brother and how he perceived their relationship. It explains that Rama IV thought:

[Pinklao] was a man of great virtue ... and commanded the respect of the members of the royal family and of the ministers of state and government officials. The King was also aware that his younger brother’s name, together with his own royal name, had been mentioned on the occasion of the presentation of the crown. He sincerely loved and trusted his younger brother and wished to have the latter personally represent him as chief of the army in time of war, and therefore felt that he deserved greater honors.¹¹³

Further, in the long description of the coronation of Rama IV, there is no mention of the role Pinklao played and little reference elsewhere to what Pinklao did to show loyalty and obedience to his older brother. When describing the coronation of Pinklao, Rama IV’s role, however, is highlighted:

[T]he Ceremony of Investiture performed for former Heir Apparents was not to be accorded him. Rather, the King [Rama IV] commanded that the ceremony be enhanced with more honors

¹¹¹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 2, lines 25-27.

¹¹² The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 3-4, lines 6-7, 5-23.

¹¹³ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 41-42, lines 8-23, 1-3.

... the coronation of the Second King [Pinklao], too, was almost similar to the King's own coronation. ¹¹⁴

[A]t the King's order ... [Rama IV] went up to present water to the Heir Apparent ... the Heir Apparent then ... formally accept his Royal Nameplate from the King ¹¹⁵

[F]ollowed by twenty-one more salutes fired from within the Grand Palace at the royal command of [Rama IV] ... [Rama IV] himself was viewing the procession. ¹¹⁶

The text seems intent on showing what Rama IV did to show **loyalty** and **respect** to Pinklao, almost as if the roles were reversed. In fact, although the chronicle is full of descriptions of the many ceremonies that Rama IV initiated or participated in, from cremations and cutting of the top-knot rites, greeting envoys to making pilgrimages and tours, there are only two references to the two brothers taking part in events or ceremonies together. One is in a general description of the promotion of certain nobles ¹¹⁷ and the other is when describing the funeral of Rama III. ¹¹⁸

For example, in describing a trip to Saraburi to visit the Phra Buddhabat shrine, Rama IV is said to have "had a large retinue. Even the Queen ... who was at that time ill" ¹¹⁹, but no mention is made of Pinklao going along. This is also evident when the new pagoda was built at Phra Pathom Chedi in Nakorn Pathom, the efforts of Rama IV being described in great detail, including many ceremonies, events and merit making activities. The chronicles then describe Pinklao making a visit, evidently on his own, to make merit. ¹²⁰ These incidents seem to show that, even for

¹¹⁴ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 41-42, lines 8-23, 1-3.

¹¹⁵ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 42-43, lines 9-10, 1-2, 16-17.

¹¹⁶ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 46, lines 9-17.

¹¹⁷ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 71, lines 27-29.

¹¹⁸ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 82, lines 9-12.

¹¹⁹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 236, lines 20-23.

¹²⁰ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 503-505.

events and activities that were important to Rama IV, such as the renovation of Phra Pathom Chedi, the two did not participate together.

In addition, even though there is a statement at the beginning of the chronicle saying that Rama IV promoted Pinklao to his high position because he "...realized that his younger brother was extremely knowledgeable in domestic and foreign affairs,"¹²¹ there is no discussion in this narrative of Pinklao interacting with foreign envoys, other than to receive gifts. For example, in noting the arrival of Harry Parkes, an envoy of Sir John Bowring, the narrative states "[t]here were also many gifts for the Second King. He too had his officials come forward to receive them."¹²² This shows that Pinklao did not participate with Rama IV in receiving the envoy; a similar pattern repeated with the arrival of the American envoy, Townsend Harris,¹²³ the French envoy, M. de Montigny,¹²⁴ the Portuguese envoy,¹²⁵ and the Dutch envoy, John Henry Donker Curtius.¹²⁶

As a final example of the apparent lack of co-participation in activities, there is no mention of the two brothers traveling together, despite the fact that Flood states that Pinklao and Rama IV "traveled extensively after they assumed the throne"¹²⁷ In fact, there are numerous sections describing Rama IV's travels, but just one reference to Pinklao making a trip out of Bangkok, in this case to the Southern Provinces,¹²⁸ but no mention of them ever going any place together.

The Thiphakorawong Chronicles are quite noticeable in their lack of description of the two brothers acting on matters together. This is particularly striking

¹²¹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 41, lines 9-10.

¹²² The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 131, lines 21-22.

¹²³ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 132-134.

¹²⁴ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 136-137.

¹²⁵ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 197-198.

¹²⁶ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 228-230.

¹²⁷ Chadin (Kanjavanit) Flood, The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, B.E. 2394-2411 (A.D. 1851-1868), by *câwphrajaa thîphaakorawong*, Volume Three: Annotations and Commentary (Tokyo: Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1967) 195.

¹²⁸ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume One: Text 228.

when compared to the portrayal of the togetherness of Ekathotsarot and Naresuan, as well as Surasih and Rama I, in the other royal chronicles.

The final section in this narrative that would seem to indicate that the relationship between Pinklao and Rama IV was less of an ‘ideal’ brother relationship is when describing the death of Pinklao. There is no mention of Rama IV going to attend him during his illness, other than one small reference to visiting him when he was ailing.¹²⁹ Upon the death of Pinklao, Rama IV is described undertaking his required duty in going “up to the Second King’s Palace and performed the ceremony of pouring sacred water over his remains”¹³⁰ and then, with respect to Pinklao’s funeral, “the King commanded that ... funeral pavilion was to be very large ... and it was not to be lacking in anything but to be the same as that used for the cremation ceremony for a king ...”¹³¹ However, in the long description in the narrative of the many ceremonies and events surrounding the fifteen days of the funeral, the only reference to Rama IV’s participation is that “[Rama IV] himself came out to confer the fire that started the cremation.”¹³² What is interesting in this whole description is that there is no discussion or reference to Rama IV expressing grief at Pinklao’s death. This can be contrasted with the descriptions of the suffering of Ekathotsarot and Rama I when their brothers die.

Thus, the best one could say about the portrayal of the brotherly relationship between Rama IV and Pinklao in this chronicle is that it appears to try to portray any ‘ideal’ nature of the relationship in terms of omission rather than direct evidence. That is, there is no discussion of Pinklao not showing **loyalty** or cooperating, but little reference to participating in functions and ceremonies with his older brother; there is no indication of any **disobedience** or disagreement, but no mention of any consultations between the two on matters of state, foreign policy or other matters; there is no allusion to a lack of **respect**, but little mention of **deference** on the part of Pinklao.

¹²⁹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume Two: Text 356.

¹³⁰ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume Two: Text 354.

¹³¹ The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume Two: Text 369, lines 14-17.

¹³² The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume Two: Text 371, lines 17-18.

2. Communications of Rama IV

In connection with this analysis and review, two collections of letters and other communications of Rama IV were reviewed: The Writings of King Mongkut to Sir John Bowring¹³³ and A King of Siam Speaks.¹³⁴ These collections include personally correspondence and other writings of Rama IV, mainly to foreigners and mostly written in English. While not strictly historical narratives, these volumes provide insight into the thinking of Rama IV with respect to his younger brother.

a. The Writings of King Mongkut to Sir John Bowring

The Writings of King Mongkut to Sir John Bowring contains 23 letters written by Rama IV, some rather long and involved, along with two short letters written by Pinklao and a few miscellaneous other pieces. The two letters written by Pinklao are interesting only in that they seem to indicate that Pinklao did, in fact, have more involvement in government affairs than is portrayed in the Thiphakorawong Chronicles. Both are in reply to John Bowring, showing some personal involvement between the two, and speak of meeting with the various foreign diplomats and treaties and embassies.¹³⁵ However, the noteworthy aspect of the letters is that neither of them makes any reference by name or inference to Rama IV.

Of the 23 letters written by Rama IV, only five make any mention of Pinklao, with most of the references to minor matters such as to acknowledge the receipt of letters or gifts on his brother's behalf. Only one makes any inference that the two of them were working together on some matter when it states, "Myself [Rama IV] & the Second King [Pinklao] & [list of other named officials] ... are unanimously thanking Your Excellency mostly for good opinion in appointment given to Honourable R. Gingell Esquire to be consul here"¹³⁶

¹³³ The Writings of King Mongkut to Sir John Bowring (A.D. 1855-1868), eds. Winai Pongsripijan and Theera Nuchpiam (Bangkok: The Historical Commission of the Prime Minister's Secretariat, 1994).

¹³⁴ M.R. Seni Pramroj, and M.R. Kukrit Pramroj, A King of Siam Speaks (Bangkok: Siam Society, 1987).

¹³⁵ The Writings of King Mongkut 27, 64.

¹³⁶ The Writings of King Mongkut 59.

b. A King of Siam Speaks

The second work, A King of Siam Speaks, was compiled by, M.R. Seni and M.R. Kukrit Pramoj, brother descendants of the royal family and former prime ministers of Thailand. The volume contains 58 letters, proclamations, notifications and correspondence to various recipients, covering a variety of subject matter, along with commentary at the beginning of each division of correspondence. All of the entries were composed by Rama IV, both translated from Thai and written in English.

While a fair number of the entries in this volume make reference to Pinklao, 17 of 58, about half of those refer only to minor or official matters. However, there are a number of interesting writings regarding Pinklao and Rama IV contained in this work. Several of the entries indicate, as in the volume described above, that Pinklao was more involved in government affairs than portrayed in the Thiphakorawong Chronicles. For example:

Notification–Concerning Dika Petitions Submitted to His Majesty: ... should any of the cases come under the jurisdiction of the Second King, the same will be transferred to the Second King for judgment ...; ¹³⁷

To W.J. Butterworth, C.B., The Governor of Prince of Wales Island: ... The preparation of the ceremony in dignifying of my dearest full brother Prince ‘T.N. Chaufa Krom Khun Isresrunsun’ to be my second monarch or vice King ...; ¹³⁸

To C.B. Hiller, Esq., The British Consul in Siam: ... as the said par to the land belonged to His Excellency Phya Bhrabul Sombatta, who is noble Minister of His Majesty the Second King, and not of mine, so his land is in right to be dependant to the Second King. I have no right to compel the owner or possessor thereof to sell to you ...

...

¹³⁷ Seni Pramoj 63-64.

¹³⁸ Seni Pramoj 96-97.

And the Second King has signed the appointment of Siamese plenipotentiaries on the time of negotiation of the Treaty...he has received the Royal letter and presents...so I think it is right that he ought to assist Her Britannic Majesty's Government in any rates where the necessity occurred directly on his part ...

[A]s he also is the King of Siam and has right to hear from foreigners, and he is clever and has more facility of the English language, custom, usage &c. than myself.¹³⁹

These examples all show that Pinklao had a certain level of governmental responsibility, something that is not evident in the Thiphakorawong Chronicles. They also show that Rama IV had a level of **respect** for Pinklao and refused to overstep his bounds so as not to offend his younger brother. This, again, seems to show a role reversal, although, it should be noted, no corresponding communications written by Pinklao have been reviewed to see if he would have made similar statements.

The compilers of this work include some commentary on the domestic and private side of Rama IV. In this regard, they allude to some conflict between the two brothers and disappointment on the part of Rama IV in the relationship. However, as was done with respect to Surasih and Rama I, the compilers tend to downplay these matters and emphasize that Pinklao and Rama IV had a close relationship, with any dissension the result of harmless sibling rivalry:

The King had only one full younger brother, Prince Chow Fa Chudhamani [Pinklao], of whom he was indeed very fond and from whom he rather expected great things ... In [Rama IV] opinion, this younger brother never quite came up to his expectations ... The Second King was, however, a popular figure due to his dashing personality, which King Mongkut never ceased to make fun of. The younger brother, on the other hand, would retaliate by calling the King old-fashioned and senile ... Although there appeared to be constant rivalry between the two brothers,

¹³⁹ Seni Pramroj 123-124.

such rivalry was completely fraternal and friendly. The sarcastic remarks they made about each other were made out of true affection. The Second King died before his elder brother who was at this beside up to the last moment.¹⁴⁰

It is interesting that Pinklao is portrayed acting perhaps with less than ‘ideal’ younger brother characteristics toward his older brother than might be expected, not necessarily treating his older brother with full **respect** and **deference**.

The possible dissension and conflict between the two brothers is also brought up in a couple of letters written by Rama IV:

To Krom Mun Bavorn Vichaicharn [Nephew of Rama IV, eldest son of Pinklao, who was at that time absent from Bangkok, and whom the King suspected of running away from danger]: ... some men and women who were of no social standing and utterly ignorant of the affairs of government, had been extolling the superlative intelligence of His Majesty the Second King ... they believe that the Second King has been driven to despair by the stupidity of the First King ... you need not trouble the august ears of His Majesty with the contents of the latter part of this letter.¹⁴¹

To Phya Montri Suriwongse and Chao Mun Sarapethdhakdi [Ambassador and Vice-Ambassador to England]: ... A great number of Englishmen ... retain a fixed idea ... that the First King is a decrepit old man, so weak and thin and stupid as to be entirely incapable of conducting any official business. The only reason why he ever became King at all was that he happened to be elder brother to the Second King, who is actually at the head of affairs ... Whenever he is called upon to receive foreign guests, the Second King must always be behind his back, to tell him what to say to them. The Second King ... is so very learned and so full of

¹⁴⁰ Seni Pramoj 188-189.

¹⁴¹ Seni Pramoj 161-167.

culture as to become the central figure surrounded by worshipping pundits and the intelligentsia. ... He [Pinklao] cannot make even a chance visit to any provincial town without being offered the daughters of governors or officials ... As for me, I am always looked upon as an old man wherever I go. No one has ever presented me with his daughter, and I always have to return home empty-handed, on account of my being an ancient relic ... I have even gone to the expense of buying a riding cap, and have taken pains to go out riding wearing it, with the hope of creating an impression of youthfulness. I was a failure; people still maintain that I am old and still refuse to give me their daughters.¹⁴²

While many of the statements could perhaps be taken as ‘sarcastic remarks’ made out of ‘true affection’ by Rama IV, an underlying level of tension and discord appears evident. These letters also seem to indicate a level of rivalry that perhaps transcends merely being ‘fraternal and friendly’.

3. Modern Day Historical Narratives

Pinklao gets relatively spotty coverage in the modern day historical narratives. Manich Jumsai’s Popular History of Thailand devotes a relatively long section to describing the reign of Rama IV, more than 50 pages, but there is no mention of Pinklao. Abha Bhamorabutr makes one small reference to Pinklao, labeling him “Second King”, and makes the claim that he “became the most important adviser of the government during the reign of King Rama IV.”¹⁴³ Rong Syamananda gives him a bit more mention, calling him “King Pinklao”. Rong also makes a connection between that earlier ‘ideal’ younger brother, Ekathotsarot, and Pinklao, by stating that “Rama IV appointed him as the Maha Uparat with the exalted position of King Pinklao. Thus his reign resembled that of Naresuan the Great in that the First King was assisted by the Second King in ruling the country.”¹⁴⁴ Rong does try to portray

¹⁴² Seni Pramroj 211-214.

¹⁴³ Abha 90.

¹⁴⁴ Rong 119.

Pinklao as being more involved in state affairs by noting his private meetings with the foreign envoys, John Bowring and Townsend Harris, something not noted in the Thiphakorawong Chronicles. However, it is clear, again, that these meetings were held separately from his older brother: “He [Sir John Bowring] had an audience with King Mongkut on April 16, 1855, and then a private audience with the Second King, Pra Pinklao;”¹⁴⁵ and “After his [Townsend Harris] audience with King Mongkut, he was received by the second King Pinklao.”¹⁴⁶

Chula Chakrabongse’s Lords of Life, which is primarily focused on the kings of the Chakri dynasty, naturally devotes more attention to Pinklao. Chula Chakrabongse, similar to Rong, draws a parallel between Pinklao and Ekathotsarot, perhaps with an attempt to attribute some ‘brotherly idealness’ to the relationship between Pinklao and Rama IV:

Soon after the coronation it was the occasion for the King to appoint his deputy—the Uparaja, and his choice could hardly fall on anyone else but his full brother, Prince Chutamani. Instead of merely appointing him Deputy-King, Mongkut returned 250 or so years to the reign of King Naresuan and, like him, he appointed his brother Second King of almost equal status and gave him a coronation of nearly the same splendor, with the Second King then going to live at the Palace of the Front¹⁴⁷

Chula Chakrabongse then goes on to try to explain why Rama IV appointed him as Second King. In doing so, he alludes to some possible ulterior motive on the part of Rama IV and potential conflict between the two. However, Chula Chakrabongse gives strong emphasis to Rama IV’s ‘love’ for his younger brother, and, again, reaches back to Ekathotsarot and Naresuan:

There is a substantiated story that King Mongkut [Rama IV] wanted the council to offer the throne jointly to his brother and

¹⁴⁵ Rong 120.

¹⁴⁶ Rong 121.

¹⁴⁷ Chula Chakrabongse 184.

himself, hence he went on to make him an almost equal Second King, and that it was because Prince Chutamani's [Pinklao] horoscope was so strong that he was likely to be a king one day, which made Mongkut feel that, if he were King alone, he would not live very long. As he had been for 27 years a strict and progressive monk, the founder of the new Tammayut sect, it is difficult, even in the face of seemingly good evidence, to believe that he could have been influenced by such a superstitious idea. Might it not be more likely that he loved his brother as dearly as Naresuan had loved Ekatotsarot [*sic*], yet he felt in his brother a feeling of rivalry, and by making him the Second King he was able to demonstrate his great love and at the same time put an end to any ambition which the younger prince might have entertained.¹⁴⁸

Interestingly, Chula Chakrabongse also raises the issue of dissension between the two brothers, although, as he depicted these matters with Surasih, it is done in a somewhat apologetic manner:

It is thus sad to relate that the two brothers did not get on, and there were both suspicion and jealousy on the part of the younger. On many important family occasions, the Second King pleaded illness and would not attend, while the real reason was that he feared that he and his family would not be given high enough places¹⁴⁹

However, while Chula Chakrabongse alludes to some less than 'ideal' younger brother qualities in Pinklao, he continues to show Rama IV as the 'ideal' brother, almost, as noted previously, as if the roles had been reversed. He writes that Rama IV "showed many concessions and great restraint toward the Second King, he would never even depart from Bangkok on a journey without first writing to ask leave of his younger brother,"¹⁵⁰ and "[i]n his last illness King Mongkut [Rama IV] gave him the

¹⁴⁸ Chula Chakrabongse 184-185.

¹⁴⁹ Chula Chakrabongse 201.

¹⁵⁰ Chula Chakrabongse 200.

most devoted care until P'ra Pinklao died”¹⁵¹ Thus Rama IV, the older brother, is portrayed showing **loyalty, respect, obedience** and **deference** to his younger brother, perhaps behavior of an ‘ideally’ tolerant and loving older brother who has to deal with a difficult younger brother.

4. Rama IV as Younger Brother

Rama IV, as well as being an older brother to Pinklao, was also a younger brother to King Rama III. The impression that many Thai people will provide of the relationship between Rama IV and Rama III is that Rama IV willingly gave up his right to the throne when his father, King Rama II, died and dutifully allowed his older half-brother to become king in his place. This was despite the fact that Rama IV had a superior claim to the crown being the oldest son born of a royal queen, unlike Rama III who was born to one of Rama II's consorts. A review of the available Thai historical literature, however, provides only limited information on the relationship between these two brothers.

Although there is a chronicle written by Chaophraya Thiphakorawong covering the third reign of Rama III, it has not been translated to English and thus was not reviewed. All of the modern day Thai historical narratives give little space to the issue of the succession of Rama III over Rama IV to the throne, handling the matter with some degree of delicacy. One narrative notes that Rama IV, at the time of the death of Rama II, had just become a monk, so he “...decided to remain in priesthood so as to be out of his brother's way as long as his brother reigned,”¹⁵² thus, portraying a certain amount of **deference** to his older brother. The narratives also note that Rama IV was “very young,”¹⁵³ “only twenty years old,”¹⁵⁴ as another reason he was not chosen to be king. This is an interesting excuse, particularly considering that some years later, when King Rama V succeeded to the throne at fifteen years old, age did not appear to present an impediment to assuming the crown.

¹⁵¹ Chula Chakrabongse 201.

¹⁵² Manich 465.

¹⁵³ Chula Chakrabongse 144.

¹⁵⁴ Abha 158.

Of course this brief and delicate handling of the relationship between the two brothers in the narratives could be an effort to avoid speaking of un-brotherly behavior, behavior that is alluded to, however, in some of the writings by western historians. For example, David Wyatt notes that “Mongkut [Rama IV] was figuratively bundled off to a Buddhist monastery where his saffron robes might shield him from the winds of intrigue”¹⁵⁵ and Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit state “in 1824, the future King Mongkut [Rama IV] withdrew into a *wat*, perhaps to avoid a succession battle with his brother, King Nangklao, Rama III.”¹⁵⁶

In addition, Kittisak Kerdarunsuksri makes an interesting connection between some scenes in *Ramakien* recomposed by Rama IV and the succession issue:

One of King Mongkut’s [Rama IV] policies to promote the notion of a glorious country, was to revive the court performances ... In doing this, he deliberately selected certain episodes from the *Ramakien* for recomposition for the repertoires of his royal troupe ... He for example rewrote the episode of *Phra Ram Doen Dong* (Rama wandering in the forest). This episode noticeably echoed his own renunciation of his right to the throne and his retirement from worldly pleasure to enter an ecclesiastical life in order to make way for the crowning of his half brother, King Rama III.¹⁵⁷

The implications of choosing this scene as a subject, along with the image of Rama IV involved in ‘intrigue’ and avoiding ‘battle,’ raises questions as to ‘ideal’ younger brother behavior on his part. These issues are ignored or, at best, delicately handled in the Thai historical narratives. Thus, similar to the way in which the perhaps less than ‘ideal’ younger brother behavior of Pinklao was handled, that is, through omission, such may be the case with the portrayal of the relationship between Rama IV and his older brother, Rama III; it is what is *not* said that attempts to create

¹⁵⁵ David K. Wyatt, *Thailand, A Short History*, 2nd ed. (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2003) 151.

¹⁵⁶ Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit, *A History of Thailand* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2005) 37.

¹⁵⁷ Kittisak Kerdarunsuksri, *Ramakien in Modern Performance: The Reflection of an Identity Crisis* (Amsterdam: 7th International Conference of Thai Studies, 1999) 2.

the portrayal of Rama IV as an ‘ideal’ younger brother to Rama III in the Thai historical narratives.

5. Summary

The Thiphakorawong Chronicles, along with the modern day historical narratives, present quite a different portrait of the relationship between Pinklao and Rama IV than had previously been seen with respect to Ekathotsarot and Naresuan and Surasih and Rama I. In this case, the direct evidence showing Pinklao exhibiting those behavior traits of the ‘ideal’ younger brother is not readily apparent. Alternatively, evidence that he did *not* have those characteristics is also not presented.

This could be because the relationship was possibly less than ‘ideal’, as alluded to by Seni and Kukrit Pramoj and Chula Chakrabongse. The possibly troubled relationship could also be the underlying reason for the critical correspondence of Rama IV regarding his brother.

Flood makes note of the less than ‘ideal’ relationship in the annotations and commentary to the Thiphakorawong Chronicles. When describing the events that lead Rama IV to call for his brother to be offered the kingship along with himself, Flood explains, as Chula Chakrabongse noted, this was because of an astrological prediction that Pinklao would become king in his own right someday and Rama IV feared that unless he made Pinklao some sort of ‘king’ now, “...an unfortunate event would happen to make way for the inevitable rise of his brother to the kingship.”¹⁵⁸ David Wyatt attributes Pinklao’s rise to power as a “...stratagem intended to neutralize his powerful brother (and his small army)...,”¹⁵⁹ thus implying that it was a calculated move by Rama IV, not so much out of ‘love’, but perhaps fear of his brother.

Flood also relates a letter written by Rama V to his son which mentions “that during the reign of [Rama IV] relations between the King and the Second King were not always harmonious. He noted that the frictions came about because the King

¹⁵⁸ Flood, The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume Three: Annotations and Commentary 20.

¹⁵⁹ Wyatt Thailand, A Short History 167.

(Rama IV) had harbored a certain rancor because he felt the Second King was very popular. This ill feeling was augmented by the fact that the Second King generally did things in a too spectacular and ostentatious manner.”¹⁶⁰

Needless to say, allusion to these matters did not make it into the official state sponsored chronicles and, when raised in the other historical narratives, are couched in apologetic terms or explained away as mere brotherly competition.

D. Summary

1. ‘Ideal’ Younger Brothers

With respect to the portrayal of Ekathotsarot, Surasih, and, to a lesser extent, Pinklao, we can see the creation of a portrait and image of the ‘ideal’ younger brother in the Thai historical narratives, principally the Ayutthaya chronicles and the Thiphakorawong Chronicles. Prince Damrong’s chronicle-like work, along with many of the modern historical narratives, carries this image forward. They are cast as **loyal** companion, **obedient** servant, **respectful** attendant and **deferent** follower of their older brothers. These are the same behavior traits identified as defining the role of ‘ideal’ and seen in the younger brother characters in *Ramakien*.

The Ayutthaya chronicles, with the many recensions and additions made during the early Bangkok period, firmly establishes this portrait with respect to Ekathotsarot, in essence portraying him as the ‘ideal’ younger brother. The Thiphakorawong Chronicle of the First Reign then portrays Surasih in very much the same light as Ekathotsarot. Notwithstanding some allusions to less than ‘ideal’ behavior on Surasih’s part, the parallel is strong enough that Surasih is compared to Ekathotsarot and, thus, he can be attributed the air of the ‘ideal’ younger brother.

Pinklao receives much the same treatment in the Thiphakorawong Chronicles of the Fourth Reign and other historical narratives, although perhaps mainly by omission. Thus, notwithstanding some indication that Pinklao was less than ‘ideal’ as

¹⁶⁰ Flood, The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, Volume Three: Annotations and Commentary 44.

a younger brother, he is also compared with Ekathotsarot, and therefore, by association, can be ascribed as acting within the role of ‘ideal’ younger brother.

2. Parallels with *Ramakien*

As the discussion above notes, there are a number of parallels in the portrayal of the historical royal younger brothers and the depiction of younger brothers in *Ramakien* between the royal chronicles and historical narratives. These are summarized below:

1. The portrayal of the historical younger brothers in exhibiting the characteristics identified in *Ramakien* as defining the role of younger brother, specifically in showing **loyalty, obedience, respect** and **deference** for their older brothers;
2. The constant pairing of the two royal brothers, acting and performing as one, reminiscent of Phra Lak and Phra Ram’s relationship;
3. The younger recognizing the hierarchy in the relationship, even while maintaining a devoted companionship with his older brother, similar to the way Phra Lak and Phra Ram are portrayed in *Ramakien*.
4. The willingness of the younger to get in harm’s way to protect the elder, as Phra Lak would do for Phra Ram;
5. The fight scenes in which each brother engages the enemy in hierarchical order;
6. The older brother sending the younger to fight on his behalf, as Phra Ram often did with Phra Lak;
7. The description of a troubled, yet reconciled, relationship between the two brothers, similar to the relationship that Sukhrip and Phiphek had with their older brothers, who may fight, but ultimately reconcile; and
8. The death scene expressions of grief and sorrow.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

This thesis undertakes an analysis of one of the roles in *Ramakien*, that seminal piece of traditional Thai literature, and parallel portrayals in selected Thai historical narratives. The role selected, that of younger brother, while generally not thought of as a central one, provides rich and useful material with which to analyze and draw conclusions about *Ramakien* and the presentation of Thai history. From these findings we can make some observations about the concept of the ‘ideal’ in traditional and present day Thai society.

A. Findings and Conclusions

The first objective of this thesis was to study and compare younger brother characters in *Ramakien* to see if they are depicted having common behavior in relation to their older brothers. This was done with the idea that if there is similar behavior among a number of characters in the same role, then we can define the role using such behavior. Using that vantage point, we can create a profile of the ‘ideal’ younger brother as represented in *Ramakien*.

From the long and detailed analysis in Chapter V, we see that the three principal younger brother characters in *Ramakien*, Phra Lak, Sukhrip and Phiphek, all demonstrate similar behavior traits of **loyalty, obedience, respect** and **deference** toward their older brothers. Thus, we can conclude that a clearly distinguishable role of younger brother does exist in *Ramakien* and can be defined using the common profile of their behavior.

When coming to the question of defining an ‘ideal’ younger brother, the special familial nature of brother relationships needs to be considered. This feature affords the younger brother room to deviate from the common behavior identified above, but generally remain within the profile of the role. However, those younger brothers that do not deviate, particularly when presented the opportunity to stray, and consistently and uniformly demonstrate all of these elements in their relationship with their older brothers, can be considered ‘ideal’ younger brothers.

From the examination of the three younger brother characters, we see a consistent pattern of behavior, despite being presented with many situations where they could deviate, and, thus, all three can be classified as ‘ideal’ younger brothers. Accordingly, we can conclude that the portrait of an ‘ideal’ younger brother, as represented in *Ramakien*, is one of unwavering **loyalty**, unquestioned **obedience**, unshakable **respect** and unflinching **deference** toward their older brother.

The second objective of this thesis was to examine the portrayal of royal younger brothers in selected Thai historical narratives and draw parallels between this portrayal and the presentation of the role of the younger brother in *Ramakien*. From the study of Prince Ekathotsarot, younger brother of King Naresuan, Prince Surasih, younger brother of King Rama I, and King Pinklao, the younger brother of King Rama IV, we see the creation of a portrait and consistent maintenance of the image of the ‘ideal’ younger brother. While this is principally true in the royal chronicles, it is also seen in the later works of Prince Damrong and modern Thai historical narratives. With varying degrees of intensity, these three historical royal younger brothers are portrayed as consistent in their behavior as being a **loyal** companion, an **obedient** servant, a **respectful** attendant and a **deferential** follower of their older brother, the same behavior traits identified as defining the ‘ideal’ younger brother in *Ramakien*.

The portrait is firmly confirmed in the behavior of Ekathotsarot in the Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya. The picture of Surasih is much the same in the Thiphakorawong Chronicle of the First Reign. This, along with the attempt to downplay indications of dissent with his older brother and later day associations made between Surasih and Ekathotsarot, clearly paint Surasih as the ‘ideal’ younger brother. Pinklao, although receiving much less attention in the historical narratives, is also compared with Ekathotsarot. Taken together with an apparent masking of a perhaps less than ‘ideal’ relationship with his older brother, Pinklao is also attributed with the air of being the ‘ideal’ younger brother.

The parallel analysis of *Ramakien* and the Thai historical narratives indicates that the narratives have strong literature-like aspects. The presentation of historical figures is comparable to the depiction of fictional characters in which dialogue is attributed, emotions are displayed and dramatic action is detailed. Instead of merely

relating dates and events, with citations to kings, the narratives also include well-developed historical figure ‘characters’, the portrayal of whom has many parallels in *Ramakien*. This is particularly evident in the royal chronicles, but elements can be seen, as well, in the latter-day narratives as well. While making the historical narratives perhaps more interesting to read, it also has an impact on historical focus, a focus that clearly trends toward ‘idealization’ of the historical figures.

Given that the majority of the recensions of the Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya were made during the reign of King Rama I, an obvious correlation between *Ramakien* and these royal chronicles is that they were both compiled and composed during the reign of King Rama I. While the focus of the research of this study was not to analyze the influence one had over the other, the common portrayal of the ‘ideal’ central figures is readily apparent. This portrayal of ‘idealized’ figures is not limited to the earlier compositions, as it is carried forward in later historical narratives, first in the Thiphakorawong Chronicles, then in the subsequent Prince Damrong’s chronicle-like work and finally in modern day narratives. This would seem to reflect a common and continuing desire to present the ‘ideal’ as a concept to be emphasized and upheld.

In addition, the tendency to emphasize and uphold the ‘ideal’ is highlighted by the comparison made between *Ramakien* and Makhan Sen’s translation of Valmiki’s *Ramayana*. While the comparison of the role of younger brother between *Ramakien* and Valmiki’s *Ramayana* shows a basic overall similarity in role depiction, since the characters generally exhibit the same behavior traits, defined in terms of **loyalty**, **respect**, **obedience** and **deference**, the consistency of the behavior of the younger brother characters is different. This is particularly evident when comparing Vibhishana and Phipek, wherein Vibhishana, the only one who does not stay true to form in showing the ‘ideal’ traits of being a younger brother, actively fights against his older brother and shows no reconciliation at his death. In addition, while Lakshmana, as with Phra Lak, never loses his **respect**, and is always **obedient**, showing proper **respect** and **deference**, he is also shown as someone who thinks and acts with reason, rather than just proceeding with unquestioning obedience and deference, as most often seen with Phra Lak.

Therefore, we can see that the role of younger brother in *Ramakien* is presented as being more ‘idealized’, perhaps even ‘super-idealized’, as compared to this version of Valmiki’s *Ramayana*. All the younger brother characters in *Ramakien* are depicted as having the consistent behavior of an ‘ideal’ younger brother, while in this version of Valmiki’s *Ramayana* they deviate at times from such behavior. This ‘super-idealization’ is also seen in the pictorial depictions of *Ramakien* in the mural paintings along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha.

The research in this thesis leads one to conclude that the tendency to attribute fictional characters and royal figures with ‘ideal’ behavior may reflect a conventional Thai way of thinking; a way of thinking where the ‘ideal’ is a value to be upheld and maintained, but which does not necessarily correspond to reality and indicating an accepted divide between the ‘ideal’ and the ‘real’. Thai people want to believe in a concept of ‘ideal’ behavior and have shown a willingness to attribute such ‘idealized’ behavior whenever possible, be it literary characters or historical figures. In this light, the close parallel in behavior between the younger brother characters in *Ramakien* and the Thai historical narratives is not surprising. As well, the tendency to ‘super-idealize’ characters, as seen when making the comparison between *Ramayana* and *Ramakien* or when creating pictorial depictions, such as in the mural paintings at the Temple of the Emerald Buddha, is also not surprising.

B. Observations and Possible Further Research

There are several areas stemming from the examination of *Ramakien* and the Thai historical narratives that raise interesting questions. Set forth below are possible areas that might warrant additional contemplation and research.

One matter for possible interesting research regards the source and origin of the portrayal of the Ekathotsarot in the late Ayutthaya chronicles. As has been noted, much of the narrative about Ekathotsarot in these chronicles, including the discussion expanded discussion of Naresuan, was added in editions compiled in the early Bangkok period, the same period when *Ramakien* was compiled and composed. In this regard, the very brief discussion of Ekathotsarot’s relationship with Naresuan in Van Vliet’s narrative is noted, along with the lack of any reference to such relationship in the Luang Prasoet Chronicle, both written almost contemporaneous

with the times of Ekathotsarot and Naresuan. This leads one to wonder about the origin of the close participation of Ekathotsarot in Naresuan's military exploits, as well as Ekathotsarot's close relationship with his older brother. Most of the other narratives, including Van Vliet's, uniformly describe Ekathotsarot as a peace-loving king who immediately called off the wars initiated by Naresuan and never participated in any conquests during his own reign. This leaves the impression that Ekathotsarot had no real tolerance for war and, thus, the close participation with his older brother, as initially set forth in the late Ayutthaya chronicles compiled during the early Bangkok period and then carried forward in latter-day Thai historical narratives, appears curious.

Nidhi Eoseewong makes the argument that "King Naresuan may already have been a hero for the people of Ayutthaya, but the chronicles make him an even greater hero for the Bangkok period. He was the ideal king – clever, a brave warrior, and a patron of Buddhism."¹ If we extend this line of thinking to Ekathotsarot, there may have been a desire to enhance the role of Ekathotsarot as the ever faithful and loyal 'ideal' younger brother, much as the depiction of Phra Lak in *Ramakien*. This is the picture presented in all the editions of the Ayutthaya chronicles compiled during the early Bangkok period. Accordingly, one might explore the possibility that this was done to provide a backdrop to the relationship between Surasih and Rama I, as well as Pinklao and Rama IV. Ekathotsarot and Naresuan are fashioned into the 'ideal' Phra Lak-Phra Ram brother relationship, with Ekathotsarot playing the 'ideal' Phra Lak type younger brother. Surasih and Pinklao, in being compared to Ekathotsarot, could thus be characterized as 'ideal' younger brothers as well.

Further, as was previously noted, parallels are readily apparent in the 'idealizing' of the characterizations of the younger brothers in both *Ramakien* and the Ayutthaya chronicles compiled in the early Bangkok period. Accordingly, the influence one had upon the other might warrant additional contemplation and study.

Another area of study that the results of this thesis invite is to look at other Thai literature, both classical and modern, to see how the role of younger brother is

¹ Nidhi Eoseewong, "The History of Bangkok in the Chronicles of Ayutthaya," trans. Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit, *Pen & Sail, Literature and History in Early Bangkok*, eds. Chris Baker and Ben Anderson (Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2005) 313.

depicted and try to draw some parallels with the representation of the ‘ideal’ in *Ramakien*. This might show the consistency and development of these concepts, thus furthering the understanding of traditional and changing Thai ways of thinking.

In addition, an intriguing area of further study is a more comprehensive investigation of the origins of *Ramakien* itself. As seen in Chapter II, the roots and road traveled from *Ramayana* to *Ramakien* are blurred by many theories. Given the ‘super-idealization’ as seen in *Ramakien*, when and how this aspect was developed would be interesting to explore.

C. Final Remarks

It is said that one who studies these ancient texts is “...expected to possess or try to possess certain degree of Sadhana (devotional practice) together with Swadhyay (self study) in understanding proper perspective.”² During the course of this research and examination of *Ramakien*, I have certainly tried to possess a degree of *Sadhana* and *Swadhyay*. Whether I have obtained the ‘proper perspective’, time will only tell, as I feel this is just the beginning of my quest to reach into this classical literature, with a long road still to follow. That road has many forks and bends and goes down many paths; which one to take is, in itself, a matter of further contemplation.

However, for now I will close with the final words in *Ramakien*:

Finished, this story of Rama eliminating	That demon race
Which righteously His Majesty	Did compose
With tireless intention undertaken	As a celebration
And delight given completely	For joy and contemplation

จบ	เรื่องรามศมล้าง	อสูรพงศ์
บ	พิตรธรรมิกทรง	แต่งไว้
ริ	ร่ำพร่ำประสงค์	สมโภช พระนา
บุรณ์	บำเรอรมย์ให้	อ่านรื่องรามศม ³

จบบริบูรณ์

² Lallan Prasad Vyas, ed., *Ramayana Around the World* (Delhi: B.R. Publishing, 1997) vii.

³ *Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 4* [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธยอดฟ้าจุฬาโลกมหาราช, เล่ม ๔] (Bangkok: Fine Arts Dept, 2540 BE (1997 CE)) 583.

REFERENCES

- Abha Bhamorabutr. Thai History (English Version). Bangkok: Somsak Rangsiyopas, 1988.
- Akin Rabibhadana. The Organization of Thai Society in the Early Bangkok Period 1782-1873. Bangkok: Amarin, 1996.
- Amara Prasithratsint. "Hierarchy of Diverse Languages in Thailand." Bangkok: Paper for "Multilingualism In Thailand", Thai Studies Center, Chulalongkorn Univ., 2007.
- Baker, Chris and Pasuk Phongpaichit. A History of Thailand. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005
- Baker, Chris, Dhiravat na Pombejra, Alfons van der Kraan, David K. Wyatt. Van Vliet's Siam. Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2005.
- Bechstedt, Hans-Dieter. "Identity and Authority in Thailand." National Identity and Its Defenders. Ed. Craig J. Reynolds. Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2002. 238-261.
- Bofman, Theodora Helene. The Poetics of the Ramakian. Detroit: Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois Univ., 1984.
- Boonsanong Punyadyana. "Social Structure, Social System, and Two Levels of Analysis: A Thai View." Loosely Structured Social Systems: Thailand in Comparative Perspective. Ed. Hans-Dieter Evers. New Haven: Yale University, Southeast Asian Studies, 1969. 77-105.
- Bose, Mandakranta, ed. The Ramayana Revisited. New York: Oxford UP, 2004.
- Brummelhuis, Han ten. "Abundance and Avoidance: An Interpretation of Thai Individualism." Strategies and Structures in Thai Society. Eds. Han ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp. Amsterdam: Anthropological Sociological Centre, University of Amsterdam, 1984. 39-54.
- Buck, William. Ramayana. Berkeley: U of California P, 1976.
- Bunnag, Jane. Buddhist Monk, Buddhist Layman. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1973.
- Cadet, J. M. The Ramakien, The Thai Epic. Chiang Mai: Browne International, 1982.

Cadet, John. "Book Review – The Ramakien." The Journal of the Siam Society 58.2 (July 1970): 162-165.

Charnvit Kasetsiri. The Rise of Ayudhya. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford UP, 1976.

Chula Chakrabongse, Prince. Lords of Life, A History of the Kings of Thailand. Bangkok: DD Books, 1982.

Cooke, Joseph R. Pronominal Reference in Thai, Burmese, and Vietnamese. Berkeley: U of California P, 1968.

The Royal Chronicles of Ayutthaya. Trans. Richard D Cushman. Ed. David K. Wyatt. Bangkok: Siam Society, 2000.

Damrong Rajanubhab, Prince. The Chronicle of Our Wars with the Burmese. Trans. Phra Phraison Salarak Thein Subindu, alias U Aung Thein. Ed. Chris Baker. Bangkok: White Lotus, 2001.

Desai, Santosh N. Hinduism in Thai Life. Bombay: Popular Prakashan, 1980.

Dhani Nivat, Prince. "Book Review – Ramakien." The Journal of the Siam Society 60.1 (Jan. 1972): 389.

Dhani Nivat, Prince. "Hide Figures of the Rāmakien at the Ledermuseum in Offenbach, Germany." The Journal of the Siam Society 53.1 (Jan. 1965): 61-66.

Dhani Nivat, Prince. "Review of Books-*The Ramakien of King of Thonburi*." The Journal of the Siam Society 34.1 (Apr. 1943): 81-86.

Dhani Nivat, Prince. "Review of Books – The Ramakirti." The Journal of the Siam Society 33.2 (March 1941): 170-175.

Dhani Nivat, Prince. "The Reconstruction of Rama I." The Journal of the Siam Society 43.1 (Aug. 1955): 21-47.

Prince Dhani Nivat, "The Shadow-Play as a Possible Origin of the Masked-Play," The Journal of the Siam Society 37.1 (Oct. 1948): 26-32.

- Dhida Saraya. Tamnan & Tamnan History: A Study of Local History [ตำนานและตำนานประวัติศาสตร์กับการศึกษาประวัติศาสตร์ท้องถิ่น]. Bangkok: Office of the National Culture Commission, Ministry of Education, 1982.
- Dhiravat na Pombejra. Siamese Court Life in the Seventeenth Century as Depicted in European Sources. Bangkok: Department of History, Faculty of Arts, Chulalongkorn University, 2001.
- Dictionary of the Royal Institute, 1999 [พจนานุกรม ฉบับราชบัณฑิตยสถาน ๒๕๔๒]. Bangkok: Royal Institute, 2003.
- The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, Chaophraya Thiphakorawong Edition, Volume One: Text. Trans. and eds. Thadeus Flood and Chadin Flood. Tokyo: Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1978.
- The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, B.E. 2394-2411 (A.D. 1851-1868), by c̄awphrajaa th̄íphaakorawong, Volume One: Text. Trans. Chadin (Kanjavanit) Flood. Tokyo: Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1965.
- The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, B.E. 2394-2411 (A.D. 1851-1868), by c̄awphrajaa th̄íphaakorawong, Volume Two: Text. Trans. Chadin (Kanjavanit) Flood. Tokyo: Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1966.
- Embree, John F. "Thailand – A Loosely Structured Social System." American Anthropologist. 53, No 2 (Apr.-Jun. 1950): 181-193.
- Evers, Hans-Dieter, ed. Loosely Structured Social Systems: Thailand in Comparative Perspective. New Haven: Yale University, Southeast Asian Studies, 1969.
- Flood, Chadin. The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The First Reign, B.E. 2325-2352 (A.D. 1782-1809), Chaophraya Thiphakorawong Edition, Volume Two: Annotations and Commentary. Tokyo: The Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1990.

- Flood, Chadin (Kanjavanit). The Dynastic Chronicles, Bangkok Era, The Fourth Reign, B.E. 2394-2411 (A.D. 1851-1868), by câwphrajaa thîphaakorawong, Volume Three: Annotations and Commentary. Tokyo: The Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1967.
- Goldman, Robert P. "Resisting Rama: Dharmic Debates on Gender and Hierarchy and the Work of the *Valmiki Ramayana*." The Ramayana Revisited. Ed. Mandakranta Bose. New York: Oxford UP, 2004. 19-46.
- Hanks, Lucien M, Jr. and Herbert P. Phillips. "A Young Thai from the Countryside." Studying Personality Cross-Culturally. Ed. Bert Kaplan. New York: Row, Peterson, 1961. 637-656.
- Hanks, Lucien M. "The Thai Social Order as Entourage and Circle." Change and Persistence in Thai Society, Essays in Honor of Lauriston Sharp. Eds. G. William Skinner and A. Thomas Kirsch. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975. 197-218.
- Hodges, Ian. "Western Science in Siam: A Tale of Two Kings." Osiris, Beyond Joseph Needham: Science, Technology, and Medicine in East and Southeast Asia. 2nd Series, 13 (1998): 80-95.
- Inscription of King Ramkamhaeng the Great. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University, 1984.
- "International Ramayana Conference Comes To NY," Lokvani press release 20 April 2005. Lokvani. 27 Aug 2007. <www.lokvani.com/lokvani/article.php?article_id=2449>.
- Kam, Garrett. Ramayana in the Arts of Asia. Singapore: Select Books, 2000.
- Kemp, Jeremy H. "The Manipulation of Personal Relations: From Kinship to Patron-Client." Strategies and Structures in Thai Society. Eds. Han ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp. Amsterdam: Anthropological Sociological Centre, University of Amsterdam, 1984. 55-69.
- Keyes, Charles F. "The Case of the Purloined Lintel: The Politics of a Khmer Shrine as a Thai National Treasure." National Identity and Its Defenders. Ed. Craig J. Reynolds. Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2002. 212-237.

- Kittisak Kerdarunsuksri. Ramakien in Modern Performance: The Reflection of an Identity Crisis. Amsterdam: 7th International Conference of Thai Studies, 1999.
- Klausner, William J. Further Reflections on Thai Culture. Bangkok: Institute of Security and International Studies, Chulalongkorn University, 2006.
- Klausner, William J. Personal interview. 23 May 2007.
- Klausner, William J. Reflections on Thai Culture. Bangkok: Siam Society, 1993.
- Klausner, William J. Thai Culture in Transition. Bangkok: Siam Society, 2002.
- Klausner, William J. Transforming Thai Culture. Bangkok: Siam Society, 2004.
- Kowit Tangtrongchit [โกวิท ตั้งตรงจิตร]. Extolling the Story of Ramakien [อุยเฟื่อง เรื่องรามเกียรติ์]. Bangkok: Suwiryasanon [สุวีริยาสาสน์], 2547 BE (2004 CE).
- Maenduan Tipaya. Ramakien, The Thai Ramayana. Bangkok: Naga Books, 1993.
- Malini Phaloprakan, ed. [มาลินี ฝิโลประการ เรียบเรียง]. Ramakien [รามเกียรติ์]. Chiang Mai: Tanpanya [ธารปัญญา], 2546 BE (2003 CE).
- Manich Jumsai. Popular History of Thailand. Bangkok: Chalermnit, 1977.
- Manich Jumsai. Thai Ramayana, as Written by King Rama I. Bangkok: Chalermnit, 1977.
- Mehta, Julie B. "The Ramayana in the Arts of Thailand and Cambodia." The Ramayana Revisited. Ed. Mandakranta Bose. New York: Oxford UP, 2004. 323-334.
- Mulder, Niels. Everyday Life in Thailand. Bangkok: Duang Kamol, 1985.
- Nidhi Eosewong. "The History of Bangkok in the Chronicles of Ayutthaya." Trans. Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit. Pen & Sail, Literature and History in Early Bangkok. Eds. Chris Baker and Ben Anderson. Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2005. 289-341.
- Nitda Hongwiwat [นิดดา หงษ์วิวัฒน์]. Ramakien with Mural Paintings From the Galleries at the Temple of the Emerald Buddha [รามเกียรติ์ กับจิตรกรรมฝาผนังรอบพระระเบียงวัดพระศรีรัตนศาสดาราม]. Bangkok: Phuean Dek [เพื่อนเด็ก] 2547 BE (2004 CE).

- Nitda Hongwiwat [นิดดา หงษ์วิวัฒน์]. The Story of Ramakian, From the Mural Paintings along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha. Bangkok: Sangdad, 2545 BE (2002 CE).
- Olsson, Ray A., M.D. The Ramakien, A Prose Translation of the Thai Ramayana. Bangkok: Praepittaya, 1968.
- Peleggi, Maurizio. Thailand, the Worldly Kingdom. Singapore: Talisman, 2007.
- Pensak Chagsuchinda. NANG LOI: The Floating Maiden. Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series No. 18. Denmark: University of Copenhagen, East Asian Institute, Thai Section, 1973.
- Phlai Noi [พลายน้อย]. Ramakien, Combined Edition [รามเกียรติ์ ฉบับมหากษัตริย์]. Bangkok: Sataporn Books [สถาพรบุ๊คส์], 2549 BE (2006 CE).
- Potter, Sulamith Heins. Family Life in a Northern Thai Village. Berkeley: U of California P, 1977.
- Powell, Thomas H. and Peggy Ahrenhold Gallagher. Brothers & Sisters-A Special Part of Exceptional Families. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes, 1993.
- Premseri [เปรมเสรี]. Ramakien [รามเกียรติ์]. Bangkok: Ruamsan (1977) [รวมสาส์น (1977)], 2546 BE (2003 CE).
- Ramakian [Rāmāyana], Mural Paintings Along the Galleries of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha. Advisors Subhadradis Diskul, H.S.H. Prince and M.R. Saeng Suriya Ladavalayu. Bangkok: Government Lottery Committee. H.N. Group, 2004.
- Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 1 [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธยอดฟ้าจุฬาโลกมหาราช, เล่ม ๑]. Bangkok: Fine Arts Dept, 2540 BE (1997 CE).
- Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 2 [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธยอดฟ้าจุฬาโลกมหาราช, เล่ม ๒]. Bangkok: Fine Arts Dept, 2540 BE (1997 CE).

Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 3 [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธยอดฟ้าจุฬาโลกมหาราช, เล่ม ๓]. Bangkok: Fine Arts Dept, 2540 BE (1997 CE).

Ramakien by King Rama I, Volume 4 [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธยอดฟ้าจุฬาโลกมหาราช, เล่ม ๔]. Bangkok: Fine Arts Dept, 2540 BE (1997 CE).

Ramakien by King Rama II [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ พระราชนิพนธ์ใน พระบาทสมเด็จพระพุทธเลิศหล้านภาลัย]. Bangkok: Silpa Banakhan [ศิลปาบรรณาคารจัดพิมพ์], 2001.

Rao, Velcheru Narayana. "A Ramayana of Their Own: Women's Oral Tradition in Telugu." Many Ramyanas, The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia. Ed. Paula Richman. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991, 114-136.

Reynolds, Frank E. "Ramayana, Rama Jataka, and Ramakien: A Comparative Study of Hindu and Buddhist Traditions." Many Ramyanas, The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia. Ed. Paula Richman. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991. 50-63.

Richman, Paula, ed. Questioning Ramyanas. Berkeley: U of California P, 2001.

Richman, Paula, ed. Many Ramyanas, The Diversity of a Narrative Tradition in South Asia. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.

Rong Syamananda. A History of Thailand. Bangkok: Thai Watana Panich, 1986.

Ruenruethai Satchaphan [รินฤทัย สัจจพันธุ์]. Glossary of Names in Ramakien [นามานุกรม รามเกียรติ์]. Bangkok: Suwiriyan [สุวีริยาสาส์น], 2546 BE (2003 CE).

Sanders, Robert. Sibling Relationships, Theory and Issues for Practice. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Sen, Makhan Lal. The Ramayana of Valmiki. Calcutta: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1976.

Seni Pramoj, M.R. and M.R. Kukrit Pramoj. A King of Siam Speaks. Bangkok: Siam Society, 1987.

- Singaravelu, S. "A Comparative Study of the Sanskrit, Tamil, Thai and Malay Versions of the Story of Rama with Special Reference to the Process of Acculturation in the Southeast Asian Versions." The Journal of the Siam Society 56.2 (July 1968): 137-185.
- Singaravelu, S. "The Episode of Maiyarab in the Thai Ramakien and Its Possible Relationship to Tamil Folklore." The Journal of the Siam Society 74 (1986): 21-26.
- Singaravelu, S. "The Rāma Story in the Thai Cultural Tradition." The Journal of the Siam Society 70 (1982): 50-70.
- Siriwan Yimlamai [ศิริวรรณ ยิ้มละมัย]. Story of Thai Literature: Ramakien [เล่าเรื่องวรรณคดีไทย รามเกียรติ์]. Bangkok: Mac Books [แม็ค], 2006.
- Srisurang Poolthupya. Thai Customs and Social Values in the Ramakien. Bangkok: Thai Khadi Research Institute, 1981.
- Srisurang Poolthupya. The Indian Influence on Thai Culture in the Thai Ramayana. Bangkok: Thai Khadi Research Institute, 1979.
- Subhadradis Diskul, M.C. History of the Temple of the Emerald Buddha. Bangkok: Bureau of the Royal Household, 1982.
- Suchit Wongthet, ed. [สุจิตต์ วงษ์เทศ]. The Story Of Ramakien During The Time Of Ayutthaya [บทละครเรื่องรามเกียรติ์ สมัยกรุงศรีอยุธยา]. Bangkok: SAC Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Anthropology Center, 1997.
- Suriyavudh Sukhasvasti, Prof. Dr. M.R. [ศาสตราจารย์ ดร. ม.ร.ว. สุริยวุฒิ สุขสวัสดิ์]. Prasat Khao Phnom Rung [ปราสาทเขาพนมรุ้ง]. Bangkok: Ruanboon, 2006.
- Suriyavudh Sukhasvasti, Prof. Dr. M.R. [ศาสตราจารย์ ดร. ม.ร.ว. สุริยวุฒิ สุขสวัสดิ์]. Prasat Hin and Lintels [ปราสาทหินและทับหลัง]. Bangkok: Sata Print [สตาร์ปรีนท์], 1999.
- Swami Satyananda Puri. The Ramakirti: The Thai Version of the Ramayana. Bangkok: Thammasat University, 1998.

- Terwiel, Barend J. "Formal Structures and Informal Rules: An Historical Perspective on Hierarchy, Bondage and the Patron-Client Relationship." Strategies and Structures in Thai Society. Eds. Han ten Brummelhuis and Jeremy H. Kemp. Amsterdam: Anthropological Sociological Centre, University of Amsterdam, 1984. 19-38.
- Thianchai Iamwonmen. Thai-English Dictionary of 88,000 Words. Bangkok: Ruamsan (1977) [รวมสารานุกรม (1977)], 2547 BE (2004 CE).
- Velder, Christian. "Notes on the Saga of Rama in Thailand." The Journal of the Siam Society 56.1 (Jan. 1968): 33-46.
- Vella, Walter F. Chaiyo! King Vajiravudh and the Development of Thai Nationalism. Honolulu: UP of Hawaii, 1978.
- Van Vliet, Jeremias. The Short History of the Kings of Siam. Trans. Leonard Andaya . Ed. David K. Wyatt. Bangkok: Siam Society, 1975.
- Vyas, Lallan Prasad, ed. Ramayana Around the World. Delhi: B.R. Publishing, 1997.
- Wenk, Klaus. Phali Teaches the Young, A Literary and Sociological Analysis of the Thai Poem Phali son nong. Trans. Volkmar Zuhlsdorff. Southeast Asia Paper No. 18. Hawaii: Univ. of Hawaii, Southeast Asian Studies, Asian Studies Program, 1980.
- The Writings of King Mongkut to Sir John Bowring (A.D. 1855-1868). Eds. Winai Pongsripian and Theera Nuchpam. Bangkok: The Historical Commission of the Prime Minister's Secretariat, 1994.
- Wyatt, David K. "The 'Subtle Revolution' of King Rama I of Siam." Moral Order and the Question of Change: Essays on Southeast Asian Thought. New Haven: Southeast Asia Studies, Yale Univ., 1982. 9-52.
- Wyatt, David K. Thailand, A Short History, 2nd ed. Chiang Mai: Silkworm, 2003.

BIOGRAPHY

Name: Frederick B. Goss

Address: 270 Soi Suan Plu, 1, Thungmahamek, Sathorn,
Bangkok, 10120, Thailand

Nationality: USA

Birth date/Place: December 9, 1957/Connecticut, USA

Education: Chulalongkorn University, Masters of Arts – Thai
Studies, 2004-2007
The George Washington University, Masters of
Business Administration – Finance and Investments,
1980
The George Washington University, Bachelors of
Business Administration – Finance, 1979

Career: U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 1980-1996
(Financial Analyst, 1980-1985; Branch Manager, 1985-
1994, Assistant Regional Director, 1994-1996)
MuniFinancial, 1996-2001, Director – Municipal
Disclosure