The historical sources are nearly all agreed that King Mang Rai founded Chiang Rai in Culasakkaraja (C.S.) 624, a year Tao Set. It is therefore probable that Chiang Rai was founded sometime between 27 March 1262 A.D. and 28 March 1263 A.D.2

Most sources do not indicate the day and the month, but according to a work on the history of Phayaio (PAY.PP.29), the foundation day was a day 3, month 2, day 15 of the waxing moon, i.e. day of the full moon, C.S. 624. That corresponds to a Tuesday in about October - November 1292 or to a Tuesday two months later, viz. in about December 1262 - January 1263, depending on whether “month 2” here means the Län Nâ calendar or the Central Thai calendar.3

According to two chronicles of Phayao (PAY.WSS/ms and PAY.WSB/ms), Chiang Rai was founded at the hour Tût Kham, a day 6, day of the full moon, month 5, C.S. 624, which corresponds to a late Friday afternoon towards the end of January of the beginning of February 1263 A.D.

In 1986, the astrologer Arun Lamphen of the Astrological Society of Thailand calculated the date mentioned in the two chronicles in terms of the modern calendar. He concluded that the details of the date were consistent among themselves and that according to that date Chiang Rai was founded at the auspicious time of 17.48 h on Friday, 26 January 1263 A.D., Buddhaskarâja (B.S.) 1805.4

All our sources call the king who founded Chiang Rai, PhayaMang Rai พระมันะเรีย, and sometimes shorten this to Mang Rai, leaving out the word phrayâ.5

Phaya (in Län Nâ usually spelled /brayâ, braña พระยา/ pronounced phayâ) is a title of possibly Mon or Khmer origin meaning “king.”6 The same title was also borne by the kings of Sukhôthai. In later times, however, the title was devalued in Län Nâ as well as in Central Thailand and became a rank for government officials (phrayâ, phayâ พระยา).

Mang is a word which is attested in an area roughly between the following four points: Southwest Yünnan - Chiang Mai - Prome/Pagan - the northern Shan States. In Thai-speaking areas, the word appears as mang สัม in Pâli texts, mông मङ्ग, mìu mìu; in Chinese sources as meng, and in Burmese sources as min or meng (although spelled /man/). The oldest known mention of the word is under the form mang, attested by a contemporary source for around 860 A.D. in the southwest of Yünnan.6 Later sources mention the word for an even earlier time, presumably in the area Prome - Pagan - Tagaung.7 Through-out the time and throughout its area of distribution, mang has the meaning of “king” or of “kingdom.”8

We do not know for how long mang was used in the royal house of the Thai Yuan, to which Phaya Mang Rai belonged. But it seems that soon after 1300 A.D. mang fell into disuse and was replaced by phayâ after a period of transition during which both words were used. The Chronicle of Chiang Mai mentions only two mang: Mang Rai and Mang Khram, his son. Both are also called phayâ by the chronicle. But although mang is regularly used for Phaya Mang Rai and sometimes even exclusively (dropping the phayâ), his son is rarely called Mang Khram; usually he is called Phaya Khram. All later kings are called phayâ only.

The oldest known stone inscription to mention King Mang Rai by name is the inscription from Wat Phra Yün, Lamphûn, which dates from around 1371 A.D. Here the king is called Phaya Mang Rai Luang /braña marñi rây hîvâr pût. โมะ เวษะ วาทะ/ 9 Although the inscription was written 55 - 60 years after his death and therefore is not strictly a contemporary source, there still must have been a number of older people living who had known the king, so that his title/name should be correct. Also, later inscriptions call him Phaya Mang Rai,9 Mang Rai10 or Miuang Rai.11 Evidently the king was known as Phaya Mang Rai to his contemporaries.

The personal name of the king thus was Rai,12 and it would be correct to call him King Rai. But historians are used to calling him Phaya Mang Rai or King Mang Rai, although that is a pleonasm meaning King King Rai. Appellations such as "Pho Khun Mengrai" โพธิสมภู แง้วไกร etc. are new creations made up in modern times and are not found in any of the historical sources.

King Mang Rai was born in 1238 or 1239 and died in 1311 or 1317; he was therefore a young man of 23 - 24 years when he founded Chiang Rai.13 His mother was a princess of the royal house of Chiang Rung14 and therefore was a Thai Lî. His father was the king of Ngôn Yang พระยา, whom he succeeded at the age of 21, after his father had died.

We do not know where Ngôn was. General opinion appears to identify this country with the area around present Chiang Sân, or with the triangle Chiang Sân - Mâ Jan - Mâ Sài, because some sources of uncertain age and provenance vaguely speak of a place called Hiranya Nakthôn Ngôn Yang Chiang Sân (for instance PAY. PP), but definite proof is lacking. One could also consider other regions to the north or to the east, for instance the area of Chiang Tung, which city claims to have been
founded by Phaya Mang Rai or initially governed by persons whom he had appointed,15 or perhaps the area of Chiang Rung, the home of his mother.

Evidently Phaya Mang Rai was not a native of the region of Chiang Rung. Our sources indicate that he was a newcomer and depict him as a founder or conqueror and "uniter" of several minor Thai principalities in an area beyond his own inherited kingdom. While on one of these "excursions," he found by chance the site of the future Chiang Rung. His auspicious elephant which had broken loose and had wandered away. The king traced the animal to the peak of a little hill, Doi Jom Thong, situated on the bank of the river Ma Kok.

The sources say that when he reached the hill, he became convinced that the area would make an excellent site for the chief city of a new kingdom. According to the Chronicle of Chiang Mai, he considered the precedent that two of his ancestors had founded their chief cities and kingdoms at the foot of hills, and then decided: "I should make the hill the navel of the country (sadii miiang, "country navel"), namely the centre of the country (bui, "heart of the country"). Thereupon Phaya Mang Rai built a wiang around Doi Jom Thong so that the hill was in the middle of the wiang. He built it in the year Tao Set, C.S. 624. (The newly founded country; HP) was called Miang Chiang Rai.16 King Mang Rai then lived permanently there, making the city of Chiang Rung his capital.

According to Northern Thai usage, the word wiang, in its strict sense, means a rampart, wall, palisade or any kind of solid fence. By application, wiang means a fortified settlement of importance. If the monarch himself, or one of the higher-ranking royalties, lived in the wiang, the wiang was called a chiang. The country as a whole which was subject to a wiang or a chiang was called a miang, or mong. Thus, the new city founded by King Mang Rai received the name Chiang Rung, obviously named after its royal founder, and the country was called Miang Chiang Rung. Chiang Rung, therefore, means "(King) Rai's City." Similarly, when his grandson, Phaya San Phu, founded a new capital city in 1327, that city received the name Chiang San, "(King) San (Phu's) City."

A country (miang, mong) of the northern Thais and its capital city (wiang or chiang) can be compared to a city-state in the western sense, or to a not too extended principality, where the name of the country and the name of the chief city are identical, such as Athens or Sparta or present day Luxembourg. In former times, there were quite a number of such little Thai countries or city-states all over northern Thailand and beyond; in fact, Lan Na was a conglomerate of city-states, some of them quite independent at times, but usually accepting the authority of the powerful city-state Chiang Mai (founded by Phaya Mang Rai more than 30 years later, in 1296).17 A miang usually covered the area of a valley; its borders were the surrounding mountains. Beyond the mountain, in the next valley, would be another miang.

There is not much doubt as to the identity of the hill Doi Jom Thong which was the nucleus of the city-state Chiang Rung, because in the extreme western part of the present town of Chiang Rung there is a hill called Doi Thong or Dom Thong. Also, along the upper part of the western slope of that hill there are remains of an old earthen wall. An automobile parking lot was created in 1987 by removing part of it; the rest can still be seen. Although at present the Ma Kok river flows at a little distance from this hill, photographs taken from the air or even a glance down from the hill show that formerly the Ma Kok passed by the foot of the hill at its northwestern slope; obviously, in the past the hill was on the bank of the river, and later the river changed its bed a little to the north.18 Doi Jom Thong of our chronicles and present Doi Thong or Doi Jom Thong in the western part of the town of Chiang Rung should be one and the same hill.

I must admit that I do not clearly understand what the chronicle means when it says that King Mang Rai built his wiang around the hill and made the hill the navel or the middle of his new country, sadii miang. We know that, in the past, Thai groups lived on not too high hills bordering a plain with a good water supply, and that they built earthen walls on and around the slope of the hills. But the expression sadii miang, "country navel, city-state navel, city navel," has so far, it seems, only been found in connection with Chiang Rung. At least I do not know which other Northern Thai city-state had a sadii miang, a hill that was the spiritual middle or the navel of the country. Towns in Central Thailand have a lak miang, "city pillar," which is regarded as the spiritual centre of the town, and Chiang Mai has its Sao Intakhin, "Indra's Pillar," which is not (or no longer) regarded as the town’s centre, but the city-state of Chiang Rung obviously had something different, namely a hill, not just a pillar.

By the time of Phaya Mang Rai, the Thai groups between Chiang Rung and Chiang Mai presumably had had contact with Hinduism, Tantric Buddhism, Mahayana Buddhism and Hinayana Buddhism, in addition to whatever their own religion was. It is tempting to speculate that these Thai groups tried to amalgamate their customary way of living on a hill in or near a plain with the Indian concept of a central world-mountain, and thus arrived at their own concept of a country-navel or city-navel which was a hill situated within or very close to their capital town. That would make their king a "King of the Mountain" like the kings of Funan or the Sailendras who, incidentally, had the same dynastic title, viz. Mahârâja, as the much later kings of Lân Nâ.

It is perhaps not impossible that King Mang Rai also erected a pillar on top of Doi Jom Thong because according to an old northern custom, which was widely observed until about a century ago, a settlement of some importance had to have such a pillar, made from the trunk of a tree. The pillar was called jai bân or jai miang, "heart of the village" or "heart of of the country." It usually stood on a separate place within the settlement. The correct dimensions, as postulated by tradition, are: The height should be equal to the height of the prince ruling
at the time; the diameter should be 5 or 7 or 9 times his fist. However, there were certain variants. Sometimes the pillar was definitely taller than human size, and sometimes much smaller. Often there was not one pillar but a group of them. For instance, until the 1960's, Wiang Pao Pao had three pillars, perhaps 2.50 m tall above ground; at present, only one is left. Lampang still has its three pillars; the tallest is about 4 and the smallest about 2.50m high (fig.1). Thai Lü villages usually seem to have five rather short pillars; for instance, the jai bön of Bàn Tại Sop Wăn close to Nân (fig. 2). In modern times, most of the pillars and even the memory of them slowly disappear.

It is not known whether the custom of erecting such pillars was already practised in the time of Phayà Mang Rái or whether the custom was introduced in later times. Considering that these jai bön / jai miu áng seem to have been common to the whole of Lân Nâ and beyond, it appears possible that the concept of a village or country pillar is quite old and was part of Thai culture in the time of King Mang Rái. Also, further to the south, both in Mainland and Island Southeast Asia, pillars and hills were used to mark the spiritual center of kingdoms. King Mang Rái would neither have been alone nor the first monarch to use a combination of pillar(s) and hill to indicate the "heart" or the "navel" or the "axis" of his country.

However, our historical sources say nothing about a pillar on Dòi Jom Thong. And the archaeological evidence from the top of the hill, if there was any, was lost decades ago when the peak of the hill was chopped off by several meters and flattened to make a suitable surface for a telecommunication station. But in spite of its more profane use in the recent past, the upper part of Dòi Jom Thong has been a place of worship for as long as local memory reaches back. It is frequented by Buddhists (who have erected a stûpa and built a little monastery), by local Chinese (who have also built their shrine), and by those who wish to propitiate the ancestral and clan spirits Phi Môt and Phi Mêng, well known over all northern Thailand. It therefore seems not unreasonable to assume that King Mang Rái had already erected something to worship on top of the hill, which may have been one or several pillars.

It is perhaps also significant that the stûpa which was built in 1864 on Dòi Jom Thong was not built on the top of the hill, which would normally have been its place, but a little below. Possibly there was something on the peak which the people did not wish to disturb.

Thus, at the beginning of its history, Chiang Rái was a little fortified settlement or wiang on Dòi Jom Thong. The fortifications of a wiang at that time seem to have consisted of an earthen wall with the earth being dug up on the spot, so that while heaping up the earthen wall, a dry moat or trench was excavated at the same time. This earthen wall would run around the settlement, or at least include its most important part, the moat being on the outside. The earthen wall possibly had a wooden fence or palisade on its crest, and it would have had one or several entrances.
Since Đời Jóm Thòng is not very big, the available space probably soon became insufficient, especially after the entire court had moved in and the country's administration was conducted from there. It is therefore probable that from an early time on, the three or four little hills immediately beside Đời Jóm Thòng became part of the city together with some of the flat area at the foot of the hills, the whole complex forming several compartments which were protected from the outside and connected with Đời Jóm Thòng (and among each other) by earthen walls. Even today one sees short stretches of regular elevations along the slope of some of these hills. This concept of compartment town, sometimes extending over several hills, is well known from many other old Thai settlements in Lân Nâ; an example is Phráo (fig. 3). Apart from its rather special sadū mūang, Chiang Rāi should have been a typical Thai town of its time.

During the decades that followed its founding, Chiang Rāi expanded towards the east, but not very much. This can be deduced from the fact that Chiang Rāi's major monasteries (Wat Ngam Mūang, Wat Phra Kāo, Wat Phra Sing) are all in the western half of the present town, on or close to the hills beside Đời Jóm Thòng.

The town lost some of its status after King Mang Rāi founded Chiang Mai in 1296 and moved his court there, but it regained and perhaps even increased its importance in 1311 or 1317 after the death of the king, because his successors, now kings, of both the Yuan State (Chiang Rāi) and the Ping State (Chiang Mai), lived in Chiang Rāi. Another decline in prestige, although perhaps not in commercial or strategic importance, occurred in 1327, when King Sam Phū founded Chiang Sān on the Mā Không river and moved his court there. Chiang Rāi definitely became a provincial town, although one of importance, in 1339 or 1340 when King Phā Yū moved his court to Chiang Mai and he and his successors continued to live there.

It therefore seems that during the golden age of independent Lân Nâ, Chiang Rāi extended for less than 1 km, or less than a 10-minute walk, from Đời Jóm Thòng to the east. In other words, up to about 1560 (and perhaps much later), Old Chiang Rāi probably only covered about the western half of present Chiang Rāi. Correspondingly, there would have been a wall running north-south across what is now approximately the middle of Chiang Rāi town, but its remains, if there are any left, have not yet come to light.

During Lân Nâ's golden time, Chiang Rāi was governed by princes of the royal Chiang Mai line, descendants of King Mang Rāi. Some of them were quite independent. One of the most powerful men was Thāo Mahā Phrom พรมห์บรม. his younger brother of Phaya Kū Nā (r. 1355-1385) who began the
modernization of the Lân Nà sangha. Thảo Mahâ Phrom is reported to have obtained in Kamphêng Phet and brought to Chiang Râi the two famous Buddha images Phra Sing and Phra Kâo (the Emerald Buddha). Upon the death of Phâyâ Kû Nâ, he vainly tried to seize Chiang Mai. In return, his nephew, the son of Phâyâ Kû Nâ, now Phâyâ Sâm Mûâng Mâ, went up to Chiang Râi, captured him, and brought the Phra Sing to Chiang Mai, perhaps around 1385-1390. The Phra Kâo, however, well hidden under a layer of lime, was not recognized, and stayed on in Chiang Râi until the time of Phâyâ Tîlok (Tilok, Tilaka, r. 1441-1487) when the image was brought first to Lampang and then to Chiang Mai.

Another governor of royal blood was Thảo Mûi Tûmbî. In 1484 he made a Buddha image in the cave of the hill Đoi Thâm Phra nguyên (about 5 km upstream from Chiang Râi directly on the north bank of the Mâ Kôk), provided eight families of slaves for its service and a regular income for its upkeep. This image may or may not be the brick-and-stucco image that one sees in the cave at present. The inscribed stone slab which records the event is in the National Museum in Lamphün.

In 1558, with the capture of Chiang Mai, Lân Nà came under Burma's rule, which finally ended in 1804 when Chiang Sân, Burma's last stronghold, fell. During that time, Chiang Râi is hardly mentioned in the sources, which probably means that it was politically and militarily of little importance. The Burmese favoured Chiang Sân, at least militarily. In 1701-1705 (the sources are not agreed on the date), the king of Burma removed Chiang Sân from the administration of Chiang Mai and placed it with its dependencies as a new province directly under Angwa (Ava); Chiang Râi also was among these dependencies of Chiang Sân, at the latest since 1715-17. Maps of the 19th and of the early 20th century still show Chiang Sân as a more important place than Chiang Râi.

Chiang Râi twice tried to rise against the Burmese. The sources do not explain the circumstances for either attempt. In 1600, Chiang Râi revolted. A Burmese military force arrived and took the town. In 1614, the Burmese Pha Sutthô led a military expedition to Lân Nà. A result was that all members of Chiang Râi's ruling family were deported to Burma and were replaced by four local "country fathers," phô mûâng phûh拴. During their occupation of Lân Nà, because of increased uprisings and civil war the Burmese had to rely more and more on Burmese-appointed government officials and on locally stationed Burmese military garrisons, in addition to military expeditions sent over from Burma. Judging by their names, the Burmese military seem to have mostly been ethnic Burmese or Burmese Mon; perhaps some were Shan with a Burmese name. Few of the civilian officials, however, although Burma-appointed, seem to have been ethnic Burmese; mostly they appear to have been western Shan (Ngio), Khôn, perhaps Lû, and local Thai Yuan. The lower bureaucracy was made up of Yuan anyhow.

The more important Lân Nà city-states had, at least in theory, a tri-partite government. Nominally at the top was the Ruling Prince, called phâyâ or jao fâ, often, a local person. He either belonged to an old ruling family or was appointed by the Burmese. In fact, his authority was limited. Next came the Burmese Resident, called müowan, who held the real civilian power. The third was the military commander of the town, sîke (often called jakkâi etc. in Yuan texts). Many times, however, there seems to have been either only a müowan or only a sîke.

One of the Burma-appointed officials was Mang Phara Saphâk, Senior Ruling Prince of Chiang Râi and Senior Resident of Chiang Sân. His name is frequently mentioned in the years after 1700, and once additional sources have been studied, it might be possible and worthwhile to attempt the biography of this remarkable man. He seems to have been an able administrator, loyal to his (Burmese) king, considerate towards the people and the region that had been entrusted to him, pious, and not without a sense of fun.

Here are a few stations in his life, taken from chronicles:

* Between 1702 - 05, Sâm Luang Thông แสAFFDLz-KLLFALAL-AF404Thong was appointed Ruling Prince of Mûâng Mai (Mûâng Hai), also called Mûâng Rai Chà Meang Lô, Meang Vihar."

* Between 1704 - 1708 he was appointed Ruling Prince of Chiang Râi, where he constructed the Pepper Grove Mansion, Khum Pâ Phrîk ภูมิปราที.

* Between 1710 - 12 he did some construction work and made merit at Wat Phra Kham วัดพระคำ on the northern end of the island Don Thân at Chiang Sân (which island has now practically disappeared). On one of these occasions he arranged for a kind of verbal contest between girls paddling boats on the Mâ Không, which was a great event and much enjoyed by the people of the area."

* Between 1711 - 14 he was appointed Resident of Chiang Sân with the name Mang Phara Saphâk มุกข์อัษฎาภัก.

* In 1715 - 16, by order of the King of Angwa, the city-states Mûâng Kâi မြို့မောင်ကြီး, M. Rai မိုးရိုး, M. Len မြန်, M. Phâyâ မြို့ပျဉ်, M. Låo မလွန်, Chiang Râi แขงราย and M. Luang Phû Kâh မြောက်ခေါက် were placed under Chiang Sân, to be under the authority of the Myowan Mang Phara Saphâk, the Nâ Râi น้ำรั้ว and the Nâ Khân น้ำขัน.

* In 1719 - 20 he built an ubosot (ordination hall) in the pool or lake Nong Pathama Râk นองปัทมา Rak (not identified).

* In 1722 - 23 he put the umbrella on the stûpa Jom Si จอมศิริ (not identified) and again organized a verbal contest between female boat crews.

* In 1724 Jao Fâ Lak Thî ลำพักผู้, the Ruling Prince of Chiang Sân, died. The jao fâ was succeeded by his son, Jao Yot Ngiâm Mûâng เจ้าอยุท นางมุ่ง.

* Between 1725 - 27 he made more merit at Wat Jom Si, also called Wat Jom Si Song Mûâng วัดจอ姆ศิริ อดีตมุ่ง, and arranged another verbal contest between female crews, this time on the pool or lake Nong Pathama Râk.
In 1725 - 26 he diplomatically persuaded a number of towns not to revolt, and survived an assassination plot.\textsuperscript{40}

From Chiang Mai's revolt in 1727 - 28 on, his life story is not so clear.

When Chiang Mai military forces beleaguered Chiang Sän in 1728, the myowan, the sitke and all Burmese managed to escape.\textsuperscript{41}

Many towns sided with Mang Phara Saphâk, who in the end seems to have had the upper hand. A royal order was received from Angwa placing Phra, Nân, Lumphâng, Phayao, Salao, Thông, Chiang Rôn, Chiang Rom, M. Khôp, M. Sât, Chiang Không, Chiang Râi, "the whole of Lân Nâ," under the administration of the Myowan Mang Phara Saphâk.\textsuperscript{42}

In 1728 - 29, the Ruling Prince of Chiang Sän, Jao Fa Yot Ngam Müang, died, aged 25. He had ruled for four years.\textsuperscript{43}

However, in 1730 - 31 a certain Mong Yang Pâng Châ was appointed myowan of Chiang Sän,\textsuperscript{44} and in 1733 the Burmese general Bo Sakhang Kia was appointed myowan with the name of Kia Saphâk.\textsuperscript{45}

On the other hand, in 1735 - 36 the King of Burma sent Mang Phara Saphâk many valuable gifts, and also his wife received a complete gold betel set.\textsuperscript{46} And when in 1737 - 38 Miiang Fâng revolted, the Myowan Mang Phara Saphâk sent troops who took care of the matter.\textsuperscript{47}

Finally, according to one group of sources, the Myowan
Mang Phara Saphak died in 1740, having been Ruling Prince of Chiang Rai for 31 years, while according to another group of sources, it was the Myowan Kia Saphak who died in 1740.

Mang Phara Saphak also was the founder or co-founder of a number of bronzes, of which five have been identified so far. Two of them are Buddha images, two are images of the Buddha's disciples, and one is a pasada model. They are no great masterpieces; nonetheless they are valuable because of the rarity of bronzes (and other pieces of art and architecture) from the time of the Burmese occupation. All five bronzes have inscriptions written in Tham letters of the Lann Na variety and in the Yuan dialect. The inscriptions have been published but they have not yet been fully investigated.

One of the Buddha images (fig. 4), about 120 cm high and seated in the position māraνiṇa, is at present in Wat Phra Jao Lân Thong วัดพระเจ้าทอง in the town of Chiang Sän, where it is known under the name of “The Buddha with the 100,000 pins,” Phra Jao Sän Swīร์พระเจ้าสัน วี, meaning that it was cast in several parts which then were joined together with many little pins.

Summary of the inscription on this image: In 1726 A.D., Phaya Luang Jao Mang Phara Saphak พระยาหลวงมังพะราศภาก, who is ruler in Mong Chiang Rai พระยาหลวงมังช้างเราย and is myowan in Chaya Lakka Buri Mong Chiang Sän ม่วนช้างเราย ม่วนฉะเชิงเทรา, together with Busaba Siritha Wathana Thēpha Rācha Kanyā บุษบาสิริทเทพาราชากนงา, cast this Buddha image in pious memory of the deceased Jao Rācha But by name of Phra Yot Ngam Mong พระยาโยตคงม่ล, which was built on the place where he was cremated พระยาโยตคงม่ล ทำสร้างที่ที่ถูกเผา. The image has a weight of 350,000 bronze. They installed the image in this monastery, Arām Sī Sōng Mong อารามสิสองม้ง, which was built on the place where he was cremated พระยาโยตคงม่ล, as an object of reverence for men and gods until the end of the 5000 years.

The other Buddha image (fig. 5), 127 cm high, standing and holding an alms bowl, is in the Guimet Museum, Paris, which received it from the “mission de Barthélemy et de Neuville.” The Marquis de Barthélemy and Jean de Neuville travelled in Indochina and Thailand in 1894 - 95 and 1896 - 97, but de Barthélemy does not mention the image in his books.

Summary of the undated inscription: Mang Phara Saphak, who is ruler of Muang Chiang Rai and myowan of Muang Chiang Sän, and Busaba Siri Wathana Thēpha Rācha Kanyā, (and the) Phra Rācha But Yot Ngam Muang, cast this Pacceka-buddha.

The two images of the disciples, Sāriputta and Moggalāna (figs. 6 and 7), are 89 and 90 cm high respectively. The late abbot of Wat Phra Kāo วัดพระโค (in Chiang Rai) and head monk of the province of Chiang Rai, Phra Thuthiwong-wiwat พระทุธวิicont, brought the images before 1957 from the ruins of Wat Ngam Muang วัดยางม่วง, nearby, to Wat Phra Kāo, where they are now in the wihan to the left and right of the main Buddha image.
Summary of the very similar inscriptions on Sārīputta and Moggalāna: In 1727, Phaya Luang Jao Mang Phara Saphāk, who is ruler of Mông Chiang Rāi and is Myowān Luang of Mông Chiang Sān, together with Busābā Sīri Wathana Thephā Rācha Kanyā and her son, the Rācha But by name of Phra Yot Ngām Mông, cast this image of the disciple Moggalāna (Sārīputta); it has a weight of 75,000.\textsuperscript{53}

The model of the pāsāda, about 165 cm tall (fig. 8), is in the Bangkok National Museum. Summary of the inscription: In 1727, Phaya Luang Jao Mang Phara Saphāk พระยาหลวงเจ้าม้าสพอาทก, who is ruler of Mùāng Chiang Rāi นครสวรรค์เมืองเชียงราย and Myowān Luang of Mùāng Chiang Sān นครสวรรค์เมืองเชียงแสน, together with Busābā Sīri Wathana Thephā Rācha Kanyā บุษปราบสีรีวัฒนาเทพรัชกาญญ, and her son, the Rācha But เจ้าราชธัญ By name of Phra Yot Ngām Mùāng พระยาธัญ

เมือง, cast this pāsāda, which has a weight of 96,000, in order to serve as a receptacle of Buddha image(s) and relic(s).\textsuperscript{54}

From the same period of time and likewise from Chiang Sān, there is also the model of a wihān (vihāra)\textsuperscript{55} which can be opened so that the interior becomes visible. The model, 102 cm high (fig. 9), is in the Ayutthaya National Museum.

Summary of the inscriptions on the wihān model: In 1726, Mùīn Sāra Phīrom หมื่นสารภิรมย์ and his wife, who live in front of Wat Khāo Pān วัดหลวงปู่ภูมิ, presided over the foundation of this Lohajetavanavihāra. The Lohavihāra weighs 120,000 of bronze.\textsuperscript{56}

The monastery, now called Wat Phā Khāo Pān วัดพระหลวงปู่, is located in the town of Chiang Sān close to the bank of the
river. Miu Sara Phiom's house would have been either directly on the bank of the river or only a very short distance from it, between the river and the monastery.

After the war of liberation from Burma came to an end with the recapture of Chiang Sân in 1804, the entire region was exhausted and towns and villages were depopulated. Chiang Rai was an empty town for a number of years. It was also utterly devastated and therefore was refounded in 1844.57

During the first years after 1844, the reestablished city was protected by a stockade or palisade.58 In 1858, the first part of the new city wall was built, a stretch of about 600 meters from the Nang Ing Gate in the north to the east.59 During the following years, more sections of the wall were added clockwise around the town. The final stretch of wall, from the Si Gate to the Chiang Mai Gate and beyond, reaching the hills in the northwest, was built in 1874.60 It is not known whether these palisades and walls were built on some earlier fortifications of the city or not. The new city measured about 1.7 km from west (Doi Jom Thong) to east and about 650 meters from north to south.61 The gates mentioned during these years are: Pratü ("gate") Nang Ing, Thâ Nâk, Si (locally pronounced saï) Jao Shâi, and Chiang Mai.62

The French physician Dr. P. Neis, who was in Chiang Rai from 20 to 23 February 1884, either made a photograph or drew a sketch of the city wall together with an unspecified gate. From that original, Eugène Burnand made a clean copy in the form of a drawing, under the supervision of Neis. From Burnand's drawing the engraver Hildibrand (?) may have made the litho-
graph which was printed in Neis’ article of 1885.\textsuperscript{63} That is the only known picture of Chiang Rai’s former city wall (fig. 10).

Neis observed that on the latest maps then available (1884), the town was still called “ruins of Chiang Rai.” Therefore, upon arrival at Chiang Rai (by boat from Luang Phra Bang), he was surprised to see that in fact in place was a fortified city. According to him, the fortifications were somewhat dilapidated at certain spots though nonetheless impressive, and had a circumference of more than eight kilometers. But once inside the city, he found that most of the space was taken up by ruined monasteries and big gardens. The market was quite well stocked with merchandise and was visited every morning by 300-500 muddy and generally filthy and therefore a permanent source of all kinds of illnesses, and that the wall also obstructed the flow of fresh air.

That piece of information may not be altogether incorrect. Dr. Briggs worked in Chiang Rai from about 1903 to 1918; in 1910 he founded the Overbrook Hospital.\textsuperscript{71} Chiang Rai was surrounded by swamps and former riverbeds of the meandering Ma Kok, and the inner part of the town contained stagnant water. The latter problem may have been man-made, self-induced by the construction of city walls (loss of natural drainage), and by the uninterrupted feeding of fresh water into the town as reported by Hallett (Chiang Mai had a similar problem: its southeast corner was a swamp with an overflow or spillway into the moat).

A drainage channel about 1.5 km long had already been excavated in the city in 1865, from the pond Nong Si Jang (not identified, but probably in the east) to the Chiang Mai Gate in the west.\textsuperscript{72} More drains or moats were dug in 1899, inside and outside the city.\textsuperscript{73} The newspaper \textit{The Lao News} reported in 1905: “Dr. Briggs of Chiang Rai has, at the request of the government, overseen the laying out of Chiang Rai into streets and the draining of a large part of the city which heretofore has been a malaria swamp and tiger jungle.”\textsuperscript{74} Hosseus,\textsuperscript{75} who was in Chiang Rai in 1905, writes of swampy, low-lying areas housing a multitude of snakes, and mentions frequent cases of mysterious cholera and typhoid illnesses. Le May,\textsuperscript{76} who visited Chiang Rai in 1914, seems to have found the city wall in a state of neglect and decay: “The city wall is built of mud, and one only catches a glimpse of it here and there . . . .”

All this shows that Dr. Briggs may indeed have regarded the city wall as a public health hazard which gave cause for concern. And many people would have wished to obtain free bricks from the city wall.

During the period of reconstruction of the city after 1844, the city received a new city navel, \textit{sadu miang} in order to prevent the city wall from becoming a malaria swamp and tiger jungle. Some people in Chiang Rai still remember that it was not very solid and that the debris were later removed to make room for the construction of a school building in the monastery compound.\textsuperscript{77}

A Buddha image and a stūpa were built on Đô Jôm Thong in 1864. The stūpa collapsed in the same year and was rebuilt in 1865. It was forcibly opened (and presumably robbed) in 1899, but the perpetrator was caught and handed over to the authorities.\textsuperscript{78}

Between 1985 - 1988, partly with local funds and partly with funds from the Federal Republic of Germany, plans for the revival of some items of Chiang Rai’s past were made and carried out. Thus, twelve commemorative signs at the sites of the former city gates were erected, a stretch of the old city wall was rebuilt, and a city navel pillar \textit{đô miang}, was erected on Đô Jôm Thong.\textsuperscript{79}
The Reconstructed City Wall

Initially, it had been hoped that a complete city gate together with a part of the city wall could be rebuilt. But neither detailed technical descriptions nor photographs or drawings could be found other than Neis's picture, printed in 1885, which only shows part of the wall with what must have been a minor city entrance, not a "real" gate. As for the construction site, after a thorough discussion which took into account such items as traffic flow, space available, water mains, power lines, sewers and drainage, and the municipality's overall plan for the future development of the city, the site of the former Yang Song Gate in the east was selected where there still was a section of the former city moat, incorporated in a little public park.

Two short stretches of wall, the northern and southern wings of the former Yang Song Gate, then were rebuilt but not the gate itself. The gate was omitted because no reliable data were available. But in order to indicate that formerly there had been a gate here, each of the stretches of wall received a passageway for pedestrians modelled on the minor gate in Neis's picture. These passageways, therefore, serve a modern function and as a reminder or souvenir; they are not reconstructions of passageways or secondary gates to the left and right of the original Yang Song Gate.

The wall as it has been rebuilt can be called an authentic reconstruction based on historical evidence, as far as its location, its dimensions and its general appearance are concerned. The dimensions were calculated from Neis's picture, assuming that the elephant in the gate was 2.50 m high, which is perhaps slightly above average. The reconstructed wall, therefore, should look reasonably like Chiang Rai's city wall around 1880 (fig. 11).85

The construction materials and construction technique used, however, are modern. The former wall almost certainly was solid and consisted of an earthen core with a mantle of bricks. The new wall is hollow. It rests on foundations in the ground and consists of a skeleton of reinforced concrete pillars and beams which are covered with two layers of bricks. The bricks were specially made of a size used in the past, 28 x 14 x 8 cm, which was the size of some old bricks that were found in the neighbourhood of the gate.

The northern stretch of wall is 26.30 m long and the southern stretch measures 43.70 m. The wall is 5.00 m high,
including the crenelations on top, and 2.50 m thick. The crenelations alone are 80 cm high. The two passageways are 3.45 m high and 1.70 m wide. The budget for the construction was ฿974,265. The new wall was ceremoniously inaugurated on 26 January 1988. A sign in three languages (modern Thai, classical Thai Yuan with Tham letters, and English) is attached to the southern stretch of wall and informs visitors.

The City Navel Pillar

The original idea had been to build a city navel พระจุลนิมิต by erecting a pillar somewhere in suitably arranged surroundings so that people could come and pay their respects to it and certain ceremonies could be held. But after study of numerous sources on the history of Chiang Rāi, it was found that that would not do because Chiang Rāi already had a city navel, viz. the entire hill Đoi Jom Thống, which, however, by its sheer size, was unsuitable for the envisaged purpose. The idea of a pillar as a centre for worship and ceremonies was, however, not abandoned but tied to the old city navel, the hill, because there was the possibility that in the past there had been a pillar on the hill. It was therefore decided to set up a pillar at or on the hill as a symbolic centre of the city navel and to call this pillar the City Navel Pillar พระจุลนิมิต.

It was agreed that the best place would be the top of the hill. However, the hilltop had been flattened and was being used as a telephone relay station complete with power house, living quarters for personnel and a huge antenna mast. The Telephone Organization of Thailand was approached as to whether they could remove the equipment since it was known that they had plans to relocate this relay station. TOT very obligingly advanced their date for relocation of the relay station and soon dismantled the equipment.

Nài Phithayā Bunnāk พระพิทักษ์ บุณฑค, special lecturer for the history of Thai architecture at the Faculty of Fine Arts, Chiang Mai University, designed the city navel pillar and planned the arrangement of its immediate environment on top of Đoi Jom Thống. His ideas were based on similar constructions of the past and therefore are filled with historical and religious meaning.

The ground plan of the site of the city navel pillar faces east, with the pillar standing on a raised platform slightly off-centre to the west (figs. 12, 13). The whole arrangement is a stylized model or an abstraction (mandala) of the universe (cakkavāla) according to traditional concepts in South and Southeast Asia, modelled upon such architectural microcosms as Phnom Bakheng (Angkor) and Borobudur (Java), both dating from around 900 A.D., and supplemented by items from the Thai cosmology Traibhumikathā (1345?) and local tradition.81

When studying these old world models or models of the universe, one has to keep a few things in mind to avoid misunderstandings.
The ancient texts which explain the universe neither appear fully logical to the modern mind nor are their contents completely identical. Depending on their age, on the religious school and the geographical regions in which they were written, individual texts may accentuate one item and treat lightly or omit another. This obviously is the result of local evolution of thought through the ages, coupled with a desire to incorporate old local customs or local preferences into a world-geography the essence of which seems to have originated in India in the remote past and then been exported to regions outside India in several stages.

These cosmologies invariably are complex and are difficult to visualize because they aim at being all-comprising and perfect. They try to include the physical, geographical world as it appeared to the author; the supernatural world of the gods and the heavens; Nibbāna; and even the "history" of the universe, its periodic coming into being and its decay. If it was already difficult to explain such complex things in a written treatise, one can imagine the difficulties an artist had to face who wanted to sketch this picture of the universe in two dimensions in a painting (figs. 14, 15) or the difficulties a builder had to face who wished to erect a good-sized model of the universe, big enough for people to walk around in. Both the painter and the builder by necessity had to abstract and to stylize the ideas put forward in the texts.

Such a representation of the universe, whether painted or built up as an architectural structure, was not used in the modern utilitarian sense like a map or a scale model, made for quick and practical information. It was an object for meditation, the mind leisurely contemplating the various items, supplying connections left out by the artist or the builder. Thus, world-pictures or world-models did not have to be exact or to be to scale. It was enough if the contemplating person knew what was meant. The rest was supplied by his own imagination and by his schooling.

It resulted that basically all old architectural models of the universe were similar, but that details were open to different interpretation, depending on the school of thought which prevailed at that locality at that time, the ability of the builder to transpose those ideas into a three-dimensional mode, and on the school of thought in which the person contemplating the model had been brought up.

The modern reconstruction in Chiang Rai of such a traditional model of the universe incorporating the city navel pillar thus cannot completely satisfy one particular religious sect nor even one particular religion, but like its predecessors about 1000 years ago, it covers parts of ancient Hindu, Buddhist and local belief.

The surrounding moat represents the vast ocean which is situated between the limiting wall or the outer mountain range of the universe (cakkavālaśila, cakkavālapabbata) and the inner part of the universe.

The terrace of brown laterite blocks together with the lower six-step elevation represent the world of pleasures or the
The terrace of laterite blocks represents the earth inhabited by humans (manussabhūmi), while the six-step elevation represents the six heavens which make up the lowest class of heavens: Cātummahārajika, Tāvatimsa, Yama, Tusita, Nimmānarati and Paranīmita-vasavatti.

The upper three-step elevation represents the triad rūpabrahmaloka, arūpabrahmaloka, and Nirodha or Nibbāna. Rūpabrahmaloka, or rūpabhūmi, is the second highest class of heavens of which there are 16 and which belong to the world of appearance. Arūpabrahmaloka or arūpabhūmi is the third highest class of heavens of which there are four and which belong to the incorporeal world.

The focal point of the site is the city navel pillar (fig. 16) which represents Mount Sineru, the axis of the universe. It rises from a triangular pedestal that represents the three mountains, Trikātāpabbata, on which Mount Sineru is resting. The pillar is also equated with the jai bān or jai miang pillar, the "village (or: country) heart pillar" mentioned above. Following the traditional formula, it has the height of the monarch at the time of its erection, and a diameter five times his fist. His Majesty the King graciously had the data made known to the construction committee and permitted it to use them for the Chiang Rāi city navel pillar. His Majesty anointed the pillar in Chitrāda Palace on 27 January 1988.

The city navel pillar is surrounded by 108 satellite pillars. Four of them stand close to the city navel pillar at the four corners of the upper platform and are taller than the others. These 108 satellite pillars represent major features of the universe as illustrated in detail; for instance, on the "map of the cosmos" on the wall behind the Emerald Buddha in Wat Phra Kāo, Bangkok (fig. 15), or on the Buddhapāda from Wat Phra Sing, Chiang Mai (now in the Chiang Mai Museum, fig. 17; around 1500 A.D.). These important features or items of the cosmos are also known as the 108 auspicious signs, mangalalakākhaṇa. On Buddha footprints they are usually found in stylized form and in rigid geometrical alignment, not in the form of the map.

Also surrounding the city navel pillar, on five of the lower steps, are five channels collecting the rainwater which represent the five great rivers (pañcanadi) that water the earth on which we are living, the continent Jambudīpa: Gāṅga, Yamunā, Aciravati, Sarabhi, and Mahi. Like their originals, the channels drain towards the south.

The city navel pillar can be sprinkled with water by those who wish to pay their respects to it. The water is thought to become consecrated through contact with the pillar and to bring good fortune. The custom is to moisten one's head with a few drops.

Corresponding to the royal measurements, the city navel pillar is 1.72 cm high (measured from the top to where it enters the pedestal) and has a diameter of 39.8 cm. The outer terrace measures 35 x 35 m. Each step is 20 cm high. The platform on which the pedestal with the pillar is standing is 1.80 m above the level of the outer terrace. The pedestal of the pillar is 80 cm high.

Fig. 16 The City Navel Pillar รัศมีศิวะ. Photograph: Hans Penth 1986. 88/3/12
All pillars are sculpted from Phayao granite. The sculptor was Nai Singkham Somkhriya นิ้วซึ้งคำ สมศรีญา of Phayao. The shape and sculpted ornaments of the pillars are copied from Lao Nai sarna stones of the 16th century, examples of which can be seen, for instance, in the Lamphun Museum. At the northeast and southeast corners of the surrounding moat are explanatory signs with inscriptions in three languages: Modern Thai, classical Thai Yuan in Tham letters, and English. The budget for the construction of the city navel pillar and the surrounding "world-model" was ฿1,174,500. The city navel pillar was ceremoniously lowered into its pedestal on 31 January 1988 (and not on 26 January, as the inscription on the sign says).

Fig. 17 "Map of the cosmos" on the Buddhiphaka of Wat Pira Sing, Chiang Mai. In the Chiang Mai National Museum. Photograph: Hans Peri 1973. 73/9/9
ENDNOTES

1. CMA.B.1.37; CMA.T.10; CMA.N.23; JKM.C.87; JKM.J.111; etc. A source that disagrees is CSA.W. 255 which has King Mang Rāi move into or found the town on day 4 (Wednesday), day 7 of the waxing moon, month 5, C.S. 610, a year Kun, viz. around January - February 1249. It is immediately apparent that there must be a mistake because C.S. 610 was a year Wok, not a year Kun. No known inscription mentions the date of the founding of Chiang Rāi.

2. U Ka’s table, reproduced in Luce 1969 - 70 Old Burma (2) p. 336 and supplement. The same date results from Prasôt’s formula of calculating the beginning of the CulasakkarāJA year in terms of the Julian calendar. (The Julian calendar was used until and including 1581 A.D. From 1582 on, the Gregorian or modern calendar was officially in use, which needs a different formula).

The formula is:

1. (A.D. x 2.07 + 063.07) + 8 = A (disregard fractions).
2. (A.D. - 1) + 4 = B (disregard fractions).
3. A - B = number of days from 1 January to the beginning of the C.S. in that particular A.D. year (Prasôt 1971 Wan Sāng Krun Si Ayuthayā). The formula is:

Example for C.S. 624:

C.S. 624 = 638 - 1262 A.D.
1. (1262 x 2.07 + 603.07) + 8 = 401.
2. (1262 - 1) + 4 = 315.
3. 401 - 315 = 86.

C.S. 624 began on day 86 after the beginning of 1262 A.D., counting 1 January as day 1, viz. on 27 March 1262 (86 minus 31 days for January minus 28 days for February = 27 days in March).

3. The Lân Nā calendar counts the months ahead of the Central Thai calendar by 2 numbers. For instance, month 4 in Lân Nā is called month 2 in Central Thailand although both mean the same period of time, viz. the month Phussa.

It is quite possible that the original manuscript read “day 6, month 5” (and not: day 3, month 2), because a 6 can easily be mistaken for a 3, and a 5 for a 2. If so, this work would be in agreement with the two Phayao chronicles mentioned in the following.


If the chronicles and the astrologer’s calculations are not mistaken, Chiang Rāi was 725 years old on 26 January 1988, B.S. 2531, the day of the inauguration of the newly rebuilt stretch of city wall. The city had officially celebrated its 725th anniversary one year before, on 26 January 1987, B.S. 2530, because of an erroneous calculation: B.S. 1805 (year of foundation + 725 = B.S. 2530). However, due to the calendar adjustment of 1940 (which was made to have the B.S. begin on 1 January instead of 1 April), the B.S. 2483 began on 1 April 1940 (as in previous years) and ended after only 9 months on 31 December 1940. On 1 January 1941 began B.S. 2484 which ended on 31 December 1940. There were no January, February and March B.S. 2483. Upon Jan/Feb/Mar B.S. 2482 followed one year later Jan/Feb/Mar 2484. January, February and March of the modern B.S. therefore are in advance by 1 year over the old B.S. Thus, when at present calculating the age of an object made (or the age of a person born) during Jan/Feb/Mar in or before B.S. 2482, one has to subtract one year; but for calculations in terms of the A.D. year, no change is necessary.

Example:


5. Shorto 1971 Dict. Mon Inscriptions 258 s.v. barāh. According to Shorto, the earliest attested use of the title phayti in Burma is in 1445 in a Mon inscription. In Lân Nā, the title is attested for the first time in the Wat Phra Yīn inscription (Lamphūn) which dates from c. 1371 (published i.a. by Griswold / Prasôt 1974 Inscr. Wat Phra Yīn).


7. Phayre 1883 History of Burma 276 - 279.


10. Inscription from the Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān, Phayao, 1411 A.D.
I was wrong to assume that mang was part of the personal name of the king (Penth 1983 Prawat Lân Nâ 57 - 61).


12. See the attempts in the Chronicle of Chiang Mai to explain the king's name, Mang Râi; for instance CMA.N.21; CMA.B.37 - 38; CMA.T.9; CMA.HP.1.11V; see also: Prachâkit 1907 Phongs. Yônok 132.

13. CMA.N.20,74; CMA.T.8; JKM.C/F.87,91; Thewalôk 1963 Jômâîhet hôn 86.

14. Capital of the Sip Song Pan Nâ, Yûnnan, on the west bank of the Mâ Không river, about 250 km northeast of Chiang Râi.

15. CTU.SM.224 - 227,234. Capital of an eastern Shan state of the same name in northeast Burma, about 150 km north of Chiang Râi.

16. CMA.B.1.37; CMA.HP.1.12.R; CMA.T.10. The wording in CMA.HP is: "... จารุ สรุ กำกับ ผยง พระ ชัย ที่ บ้าน สบุ สิ่ง ท่า กลาง เมื่อง นคร ซัม" เจ้า พระ อธิ จักร วง พระ ชัย จอม รยว ที่ มี ท่า กลาง วง ซัม ใน ปึ่ง บัว เสด หลวง 624 ฟุ้ง บากุก ริ่ ร่า เมือง ขวาง ราย ชัน แส.

17. Phâyâ Mang Râi founded Chiang Mai on Thursday, 12 April 1296 or one week later, on Thursday, 19 April 1296 (Griswold / Prasôt 1977 Inscr. Wat Chiang Man 114 n. 7).

18. Large-scale maps or photographs taken from the air show that the Mâ Kok has changed its bed many times. The last time the Mâ Kok changed its bed at Chiang Râi was in 1904 when it cut short a big loop (Hosséus 1912 König Tschulalong-korns Reich 181, 190). That may have been the big loop at Đôi Jôm Thông which looks like a more recently abandoned watercourse.

19. Sao Intakhin, from sao (Thai) "pillar" + Indakhîla (Pâli) "God Indra's Pillar." Chiang Mai's Sao Intakhin is rumoured to be of stone, about 50 cm tall. But no living person has seen it; it is embedded in an octagonal brick-work structure standing in its own house in Wat Jedi Luang.

20. Nâi In Sujia นภินิเมตร สัจจ, member of the committee for the construction of Chiang Râi's city navel pillar and city wall (see below), produced during our examination of historical sources the photocopy of a page of a paper leporello manuscript, written in Tham Lân Nâ letters and in the Yuan dialect, which contained the above information. I thought that the figures 5, 7 and 9 were doubtful. The original manuscript of Nâi In's photocopy was not available for inspection. But another committee member, Nâi Bunyang Chumsi นภินิบุญชุمصี, confirmed that he had seen the same figures in another manuscript.

21. Old Phrao covers two hills with earthen walls around their slopes. At least the southern hill has a triple wall. The hills are interconnected by additional walls (Penth 1972 Old Phrao).

22. Thao, in Lân Nâ, denoted a prince of the highest rank.

23. According to JKM. But CMA says: r. 1367 - 1388.

24. Phra Sing or Phra Phuttha Sihing (Si hàpàtìmâ): JKM.C.F.100 - 102; JKM.J.124 - 126. Phra Kao or Phra Kao Morakot (Ratanabimba): JKM.C/R.115; JKM.J.145. How much of the early history of these images is fiction and how much is historical fact, still has to be found out.

25. JKM.C/F.103; JKM.J.127.

26. According to a tradition in Wat Phra Kao Dôn Tao, Lampâng, the Phra Kao was kept in this monastery between 1436 - 1468. But according to JKM, the image was moved from Chiang Râi during the time of Phâyâ Ti Lôk and reached Chiang Mai, after a stay in Lampâng, in 1481 (JKM.C/F.112, 115; JKM.J.140, 145).

27. The full title and name of the prince were, according to the inscription: Phô Yaao Jao Mûng Thâo Mûï Chiang Râi / ฬห ฤา วาย ฉะ มุ่ง พระ เมือง ราช / In the Lamphûn Museum the inscription is registered as thâm/21. ALI 1.4.1.1 Doi Tham Phra 2027 / 1484. It was published by Schmitt 1898 Inscr. Doi Tham Phra; ( . . . ) 1965 Inscr. Doi Tham Phra; and Thom / Prasân 1974 Inscr. Doi Tham Phra.

28. CMA.N.178; CMA.T.82; CRA. PR.29 - 30; CS.A. PP. 203 - 204; CSÂ.W.282; Prachâkit 1907 Phongs. Yônok 321. See also footnote 42.

29. CMA.T.81; CMA.N.172; CRA. PR. 26. Prachâkit 1907 Phongs. Yônok 312. CRA.WPL.19 does not mention a revolt but says that in that year Phâyâ Chiang Râi (sic) came to Chiang Râi.

30. CRA.WPL. 6.

31. CSÂ.PP.203; CSÂ.W.282; CRA.PR. 30; Prachâkit 1907 Phongs. Yônok 321. Should the middle syllable be read ฤาไม.routing not replacing one of the old Râi, also M. Râi, Meng Hai or Po-hai, is a town in the Sip Song Pan Nâ, c. 40 km west of Chiang Rung, towards Chiang Tung.

32. CSÂ.PP.204; CSÂ.W.282; CRA.PR. 30; CRA.WPL.7; Prachâkit 1907 Phongs. Yônok 323 - 324.
in the inscription is: Friday, day 6 of the waxing moon, month 2, C.S. 1088, which according to Roger Billard, Paris, corresponds to Friday, 29 November 1726 (Griswold 1960 Five Chiang Sen Bronzes 202). The weight indicated corresponds to about 350 kg.

51. ALI 1.4.3.2. Chiang Rāi B.S. 2270 / 1727 A.D. (?).

52. Personal communication from the abbot, whom I knew well. But he could not remember the year, only that it must have been long before B.S. 2500 = 1957 A.D.

53. ALI 1.4.3.2 Wat Ngam Mūang B.S. 2269 / 1727 A.D. (1) and (2); Griswold 1957 Dated Buddha Images, no. 100 (only Moggalā- na); Griswold 1960 Five Chiang Sen Bronzes 11 - 21. The date given in the inscription is: Tuesday, day 13 of the waning moon, month 4, C.S.1088, which according to Billard corresponds to Tuesday, 18 February 1727 (Griswold 1960 Five Chiang Sen Bronzes 15, 20 - 21). The weight indicated corresponds to about 75 kg.


55. In Lān Nā, the wihāra (vihāra) is the main assembly hall of a monastery. It contains the principal Buddha image พระบรมธาตุ and represents the Buddha’s own living quarters or Kuñji.

56. ALI 1.4.3.1 Chiang Sān B.S. 2269 / 1726 A.D.; Kasem 1966 Model Vihāra. The date given in the inscription is: Monday, day Mong Mao, day 7 of the waxing moon, month 7, C.S. 1088, year Rawā Sangā, (Ma)mira, which according to Billard corresponds to Monday, 6 May 1727 (Kasem 1966 Model Vihāra 132).

57. CRA.P.T.143.

58. CRA.P.T.144.

59. CRA.P.T.145. The text says that this stretch of wall was 350 wā long.

60. CRA. P.T.145 - 146.

61. CRA.P.T.145 says that the new city was “976 wā long” (viz. from east to west) “and 356 wā wide” (viz. from north to south). This matches well with the remains from the past, such as the location of former city gates, moats, layout of roads, etc.

62. CRA.P.T.145 - 146.

63. Neis 1885 Haut Laos. "Tous les dessins de ce voyage ont été faits par M. Eugène Burnand, d’après des photographies ou les croquis et les indications de l’auteur" (ibid. p. 65). The names Burnand and Hildibrand (the latter perhaps the engraver?) appear at the bottom of the printed sketch (ibid. p. 69). This sketch of the city wall with a gate is reproduced in Sumet 1970 Seen, frontispiece, and in the monthly magazine Silapa-Watthanatham ศิลปะวัฒนธรรม, vol 6.3, B.S. 2528 (1985) p. 61. I would like to thank M. Thomas Baude, director of the Alliance Française, Chiang Mai, for the trouble he took to obtain a photocopy of Neis’s article for me, which was not so easy.

64. Neis 1885 Haut Laos 68. The circumference of the walls of Chiang Rāi must have been about 4.5 - 5 km, not “not less than 8 km.”


67. Younghusband 1888 Eighteen Hundred Miles 43.

68. Vrooman, in: Presbyterian Board 1884 Siam and Laos 530.
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69. Bock 1885 Im Reich 321.
70. CRA. P.T.150.
71. Wells 1958 Protestant Work 104.
72. CRA.P.T.145-146.
73. CRA.P.T.150.
74. Wells 1958 Protestant Work 86.
75. Hosseus 1912 König Tschulalongkorns Reich 182.
76. Le May 1986 Asian Arcady 197.
77. CRA.P.T.146 and personal communication from several persons in Chiang Rāi.
78. CRA.P.T.145, 150.
79. The governor of the province of Chiang Rāi, Nāi Arām Iam-arun, initiated the project and supervised its implementation together with a committee of scholars, government officials and some private citizens. Seven persons from Chiang Mai University participated in the project: M.L. Bhansoon Ladavalya, Phithayāi Phuttharaksa, Phithayāi Bunnāk, Phithayāi Bunnāk, Phithayāi Phuttharaksa, Phithayāi Bunnāk, Phithayāi Bunnāk, Phithayāi Bunnāk, and myself (committee chairman). For more details, see: Penth 1988 City Wall and City Navel 22 - 24.

80. Although the rebuilt wall is the result of the best efforts that could be made under the circumstances, it is less than a perfect reconstruction with respect to certain details of its appearance. Neis's picture, as printed in 1885, probably has distorted the dimensions of the crenelations. Judging from other northern city walls, the crenelations should have been a little broader and perhaps a little higher. The space between the individual crenelations might have been less. Nonetheless, the crenelations were rebuilt according to the picture because it was the only available authority. The thickness of the wall and of the crenelations could not be accurately calculated from the picture.


82. Penth 1975 Buddhāpāda.

83. One reason for their presence on Buddhāpādas might be that the Buddha was regarded as having mastered the cosmos, as being its spiritual lord. Details concerning the 108 signs are found, for instance, in the cosmology Trāibhūmikathā or in the lists which accompany or explain the signs on Buddha footprints. These lists, although similar enough, show quite a number of variants (Albaster 1871 Wheel of the Law; Bizot 1971 Figuration; Griswold / Prasōt 1971 Inscr. Wat Traphang; Penth 1975 Buddhāpāda; TBK.C+A).
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ABBREVIATIONS

ALI - Archive of Lān Nā Inscriptions, Social Research Institute, Ching Mai University,
BEFEO - Bulletin de l'Ecole Francaise d'Extreme-Orient.
B.S. - Buddhhasakkarāja (พ.ศ.).
c. - circa, approximately.
C.S. - Culasakkara (s.c.).
JSS - Journal of the Siam Society.
ms - manuscript.
r. - ruled.
s.v. - sub voce (lemma or heading in a dictionary).
Words between slashes / / ... / are transliterations from original sources.