

DIFFICULTIES WITH INSCRIPTION NO. 1

HANS PENTH

ARCHIVE OF LĀN NĀ INSCRIPTIONS, SOCIAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE
CHIANG MAI UNIVERSITY

Inscription no. 1, known as the inscription of King Rām Khamhāng (text edition and translation i.a. in: Coedès 1924 Recueil; Griswold / Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng), generally is held to have been written by King Rām Khamhāng of Sukhōthai in 1292 (with the exception of one [Coedès] or two [Griswold / Prasöt] postscripts on face 4); to be the oldest specimen of Thai writing the letters of which, according to the inscription, had been invented by the king in 1283; to give an adequate description of Sukhōthai at the time; and therefore to be a trustworthy source for conclusions in the fields of history, art history, religion and linguistics.

As for the stone on which the inscription is written, a short, black, square pillar with a pyramidal top, inscribed on all its four faces, it seems generally accepted that Prince Mongkut, the future King Mongkut, in 1833 saw the stone in Sukhōthai and had it brought to Bangkok, together with a stone slab which is now known as the stone throne Phra Thān Manangkha Sīlā (มณฑลสีมาบัตร Manang Sīlā Bāt as it is called in the inscription), and another stone inscription with Khmer letters which is now known as the inscription of Wat Pā Mamuang or inscription no. 4. Certain ruins to the west of Sukhōthai, outside the town, have been identified as the former Wat Pā Mamuang. But Prince Mongkut is said to have found all three items together on the Palace Hill of Sukhōthai, called Nōn Prāsāt. At the time, Prince Mongkut was a monk, making a journey through some of the old towns of northern Thailand.

Inscription no.1 has at times less than enchanted its readers. Prince Narit, in a letter to Prince Damrong dated 4 August 1939, wrote that inscriptions were rather perplexing; for example, the Rām Khamhāng inscription was a mixture of Rām Khamhāng's own words and those of others, and if everything was as well in Sukhōthai as the inscription says, then what was the use of saying it? (แม้คำที่จารึกก็น่าพิศวง เช่นหลักศิลาครั้งขุนรามคำแหงสังเกตเห็นเป็นคำขุนรามคำแหงเองก็มี เป็นคำคนอื่นก็มี ประปนกันอยู่ และถ้าจารึกเมื่อบ้านเมืองดี บอกว่าบ้านเมืองมีอะไรบ้างจะมีประโยชน์อะไร; Narit 1939 Letter 9).

The substance of this article was presented as a lecture at the Siam Society on 24 January 1989.

Prince Chand (1976 Guide 29-31) and Michael Vickery (1978 Guide 205-209) were the first, as far as I know, to publish their difficulties with the inscription and its date of 1292, and to advance arguments for a lesser age, suggesting that the inscription was written in the time of Phayā Lū Thai (c. 1347-1374). I myself have tried to show that King Rām Khamhāng did not actually invent the Thai alphabet but modernized an already existing Thai alphabet which apparently had been based on Mon letters (Penth 1985 Wat Kān Thōm Inscriptions; 1985/1988 Jārūk Wat Kān Thōm; 1985 New Evidence; 1986 Thai Scripts). In 1986, Phiriya Krairiksh concluded that, for art historical and other reasons, the inscription must have been written after 1400 (Phiriya 1986 Silapa dān neramit). In 1987, Vickery, chiefly using linguistic evidence, again concluded against a great age for the inscription and even questioned its authenticity (Vickery 1987 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng). Finally, in August 1988, during a lecture at the Siam Society, Phiriya Krairiksh compared certain expressions and passages in the inscription with other Sukhōthai inscriptions and also with some Thai classics, and concluded that the inscription must have been written between 1833-1855.

Even if one disagrees with some of the arguments advanced against the traditional interpretation and understanding of inscription no. 1, the fact remains that at present scholars from various fields are not satisfied. The combined weight of their critical arguments should be reason enough to prudently review the position of the inscription as an authoritative source and to try to solve the problems it poses.

Many difficulties and uncertainties in connection with the inscription have not been publicised. For instance, the sources that deal with the discovery of the inscription in Sukhōthai and its subsequent deciphering in Bangkok need some clarification. The earliest sources seem to be two works by the Supreme Patriarch, Prince Pawaret, a contemporary of King Mongkut. In his biography of the king, the Prince Patriarch refers only to the discovery of the stone throne and inscription no. 4, but not to the discovery of inscription no. 1 (Pawaret 1962 King Mongkut Biography 11-12; Pawaret 1968 King Mongkut Biography 50-51). It is reported that an unpublished notebook of the Prince Patriarch contains the same story, again omitting the discovery of inscription no. 1; but that elsewhere in the same notebook reference is made to some of the

contents of inscription no. 1 and to its Sukhōthai origin (Krom Silapākōn 1983 Jārūk samai Sukhōthai 4-5). On the other hand, the biography of King Mongkut written by his son, the Prince Patriarch Wachirayān, says that Prince Mongkut found the stone throne, inscription no. 4 and inscription no. 1 in Sukhōthai (Bradley 1909 *Oldest Siamese Writing* 7; Coedès 1924 *Recueil "Thaï part"* 51). A good publication of all original sources would help to dissipate doubts about the history of the stone and its inscription.

In this article, I shall deal with three particular difficulties: (1) The date and objective of the inscription; (2) the "Mongol passage" in the inscription which has been interpreted as showing Mongol influence on Sukhōthai; (3) the Jindāmanī evidence which is sometimes used in discussions to back up the date 1292 for the inscription.

Date and Objective

Inscription no. 1 is undated in the sense that it does not state the year in which it was written. But it mentions three different years which are expressed in the Mahāsakkārāja era (M.S. + 78 = A.D.) plus three more years which are expressed by stating that such and such an event happened a certain number of years (khao ๗) before or after an already mentioned M.S. year. The inscription thus contains a total of six dates: three by direct indication of the year, and three by reference. In theory, the inscription could have been written at any time after the most recent date. The six dates are, in the order in which they appear in the inscription:

14 years before M.S. 1214 = A.D. 1278

Planting of sugar-palm trees. This is the usual translation of the text. Another possible translation, dating the event to 1292, will be discussed at the end of the chapter. (Face 4, lines 10-12).

M.S. 1214 = A.D. 1292

Installation of the stone throne Manang Sīlā Bāt among the sugar-palm trees. For a different translation, dating the event to 1305-06, see at the end of the chapter. (Face 4, lines 12-13).

M.S. 1207 year Kun = A.D. 1285 or 1287

Excavation of relics and their reenshrinement in Mōng Sī Sachanālai. The date is not certain because the figures and the name of the year are incompatible: M.S. 1207, year Kun "Pig." In fact, M.S. 1207 = A.D. 1285 was a year Rakā "Cock," and the year Kun would be M.S. 1209 = A.D. 1287 (or earlier / later by x number of 12 years because there is a year Kun every 12 years). In the absence of corroboration, either may be correct, the numeral or the name of the year. (Face 4, lines 4-6).

After 6 years = A.D. 1290-91 or 1292-93

Completion of a stūpa built over the reenshrined relics. The dates calculated by reference are approximate because in

the old way of counting years, any date beyond the local "New Year" could be counted as "one year later." (Face 4, lines 6-7).

After 3 years = A.D. 1292-94 or 1294-96

Completion of an enclosure wall around the Phra Mahā Thāt, probably the stūpa mentioned under 1290/1293. (Face 4, lines 7-8).

M.S. 1205 = A.D. 1283

"Invention" of Thai letters. (Face 4, lines 8-11).

Therefore, without additional evidence, the inscription could date at the earliest from 1292 or 1305-06, and could as well be more recent.

George Coedès is usually credited with having definitely shown that the inscription was written in 1292 with the aim to commemorate or to record the installation of the stone throne Manang Sīlā Bāt. However, Coedès was not so definite. Many of his readers overlooked the hesitation and prudence with which he expressed himself and interpreted and overinterpreted him in their own ways. As it is, even Coedès' own cautious reasoning needs reconsideration.

Coedès, with reservations, deduced the year of the writing of the inscription from the purpose or the objective of the inscription, and for Coedès the objective of the inscription was, again with reservations, King Rām Khamhāng's wish to record the installation of his stone throne in 1292.

As for the objective of the inscription, Coedès hesitated between being certain that the main point of the inscription was the installation of the stone throne, and thinking it probable that this might be so. Within two pages of his main work on the inscription, he offers two different opinions: ". . . la stèle avait justement pour objet de commémorer l'installation de ce trône . . ." On the next page, he says: "Il est à peu près hors de doute . . . qu'elle avait pour objet de commémorer l'installation . . . du trône de pierre" (Coedès 1924 *Recueil* 37-38).

His readers, however, had no doubts: "The purpose of the text is to commemorate the installation of the stone throne in the Sugar-Palm Grove in the gardens of the Royal Palace at Sukhodaya" (Griswold 1968 *Historian's Debt* 66). Some years later, Griswold / Prasöt wrote (1971 *Inscr. Rām Khamhāng* 191): "Coedès was the first Western scholar to bring out clearly the formal purpose of the inscription;" and then they quote a passage from Coedès 1918 *Notes critiques* 21 which only says prudently: "Il est à peu près certain qu'elle (the inscription; HP) a pour objet de commémorer l'inauguration du trône de pierre . . ."

Concerning the date of the inscription, a glance through Coedès' writings shows that throughout his life he hesitated between the certainty and the probability that the inscription was composed in 1292: ". . . m.s. 1214 (1292 A.D.), date probable de l'inscription. . ." (Coedès 1919 *Documents* 32); ". . . la stèle de Rāma K'amhəng composée en 1292" (Coedès 1964 *Etats* 357). But a few pages later in the same book, he writes: "En 1292, date probable de la stèle. . ." (p. 372)..

There is a strange item that I am at a loss to explain. In his main work on the inscription (Coedès 1924 Recueil), Coedès does not date the inscription at all but merely says that the stone throne probably was inaugurated in 1292 (p.38). What is more, in his book on the history of Southeast Asia (Coedès 1964 Etats), which contains the already quoted passage, "la stèle de Rāma K'amhəng composée en 1292" (p.357), that passage has a footnote, no. 2, which refers the reader to p. 37 of his main work on the inscription (viz. Coedès 1924 Recueil), but as has just been noted, he nowhere says there that the inscription was written in 1292 !

But others took the date 1292 as definite: "The stone inscription, which bears the date of 1214 of the old Saka era. . . equivalent to 1292 A.D. . . ." (le May 1986 Asian Arcady 13). "His celebrated inscription of 1292. . . ." (Hall 1964 History 161). "As everyone now knows, the inscription was composed in 1292. . ." (Griswold 1968 Historian's Debt 66).

In his Notes critiques (1918, p. 12-25), Coedès explains the reasons for choosing 1292 as the probable date for the inscription, and for choosing the episode of the installation of the stone throne as the probable purpose of the inscription. He explains that previously he had adopted the date 1292 for the wrong reasons by following a certain argument advanced by Bradley, but now he does not believe in that argument anymore. He then goes on to show that, by combining the episode of the excavation and reenshrinement of the relics in 1285 with the episode of the setting up of the stone throne in 1292, and with a passage in the Yüan history dealing with an embassy from Sukhōthai (Sien) to the Mongol court in China, the same date of 1292 still appears as the probable year in which the inscription was made, although for other reasons than Bradley and he had previously thought. Coedès concludes that the date 1292 is probable, although the inscription could have been engraved two or three years after the installation of the stone throne, and that the probable objective of the inscription was to commemorate the installation of the stone throne.

In other words: Coedès thought that the objective of the inscription probably was to record the installation of the stone throne in 1292, which is the reason why the inscription should date from that time. The same argumentation is also found in Griswold / Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng 194.

Six years later, Coedès again explained his reasoning concerning the purpose of the inscription (Coedès 1924 Recueil 38) : He thought it likely but not really proven ("Il est à peu près hors de doute. . .") that the objective of the inscription was to commemorate the consecration of the stone throne in 1292 because that year seemed to have been of special importance to King Rām Khamhāng since it was in 1292 that the king began his relation with the Mongol court in China: "Il est à peu près hors de doute. . . qu'elle (the inscription; HP) avait pour objet de commémorer l'installation . . . du trône de pierre . . . en cette année 1292 A.D., qui semble marquer dans le règne de Rāma Gaṃhəng une date capitale, puisque c'est alors qu'il entra pour la première fois en relation avec la Cour de Chine". Thus, the reasoning of Coedès hinges on one point: the year 1292, in

which year he thought the king had inaugurated his stone throne and also had contacted the Mongol-Chinese court.

Coedès did not explain why contacting the Mongol court was such an important event, and what the stone throne had to do with it. The reader is left to speculate on his own that perhaps Rām Khamhāng, having contacted the Mongol court, had been granted certain privileges or assurances by Kubilai Khan in 1292 and therefore now felt free to establish himself as a ruler with a throne which was such an important event that it became the main subject of the inscription, which in turn would mean that the inscription was written in 1292 or shortly afterwards.

However, there is no contact attested between Sukhōthai and the Mongol court in 1292, which breaks Coedès' chain of argumentation

The historical source that Coedès used, as he says himself (1924 Recueil 38 and 1964 Etats 372), was a passage from the Yüan Shih (in Thai: 元史) as quoted by Pelliot 1904 Deux itinéraires 242. In English translation, it reads: "November 26, 1292: The Pacification Office of the Kwangtung Circuit sent a person who arrived at the capital bearing a golden missive proffered by the chief of the country of Hsien" (Flood 1969 Sukhothai-Mongol Relations 223).

Coedès (1917 Documents 33) was satisfied that Pelliot had definitely identified Hsien "avec la région de la Haute-Ménam ou royaume de Sukhodaya." Pelliot, on the basis of Ming and Yüan sources, had advanced the following reasoning: Siam originally consisted of two countries. One was the kingdom of Hsien; it was hilly ("accidenté") and little fertile. The other was the kingdom of Lo-hou; it was flat and very fertile. These geographical conditions meant to Pelliot that Hsien must have been on the upper Menam (แม่น้ำเจ้าพระยา), and Lo-hou on the lower Menam. Lo-hou was Lop Buri. Hsien must have been the kingdom of Sukhōthai, because it was to the north of Lop Buri, and because inscription no. 1 attests to Siamese power at Sukhōthai (Pelliot 1904 Deux itinéraires 235, 244).

It is still unknown where exactly Hsien was, but there are enough indications to show that at around 1300, Hsien did not mean Sukhōthai but referred to some city lower in Thailand and closer to the ocean than Sukhōthai.

The reasoning that Hsien, a hilly and rather barren land, must be north of Lop Buri, is immediately suspect because there is such a type of land also in other directions from Lop Buri. For some years now, it has therefore been argued that Hsien should have been somewhere in the delta of the Mā Nām Jao Phrayā, or in southwest central Thailand, or even further down south (i.a. Chand 1972 Review: Griswold 1967 Towards 259; Vickery 1978 Guide 205; Vickery 1979 New Tamnan 134, 155-156). I shall not repeat the reasons but will mention some arguments that I find particularly striking.

Chou Ta-kuan, the Chinese envoy, flatly stated that Hsien/ Siam, in 1296-97 when he visited Angkor, was 15 days

southwest of Angkor (Chou Ta-kuan / Paul 1967 Notes 9). However, Sukhōthai is northwest of Angkor.

The cultures of Hsien and Sukhōthai seem to have been quite different. Hsien was a state that was known to habitually practice and to some extent live on piracy; their staple food was sago, not rice. A Chinese source, the Tao I Chih Lio which is thought to have been composed towards A.D. 1350, has this to say about Hsien: "The people of Hsien are much given to piracy; whenever there is an uprising in any other country, they at once embark in as many as a hundred junks with full cargo of sago (as food) and start off and by the vigor of their attack they secure what they want. (Thus) in recent years they came with seventy odd junks and raided Tan-ma-hsi (= Tumasik = Singapore or Johore) and attacked the city moat. (The town) resisted for a month, the place having closed its gates and defending itself, and they not daring to assault it. It happened just that an Imperial envoy (of the Chinese court) was passing by (Tan-ma-hsi), so the men of Hsien drew off and hid, after plundering Hsi-li" (Rockhill 1915 Notes 99-100).

Perhaps it is also helpful to note that the Sayām on the famous Angkor bas-relief may have originated from or may have been related to inhabitants of west-central Thailand, because their particular hairdo is similar to that of people from Old U Thōng (Khian 1966 Folk Art fig. 1; original in U Thōng National Museum). Further, the chronicle Jinakālamāli, written in 1516-1527, includes the regions of Chiang Mai, Lamphūn and Lampāng in Syāmadesa (JKM.C. 73, 96, 115). This again is an old Mon area. From all of that one might perhaps consider that around 1300, Hsien, Sien, Sayām etc. had something to do with Mon or with Mon-related people, and not with Thai, an idea that was already envisaged by Vickery 1979 New Tamnān 137 n.81.

Lastly, when the Yüan Shih wants to mention Sukhōthai, it says so. There is a passage in it stating that on 5 June 1299, the barbarians of "Hainan, Su-ku-t'ai, Su-long-tan and Pen-hsi arrived at court bearing tribute of tigers, elephants and sha-lo wood boats" (Flood 1969 Sukhōthai-Mongol Relations 226).

Thus, Hsien was not Sukhōthai and the first attested contact between Sukhōthai and the Mongol Chinese court was in 1299, not in 1292.

The assumed objective of the inscription, the commemoration of the inauguration of the stone throne, also is not evident from the inscription itself. The matter of the stone slab occurs only on face 3, lines 10-19 (crafting, inauguration and use of a stone slab) and then again on the same face, lines 26-27 (indicating the name of the stone slab as Manang Silā Bāt). Before, in between and after these two passages, entirely different matter is being dealt with. If the stone slab was what really mattered in the inscription, one would expect it to have been accorded a more prominent place and a more extensive treatment, and not to have been mentioned twice rather lightly in the third quarter or at the end of the inscription (Coedès 1924 Recueil 38 considers face 4, lines 11-27 a postscript; Griswold / Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng 192-193 think

that all of face 4 may be composed of two postscripts: lines 1-11 and 11-27). The matter of the stone slab appears too much hidden away in the inscription and too much treated as just one item among the many items written down, for it to have been the main subject or the objective of the inscription.

If indeed the stone slab had some particular importance for the inscription, then the inscription may perhaps better be described as a eulogy of King Rām Khamhāng which includes his descendance, his biography and a description of his prosperous country; the eulogy was set up at a stone seat that had been installed by the king and that was regularly used by religious leaders and the king, which was something that the king regarded as one of or as the most important deed(s) he did in his life. This would mean that the inscription was written by the king after the stone seat had been in use for a certain time because the inscription explains how and when it was used, but before the death of the king because after his death no other person would write the eulogy. The "post-scripts" which expand the eulogy perhaps also would have been written during the lifetime of the king. Such self-praising or rather self-appraising eulogies were common in the old time (see Khmer inscriptions; also the Wat Phra Yün inscription from Lamphūn, c.137; text edition and translation in Griswold / Prasöt 1974 Inscr. Wat Phra Yün); they were more a religious than a political (and not a boastful) act: a statement of who the person is and what his merits are.

Similarly, the objective of inscription no. 2 (text edition and translation in Griswold / Prasöt 1972 King Lōdaiya), which contains one principal eulogy but also praises some other persons, may not have been to record the restoration of the Mahā Thāt in Sukhōthai. Rather, the inscription may have been written on the occasion of, or even after, the restoration of the Mahā Thāt and then was installed at the Mahā Thāt because its restoration was regarded by the person involved as one of his important deeds.

To sum up: The old reasons for dating inscription no. 1 to 1292 are not convincing because the objective of the inscription cannot have been to record the installation of a stone throne in 1292 following Sukhōthai's contact with the Mongol court.

But even the year 1292 for the installation of the stone throne is not entirely certain; it may have been 1305-06. The inscription says (face 3, lines 10-13):

1214 สกปิมโรงผขุนรามค้แหง...ปลูกไม่ตานนี้ไค้สืบค้เข้าจ้ิงให้
ช่างพนษคารหิน จ้งงทวงกลางไม่ตานนี้

Ājān Phithayā Bunnāk (Faculty of Fine Arts, Chiang Mai University) points out to me, and I agree, that the text can be translated in a simple, straightforward way:

"In A.D. 1292, King Rām Khamhāng . . . planted these sugar-palm trees. After 14 years (= A.D. 1305-06), he had craftsmen make a stone slab and set it up among these sugar-palm trees."

Also, there is corroboration from the stone itself. The same construction with ได้ and จึง occurs on face 4, line 4-6, on the occasion of the excavation and reenshrining of the relics in Sī Sachanālai:

1207 สกมปีกรให้พูด(เอา) พระธาตุออกหงหลายเทหนักทำบูชาบเรอ
แก่พระธาตุใต้เดือนทววนนึ่งเอาจลงฝังในกลาง (เมื่อ) งขริสขนาไล

"In A.D. 1285 (or 1287, see above), he had relics dug up. Everyone saw them and paid their respects to them. After one month and six days, they were reenshrined in the city of Sī Sachanālai."

Bastian, who was in Bangkok in 1863 where he examined old inscriptions and whose understanding of inscription no. 1 still was somewhat rudimentary, translated: "When the era was dated 1214, in the year of the dragon, the father-benefactor Ramkhamheng. . . planted a palm tree, and after nineteen (sic!) rice crops had gone by, he ordered the workmen to prepare the smooth surface of a stone, which was fastened and secured in the middle of the trunk of the palm tree" (Bastian 1866 Siamese Inscriptions, in: Griswold / Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng 185-186, 224).

But ever since Father Schmitt merged the two main clauses into one clause with a string of subordinate clauses, because he thought that the stone throne was made in 1292, all the other renowned translators of the inscription followed him: Bradley, Coedès, Griswold / Prasöt:

Schmitt: "En caka 1214, année cyclique du grand dragon, le prince Rāma-Khomhēng . . . fit placer par son architecte un trône de pierre, à l'ombre d'un groupe de palmiers que Sa Majesté avait elle-même plantés, il y a quatorze ans passés" (In: Griswold / Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng 224-224).

Bradley, professor of rhetoric, inserted one subordinate clause in the main clause and translated (his brackets) : "In 1214 of the era, year of the Great Dragon, Prince Khun Ram Khamhaeng . . . (having) planted this grove of palm trees fourteen rice-harvests (before), caused workmen to hew slabs of stone and to set them up in the open space in the center of this palm grove" (Bradley 1909 Oldest Siamese Writing 28, 57).

Coedès: "En 1214, année du dragon, le Prince Rāma Gamhèn . . . qui avait fait planter ces palmiers à sucre depuis quatorze ans déjà, ordonna à des ouvriers de tailler cette dalle de pierre et de la placer au centre de cette palmeraie" (Coedès 1924 Recueil 47).

Griswold / Prasöt: "In 1214 saka, a year of the dragon, King Rāma Gamhèn . . . who had planted these sugar-palm trees fourteen years before, commanded his craftsmen to carve a slab of stone and place it in the midst of these sugar-palm trees" (Griswold / Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng 214).

Depending on whether one assumes an imaginary "full stop" before ได้ in the inscription text or not, and on which object one places the emphasis, the trees or the stone slab, one is led to favour one or the other of the two possible translations.

Thus, inscription no. 1 may date from 1292-96 or 1305-06, because those are the last years referred to in the inscription, or else it may date from a few years later, but it should have been written during the lifetime of King Rām Khamhāng, perhaps including the "postscripts."

The "Mongol Passage"

Coedès saw Mongol influence on Sukhōthai social and political thinking as revealed by inscription no. 1; he saw a similarity between the structure of Rām Khamhāng's government and that of the Mongol khans (Coedès 1962 Peuples 137), and also a similarity in political and filial behaviour (Coedès 1964 Etats 358). But while he cautiously formulates his ideas, others who obviously copy from him are less cautious. Coedès' "une certaine dose d'inspiration mongole dans la structure sociale" (1962 Peuples 136-137) and "(les princes thai) semblent . . . s'être inspirés de l'exemple des Mongoles, dont la prodigieuse épopée devait frapper leur imagination . . . l'inscription de Rama K'amhèng . . . sonne même parfois comme un écho de la geste de Gengis Khan" (1964 Etats 347) become "King Rama modelled his institutions closely on Mongol examples; his great inscription . . . seems to have echoed the language of Genghiz Khan, and the King may have been an actual ally of the Great Khan . . . he visited Peking in 1294 . . ." (FitzGerald 1972 Southern Expansion 80-81).

A certain passage from the inscription was particularly in Coedès' mind. It is the passage on face 1 where Ram Khamhāng says of himself: "When I went hunting elephants, . . . I brought them to my father. When I raided a town or village and captured elephants, young men or women of rank, silver or gold, I turned them over to my father." For Coedès, this passage was too close to the oath of the electors of Genghis Khan than to be just a coincidence: "Ce passage rappelle de façon trop exacte pour être fortuite le serment des électeurs de Gengis Khan" (Coedès 1964 Etats 358). The Mongol text that Coedès refers to is the oath of Genghis Khan's three electors as recorded in the Secret History of the Mongols: "Nous avons décidé de te proclamer khan. Nous marcherons à l'avant-garde, dans la bataille; si nous enlevons des femmes et des filles, nous te les donnerons. Nous irons à la chasse, au premier rang; si nous prenons du gibier, nous te le donnerons" (Vladimirtsof in Grousset 1960 L'empire 258).

If the passage in the inscription was inspired by the Secret History, then there is a difficulty. The Mongol alphabet was created in 1269 (Hirth 1887 Chinese Oriental College 211) or about 40 years later, c. 1310 (up to 1272, the Mongols had used Uighur letters and then Tibetan letters from 1272 to c. 1310; Encycl. Britannia, 1983 edition). The Secret History was composed in the Mongol language between 1228-1264 and existed in Chinese transcription (not yet translation) only since 1368 (dtv Brockhaus Lexikon, 1984 edition).

This means that at the time of Rām Khamhāng, knowledge of the Mongol epos certainly was restricted, and abroad

probably non-existent. Unless there were at present unknown close relations between Sukhōthai and the Mongol court, Rām Khamhāng would not have had the detailed knowledge of the Secret History which permitted him to use a certain passage from it for his inscription. Until such close ties can be demonstrated from other sources (they are not apparent from the official Yüan history), one has to assume that either the similarity between the two passages is a coincidence, or else that the inscription was composed at an indefinite and possibly much later time, after the Secret History had become known in Thailand, where then a short passage was adapted for an inscription dealing with Sukhōthai and one of its former kings, Rām Khamhāng.

Thus, Mongol influence on Sukhōthai society can probably be ruled out. However, the choice between a coincidental similarity of the two passages (which would mean that the inscription dates from 1292-c. 1305 or a few years later) and a plagiarism or adaptation perhaps centuries later (which would mean an equally reduced age of the inscription), cannot safely be made without further evidence.

The Jindāmani Evidence

Jindāmani (จินตามณี from P. *cintāmaṇi*) is the collective name of a group of works intended as primers or reference books on correct orthography and versification. There are quite a number of Jindāmani manuscripts, some very different from others.

The usual opinion seems to be that the author of the first Jindāmani probably was the royal chief astrologer, *hōrāthibodī* (P. *horādhipati*) who may have originated from or may have lived for some time in Sukhōthai and / or Phijit, that he composed the Jindāmani by order of King Nārāi in 1672, and that he also may have been the author of the so-called Luang Prasöt Chronicle, composed in 1680. That opinion was first put forward by Prince Damrong in 1932 and was later repeated and somewhat deepened by Thanit Yupho (see: Silapā Bannākhān 1961 Jindāmani 146-151). King Nārāi ruled from 1656 to 1688.

Prince Damrong and Thanit Yūphō based their view on three notes contained in Jindāmani manuscripts. The first note is found in nearly all the Usual Jindāmanis (see below) and says:

จินตามณีนี้ พระโหราธิบดี เดอมอยู่เมืองสุโขทัย แต่งถวาย แต่ครั้งสมเด็จพระนารายณ์เป็นเจ้าลพบุรี

"The chief astrologer who formerly lived in Müang Sukhōthai, composed this Jindāmani and presented it to king Nārāi, Lord of Lop Buri."

The second note is found in one of the Unusual Jindāmanis (JM.NLB/93; see below) and says:

Page 16, line

- (2) . . . ครั้นจุลศักราช 104 ปีชวดศก จึงพระอา
(3) จารยเจ้าผู้มปัญหาแต่งจินตามณีถวาย . . .

The date, C.S. 104, obviously is defective. Since the name of the year is given, Chuat, and since it is thought that the time of King Nārāi is meant, the date is understood as C.S. 1034 = A.D. 1672.

"In A.D. 1672, the learned royal teacher composed the Jindāmani for presentation to His Majesty."

The third note is from the end of one (or several) Usual Jindāmani manuscript (s) and says in verse form that the learned chief astrologer (โหราประเสริฐ) originally was from Ökha Buri (ชาวโพนบุรี) which Prince Damrong and Thanit understood to mean Müang Phijit (Silapā Bannākhān 1961 Jindāmani 147-148).

Thanit Yūphō classified the Jindāmanis into four main groups (Silapā Bannākhān 1961 Jindāmani 128 ff). Group no. 1 is made up of only a few manuscripts which are, however, quite different from the others. A particular characteristic is that they have a preface on the origin of Thai letters which is not found in other Jindāmanis. Thanit calls this group "จินตามณี ฉบับความแปลก" "Jindāmani with strange contents," or "Unusual Jindāmani." Group no. 2 is by far the largest group with more or less similar contents though requiring a division into four subgroups. Thanit calls this group "จินตามณี ฉบับความพ้อง" "Jindāmani with identical contents" or, somewhat freely but perhaps more to the point, "Jindāmani with ordinary contents," "Usual Jindāmani." Groups no. 3 and no. 4 consist of only a few items, all 19th century creations, such as Prince Wongsāthirāt Sanit's "Second Volume of Jindāmani," composed in 1849 (group no. 3), and Bradley's Jindāmani anthology cum dictionary (group no. 4).

The Unusual Jindāmanis are of interest here because of their introductory note on the origin of the Thai letters.

The oldest known Unusual Jindāmani manuscript is in the Royal Asiatic Society in London. It is a leporello paper manuscript which has a date equivalent to A.D. 1732 and which in the following shall be called JM.RAS. Dr. Henry Ginsburg of the British Library in London kindly informs me in a letter dated 10 March 1988 that this manuscript is no. 8 in a collection of about 25 Thai manuscripts and that there is no information on its origin.

Of this manuscript, the late Professor Khajōn Sukhaphānit ขจร สุขพานิช had a microfilm made which he gave to the Fine Arts Department, Bangkok. It is now in the National Library and has become quite brittle. From that microfilm, the text of the manuscript was first printed in 1961 under the title "จินตามณี ฉบับพระเจ้าบรมโกศ" "Jindāmani, version of Phra Jao Boroma Kōt," which was included in a book on the subject of Jindāmani (Silapā Bannākhān 1961 Jindāmani 158 ff). An identical reprint was made in 1969, and a third edition with a slightly different pagination appeared in 1971. King Boroma Kōt of

Ayuthayā may have had nothing to do with this Jindāmani, but 1732 was the first year of his reign, hence the title of the publication.

Judging by the microfilm, it seems that the manuscript is made of black paper and that the letters are written in gold colour, now somewhat faded. Each page has five lines of writing. Each line of writing is marked by a horizontal line that is drawn across the page. The upper part of the letters touch the line but the end of the long stroke of tall letters like ๒, the tone marks and the vowel i are above the line. Definite traces of use and insect attack as well as general marks of age are apparent.

Still according to the microfilm, it seems that, if one opens the first fold of the manuscript, the upper page has the title of the book: หน้าต้น สมุทหนังสือ จินตามณี "Front Page, Book of Jindāmani."

The lower page has five lines of writing. The first three lines contain the introductory note or preface:

- (1) อันหนึ่งในจดหมายแต่ก่อนว่า คักกราช 645 มแมศกพร
ณารองเจ้าได้เมืองศรีสัชนาลัยแล้ว
- (2) (แ) (ต)ง(ห)หนังสือไทยแลจได้ว่าแต่งรูปก็ตีแต่งแม่อักษรก็ตีหม
ได้ว่าไว้แจ้ง อหนึ่งแม่หนังสือแต่ กกา กน
- (3) ฯลฯ ถึงเกอยเมืองขอมก็แต่งมืออยู่แล้ว เหนว่าพรณารองเจ้าจ
แต่งแต่รูป อักษรไทย

"(An) old document (s) state (s) that in A.D. 1283, after he had obtained Müang Sī Sachanālai, Phayā Ròng devised the Thai writing system (täng nangsü Thai). It is not clearly stated whether he devised the form (täng rūp) or whether he devised the letters themselves (täng mä aksòn). (Because) the letter combinations (mä nangsü) from kkā, kn, etc. to keòy had already been devised in the Khòm country, I think that Phayā Ròng only devised the form of the Thai letters (täng tä rūp akson Thai)." (Tentative translation.)

The remaining two lines on this page consist of a date that is elaborately expressed in Buddhasakkarāja (... พระพุทธ
ศักราชล่วงไปแล้วได้ 2275 พรวษา ...) and Culasakkarāja (... จุล
ศักราชได้ 1094 ศก ...) and which corresponds to A.D. 1732. Since nothing else is added, that should be the date of the manuscript.

The preface on the Thai letters and the date of the manuscript seem to be integral parts of the manuscript and not later interpolations because the handwriting looks the same as in the rest of the manuscript.

The subject matter of the book then begins on the top page of the next fold with the words: อักษรสูงตำนาน คำตรง คือ
ชา

A comparison between the microfilm and the printed version (JM.RAS 1961) shows that the latter is nearly, but not exactly, identical with the original. I cannot say if the manu-

script also contains the remark on the author of the Jindāmani, the royal teacher, because I did not dare to run the whole brittle microfilm through the reading machine; but the printed version does not contain that note.

The National Library in Bangkok is in possession of several Jindāmani manuscripts. At least three among them belong to the category Unusual Jindāmani. They are catalogued as

- จินตามณี 5; formerly: 1/ก (= JM.NLB/5; my code)
 จินตามณี 25; formerly: 1 (= JM.NLB/25)
 จินตามณี 93; formerly: 1/ก (= JM.NLB/93)

All manuscripts are black paper leporello books of a size roughly 12 x 36 cm, written in gold-colour ink. None of them is dated. Judging solely by their appearance, the oldest would be JM.NLB/5 followed by the two others which look newer. The manuscript JM.NLB/5 was part of the original funds of the National Library. JM.NLB/25 was received in 1909 from Prince Damrong, and JM.NLB/93 in 1936 from the Department of the Secretary-General to the Council of Ministers กรมเลขาธิการคณะรัฐมนตรี.

The preface on the devising of Thai letters is more or less identical in all three manuscripts of the Bangkok National Library, and is in substance close to the preface of the manuscript in the Royal Asiatic society.

Here is, as an example, the preface of JM.NLB/93:

Page 1

- (1) คักกราช 645 ปีมะแมศก พญาร่วงเจ้าได้เมืองศรีสัชนาลัย จึงแต่ง
- (2) หนังสือไทยแลแม่อักษรทั้งหลายตามผากทั้งปวงอันเจรจางซึ่งกัน
แลกัน และครั้ง
- (3) นั้นแต่งแต่แม่อักษรไว้ แลจะได้แต่งเปนปรกตวิถารณหามีได้
แลกลบุตร
- (4) ผู้จะอ่านเขียนเปนอันยากนัก แลหนึ่งแม่หนังสือแต่กกาถึงกน ฯลฯ
จนถึงเกย

Page 2

- (1) เมืองขอมก็แต่งมืออยู่แล้ว พญาร่วงเจ้าจึงแต่งแต่รูปอักษรไทยต่าง
ต่าง...

"In A.D. 1283, after he had obtained Müang Sī Sachanālai, Phayā Ruang devised the Thai writing system (täng nangsü Thai) and all the letters (mä aksòn) according to the spoken language. It is not clear whether at the time he only devised the letters (täng tä mä aksòn), and whether the arrangement was conventional or unconventional (täng pen pokoti witathān), (but) the students found reading and writing to be very difficult. (Because) the letter combinations (mä nangsü) from kkā to kn etc. and on to key had already been devised in the Khòm country, Phayā Ruang only devised the form of the various Thai letters (täng tä rūp akson Thai täng täng)." (Tentative translation.)

"Phayā Ròng" in the JM.RAS preface should be the same as "Phayā Ruang" in the JM.NLB prefaces; it could be an older form or a local variant of the name.

That Phayā Ruang had something to do with the "invention" of Thai letters, or else was strong in magic and had superior knowledge, is corroborated by the existence of a number of tales of unknown origin and age that were current during the Ayuthayā period. Phra Wichian Prīchā (Nòi) included one of them in his Phongsāwadān Nūa which he composed from old sources and finished in 1807. These stories give no date for the "invention" of the Thai letters.

According to the tale in Phongsāwadān Nūa, Phra Jao Arun Rāt alias Phayā Ruang (พระเจ้าอรุณราชคือพระยาร่วง) lived around B.S. 1000 (A.D. 457), C.S. 119 (A.D. 757). For the purpose of cancelling the Buddhasakkarāja (จะลบคักราชพระพุทธรเจ้า), he called a conference of the major kings. On that occasion, he ordered the devising of the Thai Chiang, Mon, Burmese, Thai, Khòm Chiang and Khòm letters (พระองค์เจ้าให้ทำหนังสือไทยเฉียงมอญพม่าไทยแลขอมเฉียงขอมมีมาแต่่นั้น; PN' 1914. 9-10; Pn' 1963. 9-10).

The classical Sukhōthai historical sources such as inscriptions do not mention a king Phayā Ruang. The name seems to occur only in sources from countries around Sukhōthai and may be attested in primary sources only since about A.D. 1500. The oldest source known to me is an unpublished inscription from Phayao dated A.D. 1498 (ALI 1.5.1.1 Wat Phayā Ruang 2041 / 1498). The sources which mention a Phayā Ruang therefore may not be contemporary to events in Sukhōthai / Sī Sachanālai around 1250-1350; they could be more recent and "foreign" sources. Ruang was understood to mean "shining, brilliant, full of light" because sources written in Pali have translations of the king's name such as Rocarāja (Jinakālamāī); likewise, in the story of the Phongsāwadān Nūa mentioned above, the king is called Phra Jao Arun Rāt "King Arun" (P. roca, aruṇa).

The name Phayā Ruang has in many cases to be freely translated as "a king (or prince) of Sukhōthai / Sī Sachanālai" because it is not possible to identify the particular ruler. It may be that originally Phayā Ruang meant only the first of the Sukhōthai monarchs, King Srī Indrapatindrāditya or Indrāditya, whose title was understood to mean "Lord Sun" or "Lord Light." In the Traibhūmikathā, composed in 1345 (?), the word aditya of the title is exchanged for the synonymous sūrya and the author Phayā Lū Thai is called "grandson of Phayā Ramarāja who belonged to the (King) Sun dynasty" (exordium TBK.KW' 1972.9: หลานเจ้าพระนารามราชผู้เป็นสุริยวงศ์; colophon TBK.KW' 1972.326: หลานแก่พระนารามราชอันเป็นสุริยวงศ์). In later times, the Traibhūmikathā was known simply as Trai Phūm Phra Ruang. It appears therefore that later authors, particularly if living far from Sukhōthai, may not have been aware that Ruang was not a personal name but the name of the dynasty derived from the title of its founder, which is why our sources use Phāya Ruang, Rocarāja etc. seemingly for any of the Sukhōthai kings.

The date 1283 mentioned in the Jindāmanī prefaces for the devising of Thai writing by Phāya Ruang is also mentioned in inscription no. 1 for the devising of Thai letters by King Rām Khamhāng. Those two seem to be the only sources which have a date for the "invention" of the Thai script.

The unexplained technical matter in the "old document" concerning the exact nature or provenance of the Thai letters, commented upon by the author of the Jindāmanī preface, is also not explained in inscription no. 1 (face 4, lines 9-11):

พขุนรามคำแหงหาใคร่ใจในใจแลใส่ลายสีโทนี้ลายสีโทนี้จึงมีเพื่อขุนผู้
นั้นใส่ไว้

"Phò Khun Rām Khamhāng had the deep wish to fix (the shape of ?) these Thai letters (sai lāi sū Thai nī). These Thai letters exist because he set them up (sai wai)."

Thus, the Unusual Jindāmanī prefaces deal only with one item, the devising of a Thai writing system, for which they have four details all of which are compatible with what is said in inscription no. 1, viz., time: A.D. 1283; place: Sī Sachanālai / Sukhōthai; person involved: Phayā Ruang / Phò Khun Rām Khamhāng; no technical details concerning the letters.

The transfer of name and place, Rām Khamhāng > Ruang, and Sukhōthai > Sī Sachanālai, is another example of the change that past events underwent in later writings: a specific monarch in Sukhōthai becomes an anonymous Phayā Ruang of Sī Sachanālai or Sukhōthai.

But all of that does not mean that the Jindāmanī evidence proves 1292 or 1306 or another definite year to be the date of inscription no. 1. It only shows (1) that in 1732, perhaps already in 1672, there was a claim or tradition that, according to an unspecified, old and vaguely worded document, Phayā Ruang (Ròng) had devised a Thai writing system in 1283 after he had obtained Sī Sachanālai; and (2) that in 1732 or already in 1672, an obviously knowledgeable person commented that in his opinion Phayā Ruang did not actually invent the whole system, because it had already been in use in the "Khòm country," but only devised the form of the Thai letters.

It results from the above that the Jindāmanī evidence does not directly answer the question of the age of inscription no. 1 but only corroborates part of the contents of the inscription. On the basis of that corroboration, the inscription should be centuries older than 1732 or 1672 and should date from the Sukhōthai period.

Conclusion

The discussion in this article has produced the following results concerning the date of the inscription. (1) The traditional reasons for dating inscription no. 1 to 1292 are not

convincing; yet, because of other reasons, the inscription may date from that year or from a few years later, for instance from 1305-1306 or even later, but should date from a time when King Rām Khamhāng was still alive. (2) The "Mongol Passage" leaves a choice between the same period and an indefinite but possibly much later time. (3) The preface of the Unusual Jindāmanī points to a date in the plain Sukhōthai period.

Therefore, on the basis of what has been discussed in this article, there appears to be no sufficient reason to move the traditionally accepted date of the inscription to a much more recent time. The evidence seems to point to a date within a period of about two decades beginning with 1292.

As for the objective of the inscription, it would seem that the inscription was intended as a comprehensive eulogy of King Rām Khamhāng, perhaps written some years after the installation of the stone seat Manang Silā Bāt which was of religious and secular importance.

I am aware of the fragility of much that has been put forward in this paper. Many conclusions were arrived at only by weighing probabilities and by judging from appearances. It is therefore likely that in future corrections will have to be made. In a sense, the present article is only an interim assessment based on limited material.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALI.

Archive of Lān Nā Inscriptions, Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University.

Bastian 1866 Siamese Inscriptions.

Adolf Bastian: On Some Siamese Inscriptions. JRAS Bengal Branch 34/1.1866.22-37.

Bradley 1909 Oldest Siamese Writing.

Cornelius Beach Bradley: The Oldest Known Writing In Siamese. JSS 6/1.1909. 1-68.

Chand 1972 Review: Griswold 1967 Towards.

M.C. Chand Chirayu Rajani: A.B. Griswold: towards a History of Sukhodaya Art; Bangkok 1967. JSS 60/2. 1972.257-284.

Chand 1976 Guide.

Mom Chao Chand Chirayu Rajani: Guide through the Inscriptions of Sukhothai. University of Hawaii 1976 (Southeast Asian Studies Working Paper no.9).

Chou Ta-kuan / Paul 1967 Notes.

J. Gilman d'Arcy Paul: Notes on the Customs of Cambodia by Chou Ta-

kuan. Translated from the French version of Paul Pelliot. Bangkok 1967.

Coedès 1917 Documents.

G. Coedès: Documents sur la dynastie de Sukhodaya. BEFEO 17/2. 1917. 1-47.

Coedès 1918 Notes critiques.

G. Coedès: Notes critiques sur l'inscription de Rama Khamheng. JSS 12/1. 1918. 1-27.

Coedès 1924 Recueil.

G. Coedès: Recueil des inscriptions du Siam. Première partie: Inscriptions de Sukhodaya. Bangkok 1924.

Coedès 1962 Peuples.

G. Coedès: Les peuples de la péninsule indochinoise. Paris 1962.

Coedès 1964 Etats.

G. Coedès: Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie. Nouvelle édition revue et mise à jour. Paris 1964.

FitzGerald 1972 Southern Expansion.

C.P. FitzGerald: The Southern Expansion of the Chinese People. Delhi - London 1972.

Flood 1969 Sukhothai-Mongol Relations.

E. Thadeus Flood: Sukhothai-Mongol Relations. A Note on Relevant Chinese and Thai Sources (with Translations). JSS 57/2. 1969. 201-257.

Griswold 1968 Historian's Debt.

A.B. Griswold: The Historian's Debt to King Mongkut. In: Thammayut Order / Mahā Makut University: In commemoration of H.M. King Rama IV (Mongkut). Bangkok 1968, p. 59-78.

Griswold / Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng.

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The Inscription of King Rāma Gā ṃhèri of Sukhodaya (1292 A.d.). JSS 59/2. 1971. 179-228.

Griswold / Prasöt 1972 King Lö daiya.

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: King Lö daiya of Sukhodaya and his Contemporaries. JSS 60/1. 1972. 21-152.

Griswold / Prasöt 1974 Inscr. Wat Phra Yün.

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The Inscription of Wat Pra Yün. JSS 62/1. 1974. 123-141.

Grousset 1960 L'empire.

René Grousset: L'empire des steppes. Paris 1960 (4e édition).

Hall 1964 History.

D.G.E. Hall: A History of South-East Asia. London 1964 (2nd edition).

Hirth 1887 Chinese College.

F. Hirth: The Chinese Oriental College. JChBRAS 22. 1887. 203-219.

JKM.C.

G. Coedès: Jinakālamālinī, traduction. BEFEO 25. 1925. 73-140.

Khian 1966 Folk Art.

Khien Yimsiri: The Folk Art of Uthong, Sukhothai and Bangkok. Bangkok 1966.

Krairiksh.

See: Phiriya.

Krom silapākòn 1983 Jārük samai Sukhōthai.

กรมศิลปากร "จารึกสมัยสุโขทัย" กรุงเทพฯ 2526

le May 1986 Asian Arcady.

Reginald le May: An Asian Arcady. Bangkok 1986 (photographic reprint of the original edition, Cambridge 1926).

Narit 1939 Letter.

สาสน์สมเด็จพระ (สมเด็จพระเจ้าฟ้ากรมพระยานริศฯ และ สมเด็จพระ กรมพระยาดำรงฯ) นิตยสาร ศิลปากร 8/6.2509. 6-10.

Pawaret 1962 King Mongkut Biography.

สมเด็จพระมหาสมณเจ้า กรมพระยาปวเรศวริยาลงกรณ์ "พระราชประวัติพระบาทสมเด็จพระจอมเกล้าเจ้าอยู่หัว" ใน - "พระราชประวัติ และ พระราชนิพนธ์บางเรื่อง ในพระบาทสมเด็จพระจอมเกล้าเจ้าอยู่หัว" (งานพระศพพระเจ้าบรมวงศ์เธอ พระองค์เจ้าประดิษฐาสารี) กรุงเทพฯ 2505.

Pawaret 1968 King Mongkut Biography.

H.R.H. Sangharāja Kromaphraya Pavaresvariyalongkorn: A Brief Account of King Mongkut (Rāma IV). Translated by Phra Mahā Pichit, Phra Mahā Win and Phra Khantipalo. In: Dhammayut Order / Mahāmakuta Rājavidyalaya (eds.): His Majesty King Rama the Fourth Mongkut. Bangkok 1986 p.40-58.

Pelliot 1904 Deux itinéraires.

Paul Pelliot: Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIIIe siècle. BEFEO 4.1904. 131-413.

Penth 1985 Wat Kān Thōm Inscriptions.

Hans Penth: The Wat Kān Thōm Inscriptions and the Development of Thai Letters. Paper presented at the Seminar on Lān Nā History and Archaeology, arranged by the Chiang Mai Teachers College. Chiang Mai 1985.

Penth 1985 New Evidence.

Hans Penth: New Evidence from Lān Nā Concerning the Development of Early Thai Letters and Buddha Images. The Siam Society's Newsletter 1 /3. 1985. 3-7.

Penth 1986 Thai Scripts.

Hans Penth: Thai Scripts. An Outline of their Origin and Development. In: สมเด็จพระเจ้าพี่นางเธอ เจ้าฟ้ากัลยาณิวัฒนา "ยูนนาน" กรุงเทพฯ 2529 น. 246-249

Penth 1989 Jārük Wat Kān Thōm.

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ "จารึกวัดกานโถม และความเป็นมาของอักษรไทย" ใน - จันทรฉาย กัดอธิตม "ข้อมูลประวัติศาสตร์ในรอบทศวรรษ (พ.ศ. 2520-2530)" กรุงเทพฯ 2531 น. 14-24 (Reprint of the Thai version of Penth 1985 Wat Kān Thōm Inscriptions).

Phiriya 1986 Silapa dān neramit.

พิริยะ ไกรฤกษ์ "ศิลปะแดนเนรมิต (ศิลปะสุโขทัย ระหว่าง พ.ศ. 1750-1900)" เมืองโบราณ 12/1.2529.23-37.

PN' 1914 / PN' 1963.

Phongsāwadān Nūa, editions 1914 / 1963. พระวิเชียรปรีชา (น้อย) "พงศาวดารเหนือ" ประชุมพงศาวดาร 1.2457.1-78 / ประชุมพงศาวดาร สำนักพิมพ์แก้วหน้า 1.2506.1-78.

Rockhill 1915 Notes.

W.W. Rockhill: Notes on the Relations and Trade of China. T'oung Pao 16.1915. (The passage on Hsien was reprinted in Prince Damrong [translated and footnotes added by J. Crosby]: Siamese History prior to the founding of Ayudhya; JSS 13/2.1919; reprinted by The Siam Society: Selected Articles from The Siam Society Journal, vol. 3; Bangkok 1959 p.83 n.2.)

Silapā Bannākhān 1961 Jindāmani.

ศิลปาบรรณาคาร "จินตามณี เล่ม 1-2 กับ บันทึกเรื่องหนังสือจินตามณี และ จินตามณี ฉบับพระเจ้าบรมโกศ" กรุงเทพฯ 2504.

TBK.KW' 1972.

Traibhūmikathā, edition Khlang Withayā 1972.

"ไตรภูมิพระร่วง" สำนักพิมพ์คลังวิทยา พระนคร 2515.

Vickery 1978 Guide.

Michael Vickery: A Guide Through Some Recent Sukhothai Historiography. JSS 66/2. 1978.182-246.

Vickery 1979 New Tamnān.

Michael Vickery: A New Tamnan About Ayudhya. JSS 67/2. 1979. 123-186.

Vickery 1987 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng.

Michael Vickery: The Ram Khamhaeng Inscription: a Piltown Skull of Southeast Asian History? Proceedings of the International Conference on Thai Studies. The Australian National University, Canberra, 3-6 July 1987. Vol.1, p.191-211.