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Abstract
Over twenty-five years ago the Wat Bāng Sanuk inscription from Wang Chin, Phrā, was dated to 1339. Today, the arguments that led to this date appear less convincing. The present paper describes a renewed dating effort which resulted in the year 1219. This early date is not credible without corroboration. The true date of the inscription, therefore, remains doubtful. Its determination will depend on future arguments that may have to include calendrical, paleographical and population-historical considerations. These deliberations will also be useful for dating other inscriptions.

The stone inscription of Wat Bāng Sanuk, from Amphō Wang Chin south of Phrā, records the construction of a jedi (stūpa) and the donations made to it. Only the upper part of the stone slab has survived in a damaged form. The inscribed text is therefore partly mutilated and incomplete.

What is left of the original stone measures 46/28/7 cm; the stone breaks off after line 29. The beginning of the inscription is in Pāli, the rest is in Thai language. The square Thai letters are similar to those of other old inscriptions, of a type to which the Rām Khamhāng inscription also belongs (which, however, places i and u on the line and not, as usual, above and below the line). The
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relatively high age of the inscription is indirectly confirmed by the absence of a horoscope, duang chatā, which is usually present in later inscriptions.

The author does not seem to have been a very skilled writer because he sometimes omits key words such as a verb, a noun, a pronoun or name, or a connecting particle, which the reader has to supply for himself and which increases our difficulties with the text. But that may also be part of the author's style, or the style of time and place, because brevity is typical for old Lān Nā texts. The letters appear to be fluid and not at all clumsy.

The surviving text, after an introductory salutation in Pāli, says that the ruler or governor (jao mūang) of Trók Sałôp and Sā Ngūn ēng trōk slō (u) และ จุน had nobles and commoners stamp 11,108 Buddha images made of tin (hiak, a tin/zinc/lead alloy) and clay. He and/or his people also gave a relic, two ivory Buddha images, silver and bronze trays for areca nuts, and surrounded these items with umbrella(s) and flag(s); the whole formed a procession or gathering and was accompanied with the sounds of music and drums; and there were also bowls of roasted rice, flowers, torches, candles, incense, sandalwood, and fragrant oil. The ruler then knelt down in solemn salute and donated the offerings in homage to the Buddha, the Dhamma and the Sangha. He placed them down in the crypt (?) of a jēdī at an auspicious moment. The jēdī was then built of laterite, covered with white stucco, and finished within a month. He also had a sālā built. Then further donations were prepared: a family of slaves to look after the "phra" (Buddha images or the relic?), an elephant, a horse(?), a cow/ox, a buffalo, etc. As for the governor of Sałôp, he donated monastic robes, (rice fields with an annual tax income of) some 860,000 cowries (as an endowment for the upkeep of the place), fifty pillows, (annual taxes from an) areca nut (plantation) ... (here the stone breaks off).

The auspicious moment when the items were placed in the jēdī, is dated in the inscription but the date is mutilated. Griswold and Prasert (1979) thought that the date was equivalent to A.D. 1339, that the inscription dates from that year, and that it therefore is the second oldest known Thai written document, less than fifty years younger than the Rām Khamhāng inscription of 1292.

The mutilated date of the event begins in line 20 and carries on to line 21. Here the left part of the stone is chipped so that at the onset of each line a few letters are missing. For the date the missing letters at the beginning of line 20 are not important because the date begins further on in that line. But the missing letters at the start of line 21 are crucial because they are part of the date and cannot easily be reconstituted. Also, it is difficult to decide how many letters are missing at the beginning of line 21; probably three or four letters of average width. Presumably four letters are missing if the beginning of the line followed the contour of the stone as the upper lines do. But only three letters would be missing if the stone here had a flaw at the time of engraving, as is suggested by line 19 whose first word, ดู, begins one or two letter positions removed to the right, as if the stone surface in front of the word could not be used.
The date on the stone reads as follows. The missing letters are represented by dots (see also note 2 above):

(20) วนน เม็ง แปล เลื่อน เจ็ด ออก สิ
(21) [ . ] ‘วัน ที่ แรก เทมา และ โร้

That translates as "day Mong Pao, month 7, day 'si [...]...am' of the waxing moon, year Kat Mao and Thô." The number of the day, "si [...]...am", is no longer complete. The number of the year evidently was not recorded at all, only its names: Kat Mao and Thô.

The year was understood by Griswold and Prasert to be C.S. 701 which indeed was a year Kat Mao according to the Thai system of naming years, and also a year Thô according to the Khmer/Mon (Khôm) system.

A year Kat Mao occurs every sixty years, for instance C.S. 581, 641, 701, 761, etc. Explaining their choice of C.S. 701 = A.D. 1339, Griswold and Prasert wrote (1979, 63):

Obviously C.S. 641 (1279 A.D.) will not do, because the Tai script did not come into existence until 1283 A.D .... C.S. 761 (1399 A.D.) is very improbable because of the total absence of the mai-han-akasa. We therefore take the year to be C.S. 701 = 1339 A.D. which the archaic appearance of the script serves to confirm.

The reading of the month presents no formal difficulties. But it is not apparent whether this "month 7" was counted in the so–called styles of Sukhôthai, Chiang Tung, or Chiang Mai, i.e. whether the month Jettha (Jyestha; Sukhôthai), Visakhâ (Vaisákha; Chiang Tung) or Cîttâ (Caitra; Chiang Mai) was meant. 6

The day fell in the phase of the waxing fortnight of the moon but the day-number is uncertain. The mutilated text says: day Mong Pao, day "si [...]...am" of the waxing moon. Theoretically, the day might have read sî kham "waxing 4." But it is not probable for two reasons: the reading seems to be clearly sî, and not sî (the difference, here and elsewhere on the stone, is a little tail attached to the right part of the vowel "i"); and it is unlikely that the stone surface, prepared for receiving the inscription, had a big, unusable spot which extended over several lines and was large enough for up to three or four letters. Besides, that would not have been a day Mong Pao (see note 7 below).

The day, therefore, probably had two digits because of the long space it needed on the stone. The first digit presumably was 1 (of sip "ten") and the second digit is lost. However, the day–number must have been between 10 and 15 because there are only 15 days to the waxing moon.

It is possible to guess at two of the missing letters and to narrow somewhat the choice between the six days, 10–15. Line 20 ends with sî, si; line 21 at the beginning is destroyed but has enough free space for three or four letters. The first of these letters must be (ū), i.e. the end of the word sî, sip "ten." The last of the missing letters must be (ค) of คำ kham "night" (คำ):
Thus, the number 10 is excluded because of excessive free space. There is enough space for one or two letters between สิม and สิ่ง, and these letters should be the end of the numbers 11, 12, 13, 14 or 15, i.e. either เด็ก (of สิมเด็ก), สัง所属, สามสัม, สิ่งสิ, or หาห้า. The last one, 15, may be somewhat less probable than the others because it could, perhaps more commonly, also be expressed as "full moon day"เติมเจตแพง (เพดก).

But Griswold and Prasert thought that the two missing letters might be ห้า หา (=ห้า) "5" because they estimated that there was enough space for two letters between (บ) and (ต). Therefore, the day would be "waxing 15."

That, however, was not a day Mông Pao, and was not even close to a day Mông Pao. The two authors foresaw this objection and countered it with the argument that the Sukhothai calendar at the time was not exact which is why it had to be corrected later by Phayā Lü Thai (Mahādharmarāja I) in the years around 1350, as is told in the Khmer-language inscription from Wat Pā Mamuang, Sukhothai (c. 1361; inscr. no.4).

Griswold and Prasert's reasoning that the inscription should be dated to 1339 thus repose on four arguments: there was no Thai script before 1283; the diacritical marker mai han glyph is absent (which makes the inscription, in the eyes of the authors, earlier than c. 1361); the internal day-month-year inconsistency of their proposed date 1339 is immaterial because the calendar at the time was defective; the archaic script features confirm an early date.

With the exception of the last argument, viz. that the letters are archaic and the inscription therefore "old," the other three arguments at present seem weaker than when they did when the authors wrote their article over twenty-five years ago. That there was Thai script long before 1283, i.e. before Rām Khamhāng of Sukhothai devised his own type of Thai letters, was already assumed by Cœdès and others before him; the existence of such early Thai script ("proto-Thai script") has been a scholarly conjecture since, even though no written specimen dating from that time may have survived. The mai han glyph is no precise indicator of the age of an inscription (Penth 1992, 21–22, 44–47 and Penth 1985, 177 n.5, referring inter alia to Cœdès 1925, 10–15; Burney and Cœdès 1927, 87ff, 101; and Cœdès 1964, 360). Lastly, the argument of a calendar disorder may not be applicable to this inscription.

The calendar disorder referred to by Griswold and Prasert would only have affected the correctness of the officially calculated lunar day, the beginning of a month, the intercalation of a month or of a day, etc. It would not have affected the name of the day or the name of the year because here no calculations are necessary. Day follows upon day, whether in the "Thai" style (Mông Pao,
etc.) or in the "Mon" style (Sunday, Monday, etc.). Their order is permanently fixed and independent of calculated values for the moon, the sun or the planets. Therefore the name of the day and the year as mentioned in the inscription cannot easily be dismissed.

Besides, if in about 1350 something was wrong with the calendar at the Sukhothai Court, there was not necessarily also something wrong with the calendar at Wat Băng Sanuk which was a hundred kilometers from Sukhothai. Lân Nà inscriptions have many examples of local short-time calendar aberrations.

III

Since the arguments that led to the date 1339 appear less solid than previously thought, a question arises immediately: what if the date in the Wat Băng Sanuk inscription were correct and that the year Kat Mao were not C.S. 701?

The three nearest possibilities before and after C.S. 701 are two dates in C.S. 581 and one in C.S. 881. Both of these years had a month 7 with a day Mõng Pao, where "month 7" could have been in the Chiang Mai or in the Sukhothai style, viz. "month 7" could mean month Citta or month Jeṭṭha. During that period there was no such combination in Chiang Tung style, i.e. month 7 meaning Visākha. The three possible dates are:

- Day Mõng Pao, 11/07 (Ch. Mai style)/C.S. 581 = Thursday 28 March 1219
- Day Mõng Pao, 12/07 (Sukh. style)/C.S. 581 = Monday 27 May 1219
- Day Mõng Pao, 14/07 (Sukh. style)/C.S. 881 = Thursday 12 May 1519

The year 1519 is too late for the archaic appearance of the letters. The two remaining dates both fall in the year 1219. The date 27 May 1219 may have a space problem: sip-sòng kham, สิป-สองคำ "waxing 12" would require three letter positions for sòng while presumably only two positions are available, as has been explained above; the word would be too long.

That leaves 28 March 1219 as a possible date for the Wat Băng Sanuk inscription, and although sip-et kham, สิป-เอตคำ "waxing 11" theoretically also requires three letter positions for et, เต, space may be no problem in this case because the slender letter "இ" could easily be accommodated in addition to the two letters เต to form the word เต. Therefore, the day could indeed have read "Mõng Pao, waxing 11."

The basis for the date 1219 thus is: there was a day Mõng Pao in a month 7, and the stone has precisely the space required for writing the date.

Such a surprisingly early date is not acceptable without further corroboration. Here are three observations that might begin to make the date more credible.

The inscription does not mention personal names, only titles based on toponyms which in part are not Thai. It speaks of a Jao Müang ("ruler, governor
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of") Tròk Salòp and Sà Ngun, nà nam ñîq trok salôp ñà nàng rùn (line 9) and also names a Jao of Salôp, nà fâ bây slôp (line 26) who may or may not be the same person.11 The word salôp recurs in the former name of Wat Bâng Sanuk, viz. Wat Pâk (Mâ) Salôp, wà bâp (mâ) sà ngun12 The word sà might be Thai (?) and could be the same as modern châ, jâ (as in Jâ Hom, Chà Phân, etc.), meaning a shallow seasonal pond. But the words tròk and salôp do not sound Thai. The inscription thus conveys the impression that its author, a Thai speaker, lived in an area with non–Thai place–names, perhaps even among a non–Thai people; as if the local Thais had arrived here only recently, had settled down, but had not yet really Thai–ized the country. That would have been the case if the inscription had been composed before or not long after the Thais took over the Sachanalai–Sukhôthai region, which they are supposed to have done in about 1220 (Côdès 1964, 357).

The year 1219 for the Wat Bâng Sanuk inscription would fit such a scenario. Of course one could also argue that even today, though the region has been under Thai administration for seven hundred years, the brook is still called Salok. The square characters of the inscription could be Thai letters of the type that were used by Râm Khamhâng when he formed his own script variant. Here one would like to know more about where these particular square characters stand in the general chain of development of square letters, and where square letters stand in the overall chain of development of Thai letters.

The day on which the ruler of Tròk Salôp made merit by enshrining the items in the stûpa was close to New Year and therefore was not just an ordinary day.13 To be precise, it was the day after New Year, C.S. 581, which fell on 27 March 1219. Indeed, the period of the first days of a new year traditionally was, and still is, regarded as a very proper occasion to make merit. That increases the credibility of the calculated date for the Wat Bâng Sanuk inscription because it falls well within a time appropriate for making merit.

Here are three similar instances from the past. (1) The Buddha relics believed to be enshrined on Dòi Tung (north of Chiang Râi), together with other neighboring holy sites, traditionally were venerated at the beginning of each year; the custom has changed now, but the Caves' Chronicle, Tamnân Tham Pum, Tham Plâ, Tham Plo Plûng Fâ from nearby, which also covers part of the Dòi Tung history, still conserves the memory of it: "[All the kings down to Phaya Phâ Yü, r. 1337–1355] regularly went to perform acts of merit at the great relics on Dòi Tung, also on Dòi Chang Mûp and at the caves Tham Pum, Tham Plâ and Tham Plo Plûng Fâ, from the time of New Year, when the sun had entered Aries."14 (2) On New Year's day C.S. 865 (30 March 1503) the construction of the wihân of Wat Sî Suphan, Chiang Mai, was begun.15 (3) On the day after New Year C.S. 885 (31 March 1523) a great merit–making festivity took place at Wat Yâng Num, Chiang Mai. The king, Phayâ Kâo, donated rice fields to the principal Buddha image and three families (for its service?). Another important donation (name or nature of the gift are lost) was made with substantial monetary contributions from the princess grandmother and other faithfu ls.16
I am aware of the vulnerability and fragility of the reasoning "pro 1219" and shall not insist. The above attempt at dating the inscription did not bring a definite result. The true date of the inscription is still uncertain. However, it has become evident that the question of the date of the inscription is more complex than hitherto thought. Since there is a possibility that the actual date of the Wat Bang Sanuk inscription could be 1219, or may not be 1339, or indeed was 1339, it would certainly be fruitful or at least informative to collect more arguments, for or against either date, or for a third date. Without reliably dated pieces of Thai writing from such an early time, a renewed consideration of the cultural history of the area may be one option, in particular the population and settlement history with its ethnic, philological (and particularly paleographical), calendrical and religious elements. Also, a re-examination of the stone itself seems indicated. Such multiple assessments will almost certainly turn up new insights, and not just in aid only of solving the riddle of the date of this particular inscription.

The personal and place names mentioned in the inscription make it possible to theorize that the region of Wat Bang Sanuk then had an austroasiatic substratum, perhaps closer to Mon than to Khmer or Lawa. One wonders why in 1219, when from Wang Chin the road to Si Sachanālai and Sukhōthai was so much easier than that to Lampāng–Lamphūn, the author of the inscription would count months in "Chiang Mai" style and not in "Sukhōthai" style. When and where was the origin of the "Chiang Mai month" reckoning? Did Old Mon (Lamphūn) or, subsequently, Lān Nā cultural influence extend across mountains so far south?

Notes

1. Wat Bang Sanuk วัดบางสนุก is located at the mouth of the brook Huai Salok หัวสะอาด, on the west bank of the Yom River, in Amphō Wang Chin, Phrā province, about 63 km southwest of Phrā in a straight line, c. 31 km southwest of Amphō Lōng, c. 45 km south of Lampāng, c. 55 km northwest of Old Sī Sachanālai and c. 100 km north of Old Sukhōthai. (Map 1:50,000, series L 708, sheet 4964.4; series L 7017, sheet 4944.4; GC 642787. The map of the L 708 series wrongly calls the brook "Huai Pan Jen" which in fact is a tributary of the Huai Salok further upstream.)

Until 1920 the site was a monastery ruin called Wat Pāk (Mā) Salōp วัดปาก (แม่) สล้อ (or: สล้อSalok) "Monastery at the Mouth of the (Mā) Salōp" which had extensive premises that stretched for perhaps 200 m along the Yom River. The southern end of the premises touched the brook Huai Salok which comes down from the hills in the northwest and is about 10 km long. The old monastery ruins consisted chiefly of the remains of a jedī (stūpa) and small mounds of bricks and
laterite, presumably the remains of buildings. The northern part of the premises became the Wat Băng Sanuk school, the amphô office, and the police station. The new monastery was rebuilt from 1920 on, around the remains of the old jedî, and the former name was changed to Wat Băng Sanuk.

The inscribed stone slab was excavated in 1954 about five meters north of the northern wall of Wat Băng Sanuk, on the premises of the school. It presumably was found in or at a mound of bricks and laterite blocks among the two Bodhi trees, now built up as a platform. In 1955 it was brought to the National Museum, Bangkok, and in 1985 it was in the Hô Phra Samut Wachirayân, National Library, where I took the photograph that accompanies this paper.

The inscription is known as พ. 1; Inscr. No. 107; or 1.8.1.1 Wat Băng Sanuk 1339(?). It has repeatedly been published, in, among others, Prasàn and Prasert 1966; Prasàn and Prasert 1970; Griswold and Prasert 1979; Kannikã et al. 1991a.

Among other items found on the land was an inscribed stone fragment, measuring 10x9x3.5 cm, with five lines of writing and with a lettering and orthography similar to the big stone, possibly a part of it; reddish and black phra phim (clay Buddha votive images cast from moulds) both round and sîmâ–shaped, with one or several images of the Buddha; and pottery shards. A few pieces were for some time kept in Wat Băng Sanuk but were no longer there in 1996.

2. I have separated the words; they are written without spaces in the inscription.

3. Thông in Lân Nā texts means "bronze," not "gold" (which is called kham ขาม). Besides, in an enumeration of metals, the more precious metal is mentioned first. If thông here were to mean "gold," one would expect the sequence "gold and silver," not "silver and gold."

4. Griswold and Prasert (1979) understood "monastic robes for Jao Phài Salôp" whom they considered the abbot of the monastery. The difference in translation stems from the word phâi ไฟ which they take as part of the name, while I favor the translation "concerning, on the part of." It is possible that, at the time, there was not yet a monastery, only the newly–built jedî and sâlâ, and that from this beginning, as a place of worship, the monastery developed later when monks came to live permanently near the jedî. The monastic robes could have been for monks invited to the ceremony from elsewhere, and the pillows for visiting worshipers resting in the sâlâ.

5. Here Griswold and Prasert insert a reference to their 1971 article, The Inscription of King Râma Gamhèn of Sukhodaya (1292 A.D.). This inscription, usually thought to date from 1292, says that the king devised "these Thai letters" in 1283. For a discussion of the date 1292, see Chamberlain (1991).

6. The so–called Chiang Mai style of numbering months is one unit higher than the so–called Chiang Tung style and two units more than the so–called Sukhôthai style; for instance, the Chiang Mai month 7 (Citta) would be called month 5 in central Thailand.

7. A date calculation by computer shows that 15/07/C.S. 701 in Chiang Mai style was a day Kat Kai, thirty–eight days past and twenty–two days before a day Mông Pao; in Chiang Tung style it was a day Kâ Rao, four and fifty–six days removed from a day Mông Pao; and in Sukhôthai style it was a day Kâ Mao, thirty–four or twenty–six days distant from a day Mông Pao. These differences seem to exclude the possibility of an erratically intercalated day or month.

For the sake of completeness, the other possibilities are given in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waxing</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Distance from a Day</th>
<th>Pök</th>
<th>Tao Set</th>
<th>Tao Si</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>49/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pök Jai</td>
<td>49/11</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Chiang Tung)</td>
<td>15/45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tao Set</td>
<td>15/45</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Sukhôthai)</td>
<td>45/15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tao Si</td>
<td>45/15</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>43/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kāp Sangā</td>
<td>43/17</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Chiang Tung)</td>
<td>9/51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pök Si</td>
<td>9/51</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>(Sukhôthai)</td>
<td>39/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pök Set</td>
<td>39/21</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>42/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dap Met</td>
<td>42/18</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Chiang Tung)</td>
<td>8/52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kat Sai</td>
<td>8/52</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(Sukhôthai)</td>
<td>38/22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kat Kai</td>
<td>38/22</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>41/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rawâi San</td>
<td>41/19</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Chiang Tung)</td>
<td>7/53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kot Sangā</td>
<td>7/53</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>(Sukhôthai)</td>
<td>37/23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kot Jai</td>
<td>37/23</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>40/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mõng Rao</td>
<td>40/20</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(Chiang Tung)</td>
<td>6/54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruang Met</td>
<td>6/54</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>(Sukhôthai)</td>
<td>36/24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruang Pao</td>
<td>36/24</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Chiang Mai)</td>
<td>39/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pök Set</td>
<td>39/21</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Chiang Tung)</td>
<td>5/55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tao San</td>
<td>5/55</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>(Sukhôthai)</td>
<td>35/25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tao Yi</td>
<td>35/25</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(I am very grateful to Dr. J. C. Eade, Canberra, who some years ago let me have his computer program "Faraut 3" for calculating dates and, more recently, his advanced program "SEAC.")

8. It seems that it may have been in advance by an unknown number of days. For details of what supposedly was wrong with the calendar of the Sukhôthai Court and what corrective measures were taken, see face 2, lines 1-10 of the Wat Pâ Mamuung inscription (in Coedès 1924, 91-102; Griswold and Prasert 1973, 1: 127-144) and Coedès's 1924 comments, 98-99 n. 3.

9. "The day of the month, आू .., is mutilated. As the lacuna is wide enough for just two letters, the obvious reconstruction is आू, 'fifteen'; but in any case the complete number has to be something between ten and fifteen, as the waning moon begins the day after the fifteenth of the waxing. Not one of these dates in the seventh month of C.S. 701 (1339) would be a 'mōn plau' day in the Tai cycle; but the discrepancy, rather than invalidating our view that the year was really C.S. 701 (1339), must be considered as an example of the disarray of the calendar in the Sukhodaya area before it was reformed by Mahâdharmarâjâ I between 1347 and 1357." (Griswold and Prasert 1979, 63)

"... the Sukhodayan calendar had evidently gone wrong during his father's reign, and Mahâdharmarâjâ himself, after mounting the throne [in 1347] made the intricate calculations by which he succeeded in setting it right." (Griswold and Prasert 1973, 131)

10. Because, in their view, the mai han âkât made its first appearance in about 1361 (Griswold and Prasert 1973, 113); cf. Penth 1985, 176 n. 1.

11. This last name has been understood to mean a monk by name of Jao Phai Salôp; cf. above, note 4.

12. Cf. above, note 1. It has been stated that this place was in, or that this individual was from, the area of the province of Nâń: "ตรวจสถาน , เฉียง (np. in the province of Nâń)" , where "np." stands for "name of a person, name of a king" (Ishii et al. 1989, 62, where the authors are referring to the present inscription which they call Inscription No. 107). Unless "Nâń" here is an error for its neighboring province Phrá, that statement would need elaboration.

13. Professor David Wyatt, Cornell University, made this pertinent point during the discussion after the paper had been read at the Conference in Chiang Mai.

14. "...เพื่อใจปะกิจทำกุศลบูญการ ให้ผู้ผูดูจ้า ชอบพุทธ ดีอยู่ และข้าพระส ำปุณ คำตอบ ผู้เปล่งเสียงผัด ตั้งแต่กุศลเดือนอันตกปีใหม่ อัทธิตย์ชื่อสุเมธราชูส" (Pen ð et al. 1993, 54, 128).

15. "And then, in the year Kâ Kai, month Visâkha, the Thais say month 6, the horas (say) night 4 of the waxing moon, Thursday, the Thais say day Kot Sangâ, on the day of New Year, at the hour Têt Chao (06.00–07.30h), they (began to) build the great wiñăñ" /ถัดนี้ ให้ปักใต้ เดือนวิษณุ ไหว้ เดือน 6 ไหว้ ออก 4 ค่า วันปรุงส โลกซึ่งว่า ศกริษชั้นปีใหม่ ถามดูเมื่อเช้า บลุกมหาริยา แล / (I.2.1.1 St Suphan Arām 1509, 1.20–23).

This inscription still awaits a modern text edition and translation; so far its first and only publication is in Schmitt (1898, 268, 275). Faces 1 and 2 are reversed there; also Schmitt mistakenly thought that the wiñăñ construction ended on that day.

16. "In the year Kâ Met, month 7, night 14 of the waxing moon, the Thais (say) day Rawâî Si, the Mon (say) day 3 (Tuesday), (Cula)sakkarâja 884 (an obvious error for 885, as corroborated by the position of the heavenly bodies in the accompanying horoscope, or duang chatâ), His Majesty was pleased to donate rice fields of 60,000 cowries annual tax income as food for the Buddha image, and 3 families of slaves (to serve the image) "..." (donation of an unidentified object) the (total) cost was 6,000 weight of silver; the princess grandmother gave 400, other faithfuls gave 5,600" /ปีนี้ในเดือน 7 ออก 14 ค่โยวิษณุ ฮี 884 คาวาราจ 60,000 เหล่าสุคนธ์ ผ่า ผ่าน 400 ฟุน ผ่าน 5600 เหล่าสุคนธ์ / (I.2.1.1 Wat Yang Num 1523: 1.1–5, 2.1–3).

The location of Wat Yang Num in Chiang Mai is unknown. The inscribed stone at some time broke into several pieces, the last surviving piece (?) I found in Wat Phan Tao, Chiang Mai. This upper left fragment of only the front face is published in Penth 1975a and 1975b. At the time of these publications, the existence of old rubbings showing approximately the complete upper half of the stone, front and back, was still unknown. These additional parts of the inscription have not yet been published; the text quoted above is partly taken from those rubbings. The lower part of the stone seems lost, and with it the name of the object that cost 6,000 weight units in silver (presumably c. 6.6 kg).
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