Abstract

The article treats in seven different sections aspects of rice and rice fields in northern Thailand’s past. It shows how fields were defined, assessed, and named, what rice was planted, how and what fields were donated to monasteries to help with their upkeep, who were the field administrators, and with statistics points out various considerations such as relevant fertility. Much cultural and old-time administrative matter is explained, including its particular vocabulary. The facts are nearly all taken from inscriptions.

1. Introduction

The staple food of Lân Nâ ลำน่าน “Region of a Million Rice Fields”¹ was and is rice. While preparation, irrigation and use of rice fields lay in private hands, their evaluation (assessment) for taxes and their administration was an important

---

*In the present article, the standard code-names of the Archive of Lân Nâ Inscriptions (Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University) are used for inscriptions; names or codes used by other authors or institutions are indicated in the bibliography.

Quotations from primary text sources are generally written in modern Standard Thai orthography. However, quotations between slashes / ... / conserve the original orthography of a text. Letters in parenthesis (...) are my own addition; letters in brackets [...] are doubtful readings. The number of dots .... in a text quotation indicates approximately the number of unreadable letters.

Numbers are uniformly rendered as figures, though in the original they can be either numerals or words, or a mixture of both. For example: /สาระแย้มขบ 50 แฉ ะ = ฉะ 250 ขาว “Rice fields of a size requiring 250 measures of seed-rice” (1.2.1.1 Kï Wat Sao Hin c. 1480).

Numbers in texts from old Lân Nâ can be baffling; for instance: “The (construction) costs were 6,000 silver” สิบห้า 6,000 พี (1.2.1.1 Wat Yïng Num 1523). “The Nâ Thai field of 100 measures seed-rice” ปราภ 1001 สะบู (1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lô 1498).

¹ The oldest known Thai document to mention the name is a stone inscription from Chiang Khïm on the Mä Khïng River, dated 1554 (Penth 1980 The Toponym Lân Nâ; Penth 1988 Inscr. Wat Chiang Sï 1553). However, the toponym must be much older than that because it appears already on European maps at least since 1448, spelled /Llana/ on the Leardo map of that year, and /lanna/ on Behaim’s globe of 1492 (Suárez 1999 Early Mapping: 107).
On Rice and Rice Fields in Old Lân Nâ

task of the local and state bureaucracy. Though Lân Nâ and her southern neighbours, Sukhôthai and Ayuthyâ, had much in common concerning the administration of rice fields and rice, there were also differences. But while details from Old Sukhôthai / Ayuthyâ / central Thailand are rather well known, particulars from Lân Nâ often are less well known and present problems. The following pages aim to explain some administrative details typical for Lân Nâ.

In the absence of old archive material such as documents concerned with income from and administration of fields, a valuable source for information are stone inscriptions when they list the property of a monastery or report on donations to a monastery, and to a lesser extent chronicles. Old local law codices also have interesting material on rice and rice fields. But in spite of valuable efforts to handle these difficult texts, because of shortcomings in their publication (transcription, translation, general presentation) this source on the theoretical background (as opposed to the real cases reported in inscriptions) still cannot be conveniently and reliably tapped.²

In the present article, the difficult question of the ownership of fields, or of land in general, will largely be avoided. In theory the king owned all land but ordinary citizens, in particular cultivators, nonetheless had powerful claims if not downright possessory rights. Land for building a monastery could be bought.³

For the purpose of this paper it is assumed that individuals were the owners, unless they rented fields from others, that also monasteries could own fields, and that, when a monastery received the donation of a field, it became the de facto owner, because that is what the texts seem to say. Also, there still are a few monasteries which traditionally have owned fields, to the extent that their monks seldom

² To mention only two Lân Nâ law texts, rendered in Thai transcription and English translation: (1) Prasôt 1971 Mang Râi Sât (Thai text) and Griswold / Prasôt 1977 Judgments (the first 20 articles in English); (2) Arunrat / Wijeyewardene 1986 Laws of Mang Râi (Thai text and English translation).

³ For instance, a stone inscription from the environs of Chiang Mai, probably dating from between 1450 - 1550, states that someone “bought land for founding a monastery” ซื้อที่พิน สร้างวัด. Unfortunately there are no details available because the text before and after this passage is destroyed (1.2.1.1 Wat Hua Nồng).

An example from Phayao for 1474: “(Prince Yuthisathian, the former ruler of Phitsanu Lôk who emigrated to Phâyêt Tîlok and was made governor of Phayao, converted his beautiful residence Bàn Nông Tao into a monastery.) He paid the king via Mùn Châng Pû Kâm 2,000 silver pieces stamped “5 Chiang Mai” as price for the ârâma property” เฉลิมฉลอง 5 เชิงทอง 2,000 โกดังจักรีณีข้าหลวงภำษำ ภำษำ แก้วพระเป็นเจ้าได้เป็นค่ารำย (1.5.1.1 Bàn Nông Tao 1474). The silver money used here probably were khâ khîm ข้าม silver pieces.
or never make their (in principle obligatory) morning rounds for alms. Monasteries even "owned" villages and collected tax from them.

How real that "ownership" was, whether an individual person only had the right to use the field, and whether a monastery only gained the right to the field’s or the village’s tax or to some of the usufruct (and not actual "title"), is another point. What mattered for the individual was that he had a plot of land at his disposal, and for the monastery it was important that it received a regular income from a specific field or village for its subsistence. It may well have been that this permanent income was comparable to an endowment fund or trust, and that it did not include actual ownership of the fund or trust; at least there is no known instance from inscriptions that a monastery sold its fields or villages, though practically all formerly donated fields at present have other owners and villages are no longer under a monastery.

In terms of the country’s overall administration, in Ayuthaya, at least in theory, rice field administration was under central control. Already early Ayuthaya had, among its 4 principal ministers and their departments, krom น้า, one called krom น้า นา “Department for wet rice fields”, or “paddy fields”, which was headed by the khun น้า ชู เป็น and which was responsible for rice fields and other agricultural affairs. Län Nă did not have such a central institution. Its rice fields and rice probably were supervised more from local levels.

In terms of “ownership” and use of fields, in Län Nă there may have been three kinds of fields. (1) Crown property, i.e. fields that were directly under the king and his immediate family. (2) State property, i.e. fields that belonged to the mūang เมือง “country”. They were attached to the position of appointed governments officials, and their usufruct, or part of their produce, formed a part of the official’s rank and income (“official fields”). (3) Ordinary fields, “owned” and worked by private citizens. The exact difference between crown and state property is unknown and perhaps was somewhat fluent. Crown property fields and state property fields (น้า ขุน “rent field”) were rented out to private individuals. There were no permanent or official state farmers.

4 For instance Wat Sī Sawāng in A. San Pā Tòng, Chiang Mai province.
5 For instance, in 1495 Wat Lī near Phayao “had 6 villages since of old” บ้านกับวัดมีแม่บ้าน 6 บ้าน (1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495; see also below in footnote 20).
6 These four departments, or ministries, were collectively called jatusadom จัตุสัสดิ “the four pillars”. The four ministers were known as: Khun Mūang ขุนเมือง “Minister of General Country Affairs”, Khun Wang ขุนวงศ์ “Minister of Palace Affairs”, Khun Khlang ขุนคลัง “Minister of the Treasury”, and Khun Nă ขุนนา “Minister of Rice Fields and Agricultural Affairs”.
7 Cf. “H.M. the king of Chiang Mai granted royal fields to this monastery” (follows a list of fields) สมเด็จ ... เจ้าเมืองพิบูล เชียงใหม่ มีพระราชดำรัสหลาย ที่กษัตริย์ ไว้กับอารามยิ่งนี้ (1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492).
8 The exact meaning and usage of the word khun ขุน present difficulties. It is usually understood as "pit, mine, a hole from which something desirable can be extracted; to exploit". But for practical purposes it is often convenient to translate it as "for rent, rental, to rent".
With few exceptions, for all fields a tax or rent had to be paid. Newly opened fields were tax exempt for some years.  
There were, and still are, two basically different kinds of fields.

(1) Wet rice or paddy fields, nā ฿ (seldom P. khetta, T. khet, or Sk. kṣetra, T. kaset). The origin of the word nā is unknown but it seems to be common to most if not all Thai dialects. The fields are usually arranged in groups, one field or plot adjoining the next, separated from each other by low earth walls, khan nā ฿mu. Individual fields or plots were counted with the help of the classifier rai ฿ “a plot of field”, for instance ฿3 “3 plots wet rice fields”. In central Thailand also the word krathong ฿vessel” was used and there is now the common classifier for a single plot, krathong nā ฿vessel, the word rai in this sense having fallen in disuse.

At an unknown time, in central Thailand the word rai began to be used to indicate the size of fields, and of land in general. In this sense it is now used throughout Thailand as a standard surface measure equaling 1600 square meters (4 ngān ฿ or 400 square wā ฿). In Lān Nā, however, rai continues to be used in the old meaning of “plot of field” though the expression used now is usually rai müang ฿ “rai of the local country, local rai”, to distinguish it from the official surface measure which is called rai phās™ ฿ “tax rai”.

The fields have to be lightly flooded, with water at a certain level, during much of the rice growing period. The shape of an individual field, surrounded by its little earthen dams which retain the water, is usually rectangular in the plains. In hilly terrain fields can be of any shape and size because they have to follow the contours of the land to maintain an even flood level. In steep territory such rice fields take the form of irregular terraces.

(2) Upland fields or plantations, also called dry fields, rai ฿. These are fields on elevated terrain, at the foot or on the flank of a hill, often made by clearing the forest and underbrush with fire, and used only for two to three seasons until the soil is exhausted (swidden farming). They depend on rain water (now often supplemented by modern irrigation methods) and can be used to grow certain varieties of rice that do not require flooding (“dry rice”, “hill rice”), or to grow other crops such as cotton, peppers, vegetables, also fruit trees, etc.

---

9 This is attested from several old law codices; cf. Art. 11 in Prasōt 1971 Mang Rāi Sāt: 6, and Griswold / Prasōt 1977 Judgments: 152.
There may have been other cases of exemptions, with details as yet unknown, because an inscription of 1500 from Nān mentions nā bia ฿ “cowry fields”, i.e. “taxable fields”, implying that there must have been tax exempted fields (1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500).

10 From Malay padi “(1) rice as a plant in the field; (2) rice in the ear; (3) rice in the husk, unhusked rice”.
When reading of *rai*, therefore, one must decide whether an upland field, the classifier for a wet rice field, or the modern surface measure is meant.

Since about 50-70 years or so, with the use of modern irrigation techniques and newly developed rice strains, these formerly rather clear differences between low lying wet rice fields *nā* and upland fields *rai*, tend to become less strict. Today it is often possible, after the wet rice has been harvested, to plant on the same field, a second and even a third rice crop of different variety, or, without flooding, an entirely different crop, for instance onions or other vegetables.

In Old Sukhōthai, fields either were measured geometrically, i.e. their length and width were indicated by the linear measure *wā* *rū*, or they were counted in individual plots, *rai* *

An amount of rice was indicated, not in weight, but in measures of capacity such as *sat* *khon* and cart, i.e. cartload, *kwian* ภ ร. ภ. *ratha*. Field taxes, *ākōn* อาหาร, were determined in cowries, *bia* บิ, and were due annually.

---

11 An example from Sukhōthai in 1399: “(The queen mother gave) a field which was 400 *wā* (byāma) long and 200 *wā* wide” khetta† catusatabyāma† ṣūmāna viṭṭhārato (sic) byāmasatadvayantassa (inscr. # 93, Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, 1399+).

The *wā*, at present equal to 2 m, formerly was shorter. In the present article, it is equated to 1.75 m.

12 For example: “(The king) donated 400 *rai* (“plots of paddy fields”) to the monastery” *ākōn* 400 ใบ (inscr. # 49, Wat Sōrasak, Sukhōthai, c.1418).

13 For example: “5 *sat* for the sāmaneras and 10 *sat* for the monks” *ākōn* 5 สัมบันดา *sāmaṇera* and 10 for *bhikkhu* (inscr. # 49, Wat Sōrasak 1418, Sukhōthai). - One *sat* was appr. 20 liters or 16 kg of husked rice.

14 For example: “She (the queen mother) gave 100 fields amounting to (= with a yield of) 10 carts” *ākōn* 100 *ratha* "(inscr. # 93, Asokārāma 1399+, Sukhōthai, face 1).

From the same inscription, face 2, but with reference to a different monastery: “(The queen mother) donated 25 cart(loads) of rice per year to the people in the monastery,” pañcavīṣarathā-viṭṭhānāna añuvassa rathāvi (sic) (inscr. # 93, Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, c.1418).

Cowries are small, oblong sea-shells widely used throughout South and Southeast Asia as a small monetary unit. According to the French merchant and currency specialist Tavernier, who between c. 1610-1650 travelled and traded here, they were only found in the Maldive Islands (southwest off the southern tip of India) and exported by the Maldives rulers; they were called *cori* in India (Tavernier 1718 Les six voyages (2): 18, 604. One wonders, therefore, whether his note on p. 484 that they were brought to Siam from the “Manilles” is a misprint or points to another source in Southeast Asia, perhaps located in the Philippines in the general area of Manila, and hence the different Thai name *bia*, seemingly unrelated to the Indian word *cori*).

15 Cf. “(she donated fields with) taxes consisting of 25 carts of rice at the beginning of each year” *ākōn* 25 ใบ (inscr. # 93, Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, 1399+).

16 Cf. “(she donated fields with) taxes consisting of 25 carts of rice at the beginning of each year” *ākōn* 25 ใบ (inscr. # 93, Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, 1399+).
In Old Lân Nâ, ordinary plots of land could also be measured in length and width, often using the wâ,17 but likewise by specifying borders, or using a combination of both,18 though sometimes in an abbreviated or imprecise manner.19 However, rice fields do not seem to have been measured. Their physical dimensions, i.e. their size, hardly were of interest. I cannot remember one instance in which the wâ or another measure was used to indicate the size of a rice field. Occasionally, they were counted as individual plots, rai (or rai múang).20 Rather, the size of a field was indicated by the amount of seed-rice needed. In the hilly North with its often odd-shaped wet rice fields, application of a linear measure, such as the wâ, to indicate the size of a field, would indeed have been difficult if not impossible. Rice was measured in capacity, for instance in certain baskets, but

17 Here are 3 examples. An inscription of 1617 from Chiang Sân describes the donation of a betel nut (areca) plantation or garden: “presented (the monastery) with an areca plantation at Bân Chum Sâng, long 34 wâ (60 m), wide 15 wâ (26 m)” (Wat Phâ Khao Pân 1617).

An inscription of 1489 from the former Müang Òi, 40 km north of Phayao in the border area of the provinces Chiang Râi and Phayao, describes the donation of a salt field and a forest: “(Mùn Thòng, governor of Müang Òi,) gave a salt-village (to Wat Mahâ Wan). (The salt field was) long 40 wâ (70 m), wide 40 wâ. He also donated a forest, Pâ Lào, to this monastery, long 150 wâ (260 m), wide 150 wâ (Wat Mahâ Wan 1489).

18 Cf. the description of the compound of Wat Chiang Sâ at Chiang Khòng on the Mâ Khòng river (Yuan: Mâ Khòng): “In the east the Mâ Khòng is the border, in the west 50 wâ (from the river), in the north and south the (agricultural lands of) villages are the border” (Wat Chiang Sâ 1554).

19 Cf. the vague description of the premises of Wat L™, Phayao, in 1495: “Jao S™ Mün of Phayao (Yuan: Phayâo) had stones brought and set up to mark the land of the (monastery) compound (gâmakhetta) which has a circumference (?, parimandala) of 700 wâ” (Wat L™ 1495).

20 Here are two examples:

“200 plots of paddy field (rai)” (Wat Mün Lò 1498).
also in weight, particularly the mün ฟั่น, lit. “10,000”, or appr. 11 kg. Field taxes in Lân Nâ were due annually and usually were accounted in cowries.

Since this article relies much on donations made to monasteries in the past, some explanatory remarks about such donations are perhaps useful.

Making donations in one form or another to holy sites is an old Theravâda custom. Already king Asoka of north India (r. appr. 273 - 235 B.C.) recorded on a pillar erected at Lumbiniz, the Buddha’s birthplace, that he had a stone image of Mayä (?) made, a stone pillar erected, and that he exempted the village of Lumbiniz from imposts and granted it the eight rights.

Making donations of fields, persons, etc., to a monastery also is an old Theravâda tradition; field donations are said to have begun around 100 - 50 B.C. in Lankâ. In Lân Nâ such donations are attested since pre-Thai times, for instance in a Mon inscription of 1218 from Lamphûn. The oldest known donation of a field made by a Thai dates from 1411 in the Phayao region, and the last from 1611 from a place north of Chiang Râi, followed in 1617 by an areca garden at Chiang Sän. This does not mean that after c. 1600-1650 no more donations were made but they certainly became less frequent and finally probably stopped as Lân Nâ continued to be occupied by the Burmese until their final forced withdrawal took place.

21 Cf. a passage in the Chronicle of Chiang Mai which refers to the years around 1290: “(King Mang Râi) ordered to designate the districts in which to collect the rice field taxes in cowries (for Wat Kân Thôm): each year 620,000 cowries for the monks’ food in the district of Jâm and 500,000 cowries for the administrators (?) in the district of Châ Chàng” (CMA. N: 53; HPms: 2.8R; W: 39; U: 31).

22 Here is one rare exception: “(In 1375 Phayâ Kû Nâ) donated rice fields as food for the relic (in Wat Suan Dòk, Chiang Mai) with a (tax) value of 10,000 silver ... until the end of the 5,000 years” (MS.PN: 211).


24 “S. Paranavitana* pointed out that granting income from land which was vested in the monasteries was an innovation that seems to have originated during this very period (c. 100 - 50 B.C.; HP) in order to make the Sangha more independent on the liberality of individual supporters. - * University of Ceylon History of Ceylon, vol I, p.245, n.1” (Bechert 1992 Writing down the Tripîtaka: 49).

25 1.3.1.1 Wat Kû Kut 1218.

26 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahâ Wihân 1411.

27 1.4.1.1 Mahâ Thât Chiang Lâ 1611.

28 1.4.1.1 Wat Phâ Kháô Pân 1617.
place between 1775 and 1804. King Kāwila (r. 1782-1816) who is known to have made many donations no longer included fields. But in other regions of Thailand such donations seem to have continued sporadically, for instance in 1808 in Ubon.  

In Lān Nā as well as in central Thailand, wet rice fields (hardly ever upland fields), plantations, persons and other items, usually were donated to monasteries in order to provide them with a steady supply of food, income, and labour. Often a donation was not made to the monastery as a whole but to individual receivers in the monastery, for instance to the main Buddha image, to the jedī (cetiya, stūpa), the bōt (uposatha premises and building), or to the monks as a group.

Before fields and persons (slaves) could be donated, they had to be selected and their choice had to be administratively processed. The administrative term for this procedure was tāng แง่ง “to organize”. To make a donation was called “to place with” wai kap ไว้กับ, seldom “to give to” hü kap ให้กับ. As one inscription of 1497 from Phayao refers to this procedure, “he ordered to organize fields and persons and to place them with this monastery” ซึ่งตั้งมาภัณฑ์ไว้กับวัดนี้.

These donations were meant to be an annual contribution towards a monastery’s subsistence and, in a more general way, to strengthen, khamchī ช่วย “prop up”, the Buddhist religion. They were not limited in time for a certain number of years. In principle, they were irreversible and were meant “for ever”, i.e. until the end of Buddhism which was thought to occur 5000 years after the death
(Nibbāna) of the Buddha.\textsuperscript{36} That idea was often expressed in inscriptions, albeit in an abbreviated manner which may puzzle a modern reader who is not familiar with the underlying ideas that (a) the Buddhist religion will last for a total of 5000 years counted from the death (Nibbāna) of the Buddha, and that (b) the donation in question is meant to assist the religion from the day the donation was made until the end of the 5000 years.

For example, an inscription of 1489 from a monastery near Chiang Mai says, when reporting on a donation of persons: “All of them in this group, also their children and grandchildren, are to be in the service of the Buddha image of this monastery, (with the generations) following each other until the end of the Religion (after its) 5000 years” \textsuperscript{37} Similar an inscription of 1529 in Phrä: “(The King of Chiang Mai ordered the Prince of Phrä) to place 5 families and fields of 1,000 measures seed-rice with the (main) Buddha image of Wat Bupphārām, until (the end of the Religion after its) 5000 years” \textsuperscript{38} Even a small donation helped to make the Religion shine: “(they founded this little wooden Buddha image) in order to make (the Religion) flourish (until the end of its span of) 5,000 years \textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{36} The Buddha is said to have predicted (Cullavagga, Vin II 256.9-16) that his dhamma or religion might last for 1000 years but if women were admitted to the Order, its existence would only be 500 years. However, after his death this period was extended and by about 100 - 1 B.C. it had been lengthened to 5000 years (v. Hinüber 1996 Chips: 47, quoting (1) Lamotte 1958 Histoire: 210f; 215f; (2) Samantapāsādikā 1291,18-26; (3) Nattier 1991 Once Upon a Future Time).

Buddhaghosa (between A.D. 410-500), in his Manorathapūraṇī (a commentary on the Aṅguttara Nikāya), also records the prophecy of 5000 years; the Religion will decline in stages of 1000 years until it disappears entirely after 5000 years. (Griswold/Prasöt 1973 Epigraphy of Mahādharmarāja I: 84-85, 98-99, n.40, quoting Coedès 1956 Le 2500e anniversaire: 4ff and Hardy 1850 Eastern Monarchism: 427ff.)

In Lān Nā it was thought that the Buddha himself had established his religion for 5000 years. An inscription of 1492 from Chiang Mai says: “Lord Buddha Śrī Śākyamunī Gotama established his religion to last for 5000 years” \textsuperscript{37} An inscription from Phayao, in the same year, accepts the figure of 5000 years and uses it for a dating of its own: “In (C.S.) 854, since the Buddha went to Nibbāna - they give the Religion 5000 years - there have now passed 2037 years, and there are still to come 2963 years, in the year Tao Jai” \textsuperscript{38} This kind of indicating a date, viz. counting the years elapsed and the years still remaining to make a total of 5000, is at the base of the various post-Nibbāna eras (“Nibbānasakkarāja”), such as the Buddhassakkarāja (B.S.) \textsuperscript{39} now in use in Thailand.

\textsuperscript{37} 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489.
\textsuperscript{38} 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529.
\textsuperscript{39} 1.2.2.2 Wat Dōk Kham 1783.
There were no title deeds to confirm the ownership of land and probably no documents attesting to someone’s right to use a certain plot of land. Major donations, because they affected tax income, presumably were recorded in the appropriate office, where persons worked whose titles included the words nangsiū นังสือ “document, record”. But in general there probably was little “paperwork”. People of the local community knew who owned what. In the case of monasteries, where monks came and went, i.e. were ordained and often left the Order after some years, government officials, respected local citizens such as doctors, ex-monks and even persons without apparent distinction, all male, acted as witnesses who “knew”, hū (รู้) รู้. This was no mere formality; on occasion they had to testify even before an official investigator sent by the king himself.

In order to better assure the continuity of donations, and to make known the name of a generous donor, donations and witnesses were listed (tām ตั้ม “written”, tòng ต้อง “inscribed) on specially prepared flat, ogee-shaped stone slabs or on square stone pillars (hin, lak, selā, sīmā ฮิน, เลัก, เสล, เสมา, สีมา). The inscribed stones were set up in the monastery that received the donation, usually in public view at the jedī (stūpa) or in the wihān, but sometimes in the ubōsot (uposatha hall) where access was restricted to monks and selected laymen. The texts (jārik, jārik,
järük, järít จารก จาริก. จารีก. จาริต 43 of the inscriptions were composed or supervised by officials. Stone inscriptions (hin järük, seš järük, seš järít, lit. “stone with text”) 44 were official documents. They were charters or patents, documentary evidence that attested to old or new donations. Also their inscribing and setting up (fang hin järük ฝังจาริก ฝังจาริก, mostly shortened to fang järük, fang järít ฝังจาริต, ฝังจาริต lit. “to plant the (stone with) text”) was supervised by “the police”, dāp rüan, 45

43 It is maintained in northern Thailand that there is a difference between järık, järık, järük and järít. The first three words are understood as “inscription, writing, text”, while the other is thought to correspond to modern Thai järít จาริต (P. cāratta) “conduct, customs, practices”, and in the case of donations to have the particular meaning of “covenant, (new) order of things, (new) arrangement”. It is reasoned that a donation, dealing with people and property, is a practice that begins a new local order, arrangement, or tradition.

Indeed there is one inscription that uses the word katikā กติกำ, กิตำ “covenant, agreement, arrangement” (which implies a new order of things) and says of a donation, “do not let the covenant (concerning the donation) be cancelled, do not let it be neglected nor withdrawn (and the donations) given to some other use” อย่าให้บัตรกิตำ อย่าให้ใช้ คืนไปให้ใน (1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554).

However, it may be simpler to assume that all four words are merely variants and go back to a common source, viz. jār- or jān-, spelled cār จา “to draw a line, to incise, to write”, because:

(1) There is the Khmer word jār /cār/ “to write with an iron stylus, to inscribe” (palmleaf manuscript, etc.), and there is the Central Thai word jān spelled /cār/ จา with the same meaning.

(2) There is the Old Mon word /cārīt/ (i.e. jārít จาริต) “to draw a line; a line”; there is also /cā khī/ and /cā re/ “scribe” (Shorto 1971 Dic. Mon Inscriptions).

(3) In Yuan inscriptions, the word jārít is treated, in terms of grammar and context, no different from jārik.

(4) Possibly the different final consonants k / t in jārik etc. and jārít are parallels to a similar case involving p / k, viz. to the correct mondop (P. mañapa) which has the Yuan variant mondok.

Incidentally, the word jārít is practically only found in the expression fang jārít ฝังจาริต “to plant (a stone with a) jārít”, viz. to set up a stone with jārít. The only exception known so far is “the monk ordered that there be a jārít for the monastery” ซึ่งมีจาริตกับยามอื่นนี้; later on two officials came and “set up the jārít” ฝังจาริต (1.3.1.1 Weluwan Arım 1488).

Also, so far jārít has been found attested only between 1488 - 1560.

In the present article, jārik, jārik, jārük and jārít, are equally translated as “(inscribed) text, inscription”, or similar.

44 In pre-Thai times, in 1219, the Lamphûn Mon used the expression/selālekh’, selālekha/ “stone (with) inscription” (1.3.1.1 Wat Dön 1219). That goes back to P. lekha “writing, inscription, letter”, in Old Mon lekh’ “writing, written record” (Shorto 1971 Dic. Mon Inscriptions).

45 For example: “Mûn Yû Dāp Rûan ordered dāp rûan officers to come here and to set up (the stone inscribed with) the donation charter” เจ้าหน้าที่ผู้มา ดำเนินการ ที่ยืนประกาศฉบับเรียนมาฝังจาริต (1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tông Tám 1488).
or by other state officials. If they became damaged, they could be copied on new stones.

The acquisition of a suitable stone, *hin* (occasionally spelled /หิน/), and the engraving of the text seem to have been taken care of privately and locally and presumably were regarded as an act of merit. One inscription from Sukhothai mentions the name of the man who supplied the stone and the name of another who was the engraver, or who sponsored or supervised the engraving. But usually neither the supplier of the stone, nor the author nor the scribe of the text are mentioned.

The time from the day when the donation was made, until the erection of the donation inscription, usually was not long. Here is an example. On 5 August 1495 Phayao Kao and his mother were jointly consecrated ruler (the prince was only 12 or 13 years old). Thereafter the queen mother donated gold to gild a newly-made, big Buddha image and re-assigned the old monastery slaves and servants to include the new image in their work. The image was inaugurated on 28 December 1495, and the inscription was set up on 26 June 1496; obviously by then everything had been carried out as requested. By the way, the shortness of this intermediate span of time, is the reason why historians usually accept the last date of an event.

---

46 The setting up of such a donation charter document on a stone is often described in terms similar to the following.

(After a monk had transferred the merit for constructing the monastery to the Mahā Thewī, mother of the king, she) ordered a charter for this monastery (which was to indicate its property: premises of 27 x 60 wà; and 4 families of slaves) ... Lâm Mùn Suwan and Mùn Nói Kham, the lawyer, received the words of the Mahā Thewī and had the charter issued (and set up on stone) so that the monastery will be secure until the (end of the) 5000 years of the Religion ... (1.3.1.1 Weluwan Arâm 1488).

Here is how, in 1496, a stone inscription from a monastery in the Phayao region describes the setting up of this inscription, after the king of Chiang Mai, Phayao Kao, had donated taxes from fields and people to a monastery: “Sän Kalyāña, Mùn Lâm Nā Hörāthibōdī (and) Phan Naṅsū Tāng Mūaṅ Sī Mangkhalā received the king’s order to come here, write (“chisel”) the inscription and to set (the charter) up, (to last) until the end of the Religion” ... (1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491 and 1491 (2)).

47 This seems to have been a rare event; hardly any stone inscription copies are known from Lân Nā. Here is an example: In 1491 a newly appointed governor of Phayāo noticed old broken inscribed stones, had them recopied on new stones, investigated the subject matter laid down in the text, and restored debt-slaves to a monastery (1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491 and 1491 (2)).

48 Inscr. # 14 Wat Khēmā, Sukhothai, 1536.

49 Here is a rare exception: “Written by Uttama Panyā Wijit” ... (last sentence of the Phayao stone inscription 1.5.1.1 Wat Klāng 1490).

50 1.4.1.1 Wat Sī Sutthāwāt 1496. The monastery still exists; it is in Wiang Pā Pao, about 90 km north of Chiang Mai on the way to Chiang Rāi.
mentioned in an inscription, as the date of that inscription, in case the date of the execution of the inscription is not expressly mentioned.51

It must have been tempting for provincial administrators or local influential persons to tamper with a donation, to use part or all of it for themselves, and even to cancel it, ao ðk เอาออก “to take off, to take away”. Such misuse or outright theft of donation is several times reported in inscriptions after the donations had been returned by later officials who succeeded the wrongdoers in office.52

To safeguard donations against malappropriation, inscriptions contained admonitions such as “whoever will come as governor and administer this country, do not take (the donation) away”.53 Other inscriptions bless those who will respect a donation and heavily curse those who will not: “Nobody shall take (the donation) away. If someone takes it away, may he die and fall into the Avîci hell!”54

On occasion, presumably because of serious infractions, a later royal order reconfirmed earlier donations. For instance in 1496, in the Phayao region, a direct royal order55 reconfirmed in detail, with the consent of the assembled local authorities, donations which had been made as long as 85 years ago and whose particulars had been laid down in an earlier inscription in the year 1411.56

Some cases concerning slaves, and not only re-dedications, are rather curious. In 1554, Phayâ Mâ Ku gathered the descendants, 22 families, of the original 40 families of four white-clad ascetics who had been donated to the reliquary Phra That Dùi Nòi (between San Pâ Tòng and Jôm Tòng, Chiang Mai province) by Nâng Jâm Thewî.57 Since the Mon queen Jâm Thewî presumably ruled Lamphûn in about 750 A.D., 800 years would have elapsed between the original dedication and the re-confirmation!

---

51 It is true that there is speculation that several inscriptions were written long after events. But as far as I know, it has not yet been possible to definitely identify such a case.

52 Here is a summary of such an event, as recorded in 1513 in Wat Nông Kwâng of Müang Òi in the southern part of Chiang Râi province. In 1466 Mûn Mahâ, the governor of Müang Òi, built Wat Nông Kwâng and decreed: “That village which I have built, that areca plantation which I have set up, and also rice fields of 30 measures seed-rice with 9,000 cowries tax which I have newly opened up, I donate them all to this monastery”. But when Mûn Sâm became governor he revoked the donation (for unstated reasons). However, when Mûn Kham Châng became governor in 1513, he restored Mûn Mahâ’s former donations (1.4.1.1 Wat Nông Kwâng 1513).

53 เจ้าไทยผู้ได้มาถึงเมืองนี้ อย่างมา นอกจาก แต่ (1.4.1.1 Wat Mahâ Wan 1489).

54 ฉะนั้นต้องบอกถึง มิฉะนั้นต้อง ให้ฉัน (1.2.1.1 Wat Yâng Num 1523).

55 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Kham 1496.

56 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahâ Wihân 1411.

57 1.2.1.1 Jula Khîrî 1554.
Misuse of donated persons or land for other purposes was regarded as “to disturb a settled order, to break up an arrangement” klua klaao กิ่งเก้า and future officials were likewise warned in inscriptions not to disturb the donated persons in their assigned religious duties by sending them to do other work, 58 in particular public work (corvée) and military service, 59 and not to revoke land donations. 60 The above mentioned expression, ao òk “take off”, could be used for both, people and fields. 61

Such donations were perceived to create religious merit (puñña, kuśala), and the donor usually formulated a wish concerning the aim towards which this merit should count; often it was to become an arahant under the future Buddha Ariyametteyya, or to also become a Buddha, and to have a great many worldly possessions during the rebirths that precede the final life which will be ended by going to Nibbāna (Nirvāṇa). Frequently the wish was expressed that the merit go to the king. 62

Mentioned together with a donation of fields can be a donation of people, sometimes simply called “person”, khon คน, but often more to the point, “(bond-)slave, bondsman, servant”, khà ('(' or “house(hold)”, rüan / hüan รัตน; in such case the family head was named (it could be a woman), and sometimes the dependents were listed.

Not all donated persons were slaves in the Western sense. Generally, the inscriptions differentiate between “to donate persons as alms”, thañ khon ทานคน (from P. dāna “gift”) and “to assign persons”, wai khon ไว้คน, meaning that their

58 For instance: “Whoever comes to administrate Müang Òi ... do not disturb any of them” ผู้ใดมา
กินเมืองอยู่ ... อย่ากีดกันชาวผู้นั้น (1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Wan 1489).
59 For instance: “(Future) princes and nobles (who will administrate this country), do not disturb
(10 donated families in their work for the monastery), do not order them to do any kind of public
work” จ้าวผู้ใด อย่าให้อิสระแก่ ใสรักษา กรมสมภพ เกินแสดงยิน (1.4.1.1 Wat Pratīyā 1496).
60 For example: In 1513 the governor of Müang Òi donated a large plot of land to the main Buddha
image of a monastery. In an inscription he exhorted his successors: “Whoever in future will be the
lord to come and govern the country, ... do not revoke nor disturb (my donation)” เจ้าไทยผู้ได้เจ้า
เมืองมิ่งอยู่ ... อย่าเอาดอก พยายามกันยีกันแตก (1.4.1.1 Wat Nong Kwâng 1513).
61 For example: “Do not take away the persons and the nā kluaï rice field(s) of 30 measures
seed-rice (which were donated to the Buddha image)” อย่าเอาพญาล้านจากด้วย 30 ข้าวเหนียว (1.5.1.1 Wat
Khwâng 1491 (2)).
62 For example: “Concerning the merit I made in donating land to this Buddha image, may the
merit (go to and) make vastly prosper both their Majesties, mother and son” ด้วยธุรกิจบุญครั่งนี้แก่
พระพุทธเจ้าท่าน บุญดีนี้จะให้บุญแก่พระเจ้า แม่และลูก จนทุกทิศ (1.4.1.1 Wat Nong Kwâng 1513).

A brief survey of pious Buddhist wishes and their historical development is in v. Hinüber 1996
Chips: 47 ff.
public duties, such as corvée etc., was not towards a prince etc., but had been transferred to a monastery.

Slaves in Lān Nā kept a considerable amount of personal freedom, which had to do with the reason why they had become slaves. Very broadly speaking, there were two kinds of slaves, “real slaves” and “honorary slaves”. I shall disregard here the scholastic view of some thammasāt (dharma śāstra) that there are five kinds of slaves or even seven kinds with many sub-categories because in Lān Nā these theoretical divisions were hardly applied in daily life.

Many, perhaps the majority of the “real slaves”, were persons who had borrowed money, ngôn "silver", from individuals or from a monastery (whose wealth could be used much as a bank loan today), had gone bankrupt, and had become a money-slave, khon ngôn "a man (who owes) silver", of the creditor. It was customary that the borrower’s person with or without his immediate

---

63 Cf. 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Suphan 1509, where every ‘assigned’ person had to provide annually five pieces of the three most used general tools: slashing knife, ax, and spade. The ‘donated’ persons had to take care of the main Buddha image.

64 For instance MRS.CKey.A+W: 48f/109f, Art. 66.

65 See for instance Lingat 1931 Esclavage privée: 293-296.

66 As already mentioned, the actual “owner” of the money, hence the creditor, often was not the monastery as an institution but usually certain entities within the monastery, such as the principal Buddha image, the Scriptures, etc.

The granting of loans taken out of a monastery’s treasure was intended to be of profit for the monastery. Monasteries even were sometimes given an amount of silver with the express purpose to serve as a revolving fund for lending out in order to help finance specific needs. For instance, in 1500 the king of Chiang Mai and his mother gave to Wat Phra Thañ Hariphunchai two funds, one of 1,100 silver and the other of 5,700 silver. The interest, dōk (mod. Thai dōk bia "flowers from the cowries"), gained from the first was to be used for buying betel and miang (fermented tea leaves for chewing as a tonic); the interest from the other was “for rice to put in alms-bowls”. Both funds were a gift of worship for the Dhamma scriptures in the monastery library (1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509).

67 Here is an example from the Phayao area in the years around 1485: “Formerly a family, the family of Āi Hao Kham Ling, had borrowed and not paid back (kin đaten up) 500 silver from the Buddha image. Phò Nòi, the phan nà rian, poured water and donated them as slaves to the Buddha image (of Wat Pà Mai in Wiang Lò)” (1.5.1.1 Wat Pà Mai 1497).

At the time, becoming a money slave was so common that the famous Burmese / Mon law codex, the Dhammavilāsa Dhammasattha, contains the restriction: “Monks and Brahmans are not allowed to become slaves, even if they need money and offer themselves as slaves.” (Nai 1992 Dhammasāt Texts: 589.)
family served as collateral or bond. If he defaulted on his payments, he as collateral could be seized and made to work for the creditor as a money-slave or bondsman. The law even said that he had to sell himself.68 If another person bought the debt, thai ไถ่, from the original creditor, this money-slave changed creditors, or masters; likewise, if the bond-slave did not fancy his present master, he could persuade another person to buy his debt. If he himself saved enough money (which he could do since he had much freedom for personal activities), he could pay back his debt and thus redeem himself. If his creditor donated him to a monastery, he became a “person donated as alms (dāna)” or “donated person”, khon sin thàn คุณสินทาน. The buying out of a monastery slave, or his own self-redemption, seems to have been difficult and exceptional,70 and a monastery slave with his offspring tended to stay permanently bonded. Still, his (her) status offered advantages; for instance, he could not be conscripted for public or the prince’s work (corvée), could not be displaced, i.e. taken away from his particular religious site and duties, and even enemy armies would be reluctant to move him abroad as war booty.71

“Honorary slaves” were persons who, out of their own pious free will, or because of an order, became permanent attendants of, for instance, the principal Buddha image in a monastery. They too held certain privileges. An inscription of 1496 expressly distinguishes between the two kinds of slaves, khon ngôn คุณเงา

68 “(If the debt cannot be repaid) the debtor shall sell himself (as debt slave)” /ผู้มีหนี้ที่ชำระไม่ได้จะขายตัวเป็นทาส (MRS.CKcy.A+W: 31 / 95 (Art. 29)).
69 The usual translation of thai ไถ่ with “to redeem” in this context is not appropriate because the person was not freed of his debts; he and his debts were merely transferred to a new creditor.
70 Here is one such rare example: around 1525, a person only identified as phay¡ เจ้าคู, paid a monastery in Phayao the sum of 300 silver because the slave woman of the monastery’s Buddha image, who by then was around 40 years old, had taken up service with a son of that person (1.5.1.1 Wat Khw¡ng c. 1530).
71 Here is an example. In 1567 Queen Wisuttha Thewï of Chiang Mai donated five villages in three forests and the revenue of the entire region to the service of a monastery that carried her name, Wat Wisuttharãm. The villagers were not to be used for outside or public work (1.2.3.1 Wat Wisuttharãm 1567; a silver-foil document with the royal seal). The monastery still exists under the same name and is located in Bān Pā, north of Hòt near the Mā Ping.

In 1632 King Sutthô Thammârâcha of Burma (i.e. Thalun; HP) waged war at Fâng, Chiang Mai and Lamphûn. He ordered to send the inhabitants of the five villages to Burma. The villagers maintained that they were protected from displacement by a written command from Queen Wisuttha Thewï. King Sutthô, upon seeing the document with the royal seal, acknowledged its validity and allowed the villagers back to the service of Wat Wisuttharãm as before (Kraisï 1984 Kep phak sai så: 129, quoting from an old palmleaf document in Bān Thung near Wat Wisuttharãm). I have not seen that palmleaf ms. But there is a somewhat less factual and more chatty version of the Sutthô episode on pp. 7.1 - 20.4 in a palmleaf manuscript that the Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University, borrowed from Mr Kraisï Nimmânhemin in 1990 and microfilmed as no. 90.166.03 023-023 in the same year.
“debt persons” and *khon yin dê* คชีนยิน “voluntary persons”. Even ranking government officials and other socially better placed persons could be debt slaves as well as or honorary slaves.

Often, therefore, the Thai word *khâ* ข้า cannot be translated as “slave” but should be understood as “servant” or “debtor”, also “adherent, supporter”.

### 2. The Rice Field Specification Formula

**Part 1: Size and Taxes of a Field**

A complete description of a field comprised four specifics: size, tax value, name and location. These specifics were made up of eight basic elements arranged in a certain sequence. Since the sequence was usually strictly followed, one can call the whole arrangement a formula for rice field specification. Disturbed text passages can often be cleared up if one remembers the elements and their sequence.

However, I do not think I have ever seen the full formula employed for any one field. Mostly one or more elements were left out, presumably because the remainder was already sufficient for the occasion. The formula therefore was more of a blank theoretical convention that could be filled in with specific elements as the need arose.

This is the complete formula. The numbers 25 and 5,000 are fictitious and can in a real case be substituted according to circumstances. The name of the field can occupy either of the two positions indicated, with the one in parenthesis probably less often used:

\[
Nâ นา - Name - 25 - Khåo ข้าว - (Nâ นา - Name) - Khâ ดำ - 5,000 - Bia เบี้ย - Location
\]

\[i.e.\]

Field - Name - 25 - Seed Rice - (Field - Name) - Tax - 5,000 - Cowries - Location

Very often, perhaps mostly, fields were described only by the two specifics, size and tax rate, which were expressed in a basic formula of six elements. In this section we shall examine these two specifics. In the next section we shall consider the remaining two specifics, viz. the name of the field and its location.

That basic formula is:

\[
Nâ นา - 25 - Khåo ข้าว - Khâ ดำ - 5,000 - Bia เบี้ย
\]

\[i.e.\]

---

72 1.5.1.1 Wat Bân Dân 1496.
73 See below in the section *Donation Packages*: Wat Phan Tông Täm, 1488.
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Field - 25 - Seed Rice - Tax - 5,000 - Cowries
or in full
“A field (of a size that requires) 25 (measures) seed-rice
(with an annual) tax of 5,000 cowries.”

The basic formula of two specifics with six elements was often abbrevi-
ated. In the following presentation the same fictive example is used throughout,
and is then illustrated by a concrete example. The abbreviations have the diamond
◆ replacing an element that is missing from the formula.

Example:

Example: นำ 25 ข้าว ค่า 5,000 เฝือก
“A field of 30 measures seed-rice with a tax of 9,000 cowries.”

Example: นำ 25 ข้าว ค่า 5,000 ◆
“A field of 20 measures seed-rice with a tax of 5,000 cowries”.

Example: นำ 975 ข้าว
“A field of 975 measures seed-rice”.78

Example: นำ 82,000 เฝือก
“A field with a tax of 82,000 cowries”.79

Example: นำ 500,000
“A field with a tax of 500,000 cowries”.80

74 1.4.1.1 Wat Nong Khwai 1513.
75 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahah Wihan 1411.
76 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahah Wiian 1411.
77 1.4.1.1 Wat Ban Yang Mak Muang 1479.
78 1.5.1.1 Wiang Kao Phayaao 1411.
79 1.4.1.1 Dooi Tham Phra 1484.
80 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Aram 1512.
Example: 500 ข้าว
“A field of 500 measures seed-rice”.81

The elements of the formula denote the following details.

The first element, $n$ น้า, is “field” in general, here “field for growing wet rice, paddy field”. The word can also mean other “fields”, for instance $n$ น้า นาเกลือ “salt field”,82 and it is also used in the abstract sense as in $n$ น้า บุญ “a field of merit”, meaning a continuous occasion to make merit, such as a monastery which one supports. But here, obviously, it means a wet rice or paddy field.

The second element is a figure of modest size, often not more than 100, and quantifies the third element, $kh$ ข้าว, which in inscriptions is spelled /kh/ or /k̂h/ khao “rice”. This is the old orthography of modern Standard Thai $kh$ ข้าว, dating from a time when the word was pronounced with a short diphthong ao, not yet with a long /ao/. It is still spoken (and written) khao for instance in the Yuan dialect of north Thailand.

But $kh$ ข้าว here does not mean “rice for consumption”. It is a shortened expression for $kh$ ข้าว ชิว (=ข้าวทำพันธุ์) “seed-rice”, and the figure preceding $kh$ ข้าว is the number of measuring units, i.e. the amount, of seed-rice needed for this particular field. The name of the measuring unit is not mentioned.

The reason behind this is an obviously very old tradition that indicates the size of a field by informing one on how much seed will make full use of it, and not by pointing out its physical extension.

Even today a northern farmer will not ask, “how large is this field?” but, “how much seed-rice is needed for this field?” The Yuan, as the Khüm, the Lü and the northern Lao, did not measure the surface in terms of length and width83 but in terms of seed-rice needed. The often curved, winding and terraced fields indeed would be nearly impossible to measure using a linear system such as the wa.84

---

81 Context: “Jao Si Mün Phayāo ... wished to donate food to the Buddha image, (ricefields of) 500 measures seed-rice” เจ้าสิมพญา ... ได้มาอั่งเป็นเจ้าที่มีพระพุทธรูปเจ้า 500 ข้าว (1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yôt 1412).
82 Brine from underlying rock-salt evaporates on the surface of the soil, turns into a thin layer of salt, is raked together and then, by dissolution in water and renewed evaporation (boiling, tom klüa ต้มเกลือ “to cook salt”), is processed into edible salt.
83 “De nos jours, les Lu’ comme les Laotiens ne mesurent pas les rizières.” (Rispaud 1937 Les noms: 110; similarly Guignard 1912/1971 Dict.: LIII.)
84 Also in Old Europe linear measures were hardly used to indicate the size of a field. Here the amount of ploughing that could be done in one day served as indicator. Cf. for instance German Tagwerk, i.e. the area ploughed in one day, or Joch, the surface that a team (Joch) of oxen could work in a day, c. 35 - 70 Ar “acre”, or between 3,500 and 7,000 sqm.
According to a Phayao chronicle, reporting on the time when Phayao was founded, about 1000 years ago according to tradition, the first ruler decreed that “each person was to work (a) rice field(s) with 50,000 (or 5 mün) rice-seed”,  Çalışması, 50,000 ข้าวเชื้อ. This amount of 5 mün rice-seed per person (c. 55 kg) is a modern-time amount for a surface manageable by one person. It is therefore possible that the whole passage only projects the situation from the time the author wrote, back into the past. But at least it shows that when that chronicle was written or re-composed, perhaps in the nineteenth century, the author took for granted that also in the old days the surface or size of a rice field was determined by the amount of seed needed.

A palm leaf text, dating perhaps from about 1875 - 1900, which deals with the tax situation in about 1720-50 in the Chiang Sän area for rai, upland or dry rice fields, says:

“I shall explain the matter of the traditional dry rice fields (rai) at Thã Õ.

(1) For a field of (a size that requires) 1 bung-basket of seed-rice, the tax is 1,000 cowries, (plus) 400 cowries commission fee for the tax-collector.86

(2) If 1 yang-basket (of seed-rice) is enough (for the field), the tax is 400 cowries, (plus) 200 cowries commission fee.

(3) If 1 yäng-basket of seed-rice is sufficient, the tax is 200 cowries, (plus) 100 cowries commission fee.

The writing fee (“cost for ledger and pencil”) is not included in the commission fee.”87

ตามบุตราน อันจำแก่ไข่ท่าย้อย มีลัพธ์นี้.

(1) ไร่หนึ่ง หลัง 1 เลียงข้าวเชื้อ บู 1 ต้องขึ้น เขาผันเบี้ย ยาลูจัด 400 เบี้ย.

(2) กันเสียง อีง 1 เข้า 400 เบี้ย ยาลู 200 เบี้ย.

(3) กันเสียงขี้ แขง 1 เข้า 200 เบี้ย ยาลู 100 เบี้ย.

คำปั๊บ คำสอง บิ่้นในยากนั้น.88

---

85 PAY.WSB.
86 One can also understand that the 400 cowries commission fee are included in the tax: “... the tax is 1,000 cowries, 400 (of which) are commission fee for the tax-collector.” Similarly in the two following instances.
87 One could perhaps also understand, “No writing fee is imposed for that commission-work,” i.e. the tax collector himself is to bear the expense for the stationery used to record the taxation.
88 A palmleaf ms called “History of Chiang Rái and Chiang Sän” หนังสือพื้นเมือง เชียงราย เชียงเสม of Wat Methangkarawat, A. Müang, Phrä; SRI microfilm 81.088.05.081-083, p.39. - Also in “Chronology of royal Princes in the Lân Nâ Country” ลำดับราชบุรุษหลวงในเมืองท่าน, a palmleaf ms of Wat Pong Sanuk Tai, T. Wiang Nüa, A. Müang, Lampang, SRI microfilm 81.069.09.083, p.92-94. - I have added punctuation to the Thai text.
That seed-rice was meant by the old scribes was already recognized in 1959 by Cham Thòngkhhamwan when he published an inscription of 1500 from Nân. The inscription records two donations of fields to a monastery, viz. นํา ... 10 ชํัว and นํา ... 50 ชํัว. He commented in two nearly identical footnotes that here 10 (50) measures of seed rice were meant, and that the unit of measure was the ตําง ชํัว: “10 (50) ชํัว = 10 (50) ตําง คือจําจําปัลลีที่ใช้ทํานานหรือตํางนี้จำนวน 10 (50) ตําง.”

Neither this nor other inscriptions name the unit for measuring the seed-rice. But it is unlikely that it was the ตําง ชํัว. The word ตําง, in central Thailand as well as in the North, means “pack-saddle” (usually a frame with woven containers hanging down on either side of the pack animal, with a connecting bridge at the top), also the “packs” or the “load” thus carried, or “to carry by pack-animal”. The word also seems to have been used as a rather rough measure of volume or weight in overland transportation by caravan, “one animal load”. But though occasionally the word may have been used as a measure, it certainly was not a standard measure of capacity or weight for Lán Nâ’s rice farmers.

It is therefore probable that not ตําง ชํัว was meant but perhaps the similar-sounding Yuan word ตําง ชํิง, spelled /µÀ“ß/ in Yuan texts, which in Lán Nâ was a common measure of volume for rice, beans, etc.

In theory, according to certain old text books, the ตําง ชํิง basket held 525,000 grains of rice. Evidently, this was not of much practical value. 1,000 grains of unhusked, glutinous rice weigh c. 34 grams, or c. 0.034 kg. In other words, 1 kg has about 29,412 rice grains. The ตําง ชํิง mentioned here would therefore theoretically have contained c. 17.8 kg, or about 34.5 liters.

On the more practical side, I was told by elderly upcountry farmers and merchants, that the old Yuan ตําง ชํิง basket was equal to 1 old หมิน in weight in the case of unhusked glutinous rice (other items have different ratios between volume and weight). Since one old weight unit (the name is never mentioned) was about 1.1 gram, 1 หมิน was about 11 kg, i.e. one old ตําง ชํิง basket

---

89 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500. In: Cham 1959 Järük Wat Châng Kham C.S.862: n.11, 14; Cham 1965 Lak thì 72: n. 11, 14.

Also other authors on occasion state that the unit was the ตําง ชํิง; for instance Prasân Bunprakhâng and Prasöt na Nakhôn when they published inscr. 1.5.1.1 Wat Pâ Mai 1497. See Prasân / Prasöt 1965 Järük Wat Sî Umbông Kham: n.19; Prasân / Prasöt 1970 Lak thì 101: n.19.

90 Among all the dictionaries I consulted, only Prâphithayâ 1964 Dic.: 552 (s.v. ตําง) said that ตําง ชํิง could also mean a measure, for instance ชีวะที่ตําง “5 ตําง of rice”; but the dictionary had no details.

91 See for instance: Khana Panja 5 Jamphuak “Die 5 Methods of Measuring”.

92 Weighed by myself.

93 I weighed several old Buddha images with inscriptions that indicated both their date and the amount of bronze used. Cf. Penth 1994 Jinakâlamâlî Index: 320.
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contained about 11 kg of glutinous, unhusked rice. Further, one liter of unhusked, glutinous rice weighs c. 515 grams, or c. 0.515 kg. Therefore, 1 kg of rice equals c. 1.94 liters. Thus, one old tāng ตะ่ง basket would have held about 11 kg or 21 liters of rice.

It is remembered that in the decades around 1900 new standard weights were introduced from Bangkok. The reason given was to standardize various old measures and to set a standard exchange rate with the metric system, in particular the liter and the kilogram. The new standard tāng ตะ่ง (ตังหลวง “royal tāng, standard commercial tāng”) for rice was 1.3 kg. At the same time the old mūn ผีเนะ was increased from 10,000 units of weight to 12,000, i.e. from 1.1 kg to 13.2 kg, which was rounded off to 13.5 kg. This caused much confusion between the old weights and the new weights that still had the old names. There were variations in the tāng from one locality to the other. In the 1960s, the tāng as a rice measure was supposed to hold exactly 20 liters (as I was told), and similar data are found in dictionaries. For Old Lân Nà, these data have to be used with caution.

As for the mūn ผีเนะ weight unit, it was commonly used in Old Lân Nà when referring to weight, also for the weight of rice. There is, for instance, the passage in the Chronicle of Chiang Mai which states for the year 1566: “Rice was very expensive. One mūn cost 50 silver.” It is therefore possible that seed-rice was measured in mūn.

To sum up: We do not know what unit of measure the Old Lân Nà rice farmer used for his seed-rice. With present knowledge, there is a choice between several baskets, for instance the bung, yâng, yâng, and the tāng, and the weight mūn. Their correspondence with modern metric measures is only approximately known.

Incidentally, my informants tended to agree that 2 “modern” tāng of 40 liters seed-rice would be needed for 1 modern rai (1600 m²).

Whatever the unit for measuring seed rice, the amount of seed-rice needed was an approximate indicator of the size of a rice field, and also of a person’s or of monastery’s wealth; but much depended on the fertility of the soil, which varied considerably. Most fields seem to have needed between 12 and 100 measures of seed-rice.

---

94 Weighed by myself.
95 A law that regulated weights and measures was passed in 1923 (Credner 1935 / 1966 Siam: 385)
98 CMA.NL: 20; N: 167; HPms: 5.24R; W: 122; U: 96.
99 I have not been able to find out how many kg of rice will fill them.
100 See below in section 7, Some Rice Field Statistics: Field Fertility.
101 See below in section7, Some Rice Field Statistics: Fields and their Seed-Rice.
On a few occasions the seed-rice or khāo figures were much higher which would indicate extended field possessions, hence considerable wealth. Here are two examples. One instance, of 21,685 khāo, has already been quoted above as an example for an abbreviated form of the formula: “(The king of Chiang Mai, Sām Fang Kān, r.1402-42) gave the monastery Phra Suwanna (Mahā) Wihān rice fields for 21,685 measures of seed-rice; if one assesses (the fields for) this seed-rice in terms of (field) taxes, these amount to 4,686,000 (cowries)” 102 The other example is somewhat dubious. The text seems to say that a man at Lampāng in 1504, Nāi Yī, owned fields of 10,000 measures seed rice and bought from this funds seven families for 2,810 silver: 103

The fourth element of the formula, khā “value; cost, fee”, 104 here means the fee levied for using the field. This fee, a rent, sometimes was also called chao or khā. 105 In other words, khā indicates the rent value of a field, or its tax-value. This field tax was due annually, as has been mentioned in the previous section.

This old meaning of khā, “rent-value” or “tax”, survived into modern times. It was retained in the expression khā nā “rice field taxes” which was in common use until the tax reforms of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries made ear-

---

102 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.

In Old Yuan the word pramān ประกาศฉะ does not mean “approximately” as in modern Thai, but “the exact amount”, from P. parimāṇa “measure, quantity, sum total”. If indeed the unit was 1 mūn = 1.1 kg, this would mean the enormous amount of over 23 metric tons of seed-rice (23,800 kg)!

103 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504.

I suppose that here khāo 10,000 “10,000 rice” is a reversed and abbreviated form of the beginning of the formula, (nā) 10,000 khāo > khāo 10,000, i.e. that the amount of 10,000 refers to the seed rice needed for the fields. That would represent about 11 metric tons (11,000 kg).

But it might be that “10,000” is the annual tax value of his fields, and that he somehow traded his fields or their taxes for the amount of silver with which he bought the slaves.

Or else he owned a stock of rice of 10,000 weight units which he sold to buy the slave families.

104 Because of similarities in spelling and meaning, it is perhaps possible that this word khā (spelled gā ค) is related to, or is an abbreviated form of, Pāli bhoga “enjoyment, possession, wealth; revenue- or tax-owing”, for instance of a village (cf. PED s.v. bhoga), or bhogā “the produce taxes of certain lands” (Geiger 1953 Culav. Transl. (1) : 16. n.4, referring to an episode in which Culav. tells of a donation of taxes, made in around 380 by King Buddhādaśa of Langkā to the monks of the Mahāvihāra).

105 For chao ช่วย with mai ek, cf. “(The king) assigned land to Wat Chiang Sā, in Bān Nāng Jan Village, Bān Chiang Sā Village, (and in) Bān Kóng Kāo Village. Altogether it had a rent value (“tax”) of 81,800 cowries; (he also allowed) wax and khing (= ?) for Wat Nāng Jan with a rent-value (“tax”) of 1,250 of weight” 81,800 đâm (tax) ; 1,250 đâm (tax) (1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554).

For chao ช่วย without the mai ek, see above the quotation of tax examples from Thā O in the Chiang Sān area.
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lier taxes and their technical terms obsolete. Since not only wet rice fields, nā, were taxed, but also upland fields on hills and mountain slopes, rai ไร, whether used for hill rice or other crops, the farming taxes levied on both types were collectively called khâ rai khâ nā คำไร คำนา.

The fifth and sixth elements of the formula indicate that these taxes were due, or were calculated, in bia בל “cowries”, in inscriptions mostly spelled ฿. The figures mentioned here are much higher than the figures for seed-rice. If, on occasion, the formula is used in such an abbreviated form as to make it doubtful whether seed-rice or taxes are meant, it can be helpful to remember that a modest figure usually means seed-rice, and a large figure, taxes in cowries. The range of taxes in terms of cowries, as far as I know, was between 2,500 and 2 million, even nearly 4.7 million bia.

Little is known about how field taxes were actually collected. But it is on record that in 1443 a change occurred. From then on, rent or taxes (suai สว, chao ชะ) had to be paid to the administrator of the locality (jao khwän เจ้าเตวน), and the Crown collected the taxes from these local administrators. The change suggests that previously taxes perhaps had been paid more directly to the Crown. Also, it is probable that the rice field tax, though calculated in “money”, often was paid in kind, i.e. in rice; this was done until the nineteenth century, as older people remember.

What happened to a field and its tax when it was given to a monastery? I suppose that generally the taxes were transferred from the Crown to the monastery, probably being paid directly to the monastery, and that other issues depended on circumstances. Here are two basic scenarios.

(1) Field with tenant or owner.

The tenant or owner kept the field as before, that is to say, he kept his part of the produce, but from now on paid the tax to the monastery. The reasons why I suppose that this was so are, (1) otherwise the tenant would have been abruptly

106 Cf. Prakat ngoen kha na tra daeng prot hai tang khang, a proclamation allowing delayed payment of certain paddy taxes for the year 1864, as quoted in v. Mehren / Sawers 1992 Revitalizing: 54 n.37.
107 For a tax levied on a rai planted with rice, see above the quotation of tax examples from Thã Ô in the Chiang Sän area.
109 See below in section 7, Some Rice Field Statistics: Rice Field Taxes.
110 CMA.N: 105; HPms: 4.4R; W: 76, U: 61.
111 An example dating from 1808 in Ubon in the Northeast: “Whoever comes to work ricefields on this donated land, if he harvests 1 cart load (of rice), collect 1 thang ถัง bucket as field tax; if 2 cart loads, 2 thang” ผู้ใดจะมาเพาะนาในที่นี้หลายปี นำไว้ได้แกวียน 1 ให้เก็บคำดินถัง 1. 2 แกวียน (เกีย) 2 ถัง (2.3.1.1 Wat Pã Luang 1808).
dispossessed and possibly could not have survived, (2) the monastery would have to find persons to work the field, (3) this arrangement, donating the tax to the Religion, brought merit to the king.

(2) Field without tenant or owner.

In chronically underpopulated L"an N"a, there must have been vacant fields. Also, occasionally part of the forest or vacant land would be made into new fields. If such a field was donated, the king or the monastery would have to find or appoint persons, slaves, to work it. The reason why I think this also happened sometimes is, that there are inscriptions which tell us that fields and persons were donated.\(^{112}\) I suppose that at least some of these slaves were employed to work fields. In this case, presumably, again the tax went to the monastery, and the remainder of the produce was used for the upkeep of these persons. Even if other arrangements were made between the monastery and those who worked the fields, the king still would have donated his taxes to the Religion, and gained merit.

That ends our survey of the six elements which make up the basic formula to describe the size and tax rate of rice fields. To repeat: The fictive example mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, น่า 25 ข้าว ค่า 5,000 เหรียญ, is a brief wording for “paddy-fields of a size which requires 25 measures (มัน?) of seed-rice and which carry an annual tax of 5,000 cowries”, or more concisely, “fields of 25 measures seed-rice with 5,000 cowries tax”.

The rice in question was glutinous rice, khao n"ung ข้าวเหนียว “rice to be steamed”, which still is the staple food of the Northerners, and not khao jao ข้าวเจ้า, the non-glutinous variety now preferred in central Thailand, which is boiled.\(^{113}\) More about the occasionally debated question, what kind of rice was meant in old L"an N"a texts, will be discussed below in section 4, Glutinous Rice or Non-Glutinous Rice?

\(^{112}\)See below in section 4, Glutinous Rice or Non-Glutinous Rice? and section 5, Donation Packages.

\(^{113}\)Northerners call glutinous rice, khao n"ung ข้าวเหนียว “rice that is to be steamed”. This type of rice is called in central Thailand khao niao ข้าวเหนียว ”sticky rice”.

The non-glutinous rice, which traditionally is boiled, has the same name, viz. khao jao ข้าวเจ้า in the North and khao jao ข้าวเจ้า in central Thailand, i.e. “rice (that has been cooked until it is) dry”. The word jao เจ้า is often spelledเจ้า and pronounced jao (not to be mistaken forเจ้า jao “prince, lord”).

It should be noted that the modern central Thai spellingเจ้า for “to steam” in the expression khao n"ung ข้าวเหนียว means, not glutinous rice, but non-glutinous rice pre-cooked at the factory, so-called parboiled rice.

Rice grains and husks, embedded in old clay bricks, show that centuries ago glutinous rice was also eaten in the central region; only later it was later abandoned in favour of the “lighter” non-glutinous rice, khao jao or khao suai.
An observation concerning payments made in cowries shall conclude this chapter. Many articles or goods could be paid for either in *bia* “cowries”, or in *ngön* “silver (weight-units)” \(^{114}\). For instance, prices of manuscripts donated to monasteries were quoted either in silver or in cowries.\(^{115}\) One would expect that higher priced items usually were calculated in silver because cowries were a very small denomination. This may have been the case though I do not have the statistical data to show it. But it seems possible that traditionally certain items were traded in cowries, and others in silver. For instance, construction material probably more often was priced in silver.\(^{116}\) As for land-taxes, they were almost always\(^{117}\) specified in cowries, even if a high tax amount might have been converted into the larger denomination “silver” for practical reasons. Assessing a field’s tax value in cowries may have been an old tradition, perhaps a left-over from rather ancient times.

### 3. The Rice Field Specification Formula

#### Part 2: Name and Location of a Field

The other two specifics that complete the description of a field are the field’s name and its location.

The names allude to the field’s characteristics, its quality, its location, or to some little local event. Some are appellations that indicate the individuals or the recipients (monks, the principal Buddha image, etc.) for whom the rice or the taxes were intended. Other names indicate field categories that connect them with the titles of certain officials; see also below in section 6, *Rice Field Administrators*.

---

\(^{114}\) The weight-unit for silver was sometimes called *bāt*, modern Baht. I suppose, but am not certain, that this unit also was about 1.1 g, the same as the usual (unnamed) weight unit used, for instance, for bronze.

\(^{115}\) At Thā Sōi on the Mā Ping (now flooded by the waters of the Bhumibol Reservoir) in 1531 a commentary on the Ekanipāta of the Aṅguttaranikāya cost 100 *ngön* (v.Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons: 73, 75), and in 1551 a manuscript copy of the Buddhavamsa and its commentary, the Madhuratthavilāsinī, cost 62,000 *bia*: 8,000 *bia* for the palm-leaves and 54,000 *bia* for copying the text (v.Hinüber 1996 Chips: 54-55).

\(^{116}\) Cf. “The (construction) costs were 6,000 silver” สิมั้งเงิน 6,000 สัปะ (1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523).

\(^{117}\) One of the rare exceptions was already mentioned at the beginning of this section, for the year 1375: “Fields with a (yearly) tax of 10,000 silver” อาไร้เงิน 10,000 สัปะ (see footnote 87).

Here is another example. In 1567 the queen of Chiang Mai, Wisuttha Thewī, donated the people of, and the income from, several villages including Bān Pā (north of Hōt) to a monastery. That donation included the wet rice fields of Bān Pā: “The field rent of Bān Pā, 500 silver per year, ... (and all other taxes and revenues there) are a royal donation for the support of Wat Rācha Wisutthārām” ดำาปิบรมณ์ 500 เงิน ชีป ... เป็นพระราชทานอุปถัมภ์เงินวัด ราชวิศษฎพาราม (1.2.3.1 Wat Wisutthārām 1567).
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Judging from the names, a number of fields were of inferior quality, whereas one would expect that fields, given to monasteries for the sake of making merit, would be of particularly good quality, as normally other items were (and still are) when donated to the Buddhist religion. One wonders whether in general the people thought that a rather high percentage of fields in the North were of poor quality.

The meaning of some of the names are dubious or unknown. As with other toponyms, such names (and even perfectly comprehensible ones) might be corruptions of earlier names, dating perhaps even from pre-Thai times.

As has already been mentioned, the name of the field can occupy either of two possible positions in the rice field specification formula. The location of the field is placed at the end:

\[
Nā \text{ นา - Name - } 25 \text{ - Khāo ข้าว - (Nā นา - Name) - Khā คำ - } 5,000 \text{ - Bia เบี้ย - Location}
\]

1. Names of Fields

Here are some examples to show the context of the names within the rice field specification formula. The symbol ♠ stands for the name of the field while the symbol ♦ again indicates an element missing from the 8-element formula. The name of the field is usually preceded by the word nā นา “field”:

\[
\text{Example: น้า ♠ 25 ข้าว ♦♦♦♦} \\
\text{“The Dòn Klâng field of 12 measures seed-rice”.}^{118}
\]

\[
\text{Example: น้า ♦ 25 คำ 5,000 ♦} \\
\text{“The Phra field of 175 measures seed-rice with an annual tax of 96,800 cowries”.}^{119}
\]

\[
\text{Example: น้า ♦ 25 ♦♦♦♦♦} \\
\text{“The Nam Tâi field of 30 measures seed-rice”.}^{120}
\]

\[
\text{Example: 100 ♠ 5,000 ertime ♦} \\
\text{“The Than Jat field of 100 measures seed-rice with an annual tax of 55,000 cowries”.}^{121}
\]

---

118 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.
119 1.5.1.1 Wat Lî 1495.
120 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.
121 1.5.1.1 Wat Lî 1495.
25 ข้าวนา ♦ คำ 5,000 ♦

Example: 100 ข้าวนาของเอ๋ง คำ 45,000

“The Nòng Theng field of 100 measures seed-rice with a tax of 5,000 cowries”.

If the word น้า นา is omitted, it may be difficult to recognize the name. Here is such an example, made up of 4 items all in the form of

25 ข้าว ♦♦♦ 5,000 ♦♦

นา มี 50 ข้าว รอบหว้า 50,000 50 ข้าว ตันกว่า 50,000 50 ข้าว ตันแวด 50,000 50 ข้าว 8 เพียก 50,000

Written as a list the details become clearer:

นา มี
50 ข้าว รอบหว้า 50,000
50 ข้าว ตันกว่า 50,000
30 ข้าว ตันแวด 50,000
50 ข้าว 8 เพียก 50,000

“(The monastery) has (the following) rice fields:

50 measures seed-rice, the Hòm Wua field, with 50,000 cowries tax
50 measures seed-rice, the Ton Kwào field, with 50,000 cowries tax
30 measures seed-rice, the Ton Khâ field, with 50,000 cowries tax
50 measures seed-rice, the Pät Phiak field, with 50,000 cowries tax.”

The following collection of field names is intended to show the variety of such names. All refer to wet rice fields, น้า นา; I do not remember having read the name of an upland field, rai / hai.

Nā Bān Ăng นาบ้านยาง “The field(s) at the village Bān Ăng”.

122 1.5.1.1 Wat Lì 1495.
123 1.2.1.1 Jula Khiri 1554. This high tax either included the four villages under the monastery (the text is not clear on that) or else there was a steep tax increase or an inflation.
124 Since the word rai / hai can be spelt in several ways, ไร้, ไร, ไ赖, ไ赖, each with a different meaning and one or two with more than one meaning, and since old texts often dispense with tone markers, one must be careful not to misunderstand the meaning. Here is an example: In 1514 a bronze Buddha image was cast and placed in rai hòm ระห่ำ ใน ร่ำ หมู่. This does not mean that the image was placed on a good-smelling upland field, but in a monastery, Wat Rai Hòm, with the word Wat “monastery” omitted in the text, as is often the case. Again, that name does not mean “Monastery at the good-smelling upland field”, but “Monastery with the fragrant rai / hai tree”. The hai tree is of the ficus kind, looks similar to the banyan, and some varieties do have strong smelling flowers and even a smell of their own (1.2.3.2 Wat Rai Hòm 1514).
125 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.
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Nã Dong แปลว่า “Fields at (in) the hillyforest”. \footnote{1.1.1.1 ภูมิที่ Köt 1490.}

Since this expression forms part of the title and rank of an official, Phan Nã Dong ทิพย์ถ่ง, “the official with the rank of 1,000 whose duties are concerned with nã dong rice fields”, it seems that nã dong was not the name of a certain field but rather the name of a type or a category of fields. See also below, Nã Lang.

Nã Đôn Klâng แปลว่า “Field on the middle mound” and
Nã Đôn Tai แปลว่า “Field on the southern mound”. \footnote{1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.}

Đôn means a high ground or elevation among otherwise flat land and usually is a dry site, distant from water; a field here is difficult or impossible to irrigate and depends on rain.

Nã Đôn Hai แปลว่า “Field on the mound with banyan trees”. \footnote{1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.}

Hai (spelled ไก) is a shady fig tree, called ton sai ตันไช่ in central Thailand. But since inscriptions mostly do not have tone markers, alternatively here could be meant hai ไห “dry rice field, plantation”, and the meaning of the name could be “Field at the mound with the plantation”.

Nã Fâng แปลว่า “Fâng tree field”. \footnote{1.4.1.1 Wat Phra Khing 1488.}

Nã Hồng Phâk แปลว่า “Shovel field”. \footnote{1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.}

Perhaps a field shaped like, or situated in, an area similar to the inner part (hòng) or “loading cavity” of a shovel (phâk).

Nã Huài Đôn Thâp แปลว่า “Field by the brook Huài Đôn Tap”. \footnote{1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.}

Nã Janghan แปลว่า “Monk food field”. \footnote{1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498; 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500.}

Probably a field the rice of which was meant as food for monks of a certain monastery.

Nã Khen แปลว่า /น้ำขัน/ “Difficult field”. \footnote{1.4.1.1 Wat Phra Khing 1488.}

The word khen can also mean “misfortune, calamity”. Obviously the field name points to something unfortunate, either obstacles arising from the field itself, or an incident that took place on or near it.

Nã Khû Kà แปลว่า “Khû kà field”. \footnote{1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.}

Khû kà “crow excrement” (alluding to the shape of the seeds?) is the name of a vine with bitter taste and medicinal properties; it is also the general name for a number of other vines, climbers and herbs, such as khû kà lâi, khû kà dâng, khû kà nòi, etc., some of which were also used for medical purposes.
Nā Khrāng น่าคราง “Field ...” (7).  
Nā Khūa Bā น่าเขียวبناءเขียว/ “Crazy eggplant field”. 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500.
The shrub/climber (*lamphōng* สัตผ่อง in central Thailand), an annual, has poisonous seeds which induce a state of stupor or drunkenness (even now used for criminal purposes), but the roots were used against rabies and “general idiocy”.

Nā Klāi /น่าคล้ำ/ “Kluai Field”. 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.
A monastery received “(a) nā klāi field(s)” of 30 measures seed-rice. Khāo klāi ขาวก้า is a certain variety of glutinous rice, which could mean that the monastery had that many fields for planting that particular rice. However, there is little or no reason to specify the rice planted (see the section Glutinous or Non-glutinous Rice?). Since klāi กลาย also is the name of a small tree, and klāi กลาย means both, “banana” and “orchid”, the name of the field probably alludes to one of these.

Nā Kon น่าก้อน “Bottom field” (7).  
Nā Kōng น้ำกอง/น้ำกง/ “Curved field”. 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.
Kōng also has other meanings, depending on the word-tone (not indicated in the inscription), for instance “crossbow” น้า. If the above translation is correct, its shape was curved like the rib of a boat. But here the name is obviously connected with a village of the same name, Bān Kōng /บ้านกอง/, mentioned in the same inscription immediately after the field, which name could mean “Crossbow Village” บ้านริ้ว. Hence the name of the field might be “Field at Crossbow Village”, or perhaps “Field at the curved village”.

Interestingly, the taxes for the field were only 500 cowries, and for the village even less, just 400. The village with its field probably was not affluent.

Nā Kwām น่ากว่า “Soggy Field”  
A rather undesirable wet rice field with too much water and continuously muddy soil. It produces a poor harvest unless properly drained, which sometimes is quite impossible if it is located in a depression of the land, resembling a shallow seasonal pond.

Nā Kwāng น่ากว้าง or น่ากว้าง /กว้าง/ “Dear field” or “Broad field”. 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500.
Since the inscription does not use tone markers, it is not possible to decide which meaning is correct.

---

135 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.  
136 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.  
137 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491.  
138 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mün 1493.  
139 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.  
140 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Arām 1512.  
141 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500.
Nā Kwāo Bong นำวาระ “Kwāo tree field”. A field with/near (trans) planted (bong) kwāo trees. The ton kwāo tree, among Westerners usually known as “flame of the forest”, butea frondosa (also butea monosperma), is one of the most striking trees in Lān Nā, not only because of its shining orange or scarlet flowers but also of its sometimes peculiar angular growth. Besides, it had many uses. For instance, it was a source of medicine, of dye, and on its branches the lac insect secreted its valued resinous substance.

Nā Lak Chāng นำแลกช่าง “Elephant pole field”. Presumably nearby there were poles to attach elephants.

Nā Lang นำหลัง “Fields at / on the back”. Since this expression forms part of the title and rank of an official, Phan Nā Lang พานหลัง, “the official with the rank of 1,000 whose duties are concerned with nā lang rice fields”, it seems that nā lang was not the name of a certain field but rather the name of a type or a category of fields. It is uncertain how to understand lang here: back, backside, topside, etc. See also above, Nā Dong.

Nā Lom Lāng นำแลมเอ่าง “Lom läng tree field”.

Nā Mā Lāi นำมล้าย “Striped dog field”.

Nā Nām Tāi นำนามตา “Dead water field”. Obviously a field with insufficient water, to which the water supply was interrupted, or often failed, etc.

Nā Nān Lọ นำนานหล่อ “Field of the ex-monk Lọ” and
Nā Nān Lọ Nòi นำนานหล่อกนัย “Field of the ex-monk Little Lọ”
Nā Ngua นำงู “Cow Field”.

Nā Nông Teng นำหนงเตง/นำหน่งเตง/ “Field at the teng bush pond”. Teng is the name of a big tree in central Thailand but seems to mean some bush or large shrub in the North.

(Nā) Pāt Phiak 8 เพียก “eight-plot field”. Presumably a group of eight individual plots of rice fields, each with its own surrounding water-retaining mud wall.

Nā Phī Tāi นำพีตาย “Dead man’s (woman’s) field”.

142 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.
143 1.5.1.1 Wat Műn Lọ 1498.
144 1.1.1.1 Árām Sī Kōt 1490.
145 1.5.1.1 Wat Műn Lọ 1498.
146 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.
147 1.5.1.1 Wat Műn Lọ 1498.
148 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.
149 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Árām 1512.
150 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.
151 1.2.1.1 Jula Khīrī 1554.
152 1.5.1.1 Wat Műn Lọ 1498.
The former owner probably bequeathed the field to the monastery on his deathbed.

Nā Phra Nā Phra “The monk’s or the Buddha image’ field”. 153

Nā phra at present means “the monk’s field”, i.e. a field which stays reserved for a man while he is in the monkhood. As a monk he cannot own property but it is common practice that the family keeps some land for him in case that one day he will leave the monkhood and will then need it to support himself.

But in the inscription of Wat L™ from 1495, which lists the field holdings of the monastery, nā phra obviously refers to a field the rice of which is either meant for the monks or the Buddha image.

In the inscription of Wat Phra Köt (“monastery with the Buddha image called Phra Köt”) from 1500, it is evident that nā phra means the Buddha image. One field, called Nā Kwâng “broad field” or “deer field” was expressly described as to produce rice for phra, the Buddha image: เป็นนาข้าวพระ. Further down, the inscription mentions a field called Nā R™ “long field” half of whose rice was meant for the image (phra) and the other half as food (for the monks (janghan): นารี 50 ข้าว เป็นนาพระ 25 เป็นนานัจจัพัน 25.

Nā Pön Taiwāi Nā Pön Taiwāi “Prediction Field”. 154

A field about which someone, a friend or acquaintance, had made a prediction (“will bring a good harvest once in three years”, etc.)

Nā Pong Nā Pong “Muddy field”. 155

Nā Pòng (Phòng) Nā Pòng (Phòng) “Uneven field”. 156

The word pòng means “puffed up, convex, swelling up and down”, a flat surface with one or several patches rising up as blisters on the skin. Judging from the name, it was not a level field but had an uneven surface, meaning that part of it received too much water while other parts were (nearly) dry; hence the name indicates a not very desirable field.

Nā Prang Nā Prang “Off-season field”. 157

Nā Prang, also called nā dò, is an off-season paddy field for a second harvest, mostly worked in the dry, hot season, needing artificial irrigation. It is usually unsuitable for rice growing during the normal rice season, for instance because during the rains it is subject to uncontrolled inundation.

153 1.5.1.1 Wat L™ 1495; 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500.
154 1.4.1.1 Wat Phú Khing 1488.
155 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.
156 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.
157 There is a monastery called Wat Nā Prang วัดนาปราง in A. Pong, Phayao province.
Nā Rang นารัง “New Field” (?).\textsuperscript{158}

See also below in the chapter *Donation Packages: Persons and Fields* for Wat Mahā Phōthī, 1500.

Nā Rāṅg Mū นารางมู “Pig-trough field”.\textsuperscript{159}

Nā Rī นารี (or perhaps นารี) “Long field”.\textsuperscript{160}

*Rī* can have several meanings indicating length: long, oval, lengthwise (as opposed to ‘across’).

(Nā) Rim Nông (นาริมนอง “Field by the pond”).\textsuperscript{161}

*Nông* means a pool or small lake. If it is shallow, it will be “seasonal”, i.e. often dry in the hot season and overflowing in the rainy season. A field immediately by such a pond with ill-defined banks usually is difficult to work, with crops of irregular and below average quantity. For a high-yield field by a pool, cf. below *The Ratio Seed-Rice - Cowries*.

(Nā) Ròm Wua ร่อมว้า “The field where the cows are gathered”.\textsuperscript{162}

Bañ Nā Rōt บ้านราด “The village of (the) Nā Rōt”.\textsuperscript{163}

The meaning of the name is uncertain because it can be understood in several ways.

*Rōt* (often ล่ำต อ่ำต) “little, small” can be a personal (nick)name: “The village at Shorty’s field”.

*Rōt* could also refer to the small size of the field: “The village at the little field”.

The expression *Nā Rōt* is also attested as a personal name or as a title of a person who perhaps administrated small fields (see below in the section *Rice Field Administrators*)\textsuperscript{164}: “The village (of the man called) Little Field”; “The village of the Nā Rōt official”.

Nā Rūāk นาเรือก /นาเริ่ก/ “Bamboo matting field”.\textsuperscript{165}

*Rūāk* is a kind of coarse matting made from split bamboo. It can be rolled and transported to make an enclosure for animals, also for fish etc. in a piece of water. The word can also mean a kind of hunting net, or fence, made from long strips of leather, which was also used to keep animals out of a temporary camp.

Nā Sāi Mūn นาหาบมุน /นาหาบมุน/ “Sandy field”.\textsuperscript{166}

Nā Sāng Kham นาสังคาม “Field ... ”.\textsuperscript{167}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{158} 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthī 1500.  
\textsuperscript{159} 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lō 1498.  
\textsuperscript{160} 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kṑṭ 1500.  
\textsuperscript{161} 1.5.1.1 Wat Mīn Lō 1498.  
\textsuperscript{162} 1.2.1.1 Jula Khiri 1554.  
\textsuperscript{163} 1.2.1.1 Wat Kān Thōm 1499.  
\textsuperscript{164} 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthī 1500.  
\textsuperscript{165} 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lō 1498.  
\textsuperscript{166} 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.  
\textsuperscript{167} 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.  
\end{flushleft}
The word *kham* means “gold”. Since *sāng* “to comb” does not seem applicable here, perhaps a word of similar sound was meant, for instance:

- < อง “rice granary”: Field at the golden (i.e. royal / state?) rice barn.
- < ส่าง “ex-monk”: Field of the former monk Kham.
- < ส่าง “pit, well, mine”: Field at the gold(en) pit.
- < ช่าง name of a tall grass: Field at the *sāng kham* grass.
- < ช่าง name of a large tree: Field at the *sāng kham* tree(s).

*Nā Tā Nghĩ* น้าแง “Watergate field”
*Nā Tā Ngā Lum* น้าตาแงล้ม “Lower watergate field”.
*Nā Thai* น้าไถ “The ransomed field”.

Presumably a field which once was redeemed, purchased back or otherwise recovered by paying a fine, price, etc.

*Nā Than Jat* น้าทันจัด “The field that was arranged in time”?.
*Nā Thò* น้าด้วย “Field with water-pipe”.

Such tubes for irrigation usually were made from bamboo.

*Nā Thòn* น้าทอง “The revoked field”.
*Nā Thòng* น้าทอง “Thòng tree field”.

The *mai thòng* ไม้ทอง or *ton thòng* ต้นทอง tree is called *thòng lăng* ทองหลวง in central Thailand.

(Nā) *Ton Khā* ตันแคะ “The Ton Khā Tree Field”.
(Nā) *Ton Kwāo* ตันกว่า “The Ton Kwāo Tree Field”.

For the ton kwāo tree, see above *Nā Kwāo Bong*.

*Nā Ú Nām* น้าโอ้ “Field at the cradle of water”.

Obviously a field with good water supply.

*Nā Wang Ngū* น้าวัง “Snake Pit Field”.

---

168 1.5.1.1 Wat Mùn Lò 1498.
169 1.5.1.1 Wat Mùn Lò 1498.
170 1.5.1.1 Wat Lì 1495.
171 1.5.1.1 Wat Mùn Lò 1498.
172 1.5.1.1 Wat Mùn Lò 1498.
173 1.5.1.1 Wat Mùn Lò 1498.
174 1.2.1.1 Wat Jula Khiri 1554.
175 1.2.1.1 Wat Jula Khiri 1554.
176 1.5.1.1 Wat Lì 1495.
177 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.
2. Location of Fields

In the above examples, the location of a field sometimes was indicated by its name (Nā Bān Āng “Field at Bān Āng”, etc.) and one can assume that these fields were in the environs of the monastery.

But fields were not always situated nearby. Sometimes they were in distant districts. In such a case the location could be mentioned at the end of the 8-element-formula. Here are some examples, this time quoted in their context for easier understanding because such text passages tend to be difficult, not least because of their brevity. The symbol $\oplus$ stands for the location while the symbol $\diamond$ again indicates an element missing from the formula.

An inscription from Phayao in 1412 says: “Jao Sī Mūn (, the governor of) Phayao, ... wished to donate food to the Buddha image (of Wat Kao Yôt), (rice fields of) 500 (measures seed-) rice, (located) in the Phan Nā Chiang Dī” เจ้าสี พยวา ... ใครมักเป็นจั่งหัตถะพระพุทธเจ้า 500 ข้าวอั้งพันนาเชิงที.178

The rice field specifics formula helps to understand this otherwise rather short text passage:

$Nä$ นา - Name - 25 - $Khāō$ ข้าว - (Nā นา - Name) - $Khā$ คำ - 5,000 - $Bia$ เมีย - Location น $\diamond$ 25 $\diamond$ คำ 5,000 $\oplus$

Text: $\diamond$ 500 ข้าว $\diamond\diamond\diamond$ พันนาเชิงที

Wat Kao Yôt was immediately outside Phayao town. The location of Phan Nā (“district”) Chiang Dī is uncertain but it seems to have been further east, beyond the long hill Đòi Duan.

Sometimes details were left vague, perhaps it did not matter from exactly what fields the taxes came, the particulars being left to local administrators: “(In about 1290 Phayā Mang Rāi) ordered to designate the districts in which to collect the rice field taxes in cowries (for Wat Kān Thōm): each year 620,000 cowries for the monks’ food in the district of Jâm and 500,000 cowries for the administrators (?)\textsuperscript{179} in the district of Chā Châng’’ ที่อั้งข้าวเก็บเมียคำนา ปีใหม่ 620,000 เมีย นเป็นคำจั่งหัต ข้าวนjem 500,000 เมีย เป็นคำภมิ ข้าวนjemหัต.180

\textsuperscript{178} 1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yôt 1412.
\textsuperscript{179} เป็นคำภมิ. Whereas \textit{kin} here could mean “to eat” and therefore “food in general, food for all others; general expenses”, there is an inscription of a monastery near Chiang Mai where \textit{kin} expressly means the remuneration for that important monastery’s administrators: “Salary for administrators: 200,000 cowries” ไว้ที่ผูกภมิภมิ 200,000 เมีย (1.2.1.1 Wat Tāpôthhrām).
\textsuperscript{180} CMA. N: 53; HPms: 2.8R; W: 39; U: 31.
Wat Kān Thōm is located in Wiang Kum Kām, about 5 km southeast of Chiang Mai. The first group of fields presumably were in present A. Mā Jām, a valley district in the hills c. 90 km southwest of Chiang Mai, at the time not easily reached. The location of the second group of fields is not certain; perhaps Chā Chāng was in Lampāng province on the river Mā Chāng.181

The administrators who were charged with the execution of a royal donation had a certain leeway. In 1488 there was a royal order for a donation to the monastery Wat Phan Tōng Tām in Chiang Sän. That order was given only in general terms, viz. “to donate rice fields with 600,000 cowries (tax) (and) 15 families” ตั้งไว้ว่า ๖๐๐,๐๐๐ เขี้ยว (และ) คน ๑๕ ครัว.

Local officials then made these specific arrangements: “The fields with 600,000 cowries (tax) were to be taken from the Phan Nā (district) Muan. (As for) the 15 families, if there were not enough among the relatives of Phan Tōng Tām (who had built the monastery), additional families were to be found ... (However) the donation of (fields with) 600,000 cowries (tax was split): 593,000 (cowries) field tax (plus) 7,000 cowries tax on a village” arranty พนานมัน ตั้ง ๖๐๐,๐๐๐ เขี้ยว (ส่วน) คน ๑๕ ครัว (น้ำ) ในชุมชนพันต้อง (แต่มี) นอก ที่อยู่ (เพิ่ม) แม่ ... ไว้เมื่อ ๖๐๐,๐๐๐ เขี้ยว (แบ่งออกเป็น) ต่าน ๕๙๓,๐๐๐ (และ) บ้าน ๑ ต่า ๗,๐๐๐ เขี้ยว.182

Phan Nā Muan presumably is present A. Chiang Muan in Phayao province (c. 50 km southeast of Phayao), or about 150 km south of Chiang Sän.

Incidentally, also another monastery in Chiang Sän, Wat Prāsāt, received fields in that district: “... ordered to give fields with 100,000 cowries tax in Müang Muan” ไว้ในกัน ๑๐๐,๐๐๐ เขี้ยว อำเภอเมือง.183

One final observation: In Lān Nā, the name of a field seldom is a part of a village name; a rare example was mentioned above, viz. Bān Nā Rōt “village at the Nā Rōt field”. This somewhat distinguishes Lān Nā from other Tai regions, for instance in Laos, where villages often carry field names, such as Bān Nā Luang “Village at the large Field”.

4. Glutinous Rice or Non-Glutinous Rice?

One hears or reads sometimes that stone inscriptions expressly mention khāo nūng “glutinous rice” and even differentiate between donations of fields for khāo nūng and khāo jāo “non-glutinous rice”,184 meaning that both varieties were commonly eaten in Old Lān Nā. If true, that would mean a surprising change in

182 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tōng Tām 1488. The place name Muan ใน this inscription has no mai ek.
183 1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496. The place name Muan ใน this inscription carries the mai ek.
184 For these expressions, see above in section 2, Size and Taxes of a Field, footnote 40.
eating habits because it is generally thought, also attested by archaeological finds,\textsuperscript{185} that the Northemers, including Lawa and Karen, have been growing and eating steamed glutinous rice since of old. However, it seems that the alleged mention of glutinous or non-glutinous rice in old texts derives from a misunderstanding.

Firstly, a farmer would not differentiate between fields for glutinous and non-glutinous rice because these types of rice do not need different kinds of fields. Both are chiefly grown as wet-rice varieties on flooded fields (nā น้า), and what kind of wet-rice is grown on a paddy field depends only on the farmer. There is therefore no reason to mention separate fields.

Secondly, when asking for an example from a text that allegedly mentions one or the other type of rice, it has been my experience that (with one exception, see below) a passage was never quoted which clearly showed that non-glutinous rice was meant. Invariably a passage was quoted that allegedly referred to glutinous rice. These quotations usually involved the number ròi ร้อย “100” and always the number nüng หนึ่ง “1” and were of this type: ไร��าฯชีวันฟ้า = ไร��าชีวันฟ้า “he gave fields of 100 (measures seed-) rice”.\textsuperscript{186} However, the proponents of “glutinous rice” would interpret ròi khao ning ร้อยข้าวเหนียว as “100 ข้าวเหนียว”, meaning “100 (measures of) glutinous rice”, and it would be assumed that, since glutinous rice was mentioned, there must also have been non-glutinous rice.

This interpretation is not likely to be correct because of the following reasons.

(1) One could collect many such text examples from all over Lān Nā. This would lead to the surprising conclusions that non-glutinous rice must have been much favoured in Lān Nā because it was necessary to mention glutinous rice, and that glutinous rice mostly was handled in amounts of 100.

(2) Nearly all stone inscriptions are written in Fak Khâm letters. In these inscriptions, /ň/ or /ń/ is the usual spelling of “1”. That parallels the frequent Tham spelling /ń/ though /ń/ is considered correct. I cannot remember having seen the word “to steam” in an inscription, but judging from the way it is spelt in other Lān Nā texts written in Tham letters, where the word is spelled /ń/, inscriptions would probably spell it /ń/ or /ń/, with a leading ň.

(3) The number 100 can be expressed in two ways: nüng ròi หนึ่งร้อย and, perhaps more usual, ròi nüng ร้อยหนึ่ง. In the latter case, when objects are counted, the speaker can choose between two variants: the object can precede ròi nüng, for

\textsuperscript{185} Rice grains and husks imbedded in old clay bricks.

\textsuperscript{186} An example from inscr. 1.5.1.1 Wat Pâ Mai 1497: พณณกรรม กินเมืองลง ไว้สร้อยข้าวเหนียว (เรซาย เซกนิ่ง) เบียนวัฒนประชี “When Mùn Yót was governor of Mùi-ng Lò, he gave fields of 100 measures seed-rice as food for the (principal) Buddha image”. See below in section 7, Donation Packages: Wat Pâ Mai, 1497.
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instance *kham ròi nüng* คำรือหนึ่ง “100 (weight in) gold”,\(^{187}\) or the object can be inserted in between the words *ròi nüng*, for example *ròi khao nüng* รือข้าวหนึ่ง “100 (measures of) rice”.\(^{188}\)

Therefore, the text passages which allegedly refer to glutinous rice in fact are abbreviated versions of the specifics formula, of the type นํา 25 ชั่ว รือสั่น, and mean “rice fields (of a size that require) 100 (measures of seed-)rice”. One infers that glutinous rice was meant, not because the text says so, but because we know the traditional preference of the Northerners.

A well-known instance of the assertion that an old Northern text specifies the type of rice, is the translation of an inscription from Lampáng, dated 1476,\(^{189}\) which allegedly mentions both, non-glutinous and glutinous rice, *khao jao* and *khao nüng*. The inscription deals with building and merit-making activities at Wat Phra That Lampáng Luang. This famous monastery and shrine is located c. 16 km south of Lampáng town. Together with its attached school it covers a knoll which arises from the fields and which is surrounded by a triple moat.

The passage concerning the rice is in the last three lines of the inscription, viz. lines 15 - 17. When Cham Thôngkhamwan first published the inscription in 1952,\(^{190}\) he accompanied his transliteration with a literal modern Thai reading (I have separated the words in the transliteration):

\(^{187}\) Context: ตัวคำ รือหนึ่ง เป็นคำจำกัน “for a price of 100 in gold” (1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411). - Cf. /ข้าวหมาป้าหนึ่งคำรือหนึ่ง “(one pair of red-gold water pots, decorated with pure gold,) weighing 100” (1.3.1.1 Wat Phra That Hariphunchai 1509).

\(^{188}\) Here are some more examples.

*Nà ròi khao nüng*: /มา ข้าว หนึ่ง / “rice fields for 100 measures of seed-rice”, corrected by means of an insert to /ให้ข้าวหนึ่ง / = มา 200 ชั่ว ข้าว “rice fields for 200 measures of seed-rice” (1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Ruang 1498). Obviously, no glutinous rice was meant.

*Ròi nòng nüng*: /pen phrabācayyā 100 ข้าวหนึ่ง / “(This commentary on the Ekanipāta of the Aṅguttaranikāya was made) at a cost (paccaya) of 100 silver”. (Colophon of a Wat Lai Hin manuscript, Lampáng, 1531, transliterated in: v. Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons: 73; my translation.)

\(^{189}\) A corresponding example for 10,000, *nòng nüng*:

\(^{190}\) 1.6.1.1 Wat Phra That Lampáng Luang 1476.

Cham 1952 Jārük Jangwat Lampáng C.S. 838.
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Transliteration
(15) โป นา ภัพ พระ 200 เขา
(16) เจจา โย ข้า ครัว นิง ภัพ พระ
(17) โป นาร็อย เขา นิง ภัพ ตัวย แล

Modern Thai reading
(15) โปรานกัฒพระ 200 ข้าว
(16) เจจาข้าครัวนิงภัพพระ
(17) โปรานร็อยข้าหนูนิงภัพแยล

Cham presumably understood:
“(Someone) gave 220 fields to the image.
The Prince (jao) gave 1 slave family to the image and also 120 fields”.

In this, his first, publication of the inscription, there was not yet question of glutinous and non-glutinous rice. In passing, because it does not bear directly on the rice problem under scrutiny, it might be mentioned that in lines 15 and 17 Cham misread khao /ข้าว/, as written on the stone, for chao /ชáo/. The easily made error led him to another error, viz. that this chao /ชáo/ stood for são /สำ/ “20”. Cham also did not explain his reading, in l. 17, of ròi são nüng ร้อยข้าหนูนิง = “120” which would have needed a comment because it seems quite unusual.

Cham presumably understood:
“(Someone) gave 220 fields to the image.
The Prince (jao) gave 1 slave family to the image and also 120 fields”.

In the second edition of the inscription, published in 1965, Cham amended his reading:

Transliteration
(15) โป นา ภัพ พระ 200 เขา
(16) เจจา โย ข้า ครัว นิง ภัพ พระ
(17) โป นาร็อย เขา นิง ภัพ ตัวย แล

Modern Thai reading
(15) โปรานกัฒพระ 200 ข้าว-
(16) เจเจา, ให้ข้าครัวนิงภัพพระ
(17) โปรานร็อยข้าหนูนิง, ภัพแยล

191 A footnote in Cham’s article, line 15 says: “ข้าว = ข้าวป้า”, i.e. “são means 20”.
192 The figure 1 or the word nüng หนึ่ง “one” are often used in inscriptions as a kind of “comma” in order to separate, in an enumeration of single items, one item from the next (“Mr. X 1 Mr. Y 1 Mr. Z 1” = Mr. X, Mr. Y, and Mr. Z). Cham may have thought that here, similarly, nüng was used to indicate the end of the item “120 fields”. For example: เท่าที่เห็นได้ 1 ชื่ออาวุธ ท่าพลัง ครัว 1 กินเงิน พระเจ้า “Once there was a family, named Ai Hao Kam Ling, who had borrowed silver (i.e., money) from the Buddha image”; see below, Donation Packages: Wat Pà Mai, 1497.
193 Cham 1965 Lak thĩ 65.
He now presumably understood:
“(Someone) gave 200 non-glutinous rice fields (khāo jao) to the image.
(He/They) gave 1 slave family to the image and also 100 fields of glutinous rice
(khāo nüng).”

Cham here placed a cross + in front of line 15. Such a marker, in inscriptions, shows that something is missing here and that the missing piece is written elsewhere. This missing text, or insert, has at its beginning also a cross. So, the cross marker of Cham’s transliteration shows that either something is missing at the beginning of l.15, or else that l.15-17 is the insert, added at the end of the inscription. But since neither his transliteration nor his modern Thai reading show a corresponding marker elsewhere, the reader does not know whether these three lines are main text or insert.

In a footnote Cham explained that glutinous rice was meant by khāo nüng:
“ชำวเหน่ง = ชำวเหนิ้ง”, i.e. “khāo nüng (steamed rice) = khāo niao (glutinous rice)”.

An immediately dubious item is Cham’s handling of the word nüng /nǐːŋ/. Firstly, the modern spelling of nüng “steamed” is not เให้ but เ�่, though in Lannâ’s Tham letters it would be written เ�่. Secondly, in line 16 Cham gives it the meaning “1” but in line 17, “steamed”. Thirdly, this inscription, like many others, spells “1” simply /nǐːŋ/ or /nǐːŋ/. Also, “to steam” would almost certainly have been spelled เย็น or เยิง in the inscription, not /nǐːŋ/, as has already been explained at the beginning of this section. Therefore, the expression ròi khāo nüng /รํอยเขานี้ิ่ง/ in line 17 could very well mean nüng ròi khāo “100 rice” and it is likely that this passage refers to the usual rice field specifics and means:

(17) ไรนรายข้าวเหนิ้ง ภันด้วย แซ
“(he) also gave fields of 100 (measures) seed-rice.”

If this khāo nüng possibly does not mean “steamed rice, glutinous rice”, khāo jao at the end of line 15 and the beginning of line 16 also possibly does not mean “non-glutinous rice”. The first element, khāo, could be seed-rice:

(15) ไรนกิ่งพระ 200 ข้าว
“(Someone) gave fields of 200 (measures) seed-rice to the Buddha image”.

The second element, jao, then would be the beginning of the next phrase:

(16) เขาไปข้าวกระรำ 1 ภันพระ
“the governor (jao)\(^{194}\) donated one family of slaves to the Buddha image”.

\(^{194}\) Jao here should mean the governor of “Müang Nakhôn”, i.e. Lampāng. He is the hero of the inscription and at the beginning is introduced by his official rank and name, Jao Mün Kham Phet เข้ามันคามเพชร.
Therefore the entire passage would have meant:

(15) ... ไร่นากับพระะ 200 ข้าว
(16) เจ้าไร่ข้าวเจ้า 1 ภพพระ
(17) ไร่นา 100 ข้าว กับดิ้นแล้

“(Someone) gave fields of 200 (measures) seed-rice to the Buddha image. The governor donated one family of slaves to the Buddha image and also gave fields of 100 (measures) seed-rice.”

This is about as far as one can go when using only Cham’s transliteration and modern Thai reading.

Reading the inscription in its original form (for instance from the photograph in Cham’s second edition), one will find that lines 15-17 are a postscript meant to be inserted at the end of line 8 where there is the corresponding marker + which is omitted in both of Cham’s text editions. With the insert put in its proper place, here is a detailed summary, or a shortened translation, of the inscription:

“In 1476 Jao Mün Kham Phet, having become governor of Müang Nakhon, supported the Buddhist religion at Lampang. He built a (surrounding) wall, a wihan, and cast a bronze Buddha image of 120,000 weight (c. 132 kg). He celebrated its casting and installed the image in the wihan. He donated 4 families to serve the image. [He gave fields of 200 (measures) seed-rice to the image. The Jao (also) gave a slave-family to the image, together with fields of 100 (measures) seed-rice.] He built a sala, dug a well, and made a way leading to the stupa. His Excellency wishes that the merit thus acquired will make him a Buddha in the future. May all worthy men applaud!”

The passage in brackets is the postscript in lines 15-17, inserted where it belongs. If now one considers it in its context with line 8, which is the description of donations made to the Buddha image, it becomes unlikely that two different kinds of rice were meant:

---

195 Lampang.
196 The site of Wat Phra That Lampang Luang.
197 /พระ/, unknown to me and glossed by Cham as พระวิชญาณ, surely is a honorific.
Transliteration:
(8) ไว คน สิริ วงศ์ ที่ ราชา +
...
(15) ไว นา ภัญ พะระ 200 เขา
(16) เจา ไว ขา ศรีวัณ ภัญ พระ
(17) ไว นา รอบย เขา นง ภัญ ตาย แล

Modern Thai reading:
(8) ไรคนสิริวงศ์ที่ราชา +
...
(15) ไวนาภัญพระระ 200 ชาว
(16) เจาไรชาศรีวัณภัญพระ
(17) ไวนารอบยชาวเนกภัญตายแล

“(Jao Mün Kham Phet, governor of Lampang, cast a bronze Buddha image of 120,000 weight and installed it in a vihān of Wat Phra That Lampang Luang). He placed 4 families at its service and gave the image fields of 200 (measures) seed-rice. The governor (jao) also gave the image 1 slave family together with fields of 100 (measures) seed-rice”.

It is evident that this text passage has nothing to do with glutinous rice or non-glutinous rice but deals with two donations to the Buddha image, each consisting of people and fields. There was a certain difference between the first and the second donation. The first consisted of four ordinary families (khon), whose duty was to care for the image, and of fields. The second donation was one slave family (khā) (with unspecified duties) and more fields. This second lot of fields went together with the slave-family and presumably was meant for their upkeep.

Incidentally, already in 1952 Kasem Kıpina had understood that here seed-rice was meant and not glutinous rice. But possibly he had not noticed that the last three lines of the inscription were an appendix meant as an insert because he merely summarized them: “He gave the Buddha image 20 of rice (twenty of seed-rice)” ไวนาภัญพระพุทธเจา 20 เขา (ยี่สิบพันของข้าวหลุด)”.

5. Donation Packages

Often the donation to a monastery did not consist of just a single item such as a set of scriptures, fields and their taxes, or persons, but of several different items given at the same time and which together formed a donation package. Some of these donation packages were comparatively simple, consisting of only two or

---

perhaps three items; others were more complex. Here are some examples that include rice fields; for the donation package of a salt field and a forest see above in the chapter Introduction, footnote 17. In the original texts quoted below, the various items are written one after the other; for easier understanding, I have often listed them one beneath the other.

a. Simple Donation Packages

Persons and Fields

One of the more common donation packages was a field and people to work for the monastery. If the donated fields had tenants (“owners”) these probably continued to work them but from now on paid their taxes to the monastery. If the fields had no tenants, the monastery had to find the necessary manpower, and presumably rented the field out or used its own slaves, perhaps the persons who had been newly donated on the same occasion as the fields.

Fields and Persons for Wat Yāng Num, 1523

The following two examples are from the province of Chiang Mai. They show that the tax was not necessarily paid in “money” but in kind, i.e. as rice, at the indicated cowry rate.

“King Mā Nai (Phayā Kāo) was pleased to place, as rice for the Buddha image, rice fields with 60,000 cowries (tax), and 3 families of slaves.”

(fields and persons for wat yāng num, 1523)

.Fields and Persons for Wat Sī Bun Rüang, 1496

“The king ...

- gave a Buddha image (with a weight of) 100,000 bronze (c.110 kg) for Wat Sī Bun Rüang here;
- bestowed fields with 500,000 cowries (tax); the rice was meant as an offering to the (main) Buddha image and the monks;
- bestowed 12 families to take care of the Buddha image and the monks...

These monastery inhabitants were all donated in order to take care of the Buddha image and of the monks, and also to do other work for the monastery.”

199 1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523.
Persons and their Fields for Wat Pä Bong, 1496

The above two instances involved persons and fields that apparently were unrelated, i.e. the persons donated were not also the tenants of the donated fields. Some of the following examples will show that here tenants as well as their fields were donated, thus forming a donation package of a slightly different type, viz. “people and their fields”. One can suppose that these persons somehow were under the direct influence of a local lord who himself had the power, or had royal approval, to transfer them, their land, and the tax to a monastery.

The first example comes from a locality about 100 km north of the town of Lampäng. A local official is described being in audience with the King of Chiang Mai, Phayä Käo, in the king’s hò kham (Gold Hall), which was a building that comprised the audience hall, offices, and sometimes also the ruler’s sleeping quarters.

“Jao Sän Kalyäna addressed respectfully the king in the Gold Hall and said: ‘I respectfully greet Your Majesty. I have finished building the monastery Wat Pä Bong. (Now) I ask for 3 villages of Yäng Nam Man people in Jä Hom:

- Bän Kòk, Bän Tüng, and Bän Lün;
- (together) they are 28 families
- with fields of 90,000 cowries (tax),
- also (their rights in?) the forest Pä Wang Nam.’

The king said: ‘Very well.’ ...”

(Appendix in a different handwriting:) “As for them, the king poured water (on the earth) and placed them with Wat Pä Bong.”

As older people remember, “to eat the rice of the Buddha image”, i.e. to receive this rice, was an honour reserved for monks and worthy laymen.
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Fields and Persons for Wat Phra Köt, 1500

This inscription from Nâً province shows that on occasion several different donors concurrently gave fields and / or persons.

“The queen (mother)202 ... told Jao Phuak Khongkâ to set up a stone (inscription) in Wat Phra Köt ... (in order to record the following donations):

- The Nâ Kwâng field of 10 measures seed-rice; Mün Sâi Thao donated it as a field to grow rice for the monks.
- The family of the white-clad ascetic Phông and Āi Kham; Mün Sâi Yôt donated these slaves.
- The family Mä Ming; Mün Sâi Phek donated them.
- The Nâ Rî fields of 50 measures seed-rice, divided into fields of 25 measures seed rice for the Buddha image and of 25 measures seed rice for the monks’ food; (further) the families Mä Sî Tawâng, Kalyâ, Phò Pheng, Phò Khai, Nâng Phim and Mongkon, who (all) own taxable fields (nâ bìa); the Mahâ Sâmî Yânasâthara donated them.

...”

พระมหาราชเทวีจ้า ... เผ subscribes to the view that the plants by the inscription ... The expression mahâ thewē means “mother of the king” while râcha thewē is “queen”. The unusual expression used here, phra mahâ râcha thewē, could mean either.

201 1.6.1.1 Wat Pâ Bong 1496.

202 The expression mahâ thewē means “mother of the king” while râcha thewē is “queen”. The unusual expression used here, phra mahâ râcha thewē, could mean either.

203 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500.
Persons and Fields for Wat Bupphārām, 1529

- “(The king of Chiang Mai ordered prince Un of Phra) to place 5 families and fields of 1,000 measures seed-rice with the (main) Buddha image of Wat Bupphārām ...
- The family of the ex-monk Thit Phian ... in debt for ("whose value was") 500 silver, the prince bought them out and donated them to the Buddha image Phra Sān Thong.”

- ให้โคน 5 ครัว นา 1,000 ข้าว กับพระพุทธรูป วัดบูปหねぇรรม ...
- ทิทพีเยน ... ครัว 1 ค้า 500 เงิน เงินมิ่งเดือกับพระพุทธรูป204

Persons and their Fields for Wat Mahā Phōthi, 1500

This donation of probably quite common items to a monastery in Chiang Rāi looks simple enough, yet much remains doubtful:

- “(The queen mother ordered to set up a stone inscription in Wat Mahā Phōthi to record the donation of)
- 72 families of Yāŋg people (follow their names).
- They have nā rang fields (new fields?) with 1,200,000 (cowries tax).
- (They must supply?) bees wax of 25,760 weight (c. 28.5 kg).
- (The also must send?) oleo resin of 102,500 weight (c. 113 kg).
- (and) wax ... of 7,950 weight (c. 9 kg).”

- ชายาง 72 ครัว ...
- น้ำรัง 1,200,000
- เป็นฝั่ง 25,760 น้ำ
- ได้น้ำมัน 102,500 น้ำ
- ผึ้งกับผึ้ง 7,950 น้ำ205

204 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529.
205 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

This inscription is from a monastery which is now called Wat Jet Yòt, immediately outside the old walled city of Chiang Rāi to the south.

Chào Yāŋg, or Yāŋg for short, is the usual northern term for the Karen, who are hill people. No Karen have been reported from here. If these chào Yāŋg people were Karen, perhaps they lived, and their fields were, at a distance of 20 kilometers or so, in the lower hills surrounding the Chiang Rāi plain.

However, about 40 out of the 72 families’ names are still readable on the inscribed stone, and all appear to have Thai names. Among them were 2 thit ทิท “ex-monk”, one chiang เชียง “ex-novice” and one nāng นาง “lady”. Besides, the word yāŋg in the North can also mean a not too dense or wild forest. Therefore, these chào yāŋg people probably were ordinary farming and forest-gathering Thai people who lived in a rich forest.

Similarly, there is also mention of three villages of chào yāŋg nam man people ชาวายำน้ำมัน, in the valley of the Wang river halfway between Chiang Rāi and Lampāng, who were donated to a monastery in 1496 (1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496; see above).
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b. Complex Donation Packages

Donation Package for a Buddha Image, 1484

About 5 km upstream from Chiang Rai, on the north bank of the Ma Kok river, stands a solitary lime stone hill. Rainwater has washed part of the lime away, making holes in the hill and otherwise deforming it. At a height of about 5 meters above ground level, facing the river, is a lofty and softly illuminated cave in the form of a U, with two entrances. In it is a large, old, seated Buddha image. The hill is locally known as Dòi Tham Phra “Hill with a cave with a Buddha image”. The cave was used by man of Proto-Melanesian stock already during c. 10,000 - 4,000 B.C., in late palaeolithic and early neolithic times (Hoabinhian, Bacsonian).206

In 1484 the ruling prince of Chiang Rai erected a Buddha image in the cave, probably made of brick and stucco, perhaps the predecessor of the present one. He then donated eight families to the service of the image. The hard local limestone evidently was the basis for a limestone tile or cement production, worked from a little village nearby. As usual, taxes were levied on village and product, and now the prince also donated these taxes to the Buddha image. He had the event inscribed on a stone slab erected in the cave. The stone was still there in 1887 when Auguste Pavie made a paper rubbing of it.207 Between c. 1927-1930 it was moved to the Lamphûn museum, and in 1998 to the Chiang Sän museum.208 Here are the details of the donation.

“The prince of Chiang Râi, Thão Mûi, built a Buddha image in this cave ... He donated (8 households of) slaves to it:

- The family Yî Thòng, one wife; this family had borrowed 300 (bât) silver.
- The family Nâng Ām; (borrowed and did not return) 105 bât.
- The family Yî Bä
- ... (etc.; the remaining families are named but their debts are not mentioned)
- The family Thân Kon.
- The family Chão Peng. These (last) two households were conscripted (?).

(The prince also presented the Buddha image with the following income:)

- Rice fields with 82,000 cowries (tax).
- Old rice fields with 50,000 cowries (tax).209

207 Schmitt 1898 Inscription de la caverne: 331.
208 See Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: Appendices 6 and 8.
On Rice and Rice Fields in Old Lân Nâ

- Tax on lime stone (quarrying) amounting to 20,000 cowries.
- The village Bân Tham (“village at the cave”) with 7,000 cowries (tax). Altogether 159,000 cowries (tax).”

Donation Package for Kû Wat Sao Hin, c. 1460 - 80

Close to Wat Sao Hin, located a short distance south of Chiang Mai, formerly were the ruins of a stûpa (kû) which no longer exist. The stûpa was part of a monastery, presumably the predecessor of present Wat Sao Hin. Some inscribed pieces of a stone slab were found at the stûpa. The date has disappeared but the use of a certain title makes it plausible that it fell in the years around 1460-1480. The inscription records that the monastery, or rather its bôt (uposatha precinct with its building), received a donation. The entire text is written continuously as if in prose. But it is obvious that the first half or more was composed as a poem in a certain rhyme and meter that is locally known as lam nam or kûp yânî. The details of the donation package are in this versified part of the inscription but seem, because of the poetic nature of the text, a little vague.

“(I donate to the bôt:)
- 20 families
- Fields for 250 measures of seed-rice
- Together with (a) cow(s),
- Harrow and plough,

209 If the prince restored a former Buddha image, he probably donated new fields of 82,000 cowries and reconfirmed earlier field donations of 50,000 cowries (“old fields”). But if he founded the image, he probably donated newly opened fields and added existing “old fields”.

210 1.4.1.1 Dûi Tham Phra 1484.
Timber for small foot bridges over water channels,
Also fire-wood,
With rice, to make warm and hot water.'"

The donation written as lam nam: (the parts in brackets do not refer to the donation):

[พระสิมแสน]  ชื่อไถ่ชาวระ
นางสองร้อย 50 ซัว และขึ้นตัวระ
เมืองไถ่ ชมชัว ทั้งหลัง และข้าว
ให้เป็นนำยู่น บ Specifies กำหนด

The donation written in the form of a list:

- 20 ศรับ
- น้ า 250 ซัว
- และขึ้นตัวระ
- เมืองไถ่
- ชมชัว
- ทั้งหลัง
- และข้าว ให้เป็นนำยู่น บ Specifies กำหนด

Donation Package for Wat Phan Tòng Täm, 1488

Wat Phan Tòng Täm รัตฟันต้องเดิน probably is identical with the monastery ruins now called Wat Phuak Phan Tòng วัดพางพัน terng in the northeastern part of Chiang Sän city. It had an inscribed stone slab which recorded a donation package. The stone was for a long time in the Lamphun museum but in 1998 was moved to the Chiang Sän museum.212

The inscription says that at one time, the government official Phan Tòng Täm had built a monastery in “Müang Chiang Sän”. In 1487 his son and his daughter, Phan Yä Kitti and Mä Jao Säo Kham Röi, presented the monastery to the king and his mother วางที่ถือเป็นรัตฟันเจ้าแม่ลูก. Their Majesties ordered that fields be donated with 600,000 cowries annual tax and 15 families to the monastery, together with enough teak timber to build a wihän and a library, and had Mün Yä Däp Rüan carry out the order. There were seven witnesses to the order.

Mün Yä Däp Rüan forwarded the royal order to the proper authorities and in 1488 had his men set up the stone inscribed with the donation regulations. The inscription ends with a list of the slaves and a list of probably local witnesses. The short, elliptic, succinct style of the inscription is typical for old Län Nä inscriptions. Possibly it represents the official, bureaucratic style of the time.

211 1.2.1.1 Kù Wat Sao Hin c. 1480.
212 See Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: Appendices 6 and 8.
The details of the donation package were as follows.

“The two Majesties, mother and son ... ordered to donate rice fields with 600,000 cowries (tax) (and) 15 families (to the monastery), (further) to supply teak timber for the construction of the wihān and the library; and they ordered Phò Jao Mùn Yā Dāp Rūan to receive (and to execute) their order ...

(Mùn Yā Dāp Rūan forwarded the order to the competent officials who then decided on these specific arrangements:) The fields with 600,000 cowries (tax) were to be taken from the district Phan Nā Muan.213 (As for) the 15 families, if there were not enough among the relatives of Phan Tòng Täm (who had built the monastery), additional families were to be found.

Mùn Yā Dāp Rūan sent dāp rūan officers here to set up the stone inscription, in the year Pök San, C.S. 850 (A.D. 1488) ...

(As for) the donation of 600,000 cowries (tax, it was split): 593,000 (cowries) field tax (plus) 7,000 cowries tax on a village.”

The inscription shows that court and local authorities had a certain latitude in executing royal orders. In this case, they had to come up with 600,000 cowries field tax; but obviously they could only find 593,000 cowries from rice fields and therefore added 7,000 cowries tax levied on a village.

As for the teak timber, that obviously was no problem and therefore found no extra mention.

One observes that the 15 families of monastery slaves, who are listed towards the end of the inscription, in fact must have been well-to-do and socially respected persons; they obviously were “honorary slaves” or rather “honorary monastery servants”. The son of the founder of the wat, a phan “1000” in rank who had presented the monastery to Their Majesties, was the first on the list.

**Donation Package for the Tapōthārām, 1492**

Wat Tapōthārām, popularly known as Wat Rampöng, is a few kilometers southwest of Chiang Mai. Its stone inscription tells of its founding by the king of

---

213 Phan Nā (“district”) Muan presumably is present A. Chiang Muan in Phayao province (c. 50 km southeast of Phayao), c. 150 km south of Chiang Sän.

214 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Täm 1488.
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Chiang Mai, Phayā Yôt Chiang Rāi, and queen Atapā in 1492, and of the lavish donations it received from the Majesties.

Here is a very detailed donation package which indicates the recipients and the location of fields and also the manpower (“people, slaves”) donated.

“Donation of fields
with a (total) tax
value of
(Details:)
For the stūpa(s) with/at the 4 sides\textsuperscript{215} 400,000 cowries
For the Buddha image in the wihān 500,000 cowries
For the uposatha building 400,000 cowries
For food 1,551,000 cowries
Salary for administrators 200,000 cowries

All these fields are in the region called Mūn Khāo Sān Khāo, in the Phan Nā (“district”) Kū Kham of Đōi Kham.\textsuperscript{216}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 families of debt slaves</td>
<td>9,700 silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 families of relatives</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 families of slaves of the king of Chiang Mai</td>
<td>- - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,720 small ornamental gold plates\textsuperscript{217}</td>
<td>19,040 silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making (a) Buddha image(s), copying scriptures</td>
<td>153,430 silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of all gifts to Wat Tapōthārām</td>
<td>182,170 silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of all royal merit-making activities</td>
<td>513,810 silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total of wealth spent</td>
<td>695,980 silver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{215} The meaning is not clear. The expression พุทธิกาใน 4 ด้าน means either “stūpa with four sides”, i.e. a square stūpa, or “the (four) stūpas at the four sides”. Since the monastery has one impressive old-looking round stūpa at the usual place behind the wihān (i.e. close to the western wall of the wihān) the text may not refer to it. Perhaps the present shape of the stūpa does not date from the foundation of the monastery in 1492 but is the result of some re-building at a later time. If there were four stūpas, nothing of them seems left.

\textsuperscript{216} The hill Đōi Kham is in T. Mā Hia, A. Müang, Chiang Mai, approx. 5 km southwest of the Tapōthārām.

\textsuperscript{217} Tā kham (lit. “gold eye”) can mean small, round or square, pieces of gold foil or gold plate, for instance to adorn a cetiya, but also a very loosely woven piece of gold cloth with wide meshes (“eyes”), a kind of net, as is sometimes suspended above a Buddha image.
Donation Package for Wat Pà Mai, 1497

The ruins of Wat Pà Mai are located at Wiang Lò on the Mä Ing in Amphô Jùn, about 36 km northeast of Phayao in a straight line.

This account of a donation package, contained in a stone inscription, is instructive because it not only records a certain donation made at one time but adds a review of earlier donations and thus presents a short “donation history” of the monastery.

In short, the inscription says that in 1497 the governor of Müang Lò asked a monk to rebuild Wat Pà Mai. He then transferred the merit to both their Majesties (i.e. the king, Phayâ Käo, and his mother). The Princess Mother donated 500 silver. The king donated rice fields with 400,000 cowries tax, 30 families, and a plot of land for the monastery, located on the river Mä Ing between the inner and outer city moat of Wiang Lò. The purpose of that land is not apparent.

Then follows an account of three earlier donations made to Wat Pà Mai. Around 1480 (?), when Müin Yòt was governor of Müang Lò, he gave fields of 100 measures seed rice to the principal Buddha image. At an unstated time a family

---

218 1.2.1.1 Wat Tapôthârâm 1492.
219 In Yuan, wiang means a fortified settlement, a city; müang means the country, or the city state as a whole.
220 Not: queen mother; her husband had not been the king.
borrowed 500 silver from the Buddha image and later defaulted on repayment; thereupon, perhaps in around 1485 (?), an official made them slaves of the image. In 1489, when Mùn Sai was governor of Müang Lò, he gave fields of 200 measures seed rice as food for the Buddha image.

The text concerning the donations says in translation:

“The Princess Mother gave 500 silver for construction purposes.\footnote{The expression \textit{s"ang n"a r"ian} does not only denote building activities but also additions or improvements donated to a monastery. Cf. above the donation package for the Tap\o th\"ar"am, where \textit{s"ang} not only includes the copying of (scripture) books, \textit{nang s"u}, but also the purchase of 10 slave families and the acquisition of ornamental little gold plates, \textit{t"a kham}. Consequently, the phrase in question here probably should be understood in a broad sense: “500 silver to cover the costs for any desired acquisitions for the monastery”.}

The king ... ordered to arrange for fields and persons to be given to this monastery:

- fields with 400,000 cowries (tax)
- food for the Buddha image: 200,000 cowries
- food for the monks in this monastery: 200,000 cowries
- persons of 30 families
  - for the service of the Buddha image in the wih\ahn: 20 families
  - for the uposatha building: 5 families
  - for the library: 5 families.

He also gave a plot of land with these borders: in the east to the bank of the river, in the south to the outer city moat, in the west 100 w\ahn, and in the north to the city moat ...

When (in c. 1480?)\footnote{The year c. 1480 (?) for this governor is a guess; from the context it appears merely that he was in office before 1489 when Mùn Sai was governor.} Mùn Yòt was governor of Müang Lò, he gave fields of 100 measures seed-rice as food for the Buddha image.

Formerly a family, the family of Æi Hao Kham Ling, had borrowed 500 silver from the Buddha image (and had defaulted on repayment). Phò Nòi, who was the \textit{phan n"a r"ian}, (in c. 1485?)\footnote{The year c. 1485 (?) for this donation is a guess; from the context it appears merely that the family was donated after Mùn Yòt had been governor and before 1489 when Mùn Sai was governor.} poured water and donated them as slaves to the Buddha image.

When Mùn Sai was governor of M. Lò, he gave fields for 200 measures seed-rice to the Buddha image; that was in the year Kat Rao, month 7, day 2 of the waxing moon, day Kat Met ( = 1 April 1489).”
On Rice and Rice Fields in Old Lanná

6. Rice Field Administrators

On behalf of the government, rice fields and their produce, i.e. rice, were administrated by persons whose titles or popular appellations included the words na “wet rice field”, khao (khao) “rice”, and chāng, sāng “(state) granary, rice bin”. Little is known about their functions and duties, and even less about how they did their work in everyday life. All of them seem to have been men; apparently no women were employed in this work. Some may not have been state government officials but only had to do with “rice” on a local or even private level. Hopefully at a later time we will be able to better understand and translate the titles. Towards this aim, the following selection of titles and names includes a brief “profile”, i.e. a description of their activities according to the context, and occasionally a translation of the text itself which is placed in between quotation marks “...”. The date is the date of the event which is not necessarily the date of the inscription. The name of the town/province indicates where this official presumably was stationed, which is not always identical with the place where the event took place; for instance, Mūn Lām Nā Horāthibodī almost certainly was based at the Chiang Mai Court but had to travel upcountry in order to arrange matters for a far-away monastery in Müang Lò, today in the province of Phayao.

224 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.
Some of these officials clearly had other qualities and interests besides field administration; cf. the mün nā lang Yôt who assisted in the casting of a Buddha image.

Names and Titles with “Nā”

Nā

Jao Thāo Sòng Sän Nā เจ้าท้าวสองแสนนา
1370, Chiang Mai. This title / name “Royal Prince 200,000 Rice Fields” was used for King Kü Nā (r. 1355-85) by his contemporaries, as is attested in a stone inscription at Lamphūn. His rulership or power over a great number of fields is also indicated by his usual name, Kü Nā ภูมิ “One million fields”. This name / title remains unexplained. Although it reminds one of the old central Thai system of allotting honorary rice fields, sakdi nā ศักดิ์นา, to all citizens in order to fix their social standing, that system was not in use in Lān Nā where power or rank were expressed with numbers, for instance phan พัน “1000”, an imaginary command over that many persons.

Nā Dong

It seems that nā dong “fields at (in) the hilly forest” were a special category of fields which were under a particular government official; cf. also nā lang.

Phan Nā Dong พันนาลง
1490, Pāi, Mā Hong Sòn province. He probably was one of the witnesses to a donation of slaves made by the king and his mother (mahā thewī) to a monastery.

Nā Lang

Officials with the title nā lang seem to be mentioned more frequently than other officials whose title include the word nā. They were represented throughout the ranks of government officials. There was the plain nā lang, the “100” ròi nā lang, the “1,000” phan nā lang, and the “10,000” mün nā lang. It seems that nā lang “fields at / on the back (?)” were a special category of fields which were under a particular government official; cf. also nā dong.

---

225 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yün 1370.
226 1.1.1.1 Ārām Śi Köt 1490.
Nā Lang โอมีีน่าหลัง ....
1500, Chiang Rāi. The wife or, more probably, the widow Ai of Nā Lang .... (his name is unreadable) is the 34th in a list of 72 heads of slave families of chāo yāng farming and forest people who were donated to Wat Mahā Phōthi, immediately south of the old walled town of Chiang Rāi.

Nā Lang Suthon Khāwin นำลง ธุฒนควิน
1563, Chiang Mai. As part of his last will and testament he donated his house of 3 ‘rooms’ บ้าน 3 ห้อง to a standing (bronze) Buddha image that had been cast recently.

Ròi Nā Lang Lām Mùn ร้อยนำลง สามห์ยืน
1489, Müang Kuak. This nā lang held the rank of 100 (ròi), and was the secretary / announcer / public relations man (lām) of a high-ranking official who had the rank of 10,000 (mùn). He is the sixth in a list of seven persons who witnessed donations made to a monastery near Lamphūn, and the setting up of a stone inscription recording the donations.

Phan Nā Lang พันนำลง
1488, Phayao. The queen (queen-mother?) in Chiang Mai sent an order on gold foil to the wife of the governor of Phayao. In the document, the queen asked to assign 20 families to the service of the Buddha image and the mahāthera of Wat Dòk Kham. The Phayao governor’s wife, in turn, asked eight local officials to take the document to Wat Dòk Kham.

This unnamed phan nā lang is the first in the list of these eight officials, taking precedence over other phan and also thao müang.

Phan Nā Lang Chiang Nòi พันนำลง เชียงน้อย
1489, Müang Kuak. This nā lang held the rank of 1,000 (phan), was an ex-novice (chiang) and his personal name was Nòi. He is the fourth in a list of seven witnesses to several donations made to a monastery near Lamphūn, and to the setting up of a stone inscription which recorded the donation.

227 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500. For a note on these chāo yāng people, see above in the chapter Donation Packages: Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.
228 1.2.3.2 Wat Mùn Tum 1563. A ‘room’ ห้อง in Yuan means the space in between four pillars of a house, no matter whether there are partitions, curtains, etc. “Three rooms” means a house on a rectangular plan with four pillars on either side, not including the raised verandah in front.
229 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489.
230 1.5.1.1 Wat Dòn Khrām 1488.
231 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489.
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Phan Nā Lang พันนาหลง
1490, Pāi, Mā Hong Sôn province. Phan Nā Lang was one of the witnesses to a donation of slaves made by the king and his mother (mahā thewī) to a monastery in M. Pāi, A. Pāi.

Phan Nā Lang Yāna Wisā Ròt พันนาหลง ญาณวิสาขาด
1502, Wiang Pā Pao, c. 90 km north of Chiang Rai. By order of the queen mother in Chiang Mai, he was to arrange her personal donation with an accompanying inscription: 10 families to serve the Buddha image in a monastery near Wiang Pā Pao and to supply annually 11 kg lamp oil as a gift of worship for the image.

Phan Nā Lang Thep พันนาหลง เทพ
1513, near Phān south of Chiang Rāi. He is the fifth in a list of 11 witnesses to a land donation made by the governor of Müang Òi to a Buddha image. In that list, four monks precede seven laymen. In the laymen’s group, the Phan Nā Lang Thep comes first, preceding a phan nangsū พันหนังสือ, a thao müang เท่า เมือง, a pāk nangsū ปากหนังสือ, an ordinary phan พัน, another thao müang เท่าเมือง, and a sān khāo แสนข้าว.

Phan Nā Lang Khwan พันนาหลง ชาวญ
1520, Chiang Mai. He is the first in a list of five persons who sponsored the consecration of an uposatha precinct (khandhas™m¡). He precedes three sān khāo and an untitled but obviously otherwise important person, Nāi Suwan.

Besides, he is the first in a group of witnesses to donations made to the uposatha hall. In that list he precedes a Sān Khāo and ordinary villagers.

Mün Nā Lang พันน่าหลง
1493, Phayao. Presumably the same as Mün Nā Lang Sī Phat. He was represented by one of his men, a certain Yā Sitthi ญาสิทธิ, to witness a donation of slaves made to a monastery.

---

232 1.1.1.1 Ārām Sī Kōt 1490.
233 1.4.1.1 Wat Uthumphara Ārām 1502.
234 1.4.1.1 Wat Nông Kwāng 1513.
235 1.2.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1520.
236 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493.
Münn Nā Lang Sī Phat หมื่นนาหลัง ศรีพัด
1492, Phayao province. 237 He is the first in a list of four lay witnesses to a multiple donation consisting of slaves for the service of a Buddha image, an annual delivery of sesame oil, etc. (details lost) made by the governor of Chiang Rai to a monastery about 12 km northwest of Phayao. Somewhat unusually, this list of lay witnesses is followed, and not preceded, by a list of three monk witnesses.

Münn Nā Lang Sī Phat หมื่นนาหลัง ศรีพัด
1493, Phayao province. 238 He is named as the first of two witnesses who “know” that a certain monastery has certain fields and a village.

Münn Nā Lang Sī Phat หมื่นนาหลัง ศรีพัด
1495, Phayao. 239 He is the first in a list of nine witnesses to various donations of persons, rice fields and villages made over time to a monastery next to Phayao city.

Münn Nā Lang Thep หมื่นนาหลัง เทพ
1495, Phayao. 240 He is the second in a list of eight lay witnesses to a donation of persons and of a village with two areca trees, made by the former and the present kings of Chiang Mai, to a monastery just outside Phayao city to the northwest.

Münn Udom Nā Lang หมื่นอุดม นนาหลัง
1496, Phayao. 241 He is the first in a list of at least a dozen local officials from the various government branches who were assembled in a meeting called by the governor of Phayao. They accepted, or attested to, an order by the Mahā Thewī, the king’s mother, who reconfirmed previous donations made to a monastery, some as far back as 1411.

237 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ärām Khōi Sum 1492.
238 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Münn 1493.
239 1.5.1.1 Wat Līi 1495.
240 1.5.1.1 Wat Ärām Pà Ya 1495. The two kings are, Phayā Yòt who abdicated probably on 07/06/1495 (PAY.PP: 36) and certainly before 31/07/1495 (1.5.1.1 Wat Ärām Pà Ya) in favour of his son, Phayā Kào who, being only 12 or 13 years old, was consecrated king with his mother on 05/08/1495 (1.4.1.1 Wat Sī Suthāwāt 1496).
241 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Kham 1496.
Mün Nā Lang หมื่นนาหลง
1500, Chiang Rāi. 242 He is the fourth in a list of at least seven witnesses to the donation a group of 72 chāo yāng agricultural and forest-gathering people and their taxes to a monastery next to Chiang Rāi town, and to the setting up of a stone inscription which records the donation.

Mün Nā Lang Thàn Kham หมื่นนาหลง แต่น้า
1506, Phayao province. 243 He is the second in a list of 10 witnesses to a donation of slaves made to a monastery about 12 km northwest of Phayao.

Mün Nā Lang Yöt หมื่นนาหลง ยอด
1516, Phayao. 244 He is the first in a list of four persons who helped, chuai ช่วย, with the casting of a big bronze Buddha image, probably in Wat Sip-sòng Hòng immediately outside Phayao town.

Mün Nā Lang Jöm Sawan หมื่นนาหลง jom sawan
Mün Nā Lang Suan In หมื่นนาหลง สนั่นินทร์
1529, Phrä. 245 The ruling prince of Phrä and his wife had built or rebuilt Wat Bupphārām (located northeast outside the town of Phrä). Then the prince asked Mün Nā Lang Jöm Sawan “to bring the merit” ขยายญิโระให้ to Mün Ying so that the latter might present it to the king (in Chiang Mai, viz. Phayā Ket). The king then ordered that people and fields be assigned to the monastery.

Mün Nā Lang Suan In was the fifth in a list of eight witnesses to the donation, after five other mün and before a phan (“1000”) thao müang พันแย้เมือง.

Probably both mün nā lang were local Phrä people.

Nā Ròt

Ròt (often lòt ล้อ) means “little, small”; hence nā ròt “little field”. Possibly a person with this appellation had to do with rice fields of small significance. See above in the chapter Name and Location of Fields: Nā Ròt, where the expression nā ròt means a type of field. Since the highest rank connected with nā Ròt that has been found so far, is only “50”, it may be that nā ròt was not a title or rank of a government official, but perhaps the appellation for a farmer who owned a number of minuscule (terraced, hilly?) fields.

242 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.
243 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām 1506. This monastery, its ruins now nearly disappeared, is identical with Wat Wisuttha Ārām Khōi Sum (see below).
244 1.5.1.1 Wat Sip-sòng Hòng 1516.
245 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529.
Nã Ròt นารอด
1500, Chiang Râi.\textsuperscript{246} He is the sixteenth in a list of 72 heads of slave families. They were *châo yâng* farming and forest gathering people who were donated, together with their taxes from wet rice fields, oleo-resin and wax, to Wat Mahâ Phôthi, just outside Chiang Râi’s former southern city wall.

Nã Ròt Udom Mongkon นารอด อุดมมงคล
1500, Lamphûn.\textsuperscript{247} He was the head of one of 12 families donated by the king of Chiang Mai and his mother to the newly-built library of Wat Phra Thêt Hariphunchai.

Hâ Sip Nã Ròt หำสิป นารอด
1496, Chiang Mai province.\textsuperscript{248} An official with the lowly rank of *hâ sip* “50”, he is the third in a group of three persons (after a mahâthera and Sân Khâo Phân) who were witnesses to the donation of a slave to a Buddha image.

Nã Rüan

Lâm Pâk Nã Rüan Nüa ลำปักนาเรียนเหนือ
1492, Phayao province.\textsuperscript{249} He is the fourth and last in a list of four lay witnesses to a multiple donation consisting of slaves for the service of a Buddha image, an annual delivery of sesame oil, etc. (details lost) made by the governor of Chiang Râi to a monastery about 12 km northwest of Phayao. Somewhat unusually, this list of lay witnesses is followed, and not preceded, by a list of three monk witnesses.

Pâk Rat Nã Rüan ปากรัต นาเรียน
1496, Chiang Mai province.\textsuperscript{250} He is the third in a group of four persons (two ordinary citizens and two officials, in that order) who escorted a new slave, khâ ชำ, of the Buddha image to the monastery. That slave himself was an official, Lâm Wan ลำวน.

\textsuperscript{246} 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahâ Phôthi 1500.
\textsuperscript{247} 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Thêt Hariphunchai 1509.
\textsuperscript{248} 1.2.1.1 Wat Kâo Lêt 1497.
\textsuperscript{249} 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārâm Khôi Sum 1492. See also note 260.
\textsuperscript{250} 1.2.1.1 Wat Kâo Lêt 1497.
Phan Nà Rüan Phò Nòi พันนาเรื่อน พนบัย
C. 1485, Müang Lò (35 km northeast of Phayao).251 “Formerly a family, (viz.) the family of Āi Hao Kham Ling, had borrowed 500 silver from the Buddha image (and had defaulted on repayment). Phò Nòi, the phan nà rüan, poured water and donated them as slaves to the (principal Buddha) image.”

Phuak Kham Nà Rüan พวกคำ นาเรื่อน
1488, Chiang Sän.252 He is the fifth in a list of nine witnesses to a donation of fields and slaves, made by the king and his mother to a monastery in Müang Chiang Sän.

Nà Säi

Jao Nà Säi เจรานซ้าย
1793, Nän province.253 After the abbot and his disciples, he is the first in a list of four lay persons who made a wooden Buddha image. The honouring prefix jao shows that he either was of princely blood, or a government official with at least the rank of Phan “1,000”, or else was a very respected local personality.

Lăm Nà

Lăm Nà Pik Mò Khwan ลำนามิก หมอชวัญ
1493, Phayao.254 He is the ninth in a list of nine or eleven witnesses to a donation made to a monastery.

Lăm nā was his government title / rank, Pik presumably his personal name, and mò khwan “soul doctor” his sideline. Theoretically, it could be possible that lām nā pik was his title, nā pik supposedly being a certain category of fields.

Mün Lăm Nà Hörathibodi หมินลำนามา โรองอิทธิ
1496, Chiang Mai.255 He is the second in a list of three officials who are sent by the king, Phayā Kāo, to come here, write (tông ต้อง “chisel”) the inscription and to set it up (to last) until the end of the Buddhist religion, in order to record the

251 1.5.1.1 Wat Pū Mai 1497. The date c.1485 (?) for this donation is a guess. M. Lò, also Wiang Lò, present T. Lò, A. Jän, Phayao province.
252 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tông Tăm 1488. Phuak, lit. “group”, meant a guild of persons doing certain kinds of work, like boatmen, etc. Their leader was usually known as jao phuak เจราวา but sometimes was simply called phuak.
253 1.7.2.2 Wat Nā Luang 1793.
254 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mün 1493.
255 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496.
king’s donation of fields and persons to a monastery in Müang Lò (35 km northeast of Phayao).

Mün Lăm Nă Sumethâ Hôrâthibodî หมื่นลำนา สุเมธะพระธิบดี
1496, Chiang Mai.256 He is the second in a list of 10 witnesses to the king’s donation of 28 families of Chão Yâng Nam Man people in three villages, with their fields and a forest, to a monastery in A. Já Hom, north of Lampâng.

Mün Lăm Nă Hôrâthibodî หมื่นลำนา พระธิบดี
1497, Chiang Mai.257 The king ordered him to organize a donation of fields and persons to a monastery in Müang Lò (35 km northeast of Phayao).

Pâk Nâ ปากنا
1491, Phayao.258 He and his son, together with two others, or two other families, were debt-slaves of a mahâthera. This monk gave them to the Buddha image for its service, in a monastery near Phayao, together with the Nâ Kluai fields of 30 measures seed-rice.

Pâk Nâ Mua ปากนา เมวา
1469, Wang Nüa, about 85 km north of Lampâng.259 The son of Pâk Nâ Mua is the last in a list of seven witnesses to the donation, made by the local governor, of a village and a newly built monastery to the king. The same group also came to set up the stone inscription.

Lâm Pâk Nâ Rüan Nüa ลำปากนาเรียนเหนือ
1492, Phayao province.260 He is the fourth and last in a list of four lay witnesses to a multiple donation consisting of slaves for the service of a Buddha image, an annual delivery of sesame oil, etc. (details lost) made by the governor of Chiang Râi to a monastery about 12 km northwest of Phayao. Somewhat unusually, this list of lay witnesses is followed, and not preceded, by a list of three monk witnesses.

256 1.6.1.1 Wat Pâ Bong 1496.
257 1.5.1.1 Wat Pâ Mai 1497.
258 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwâng 1491.
259 1.6.1.1 Wat Bân Lâng 1469.
260 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisutta Ärâm Khôi Sum 1492. See also note 249.
Names and Titles with “Khão”

Phan Khão / Mūn Khão / Sän Khão

It seems that the rank ròi khão “100 rice” has not yet been found attested. As for phan khão “1,000 rice” I know of only two mentions, and for mūn khão “10,000 rice”, there are at present only three known mentions, in an inscription where one sän khão is followed by three mūn khão (see below), but all four are preceded by mūn of other government departments.

The rank usually mentioned is sän khão, “100,000 rice”. It seems to have been rather low in the hierarchy of officialdom, in spite of the high figure “100,000”, because in lists of witnesses where persons obviously are arranged in order of seniority or importance, a sän khão usually is lower than a mūn, a phan, a phuak, and even a lamphan.

Yet, there is one instance on record which shows that a sän khão certainly had power or at least influence: In that case, two sän khão either re-appropriated a field from its former tenant and transferred it to a monastery, or they simply transferred to a monastery a field that previously had been withdrawn from its tenant. They then ordered the setting up of a stone inscription recording the donation charter for that monastery. See below: Sän Khão Thit and Säng Khão Mongkhon (1520).

This brings to mind the not infrequent “sän” titles of the nineteenth century whose holders all seem to have been in charge of rather practical things. For instance, in 1877 there was a Sän Kham who oversaw the entire irrigation system in the Dòi Saket area east of Chiang Mai.261

Therefore it may be that these khão titles / ranks were more of an honorary or perhaps different type than a “real” rank in the hierarchy of government officialdom; or perhaps they were a title of a past age that was difficult and even awkward to place among the then current government functionaries.

Phan Khão Hò Li Män พันชัว ทองสิ่งแสน

1495, Phayao.262 He is the seventh in a list of eight lay witnesses to a donation of persons and of a village with two areca trees, jointly made by the former and the present king of Chiang Mai, to a monastery just outside Phayao city to the northwest. He precedes a certain Nāi Kham Lā, last of the group, who was the lām khāk ลำเกษ, perhaps “liaison person with outsiders”. The second in that group of witnesses was Mūn Nā Lang Thep, mentioned above.

---

262 1.5.1.1 Wat Āram Pā Ya 1495. For the two kings, see above under Mūn Nā Lang Thep.
Phan Khāo Hò Li Mâñ /พันขาหัวไล่มาแวน/, judging by his name, was not a Thai. Perhaps he was a Chinese Hò, possibly a Muslim trader from southern China, presumably Yûnنان which is called Müang Mâñ in Lân Nâ, though spelt differently: มัน; or perhaps he was from northern Laos - Vietnam, the location of the Mâñ (Mène) people, a Thai group.

Phan Khāo Phut พันขาหวู่ พุธ
1502, Chiang Mai. He was the last in a group of three persons who “accepted an order from the queen mother” (sc. they were ordered to handle it) and forwarded it on its administrative way to a certain Phan Nâ Lang Yâna Wisâ Ròt (q.v.) at Wiang Pâ Pao (c. 90 km north of Chiang Mai). That official, in turn, was to arrange the queen mother’s personal donation with an accompanying inscription: 10 families to serve the Buddha image in a monastery near Wiang Pâ Pao and to supply annually 11 kg lamp oil as a gift of worship for the image.

Phan Khāo Phut was in illustrious company: the first in his group was the king’s brother, and the second was Jao Phuak Yâna Khôngkhâ Tông Tâm, i.e. the head of the Writers and Painters Guild, tông tám ต้องตาม.

Mûn Khâo see below: Sân Khâo Jâm et al., 1496.

2 Sân Khâo แสนเข้าว่า ทั้ง 2
1469, Wang Nüa, about 85 km north of Lampâng. An unnamed person (or persons) in the service of two unnamed Sân Khâo was the sixth in a list of seven witnesses to the donation, made by the local governor, of a village and a newly built monastery to the king. The same group also set up the stone inscription.

Sân Khâo Sai แสนเข้าว่า ใส
Sân Khâo In แสนเข้าว่า อิน
C. 1480, Chiang Mai. They were the first and the second in a list of five lay witnesses to a donation of agricultural items made by a person whose name is lost, to the bôt (uposatha precinct plus its building) that was located about 5 km southeast of Chiang Mai. In that list, they preceded, in that order, a lamphan ลำพัน , a pâk ปาก in the service of a Mûn Nangsü ผุนนางสุ оф the Record Office, and an untitled person from the service of a Mûn Dâm Phrâ ผุนดามพร้า.

---

263 1.4.1.1 Wat Uthumphara Árām 1502.
264 1.6.1.1 Wat Bân Lâng 1469.
265 1.2.1.1 Kû Wat Sao Hin c. 1480.
San Khao Soi แสนข้าว สอบ

1489, Muang Kuak, Lamphun province. He was the fifth in a list of seven witnesses to several donations made to a monastery, and to the setting up of a stone inscription which recorded the donations. He ranked after a phan nā lang (4th) and before a rōi nā lang (6th) and a lamphan (7th).

San Khao Pho Lan แสนข้าว พ่อลาน

1489, Muang Oi, east of Phan, Chiang Rai province. He was one of nine witnesses to the donation of rice fields and the assignment of six families to the service of a monastery and its mahāthera. These donations had been ordered by the mother of the king (Mahā Thewī).

San Khao Ya Rangsii แสนข้าว ยารางสิ

1493, Phayao. He is the eighth in a group of nine or eleven witnesses to a donation of slaves made to a monastery.

San Khao Phan แสนข้าว พัน

1496, Chiang Mai province. He was the second in a group of three persons (after a mahāthera and before Há Sip Nā Rōt) who where witnesses to the donation of a slave to a Buddha image.

San Khao Jam แสนข้าว เชม
Mün Khao Söi หม่นข้าว สอย
Mün Khao Hem หม่นข้าว เหม
Mün Khao Suan Phayá หม่นข้าว แสนพย่า

1496, Jom Thong, south of Chiang Mai. Preceded by three ordinary mün, they are the fourth to seventh in a group of seven witnesses (1) to the donation, made by the king, of a Buddha image to a monastery, and of rice fields as a gift of worship to the image and the monks in the monastery; and (2) to the donation, made by several other persons, of 12 slave families who were to serve the Buddha image and the monks.

---

266 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489.
267 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Wan 1489. Former Muang Oi, about 40 km north of Phayao and about 50 km south of Chiang Rāi, must have covered much of the eastern part of present A. Phān, Chiang Rāi province.
268 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493.
269 1.2.1.1 Wat Kāo Lāt 1497.
270 Suan Phayā, spelt /suanphai/, P. + S. javana-prajñā, “quick-witted”.
271 1.2.1.1 Wat Si Bun Rüang 1496.
Sän Khao Sila แสนขาว สิลา
Sän Khao Rat แสนขาว รัตน์
1497, Müang Lò (35 km northeast of Phayao).²⁷² Both are witness to a
donation of fields and slaves, made by the king to a monastery in Müang Lò.

Sän Khao Rat แสนขาว รัตน์
Sän Khao Mongkhon แสนขาว มงคล
1504, Lamphun province.²⁷³ They are the fifth and the sixth in a list of 11
lay witnesses to the transfer of a person whose occupation was changed from
trimming timber for construction, to the service of the principal Buddha image in a
monastery that was situated about 10 km south of Lamphun.

In that list, the two “sän” are preceded by a phan “1,000”, a mün “10,000” (in
that order!), by someone without numerical rank from the Recorder’s Office (nangsiu)
and even by a lamphan. On the other hand, they are followed in that list by another
person without title from the Recorder’s Office, by another lamphan, and by
another phan.

Perhaps the sequence of the persons is not strictly to protocol, because the
list of lay witnesses precedes the list of eight monk witnesses, all of them of high
rank, and that list is followed by the name of another lay witness, no less than a
mün! It looks as if not the final list but elements of its preliminary draft were
accidentally inscribed on the stone.

Sän Khao Bun แสนขาว บูน
1513, near Phaen south of Chiang Rai.²⁷⁴ He is the last in a list of 11
witnesses to a land donation made by the governor of Müang Òi to a Buddha
image. In that list, four monks precede seven laymen. In the laymen group, the Sän
Khao is preceded by a phan nā lang พันนายลัง (the first of that group), then come a
phan nangsiu พันนายสิ้น, a thao müang ท้ามอง, a pāk nangsiu ปากหนังสือ, an ordinary
phan พัน, and another thao müang ท้ามอง.

Sän Khao Thit Noi แสนขาว ทิตน้อย
Sän Khao Mongkhon แสนขาว มงคล
Sän Khao Thong แสนขาว ทอง
1520, Chiang Mai.²⁷⁵ They are the second to fourth in a list of five persons
who sponsored the consecration of an uposatha precinct (khandhasimā). They fol-

²⁷² 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.
²⁷³ 1.3.1.1 Wat Bun Bān 1504.
²⁷⁴ 1.4.1.1 Wat Nong Kwāng 1513.
²⁷⁵ 1.2.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1520.
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low a Phan Nā Lang and precede an untitled but obviously otherwise important person, Nāi Suwan.

Besides, Sän Khāo Thit and Săng Khāo Mongkhon donated a rice field with 6,000 cowries tax, that had been withdrawn from its previous tenant, to the uposatha hall.

Sän Khāo Thòng also is the second in a group of witnesses to donations made to the uposatha hall. He follows a Phan Nā Lang and precedes ordinary villagers.

The Sän (all three?) also arranged for this stone inscription to be erected in the uposatha hall.

**Sän Khāo Jöm แสนเข้า จอม**

C. 1530, Phayao. He is the first in a list of four officials who were asked to testify before an investigating official with the title *phan nangsi tāng müang* “upcountry registrar with the rank of one thousand”. The inspector had been sent by the king of Chiang Mai. His mission was about a case in which slaves of the Buddha image of Wat Khwāng near Phayao had left the image and had themselves set up as freemen, even having their own rice fields. The testimony of Sän Khāo Jöm and the three others as persons who “knew”, i.e. as witnesses familiar with the local situation, made the investigating official return the slaves to the Buddha image.

**Names and Titles with “Chāng, Sāng”**

**Phan Chāng Ārī พันกลาง อารี**

1490, Phayao. A public collection for the construction of a wihān esulted in 3,000 silver. The state granary official Phan Chāng Ārī was the first in a group of four donors whose donations were listed apart from the public collection. These donors were mentioned separately and by name; he himself had donated 1,000 silver.

---

276 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng c.1530.
277 1.5.1.1 Wat Klāng 1490.
7. Some Rice Field Statistics

a. Fields and their Seed-Rice

A number of Lān Nā stone inscriptions mention the amount of seed rice needed for rice fields, which was the Yuan way of indicating the size of fields. Such mention usually is part of a report on a donation to a monastery, or part of an inventory that lists the rice field holdings of a monastery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Region / Province</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Nā 21,685 khāo</td>
<td>Phayao228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Nā 100 khāo</td>
<td>Phayao229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>Nā 975 khāo</td>
<td>Phayao230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1412</td>
<td>(Nā) 500 khāo</td>
<td>Phayao231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>Nā 30 khāo</td>
<td>Chiang Rāi232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Nā 200 khāo</td>
<td>Lampāng233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1476</td>
<td>Nā 100 khāo</td>
<td>Lampāng234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>Nā 20 khāo</td>
<td>Chiang Rāi235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1480</td>
<td>Nā 250 khāo</td>
<td>Chiang Mai236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.1480</td>
<td>Nā 100 khāo</td>
<td>Phayao237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1489</td>
<td>Nā 200 khāo</td>
<td>Phayao238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1491</td>
<td>Nā 30 khāo</td>
<td>Phayao239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>Nā 5 khāo</td>
<td>Phayao240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>Nā [825] khāo</td>
<td>Phayao241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

228 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.
229 1.5.1.1 Phayao 1411.
230 1.5.1.1 Wiang Kao Phayao 1411.
231 1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yót 1412.
232 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513.
233 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1476.
234 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1476.
235 1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479.
236 1.2.1.1 Kā Wat Sao Hin c. 1480
237 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.
238 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.
239 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491.
240 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493.
241 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495. “Nā 825 khāo” was the sum total of the holdings of the monastery. Hereafter the inscription listed the individual fields but these details are now incomplete because part of the text has become illegible.
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1498 Phayao

Nā 100 khāo
Nā 175 (khāo)
Nā 100 khāo
(Nā) 40 khāo
Nā 25 khāo
Nā 200 khāo
Nā 100 (khāo)
Nā 50 (khāo)
Nā 12 (khāo)
Nā 12 khāo
Nā 100 khāo
Nā 12 khāo
Nā 6 rai 12 khāo
Nā 12 khāo
Nā 12 khāo
Nā 30 (khāo)
Nā 12 khāo
Nā 12 khāo
Nā 50 (khāo)
Nā 50 (khāo)
Nā 10 (khāo)
Nā 50 (khāo)
Nā 500 (khāo)
Nā 100 (khāo)
(Nā) 100 (khāo)
Nā 1[0] (khāo)
Nā 100 (khāo)
Nā 100 khāo
Nā 30 khāo
Nā 20 khāo
Nā 50 khāo
Nā 100 (khāo)
Nā 50 (khāo)
Nā 100 (khāo)

242 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498. This inscription lists many individual fields.
243 A very rare statement: rai “plot” and khāo “seed-rice”.
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1498  Nā 100 khāo  Phayao\textsuperscript{244}

In the inscription corrected to: 200 khāo

1500  Nā 10 khāo  Nān\textsuperscript{245}

1500  Nā 50 khāo  Nān\textsuperscript{246}

1504  Khāo 10,000  Lampāng\textsuperscript{247}

Probable intention: Nā 10,000 khāo.

1504  Nā 200 khāo  Lampāng\textsuperscript{248}

1529  Nā 1,000 khāo  Phrä\textsuperscript{249}

1554  Nā 50 khāo  Chiang Mai\textsuperscript{250}

Nā 50 khāo
Nā 30 khāo
Nā 50 khāo

b. Rice Field Taxes

This table contains examples of tax amounts in cowries or biā, with an attempt to separate the amount of tax for an individual field or a small group of fields (for instance given as a donation), and the total amount of a greater donation or the entire holdings of one monastery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Tax คํา</th>
<th>Indiv. Field</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 1290</td>
<td>620,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Mai\textsuperscript{251}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1290</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Mai\textsuperscript{252}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>4,686,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Phayao\textsuperscript{253}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Rāi\textsuperscript{254}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Rāi\textsuperscript{255}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Rāi\textsuperscript{256}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{244} 1.5.1.1 Wat Phāyā Ruang 1498.
\textsuperscript{245} 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500.
\textsuperscript{246} 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500.
\textsuperscript{247} 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504.
\textsuperscript{248} 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504.
\textsuperscript{249} 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārūm 1529.
\textsuperscript{250} 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554. This inscription lists four individual (groups of) fields.
\textsuperscript{251} CMA. N: 53; HPms: 2.8 R; W: 39; U: 31.f
\textsuperscript{252} CMA. N: 53; HPms: 2.8R; W: 39; U: 31.
\textsuperscript{253} 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.
\textsuperscript{254} 1.4.1.1 Wat Nông Kwāng 1513.
\textsuperscript{255} 1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479.
\textsuperscript{256} 1.4.1.1 Dòi Tham Phra 1484. Previous holdings.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Tax Field</th>
<th>Indiv. Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>82,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang San</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1492</td>
<td>3,051,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Mai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>[370,000]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>[22,000]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

257 1.4.1.1 Đôi Tham Phra 1484. A new donation.
258 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
259 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
260 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
261 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
262 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
263 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
264 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
265 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
266 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
267 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
268 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
269 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
270 1.4.1.1 Wat Phu Khing 1488.
271 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tong Tam 1488. The original order by the king called for 600,000 cowries field tax. However, for unstated reasons, court and local administrators changed this to 593,000 cowries field tax plus 7,000 cowries tax from a village.
272 1.5.1.1 Wat Tapthahrain 1492.
273 1.5.1.1 Wat Nang Mun 1493.
274 1.5.1.1 Wat Lai 1495.
275 1.5.1.1 Wat Lai 1495.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Tax Field</th>
<th>Indiv.</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao²⁷⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao²⁷⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1445</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao²⁷⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao²⁷⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao²⁸⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Mai²⁸¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao²⁸²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao²⁸³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1496</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lampang²⁸⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1497</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phayao²⁸⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>1,200,00</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Rai²⁸⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiang Mai²⁸⁷</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamphun²⁸⁸</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamphun²⁸⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamphun²⁹⁰</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamphun²⁹¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lamphun²⁹²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁷⁶ 1.5.1.1 Wat Lì 1495. This monastery had five (groups of) fields each taxed with 45,000 cowries.
²⁷⁷ 1.5.1.1 Wat Lì 1495.
²⁷⁸ 1.5.1.1 Wat Lì 1495.
²⁷⁹ 1.5.1.1 Wat Lì 1495.
²⁸⁰ 1.5.1.1 Wat Lì 1495.
²⁸¹ 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Bun Rüang 1496.
²⁸² 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496.
²⁸³ 1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496.
²⁸⁴ 1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496. This is for 28 families in three villages.
²⁸⁵ 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.
²⁸⁶ 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Pōthi 1500.
²⁸⁷ 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Suphan 1509.
²⁸⁸ 1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509.
²⁸⁹ 1.3.1.1 Dōi Jam Tham 1502.
²⁹⁰ 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.
²⁹¹ 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.
²⁹² 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Indiv. Field</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lamphûn²⁹³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lamphûn²⁹⁴</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lamphûn²⁹⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Lamphûn²⁹⁵</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Mai²⁹⁷</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1523</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Mai²⁹⁸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>81,800</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Khòng²⁹⁹</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Chiang Mai³⁰⁰</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1484</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Bân Tham</td>
<td>Chiang Râi³⁰¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>Bân Kong</td>
<td>Chiang Râi³⁰²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bân Klòng</td>
<td>Chiang Râi³⁰³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1488</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>Bân unnamed</td>
<td>Phayao³⁰⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>Bân Phlao with 2 areca trees</td>
<td>Phayao³⁰⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>Bân Đôn</td>
<td>Phayao³⁰⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567</td>
<td>500 silver</td>
<td>Bân Pâ</td>
<td>Chiang Mai³⁰⁷</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁹³ 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.
²⁹⁴ 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.
²⁹⁵ 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.
²⁹⁶ 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.
²⁹⁷ 1.2.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1520.
²⁹⁸ 1.2.1.1 Wat Yâng Num 1523.
²⁹⁹ 1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sâ 1554.
³⁰⁰ 1.2.1.1 Jula Khîrî 1554. The monastery had four individual (groups of) fields each taxed with 50,000 cowries. Theses taxes, however, may have included also village and other taxes; cf. below Wat Jula Khîrî, footnote 320.
³⁰¹ 1.4.1.1 Đôi Tham Phra 1484.
³⁰² 1.4.1.1 Wat Phû Khi ng 1488.
³⁰³ 1.4.1.1 Wat Phû Khi ng 1488.
³⁰⁴ 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tông Tâm 1488.
³⁰⁵ 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pà Ya 1495.
³⁰⁶ 1.5.1.1 Wat Lî 1495.
³⁰⁷ 1.2.3.1 Wat Wisuttharâm 1567.
c. Field Fertility

The Ratio between Seed Rice and Tax

The following Table indicates the ratio between the amount of seed-rice needed for a field (or for a group of fields) and the tax levied on that field. A high ratio, i.e. a highly taxed field, obviously means a good, fertile field with a high return in yield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year A.D.</th>
<th>Seed Rice</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Ratio Seed Rice : Tax</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1411</td>
<td>21,685</td>
<td>4,686,000</td>
<td>1 : 216</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;308&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1459</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>469,000</td>
<td>1 : 200</td>
<td>Bān Huai Sāi&lt;sup&gt;309&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1466</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1 : 300</td>
<td>Chiang Rāi&lt;sup&gt;310&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1479</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1 : 250</td>
<td>Chiang Rāi&lt;sup&gt;311&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1493</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1 : 500</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;312&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>[825]</td>
<td>[370,000]</td>
<td>1 : 448</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;313&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1 : 450</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;314&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>1 : 450</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;315&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>96,800</td>
<td>1 : 553</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;316&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>1 : 550</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;317&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>1 : 687</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;318&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1495</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>1 : 220</td>
<td>Phayao&lt;sup&gt;319&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1 : 1,000</td>
<td>Chiang Mai&lt;sup&gt;320&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>308</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.
<sup>309</sup> 2.2.1.1 Sunanthārām 1459. Bān Huai Sāi is in Laos opposite Chiang Kham. But the inscription may originally have belonged to a monastery in eastern Lān Nā.
<sup>310</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Nong Kwāng 1513.
<sup>311</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479.
<sup>312</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493.
<sup>313</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495. This is the total amount of the fields owned by the monastery. The following items of Wat Lī are the data of certain individual fields.
<sup>314</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.
<sup>315</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.
<sup>316</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.
<sup>317</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.
<sup>318</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.
<sup>319</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.
<sup>320</sup> 1.2.1.1 Jula Khiri 1554. This monastery had four individual (groups of) fields. The very high tax for these four fields cannot be explained by their good fertility alone. It must have either included four villages and other items (the text is not clear) or else it reflects a steep tax increase or an inflation from c. 1495 on.
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### Year Seed Rice Tax Ratio Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Seed Rice</th>
<th>Tax</th>
<th>Ratio Seed Rice : Tax</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1:1,000</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1:1,666</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>1:1,000</td>
<td>ditto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.6.1.1 Wat Bān Lāng 1469
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- Cham 1952 Jārūk Jangwat Lampāng C.S. 838
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1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496
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- Cham 1965 Lak thī 70
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- Cham 1959 Jārūk Wat Chāng Kham C.S.862.
- Cham 1965 Lak thī 72.
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārūk Lān Nā (1): Nò Nò. 2

1.7.2.2 Wat Nā Luang 1793
- Unpublished

Formerly this inscription was also known both as ss12 and ss13.
1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphäräm 1529
- Penth 1983 Järük Wat Bupphäräm 1529
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Järük Län Nā (1): Phò Rô. 9

2.2.1.1 Sunanthsäräm 1459
- Kannikā 1991 Järük Bän Huai Säi
- Winai / Kannikā 1991 Lak thí 318

2.3.1.1 Wat Pā Luang 1808
- Thöm / Prasān 1981 Järük Phra Jao In Päng
- Thöm et al. 1986 Järük Phra Jao In Päng
- Thawat 1987/88 Järük Wat Pā Yai 2

c. Chronicles and other texts

CMA
The Chronicle of Chiang Mai.

CMA.HPms
A palmleaf ms of CMA in the collection of Hans Penth.

CMA.N
See: Notton 1932 Annales (3).

CMA.NL

CMA.T
See: Thon 1971 Chronicle of Chiang Mai.

CMA.U

CMA.W (CMA.W’1998)

CMA.NL
Khana Panja 5 Jamphuak คณานิสิปุ๋ย 5 จัตภาพ “The 5 Measurements”

A section of “Chanuan Hörri”, a palmleaf ms of Wat Si Sòng Müang, T. Chai Sathän, A.Sāraphī, Chiang Mai, copied in 1897. It contains principally the tables of 5 kinds of measurements, beginning with a table measures of capacity for rice (thōnathikun, donadiguṃa โพนทิศิกุล).

MRS
Mang Rāi Sät. A corpus of laws the first part of which may go back to King Mang Rāi (r. 1259 or 1261 - 1311 or 1317).

MRS.CK
A collection of laws with examples from daily life among the Thais and with examples from Indian mythology, to serve as comments on or as guidelines for decisions. It refers to the laws of Mang Rāi and Ai Fā and also to Burmese law. Manuscript from Wat Chiang Kham, Nān.

MRS.CKcy.A+W
A copy of MRS.CK transposed into Modern Thai and translated into English by Arunrat Wichiankhiao and Gehan Wijeyewardene.

MS
The chronicle Mūlasāsanā.

MS.P
Text edition of MS in modern Thai by Prasôt na Nakhôn (Prasert na Nagara), based on MS.S+P and collated with other MS manuscripts.
In: Prasôt 1975 Mūlasāsanā.

MS.S+P
See: Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā.

PAY
The chronicle of Phayao.

PAY.PP
Historical events concerning Phayao included in a ms under the misleading title “Chronicle of Müang Ngòn Yāng Chiang Sän” ตำนานเมืองเยี่ยงชียงแสน.
In: ประจุญพงศาารา, 61, 2497 (1954), 1-55.
PAY.WSB
A version of PAY in a ms kept at Wat Si Bun Rueang, Phayao, copied in 1935.
"หนังสือพื้นเมืองพระยา" วัดศรีบุญเรือง, ค. ตุน, อะเมือง พระยา.
See: SRI microfilm 80.047.05.022-022. Unpublished.

d. Articles and Books

Anonymous 1985 Lak thê 66
(ไม่ปรากฏชื่อผู้แต่ง) "หลักที่ 66 ศิลราชีวิทยาพระยา จังหวัดเชียงราย จ.ส. 846 พ.ศ. 2027" ประชุม
ศิลราชี, 3. 2508. 156-159
• 1.4.1.1 Dôi Tham Phra 1484

Arunrat / Wijeyewardene 1986 Laws of Mang Râi
Aroonrut Wichienkeeo / Gehan Wijeyewardene: The Laws of King Mangrai

Bechert 1992 Writing down the Tripiêaka

Bock 1884 / 1985 Temples
Carl Bock: Temples and Elephants. London, 1884 (Reprint: Bangkok, White

Bock 1885 Im Reiche
Carl Bock: Im Reiche des weißen Elephanten. Leipzig, 1885.

Cham 1938 Jârük Wat Präsâit
นู ทองคำวาระ "คำานิชจรีก วัฒปราสาท จังหวัดเชียงราย จ.ส. 858" ศิลปกร. 2.5. 2481 (1938).
35-42.
• 1.4.1.1 Wat Präsâit 1496

Cham 1952 Jârük Jangwat Lampâng C.S. 838
นู ทองคำวาระ "คำานิชจรีก จังหวัดลำปาง จ.ส. 838" ศิลปกร. 6.3. 2495 / 1952, 89-93.
• 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampâng Luang 1476

Cham 1957 Jârük Wat Nông Nam
นู ทองคำวาระ "คำานิชจรีกวัฒหนดหนานม ฯ จ.ส. 851" ศิลปกร. 1.2. 2500 / 1957, 84-92.
• 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kao 1489
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Cham 1958 Järük Wat Phra That C.S. 862
นี้ ทองคำวาระ "คำอานิสงส์เจ้าวิสาห์พุทธเจ้า มูลเหตุของเนื่องเหตุ จังหวัดลำพูน จ.ส. 862" ศิลปการ. 1.6, 2501 (1958), 60-68.
   1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509

Cham 1959 Järük Wat Chiang Kham C.S. 862
นี้ ทองคำวาระ "แหล่งศิลาธารี ... จ.ส. 862 ... รัชสิทธิ์คำ" ศิลปการ. 3.4, 2502 / 1959, 65-68.
   1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500

Cham 1960 Järük Wat Suwannārām
นี้ ทองคำวาระ "คำอานิสงส์เจ้าวิสาห์พุทธเจ้า วัดสุวรรณาราม" ศิลปการ. 4.2, 2503 / 1960,63-65.
   1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

Cham 1961 Järük WPT Lampāng Luang C.S. 858
นี้ ทองคำวาระ "คำอานิสงส์เจ้าวิสาห์พุทธเจ้า ... วัดพระธาตุลับบางหลวง ... จ.ส. 858" ศิลปการ. 4.5, 2504 / 1961, 73-79.
   1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504

Cham 1963 Järük Chiang Rāi C.S. 850
นี้ ทองคำวาระ "คำอานิสงส์เจ้าวิสาห์พุทธเจ้า จวัดช้างระไก" ศิลปการ. 7.1, 2506 (1963), 59-64.
   1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488

Cham 1965 Lak thē 62
นี้ ทองคำวาระ "หลักที่ 62 ... ศิลาธารีวัดพระยืน จังหวัด ลำพูน" ประชุมศิลาธารี. 3, 2508 (1965). 136-144.
   1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yūn 1370

Cham 1965 Lak thē 65
   1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1476

Cham 1965 Lak thē 68
   1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489

Cham 1965 Lak thē 69
   1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496
Cham 1965 Lak thê 70
น่า ทองคำวรรณ  "หลักที่ 70 ศิลาจาไวที่วิหารวัดพระธาตุลำปางหลวง ... จ.ศ. 858" ประชุมศิลางาน 3, 2508 (1965), 179-184.
- 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampang Luang 1504

Cham 1965 Lak thê 71
น่า ทองคำวรรณ  "หลักที่ 71 ... ศิลาจาไววัดพระธาตุ มุสะวันออกเฉยเหนือ จังหวัดลำปาง จ.ศ. 862" ประชุมศิลางาน 3, 2508 (1965), 185-194.
- 1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509

Cham 1965 Lak thê 72
น่า ทองคำวรรณ  "หลักที่ 72 ... วัดข้างค่า" ประชุมศิลางาน 3, 2508 (1965), 195-197.
- 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kôt 1500

Cham 1965 Lak thê 73 Suwannârâm
น่า ทองคำวรรณ  "หลักที่ 73 ... สร้างรามานาน" ประชุมศิลางาน 3, 2508 (1965), 198-201.
- 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Arâm 1512.

Cham 1970 Lak thê 87
น่า ทองคำวรรณ  "หลักที่ 87 ศิลาจาไวจังหวัดเชียงราย" ประชุมศิลางาน 4, 2513 (1970), 16-21.
- 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tông Tâm 1488

Cham 1983 Jåruk Wat Phra Yün
- 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yün 1370

Coedès 1925 Tamnân aksôn Thai
ยอช เชนล "ต้นานักกษวิทยา" กรุงเทพฯ 2468 (๒472/1929)

Coedès 1956 Le 2500e anniversaire

Credner 1935 / 1966 Siam

Falk 1998 The Discovery of Lumbinî
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Geiger 1953 Cūlav. Translation
Wilhelm Geiger: Cūlavamsa, being the more Recent Part of the Mahāvamsa.

Griswold / Prasert 1968 A Declaration of Independence
- Inscr. # 49 Wat Sōrasak, Sukhōthai, c.1418.

Griswold / Prasert 1969 Asokārāma Inscription
- Inscr. # 93 Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, 1399+.324

Griswold / Prasert 1973 Epigraphy Mahā-dharmarājā I (1)

Griswold / Prasert 1974 Inscription Wat Phra Yūn
- 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yūn 1370

Griswold / Prasert 1975 Inscr. Wat Khemā
A. B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The Inscription of Vat Khemā. EHS No. 15. JSS, 63.1, 1975, 127-142.
- Inscr. # 14 Wat Khemā, Sukhōthai, 1536

Griswold / Prasert 1977 Judgments

Guignard 1912/1971 Dictionnaire

Halliday 1930 Inscriptions môn

324 The inscription was written after 1399, perhaps between 1413-20.
Hardy 1850 Eastern Monachism

v. Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons

v. Hinüber 1996 Chips

Kannikā 1991 Jārük Bān Huai Sāi
กันนิกุ วิจัยเบนะ "จารกับบันหัวพระยา" ภาษา-จารก. 3, 2534 (1991), 9-23.

• 2.2.1.1 Sunan notify Rām 1459

Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā

Kasem 1964 Tamnān Wat Phra Thāt Lampāng Luang
กุสเซ่ ตารางเปริ่ม "ดาแน่นพระธาตุลำปางหลวง" ใน อารย์ เลิศรัตนกร "ดาแน่นพระธาตุลำปางหลวง. ดาแน่นพระธาตุงากบวพ. ดาแน่นเจาเจดัด" วิทย. ลำปางหลวง 2511, p. 5-31.

Kraisê 1984 Felicitation Volume
(ไม่ปรากฏชื่อบรรณาธิการ) "ลายความ เพื่อเฉลิมลองอายุครบ 6 รอบ นำโกศรี นิมมานเหมินท์" เขียนใหม่ 2527 (A.D.1984)

Kraisê 1984 Kep phak sai sā
โกศรี นิมมานเหมินท์ "เก็บผัดใส่ช้า เก็บข้าใส่เสียง" In: Krais(tm) 1984 Felicitation Volume: 127-

Lamotte 1958 Histoire
E. Lamotte: Histoire du Bouddhisme Indien. Louvain 1958,

Lingat 1931 Esclavage privée
On Rice and Rice Fields in Old Lanna

Manñ 1982 Dic.
มณี โพธิ์วงศ์ “พจนานุกรม ลานนาไทย” เขียนใหม่ 2525 (A.D. 1982)

McGilvary 1912 A Half Century

v. Mehren / Sawers 1992 Revitalizing

Met 1965 Dic.
เมธ รัตนประทุม “พจนานุกรมไทยyang-ไท-อังกฤษ” (กรุงเทพฯ) 2508 (A.D. 1965)

Nai 1992 Dhammasāt Texts

Nattier 1991 Once Upon a Future Time

Notton 1932 Chronique de Xieng Mai

Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2)

Penth 1975 Jārūk Wat Phan Tao
อัณฑ์ เพนท์ “สิทธารัศึกจากวัดพันหลวง เชียงใหม่” ศิลปะกรรม, 19.2, 2518 (1975), 103-104.
- 1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523.

Penth 1975 Steininschrift vom Kloster Phan Tao
- 1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523.
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Penth 1976 Järük phra Phuttha rup
อันส์ เผ็น "คำารีักซึ่วนพระพุจรูปในเครื่องขันติ" กรุงเทพฯ สานักนายกรัฐมนตรี 2519 (1976).

Penth 1976 Järük Wat Bän Yâng Mâk Muang 1479
  • 1.4.1.1 Wat Bän Yâng Mâk Muang 1479

Penth 1976 Järük Wat Sû Köt
  • 1.1.1.1 Äräm Sî Köt 1490

Penth 1980 The Toponym Lân Nâ
Hans Penth: The Orthography of the Toponym Lân Nâ. JSS, 68.1, 1980, 128.

Penth 1983 Järük Wat Bupphârâm 1529
อันส์ เผ็น "การสำรวจและวิจัยจาปี 1.8.1.1 วัดบุปปะราม พ.ศ. 2072 / คศ. 1529" ติลปำกร. 27.3. 2526 (1983). 73-77.
  • 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphârâm 1529

Penth 1983 Järük Wat Mahâ Wan 1489
  • 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahâ Wan 1489

Penth 1985 Järük Jula Khiri 1554
  • 1.2.1.1 Jula Khiri 1554

Penth 1985 Järük Wat Pâ Bong 1496
  • 1.6.1.1 Wat Pâ Bong 1496

Penth 1988 Järük Wat Chiang Sâ 1553
อันส์ เผ็น "การสำรวจและวิจัยจาปี 1.4.1.1 วัดเชียงตา พ.ศ. 2096 / คศ. 1553" ติลปำกร. 32.2. 2531. 43-48.
  • 1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sâ 1554
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Penth 1994 Jinakālamāli Index

Penth 1994 Jārūk Wat Kān Thom 2042
● 1.2.1.1 Wat Kān Thom 1499

Penth 1994 Jārūk Wat Hua Nong
ธัณฑ์ เณริ “จาวกิ 1.2.1.1 วัดวัดของ” ใน สรสารี ยั่งยงสุด “เรียกธุรกษ์” เขียนไทย 2537 (1994) หน้า 108.
● 1.2.1.1 Wat Hua Nong

Penth 1995 Lò Phò. 6
● 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496

Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 27
● 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495

Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 48
● 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng c. 1530

Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 59
● 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498

Penth et al. 1997 Corpus 1
Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3

Penth et al. 2000 Corpus 4

Präphithayā 1964 Dic.

Prasān 1969 Jārük Wat Bān Lāng
(briefly mentioned in the text)

Prasān 1973 Jārük Bān Mā Nā Rūa
(briefly mentioned in the text)

Prasān 1995 Phò Yò. 6
(briefly mentioned in the text)

Prasān et al. 1995 Lò Phò. 24
(briefly mentioned in the text)

Prasān / Prasōt 1965 Jārük Wat Sī Umōng Kham
(briefly mentioned in the text)
Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārūk Wat Sī Umōng Kham
ประกาศ บุญพระองค์ / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจากริ” ได้มาจากวัดศรีอุโมงค์ ... คีลภัฏกร, 9.1.
2508 / 1965, 46-52.
  ● 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497

Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Silā Jārūk Wat Sī Umōng Kham
ประกาศ บุญพระองค์ / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจากริ” ได้มาจากวัดศรีอุโมงค์ ... คีลภัฏกร, 9.2.
  ● 1.5.1.1 Wat Dön Khrām 1488

Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārūk Wat Sī Khōm Kham
ประกาศ บุญพระองค์ / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจากริ” ได้มาจากวัดศรีโคโมห์ ... คีลภัฏกร, 9.4.
2508 / 1965, 58-63.
  ● 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya 1495

Prasān / Prasöt 1969 Kham ān silā jārūk
ประกาศ บุญพระองค์ / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 99 ศิลาจากรัฐกิจทางวัง” ประชุมศิลาจากริ, 4. 2512
(1969), 77-79.
(only lines 1-8)
  ● 1.5.1.1 Bān Nōng Tao 1474

Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 99
ประกาศ บุญพระองค์ / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 99 ศิลาจากรัฐกิจทางวัง” ประชุมศิลาจากริ, 4. 2513
  ● 1.4.1.1 Wat Nōng Kwāng 1513

Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 100
ประกาศ บุญพระองค์ / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 100 ศิลาจากรัฐกิจทางวัง” ประชุมศิลาจากริ, 4. 2513
(1970), 86-89.
  ● 1.5.1.1 Wat Dön Khrām 1488

Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 101
ประกาศ บุญพระองค์ / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 101 ศิลาจากรัฐกิจทางวัง” ประชุมศิลาจากริ, 4. 2513
  ● 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497

Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 103
ประกาศ บุญพระองค์ / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 103 ศิลาจากรัฐกิจทางวัง” ประชุมศิลาจากริ, 4. 2513
(1970), 105-110.
  ● 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya
Prasän / Prasöt 1970 Järük Wat Tapōthārām
ประสาร บุญประดิษฐ์ / ประกาศ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลปะรัก ฯ ได้มาจากวัตถุที่ปรากฏ…” ศิลปะกร. 13.6, 2513 (1970), 95-100.
- 1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492

Prasän / Prasöt 1970 Järük sāliā klāng Jangwat Lampān
- 1.3.1.1 Dōi Jam Tham 1502

Prasän / Prasöt 1971 Järük Wat Phā Khāo Pān
ประสาร บุญประดิษฐ์ / ประกาศ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลปะรัก ฯ วัดพระกษัปณ” ศิลปะกร. 15.2, 2514 (1971), 89-94.
- 1.4.1.1 Wat Phā Khāo Pān 1617

Prasän / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò 2
- 1.5.1.1 Wat Dōn Khrām 1488

Prasän / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò 7
- 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya 1495

Prasän / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò 8
- 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497

Prasän / Thöm 1977 Phò Yò./3
- 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491

Prasän / Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 3
- 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491
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Prasöt 1971 Mang Rāi Sāit
ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “มังรายธาตุ” กรุงเทพฯ 2514.

Prasöt 1975 Mūlasāsanā
ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “สานมูลศาสานา” กรุงเทพฯ 2518.

Purnell 1963 Dic.

Rispaud 1937 Les noms

Sarasin 1933 (1959) Prehistorical Researches

Schmitt 1895 No. 3 Inscription Xieng Sën
  ● 1.4.1.1 Wat Präsät 1496

Schmitt 1898 No. 5 Inscription Vat Suvarna Arama
  ● 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Suphan 1509

Schmitt 1898 No. 6 Inscription Vat Lampoeung
  ● 1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492

Schmitt 1898 No. 9 Inscription de la caverne
Schmitt: IX. Inscription thaie ... de la caverne du mont Doi-tham-phra ... In: Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2): 331-339.
  ● 1.4.1.1 Dōi Tham Phra 1484
Schmitt 1898 No.18 Inscription Vat Louang
  - 1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509

Schmitt 1898 No. 20 Inscription Vat Chetyot
  - 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500

Schmitt 1898 No. 27 Inscription Vat Chay Die Suphan
  - 1.4.1.1 Wat Sī Sutthāwāt 1496

Shorto 1971 Dic. Mon Inscriptions

Suárez 1999 Early Mapping

Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārūk Phayao

The book contains 112 mostly stone inscriptions from Phayao province. Each inscription is presented, with good photographs, in transliteration as well as in a modern Thai reading with notes, and the names of the authors responsible for them are indicated. However, there is reason to suspect that these text editions are not always ascribed to the correct authors, and also, that footnotes were altered, omitted and added without the author’s knowledge.

Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā
สุธ ศรีสมวงศ์ / พรหม ชมมา “ต้านนานุระตาน” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร 2482.

Tavernier 1718 Les six voyages
Jean Baptiste Tavernier: Les six voyages ... en Turquie, en Perse, et aux Indes, pendant espace de quarante ans ... La Haye, 1718. (2 vols)
On Rice and Rice Fields in Old Lannā

Thawat 1987/88 Jārük Wat Pāi Yai 2
ข้าว ปุ้มในเขต “ศิลปะประวัติศาสตร์ไทย-ลาว” กรุงเทพฯ (Vol. 1, Texts) 2530 (1987),
หน้า 105 (“ข้าวบาระเพียงครู่ 2”)
• 2.3.1.1 Wat Pāi Luang 1808

Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 3
• 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491 (2)

Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 9
• 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Ruang 1498

Thöm 1995 Lò Phò. 10
• 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Kham 1496

Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 19
• 1.5.1.1 Phayao 1411

Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 47
เทม มีเดิม “พย. 47. จาร์วัตพระคริย่า เงินเจ้าสิงห์เงือนพลบ” In: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 64-67
• 1.5.1.1 Wiang Kao Phayao 1411

Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 57
เทม มีเดิม “พย. 57” In: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 122-127
• 1.5.1.1 Wat Klāng 1490

Thöm et al. 1991 Lak th† 302
เทม มีเดิม / ประสาร บุญประดิ / ประธาน ณ นคร “หลักที่ 302 จากพระราชโปรดเกล้า” ประชุม
• 1.5.1.1 Bān Nông Tao 1474

Thöm / Prasān 1970 Jārük C.S. 858
เทม มีเดิม / ประสาร บุญประดิ “คำอานศิลปะศิลปิน ... จ. 858 ... ฉบับพิเศษ 1” ศิลปะศิลปิน, 14.4, 2513
(1970), 95-100.
• 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496
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Thöm / Prasän 1971 Järük C.S. 859
  1.2.1.1 Wat Kao Lät 1497

Thöm / Prasän 1971 Järük C.S. 858 WPT Sä Jöm Thòng
เหิ้ม มีเดิม / ประกาศ นุญประกาศ “ค่ายานศิลารักษ์ ... จ.ศ. 585 ... วัดพระธาตุดุสิติบรมทร” ศิลป์การ. 14.6. 2514 (1971). 82-87.
  1.2.1.1 Wat Sä Bun Rüang 1496

Thöm / Prasän 1973 Järük Lò Phò./22
  1.5.1.1 Wat Wisutta-Áräm 1506

Thöm / Prasän 1974 Järük Lò Phò./21
เหิ้ม มีเดิม / ประกาศ นุญประกาศ “ค่ายานศิลารักษ์ ละ/21” ศิลป์การ. 18.3. 2517. 15-17.
   1.4.1.1 Dòi Tham Phra 1484

Thöm / Prasän 1974 Järük Lò Phò./26
  1.4.1.1 Wat Mahâ Phithi 1500

Thöm / Prasän 1974 Järük Wat Kao Yòt Lò Phò./27
เหิ้ม มีเดิม / ประกาศ นุญประกาศ “ค่ายานศิลารักษ์ วัดเกย้ยอด ละ/27” ศิลป์การ. 18.1. 2517. 76-79.
  1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yòt 1412

Thöm / Prasän 1978 Järük Wat Bun Bân Lò Phò./20
เหิ้ม มีเดิม / ประกาศ นุญประกาศ “ค่ายานศิลารักษ์ วัดบุญบ้าน ละ/20” ศิลป์การ. 22.1. 2521. 51-53.
  1.3.1.1 Wat Bun Bân 1504

Thöm / Prasän 1978 Järük Lò Phò. 17
เหิ้ม มีเดิม / ประกาศ นุญประกาศ “ค่ายานศิลารักษ์ ละ. 17” ศิลป์การ. 22.3. 2521. 68-71.
  1.4.1.1 Mahâ Thât Chiang Lâ 1611
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