CHAPTER 15

DIFFICULTIES WITH INSCRIPTION NO. 1

Hans Penth*

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

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

Inscription No. 1 has at times less than enchanted its readers. Prince Narit, in a letter to Pring Damrong dated 4 August 1939, wrote that inscriptions were rather perplexing; for example, the inscription was a mixture of Rām Khamhāng’s own words and those of others, and if everything was so well in Sukhōthai as the inscription says, then what was the use of saying it? (แม้คู่ที่จารึกกันจะยิ่ง เช่นหลักศิลากลุ่มขุดมาจากแหล่งสังเกตเห็นเป็นคำชูคำนำคำแปลทำศิลาก็มี แปลการณ์อยู่ และถ้าจารึก เมื่อถันเมืองค็อบก้าบ้านเมืองมีอะไรบางจะมีประโยชน์อะไร: Narit 1939 Letter 9).

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

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

Many difficulties and uncertainties in connection with the inscription have not been publicised. For instance, the sources that deal with the discovery of the inscription in Sukhôthai and its subsequent deciphering in Bangkok need some clarification. The earliest sources seem to be two works by the Supreme Patriarch, Prince Pawaret, a contemporary of King Mongkut. In his biography of the king, the Prince Patriarch refers only to the discovery of the stone throne and Inscription No. 4, but not to the discovery of Inscription No. 1 (Pawaret 1962 King Mongkut Biography 11-12; Pawaret 1968 King Mongkut Biography 50-51). It is reported that an unpublished notebook of the Prince Patriarch contains the same story, again omitting the discovery of Inscription No. 1; but that elsewhere in the same notebook reference is made to some of the contents of Inscription No. 1 and to its Sukhôthai origin (Krom Silapākôn 1983, Jâruk samai sukhôthai 4-5). On the other hand, the biography of King Mongkut written by his son, the Prince Patriarch Wachirayân, says that Prince Mongkut found the stone throne, Inscription No. 4 and Inscription No. 1 in Sukhôthai (Bradley 1909 Oldest Siamese Writing 7; Coedès 1924 Recueil ((Thai part)) 51). A good publication of all original sources would help to dissipate doubts about the history of the stone and its inscription.

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

**Date and Objective**

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

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

Planting of sugar-palm trees. This is the usual translation of the text. Another possible translation, dating the event to 1292, will be discussed at the end of the chapter. (Face 3, lines 10-12).

M.S. 1214 = A.D. 1292

Installation of the stone throne Manang Sila Bāt among the sugar-palm trees. For a different translation, dating the event to 1305-06, see at the end of the chapter. (Face 3, lines 12-13).

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

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

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

Completion of a stūpa built over the re-enshrined relics. The dates calculated by reference are approximate because in the old way of counting years, any date beyond the local “New Year” could be counted as “one year later.” (Face 4, line 6-7).
After 3 years = A.D. 1292-94 or 1294-96

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

M.S. 1205 = A.D. 1283

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

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

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

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

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

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

Concerning the date of the inscription, a glance through Coedès’ writings shows that throughout his life he hesitated between the certainty and the probability that the inscription was composed in 1292: “…m.s. 1214 (1292 A.D.), date probable de l’inscription...” (Coedès 1917, Documents 32); “…la stèle de Râma K’amhêng composée en 1292” (Coedès 1964, Etats 357). But a few pages later in the same book, he writes: “En 1292, date probable de la stèle...” (p. 372).

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

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

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

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

Six years later, Coedès again explained his reasoning concerning the purpose of the inscription (Coedès 1924, Recueil 38): He thought it likely but not really proven ("Il est à peu près hors de doute...") that the objective of the inscription was to commemorate the consecration of the stone throne in 1292 because that year seemed to have been of special importance to King Râm Khamhâng since it was in 1292 that the king began his relation with the Mongol court in China: "Il est à peu près hors de doute...qu'elle (the inscription: HP) avait pour objet de commémorer l'installation...du trône de pierre... en cette année 1292 A.D., qui semble marquer dans le règne de Râma Gâmheñ une date capitale, puisque c'est alors qu'il entra pour la première fois en relation avec la Cour de Chine." Thus, the reasoning of Coedès hinges on one point: The year 1292, in which year he thought the king had inaugurated his stone throne and also had contacted the Mongol-Chinese court.
Coedès did not explain why contacting the Mongol court was such an important event, and what the stone throne had to do with it. The reader is left to speculate on his own that perhaps Rām Khamhāng, having contacted the Mongol court, had been granted certain privileges or assurances by KUBLAI Khan in 1292 and therefore now felt free to establish himself as a ruler with a throne which was such an important event that it became the main subject of the inscription, which in turn would mean that the inscription was written in 1292 or shortly afterwards.

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

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

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

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

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

Chou Ta-kuan, the Chinese envoy, flatly stated that Hsien Siam, in 1296-97 when he visited Angkor, was 15 days southwest of Angkor (Chou Ta-kuan/Paul 1967, Notes 9). However, Sukhōthai is northwest of Angkor.

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

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

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

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

The assumed objective of the inscription, the commemoration of the inauguration of the stone throne, also is not evident from the inscription itself. The matter of the stone slab occurs only on face 3, lines 10-19 (crafting, inauguration and use of a stone slab) and then again on the same face, lines 26-27 (indicating the name of the stone slab as Manang Silā Bāt). Before, in between and after these two passages, entirely different matter is being dealt with. If the stone slab was what really mattered in the inscription, one would expect it to have been accorded a more prominent place and a more extensive treatment, and not to have been mentioned twice rather lightly in the 3rd quarter or at the end of the inscription (Coedès 1924, Recueil 38 considers face 4, lines 11-27 a postscript; Griswold/Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Râm Khamhāng 192-193 think that all of face 4 may be composed of two postscripts: lines 1-11 and 11-27). The matter of the stone slab appears too much hidden away in the inscription and too much treated as just one item among the many items written down, that it could be the main subject or the objective of the inscription.
If indeed the stone slab had some particular importance for the inscription, then the inscription may perhaps better be described as a eulogy of King Rām Khamhāng which includes his descendence, his biography and a description of his prosperous country; the eulogy was set up at a stone seat that had been installed by the king and that was regularly used by religious leaders and the king, which was something that the king regarded as one of or as the most important deed(s) he did in his life. This would mean that the inscription was written by the king after the stone seat had been in use for a certain time because the inscription explains how and when it was used, but before the death of the king because after his death no other person would write the eulogy. The "postscripts" which expand the eulogy perhaps also would have been written during the lifetime of the king. Such self-praising or rather self-appraising eulogies were common in the old time (see Khmer inscriptions; also the Wat Phra Yūn inscription from Lamphūn, c. 1371; text edition and translation in Griswold/Prasōt 1974 Inscr. Wat Phra Yūn); they were more a religious than a political (and not a boastful) act: a statement of who the person is and what his merits are.

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

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

But even the year 1292 for the installation of the stone throne is not entirely certain; it may have been 1305-06. The inscription says (face 3, lines 10-13):
As Phithaya Bunnag (Facility of Fine Arts, Chiang Mai University) points out to me, and I agree, that the text can be translated in a simple, straightforward way:

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

Also, there is corroboration from the stone itself. The same construction with ได้ and ซึ่ง occurs on face 4, lines 4-6, on the occasion of the excavation and re-enshrining of the relics in Si Sachanālai:

“In A.D. 1285 (or 1287, see above), he had relics dug up. Everyone saw them and paid their respects to them. After 1 month and 6 days, they were re-enshrined in the city of Si Sachanālai.”

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

But ever since Father Schmitt merged the two main clauses into one clause with a string of subordinate clauses, because he thought that the stone throne was made in 1292, all the other renowned translators of the inscription followed him: Bradley, Coedès, Griswold/Prasōt:
Schmitt: "En caka 1214, année cyclique du grand dragon, le prince Rāma-Khomhēng... fit placer par son architecte un trône de pierre, à l'ombre d'un groupe de palmiers que Sa Majesté avait elle-même plantés, il y a quatorze ans passés." (In: Griswold/Prasöt 1971 Inscr. Rām Khamhāng 224-225).

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

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

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

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

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

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

A certain passage from the inscription was particularly in Coedès’ mind. It is the passage on face 1 where Rām Khamhāng says of himself: “When I went hunting elephants,...I brought them to my father. When I raided a town or village and captured elephants, young men or women of rank, silver or gold, I turned them over to my father.” For Coedès, this passage was too close to the oath of the electors of Genghis Khan than to be just a coincidence: “Ce passage rappelle de façon trop exacte pour être fortuite le serment des électeurs de Gengis Khan” (Coedès 1964, États 358). The Mongol text that Coedès refers to is the oath of Genghis Khan’s three electors as recorded in the Secret History of the Mongols: “Nous avons décidé de te proclamer khan. Nous marcherons à l’avant-garde, dans la bataille; si nous enlevons des femmes et des filles, nous te les donnerons. Nous irons à la chasse, au premier rang; si nous prenons du gibier, nous te le donnerons” (Vladimirtsof in Grousset 1960, L’empire 258).
If the passage in the inscription was inspired by the Secret History, then there is a difficulty. The Mongol alphabet was created in 1269 (Hirth 1887, Chinese Oriental College 211) or about 40 years later, c. 1310 (up to 1272, the Mongols had used Uighur letters and then Tibetan letters from 1272 to c. 1310; Encycl. Britannica, 1983 edition). The Secret History was composed in the Mongol language between 1228-1264 and existed in Chinese transcription (not yet translation) only since 1368 (dtv Brockhaus Lexikon, 1984 edition).

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

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

The Jindāmanī Evidence

Jindāmanī (ᠵᠢᠶᠳᠠᠮᠠᠨ᠋ᠢ from P. cintāmanī) is the collective name of a group of works intended as primers or reference books on correct orthography and versification. There are quite a number of Jindāmanī manuscripts, some very different from others.
The usual opinion seems to be that the author of the first Jindāmanî probably was the royal chief astrologer, hōrāthibodī (P. horâdhīpati) who may have originated from or may have lived for some time in Sukhōthai and/or Phijit, that he composed the Jindāmanî by order of King Nārai in 1672, and that he also may have been the author of the so-called Luang Prasōt Chronicle, composed in 1680. That opinion was first forwarded by Prince Damrong in 1932 and was later repeated and somewhat deepened by Thanit Yūphō (see: Silapā Bannākhān 1961 Jindāmanî 146-151). King Nārai ruled from 1656 to 1688.

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

"The chief astrologer who formerly lived in Müang Sukhōthai, composed this Jindāmanî and presented it to King Nārai, Lord of Lop Burī."

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

Page 16, line
(2) ...คั่นคำศัพท์ 104 ปีชั่วศัก จึงพระยา
(3) จากวิจัยผู้มีปัญหาแต่จินดามณีถวิย...

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

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

The third note is from the end of one (or several) Usual Jindāmanî manuscript(s) and says in verse form that the learned chief astrologer (โคกประเสริฐ) originally was from Ōkha
Buri (เขาวโล่เมือง) which Prince Damrong and Thanit understood to mean Müang Phijit (Silapā Bannaṅkhān, 1961 Jindāmanī 147-148).

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

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

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

Of this manuscript, the late Professor Khajon Sukhaphānit ขจร สุชาติพันธุ์ had a microfilm made which he gave to the Fine Arts Department, Bangkok. It is now in the National Library and has become quite brittle. From that microfilm, the text of the manuscript was first printed in 1961 under the title จินดาเม่นี ฉบับพระเจ้าบรมไกศ “Jindāmanī, version of Pra Jao Boroma Kōt”, which was included in a book on the subject of Jindāmanī (Silapā
Bannakhān 1961, Jindāmanī 158 ff). An identical reprint was made in 1969, and a third edition with a slightly different pagination appeared in 1971. King Boroma Kōt of Ayūthaya may have had nothing to do with this Jindāmanī, but 1732 was the first year of his reign, hence the title of the publication.

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

Still according to the microfilm, it seems that, if one opens the first fold of the manuscript, the upper page has the title of the book: หน้าต้น สมุดหนังสือ จินคำอัน “Front Page, Book of Jindāmanī.”

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

(1) อันหนึ่งในจดหมายแต่ก่อนว่า ศักกิภาษฉ 645 มะแมศกรนายของเจ้าได้มีเรื่องรักษาได้แล้ว
(2) (ณ)[ติ][ห]นังสีไทยแล้วจึงได้ว่าแต่รูปภิกดีแต่งแม่ลักษภิกดีใหม่ได้ว่าไว้แล้ว ทรงฝังแม่นังสีแต่ง กะ กน
(3) จักรี ถึงแม่ไทยคำมบกิณแต่เมื่อปุ่มแล้ว เห็นว่าพระยาของเจ้าจึงแต่งแต่กรุ ลักษไทย

“(An) old document(s) state(s) that in A.D. 1283, after he had obtained Mūang Si Sachanālai, Phaya Ròng devised the Thai writing system (tāng nangsū Thai). It is not clearly stated whether he devised the form (tāng rūp) or whether he divided the letters themselves (tāng mā aksōn). (Because) the letter combinations (mā nangsū) from kkā, kn, etc. to keòy had already been devised in the Khôm country, I think that Phaya Ròng only devised the form of the Thai letters (tāng tā rūp aksōn Thai).” (Tentative translation).
The remaining two lines on this page consist of a date that is elaborately expressed in Buddhhasakkharāja (…พระพุทธศักราชสองเราแล้วได้ 2275 ปีРА... ) and Culasakkharāja (…จุลศักราชได้ 1094 ศก... ) and which corresponds to A.D. 1732. Since nothing else is added, that should be the date of the manuscript.

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

The subject matter of the book then begins on the top page of the next fold with the words: ข้าพระเจ้าทรงตั้งคุณ ค่ายตรง คือ ช้าง...

A comparison between the microfilm and the printed version (JM.RAS’ 1961) shows that the latter is nearly, but not exactly, identical with the original. I cannot say if the manuscript also contains the remark on the author of the Jindāmanī, the royal teacher, because I did not dare to run the whole brittle microfilm through the reading machine; but the printed version does not contain that note.

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

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

All manuscripts are black paper leporello books of a size roughly 12 x 35 cm, written in gold-colour ink. None of them is dated. Judging solely by their appearance, the oldest would be JM.NLB/5 followed by the two others which look newer. The manuscript JM.NLB/5 was part of the original funds of the National Library. JM. NLB/25 was received in 1909 from Prince Damrong, and JM.NLB/93 in 1936 from the Department of the Secretary-General to the Council of Ministers กรมราชกำกบคณฑี รัฐมนตรี.
The preface on the devising of Thai letters is more or less identical in all three manuscripts of the Bangkok National Library, and is in substance close to the preface of the manuscript in the Royal Asiatic Society.

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

Page 1

1. ศกษา 645 ปีมาเสมอ พายารังจ้าได้เนียงซื่นนาไร ซึ่งแต่ง
2. หนังสือไทยแยแบกษัตริย์ทางมาพวกทับบางอันเจาซึ่งกันแล็กกัน และครง
3. ณัณฑ์แต่งแยแบกษัตริย์ และได้แต่งแปลปรัณฑิการมาคมได้ แตกลับตร
4. ผู้เจ้าธีที่ยืนแกนบันยกนก และมิ่งแยแบกษัตริย์แต่งแกน ละ จบกนภย

Page 2

1. เมื่อข้อมกันดีมีอยู่แล้ว พายารังจ้าเจ้แต่งแยแบกษัตริย์ดังต่าง...

“In A.D. 1283, after he had obtained Mūang Sī Sachanālai, Phaya Ruang devised the Thai writing system (*tāng nangsi Thāi*) and all the letters (*mā aksōn*) according to the spoken language. It is not clear whether at the time he only devised the letters (*tāng tā mā aksōn*), and whether the arrangement was conventional or unconventional (*tāng pen pokoti witathan*), (but) the students found reading and writing to be very difficult. (Because) the letter combinations (*mā nangsi*) from *kkā* to *kn* etc. and on to *key* had already been devised in the Khôm country, Phaya Ruang only devised the form of the various Thai letters (*tāng tā rūp aksōn Thāi tāng tāng*). (Tentative translation).

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

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

According to the tale in Phongsāwadān Nūa, Phra Jao Arun Rāt alias Phaya Ruang (พระเจ้าอยุธยาซื่อพระวัง) lived around B.S. 1000 (A.D. 457), C.S. 119 (A.D. 757). For the purpose of cancelling the Buddhhasakkarāja (เจ้าพระพุทธเจ้า) he called a conference of the major kings. On that occasion, he ordered to devise the Thai Chiang, Mon, Burmese, Thai, Khôm Chiang and Khôm letters (พระองค์เจ้าให้ทำหนังสือไทยเขียนเมืองอุปพามาไทยแล้วขอเขียนขอมมีมากแต่นั้น; PN'1914.9-10; PN'1963.9-10).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Conclusion**

The discussion in this article has produced the following results concerning the date of the inscription. (1) The traditional reasons for dating inscription No. 1 to 1292 are not convincing; yet, because of other reasons, the inscription may date from that year or from a few years later, for instance from 1305-1306 or even later, but should date from a time when King Rām Khamhāng was still alive. (2) The “Mongol Passage” leaves a choice between the same period and an indefinite but possibly much later time. (3) The preface of the Unusual Jindāmanī points to a date in plain Sukhōthai period.

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

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

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