

## REVIEW ARTICLE

A.B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 9 and No. 10" (*Journal of the Siam Society*, Vols. 59 pt. 2 and 60 pt. 1).

### IV. COMMENTS ON EPIGRAPHIC AND HISTORICAL STUDIES NO. 9

Griswold and Prasert produced their study on the Ram Kamhaeng's Inscription in *JSS*, Volume 59 part 2, July 1971. Besides text and translation into English of the inscription, the study gives 'historical notes' going back almost to the time when the stone was quarried. I will comment shortly on the actual translation, viz. on the first or autobiographical part where Ram Kamhaeng used the first personal pronoun. But first one remark on the notes is necessary\*.

Griswold and Prasert (hereafter G and P) state that the inscription, as well as another from Li Thai's reign and a stone seat known as the Manangasilabatr, were *in situ* by the Noen Prasart when the future King Mongkut discovered them and had them brought down to Bangkok. And so, following Coedès, the inscription was set up to commemorate Ram Kamhaeng's foundation of the stone seat. Also the two authors say that the Noen Prasart was where the royal palace was located. Archaeologists are not in agreement as to where the palace was, or what the Noen Prasart was used for (one suggestion is that it was something like the Phra Meru Ground in Bangkok where royal cremations were held); but even if the Noen Prasart had been the 'palace mound', as G and P think, the Manangasilabatr was certainly not *in situ* there. The text is quite specific that the stone seat was placed in the midst of a palm grove that Ram Kamhaeng had planted fourteen years before. We do not know the location of the palm grove, but wherever it was it certainly was not at the Noen Prasart.

Before going on, let me add that some of the ideas in this Study are not generally accepted. Ram Kamhaeng's Inscription is a fertile field for arguments, arguments which are not likely to end in the foreseeable future.

---

\* This Review Article is continued from *JSS*, January 1973, Vol. 61 pt. 1, pp. 261-301,

Commenting on G and P's translation is much trickier than commenting on their interpretation. I will give just one example. The second line of the text says <sup>๕</sup>พี่น้องทองเดียว<sup>๖</sup>หาคน. In this context <sup>๕</sup>พี่น้องทองเดียว<sup>๖</sup> is a Thai phrase with a specific meaning, only unfortunately I cannot on the spur of the moment think of the corresponding phrase in English. So I will be pedantic and translate it as "Siblings". G and P, however, translates it as 'There were five of us born from the same womb'. This translation is not only inaccurate because the fathers might have been different, but sounds rather vulgar to me particularly when Ram Khamhaeng's inscription does not contain the slightest trace of vulgarity.

### Translation of the First Paragraph

*Translation Chand :* My father's name was Sri Intaratit; my mother's Nang Sueng; my elder (brother's) Ban Mueng. We were five children born of the same parents, three boys and two girls.

\* *L'Inscription du Roi Rāma Gāmhèn de Sukhodaya (1292 A.D.).* Editée Traduite par George Coedès d'après le : *Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam. Première Partie. Inscriptions de Sukhodaya.* Bangkok, 1924, pages 37-48. Réimprimée avec la permission de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Thaïlande. *Stone Inscriptions of Sukhothai.* Translation by H.R.H. Prince Wan Waihayakon (The Siam Society under Royal Patronage, Bangkok, November 1965, B.E. 2508) pp. 12.



พี่น้อง : brothers, or sisters, or in this context brothers and sisters.  
 ห้องเดียว born of the same father and mother. Another phrase with the  
 same meaning is พี่น้องคลานตามกันออกมา literally: crawled out following  
 one another.

*Translation G and P:* My father was named Sri Indraditya, my  
 mother was named Lady Soan, my elder brother was named Pan Moan.  
 There were five of us born from the same womb: three boys and two  
 girls.

๑ พี่น้องตายจากเมื่อเขมเล็ก ๆ

*Translation Chand:* Death took our eldest brother from us while  
 (I was) still small.

*Notes:* พี่ plural (cf. the poem Phra Law.) The sense here is not  
 very clear. The eldest brother might have died as a young boy, perhaps  
 even before Ram Kamhaeng, the youngest brother, was born. I think  
 the brother died when Ram Kamhaeng was still small, though a literal  
 rendering should be "while we were still small."

*Translation G and P:* My eldest brother died when he was still a  
 child.

๒ เมื่อฉันใหญ่โตสิบเก้าเข้า ขุนสามชนเจ้าเมืองลพคมมาท้อมเมืองตาก ฯ

*Translation Chand:* When I was grown up to my nineteenth year,  
 Khun Sam Chon, Lord of Mueng Chod, came to raid Mueng Tak.

*Notes:* เข้า year; ขุนสิบเก้าเข้า 19th year, that is, Ram Kamhaeng was  
 18 and in his 19th year. That year was about 1257 A.D. (1800 B.E.).  
 Ram Kamhaeng had two friends in Mangrai and Ngarm Mueng, and the  
 chronicles state that they were of the same age. Ngarm Mueng and  
 Mangrai were born in 1238 (though one chronicle says that Mangrai was  
 born a year later); and if Ram Kamhaeng was born in the same year, or  
 a year later or earlier, then he would be 19 in 1257. Intaratit was  
 already on the throne, very likely for only a short period before he could  
 consolidate his position, otherwise Khun Sam Chon would not have  
 attacked Mueng Tak. I suggest that 1257 be accepted as Intaratit's  
 accession date because tradition already gives 1800 B.E. as the start of  
 the Sukhothai story, or more specifically of the Phra Ruang Dynasty of  
 Sri Intaratit.

*Translation G and P:* When I was nineteen years old, Lord Sam Jan, the ruler of Moan Chot, came to attack Moan Tak.

๑ พ่อกูไปรบขุนสามชนหัวซ้าย ขุนสามชนขับมาหัวขวา

*Translation Chand:* My father went to fight Khun Sam Chon on the left flank. Khun Sam Chon drove in on the right flank.

*Notes:* หัวซ้าย-หัวขวา (left head-right head) translated as flank. It is difficult to point to the place where the battle took place. I do not know of many flat pieces of land, especially in the vicinity of old Tak, where elephants could charge one another. Left head-right head here might merely mean left and right front. On the other hand it could mean that Intaratit went up the left slope of a hill (head หัวเขา), while Khun Sam Chon came down the right slope of the same hill and took his opponent at a disadvantage.

*Translation G and P:* My father went to fight Lord Sam Jan on the left; Lord Sam Jan drove in on the right.

๒ ขุนสามชนเกลื่อนเข้า ไพร่ฟ้าหน้าใสพ่อกูหนีญ่ายพายจอนแจ กู้บ่หนี กู้ข้างเบกพล กู้บ่เข้าก่อนพ่อกู กู้ต่อข้างด้วยขุนสามชนฯ

*Translation Chand:* Khun Sam Chon's men advanced in a body (and) my father's men scattered in flight. I did not flee. I drove my elephant forward through the mass and overtook my father, to fight in single combat with Khun Sam Chon, each of us mounted on his own elephant.

*Notes:* ไพร่ฟ้าหน้าใส translated as 'men', to pair with Khun Sam Chon's men and as a contrast to พล (translated as 'mass'), though a more accurate rendering might be 'attendants'. It is unlikely that Intaratit's whole army, or battalion, or even company, would scatter at Khun Sam Chon's charge, but only his personal bodyguard and those near him, particularly his 'four legs of an elephant' สี่เท้าข้าง.

หนีญ่ายพายจอนแจ is rendered by G and P as หนีขยพายจอนแจ. จอนแจ is read by *Maha Cham* as จอนแจ, by *Maha Prasarn* as จอนจัน, literally: scattered in a great din. According to G and P, however, : "The expression can be dissected as หนี 'to flee'; ขย 'broken' (Pallegoix); พาย 'to disappear' (Khmer); จอน 'quickly' (cf. modern วิ่งจอน 'to run away fast')."



จับเข้าก่อน translated as 'overtook', but more likely Ram Kamhaeng charged Khun Sam Chon before his father could do so. However, G and P give an entirely different rendering, one where presumably Ram Kamhaeng was unmounted at the beginning of the episode.

*Translation G and P:* Lord Sam Jan attacked in force; my father's men fled in confusion. I did not flee. I mounted my elephant, opened (a way through) the soldiers, and pushed him ahead of my father. I fought an elephant duel with Lord Sam Jan.

๑๑ ตนกุกุ้งช้างขุนสามชน ตัวชอมาสเมือง แห้ขุนสามชนพ่ายหนี ฯ

*Translation Chand:* I charged Khun Sam Chon's elephant named Mas Mueng and was victorious. Khun Sam Chon was defeated and ran away.

*Notes:* กุกุ้ง literally: crashed into or rammed (as in battering ram), but here translated as 'charged', cf. modern expressions in sports such as กุกุ้งแหลน javelin throwing, กุกุ้งหลวง to dive into the water, กุกุ้งจับ a low tackle in rugby football.

แพ้ victorious, พ่าย defeated: in present day usage in the Central Plain, แพ้ means to be defeated (same as พ่าย), but in this context and in the North, the word has the opposite meaning.

*Translation G and P:* I fought Lord Sam Jan's elephant, Mas Moan by name, and beat him. Lord Sam Jan fled.

๑๒ พ่อกู้งขุนช่อ ช่อพระรามคำแหง เพื่อกุกุ้งช้างขุนสามชน ฯ

*Translation Chand:* And so my father exalted my name and called me Phra Ram Kamhaeng, because I had charged Khun Sam Chon's elephant.

*Translation G and P:* Then my father named me Brah Rama Gamhen because I fought (Lord) Sam Jan's elephant.

*Note:* I have taken the liberty of adding a word in brackets to G and P's translation.

There are many problems in translating Ram Kamhaeng's inscription, not the least difficult of which are spacing and the jingling sounds that are inherent to the Thai language when internal rhymes are added for euphony as well as meaningless repetitions, like อานน้ำ อานท่า. A great deal of the Inscription is written in a semi-poetical form called *Rai*.

Not everybody agrees on this point. I presume the reason is simply because some people's ears are not as long as other people's, and they cannot hear poetical sounds when they see the text inscribed on stone. Then the Inscription is continuous from the first word to the last, and it is necessary to space the text into phrases and sentences. One way of spacing produces one sense, another way produces another sense, and my way is to space the poetical passages as *Rai*. In this way I get some quite different meanings from those G and P have produced. Perhaps we might have just one example before going on to translating the second paragraph of the text.

๑ คุไปท้อบ้านท้อเมือง ได้ช้างได้วง ได้บ่าวได้นาง ได้เงินได้ทอง คุเอามาเวนแก่พ่อคุ

*Translation G and P:* When I raided a town or village and captured elephants (ได้ช้างได้วง) young men or women of rank (ได้บ่าวได้นาง), silver or gold, I turned them over to my father.

G and P have two footnotes, namely :

18) ได้ช้างได้วง—"literally 'elephants and trunks', a conventional expression for elephants".

19) ได้บ่าวได้นาง: "Conjectural translation", say G and P, and add a long footnote on what has been conjectured about these two simple words, all of which is quite meaningless. บ่าว is บ่าว a young man, such as in เจ้าน่าว a bridegroom and ลูกบ่าว a son. In today's usage บ่าว means a servant of both sexes. นาง means female, and is used for anything from a queen (นางเสด็จ, สมเด็จพระนางเธอ) to a female animal or an ogress (นางผีเสื้อ). One exception I can think of quickly is ขุนนาง, a nobleman.

ได้ช้างได้วง ได้บ่าวได้นาง, I consider there was a mistake in the engraving here and an essential rhyme is missing from the jingling sound of the sentence. The phrase should be ได้ช้างได้จ้าว (จ้าว instead of วง), and the sense should be 'when I obtained elephants and cattle, males and females, silver and gold' etc. For the benefit of my long-eared friends who can appreciate the poetry in Ram Kamhaeng's language, I will give the Thai text again.

๑ คุไปท้อบ้านท้อเมือง ได้ช้างได้จ้าว ได้บ่าวได้นาง ได้เงินได้ทอง คุเอามาเวนแก่พ่อคุ



### Translations of the Second Paragraph

๑ เมื่อชั่วพ่อกู กูน้ำเรอแก่พ่อกู กูน้ำเรอแก่แม่กู กูได้ตัวเนื้อตัวปลา กูเอามาแก่พ่อกู กูได้หมากรักหมากรักหวานอันกินอร่อยกินดี กูเอามาแก่พ่อกู

*Translation G and P:* In my father's lifetime I served my father and I served my mother. When I caught any game and fish I brought them to my father. When I picked any acid or sweet fruits that were delicious and good to eat, I brought them to my father.

*Remark:* I cannot improve on this translation.

For the second sentence, other translations are available, and I reproduce them for comparison with G and P's translation as well as my own.

*Bastian (1863):* I set out against the savages, the tribes provided with elephants, to obtain slaves for my father. I fall on their villages, on their towns. I get elephants, get tusks; I get males and females; I get silver; I get gold; I bring it all up with me and deliver it over to my father. Then my father dies. There is still an elder brother. I give support to my elder brother, in the way, as I had supported my father. My elder brother dies. Now the towns come to me, all the four towns.

๑ กูไปค้ำหน้าวังช้างได้ กูเอามาแก่พ่อกู กูไปท้อบ้านท้อเมือง ได้ช้างได้วัว ได้หมู ได้เงินได้ทอง กูเอามาเวรแก่พ่อกู พ่อกูตายยังพูกู กูพรวน้ำเรอแก่พ่อกู กูค้ำหน้าเรอแก่พ่อกู พ่อกูตายจึงได้เมืองแก่กูทั้งกม

*Schmitt (1884/5):* Quand, battant les marais, je rapportais des trompes d'éléphants, je les présentais à mon père. Faisant la guerre aux villes et aux villages, quand j'enlevais des éléphants, des trompes d'éléphants, des garçons, des filles, de l'or, j'en faisais une part pour mon père. Mon père mort, il me resta mon frère plus âgé. Pleurant mon père, je continuai à mon frère la sollicitude que j'avais témoignée à mon père.

*Bradley (1909):* If I went to hunt elephants and got them, I brought them to my father. If I went to hamlets or towns, and got elephants, got elephants' trunks, got slaves, got damsels, got silver, got gold, I brought and left them with my father. My father died. I continued to be support and stay unto my brother just as I had been unto my father. My brother died. So I got the realm entire to myself.

*Coedès (1924):* Si j'allais à la chasse aux éléphants et que j'en pris, je les apportais à mon père. Si j'allais attaquer un village ou une ville et que j'en ramassasse des éléphants, des garçons, des filles, de l'argent, de l'or, je les confiais à mon père. Mon père mort il me resta

mon frère aîné. Je continuai à servir mon frère, comme j'avais servi mon père. Mon frère aîné mort, le royaume m'échut tout entier.

*G and P (1971)*: When I went hunting elephants, either by lasso or by (driving them into) a corral, 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. When my father died, my elder brother was still alive, and I served him steadfastly as I had served my father. When my elder brother died, I got the whole kingdom to myself.

*Chand (1973)*: When I rounded up elephants, I brought them back for my father. When I raided villages and towns and acquired elephants and cattle, men and women, silver and gold, I brought them back and gave them to my father. When my father died, (the kingdom) went to my elder brother, whom I served as steadfastly as I had served my father. And when he died the kingdom became mine in its entirety.

*Notes*: ตีหนังวังช้าง: the modern expression is คล้องช้าง, to lasso an elephant. ตีหนัง literally means 'to beat a skin' which I presume means to make a noise by beating drums and driving the animals into a corral (วังช้าง, this expression is also to be found in *Luang Prasert's* version of the *Phongsawadan*). The elephants selected are then lassoed (by one of their legs) and tied down, while those not required are set free again. G and P have translated ตีหนัง as lasso (คล้อง) and his guess may be better than mine for all I know. The whole thing sounds like jingling sounds to me.

ท้อบ้านท้อเมือง: บ้าน means a house but here translated as village (หมู่บ้าน); more jingling sounds.

ได้ช้างได้วัว ได้บัวได้นาง: already dealt with. The text reads ได้ช้างได้งวง (for งวง), which I consider a mistake made by the engraver, as it spoils the rhythm of the whole sentence.

พ่อถูกตายยังพ่อกู: The experts have translated ยัง as 'still', in which case one would have expected the text to have been พ่อถูกตายพ่อกูยัง. I prefer to translate the word as a verb (ไปยัง, ตกยัง, ตกไปยัง), and the sense is "When my father died, my elder brother succeeded him; and when he died the country became mine in its entirety." This is a case of one man's guess is as good as another's (or rather as good as five others'!), so can anybody wonder why Ram Kamhaeng's inscription is such a wonderful field for psychedelic surmises?



# V. COMMENTS ON EPIGRAPHIC AND HISTORICAL STUDIES NO. 10

First a word of explanation: originally these comments comprised the first of two parts on the Sukhothai Inscriptions. It is 'destructive' in character, while the second part, called 'Guide through the Inscriptions of Sukhothai' is 'constructive' and purports to tell a straight story within the framework of the Inscriptions. Put another way, it is easy to pull down a building, but it seems only fair to put up a new structure in its place. Then it was thought that the second part could be expanded considerably to cover other aspects of the Sukhothai story than just political history, the editor of this journal was asked whether he would object to printing only the first part. He not only was kind enough to agree, but also to cut out all references to part two from the first part, and at the same time to incorporate such material from the second part as may be necessary to make this part clear. I do not intend to spend any more time on G and P's studies, I will make my comments very short, and so I apologise in advance should any remarks taken from Part Two without the accompanying explanations not be as intelligible as they should be.

Study No. 10 deals with three inscriptions, namely II, the Inscription of Wat Sri Chum, Sukhothai; Face 2 of XI, the Inscription of Khao Gop, Nakorn Sawan; and a miscellaneous stele from some unknown site. It has a date, but may not be relevant to the other two inscriptions, so we can dispense with it. The title of this study is "King Loe Thai and his Contemporaries". I think the printers must have made a mistake here, because the title should have been "King Li Thai (Maha Dharmaraja I) and his Contemporaries." The three monks, Utumporn the Maha Sami Sangharaja, Anomatassi (Phra Kru Tiloka of Inscription IX) and Sumana Thera (as well as Wat Pa Moung at Sukhothai and Wat Pa Daeng at Sri Sajnalai) all played important parts in the story of Li Thai's ordination. They had nothing to do with King Loe Thai at all.

"Who was the author of Inscription II?" ask G and P and continue: "The majority of Siamese scholars (including Chand) take it for granted that it was Srisraddha, since the whole text is basically an account of his acts of merit." (My parentheses)

G and P think it was King Loe Thai who set up the Inscription to commemorate repairs he made to the Maha Dhatu complex, including the setting up of four corner *chedis* in brick. It happens that there is a gold plate that came from one of the four corner *chedis* which says that it was the Sangharaja 'who was Maha Dharmaraja's teacher' who built the *chedis*. The year was 1384. So G and P's whole theory is contrary to the written evidence.

The story told in the chronicles of the two Sukhothai monks, Anomatassi and Sumana Thera, had nothing to do with the reign of Loe Thai. When Maha Dharmaraja Li Thai decided to become a monk, he did not want to be ordained in the sect that his grandfather had established from Nakorn Sri Thammaraj. He wanted to be ordained in the new Lanka Sect that had recently been set up at Mueng Pan (Matapan). So he sent Anomatassi and Sumana Thera to invite Utumporn, the Maha Sami Sangharaja, to become his Uppajja; and at the ceremony Anomatassi acted as his Karmavacacharu and Sumana Thera as Anussasasnacharu. In any ordination these three "teachers" are of the greatest importance. Li Thai built Wat Pa Daeng at Sri Sajnalai and Wat Pa Moung at Sukhothai, and these two *wats* played important parts in the stories of Anomatassi and Sumana Thera. So G and P equate Anomatassi with *Phra Kru* Tilokatilok, author of the Wat Pa Daeng group of Inscriptions (at least I understand that is what Prasert teaches his students), and the story and dates in the Inscriptions (Wat Pa Moung group, Wat Pa Daeng group and Wat Phra Yuen) and the northern chronicles (*Jinakarn* and *Mul Sasna*) match very well except for a couple of minor discrepancies. The chronicles were written in Chiangmai long after the events took place, so a few mistakes were bound to slip in and these can be corrected without any fanciful interpretations. So I would say that G and P's story of these two monks, as well as the elaborate chronology they have produced, show an eccentricity uncalled for in an essentially simple, straight-forward story.

Once you start to comment on these Studies, it is difficult to stop. I have tried to keep to the major points, but sometimes a minor point could turn out to be an important problem. One such is the name Bang Klang Tao (or Pan Klan Dav as G and P write it), the first king of the Phra Ruang Dynasty. The name appears eleven times in Inscription II,



But now G and P have reread the name as Bang Klang Hao (Pan Klan Hav or Bang Glang Hao): they say "of the new readings, the only one which need concern us for the moment is the name of the future King Sri Indraditya of Sukothaya read by Coedès as Pan Klan Dav, but now read with virtual certainty as Pan Klan Hav." I have said at the beginning that I know nothing about epigraphy, so I can only argue with G and P on their interpretation and not on their reading of the texts, particularly as I have no facilities to check with the Bangkok epigraphists. But in this case perhaps a question would not be out of order. Did Coedès (to say nothing of *Maha Cham*, *Maha Prasarn*, *Maha Prida* and a host of other people who have worked on this Inscription) misread the name not once but eleven times? In such a case what kind of epigraphists are these good people if they cannot distinguish the Sukhothai H from the Sukhothai T (or D)—not once but eleven times? I think G and P should state definitely how many times the reading is Bang Klang Tao, and how many times Bang Klang Hao, so that other people can decide what the name should be. As things are, some people think that Prasert is making a complete mess of the Sukhothai Inscriptions for no reason at all. (Griswold's name is not mentioned in this connection, presumably because the people who accuse Prasert appear not to have heard of Griswold.) I personally think Prasert is doing very well, and even if he is making a mess, it is about time somebody did. In this way perhaps people will go back to the original sources again rather than repeat what the masterminds have produced years ago. As Prasert is a trained mathematician, the honour of making a mess of the Inscriptions should be his and not mine.

Inscription No. XI contains two sides. It came from Khao Gop (Frog Hill, also called Khao Phra Bat or the Footprint Hill), Nakorn Sawan province; but there is nothing in the text to connect it to its place of provenance. Face 1 starts by mentioning 'Phra Ram the younger brother' who had died. Then it tells of Dharmaraja clearing brambles, moving boulders and stones, and taking measurements with his own hands to build a *chedi* on Khao Sumana Gutī. This hill is in Sukhothai

province, and it is also called Khao Phra Bat Yai, or the Greater Buddha's Footprint Hill. Then in the centre of the city Dharmaraja built a *chedi*, a *vihara*, a Buddha image in a *wat* called Ramavasa; he dug a pond where lotuses can be grown and are available for worship at all seasons; and he transmitted the merit he had gained to Phya Phra Ram. Wat Ram is mentioned in Inscription II.

The second side tells of the author's trip to Nakorn Sra Luang (Pichit), then on to Sukhothai, Sri Sajnalai, Fang, Plae (Prae), Rapun (Lamphun), Tak, Chieng (Thong ?), on to the west coast (Nakorn Pan); then overseas to India and Ceylon. After ten years he returned to Tenasserim and went to Ayodhia Sri Ram Dheb Nakorn, where he had an audience with the king whose name can no longer be read. He also put up some buildings, planted some bodhi and other trees.

It used to be thought that this was an inscription of the Ayudhia period, presumably because of the mention of Ayodhia, but this view can no longer be held. The Phra Ram of the latter period died after his elder brother, who was Dharmaraja (Boroma Pala); and there were no other Dharmarajas after that. So the events described were before the foundation of Ayudhia, very probably before Vorajeta (the future Ramatipati who founded the city), came to the throne of Ayodhia. The inscription however might have been set up later when the author had returned from his ten years' trip to India and Ceylon.

Study No. 10 deals only with Face 2 of the Inscription, but we know Griswold's thinking on this subject from what he has already written in his *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*; and we know Prasert's viewpoint from his arguments with me from a booklet he published on the occasion of his father's cremation, which contain essays and notes on this subject which he had written for Thai journals.\* The different views can be summarised as follows :

\* ผลงานค้นคว้าประวัติศาสตร์ไทย และ เรื่องของเกลือ (ไม้) เค็ม. พิมพ์เนื่องในงานพระราชทานเพลิงศพ นาย บุญเรือง ณ นคร ณ เมรุวัดพระศรีมหาธาตุ บางเขน วันที่ 31 ตุลาคม 2514 (ร.พ. อภัยธรรมย์, พระนคร, 2514), 124 หน้า.



1. Griswold, Prasert and Chand are agreed that Inscriptions II and XI both tell the story of the same man, namely the monk Sri Srata (as I write his name).

2. Prasert and Chand think that No. XI is a Sukhothai inscription while Griswold, in spite of the mention of Khao Sumana Gut, thinks it is an inscription of Khao Gop, Nakorn Sawan province, where it was found. He implies that any hill where there is a Footprint was called Khao Sumana Gut. As it happens, in Inscription III Li Thai states that one Footprint is set up in Mueng Sri Sajnalai on top of . . . hill, another in Mueng Sukhothai on top of Khao Sumana Gut; still another in Mueng Pan on top of Khao Nang Thong; and yet another on top of the hill at the mouth of Phra Bang (Khao Gop). Griswold thinks Li Thai set up Face 1 of Inscription XI (see below), so why should Li Thai call the same hill (Khao Gop) by different names in two inscriptions that he himself set up is something to explain. If Griswold's theory is acceptable, one would expect Li Thai to have said in Inscription III that one Footprint was in Mueng Sri Sajnalai on top of Khao Sumana Gut; another in Mueng Sukhothai on top of Khao Sumana Gut; still another in Mueng Pan on top of Khao Sumana Gut; and yet another on top of the hill at the mouth of Phra Bang. In such a case Griswold's theory might be correct, though I doubt it.

I will add one or two suggestions before leaving this subject. In Study No. 10, G and P state that "Inscription No. XI was discovered by Prince Damrong Rajanubhab on top of Frog Hill at Pak-nam Bo, Nagaravarga. It was shipped to Bangkok in the following year." The two authors do not give their source for this statement, so my first suggestion is that they read exactly what Prince Damrong wrote on the subject. It is to be found in an account he wrote about a trip he made by boat down the Mae Ping river from Chiangmai, namely that when he got to Nakorn Sawan he found that the inscription from Khao Gop (Frog Hill) had already been shipped to Bangkok. In short, Prince Damrong did not climb up Frog Hill as G and P state, nor did he discover any inscription there worth mentioning. My second suggestion is that perhaps the label of a Sukhothai inscription from Wat Ramavasa (called Wat Ram in

Inscription II) got mixed with an inscription from Khao Gop. Further I would suggest that the inscription from Khao Gop, (if there ever was an inscription from Khao Gop, mind you) is No. X. This is the only inscription in the books of which we do not know its place of provenance. (It is possible of course that there may be one or two inscriptions that have never been edited, and one of them was the Khao Gop stele.) If these suggestions are feasible and G and P should look further into them, then perhaps they will not have to resort to so much guesswork.

3. Prasert and Chand are agreed that Sri Srata wrote both inscriptions, while Griswold thinks a) Phya Loe Thai wrote No. II, b) Phya Li Thai (Maha Dharmaraja) wrote Face 1 of No. XI, and c) Sri Srata wrote Face 2 of the same stele.

4. All are agreed that the Dharmaraja of No. II was Loe Thai (grandson of Sri Intaratit); G and P think the Dharmaraja in XI meant Maha Dharmaraja Li Thai; while Chand thinks the same author of both II and XI (Sri Srata) wrote about the same Dharmaraja (Loe Thai). Perhaps Loe Thai was not much of an author (as were his father and his son), so Sri Srata became his ghost-writer—of Face 1 of No. XI only; Face 2 Sri Srata himself used for his own glorification after returning from a long trip abroad, that is, Face 1 might have been written some ten years before Face 2. This is Prasert's view based on the orthography of the stele, though he has conjectured that it was the other way about to fit his own particular pet theory (see below).

5. As for 'Phra Ram the younger brother' in XI, who had died :

- a) Griswold thinks he was Ramatipati, the founder of Ayudhia, viz. Maha Dharmaraja Li Thai built Ramavasa (at Nakorn Sawan) and transferred the merit he had gained to Ramatipati, whom he called 'younger brother' for political reasons.
- b) Prasert thinks Ram here meant Phya Kamhaeng Phra Ram, the author's father, though whose younger brother he was is not stated.



- c) Chand thinks Ram here meant Ram Kambaeng, the younger brother of Ban Mueng, namely Loe Thai (the Dharmaraja of the text) who built Ramavasa and transferred the merit to his own father, who was the younger brother of his uncle, Ban Mueng.

I have said at the beginning that Thai scholars do not seem to read Griswold's writing, nor, it seems, does Griswold read what Thai scholars write. To put things another way, amongst the Thai scholars who do not read Griswold's writing, we should include Prasert's name; and amongst the Thai scholars whom Griswold does not read, we should also include Prasert's name.

Griswold has wonderful energy (as can be seen from this *Studies* No. 10), and he is meticulous in all he does. Unfortunately he is inclined to follow Professor Coedès too much, and Coedès, though a great scholar, has become obsolete. The same remark applies to Prince Damrong, because of the mass of new material that has come to light. The concept of a history of South East Asia based on political boundaries is no longer tenable, because before the European period there were no such things as political boundaries. So people are going back to original sources and re-evaluating the material afresh. This Griswold has done to some extent, and his work must surely be of use to western scholars who can separate the wheat from the chaff.

The case of Prasert is different to that of Griswold. He is a member of the Thai National History Committee, so what he says is of importance, or at least is seriously studied by some people. So to be fair on Thai scholarship, as well as for his own image and the image of the History Committee as a whole (never very bright at any time, to judge from results produced in nearly two decades), Prasert should do one of these three things—in writing, and in this journal, if possible—namely a) he should refute what Griswold has produced and stand by his own writing; or b) he should refute himself and support Griswold; or c) he should refute both himself and Griswold and stick by me. But I should warn him not to accept what I have said too easily because in some instances I have gone far, far out. He should research much more, particularly about Sukhothai art and also about Sukhothai geography.

What Prasert should do is to state definitely what he accepts. Otherwise other people are going to do it for him. When I said that it would be in fairness to Thai scholarship for him to refute Griswold's theories, as Griswold's previous collaborators (*Luang* Boriban, Prince Supat and *Khun* Kraisi Nimmanhemindr) have done, perhaps I have given too broad a picture. He should do this in fairness to his colleagues on the History Committee. Perhaps in this way, the work of the Committee would advance beyond what Prince Damrong and Professor Coedès had produced long ago.

*M.C. Chand Chirayu Rajani*

*Chiangmai University*

#### ERRATUM

In my Review Article of A.B. Griswold's *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art* in *JSS*, July 1972, volume 60 part 2, pp. 257-284, lines 14-15, p. 263 should read: "Griswold however thinks Ram Kamhaeng died in 1299 A.D. or 1316 A.D."