

## Where is Rām Khamhāeng's Stupa ? A Consideration of Past and Present Topographical Identifications

As historians know, our knowledge of the far-distant past seldom arrives in a sudden burst of glory, but is more often the result of painstaking research involving the work of many scholars. It is not uncommon, of course, for different scholarly efforts to result in contradictory conclusions, and these bring on those heated debates we find in academic journals--and sometimes in intellectual confrontations of a much more personal sort !

But there is another phenomenon: the historical theory that seems so right and so self-evident that the scholarly world espouses it without question. Reiterated unanalytically for decades--or possibly centuries--historical theory may crystallize into established historical "fact." Sometimes, such a "fact" persists long after new research has cast serious doubts about its validity. And, in some cases, new evidence may even be bent or manipulated so as not to conflict with established opinion.

One example of this crystallization process concerns the identification of the stupa (or Buddhist reliquary monument) documented in the oldest known inscription written in the Thai language. Inscription 1, which describes the thirteenth century Thai city, Sukhothai, under the reign of its best known ruler, Rām Khamhāeng, reports that Rām Khamhāeng built this *stupa* in Sukhothai's sister city, Si Satchanalai.

Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa* was evidently an important one--the only one, in fact, mentioned in the inscription. Similarly, it is the one *stupa* attributed to the Rām Khamhāeng period in Sukhothai's Inscription 2, dating from the middle of the fourteenth century--that is, about one half century after the *stupa* was built. However, neither Inscription 1 nor Inscription 2 gives much detail about the *stupa*'s construction, and we are told nothing at all about its appearance.

What we *are* told is this: (table 1, passage A): that in the year 1285 A. D. Rām Khamhāeng had a relic (*Phra Thāt*) dug up, that "the relic was buried in the middle of Si Satchanalai, and a *chēdī* (*stupa*) was built on top. The *stupa* was finished in six years. A wall of boulders (*phā*) enclosing the *Phra Mahā Thāt* was built, and that was finished in three years".<sup>1</sup>

It should be remembered that the word *thāt* can mean either a relic, or a *stupa* in which a relic is enshrined. *Phra* is an honorific term. *Phra Thāt* in this passage

---

Paper presented at a Symposium on Southeast Asian Art, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, The University of Michigan, March 28, 1987.

obviously refers to a relic (or possibly relics), whereas *Phra Mahā Thāt*, around which Rām Khamhāeng built the wall, could refer to either the relic or the *stupa*. (*Mahā*, of course means "great"). In Inscription 2 (table 1, passage C), the *stupa* is called *Phra Sī Ratana Thāt*,<sup>2</sup> an elaboration of *Phra Thāt*; *Sī*, like *phra* is an honorific term, and *ratana*, meaning "jewel," is yet another term frequently found in the names of Thai *stupas* and relics. We will return to the *Phra Sī Ratana Thāt*, noted in table.1, passage B, below.

Inscription 1's statement that it took six years to build Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa*, suggests a structure of considerable size. Other than that, the only information that helps us to identify the *stupa* is topographical, that is, that the *stupa* was built in the middle of Si Satchanalai.

Si Satchanalai is identified today as a walled area about 50 kms. north of Sukhothai. A dozen or so noted writers have identified Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa* as the monument known today as Chāng Lōm (meaning surrounded by elephants), located at the approximate center of the walled area. (See table 2, cols. 4, 5. In the table, I refer to the walled area as the "hill" area, actually at the foot of the hills). In recent times the hill area and its surroundings have been called "Sawankhalok" --a name that does not appear in the Sukhothai inscriptions.

But let's get back to Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa*. It has been recognized for some time that the walls surrounding this area date from the fifteenth or sixteenth century,<sup>3</sup> that is, some two or three centuries after Rām Khamhāeng is said to have built his *stupa*. Thus the position of the walls cannot indicate where the center of Satchanalai might have been in the thirteenth century or where the *stupa* was built. But this has not deterred those writers who still, on the basis of the topographical reference, proclaim the Chāng Lōm/Rām Khamhāeng identification without question.

Another problem concerning the Rām Khamhāeng/Chāng Lōm identification is that in the past several years some art historians have begun to question a thirteenth century date for the Chāng Lōm *stupa* on stylistic grounds. A fifteenth century date for the *stupa*, as well as for most of the other buildings located within the walled area, has been proposed.<sup>4</sup> But stylistic anomalies have not done much to shake the old Rām Khamhāeng identification. Some writers who admit to the stylistic problems--but who have ignored the topographical uncertainties--have suggested that the Chāng Lōm *stupa* that we see today is a reconstruction that does not adhere to the *stupa's* original design.<sup>5</sup> Thus, in one form or another, the Chāng Lōm identification persists.

Here I am not going to discuss stylistic matters, but, instead, the identification of Inscription 1's "Si Satchanalai". This topographical datum is, after all, the most explicit information we have about Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa*.

One other place name mentioned in Inscription 1 is relevant to our discussion. This second name, "Chaliang," occurs in a passage (table 1, passage B), separate from the one documenting the *stupa* at the center of Satchanalai. But like the Satchanalai

passage, the passage refers to a place, ("Chaliang") at the middle of which a *thāt*, i.e., a *stupa* or relic was located. As in Inscription 2, (table 1, passage C), the *thāt* is called, honorifically, *Phra Sī Ratana Thāt*.<sup>6</sup>

Inscription 1's "Chaliang" (table 2, col.2) is usually identified today as an area nestled in a bend of the Yom River, southeast of the hill area. The "*Phra Sī Ratana Mahā Thāt*" is identified as the large *prāng*, or Khmer-inspired monument situated near the center of the river bend area.

It is also in the river bend that we find the wall generally identified as the one Rām Khamhāeng is reported to have built around the *Phra Thāt* in table 1, passage A. The wall is unique; constructed of large boulders, it is the only wall anywhere that fits Inscription 1's specification of *phā* in the construction.<sup>7</sup> I do not see any reason to question this identification; nor do I know of others who have done so. The wall surrounds the *prāng* identified as the *Phra Sī Ratana Mahā Thāt*--the *Stupa* of the Great Relic.

Inscription 1 does not tell us where Rām Khamhāeng dug up his relic. But the most often expressed scholarly explanation is that he removed it from the *Phra Sī Ratana Mahā Thāt* in the river bend. According to this theory, after digging up the relic and building a new *stupa* (Chang Lōm) to hold it, Rām Khamhāeng built his wall around the site where the relics had formerly been.<sup>8</sup> The theory is cumbersome, and as its proponents admit, it is a little shocking that Rām Khamhāeng would have robbed a *stupa* of its relics.<sup>9</sup> The interpretation is required, of course, if one accepts the present-day identifications of Inscription 1's "Satchanalai" as Sawankhalok's hill area and "Chaliang" as the river bend.

What I will suggest here is that passages A and B and, therefore, "Satchanalai" and "Chaliang," refer, not to two different sites but to one area--the area at Sawankhalok's river bend. As mentioned above, there is no problem with identifying the wall as Rām Khamhāeng's, and although the *Mahā Thāt* that we see today is the product of fifteenth- and eighteenth-century reconstructions, it is commonly thought that its earliest state dates from the Rām Khamhāeng period or earlier.<sup>10</sup>

True, like the names "Satchanalai" and "Chaliang" in the inscription, Sawankhalok's hill and river bend areas suggest two distinct settlements. They are about two km. apart, and each site is centered on its own cluster of ceremonial buildings. However, the two areas are contiguous, and a dirt road lined with small houses, a few shops, and some ancient temple ruins connects the river bend with the hills. Local inhabitants with whom I have talked have no idea where the dividing line between "Chaliang" and "Satchanalai" might be. A Thai chronicle, the *Phongsāwadān Nya*, which dates from the post-Sukhothai period but recounts the legendary history of Satchanalai, notes a temple, Wat Khōk Singkhārām, as having been located in the center of Satchanalai.<sup>11</sup> Wat Khōk Singkhārām is a monastery, situated roughly

half way between Sawankhalok's hill area and the river bend. It is my opinion that the center of Satchanalai at an earlier time was located even farther to the east, i.e. at the river bend. The growth of the settlement from east to west, in this elongated pattern is easily explained by the site's proximity to the river, which forms a natural barrier against expansion in a more conventional manner. Moreover, the area is heavily silted, suggesting that flooding may have necessitated a move away from the river bend to a more protected area.

In order to understand the present-day identifications of "Satchanalai" and "Chaliang" as two separate areas, it is helpful to consider how the distinction came about. The distinction appears to have been made first in the twentieth century.

At the end of the nineteenth century there was little consensus about the location of "Satchanalai," and "Chaliang" had not been identified at all. (See table 2, cols.3, 4.) As late as 1901, Aymonier noted that "Satchanalai" was a forgotten city, its whereabouts unknown.<sup>12</sup> Between 1885 and 1895, Schmitt<sup>13</sup> and Fournereau<sup>14</sup> at various times had identified "Satchanalai" with Kamphaeng Phet (well over 100 kms. to the south) and with Sawankhalok--the identification that would eventually take hold. Aymonier, while admitting that either of these identifications was possible, suggested Sukhothai as a third alternative, and, in the end, concluded that identification was impossible.<sup>15</sup>

In the early twentieth century, things became more certain. In 1906, Vajiravudh, King Rama VI visited Sukhothai and Sawankhalok, and in his *thīeo Mūang Phra Ruang*, published in 1907, explained Sawankhalok's ruins--both at the river bend and the hill area--in terms of references to "Si Satchanalai" in the Thai inscriptions and in the chronicles.<sup>16</sup> At about the same time, in 1907 and 1908, the French archaeologist Lajonquière also visited Sawankhalok and, like King Rama VI, concluded that the extensive ruins could only be the inscriptional "Si Satchanalai." Lajonquière noted that Sawankhalok's inhabitants still referred to the area as "Satchanalai" and that at least one nineteenth century map referred to the area by that name. Understandably, when he published his conclusions in 1909 and 1912, he questioned why the Sawankhalok/Satchanalai identification had not been made much sooner.<sup>17</sup>

But, although in the first decade of the twentieth century the Satchanalai/Sawankhalok identification was well-established, the identity of Inscription 1's "Chaliang" was still unknown. In 1909, the same year that Lajonquière published his conclusions, Bradley, quoting the most renowned of Thai historians, Prince Damrong, suggested that Chaliang had been located at Mūang Lōng, near Kakhon Sawan, some 200 kms. south of Sawankhalok.<sup>18</sup> Thus, with "Chaliang" not yet in the picture, historians, like Sawankhalok's inhabitants, still considered the hill and river areas one entity. In 1906 King Rama VI suggested the lotus-bud stupa known as *Chēdī Chet Thāeo*, just east of Chāng Lōm, in the hill area, as Rām Khamhāeng's stupa.<sup>19</sup>

Lajonquière, in 1909 thought Rām Khamhāengs *stupa* was the large octagonal *stupa* just west of the Phra Sī Mahā Thāt, at the river bend.<sup>20</sup>

As far as I have been able to determine, it was not until the 1920s that “Chaliang” came to be associated with Sawankhalok. The first reference I have found is in a lecture that Reginald Le May presented to the Siam Society in 1924 (published in *JSS* in 1925).<sup>21</sup> Le May, like Bradley, quoted Prince Damrong. According to Le May, Prince Damrong now thought that Inscription 1’s “Chaliang” was an old name for Sawankhalok before Satchanalai was founded (not located at Mūang Lōng, as he had previously thought). But as far as I know, Prince Damrong’s theory was not published in full until 1944, twenty years after Le May’s lecture, (and, sadly, a year after the Prince’s death). It was during those previous twenty years that scholars began to chop Sawankhalok (locally called “Satchanalai”) into two parts and call one part “Satchanalai,” the other “Chaliang”.

In Prince Damrong’s 1944 book, *Nithān Bōrānkhādī*, he would explain “Chaliang” and “Si Satchanalai” on the basis of a meticulous study of Thai chronicles and inscriptions. Prince Damrong’s research disclosed that the chronicles, which (unlike the Sukhothai inscriptions) date from the post-Sukhothai period, all refer to either “Satchanalai” or to “Chaliang”—never to both. The inclusion of one name or the other in connection with other Thai place names in the chronicles led to the conclusion that both “Chaliang” and “Satchanalai” referred to the same place—Sawankhalok. Furthermore, Prince Damrong concluded that “Si Satchanalai” was not only a newer name than “Chaliang,” but also an official, honorific one (*khruang pradap phra kīat yot*) coined by Rām Khamhāeng.<sup>22</sup>

If the theory is correct, then it would not be surprising for the old popular name, “Chaliang,” to continue in use long after the new, official name had been devised. Nor is it improbable that, in different contexts, both names could have been used in the Sukhothai inscriptions to refer to the same place. Who of us has not vacillated at times between “Ceylon” and “Sri Lanka”; “Cambodia” and “Kampuchea”; or “Siam” and “Thailand” ! Although “Satchanalai,” the official name, was the name most often used in the inscriptions dating from the Sukhothai period, three inscriptions, nos. 1, 2, and 38, refer to both “Satchanalai” and “Chaliang.”<sup>23</sup>

But in the twenty years between the time Le May first quoted Prince Damrong’s theory (in 1924), and the time that it was explained in full (in 1944), the scholarly bisection of Sawankhalok into “Satchanalai” and “Chaliang” had been performed.

Paradoxically, this turn of events can be traced to Prince Damrong himself. In 1926, just two years after Le May gave his lecture, Prince Damrong published his well-known *Tamnān Phra Phuttha Chēdī*, one of the most widely-read and widely-quoted works ever written on Thai history. In the *Tamnān*, Prince Damrong attempted

to trace the history of Buddhism in Thailand back to the religion's founding in India in the sixth century B.C. His concern here was with the broad sweep of history--with India, Sri Lanka, and Burma--not with the minutiae of place names in Sukhothai inscriptions.

Describing the spread of Theravada Buddhism from Sri Lanka to Siam, Prince Damrong noted the similarity between what is considered Sri Lanka's most important Buddhist monument, the Mahāthūpa, and Sawankhalok's Chāng Lōm *stupa*.<sup>24</sup> Both are dome-shaped monuments and both are surrounded by statues of elephants. In the 1920s, Sukhothai art was considered to be much older than we now think, and Sawankhalok's hill area was considered contemporary with Rām Khamhāeng. In the context of Indian and Sinhalese architectural history, the Chāng Lōm *stupa* must have seemed a natural selection for the most important religious monument of the Rām Khamhāeng period. It was also in the *Tamnān Phra Phuttha Chēdī* that Prince Damrong--again, without reference to the complexities of place names--identified Inscription 1's *Phra Sī Ratana Thāt* at "Chaliang" with the *prāng* surrounded by Rām Khamhāeng's wall at the river bend (passage B).<sup>25</sup> The last two chapters of the 1926 *Tamnān Phra Phuttha Ōhēdī* (which contain the Chāng Lōm/Mahāthūpa comparison) have been published in English twice--in 1962 and in 1973.<sup>26</sup> The first seven chapters, which deal with the history of Buddhism before it was introduced into Siam--and which places the Chāng Lōm identification in the proper historical perspective--have not been translated into English. Nor has the 1944 *Nīthan Bōrānkhadī*, in which Prince Damrong's explained his old name/new name theory. Beginning in the 1940s, a comparison between Sri Lanka's Mahāthūpa and the Chāng Lōm *Stupa* has been included in most western-language works on Thai art.<sup>27</sup> The visual analogy between the two monuments has done a lot, I think, to establish--irrationally--the firm Chāng Lōm/Rām Khamhāeng identification.

Today we must challenge the identification. As noted above, recent art historical studies suggest that it was the river bend area, not the hill area, that was contemporary with Rām Khamhāeng. The monument identified by Prince Damrong as Inscription 1's *Phra Sī Ratana Thāt*, or Temple of the Great Relic, is the logical choice for Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa*. Since a thirteenth century date for the early state of the monument is not disputed,<sup>28</sup> the identification resolves stylistic controversies. And no longer is it necessary to believe that Rām Khamhāeng robbed the *Phra Mahā Thāt* of its relic. The identification reunites Rām Khamhāeng's relic, wall, and *stupa* at the same site.

Before I close, Piriya Krairiksh's recent research (table 2, line 25) should also be mentioned. Dr. Krairiksh, like me, considers the *Mahā Thāt* in Sawankhalok's river bend to be Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa*.<sup>29</sup> But our opinions about "Chaliang" and "Satchanalai" are surprisingly different.

According to Dr. Krairiksh, Inscription 1 is a fabrication dating from the

post-Sukhothai period: thus, it cannot tell us anything about Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa* (or about anything else, for that matter).<sup>30</sup> And (although Chaliang is mentioned in two fourteenth century inscriptions--one referring to it as a large city),<sup>31</sup> Dr. Krairiksh contends that "Chaliang" did not flourish until late fifteenth century. Thus, he thinks that Rām Khamhāeng's "Chaliang" can only refer to Sawankhalok's hill area, which other scholars call "Satchanalai". And "Satchanalai" for Dr. Krairiksh is the river bend, which other scholars call "Chaliang".<sup>32</sup>

So, in spite of my agreement with Dr. Krairiksh about chronology and Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa*, I must end my paper with controversy. Given the disputed authenticity of Inscription 1, the controversy is a major one, its resolution crucial to any real understanding of early Thai history. But the consensus about Rām Khamhāeng's *stupa* is heartening. Whether or not the river bend *Mahā Thāt* identification will ever entirely supplant the old Chāng Lōm theory only time can tell.

*Betty Gosling*

Visiting Scholar, Horace Rackham  
School of Graduate Studies,  
The University of Michigan

#### TABLE 1

##### Inscriptional Reference to Rām Khamhāeng's *Stupa*

Passage A: Inscription 1, side 4, lines 4-8.

(In 1285) "he caused the *Phra Thāt* to be dug up so that everyone could see it. The *Phra Thāt* was worshipped for a month and six days, and was buried in the middle of the city/country of *Si Satchanalai*. A *chedī (stupa)*, was built on top of it, and the construction took six years. A wall of boulders (*phā*) was built around the *Phra Mahā Thāt* and that was finished in three years".

Passage B: Inscription 1, side 3, lines 22-23.

"There is an inscription in the city/country of *Chaliang*, erected by the *Phra Si Ratana Thāt*".

Passage C: Inscription 2, side 1, lines 36-37.

"A son of *Phā Khun Si Indradit* named *Phā Khun Rāmarāja*....built *Phra Si Ratana Thāt* in the middle of *Si Satchanalai*".

TABLE 2

## Identification of "Chaliang," "Satchanalai," and Rām Khamhæng's Stupa

Source	Date	"Chaliang"	"Satchanalai"	RK Stupa
Schmitt <sup>1</sup>	1885-1894	doesn't know	Kamphaeng Phet, Sawankhalok	
Fournereau <sup>2</sup>	1895		Kamphaeng Phet	
Aymonier <sup>3</sup>	1901		not sure, maybe Sukhothai	
Vajiravudh <sup>4</sup>	1907		Sawankhalok	C. Chet Thæo (hill)
Bradley <sup>5</sup>	1909	M̄jāng L̄ōng* (nr. N. Sawan)	Sawankhalok	
Lajonquière <sup>6</sup>	1910 1912		Sawankhalok river bend & hill	octagonal stupa (river bend)
Coedès <sup>7</sup>	1920		river bend	octagonal stupa (river bend)
Le May <sup>8</sup>	1924/5	Sawankhalok (old name)*	river bend & hill (new name)*	
Coedès <sup>9</sup>	1924	riverbend*	hill*	
Wood <sup>10</sup>	1926	river bend & hill		
Damrong <sup>11</sup>	1926	river bend	hill	Chāng L̄ōm (hill)
Claeys <sup>12</sup>	1931	river bend	hill	
le May <sup>13</sup>	1938		hill	Chāng L̄ōm
Coedès <sup>14</sup>	1944		Sawankhalok	Chāng L̄ōm
Damrong <sup>15</sup>	1944	river bend (old name)	river bend hill (new name)	
Coedès <sup>16</sup>	1956	river bend	hill	Chāng L̄ōm
Griswold <sup>17</sup>	1967	river bend		
Boisselier <sup>18</sup>	1975	river bend	hill	Chāng L̄ōm
Chand <sup>19</sup>	1976	Sawankhalok	hill and surroundings	Chāng L̄ōm
Gatellier <sup>20</sup>	1978	river bend	hill	Chāng L̄ōm
Subhadradis <sup>21</sup>	1979	river bend	hill	Chāng L̄ōm**
Promsak <sup>22</sup>	1979		river bend & hill	Chāng L̄ōm
Stratton Scott <sup>23</sup>	1981	river bend	hill	Chāng L̄ōm
Van Beek, Tettoni <sup>24</sup>	1985	river bend	hill	Chāng L̄ōm
Woodward <sup>25</sup>	1985		hill	Chāng L̄ōm**
Krairiksh <sup>26</sup>	1985 1986	hill	river bend	Mahathat (river bend)
Gosling	1987	river bend & hill (old name)	river bend & hill (new name)	Mahathat (river bend)

\* Prince Damrong quote.

\*\* Perhaps in an earlier form.

**ENDNOTES:**

1. Griswold and Prasert, EHS 9, pp.201, 217.
2. Griswold and Prasert, EHS 10, pp.93, 112.
3. Griswold, *Towards*, p.57; Srisakra, "Tribura," pp.22-24. The remains of older, earthen walls can still be seen west of the hill area. (Subhadradis, *Sukhothai Art*, p.147.)
4. Krairiksh, "Evidence," p.14. See also Gosling, "History," chap.4.
5. Subhadradis. *Sukhothai Art*, p.155. Woodward, "Plans," pp.23-5.
6. Griswold and Prasert, EHS 9, pp.201: 215.
7. Griswold, *Towards*, p.11.
8. Griswold, *Towards*, p.10-11.
9. Griswold, *Towards*, p.10; Van Beek and Tettoni, p.111.
10. Coedès, "Première Capitales," p.258; Van Beek and Tettoni, *Arts of Thailand*, p.111; Griswold, *Towards*, p.57; Krairiksh, "Evidence," p.14; Subhadradis, *Sukhothai Art*, p.189.
11. Notton, *Légendes*, p.17.
12. Aymonier, *Le Cambodge*, pp.69, 100.
13. Quoted in Aymonier, *Le Cambodge*, pp.69, 100.
14. Fournereau, *Le Siam Ancien*, pp.157-8.
15. Aymonier, *Le Cambodge*, p.69.
16. Vajiravudh, Rama VI, *Thieo*, chap.12.
17. Lajonquière, "Essai," p.85; "Domaine," p.202.
18. Bradley, "Writing," p.59.
19. Vajiravudh, Rama VI, *Thieo*, p.178.
20. Lajonquière, "Domaine," p.205.
21. Le May, "Visit," p.73.
22. Damrong, *Nithan Borankhadi*, pp.354-7. I am grateful to Bonnie Brereton for calling my attention to this work.
23. Inscription 1 (1292 A.D.): see note 1, above Inscription 2 (c.1345 A.D.): see note 2, above. Inscription 38, (1397 A.D.): Griswold and Prasert, EHS 4, pp.120-45.
24. Damrong, *Tamnan*, pp.124-5.
25. Damrong, *Tamnan*, p.120.
26. *A History of Buddhist Monuments in Siam* Bangkok, 1962; *Monuments of the Buddha in Siam*, Bangkok, 1973.
27. For instance, see Coedès, "Première capitales," p.261; Griswold, *Towards*, p.10; Stratton and Scott, *Sukhothai Art*, p.39.
28. See note 10 above.
29. Krairiksh, "Evidence," p.14.
30. Krairiksh, "Sinlapa," pp.29-30.
31. Inscription 2 and Inscription 38. See note 23 above.
32. Krairiksh, "Evidence," p.14.

**Notes to Table 2**

1. Quoted in Fournereau, *Le Siam Ancien*, pp.157, 239 and in Aymonier, *Le Cambodge*, p.100, n.1.
2. *Le Siam Ancien*, pp.157-8.
3. *Le Cambodge*, pp.69, 100.

4. *Thieo*, p.178.
5. "Writing," pp.23, n.1; p.59.
- 6.. "Origines," p.243, n.1.
7. "Origines," p.243, n.1.
8. "Visit," p.73.
9. *Recueil*, p.47, n.1.
10. *History*, p.87, n.1.
11. *Tamnan*, pp.120, 124.
12. *Archéologie*, p.410.
13. *History*, p.122.
14. *Histoire*, pp.256, n.2.
15. *Nitan Borankhadi*, p.357.
16. "Capitales," pp.258, 261.
17. *Towards*, pp.2, 10.
18. *Heritage*, pp.128, 130, 140.
19. *Guide*, pp.75, 80, 88.
20. "Stupa," pp.181, 199.
21. *Sukhothai Art*, pp.147, 148, 155.
22. *Thai Art*, p.85.
23. *Art of Sukhothai*, pp.12, 36.
24. *Arts of Thailand*, pp.107, 110, 111.
25. "Plans," pp.23-5.
26. "Evidence," pp.14; "Sinlapa," p.30.

### Works Cited

- Aymonier, Etienne. *Le Cambodge*, vol.2. Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1901.
- Boisselier, Jean. *The Heritage of Thai Sculpture*. New York and Tokyo, Weatherhill, 1975.
- Bradley, Cornelius Beach. "The Oldest Known Writing in Siamese: The Inscription of Phra Ram Khamhaeng of Sukhothai: 1293 A.D." *JSS* 6.1 (1909): 1-68.
- Chand, Mon Chao Chirayu Rajani. *Guide through the Inscriptions of Sukhothai*. Southeast Asian Studies Working Paper, No.9. Honolulu, The Southeast Asian Program, University of Hawaii, 1976.
- Claeys, J.Y. "L'Archéologie du Siam." *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 31 (1931): 361-448.
- Coedès, George. *Histoire ancienne des États-hindouistes d'Extrême-Orient*. Hanoi, Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient, 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les Origines de la dynastie de Sukhodaya." *Journal Asiatique* 15.2 (1920): 233-45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les premières capitales du Siam aux 13e-14e siècles." *Arts Asiatiques* 3.4 (1956): 243-67.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam*. Vol. 1: *Inscriptions de Sukhodaya*. Bangkok, Bangkok Times Press, 1924.
- Damrong, Prince Rajanubhab. *Nithan Borankhadi*. Bangkok, 1944.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tamnan Phra Phuttha Chedi*. Bangkok, 1926.
- Fournereau, Lucien. *Le Siam Ancien*, Part 1. Annales du Musée Guimet 27. Paris, 1895.
- Gatellier, Marie. "Le Stupa et son décor à Ceylan; son influence en Thailande et en Bermanie." *Artibus Asiae* 40.2 (1978): 177-203.
- Gosling, Elizabeth. "The History of Sukhothai as a Ceremonial Center." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan. Ann Arbor, University Microfilms International, 1983.
- Griswold, A.B. *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*. Bangkok, Fine Arts Department, 1967.

- Griswold, A.B., and Prasert na Nagara. "Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No.4 A Law Promulgated by the King of Ayudhya in 1397 A.D." *JSS* 57.1 (1969): 109-48.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No.9. The Inscription of Rama Gamhen of Sukhodaya (1292 A.D.)." *JSS* 59.2 (1971): 179-228.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Epigraphic and Historical Studies No.10. King Lōdaiya of Sukhodaya and His Contemporaries." *JSS* 60.1 (1972): 21-152.
- Krairiksh, Piriya. "New Evidence from Lan Na Concerning the Development of Early Thai Letters and Buddha Images." *The Siam Society's Newsletter*, 1.3 (1985): 8-14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sinlapa Haeng Daen Nermamit: (Sinlapa Sukhothai Rawang 1750-1900)," *Muang Boran Journal* 12.1 (1986): 23-49.
- Lajonquière, L. de "Essai d'inventaire archéologique du Siam." *Bulletin de la Commission Archéologique de l'Indo-chine*, 1912. pp.12-182.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "La Domaine archéologique du Siam," *Bulletin de la Commission Archéologique de l'Indochine*, 1909. pp.188-262.
- Le May, Reginald. *A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam*. London, Cambridge University Press, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Visit to Sawankalok." *JSS* 19.2 (1925): 63-82.
- Notton, Camille, trans *Légendes sur le Siam et le Cambodge*, vol.4. Bangkok, Imprimerie de l'Assumption, 1939.
- Promsak Jermsawatdi. *Thai Art with Indian Influences*. New Delhi, Abhinav Publications, 1979.
- Srisakra Vallibhotama. "Tribura." *Borankhadi* 7.1 (1977): 12-24.
- Stratton, Carol, and Scott, Miriam McNair. *The Art of Sukhothai: Thailand's Golden Age from the Mid-thirteenth to the Mid-fifteenth Centuries*. Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Subhadradis Diskul, M.C. *Sukhothai Art*. Bangkok, Cultural Committee of the Thailand National Commission for UNESCO, 1979.
- Vajiravudh, King Rama VI of Siam. *Thieo Muang Phra Ruang*. Bangkok, 1907.
- Van Beek, Steve, and Tettoni, Luca Invernizzi. *The Arts of of Thailand*. Hong Kong, Travel Publishing Asia, Ltd., 1985.
- Wood, W.A.R. *A History of Siam*. Bangkok, 1926.
- Woodward, Hiram W., Jr. "Monastery, Palace, and City Plans: Ayutthaya and Bangkok." *Crossroads* 2.2 (1985): 23-60.