



# ON RICE AND RICE FIELDS IN OLD LĀN NĀ\* TEXT, TRANSLATIONS, INTERPRETATIONS

Hans Penth

## Abstract

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

## 1. Introduction

The staple food of Lān Nā ล้านนา “Region of a Million Rice Fields”<sup>1</sup> was and is rice. While preparation, irrigation and use of rice fields lay in private hands, their evaluation (assessment) for taxes and their administration was an important

---

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

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

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

Numbers in texts from old Lān Nā can be baffling; for instance: “The (construction) costs were 6,000 silver” สิ้นเงิน 6,000 พัน (1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523). “The Nā Thai field of 100 measures seed-rice” /นาไร่ 1001 ไร่/ (1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498).

<sup>1</sup> The oldest known Thai document to mention the name is a stone inscription from Chiang Khòng on the Mā Khōng River, dated 1554 (Penth 1980 The Toponym Lān Nā; Penth 1988 Inscr. Wat Chiang Sā 1553). However, the toponym must be much older than that because it appears already on European maps at least since 1448, spelled /Llana/ on the Leardo map of that year, and /lanna/ on Behaim's globe of 1492 (Suárez 1999 Early Mapping: 107).

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

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

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

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

<sup>2</sup> To mention only two Lān Nā law texts, rendered in Thai transcription and English translation: (1) Prasöt 1971 Mang Rāi Sāt (Thai text) and Griswold / Prasöt 1977 Judgments (the first 20 articles in English); (2) Arunrat / Wijeyewardene 1986 Laws of Mang Rāi (Thai text and English translation).

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

An example from Phayao for 1474: “(Prince Yuthisathian, the former ruler of Phitsanu Lōk who emigrated to Phayā Tilok and was made governor of Phayao, converted his beautiful residence Bān Nong Tao into a monastery.) He paid the king via Mün Chāng Pū Kām 2,000 silver pieces stamped “5 Chiang Mai” as price for the *ārāma* property” เอาเงินลาย 5 เชียงใหม่ 2,000 ไปให้เจ้าหมื่นช้างปู่กาม ถวายแก่พระเป็นเจ้าให้เป็นค่าอาราม (1.5.1.1 Bān Nong Tao 1474). The silver money used here probably were *khā khīm* ชาคิม silver pieces.

or never make their (in principle obligatory) morning rounds for alms.<sup>4</sup> Monasteries even “owned” villages and collected tax from them.<sup>5</sup>

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

In terms of the country’s overall administration, in Ayuthayā, at least in theory, rice field administration was under central control. Already early Ayuthayā had, among its 4 principal ministers and their departments, *krom* กรม,<sup>6</sup> one called *krom nā* นา “Department for wet rice fields”, or “paddy fields”, which was headed by the *khun nā* ชุนนา and which was responsible for rice fields and other agricultural affairs. Lān Nā did not have such a central institution. Its rice fields and rice probably were supervised more from local levels.

In terms of “ownership” and use of fields, in Lān Nā there may have been three kinds of fields. (1) Crown property, i.e. fields that were directly under the king and his immediate family.<sup>7</sup> (2) State property, i.e. fields that belonged to the *müang* เมือง “country”. They were attached to the position of appointed governments officials, and their usufruct, or part of their produce, formed a part of the official’s rank and income (“official fields”). (3) Ordinary fields, “owned” and worked by private citizens. The exact difference between crown and state property is unknown and perhaps was somewhat fluent. Crown property fields and state property fields (*nā khum* นาขุม “rent field”)<sup>8</sup> were rented out to private individuals. There were no permanent or official state farmers.

<sup>4</sup> For instance Wat Sī Sawāng in A. San Pā Tōng, Chiang Mai province.

<sup>5</sup> For instance, in 1495 Wat Lī near Phayao “had 6 villages since of old” บ้านกับวัดมีแต่โบราณ 6 บ้าน (1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495; see also below in footnote 20).

<sup>6</sup> These four departments, or ministries, were collectively called *jatusadom* จตุสดมภ์ “the four pillars”. The four ministers were known as: *Khun Müang* ชุนเมือง “Minister of General Country Affairs”, *Khun Wang* ชุนวัง “Minister of Palace Affairs”, *Khun Khlang* ชุนคลัง “Minister of the Treasury”, and *Khun Nā* ชุนนา “Minister of Rice Fields and Agricultural Affairs”.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. “H.M. the king of Chiang Mai granted royal fields to this monastery” (follows a list of fields) สมเด็จพระเจ้าเมืองปิง เชียงใหม่ มีราชเขตทั้งหลาย อันกฎหมายไว้กับอารามอันนี้ (1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492).

<sup>8</sup> The exact meaning and usage of the word *khum* ขุม present difficulties. It is usually understood as “pit, mine, a hole from which something desirable can be extracted; to exploit”. But for practical purposes it is often convenient to translate it as “for rent, rental, to rent”.

With few exceptions, for all fields a tax or rent had to be paid. Newly opened fields were tax exempt for some years.<sup>9</sup>

There were, and still are, two basically different kinds of fields.

(1) Wet rice or paddy<sup>10</sup> fields, *nā* นา (seldom P. *khetta* เขตต, T. *khet* เขต; or Sk. *kṣetra*, T. *kaset* เกษตร). The origin of the word *nā* is unknown but it seems to be common to most if not all Thai dialects. The fields are usually arranged in groups, one field or plot adjoining the next, separated from each other by low earth walls, *khan nā* คันนา. Individual fields or plots were counted with the help of the classifier *rai* ไร่ “a plot of field”, for instance นา 3 ไร่ “3 plots wet rice fields”. In central Thailand also the word *krathong* กระทง “vessel” was used and there is now the common classifier for a single plot, *krathong nā* กระทงนา, the word *rai* in this sense having fallen in disuse.

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

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

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

<sup>9</sup> This is attested from several old law codices; cf. Art. 11 in Prasöt 1971 Mang Rāi Sāt: 6, and Griswold / Prasöt 1977 Judgments: 152.

There may have been other cases of exemptions, with details as yet unknown, because an inscription of 1500 from Nān mentions *nā bia* นาเบี้ย “cowry fields”, i.e. “taxable fields”, implying that there must have been tax exempted fields (1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500).

<sup>10</sup> From Malay *padi*: “(1) rice as a plant in the field; (2) rice in the ear; (3) rice in the husk, unhusked rice”.

When reading of *rai*, therefore, one must decide whether an upland field, the classifier for a wet rice field, or the modern surface measure is meant.

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

In Old Sukhōthai, fields either were measured geometrically, i.e. their length and width were indicated by the linear measure *wā* วา,<sup>11</sup> or they were counted in individual plots, *rai* ไร่.<sup>12</sup> An amount of rice was indicated, not in weight, but in measures of capacity such as *sat* สัด<sup>13</sup> and cart, i.e. cartload, *kwian* เกวียน, P. ratha.<sup>14</sup> Field taxes, *ākōn* อากร, were determined in cowries, *bia* เบี้ย,<sup>15</sup> and were due annually.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> An example from Sukhōthai in 1399: “(The queen mother gave) a field which was 400 *wā* (byāma) long and 200 *wā* wide” *khettaṃ catusatabyāmaṃ āyāmena viṭṭhārato* (sic) *byāmasatadvayantassa* (inscr. # 93, Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, 1399+).

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

<sup>12</sup> For example: “(The king) donated 400 *rai* (“plots of paddy fields”) to the monastery” / โทนาโว กบ็อาราม 400 ไร่/ (inscr. # 49, Wat Sōrasak, Sukhōthai, c.1418).

<sup>13</sup> For example: “5 *sat* for the *sāmaṇeras* and 10 *sat* for the monks” / เจาสรามเนรหาสัด เจาภิกขุสลิบสัด/ (inscr. # 49, Wat Sōrasak 1418, Sukhōthai). - One *sat* was appr. 20 liters or 16 kg of husked rice.

<sup>14</sup> For example: “She (the queen mother) gave 100 fields amounting to (= with a yield of) 10 carts” / ท่าน ประดิศถา นา ร้อย นึ่ง เปน เข้า ลิบ กาย(น)/ (inscr. # 93, Asokārāma 1399+, Sukhōthai, face 1).

From the same inscription, face 2, but with reference to a different monastery: “(The queen mother) donated 25 cart(load)s of rice per year to the people in the monastery,” *pañcaviśāraṭhāvīhi āyāmārāmikānañca anuvassaṃ adāpayi*.

<sup>15</sup> For example: “Nāi Sōrasak asked (the king) for taxes (and was granted those) of 4 plots ... altogether 40,000 cowries” นายสอรลักดี้ออกรได้ 4 ที่ ... ทั้งหมดเป็นเบี้ย 40,000 (inscr. # 49, Wat Sōrasak, Sukhōthai, c.1418).

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

<sup>16</sup> Cf. “(she donated fields with) taxes consisting of 25 carts of rice at the beginning of each year” อากรข้าว 25 เกวียน ทุกรุ่งปี (inscr. # 93, Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, 1399+).

In Old Lān Nā, ordinary plots of land could also be measured in length and width, often using the *wā*,<sup>17</sup> but likewise by specifying borders, or using a combination of both,<sup>18</sup> though sometimes in an abbreviated or imprecise manner.<sup>19</sup> However, rice fields do not seem to have been measured. Their physical dimensions, i.e. their size, hardly were of interest. I cannot remember one instance in which the *wā* or another measure was used to indicate the size of a rice field. Occasionally, they were counted as individual plots, *rai* (or *rai müang*).<sup>20</sup> Rather, the size of a field was indicated by the amount of seed-rice needed. In the hilly North with its often odd-shaped wet rice fields, application of a linear measure, such as the *wā*, to indicate the size of a field, would indeed have been difficult if not impossible. Rice was measured in capacity, for instance in certain baskets, but

<sup>17</sup> Here are 3 examples. An inscription of 1617 from Chiang Sān describes the donation of a betel nut (areca) plantation or garden: “presented (the monastery) with an areca plantation at Bān Chum Sāng, long 34 *wā* (60 m), wide 15 *wā* (26 m)” ไร่สวนหมาก (ที่) บ้านชุมแสง กว้าง ยาว 34 วา กว้าง 15 วา (1.4.1.1 Wat Phā Khāo Pān 1617).

An inscription of 1489 from the former Müang Òi, 40 km north of Phayao in the border area of the provinces Chiang Rāi and Phayao, describes the donation of a salt field and a forest: “(Mün Thòng, governor of Müang Òi,) gave a salt-village (to Wat Mahā Wan). (The salt field was) long 40 *wā* (70 m), wide 40 *wā*. He also donated a forest, Pā Lāo, to this monastery, long 150 *wā* (260 m), wide 150 *wā* ไร่บ้านเกลือกับ (วัดมหาวัน) (นาเกลือ) ไร่ 40 วา กว้าง 40 วา ไร่ป่าอัน 1 ชื่อป่าลาว อัน กับวัดนี้ ไร่ 150 วา ลวงกว้างได้ 150 วา (1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Wan 1489).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. the description of the compound of Wat Chiang Sā at Chiang Khòng on the Mā Khòng river (Yuan: Mā Khòng): “In the east the Mā Khòng is the border, in the west 50 *wā* (from the river), in the north and south the (agricultural lands of) villages are the border” (ทางตะวันออก (แม่น้ำ) ของ (น้ำ) ขรอง/ เป็นแดน (ทางตะวันตก) 50 วา หนใต้ หนเหนือ เขตบ้านเป็นแดน (1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the vague description of the premises of Wat Lī, Phayao, in 1495: “Jao Sī Mün of Phayao (Yuan: Phayāo) had stones brought and set up to mark the land of the (monastery) compound (gāmakhetta) which has a circumference (?; parimaṇḍala) of 700 *wā*” เจ้าสีหมื่นพะยาว ท้าวเอาหินมาฝัง กดหมายที่ดิน ท้าวเป็นคามเขต ปริมาณพลได้ 700 วา (1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495).

<sup>20</sup> Here are two examples:

“200 plots of paddy field (*rai*)” นา 200 ไร่ (1.4.1.1 Mahā Thāt Chiang Lā 1611).

“The Lower Watgate field, 6 plots (*rai*), (of a size that needs) 12 (measures of) seed-rice /นา แห่งลุ่ม 6 ไร่ 12 เซา/ = นาแดงลุ่ม 6 ไร่ 12 ข้าว (1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lō 1498).

also in weight, particularly the *mün* หมิ่น, lit. “10,000”, or appr. 11 kg. Field taxes in Lān Nā were due annually<sup>21</sup> and usually were accounted in cowries.<sup>22</sup>

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

Making donations in one form or another to holy sites is an old Theravāda custom. Already king Asoka of north India (r. appr. 273 - 235 B.C.) recorded on a pillar erected at Lumbinī, the Buddha’s birthplace, that he had a stone image of Mayā (?) made, a stone pillar erected, and that he exempted the village of Lumbinī from imposts and granted it the eight rights.<sup>23</sup>

Making donations of fields, persons, etc., to a monastery also is an old Theravāda tradition; field donations are said to have begun around 100 - 50 B.C. in Lankā.<sup>24</sup> In Lān Nā such donations are attested since pre-Thai times, for instance in a Mon inscription of 1218 from Lamphūn.<sup>25</sup> The oldest known donation of a field made by a Thai dates from 1411 in the Phayao region,<sup>26</sup> and the last from 1611 from a place north of Chiang Rāi,<sup>27</sup> followed in 1617 by an areca garden at Chiang Sān.<sup>28</sup> This does not mean that after c. 1600-1650 no more donations were made but they certainly became less frequent and finally probably stopped as Lān Nā continued to be occupied by the Burmese until their final forced withdrawal took

<sup>21</sup> Cf. a passage in the Chronicle of Chiang Mai which refers to the years around 1290: “(King Mang Rāi) ordered to designate the districts in which to collect the rice field taxes in cowries (for Wat Kān Thōm): each year 620,000 cowries for the monks’ food in the district of Jām and 500,000 cowries for the administrators (?) in the district of Chā Chāng” ให้อภัยแขวนเก็บเบี้ยค่านาปีไหน 620,000 เบี้ย เป็นค่าจ้งหัน แขวงแจม 500,000 เบี้ย เป็นค่ากิน แขวงแซ่ซ้าง (CMA. N: 53; HPms: 2.8R; W: 39; U: 31).

Also other taxes were due annually. In 1495 the two salt-producing villages of Wat Lī near Phayao had to send annual taxes in kind: “The village Bān Nòng Sūng Nūa ... sends 3,500 weight of salt per year” (c. 3.8 kg); the village Bān Chāng Tai sends 2,500 (weight of) salt per year” (c. 2.7 kg) บ้านหนองสูงเหนือ มงคล ... ส่งเกลือ ขวบ 3,500 น้ำ บ้านซ้างใต้ ... ส่งเกลือ ขวบ 2,500 (1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495).

An example for (resinous) oil in 1493 from the environs of Phayao: “(They shall bring lamp) oil ... (as a gift of) worship for the (principal) Buddha image in the monastery ... 10,000 weight units, every year (c. 11 kg)” น้ำมัน ... บูชาพระเจ้าวัด ... 10,000 น้ำ จูปี (1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mün 1493).

<sup>22</sup> Here is one rare exception: “(In 1375 Phayā Kū Nā) donated rice fields as food for the relic (in Wat Suan Dòk, Chiang Mai) with a (tax) value of 10,000 silver ... until the end of the 5,000 years” (พญาเกือนา) ตั้งนาไว้ให้เป็นจ้งหันแก่พระธาตุเจ้านั้น หมิ่นเงินหนึ่ง ... ต่อเท่าศาสนา 5000 ปี (MS.PN: 211).

<sup>23</sup> Falk 1998 The Discovery of Lumbinī: 15-20.

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

<sup>25</sup> 1.3.1.1 Wat Kū Kut 1218.

<sup>26</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.

<sup>27</sup> 1.4.1.1 Mahā Thāt Chiang Lā 1611.

<sup>28</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phā Khāo Pān 1617.

place between 1775 and 1804. King Kāwila (r. 1782-1816) who is known to have made many donations no longer included fields. But in other regions of Thailand such donations seem to have continued sporadically, for instance in 1808 in Ubon.<sup>29</sup>

In Lān Nā as well as in central Thailand, wet rice fields (hardly ever upland fields),<sup>30</sup> plantations, persons and other items, usually were donated to monasteries in order to provide them with a steady supply of food, income, and labour. Often a donation was not made to the monastery as a whole but to individual receivers in the monastery, for instance to the main Buddha image,<sup>31</sup> to the *jedī* (cetiya, stūpa), the *bōt* (uposatha premises and building), or to the monks as a group.<sup>32</sup>

Before fields and persons (slaves) could be donated, they had to be selected and their choice had to be administratively processed. The administrative term for this procedure was *tāng* แต่ง “to organize”. To make a donation was called “to place with” *wai kap* ไว้กับ,<sup>33</sup> seldom “to give to” *hū kap* ให้ออกกับ.<sup>34</sup> As one inscription of 1497 from Phayao refers to this procedure, “he ordered to organize fields and persons and to place them with this monastery” ให้ออกแตงนากับคนไว้กับวัดนี้.<sup>35</sup>

These donations were meant to be an annual contribution towards a monastery’s subsistence and, in a more general way, to strengthen, *khamchū* ค้ำชู “prop up”, the Buddhist religion. They were not limited in time for a certain number of years. In principle, they were irreversible and were meant “for ever”, i.e. until the end of Buddhism which was thought to occur 5000 years after the death

<sup>29</sup> 2.3.1.1 Wat Pā Luang 1808.

<sup>30</sup> I cannot remember having read of an upland field or *rai* being donated to a monastery.

<sup>31</sup> An example from a Phayao monastery in 1411: “The king and the royal mother poured water on the earth (to show their sincerity) and donated rice fields of 975 measures seed rice, and 11 villages, to the Buddha image” นา 975 ช้างนี้ บ้าน 11 บ้านนี้ มหาราช มหาเทวี หยาดน้ำ โยทาน ให้แก่พระเจ้า (1.5.1.1 Wiang Kao Phayao 1411).

The *wihān* with the monastery’s principal Buddha image is regarded as similar to, or a replica of, the living quarters of the Buddha. Hence it is an act of merit to provide for a steady supply of food for the image. In actual fact, the monastery handles the distribution of this “Buddha rice”, as it also handles the rice that is donated to the *jedī* and other sacred objects, as food to be used for the monastery’s inhabitants.

<sup>32</sup> For example: “(He donated) fields with 400,000 cowries (tax), of which 200,000 were for food for the Buddha image and 200,000 for food for the monks in this monastery” นา 400,000 เมี้ย ไร่เป็นข้าวพระพุทธรเจ้า 200,000 เมี้ย ไร่เป็นจ้งหันชาวเจ้ายังอารามนี้ 200,000 เมี้ย (1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497).

See also below in section 5, Donation Packages.

<sup>33</sup> For instance: “He asked (the king) for rice field (taxes) to be donated to the Buddha image” ขอนาไว้กับพระเจ้า (1.3.1.1 Dòì Jam Tham 1502). Incidentally, Sukhōthai used the same expression: “The mahāthera asked (the king) for rice field (taxes) to be donated (allocated) to the *ārāma*” พระมหาเถรขอนาไว้กับอาราม (inscr. # 49, Wat Sōrasak, Sukhōthai, c.1418).

<sup>34</sup> For instance: “(The king) gave paddy fields to Wat Chiang Sā” ให้ออกแตงกับอารามวัดเชียงสา (1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554).

<sup>35</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.

(Nibbāna) of the Buddha.<sup>36</sup> That idea was often expressed in inscriptions, albeit in an abbreviated manner which may puzzle a modern reader who is not familiar with the underlying ideas that (a) the Buddhist religion will last for a total of 5000 years counted from the death (Nibbāna) of the Buddha, and that (b) the donation in question is meant to assist the religion from the day the donation was made until the end of the 5000 years.

For example, an inscription of 1489 from a monastery near Chiang Mai says, when reporting on a donation of persons: “All of them in this group, also their children and grandchildren, are to be in the service of the Buddha image of this monastery, (with the generations) following each other until the end of the Religion (after its) 5000 years” เขาทั้งหลายผู้นี้ กับทั้งลูกทั้งหลายเขา หือเป็นอุปลฐากแก่พระพุทธเจ้าในอารามที่นี้ สืบๆ กันไป ตราบต่อเท่าสิ้นศาสนา 5000 ปี.<sup>37</sup> Similar an inscription of 1529 in Phrā: “(The King of Chiang Mai ordered the Prince of Phrā) to place 5 families and fields of 1,000 measures seed-rice with the (main) Buddha image of Wat Bupphārām, until (the end of the Religion after its) 5000 years” ไร่คน 5 ครว้นา 1,000 ข้าว กับพระพุทธเจ้าวัดบุพพาราม ต่อเท่า 5000 วรรษา.<sup>38</sup> Even a small donation helped to make the Religion shine: “(they founded this little wooden Buddha image) in order to make (the Religion) flourish (until the end of its span of) 5,000 years ไร่ โชตกะ 5000 วรรษา.<sup>39</sup>

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

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

In Lān Nā it was thought that the Buddha himself had established his religion for 5000 years. An inscription of 1492 from Chiang Mai says: “Lord Buddha Śrī Sākyamunī Gotama established his religion to last for 5000 years” พระพุทธศรีสากยมุนีโคดมเป็นเจ้า ประดิษฐานศาสนาไว้ 5000 ปี” (1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492).

An inscription from Phayao, in the same year, accepts the figure of 5000 years and uses it for a dating of its own: “In (C.S.) 854, since the Buddha went to Nibbāna - they give the Religion 5000 years - there have now passed 2037 years, and there are still to come 2963 years, in the year Tao Jai” ศักราชได้ 854 ตัว แต่พระเจ้านิพพานไปแล้ว ยังไว้ศาสนา 5000 ปี อันพ้นไปได้ 2037 ปี อันยังจักมา 2963 ปีเท่าใจ (1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām Khòi Sum 1492). This kind of indicating a date, viz. counting the years elapsed and the years still remaining to make a total of 5000, is at the base of the various post-Nibbāna eras (“Nibbānasakkarāja”), such as the Buddhasakkarāja (B.S.) พุทธศักราช (พ.ศ.) now in use in Thailand.

<sup>37</sup> 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489.

<sup>38</sup> 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529.

<sup>39</sup> 1.2.2.2 Wat Dòk Kham 1783.

There were no title deeds to confirm the ownership of land and probably no documents attesting to someone's right to use a certain plot of land. Major donations, because they affected tax income, presumably were recorded in the appropriate office, where persons worked whose titles included the words *nangsü* หนังสือ “document, record”.<sup>40</sup> But in general there probably was little “paperwork”. People of the local community knew who owned what. In the case of monasteries, where monks came and went, i.e. were ordained and often left the Order after some years, government officials, respected local citizens such as doctors, ex-monks and even persons without apparent distinction, all male, acted as witnesses who “knew”, *hū* (rū) รู้. This was no mere formality; on occasion they had to testify even before an official investigator sent by the king himself.<sup>41</sup>

In order to better assure the continuity of donations, and to make known the name of a generous donor, donations and witnesses were listed (*tām* ตั้ม “written”, *tòng* ต่อง “inscribed) on specially prepared flat, ogee-shaped stone slabs or on square stone pillars (*hin*, *lak*, *selā*, *semā*, *sīmā* หิน, หลัก, เสลา, เสมา, ลีมา). The inscribed stones were set up in the monastery that received the donation, usually in public view at the jedī (stūpa) or in the wihān, but sometimes in the ubōsot (uposatha hall) where access was restricted to monks and selected laymen only.<sup>42</sup> The texts (*jārik*, *jārik*,

<sup>40</sup> Literally, “leather (*nang*) with writing (*sü*) on it”. The expression meant also “message, note” and now means “book”.

<sup>41</sup> See for instance below in the section *Rice Field Administrators*: In about 1530 the king sent an official with the title *phan nangsü tāng müang* to Phayao in order to investigate an incident in which the local witness Sān Khāo Jòm testified.

<sup>42</sup> In 1520 Wat Sī Köt, now a nearly vanished ruin a few hundred meters downstream from the Mä Ngat dam north of Chiang Mai, received such an exception: “The (two) Sān (Khāo) had this stone inscription (recording the donations) set up in the uposatha hall of Wat Phra Köt เจ้าแสนที่อึ้งจาวรัตน์ไว้ในอุโบสถวัดพระเกิด (1.2.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1520).

*jārük*, *jārit* จารึก, จารึก, จารึก, จาริด)<sup>43</sup> of the inscriptions were composed or supervised by officials. Stone inscriptions (*hin jārük*, *selā jārük* หินจารึก, เสด็จจารึก lit. “stone with text”)<sup>44</sup> were official documents. They were charters or patents, documentary evidence that attested to old or new donations. Also their inscribing and setting up (*fang hin jārük* ฝังหินจารึก, mostly shortened to *fang jārük*, *fang jārit* ฝังจารึก, ฝังจาริด lit. “to plant the (stone with) text”) was supervised by “the police”, *dāp rüan*,<sup>45</sup>

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>44</sup> In pre-Thai times, in 1219, the Lamphūn Mon used the expression/*selālekḥ*’, *selālekḥa*/ “stone (with) inscription” (1.3.1.1 Wat Dòn 1219). That goes back to P. *lekha* “writing, inscription, letter”, in Old Mon *lekh*’ “writing, written record” (Shorto 1971 Dic. Mon Inscriptions).

<sup>45</sup> For example: “Mün Yā Dāp Rüan ordered *dāp rüan* officers to come here and to set up (the stone inscribed with) the donation charter” เจ้าหมื่นญา ดาบเรือน ที่อชวท้าวดาบเรือนมาฝังจาริด (1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488).

or by other state officials.<sup>46</sup> If they became damaged, they could be copied on new stones.<sup>47</sup>

The acquisition of a suitable stone, *hin* หิน (occasionally spelled /หริน)/, and the engraving of the text seem to have been taken care of privately and locally and presumably were regarded as an act of merit. One inscription from Sukhōthai mentions the name of the man who supplied the stone and the name of another who was the engraver, or who sponsored or supervised the engraving.<sup>48</sup> But usually neither the supplier of the stone, nor the author nor the scribe of the text are mentioned.<sup>49</sup>

The time from the day when the donation was made, until the erection of the donation inscription, usually was not long. Here is an example. On 5 August 1495 Phayā Kāo and his mother were jointly consecrated ruler (the prince was only 12 or 13 years old). Thereafter the queen mother donated gold to gild a newly-made, big Buddha image and re-assigned the old monastery slaves and servants to include the new image in their work. The image was inaugurated on 28 December 1495, and the inscription was set up on 26 June 1496; obviously by then everything had been carried out as requested.<sup>50</sup> By the way, the shortness of this intermediate span of time, is the reason why historians usually accept the last date of an event

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

(After a monk had transferred the merit for constructing the monastery to the Mahā Thewī, mother of the king, she) ordered a charter for this monastery (which was to indicate its property: premises of 27 x 60 *wā*; and 4 families of slaves) ... Lām Mūn Suwan and Mūn Nōi Kham, the lawyer, received the words of the Mahā Thewī and had the charter issued (and set up on stone) so that the monastery will be secure until the (end of the) 5000 years of the Religion ที่มีจารีตกับอารามนี้ ... เจ้าลำหมื่นสุวรรณ, เจ้าหมื่นน้อยคำคดี หากรับคำมหาเทวีเจ้า ที่อึ้งจารีตอันนี้เพื่อวัดอารามอันนี้ มันต่อเท่าศาสนาพระ(พุทธ)เจ้า 5000 ปี (1.3.1.1 Weluwan Ārām 1488).

Here is how, in 1496, a stone inscription from a monastery in the Phayao region describes the setting up of this inscription, after the king of Chiang Mai, Phayā Kāo, had donated taxes from fields and people to a monastery: “Sān Kalyāna, Mūn Lām Nā Hōrāthibodī (and) Phan Nangsū Tāng Mūang Sī Mangkhala received the king’s order to come here, write (“chisel”) the inscription and to set (the charter) up, (to last) until the end of the Religion” เจ้าแสนกัลยาณะ เจ้าหมื่นลำนา โหราธิบดี (และ) เจ้าพันหนังสือต่างเมือง ศรีมังคละ รับอาญาพระเป็นเจ้า (ที่) ที่อึ้งจารีต (และ) ฝังไว้ต่อเท่าสิ้นศาสนา (1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496).

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

<sup>48</sup> Inscr. # 14 Wat Khemā, Sukhōthai, 1536.

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

<sup>50</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Sī Sutthāwāt 1496. The monastery still exists; it is in Wiang Pā Pao, about 90 km north of Chiang Mai on the way to Chiang Rāi.

mentioned in an inscription, as the date of that inscription, in case the date of the execution of the inscription is not expressly mentioned.<sup>51</sup>

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

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

On occasion, presumably because of serious infractions, a later royal order reconfirmed earlier donations. For instance in 1496, in the Phayao region, a direct royal order<sup>55</sup> reconfirmed in detail, with the consent of the assembled local authorities, donations which had been made as long as 85 years ago and whose particulars had been laid down in an earlier inscription in the year 1411.<sup>56</sup>

Some cases concerning slaves, and not only re-dedications, are rather curious. In 1554, Phayā Mā Ku gathered the descendants, 22 families, of the original 40 families of four white-clad ascetics who had been donated to the reliquary Phra Thāt Dòì Nòì (between San Pā Tòng and Jòm Tòng, Chiang Mai province) by Nāng Jām Thewī.<sup>57</sup> Since the Mon queen Jām Thewī presumably ruled Lamphūn in about 750 A.D., 800 years would have elapsed between the original dedication and the re-confirmation !

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

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

<sup>53</sup> เจ้าไท้ผู้ใดมากินเมืองนี้ อย่าเอาออก แด (1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Wan 1489).

Another example, already mentioned, uses the word *katikā*: “Do not let the covenant (concerning the donation) be cancelled, do not let it be neglected nor revoked (and the donations) given to some other use” อย่าให้อถวยกติกา อย่าให้ออดก ที่ถอนไปไหน (1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554).

<sup>54</sup> โฟอย่าเอาออก พิผู้ใดเอาออก ที่มันตาย ตกอวีจันรก (1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523).

<sup>55</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Kham 1496.

<sup>56</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.

<sup>57</sup> 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554).

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

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

Mentioned together with a donation of fields can be a donation of people, sometimes simply called “person”, *khon* คน, but often more to the point, “(bond-) slave, bondsman, servant”, *khā* ข้า. Or else they could be counted as “family”, *khrua* ครัว, or “house(hold)”, *rüan / hüan* เรือน; in such case the family head was named (it could be a woman), and sometimes the dependents were listed.

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

<sup>58</sup> For instance: “Whoever comes to administrate Müang Òi ... do not disturb any of them” ผู้ใดมา กินเมืองออย ... อย่ากลัวเกล้าเขาสักคน (1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Wan 1489).

<sup>59</sup> For instance: “(Future) princes and nobles (who will administrate this country), do not disturb (the 10 donated families in their work for the monastery), do not order them to do any kind of public work” เจ้าขุนผู้ใด อย่าได้กลัวเกล้า ใส่การบ้าน การเมือง แก่เขาสักอัน (1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496).

“Local administrators are in no case permitted to employ (the 22 families donated to the service of the reliquary) in warfare or for public work” อย่าท้อ ขุนปก ขุนแคว้น ใส่การศึก การเวียง สักอัน (1.2.1.1 Jula Khiri 1554).

<sup>60</sup> For example: In 1513 the governor of Müang Òi donated a large plot of land to the main Buddha image of a monastery. In an inscription he exhorted his successors: “Whoever in future will be the lord to come and govern the country, ... do not revoke nor disturb (my donation)” เจ้าไทผู้ใดมา กินเมืองเมือลูน ... อย่าเอาออก อย่ากลัวอย่าเกล้า แต่ (1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513).

<sup>61</sup> For example: “Do not take away the persons and the *nā kluai* rice field(s) of 30 measures seed-rice (which were donated to the Buddha image)” อย่าเอาคนกับนากล้วย 30 ช้าวนี้ ออก (1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491 (2)).

<sup>62</sup> For example: “Concerning the merit I made in donating land to this Buddha image, may the merit (go to and) make vastly prosper both their Majesties, mother and son” ด้วยบุญอันกุศลที่แก่ พระพุทธเจ้านี้ บุญอันนี้จึงจำเริญแก่พระเป็นเจ้า แม่ลูกทั้งสอง จงหนัก (1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513).

A brief survey of pious Buddhist wishes and their historical development is in v. Hinüber 1996 Chips: 47 ff.

public duties, such as corvée etc., was not towards a prince etc., but had been transferred to a monastery.<sup>63</sup>

Slaves in Lān Nā kept a considerable amount of personal freedom, which had to do with the reason why they had become slaves. Very broadly speaking, there were two kinds of slaves, “real slaves” and “honorary slaves”. I shall disregard here the scholastic view of some *thammasāt* (dharmaśāstra) that there are five kinds of slaves<sup>64</sup> or even seven kinds with many sub-categories<sup>65</sup> because in Lān Nā these theoretical divisions were hardly applied in daily life.

Many, perhaps the majority of the “real slaves”, were persons who had borrowed money, *ngön* เงิน “silver”, from individuals or from a monastery (whose wealth could be used much as a bank loan today),<sup>66</sup> had gone bankrupt, and had become a money-slave, *khon ngön* คนเงิน “a man (who owes) silver”, of the creditor.<sup>67</sup> It was customary that the borrower’s person with or without his immediate

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

<sup>64</sup> For instance MRS.CKcy.A+W: 48f/109f, Art. 66.

*Thammasāt* (dharmaśāstra) “the knowledge about what is naturally right and proper” is a general appellation for the former Northern law collections, or law codices, of which there were a great many local varieties. Originally presumably a codified blend of traditional Thai and Indic elements, the later versions added Burmese and Ayuthayā elements. They were replaced during the decades around 1900 by modernized Bangkok law which became the sole law for the entire country.

<sup>65</sup> See for instance Lingat 1931 Esclavage privée: 293-296.

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

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

<sup>67</sup> Here is an example from the Phayao area in the years around 1485: “Formerly a family, the family of Āi Hao Kham Ling, had borrowed and not paid back (*kin* กิน eaten up) 500 silver from the Buddha image. Phò Nòi, the *phan nā rüan*, poured water and donated them as slaves to the Buddha image (of Wat Pā Mai in Wiang Lò)” แต่ก่อน คนครัว 1 ชื่อ อ้ายเหาคำหลิง ครัว 1 กินเงินพระเจ้า 500 พันนาเรือน ฟ่อน้อย หยาดน้ำไว้เป็นข้าพระ (1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497).

At the time, becoming a money slave was so common that the famous Burmese / Mon law codex, the *Dhammavilāsa Dhammasattha*, contains the restriction: “Monks and Brahmans are not allowed to become slaves, even if they need money and offer themselves as slaves.” (Nai 1992 Dhammasāt Texts: 589.)

family served as collateral or bond. If he defaulted on his payments, he as collateral could be seized and made to work for the creditor as a money-slave or bondsman. The law even said that he had to sell himself.<sup>68</sup> If another person bought the debt, *thai* ไถ่,<sup>69</sup> from the original creditor, this money-slave changed creditors, or masters; likewise, if the bond-slave did not fancy his present master, he could persuade another person to buy his debt. If he himself saved enough money (which he could do since he had much freedom for personal activities), he could pay back his debt and thus redeem himself. If his creditor donated him to a monastery, he became a “person donated as alms (dāna)” or “donated person”, *khon sin thān* คนสินทาน. The buying out of a monastery slave, or his own self-redemption, seems to have been difficult and exceptional,<sup>70</sup> and a monastery slave with his offspring tended to stay permanently bonded. Still, his (her) status offered advantages; for instance, he could not be conscripted for public or the prince’s work (corvée), could not be displaced, i.e. taken away from his particular religious site and duties, and even enemy armies would be reluctant to move him abroad as war booty.<sup>71</sup>

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

<sup>68</sup> “(If the debt cannot be repaid) the debtor shall sell himself (as debt slave)” / ผู้กู้หนี้ที่ขายตัวมัน เสาเทือะ/ (MRS.CKcy.A+W: 31 / 95 (Art. 29)).

<sup>69</sup> The usual translation of *thai* ไถ่ with “to redeem” in this context is not appropriate because the person was not freed of his debts; he and his debts were merely transferred to a new creditor.

<sup>70</sup> Here is one such rare example: around 1525, a person only identified as phayā พญา “prince, ruler”, paid a monastery in Phayao the sum of 300 silver because the slave woman of the monastery’s Buddha image, who by then was around 40 years old, had taken up service with a son of that person (1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng c. 1530).

<sup>71</sup> Here is an example. In 1567 Queen Wisuttha Thewī of Chiang Mai donated five villages in three forests and the revenue of the entire region to the service of a monastery that carried her name, Wat Wisutthārām. The villagers were not to be used for outside or public work (1.2.3.1 Wat Wisutthārām 1567; a silver-foil document with the royal seal). The monastery still exists under the same name and is located in Bān Pā, north of Hōt near the Mā Ping.

In 1632 King Sutthō Thammarācha of Burma (i.e. Thalun; HP) waged war at Fāng, Chiang Mai and Lamphūn. He ordered to send the inhabitants of the five villages to Burma. The villagers maintained that they were protected from displacement by a written command from Queen Wisuttha Thewī. King Sutthō, upon seeing the document with the royal seal, acknowledged its validity and allowed the villagers back to the service of Wat Wisutthārām as before (Kraisī 1984 Kep phak sai sā: 129, quoting from an old palmleaf document in Bān Thung near Wat Wisutthārām). I have not seen that palmleaf ms. But there is a somewhat less factual and more chatty version of the Sutthō episode on pp. 7.1 - 20.4 in a palmleaf manuscript that the Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University, borrowed from Mr Kraisī Nimmānhemin in 1990 and microfilmed as no. 90.166.03 023-023 in the same year.

“debt persons” and *khon yin dī* คนยืมดี “voluntary persons”.<sup>72</sup> Even ranking government officials and other socially better placed persons could be debt slaves as well as or honorary slaves.<sup>73</sup>

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

## 2. The Rice Field Specification Formula

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

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

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

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

*Nā* นา - Name - 25 - *Khāo* ข้าว - (*Nā* นา - Name) - *Khā* ค่า - 5,000 - *Bia* เบี้ย - Location  
i.e.

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

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

That basic formula is:

*Nā* นา - 25 - *Khāo* ข้าว - *Khā* ค่า - 5,000 - *Bia* เบี้ย  
i.e.

<sup>72</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496.

<sup>73</sup> See below in the section *Donation Packages*: Wat Phan Tòng Tām, 1488.

Field - 25 - Seed Rice - Tax - 5,000 - Cowries  
or in full

“A field (of a size that requires) 25 (measures) seed-rice  
(with an annual) tax of 5,000 cowries.”

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

นา 25 ข้าว ค่า 5,000 เบี้ย

Example: นา 30 ข้าว ค่า 9,000 เบี้ย

“A field of 30 measures seed-rice with a tax of 9,000 cowries.”<sup>74</sup>

นา 25 ข้าว ค่า 5,000 ♦

Example: นา ... 21,685 ข้าว พิจะ(นับ)ข้าวเป็นค่า ว่าได้ 4,686,000<sup>75</sup>

“A field ... of 21,685 measures seed-rice; (the harvest return from) the seed-rice calculated as tax amounting to 4,686 000 cowries”.<sup>76</sup>

นา 25 ข้าว ♦ 5,000 ♦

Example: นา 20 ข้าว 5,000

“A field of 20 measures seed-rice with a tax of 5,000 cowries”.<sup>77</sup>

นา 25 ข้าว ♦♦♦

Example: นา 975 ข้าว

“A field of 975 measures seed-rice”.<sup>78</sup>

นา ♦♦♦ 5,000 เบี้ย

Example: นา 82,000 เบี้ย

“A field with a tax of 82,000 cowries”.<sup>79</sup>

นา ♦♦♦ 5,000 ♦

Example: นา 500,000

“A field with a tax of 500,000 cowries”.<sup>80</sup>

<sup>74</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513.

<sup>75</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.

<sup>76</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wiān 1411.

<sup>77</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479.

<sup>78</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wiang Kao Phayao 1411.

<sup>79</sup> 1.4.1.1 Dòì Tham Phra 1484.

<sup>80</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

## ◆ 25 ข้าว ◆◆◆

Example: 500 ข้าว

“A field of 500 measures seed-rice”.<sup>81</sup>

The elements of the formula denote the following details.

The first element, *nā* นา, is “field” in general, here “field for growing wet rice, paddy field”. The word can also mean other “fields”, for instance *nā klüa* นาเกลือ “salt field”,<sup>82</sup> and it is also used in the abstract sense as in *nā bun* นานบุญ “a field of merit”, meaning a continuous occasion to make merit, such as a monastery which one supports. But here, obviously, it means a wet rice or paddy field.

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

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

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

Even today a northern farmer will not ask, “how large is this field?” but, “how much seed-rice is needed for this field?” The Yuan, as the Khün, the Lü and the northern Lāo, did not measure the surface in terms of length and width<sup>83</sup> but in terms of seed-rice needed. The often curved, winding and terraced fields indeed would be nearly impossible to measure using a linear system such as the wā.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>81</sup> Context: “Jao Sī Mūn Phayāo ... wished to donate food to the Buddha image, (ricefields of) 500 measures seed-rice” เจ้าสีหมื่นพยาว ... ใคร่ร่กเป็นเงินจ้งหันแก่พระพุทเจ้า 500 ข้าว (1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yòt 1412).

<sup>82</sup> Brine from underlying rock-salt evaporates on the surface of the soil, turns into a thin layer of salt, is raked together and then, by dissolution in water and renewed evaporation (boiling, *tom klüa* ต้มเกลือ “to cook salt”), is processed into edible salt.

<sup>83</sup> “De nos jours, les Lu’ comme les Laotiens ne mesurent pas les rizières.” (Rispaud 1937 Les noms: 110; similarly Guignard 1912/1971 Dict.: LIII.)

<sup>84</sup> Also in Old Europe linear measures were hardly used to indicate the size of a field. Here the amount of ploughing that could be done in one day served as indicator. Cf. for instance German *Tagwerk*, i.e. the area ploughed in one day, or *Joch*, the surface that a team (Joch) of oxen could work in a day, c. 35 - 70 Ar “are”, or between 3,500 and 7,000 sqm.

According to a Phayao chronicle,<sup>85</sup> reporting on the time when Phayao was founded, about 1000 years ago according to tradition, the first ruler decreed that “each person was to work (a) rice field(s) with 50,000 (or 5 *mün*) rice-seed”, คนโทนหื้อเยีย นา 50,000 ข้าวเชื้อ. This amount of 5 *mün* rice-seed per person (c. 55 kg) is a modern-time amount for a surface manageable by one person. It is therefore possible that the whole passage only projects the situation from the time the author wrote, back into the past. But at least it shows that when that chronicle was written or re-composed, perhaps in the nineteenth century, the author took for granted that also in the old days the surface or size of a rice field was determined by the amount of seed needed.

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

“I shall explain the matter of the traditional dry rice fields (*rai*) at Thā Ò.

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

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

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

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

ตามโบราณ อันจักแก้ไรทำอ้อ มีสันนี้.

(1) ไรหนึ่ง หลัง 1 เลี้ยงข้าวเชื้อ บุง 1 ดังอัน, เซาพันเบี้ย, ยากผู้จัด 400 เบี้ย.

(2) กันเลี้ยง ยัง 1, เซา 400 เบี้ย, ยาก 200 เบี้ย.

(3) กันเลี้ยงเชื้อ แยก 1, เซา 200 เบี้ย, ยาก 100 เบี้ย.

คำบับ คำสอ บ่มีในยากนั้น.<sup>88</sup>

<sup>85</sup> PAY.WSB.

<sup>86</sup> One can also understand that the 400 cowries commission fee are included in the tax: “... the tax is 1,000 cowries, 400 (of which) are commission fee for the tax-collector.” Similarly in the two following instances.

<sup>87</sup> One could perhaps also understand, “No writing fee is imposed for that commission-work,” i.e. the tax collector himself is to bear the expense for the stationery used to record the taxation.

<sup>88</sup> A palmleaf ms called “History of Chiang Rāi and Chiang Sän” หนังสือพื้นเมือง เชียงราย เชียงแสน of Wat Methangkarāwāt, A. Müang, Phrä; SRI microfilm 81.088.05.081-083, p.39. - Also in “Chronology of royal Princes in the Lān Nā Country” ลำดับราชกุลวงศาในเมืองล้านนา, a palmleaf ms of Wat Pong Sanuk Tai, T. Wiang Nüa, A. Müang, Lampāng, SRI microfilm 81.069.09.083, p.92-94. - I have added punctuation to the Thai text.

That seed-rice was meant by the old scribes was already recognized in 1959 by Cham Thòngkhamwan when he published an inscription of 1500 from Nān. The inscription records two donations of fields to a monastery, viz. นา ... 10 ข้าว and นา ... 50 ข้าว. He commented in two nearly identical footnotes that here 10 (50) measures of seed rice were meant, and that the unit of measure was the *tāng* ต่าง : “10 (50) ข้าว = 10 (50) ต่าง คือจุกข้าวปลูกที่ใช้หว่านหรือดำมีจำนวน 10 (50) ต่าง.<sup>89</sup>

Neither this nor other inscriptions name the unit for measuring the seed-rice. But it is unlikely that it was the *tāng* ต่าง. The word *tāng*, in central Thailand as well as in the North, means “pack-saddle” (usually a frame with woven containers hanging down on either side of the pack animal, with a connecting bridge at the top), also the “packs” or the “load” thus carried, or “to carry by pack-animal”. The word also seems to have been used as a rather rough measure of volume or weight in overland transportation by caravan, “one animal load”. But though occasionally the word may have been used as a measure,<sup>90</sup> it certainly was not a standard measure of capacity or weight for Lān Nā’s rice farmers.

It is therefore probable that not *tāng* ต่าง was meant but perhaps the similar-sounding Yuan word *tāng* ต่าง, spelled /ตาง/ in Yuan texts, which in Lān Nā was a common measure of volume for rice, beans, etc.

In theory, according to certain old text books, the *tāng* ต่าง basket held 525,000 grains of rice.<sup>91</sup> Evidently, this was not of much practical value. 1,000 grains of unhusked, glutinous rice weigh c. 34 grams, or c. 0.034 kg.<sup>92</sup> In other words, 1 kg has about 29,412 rice grains. The *tāng* ต่าง mentioned here would therefore theoretically have contained c. 17.8 kg, or about 34.5 liters.

On the more practical side, I was told by elderly upcountry farmers and merchants, that the old Yuan *tāng* ต่าง basket was equal to 1 old *mün* หมื่น “10,000” in weight in the case of unhusked glutinous rice (other items have different ratios between volume and weight). Since one old weight unit (the name is never mentioned) was about 1.1 gram,<sup>93</sup> 1 *mün* was about 11 kg, i.e. one old *tāng* ต่าง basket

<sup>89</sup> 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500. In: Cham 1959 Jārük Wat Chāng Kham C.S.862: n.11, 14; Cham 1965 Lak thī 72: n. 11, 14.

Also other authors on occasion state that the unit was the *tāng* ต่าง; for instance Prasān Bunprakhòng and Prasöt na Nakhòn when they published inscr. 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497. See Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārük Wat Sī Umōng Kham: n.19; Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 101: n.19.

<sup>90</sup> Among all the dictionaries I consulted, only Phrāphithayā 1964 Dic.: 552 (s.v. ต่าง) said that *tāng* ต่าง could also mean a measure, for instance ข้าวห้าต่าง “5 *tāng* of rice”; but the dictionary had no details.

<sup>91</sup> See for instance: *Khana Panja 5 Jamphuak* “Die 5 Methods of Measuring”.

<sup>92</sup> Weighed by myself.

<sup>93</sup> I weighed several old Buddha images with inscriptions that indicated both their date and the amount of bronze used. Cf. Penth 1994 Jinakālamālī Index: 320.

contained about 11 kg of glutinous, unhusked rice. Further, one liter of unhusked, glutinous rice weighs c. 515 grams, or c. 0.515 kg.<sup>94</sup> Therefore, 1 kg of rice equals c. 1.94 liters. Thus, one old *tāng* ตั่ง basket would have held about 11 kg or 21 liters of rice.

It is remembered that in the decades around 1900 new standard weights were introduced from Bangkok.<sup>95</sup> The reason given was to standardize various old measures and to set a standard exchange rate with the metric system, in particular the liter and the kilogram. The new standard *tāng* ตั่ง (ต่างหลวง “royal *tāng*, standard commercial *tāng*”) for rice was 1.3 kg. At the same time the old *mün* was increased from 10,000 units of weight to 12,000, i.e. from 1.1 kg to 13.2 kg, which was rounded off to 13.5 kg. This caused much confusion between the old weights and the new weights that still had the old names. There were variations in the *tāng* from one locality to the other.<sup>96</sup> In the 1960s, the *tāng* as a rice measure was supposed to hold exactly 20 liters (as I was told), and similar data are found in dictionaries.<sup>97</sup> For Old Lān Nā, these data have to be used with caution.

As for the *mün* weight unit, it was commonly used in Old Lān Nā when referring to weight, also for the weight of rice. There is, for instance, the passage in the Chronicle of Chiang Mai which states for the year 1566: “Rice was very expensive. One *mün* cost 50 silver.”<sup>98</sup> It is therefore possible that seed-rice was measured in *mün*.

To sum up: We do not know what unit of measure the Old Lān Nā rice farmer used for his seed-rice. With present knowledge, there is a choice between several baskets, for instance the *bung*, *yāng*, *yāng*,<sup>99</sup> and the *tāng*, and the weight *mün*. Their correspondence with modern metric measures is only approximately known.

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

Whatever the unit for measuring seed rice, the amount of seed-rice needed was an approximate indicator of the size of a rice field, and also of a person’s or of monastery’s wealth; but much depended on the fertility of the soil, which varied considerably.<sup>100</sup> Most fields seem to have needed between 12 and 100 measures of seed-rice.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>94</sup> Weighed by myself.

<sup>95</sup> A law that regulated weights and measures was passed in 1923 (Credner 1935 / 1966 Siam: 385)

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Manī 1982 Dic.: 85 who mentions local variants between 13 - 14 - 15 kg.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. Purnell 1963 Dic.: 98; Udom 1991 Dic.: 1.494.

<sup>98</sup> CMA.NL: 20; N: 167; HPms: 5.24R; W: 122, U: 96.

<sup>99</sup> I have not been able to find out how many kg of rice will fill them.

<sup>100</sup> See below in section 7, *Some Rice Field Statistics: Field Fertility*.

<sup>101</sup> See below in section 7, *Some Rice Field Statistics: Fields and their Seed-Rice*.

On a few occasions the seed-rice or *khāo* figures were much higher which would indicate extended field possessions, hence considerable wealth. Here are two examples. One instance, of 21,685 *khāo*, has already been quoted above as an example for an abbreviated form of the formula: “(The king of Chiang Mai, Sām Fang Kän, r.1402-42) gave the monastery Phra Suwanna (Mahā) Wihān rice fields for 21,685 measures of seed-rice; if one assesses (the fields for) this seed-rice in terms of (field) taxes, these amount to 4,686,000 (cowries)” ให้นำแก่พระสุวรรณวิหาร มีประมาณ 21,685 /เขา/ พิจจะ(นับ) /เขา/ เป็นค่า ว่าได้ 4,686,000 (เบี้ย).<sup>102</sup> The other example is somewhat dubious. The text seems to say that a man at Lampāng in 1504, Nāi Yī, owned fields of 10,000 measures seed rice and bought from this funds seven families for 2,810 silver: นายยีมีข้าว 10,000 ในนี้ไถ่คนไว้ 7 ครัว เป็นเงิน 2,810.<sup>103</sup>

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

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

<sup>102</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.

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

<sup>103</sup> 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504.

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

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

Or else he owned a stock of rice of 10,000 weight units which he sold to buy the slave families.  
<sup>104</sup> Because of similarities in spelling and meaning, it is perhaps possible that this word *khā* (spelled <sup>1</sup>gā คำ) is related to, or is an abbreviated form of, Pāli *bhoga* “enjoyment, possession, wealth; revenue- or tax-owing”, for instance of a village (cf. PED s.v. *bhoga*), or *bhogā* “the produce taxes of certain lands” (Geiger 1953 *Culav. Transl.* (1) : 16. n.4, referring to an episode in which *Culav.* tells of a donation of taxes, made in around 380 by King Buddhādāsa of Langkā to the monks of the Mahāvihāra).

<sup>105</sup> For *chao* เซ่า with *mai ek*, cf. “(The king) assigned land to Wat Chiang Sā, in Bān Nāng Jan Village, Bān Chiang Sā Village, (and in) Bān Kōng Kāo Village. Altogether it had a rent value (“tax”) of 81,800 cowries; (he also allowed) wax and *khīng* (= ?) for Wat Nāng Jan with a rent-value (“tax”) of 1,250 of weight” ที่เขตกับอารามวัดเชียงสา ในบ้านนางจัน บ้านเชียงสา (และใน) บ้านกองแก้วทั้งมวลมี (ค่า) เซ่า (/เซ่า) 81,800 เบี้ย (ค่า) เซ่า (/เซ่า) ฟึ่งกับคิง ต่อวัดนางจัน มี 1250 น้ำ (1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554).

For *chao* เซา without the *mai ek*, see above the quotation of tax examples from Thā Ò in the Chiang Sān area.

lier taxes and their technical terms obsolete.<sup>106</sup> Since not only wet rice fields, *nā*, were taxed, but also upland fields on hills and mountain slopes, *rai* ไร่, whether used for hill rice<sup>107</sup> or other crops, the farming taxes levied on both types were collectively called *khā rai khā nā* ค่าไร่ ค่านา.<sup>108</sup>

The fifth and sixth elements of the formula indicate that these taxes were due, or were calculated, in *bia* เบี้ย “cowries”, in inscriptions mostly spelled เบี้ย. The figures mentioned here are much higher than the figures for seed-rice. If, on occasion, the formula is used in such an abbreviated form as to make it doubtful whether seed-rice or taxes are meant, it can be helpful to remember that a modest figure usually means seed-rice, and a large figure, taxes in cowries. The range of taxes in terms of cowries, as far as I know, was between 2,500 and 2 million, even nearly 4.7 million *bia*.<sup>109</sup>

Little is known about how field taxes were actually collected. But it is on record that in 1443 a change occurred. From then on, rent or taxes (*sua* ส่วย, *chao* เชา) had to be paid to the administrator of the locality (*jao khwān* เจ้าแคว้น), and the Crown collected the taxes from these local administrators.<sup>110</sup> The change suggests that previously taxes perhaps had been paid more directly to the Crown. Also, it is probable that the rice field tax, though calculated in “money”, often was paid in kind, i.e. in rice; this was done until the nineteenth century, as older people remember.<sup>111</sup>

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

(1) Field with tenant or owner.

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

<sup>106</sup> Cf. *Prakat ngoen kha na tra daeng prot hai tang khang*, a proclamation allowing delayed payment of certain paddy taxes for the year 1864, as quoted in v. Mehren / Sawers 1992 *Revitalizing*: 54 n.37.

<sup>107</sup> For a tax levied on a *rai* planted with rice, see above the quotation of tax examples from Thā Ò in the Chiang Sān area.

<sup>108</sup> CMA.N: 35; HPms: 1.22V; W: 28, U: 22.

<sup>109</sup> See below in section 7, *Some Rice Field Statistics: Rice Field Taxes*.

<sup>110</sup> CMA.N: 105; HPms: 4.4R; W: 76, U: 61.

<sup>111</sup> An example dating from 1808 in Ubon in the Northeast: “Whoever comes to work ricefields on this donated land, if he harvests 1 cart load (of rice), collect 1 *thang* ถัง bucket as field tax; if 2 cart loads, 2 *thang*” คนผู้ไ้ผู้หนึ่งมาเฮ็ดนาในดินโอกาสที่นี่, ฝิว่าได้เกวียน 1 ให้เก็บค่าดินถั่ง 1. 2 เกวียน (เก็บ) 2 ถั่ง (2.3.1.1 Wat Pā Luang 1808).

dispossessed and possibly could not have survived, (2) the monastery would have to find persons to work the field, (3) this arrangement, donating the tax to the Religion, brought merit to the king.

(2) Field without tenant or owner.

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

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

The rice in question was glutinous rice, *khao nüng* ข้าวเหนียว “rice to be steamed”, which still is the staple food of the Northerners, and not *khāo jāo* ข้าวเจ้า, the non-glutinous variety now preferred in central Thailand, which is boiled.<sup>113</sup> More about the occasionally debated question, what kind of rice was meant in old Lān Nā texts, will be discussed below in section 4, Glutinous Rice or Non-Glutinous Rice?

<sup>112</sup> See below in section 4, *Glutinous Rice or Non-Glutinous Rice?* and section 5, *Donation Packages*.

<sup>113</sup> Northerners call glutinous rice, *khao nüng* ข้าวเหนียว “rice that is to be steamed”. This type of rice is called in central Thailand *khāo niao* ข้าวเหนียว “sticky rice”.

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

It should be noted that the modern central Thai spelling ึ่ง for “to steam” in the expression *khāo nüng* ข้าวเหนียว means, not glutinous rice, but non-glutinous rice pre-cooked at the factory, so-called parboiled rice.

Rice grains and husks, embedded in old clay bricks, show that centuries ago glutinous rice was also eaten in the central region; only later it was later abandoned in favour of the “lighter” non-glutinous rice, *khāo jao* or *khāo suai*.

An observation concerning payments made in cowries shall conclude this chapter. Many articles or goods could be paid for either in *bia* “cowries”, or in *ngön* “silver (weight-units)”.<sup>114</sup> For instance, prices of manuscripts donated to monasteries were quoted either in silver or in cowries.<sup>115</sup> One would expect that higher priced items usually were calculated in silver because cowries were a very small denomination. This may have been the case though I do not have the statistical data to show it. But it seems possible that traditionally certain items were traded in cowries, and others in silver. For instance, construction material probably more often was priced in silver.<sup>116</sup> As for land-taxes, they were almost always<sup>117</sup> specified in cowries, even if a high tax amount might have been converted into the larger denomination “silver” for practical reasons. Assessing a field’s tax value in cowries may have been an old tradition, perhaps a left-over from rather ancient times.

### 3. The Rice Field Specification Formula Part 2: Name and Location of a Field

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

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

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

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

<sup>116</sup>Cf. “The (construction) costs were 6,000 silver” สิ้นเงิน 6,000 พัน (1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523).

<sup>117</sup>One of the rare exceptions was already mentioned at the beginning of this section, for the year 1375: “Fields with a (yearly) tax of 10,000 silver” นา 10,000 เงิน (see footnote 87).

Here is another example. In 1567 the queen of Chiang Mai, Wisuttha Thewī, donated the people of, and the income from, several villages including Bān Pā (north of Hòt) to a monastery. That donation included the wet rice fields of Bān Pā: “The field rent of Bān Pā, 500 silver per year, ... (and all other taxes and revenues there) are a royal donation for the support of Wat Rācha Wisutthārām” คำนานบ้านแปะ 500 เงิน ชูปี ... เป็นราชทานอุปการในวัด ราชวิสุทธาราม (1.2.3.1 Wat Wisutthārām 1567).

Judging from the names, a number of fields were of inferior quality, whereas one would expect that fields, given to monasteries for the sake of making merit, would be of particularly good quality, as normally other items were (and still are) when donated to the Buddhist religion. One wonders whether in general the people thought that a rather high percentage of fields in the North were of poor quality.

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

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

*Nā* นา - Name - 25 - *Khāo* ข้าว - (*Nā* นา - Name) - *Khā* ค่า - 5,000 - *Bia* เบี้ย - Location

### 1. Names of Fields

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

นา ♣ 25 ข้าว ♦♦♦♦

Example: นาดอนกลาง 12 ข้าว

“The Dòn Klāng field of 12 measures seed-rice”.<sup>118</sup>

นา ♣ 25 ค่า 5,000 ♦♦

Example: นาพระ 175 ค่า 96,800

“The Phra field of 175 measures seed-rice with an annual tax of 96,800 cowries”.<sup>119</sup>

นา ♣ 25 ♦♦♦♦♦

Example: นาน้ำตาย 30

“The Nam Tāi field of 30 measures seed-rice”.<sup>120</sup>

25 ข้าวนา ♣ 5,000 เบี้ย ♦

Example: 100 ข้าวนาทันจัด ค่า 55,000 เบี้ย

“The Than Jat field of 100 measures seed-rice with an annual tax of 55,000 cowries”.<sup>121</sup>

<sup>118</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>119</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>120</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>121</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

25 ข้าวนา ♣ ค่า 5,000 ♦♦

Example: 100 ข้าวนาหนองเทง ค่า 45,000

“The Nong Theng field of 100 measures seed-rice with a tax of 5,000 cowries”.<sup>122</sup>

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

25 ข้าว ♦♣♦ 5,000 ♦♦

นา มี 50 ข้าว รอมวัว 50,000 50 ข้าว ต้นกว่าว 50,000 30 ข้าว ต้นแค 50,000 50 ข้าว 8 เฝือก 50,000<sup>123</sup>

Written as a list the details become clearer:

นา มี

50 ข้าว	รอมวัว	50,000
50 ข้าว	ต้นกว่าว	50,000
30 ข้าว	ต้นแค	50,000
50 ข้าว	8 เฝือก	50,000

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

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

The following collection of field names is intended to show the variety of such names. All refer to wet rice fields, *nā* นา ; I do not remember having read the name of an upland field, *rai / hai* ไร่.<sup>124</sup>

**Nā Bān Āng** นานบ้านอ่าง “The field(s) at the village Bān Āng”.<sup>125</sup>

<sup>122</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>123</sup> 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554. This high tax either included the four villages under the monastery (the text is not clear on that) or else there was a steep tax increase or an inflation.

<sup>124</sup> Since the word *rai / hai* can be spelt in several ways, ไร่, ไร, ไร่, ไร่, each with a different meaning and one or two with more than one meaning, and since old texts often dispense with tone markers, one must be careful not to misunderstand the meaning. Here is an example: In 1514 a bronze Buddha image was cast and placed in *rai hòm* ไร่ ห่อม. This does not mean that the image was placed on a good-smelling upland field, but in a monastery, Wat Rai Hòm, with the word *Wat* “monastery” omitted in the text, as is often the case. Again, that name does not mean “Monastery at the good-smelling upland field”, but “Monastery with the fragrant *rai / hai* tree”. The hai tree is of the ficus kind, looks similar to the banyan, and some varieties do have strong smelling flowers and even a smell of their own (1.2.3.2 Wat Rai Hòm 1514).

<sup>125</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

**Nā Dong** นาดง “Fields at (in) the hillyforest”.<sup>126</sup>

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

**Nā Dòn Klāng** นาดอนกลาง “Field on the middle mound” and

**Nā Dòn Tai** นาดอนใต้ “Field on the southern mound”.<sup>127</sup>

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

**Nā Dòn Hai** นาดอนไร่ “Field on the mound with banyan trees”.<sup>128</sup>

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

**Nā Fāng** นาฝาง “Fāng tree field”.<sup>129</sup>

**Nā Hòng Phāk** นาห้องผาก /นาห้องผาก/ “Shovel field”.<sup>130</sup>

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

**Nā Huai Dòn Thap** นาห้วยดอนทับ “Field by the brook Huai Dòn Tap”.<sup>131</sup>

**Nā Janghan** นาจังหัน “Monk food field”.<sup>132</sup>

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

**Nā Khen** นาเข็ญ /นาเข็ญ/ “Difficult field”.<sup>133</sup>

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

**Nā Khī Kā** นาขี้กา “Khī kā field”.<sup>134</sup>

*Khī kā* “crow excrement” (alluding to the shape of the seeds?) is the name of a vine with bitter taste and medicinal properties; it is also the general name for a number of other vines, climbers and herbs, such as *khī kā lāi*, *khī kā dāng*, *khī kā nòi*, etc., some of which were also used for medical purposes.

<sup>126</sup> 1.1.1.1 Ārām S(tm) Köt 1490.

<sup>127</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>128</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>129</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>130</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>131</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>132</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498; 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500.

<sup>133</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>134</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

**Nā Khrāng** นาดราง “Field ...” (?).<sup>135</sup>

**Nā Khūa Bā** นาเขือบ้า/นาเขือบา/ “Crazy eggplant field”.<sup>136</sup>

The shrub/climber (*lamphōng* ลำไผง in central Thailand), an annual, has poisonous seeds which induce a state of stupor or drunkenness (even now used for criminal purposes), but the roots were used against rabies and “general idiocy”.

**Nā Kluai** /นากลวย/ “Kluai Field”.<sup>137</sup>

A monastery received “(a) *nā kluai* field(s)” of 30 measures seed-rice. *Khāo kluai* ชาวกล้วย is a certain variety of glutinous rice, which could mean that the monastery had that many fields for planting that particular rice. However, there is little or no reason to specify the rice planted (see the section *Glutinous or Non-glutinous Rice?*). Since *kluai* กลวย also is the name of a small tree, and *kluai* กล้วย means both, “banana” and “orchid”, the name of the field probably alludes to one of these.

**Nā Kon** นากัน “Bottom field” (?).<sup>138</sup>

**Nā Kong** นาก่ง /นากง/ “Curved field”.<sup>139</sup>

*Kong* also has other meanings, depending on the word-tone (not indicated in the inscription), for instance “crossbow” กง. If the above translation is correct, its shape was curved like the rib of a boat. But here the name is obviously connected with a village of the same name, Bān Kong /บ้านกง/, mentioned in the same inscription immediately after the field, which name could mean “Crossbow Village” บ้านกง. Hence the name of the field might be “Field at Crossbow Village”, or perhaps “Field at the curved village”.

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

**Nā Kwām** นาคว่าม “Soggy Field”.<sup>140</sup>

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

**Nā Kwāng** นากวาง or นากวาง /กวาง/ “Dear field” or “Broad field”.<sup>141</sup>

Since the inscription does not use tone markers, it is not possible to decide which meaning is correct.

<sup>135</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>136</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>137</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491.

<sup>138</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493.

<sup>139</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>140</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

<sup>141</sup> 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500.

**Nā Kwāo Bong** นากว่าวบง “Kwāo tree field”.<sup>142</sup>

A field with/near (trans) planted (bong) *kwāo* trees. The *ton kwāo* tree, among Westerners usually known as “flame of the forest”, *butea frondosa* (also *butea monosperma*), is one of the most striking trees in Lān Nā, not only because of its shining orange or scarlet flowers but also of its sometimes peculiar angular growth. Besides, it had many uses. For instance, it was a source of medicine, of dye, and on its branches the lac insect secreted its valued resinous substance.

**Nā Lak Chāng** นาลักช้าง “Elephant pole field”.<sup>143</sup>

Presumably nearby there were poles to attach elephants.

**Nā Lang** นาลัง “Fields at / on the back”.<sup>144</sup>

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

**Nā Lom Läng** นาลมแล้ง “Lom läng tree field”.<sup>145</sup>**Nā Mā Lāi** นามาลัย “Striped dog field”.<sup>146</sup>**Nā Nām Tāi** นาน้ำตาย “Dead water field”.<sup>147</sup>

Obviously a field with insufficient water, to which the water supply was interrupted, or often failed, etc.

**Nā Nān Lò** นาทนันทล่อ “Field of the ex-monk Lò” and**Nā Nān Lò Nòi** นาทนันทล่อน้อย “Field of the ex-monk Little Lò”.<sup>148</sup>**Nā Ngua** นางัว “Cow Field”.<sup>149</sup>**Nā Nòng Teng** นานองเต็ง / นานองเทง/ “Field at the teng bush pond”.<sup>150</sup>

*Teng* is the name of a big tree in central Thailand but seems to mean some bush or large shrub in the North.

**(Nā) Pät Phiak** 8 เฟี้ยก “eight-plot field”.<sup>151</sup>

Presumably a group of eight individual plots of rice fields, each with its own surrounding water-retaining mud wall.

**Nā Phī Tāi** นาผีตาย “Dead man’s (woman’s) field”.<sup>152</sup>

<sup>142</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>143</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>144</sup> 1.1.1.1 Ārām Sī Köt 1490.

<sup>145</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>146</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>147</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>148</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>149</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

<sup>150</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>151</sup> 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554.

<sup>152</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

The former owner probably bequeathed the field to the monastery on his deathbed.

**Nā Phra** นามพระ “The monk’s or the Buddha image’ field”.<sup>153</sup>

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

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

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

**Nā Pön Tawāi** นาเพินตวาย /นาเพินตวาย/ “Prediction Field”.<sup>154</sup>

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

**Nā Pong** นาปง “Muddy field”.<sup>155</sup>

**Nā Pòng (Phòng)** นาปอง, นาพอง /นาพรอง/ “Uneven field”.<sup>156</sup>

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

**Nā Prang** นาปรัง “Off-season field”.<sup>157</sup>

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

<sup>153</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495; 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500.

<sup>154</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>155</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>156</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>157</sup> There is a monastery called Wat Nā Prang วัดนาปรัง in A. Pong, Phayao province.

**Nā Rang** นารัง “New Field” (?).<sup>158</sup>

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

**Nā Rāng Mū** นารางหมู “Pig-trough field”.<sup>159</sup>

**Nā Rī** นารี (or perhaps นาริ) “Long field”.<sup>160</sup>

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

(**Nā**) **Rim Nòng** (นา)ริมหนอง “Field by the pond”.<sup>161</sup>

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

(**Nā**) **Ròm Wua** รอมวัว “The field where the cows are gathered”<sup>162</sup>

**Bān Nā Ròt** บ้านนารอด “The village of (the) Nā Ròt”.<sup>163</sup>

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

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

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

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

**Nā Rūak** นาเรือก /นาเริก/ “Bamboo matting field”.<sup>165</sup>

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

**Nā Sāi Mūn** นาทรายมูล /นาชายมุน/ “Sandy field”.<sup>166</sup>

**Nā Sāng Kham** นา/สาบ/คำ “Field ...”.<sup>167</sup>

<sup>158</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

<sup>159</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>160</sup> 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kòt 1500.

<sup>161</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>162</sup> 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554.

<sup>163</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Kān Thōm 1499.

<sup>164</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

<sup>165</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498.

<sup>166</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>167</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

The word *kham* means “gold”. Since *sāng* /sang/ “to comb” does not seem applicable here, perhaps a word of similar sound was meant, for instance:

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

**Nā Tā Ngā** นาแตงา “Watergate field”

**Nā Tā Ngā Lum** นาแตงาลุ่ม “Lower watergate field”.<sup>168</sup>

**Nā Thai** นาไถ่ “The ransomed field”.<sup>169</sup>

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

**Nā Than Jat** นาทันจัด “The field that was arranged in time”(?).<sup>170</sup>

**Nā Thò** นาท่อ “Field with water-pipe”.<sup>171</sup>

Such tubes for irrigation usually were made from bamboo.

**Nā Thòn** นาถอน “The revoked field”.<sup>172</sup>

**Nā Thòng** นาทอง “Thòng tree field”.<sup>173</sup>

The *mai thòng* ไม้ทอง or *ton thòng* ต้นทอง tree is called *thòng lāng* ทองกลาง in central Thailand.

(**Nā**) **Ton Khä** ต้นแค “The Ton Khä Tree Field”.<sup>174</sup>

(**Nā**) **Ton Kwāo** ต้นกว่าว “The Ton Kwāo Tree Field”.<sup>175</sup>

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

**Nā Ū Nām** นาอุ้น้ำ “Field at the cradle of water”.<sup>176</sup>

Obviously a field with good water supply.

**Nā Wang Ngū** นาวังงู “Snake Pit Field”.<sup>177</sup>

<sup>168</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>169</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>170</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>171</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>172</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>173</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498.

<sup>174</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Jula Khirī 1554.

<sup>175</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Jula Khirī 1554.

<sup>176</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>177</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

## 2. Location of Fields

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

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

An inscription from Phayao in 1412 says: “Jao Sī Mūn (,the governor of) Phayao, ... wished to donate food to the Buddha image (of Wat Kao Yòt), (rice fields of) 500 (measures seed-) rice, (located) in the Phan Nā Chiang Dī” เจ้าสีหมื่นพยาว ... ใคร่มักเป็นจ้งหันแก่พระพุทธรเจ้า 500 ข้าวยังพันนาเชียงดี.<sup>178</sup>

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

Nā นา - Name - 25 - Khāo ข้าว - (Nā นา - Name) - Khā ค่า - 5,000 - Bia เบี้ย - Location  
นา ◆ 25 ◆ ค่า 5,000 ◆ ⊕

Text: ◆ 500 ข้าว ◆◆◆ พันนาเชียงดี

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

Sometimes details were left vague, perhaps it did not matter from exactly what fields the taxes came, the particulars being left to local administrators: “(In about 1290 Phayā Mang Rāi) ordered to designate the districts in which to collect the rice field taxes in cowries (for Wat Kān Thōm): each year 620,000 cowries for the monks’ food in the district of Jām and 500,000 cowries for the administrators (?)<sup>179</sup> in the district of Chā Chāng” หื้อบักแขวนเก็บเบี้ยค่านา ปีไหน 620,000 เบี้ย เป็นค่าจ้งหันแขวนแถม 500,000 เบี้ย เป็นค่ากิน แขวงแซ่ซ้าง.<sup>180</sup>

<sup>178</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yòt 1412.

<sup>179</sup> เป็นค่ากิน. Whereas *kin* here could mean “to eat” and therefore “food in general, food for all others; general expenses”, there is an inscription of a monastery near Chiang Mai where *kin* expressly means the remuneration for that important monastery’s administrators: “Salary for administrators: 200,000 cowries” ไว้หื้อผู้นายกิน 200,000 เบี้ย (1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām).

<sup>180</sup> CMA. N: 53; HPms: 2.8R; W: 39; U: 31.

Wat Kān Thōm is located in Wiang Kum Kām, about 5 km southeast of Chiang Mai. The first group of fields presumably were in present A. Mā Jām, a valley district in the hills c. 90 km southwest of Chiang Mai, at the time not easily reached. The location of the second group of fields is not certain; perhaps Chā Chāng was in Lampāng province on the river Mā Chāng.<sup>181</sup>

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

Local officials then made these specific arrangements: “The fields with 600,000 cowries (tax) were to be taken from the Phan Nā (district) Muan. (As for) the 15 families, if there were not enough among the relatives of Phan Tòng Tām (who had built the monastery), additional families were to be found ... (However) the donation of (fields with) 600,000 cowries (tax was split): 593,000 (cowries) field tax (plus) 7,000 cowries tax on a village” เอนายัง พันนามวน ที่อ้วน 600,000 เบี้ย (ส่วน) คน 15 ครัว (นั้น) (ถ้า) ในญาติพันต้อง (แต่) ปพอ ที่อ้วนหา (เพิ่ม) แถม ... ไร่เบี้ย 600,000 (แบ่งออกเป็น) ค่านา 593,000 (และ) บ้าน 1 ค่า 7,000 เบี้ย.<sup>182</sup>

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

Incidentally, also another monastery in Chiang Sān, Wat Prāsāt, received fields in that district: “... (ordered) to give fields with 100,000 cowries tax in Müang Muan” ไร่นาจับ 100,000 เบี้ย ยังเมืองม่วน.<sup>183</sup>

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

#### 4. Glutinous Rice or Non-Glutinous Rice?

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

<sup>181</sup> Cf. Jāṅgapura in the chronicle Jinakālamālī; Penth 1994 Jinakālamālī Index: 70-71.

<sup>182</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488. The place name Muan ม่วน in this inscription has no *mai ek*.

<sup>183</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496. The place name Muan ม่วน in this inscription carries the *mai ek*.

<sup>184</sup> For these expressions, see above in section 2, *Size and Taxes of a Field*, footnote 40.

eating habits because it is generally thought, also attested by archaeological finds,<sup>185</sup> that the Northerners, including Lawa and Karen, have been growing and eating steamed glutinous rice since of old. However, it seems that the alleged mention of glutinous or non-glutinous rice in old texts derives from a misunderstanding.

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

Secondly, when asking for an example from a text that allegedly mentions one or the other type of rice, it has been my experience that (with one exception, see below) a passage was never quoted which clearly showed that non-glutinous rice was meant. Invariably a passage was quoted that allegedly referred to glutinous rice. These quotations usually involved the number *ròi* ร้อย “100” and always the number *nüing* หนึ่ง “1” and were of this type: /ไวนารอ^ยเขานิง/ = ไวนาร้อยข้าวหนึ่ง “he gave fields of 100 (measures seed-) rice”.<sup>186</sup> However, the proponents of “glutinous rice” would interpret *ròi khao ning* as “100 ข้าวหนึ่ง”, meaning “100 (measures of) glutinous rice”, and it would be assumed that, since glutinous rice was mentioned, there must also have been non-glutinous rice.

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

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

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

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

<sup>185</sup> Rice grains and husks imbedded in old clay bricks.

<sup>186</sup> An example from inscr. 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497: หมื่นยอด กินเมืองลอ ไวนาร้อยข้าวหนึ่ง (/รอ^ยเขานิง/) เป็นจิ้งหันพระเจ้า “When Mün Yòt was governor of Müang Lò, he gave fields of 100 measures seed-rice as food for the (principal) Buddha image”. See below in section 7, *Donation Packages*: Wat Pā Mai, 1497.

instance *kham ròi nüng* คำร้อยหนึ่ง “100 (weight in) gold”,<sup>187</sup> or the object can be inserted in between the words *ròi nüng*, for example *ròi khāo nüng* ร้อยข้าวหนึ่ง “100 (measures of) rice”.<sup>188</sup>

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

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

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

<sup>187</sup> Context: ด้วยคำ ร้อยหนึ่ง เป็นค่าถ่านัน “for a price of 100 in gold” (1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411). - Cf. /ห่านักร้อยหนึ่ง/หนักร้อยหนึ่ง “(one pair of red-gold water pots, decorated with pure gold,) weighing 100” (1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai 1509).

A corresponding example for 100,000, *sän nüng*: ไรรินาสนหนึ่ง “He gave (the monastery) rice fields (with a tax) of 100,000 (cowries)” (1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Suphan 1509).

Finally an example for 1,000 and 500 in a list of donors and their donations, where /นิง/ has two meanings, viz. “1” and “item; comma, semicolon”: “1,000 silver from Phan Chāng Ārī; 500 silver from Òk Khachāo “/เงิน เจา พัน ฉาง อารี พัน นิง เงิน ออก ค่าว ทา ร้อยนิง/ = เงินเจ้าพันฉางอารี 1,000 (รายหนึ่ง) เงินออกค่าว 500 (ราย) หนึ่ง (1.5.1.1 Wat Klāng 1490).

<sup>188</sup> Here are some more examples.

*Nā ròi khāo nüng*: /นา ร้อย เขา นิง/ = นา 100 ข้าว “rice fields for 100 measures of seed-rice”, corrected by means of an insert to /สอง ร้อย/ = นา 200 ข้าว “rice fields for 200 measures of seed-rice” (1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Ruang 1498). Obviously, no glutinous rice was meant.

*Ròi ngön nüng*: /pen phraḥceyyaḥ 100 ñein nün / “(This commentary on the Ekanipāta of the Añ guttaranikāya was made) at a cost (paccaya) of 100 silver”. (Colophon of a Wat Lai Hin manuscript, Lampāng, 1531, transliterated in: v. Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons: 73; my translation.)

A corresponding example for 10,000, *nā mün ngön nüng*: ตั้งนาไว้ให้เป็นจ้งหนึน แก่พระธาตุเจ้าหนึน หมีนเงินหนึน “(Phayā Kü Nā donated) rice fields of 10,000 silver as food for the relic (in Wat Suan Dòk, Chiang Mai)” (MS.P: 211).

<sup>189</sup> 1.6.1.1 Wat Phra Thāt Lampāng Luang 1476.

<sup>190</sup> Cham 1952 Järük Jangwat Lampāng C.S. 838.

Transliteration

- (15) ไว นา กบ้ พร 200 เซา  
 (16) เจา ไว ชา ครว้ นึ่ง กบ้ พร  
 (17) ไว นา รอย เซา นึ่ง กบ้ ดวย แล

Modern Thai reading

- (15) ไวนากับพระ 200 ชาว  
 (16) เจ้าไวเข้าครัวหนึ่งกับพระ  
 (17) ไวนาร้อยชาวนึ่งกับด้วยแล

Cham presumably understood:

“(Someone) gave 220 fields to the image.

The Prince (jao) gave 1 slave family to the image and also 120 fields”.

In this, his first, publication of the inscription, there was not yet question of glutinous and non-glutinous rice. In passing, because it does not bear directly on the rice problem under scrutiny, it might be mentioned that in lines 15 and 17 Cham misread *khao* /เข/, as written on the stone, for *chao* /เซ/. The easily made error led him to another error, viz. that this *chao* /เซ/ stood for *sāo* /ชาว/ “20”.<sup>191</sup> Cham also did not explain his reading, in l. 17, of *ròi sào nūng* ร้อยชาวนึ่ง = “120” which would have needed a comment because it seems quite unusual.<sup>192</sup>

In the second edition of the inscription, published in 1965,<sup>193</sup> Cham amended his reading:

Transliteration

- (15) + ไว นา กบ้ พร 200 เซา  
 (16) เจา ไว ชา ครว้ นึ่ง กบ้ พร  
 (17) ไว นา รอย เซา นึ่ง กบ้ ดวย แล

Modern Thai reading

- (15) + ไวนากับพระ 200 ชาว-  
 (16) เจ้า, ไวเข้าครัวหนึ่งกับพระ  
 (17) ไวนาร้อย ชาวนึ่ง, กับด้วยแล

<sup>191</sup> A footnote in Cham’s article, line 15 says: “ชาว = ยี่สิบ”, i.e. “*sāo* means 20”.

<sup>192</sup> The figure 1 or the word *nūng* หนึ่ง “one” are often used in inscriptions as a kind of “comma” in order to separate, in an enumeration of single items, one item from the next (“Mr. X 1 Mr. Y 1 Mr. Z 1” = Mr. X, Mr. Y, and Mr. Z). Cham may have thought that here, similarly, *nūng* was used to indicate the end of the item “120 fields”. For example: แต่ก่อนคนครัว 1 ชื่ออ้ายเหาคำหลิง ครว้ 1 กินเงินพระเจ้า “Once there was a family, named Āi Hao Kam Ling, who had borrowed silver (i.e., money) from the Buddha image”; see below, *Donation Packages: Wat Pā Mai*, 1497.

<sup>193</sup> Cham 1965 Lak thī 65.

He now presumably understood:

“(Someone) gave 200 non-glutinous rice fields (*khāo jao*) to the image.  
(He/They) gave 1 slave family to the image and also 100 fields of glutinous rice (*khāo nūng*).”

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

In a footnote Cham explained that glutinous rice was meant by *khāo nūng*: “ข้าวหนึ่ง = ข้าวเหนียว”, i.e. “*khāo nūng* (steamed rice) = *khāo niao* (glutinous rice)”.

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

(17) ไฉนาร้อยข้าวหนึ่ง กับด้วย แล  
“(he) also gave fields of 100 (measures) seed-rice.”

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

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

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

(16) เจ้าไฉนาครัว 1 กับพระ  
“the governor (*jao*)<sup>194</sup> donated one family of slaves to the Buddha image”.

<sup>194</sup> *Jao* here should mean the governor of “Müang Nakhòn”, i.e. Lampāng. He is the hero of the inscription and at the beginning is introduced by his official rank and name, Jao Mūn Kham Phet เจ้าหมื่นคำเพชร.

Therefore the entire passage would have meant:

- (15) ... ไร่นาจับพระ 200 ช้าว
- (16) เจ้าไร่ช้าวครัว 1 กับพระ
- (17) ไร่นาจับ 100 ช้าว กับด้วย แล

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

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

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

“In 1476 Jao Mūn Kham Phet, having become governor of Müang Nakhòn,<sup>195</sup> supported the Buddhist religion at Lampāng.<sup>196</sup> He built a (surrounding) wall, a wihān, and cast a bronze Buddha image of 120,000 weight (c. 132 kg). He celebrated its casting and installed the image in the wihān. He donated 4 families to serve the image. [He gave fields of 200 (measures) seed-rice to the image. The Jao (also) gave a slave-family to the image, together with fields of 100 (measures) seed-rice.] He built a sālā, dug a well, and made a way leading to the stūpa. His Excellency<sup>197</sup> wishes that the merit thus acquired will make him a Buddha in the future. May all worthy men applaud!”

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

<sup>195</sup> Lampāng.

<sup>196</sup> The site of Wat Phra Thāt Lampāng Luang.

<sup>197</sup> /เทพ/, unknown to me and glossed by Cham as ท้าวท่าน, surely is a honorific.

Transliteration:

- (8) ... ไว คน สี ครวว ที รกษา +  
 ...  
 (15) + ไว นา กบ้ พระ 200 เซา  
 (16) เจา ไว ชา ครว้ นิง กบ้ พระ  
 (17) ไว นา รอ<sup>ย</sup> เซา นิง กบ้ ดวย แล

Modern Thai reading:

- (8) ... ไวคนสีครว้ทือรักษา +  
 ...  
 (15) + ไวนากับพระ 200 ช้าว  
 (16) เจ้าไวช้าวครว้หนึ่งกับพระ  
 (17) ไวนารอ<sup>ย</sup>ช้าวหนึ่งกับด่วย แล

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

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

Incidentally, already in 1952 Kasem Kòpina had understood that here seed-rice was meant and not glutinous rice. But possibly he had not noticed that the last three lines of the inscription were an appendix meant as an insert because he merely summarized them: “He gave the Buddha image 20 of rice (twenty of seed-rice)” ไวนากับพระพุทเจ้า 20 เซ้า (ยี่สิบพันธุ์ช้าวปลูก).<sup>198</sup>

## 5. Donation Packages

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

<sup>198</sup> Kasem 1964 Tamnān Wat Phra Thāt Lampāng Luang: 22.

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

### **a. Simple Donation Packages Persons and Fields**

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

#### **Fields and Persons for Wat Yāng Num, 1523**

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

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

พระเป็นเจ้า เจ้าแม่ใน ยินดีไฉนา เป็นข้าวพระเจ้า 60,000 เมี้ย ข้าว 3 ครัว<sup>199</sup>

#### **Fields and Persons for Wat Sī Bun Rūang, 1496**

“The king ...

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

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

<sup>199</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523.

พระเป็นเจ้า ...

- ทือรูปพระพุทธรเจ้าองค์หนึ่ง 100,000 ทอง มาไว้วัดศรีบุญเรืองนี้
- ไวंना 500,000 เปี้ย เป็นข้าวบูชาพระพุทธรเจ้า ทั้งชาวเจ้าล้งมะ
- ไว้คน 12 คร้ว ทือรักษาพระพุทธรเจ้า และชาวเจ้าล้งมะ ...

อารามิกทั้งหลายฟุ้งนี้ ไว้เขาอยู่รักษาพระพุทธรเจ้า ทั้งชาวเจ้าล้งมะ 1 ทำงานวัด จู้คน<sup>200</sup>

### Persons and their Fields for Wat Pā Bong, 1496

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

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

“Jao Sān Kalyāna addressed respectfully the king in the Gold Hall and said: ‘I respectfully greet Your Majesty. I have finished building the monastery Wat Pā Bong. (Now) I ask for 3 villages of Yāng Nam Man people in Jā Hom:

- Bān Kòk, Bān Tūng, and Bān Lūn;
- (together) they are 28 families
- with fields of 90,000 cowries (tax),
- also (their rights in?) the forest Pā Wang Nam.’

The king said: ‘Very well.’ ... ”

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

เจ้าแสนกัลยาณ ไหว้พระเป็นเจ้า ยังทอคำ “ข้าไหว้พระเป็นเจ้า ข้าสร้างวัดป่าบงก็แล้ว แล ข้าขอชาวยางน้ำมัน ยังแจ้หม 3 บ้าน

- บ้านกอก 1 บ้านทึง 1 บ้านหลุน 1
- คนมี 28 คร้ว
- นามี 90,000 เปี้ย
- กับทึงที่ป่าวังน้ำ”

<sup>200</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Bun Rūang 1496.

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

พระเป็นเจ้าว่า “ก็ดี แล” ...

เขานี้ พระเป็นเจ้าหยาดน้ำ ไว้กับวัดป่าบง แล<sup>201</sup>

### Fields and Persons for Wat Phra Köt, 1500

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

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

- The Nā Kwāng field of 10 measures seed-rice; Mūn Sāi Thao donated it as a field to grow rice for the monks.
- The family of the white-clad ascetic Phōng and Āi Kham; Mūn Sāi Yòt donated these slaves.
- The family Mā Ming; Mūn Sāi Phek donated them.
- The Nā Rī fields of 50 measures seed-rice, divided into fields of 25 measures seed rice for the Buddha image and of 25 measures seed rice for the monks’ food; (further) the families Mā Sī Tawāng, Kalyā, Phò Pheng, Phò Khai, Nāng Phim and Mongkon, who (all) own taxable fields (*nā bia*); the Mahā Sāmī Yānasūthara donated them.
- ... ”

พระมหाराชเทวีเจ้า ... เทศนา แก่เจ้าพวกคองคา ว่า หื้อฟังสีมา วัดพระเกิด ...

- นากวาง 10 ช้าว หมิ่นช้ายเถ่าไว้เป็นนาข้าวพระ
- ผ้าขาวเพิง คร้ว 1 อ้ายคำ คร้ว 1 ช้านี้หมิ่นช้ายยอดทาน
- แม่มีง คร้ว 1 หมิ่นช้ายเพ็กทานกับ
- นารี 50 ช้าว เป็นนาพระ 25 เป็นนาจังหัน 25 แม่ศรีตวาง คร้ว 1 กัลยา คร้ว 1 พ่อเพิง คร้ว 1 พ่อไซ คร้ว 1 นางพิม คร้ว 1 มงคล คร้ว 1 เขานี้ นาเบี้ย มหาสามิญาณสุธระเจ้าทาน
- ... <sup>203</sup>

<sup>201</sup> 1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496.

The *chāo Yāng nam man* people may either have been Thai people living in the forest (*yāng* can mean a not too dense forest) whose main occupation was to tap trees for oil, resin (*nam man*); or else they were Karen (*Yāng* is the Yuan appellation for them) with the same occupation. Unfortunately it is not possible to decide whether these *Yāng* were Thai or Karen because the inscription does not mention the names of the heads of the 28 families. This inscription is from a now deserted monastery in present Amphō Jā Hom, north of Lampāng. That Karen, whose habitats generally are in West Lān Nā and East Burma, indeed lived in the Lampāng region, is corroborated by Carl Bock who in 1881 reported Karen in the area east of Lampāng (Temples and Elephants: 175; Im Lande: 139-40). Another group of *chāo Yāng* people obviously were Thais; see below the note concerning inscr. 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

<sup>202</sup> The expression *mahā thewī* means “mother of the king” while *rācha thewī* is “queen”. The unusual expression used here, *phra mahā rācha thewī*, could mean either.

<sup>203</sup> 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500.

### Persons and Fields for Wat Bupphārām, 1529

- “(The king of Chiang Mai ordered prince Un of Phrā) to place 5 families and fields of 1,000 measures seed-rice with the (main) Buddha image of Wat Bupphārām ...
- The family of the ex-monk Thit Phian ... in debt for (“whose value was”) 500 silver, the prince bought them out and donated them to the Buddha image Phra Sān Thòng.”
- ให้ไว้คน 5 ครัว นา 1,000 ข้าว กับพระพุทธรเจ้า วัดบุพพาราม ...
- ทิดเพียน ... ครัว 1 ค่า 500 เงิน เจ้าเมืองไถ่ไว้กับพระแสนทอง<sup>204</sup>

### Persons and their Fields for Wat Mahā Phōthi, 1500

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

“(The queen mother ordered to set up a stone inscription in Wat Mahā Phōthi to record the donation of)

- 72 families of Yāng people (follow their names).
- They have *nā rang* fields (new fields?) with 1,200,000 (cowries tax).
- (They must supply?) bees wax of 25,760 weight (c. 28.5 kg).
- (The also must send?) oleo resin of 102,500 weight (c. 113 kg),
- (and) wax ... of 7,950 weight (c. 9 kg).”
- ชาวยาง 72 ครัว ...
- นารังมี 1,200,000
- เป็นผึ้ง 25,760 น้ำ
- ได้น้ำมัน 102,500 น้ำ
- ผึ่งกับคิง 7,950 น้ำ<sup>205</sup>

<sup>204</sup> 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529.

<sup>205</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

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

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

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

Similarly, there is also mention of three villages of *chāo yāng nam man* people ชาวยางน้ำมัน, in the valley of the Wang river halfway between Chiang Rāi and Lampāng, who were donated to a monastery in 1496 (1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496; see above).

## b. Complex Donation Packages

### Donation Package for a Buddha Image, 1484

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

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

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

- The family Yī Thòng, one wife; this family had borrowed 300 (bāt) silver.
- The family Nāng Ām; (borrowed and did not return) 105 bāt.
- The family Yī Bā
- ... (etc.; the remaining families are named but their debts are not mentioned)
- The family Thān Kon.
- The family Chāo Peng. These (last) two households were conscripted (?).

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

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

<sup>206</sup> Sarasin 1959 Prehistorical Researches: 105-06, 110-13, 121-29. Sarasin called this local variant of late Palaeolithic - early Neolithic, *Siamian*.

<sup>207</sup> Schmitt 1898 Inscription de la caverne: 331.

<sup>208</sup> See Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: Appendices 6 and 8.

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

พ่อท้าว เจ้าเมือง ท้าวมูย เชียงราย มาสร้างรูปพระพุทธรเจ้า ในถ้ำที่นี่ ... พ่อท้าวเจ้า ไร่ข้าว  
พระพุทธรเจ้า

- ยีทอง เรือน 1 เมี่ยมัน ผู้ 1 ครวนี้เอาเงิน 300 (บาท)
- นางอาม เรือน 1 (เอาเงิน) 105 บาท
- ยี่ป่า เรือน 1
- ... (etc.)
- ทำ[น]กน เรือน 1
- ชาวเบ็ง เรือน (1) สองเรือนนี้ เกณฑ์
- ไร่เนา 82,000 เบี้ย
- นาเก่า 50,000 เบี้ย
- เกินหินปูน 20,000 เบี้ย
- บ้านถ้ำ 7,000 เบี้ย
- รวม 159,000 เบี้ย<sup>210</sup>

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

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

“(I donate to the bōt:)

- 20 families
- Fields for 250 measures of seed-rice
- Together with (a) cow(s),
- Harrow and plough,

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

<sup>210</sup> 1.4.1.1 Dòì Tham Phra 1484.

- Timber for small foot bridges over water channels,
- Also fire-wood,
- With rice, to make warm and hot water.”

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

[พระลิมเสมา]	หื้อได้ชาวคร้ว
นาสองร้อย 50 ช้าว	และทั้งด้ววิว
เผื่อไถ ช่มช้าว	ทั้งหลั้ว และช้าว
ให้เป็นน้ำอุ่น น้ำร้อน	[และกุ่มบรเทา]

The donation written in the form of a list:

- 20 คร้ว
- นา 250 ช้าว
- และทั้งด้ววิว
- เผื่อไถ
- ช่มช้าว
- ทั้งหลั้ว
- และช้าว ให้เป็นน้ำอุ่น น้ำร้อน<sup>211</sup>

### Donation Package for Wat Phan Tòng Tăm, 1488

Wat Phan Tòng Tăm วัดพันต่องแต่ม probably is identical with the monastery ruins now called Wat Phuak Phan Tòng วัดพวกพันตอง in the northeastern part of Chiang Sän city. It had an inscribed stone slab which recorded a donation package. The stone was for a long time in the Lamphün museum but in 1998 was moved to the Chiang Sän museum.<sup>212</sup>

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

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

<sup>211</sup> 1.2.1.1 Kū Wat Sao Hin c. 1480.

<sup>212</sup> See Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: Appendices 6 and 8.

The details of the donation package were as follows.

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

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

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

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

พระเป็นเจ้าแม่ลูก ... ทือไวน่า 600,000 เบี้ย คน 15 ครัว ทือไม้ลักแบ่งวิหารตั้งหอปิฎก ทือพ่อ  
เจ้าหมื่นภูดาบเรื่อน รับอาชญาพระเป็นเจ้าทั้งสอง ...

เอานายังพันนามวน ทือ 600,000 เบี้ย คน 15 ครัว ในญาดิพันตองบ่พอ ทือหาแถม

เจ้าหมื่นภูดาบเรื่อนทือชาวท้าวดาบเรื่อนมา/ฝงจาริต/ในปีเปิกสัน คักราชได้ 850 ...

ไว้เบี้ย 600,000 ค่านา 593,000 บ้าน 1 ค่า 7,000 เบี้ย<sup>214</sup>

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

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

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

### Donation Package for the Tapōthārām, 1492

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

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

<sup>214</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488.

Chiang Mai, Phayā Yòt Chiang Rāi, and queen Atapā in 1492, and of the lavish donations it received from the Majesties.

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

“Donation of fields with a (total) tax value of (Details:)	3,051,000	(cowries)
For the stūpa(s) with/at the 4 sides <sup>215</sup>	400,000	cowries
For the Buddha image in the wihān	500,000	cowries
For the uposatha building	400,000	cowries
For food	1,551,000	cowries
Salary for administrators	200,000	cowries

All these fields are in the region called Mūn Khāo Sān Khāo, in the Phan Nā (“district”) Kū Kham of Dòì Kham.<sup>216</sup>

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

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

<sup>216</sup> The hill Dòì Kham is in T. Mā Hia, A. Müang, Chiang Mai, approx. 5 km southwest of the Tapōthārām.

<sup>217</sup> *Tā kham* (lit. “gold eye”) can mean small, round or square, pieces of gold foil or gold plate, for instance to adorn a cetiya, but also a very loosely woven piece of gold cloth with wide meshes (“eyes”), a kind of net, as is sometimes suspended above a Buddha image.

ไว้กับอารามอันนี้ นา (รายละเอียด มีดังต่อไปนี้)		3,051,000 (เบี้ย)
ไว้กับพระเจดีย์ 4 ด้าน		400,000 เบี้ย
ไว้กับพระเจ้าในวิหาร		500,000 เบี้ย
ไว้กับอุโบสถ		400,000 เบี้ย
ไว้เป็นจังกหัน		1,551,000 เบี้ย
ไว้หื้อผู้นายกิน		200,000 เบี้ย
นาทั้งหมดนี้ อยู่ในหมื่นข้าวแสนข้าว ในพันนาภู่กาม ดอยคำ		
ไว้คนเงิน 10 ครัว	ค่า	9,700 เงิน
ไว้คน อันเป็นญาติ 3 ครัว		(- -เงิน)
ไว้ข้าเจ้าเมืองเชียงใหม่ 20 ครัว		(- -เงิน)
ดาค่า 2,720 ค่า	ค่า	19,040 เงิน
แบ่งรูปพระ ทั้งสร้างหนังสือ		153,430 เงิน
รวมแต่สร้างในวัดไปทารามนี้		182,170 เงิน
แต่พระกรุณาที่ทำบุญจู้แห่ง		513,810 เงิน
รวมเป็นสินเงินทั้งหมด		<u>695,980 เงิน</u> <sup>218</sup>

### Donation Package for Wat Pā Mai, 1497

The ruins of Wat Pā Mai are located at Wiang Lò<sup>219</sup> on the Mā Ing in Amphō Jūn, about 36 km northeast of Phayao in a straight line.

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

In short, the inscription says that in 1497 the governor of Müang Lò asked a monk to rebuild Wat Pā Mai. He then transferred the merit to both their Majesties (i.e. the king, Phayā Kāo, and his mother). The Princess Mother<sup>220</sup> donated 500 silver. The king donated rice fields with 400,000 cowries tax, 30 families, and a plot of land for the monastery, located on the river Mā Ing between the inner and outer city moat of Wiang Lò. The purpose of that land is not apparent.

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

<sup>218</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492.

<sup>219</sup> In Yuan, *wiang* means a fortified settlement, a city; *müang* means the country, or the city state as a whole.

<sup>220</sup> Not: queen mother; her husband had not been the king.

borrowed 500 silver from the Buddha image and later defaulted on repayment; thereupon, perhaps in around 1485 (?), an official made them slaves of the image. In 1489, when Mūn Sai was governor of Mūang Lò, he gave fields of 200 measures seed rice as food for the Buddha image.

The text concerning the donations says in translation:

“The Princess Mother gave 500 silver for construction purposes.<sup>221</sup>

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

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

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

When (in c. 1480?)<sup>222</sup> Mūn Yòt was governor of Mūang Lò, he gave fields of 100 measures seed-rice as food for the Buddha image.

Formerly a family, the family of Āi Hao Kham Ling, had borrowed 500 silver from the Buddha image (and had defaulted on repayment). Phò Nòi, who was the *phan nā riian*, (in c. 1485?)<sup>223</sup> poured water and donated them as slaves to the Buddha image.

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

<sup>221</sup> The expression *sāng* สร้าง does not only denote building activities but also additions or improvements donated to a monastery. Cf. above the donation package for the Tapōthārām, where *sāng* not only includes the copying of (scripture) books, *nang sūi*, but also the purchase of 10 slave families and the acquisition of ornamental little gold plates, *tā kham*. Consequently, the phrase in question here probably should be understood in a broad sense: “500 silver to cover the costs for any desired acquisitions for the monastery”.

<sup>222</sup> The year c. 1480 (?) for this governor is a guess; from the context it appears merely that he was in office before 1489 when Mūn Sai was governor.

<sup>223</sup> The year c. 1485 (?) for this donation is a guess; from the context it appears merely that the family was donated after Mūn Yòt had been governor and before 1489 when Mūn Sai was governor.

พระมหาเทวีเจ้า ท้อเงินมาสร้าง 500 เงิน

พระเป็นเจ้า ... ท้อแตงนา กับคน ไร่กับวัดนี้

- นา 400,000 เบี้ย
- ไร่เป็นข้าวพระพุทธรเจ้า 200,000 เบี้ย
- ไร่เป็นจ้งหันชาวเจ้า ยังอารามนี้ 200,000 เบี้ย
- คน 30 ครัว
- ไร่กับ อุปลฐากพระพุทธรเจ้าในวิหาร 20 ครัว
- ไร่กับ อุโบสถ 5 ครัว
- ไร่กับ หอปฏิภัก 5 ครัว

ไร่ที่ หนวันออกฝั่งน้ำเป็นแดน หนฝ่ายใต้คือเวียงชั้นนอกเป็นแดน หนวันตก 100 วา เป็นแดน หนเหนือคือเวียงเป็นแดน ...

หมื่นยอดกินเมืองล่อ ไร่ณา 100 ข้าว เป็นจ้งหันพระเจ้า

แต่ก่อน คนครัว 1 ชื่อ อ้ายเหาคำหลิง ครัว 1 กินเงินพระเจ้า 500 พันนาเรือน ฟ่อน้อยยอดน้ำ ไร่เป็นข้าพระ

หมื่นใสกินเมืองล่อ ไร่ณา 200 ข้าว เป็นจ้งหันพระเจ้า ในปีกัตร้า เดือน 7 ออก 2 คำ วันกัตเม็ด<sup>224</sup>

## 6. Rice Field Administrators

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

<sup>224</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.

Some of these officials clearly had other qualities and interests besides field administration; cf. the *mün nā lang* Yòt who assisted in the casting of a Buddha image.

### *Names and Titles with “Nā”*

#### **Nā**

##### **Jao Thāo Sòng Sān Nā** เจ้าท้าวสองแสนนา

1370, Chiang Mai.<sup>225</sup> This title / name “Royal Prince 200,000 Rice Fields” was used for King Kü Nā (r. 1355-85) by his contemporaries, as is attested in a stone inscription at Lamphūn. His rulership or power over a great number of fields is also indicated by his usual name, Kü Nā กือนา “One million fields”. This name / title remains unexplained. Although it reminds one of the old central Thai system of allotting honorary rice fields, *sakdi nā* ศักดินา, to all citizens in order to fix their social standing, that system was not in use in Lān Nā where power or rank were expressed with numbers, for instance *phan* พัน “1000”, an imaginary command over that many persons.

#### **Nā Dong**

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

##### **Phan Nā Dong** พันนาตง

1490, Pāi, Mā Hòng Sòn province.<sup>226</sup> He probably was one of the witnesses to a donation of slaves made by the king and his mother (mahā thewī) to a monastery.

#### **Nā Lang**

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

<sup>225</sup> 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yün 1370.

<sup>226</sup> 1.1.1.1 Ārām Sī Kòt 1490.

**Nā Lang** ไอเมียนาหลัง ....

1500, Chiang Rāi.<sup>227</sup> The wife or, more probably, the widow Ai of Nā Lang .... (his name is unreadable) is the 34th in a list of 72 heads of slave families of *chāo yāng* farming and forest people who were donated to Wat Mahā Phōthi, immediately south of the old walled town of Chiang Rāi.

**Nā Lang Suthon Khāwin** นาหลัง สุทนต์คาริน

1563, Chiang Mai.<sup>228</sup> As part of his last will and testament he donated his house of 3 ‘rooms’ บ้าน 3 ห้อง to a standing (bronze) Buddha image that had been cast recently.

**Ròi Nā Lang Lām Mūn** ร้อยนาหลัง ล่ามหมื่น

1489, Müang Kuak.<sup>229</sup> This *nā lang* held the rank of 100 (*ròi*), and was the secretary / announcer / public relations man (*lām*) of a high-ranking official who had the rank of 10,000 (*mūn*). He is the sixth in a list of seven persons who witnessed donations made to a monastery near Lamphūn, and the setting up of a stone inscription recording the donations.

**Phan Nā Lang** พันนาหลัง

1488, Phayao.<sup>230</sup> The queen (queen-mother?) in Chiang Mai sent an order on gold foil to the wife of the governor of Phayao. In the document, the queen asked to assign 20 families to the service of the Buddha image and the mahāthera of Wat Dòk Kham. The Phayao governor’s wife, in turn, asked eight local officials to take the document to Wat Dòk Kham.

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

**Phan Nā Lang Chiang Nòi** พันนาหลัง เชียงน้อย

1489, Müang Kuak.<sup>231</sup> This *nā lang* held the rank of 1,000 (*phan*), was an ex-novice (*chiang*) and his personal name was Nòi. He is the fourth in a list of seven witnesses to several donations made to a monastery near Lamphūn, and to the setting up of a stone inscription which recorded the donation.

<sup>227</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500. For a note on these *chāo yāng* people, see above in the chapter Donation Packages: Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

<sup>228</sup> 1.2.3.2 Wat Mūn Tum 1563. A ‘room’ ห้อง in Yuan means the space in between four pillars of a house, no matter whether there are partitions, curtains, etc. “Three rooms” means a house on a rectangular plan with four pillars on either side, not including the raised verandah in front.

<sup>229</sup> 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489.

<sup>230</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Dòn Khrām 1488.

<sup>231</sup> 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489.

**Phan Nā Lang** พันนาหลัง

1490, Pāi, Mā Hông Sòn province.<sup>232</sup> He probably was one of the witnesses to a donation of slaves made by the king and his mother (mahā thewī) to a monastery in M. Pāi, A. Pāi.

**Phan Nā Lang Yāna Wisā Ròt** พันนาหลัง ญาณวิสารถอด

1502, Wiang Pā Pao, c. 90 km north of Chiang Mai on the way to Chiang Rāi.<sup>233</sup> By order of the queen mother in Chiang Mai, he was to arrange her personal donation with an accompanying inscription: 10 families to serve the Buddha image in a monastery near Wiang Pā Pao and to supply annually 11 kg lamp oil as a gift of worship for the image.

**Phan Nā Lang Thep** พันนาหลัง เทพ

1513, near Phān south of Chiang Rāi.<sup>234</sup> He is the fifth in a list of 11 witnesses to a land donation made by the governor of Müang Òi to a Buddha image. In that list, four monks precede seven laymen. In the laymen's group, the Phan Nā Lang Thep comes first, preceding a *phan nangsi* พันหนังสือ, a *thao müang* เจ้าเมือง, a *pāk nangsi* ปากหนังสือ, an ordinary *phan* พัน, another *thao müang* เจ้าเมือง, and a *sān khāo* แสนข้าว.

**Phan Nā Lang Khwan** พันนาหลัง ขวัญ

1520, Chiang Mai.<sup>235</sup> He is the first in a list of five persons who sponsored the consecration of an uposatha precinct (khandhasīmā). He precedes three *sān khāo* and an untitled but obviously otherwise important person, Nāi Suwan.

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

**Mün Nā Lang** หมื่นนาหลัง

1493, Phayao.<sup>236</sup> Presumably the same as Mün Nā Lang Sī Phat. He was represented by one of his men, a certain Yā Sitthi ญาติทิ, to witness a donation of slaves made to a monastery.

<sup>232</sup> 1.1.1.1 Ārām Sī Köt 1490.

<sup>233</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Uthumphara Ārām 1502.

<sup>234</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513.

<sup>235</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1520.

<sup>236</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mün 1493.

**Mün Nā Lang Sī Phat** หมื่นนาหลัง ศรีพัฑ

1492, Phayao province.<sup>237</sup> He is the first in a list of four lay witnesses to a multiple donation consisting of slaves for the service of a Buddha image, an annual delivery of sesame oil, etc. (details lost) made by the governor of Chiang Rāi to a monastery about 12 km northwest of Phayao. Somewhat unusually, this list of lay witnesses is followed, and not preceded, by a list of three monk witnesses.

**Mün Nā Lang Sī Phat** หมื่นนาหลัง ศรีพัฑ

1493, Phayao province.<sup>238</sup> He is named as the first of two witnesses who “know” that a certain monastery has certain fields and a village.

**Mün Nā Lang Sī Phat** นหมื่นนาหลัง ศรีพัฑ

1495, Phayao.<sup>239</sup> He is the first in a list of nine witnesses to various donations of persons, rice fields and villages made over time to a monastery next to Phayao city.

**Mün Nā Lang Thep** นหมื่นนาหลัง เทพ

1495, Phayao.<sup>240</sup> He is the second in a list of eight lay witnesses to a donation of persons and of a village with two areca trees, made by the former and the present kings of Chiang Mai, to a monastery just outside Phayao city to the northwest.

**Mün Udom Nā Lang** หมื่นอุดม นาหลัง

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

<sup>237</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām Khòì Sum 1492.

<sup>238</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mün 1493.

<sup>239</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>240</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya 1495. The two kings are, Phayā Yòt who abdicated probably on 07/06/1495 (PAY.PP: 36) and certainly before 31/07/1495 (1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya) in favour of his son, Phayā Kāo who, being only 12 or 13 years old, was consecrated king with his mother on 05/08/1495 (1.4.1.1 Wat Sī Sutthāwāt 1496).

<sup>241</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Kham 1496.

**Mün Nā Lang** หมื่นนาหลัง

1500, Chiang Rāi.<sup>242</sup> He is the fourth in a list of at least seven witnesses to the donation a group of 72 *chāo yāng* agricultural and forest-gathering people and their taxes to a monastery next to Chiang Rāi town, and to the setting up of a stone inscription which records the donation.

**Mün Nā Lang Thān Kham** หมื่นนาหลัง แทนคำ

1506, Phayao province.<sup>243</sup> He is the second in a list of 10 witnesses to a donation of slaves made to a monastery about 12 km northwest of Phayao.

**Mün Nā Lang Yòt** หมื่นนาหลัง ยอด

1516, Phayao.<sup>244</sup> He is the first in a list of four persons who helped, *chuai* ซ่วย, with the casting of a big bronze Buddha image, probably in Wat Sip-sòng Hòng immediately outside Phayao town.

**Mün Nā Lang Jòm Sawan** หมื่นนาหลัง จอมสวรรค์**Mün Nā Lang Suan In** หมื่นนาหลัง สวนอินทร์

1529, Phrā.<sup>245</sup> The ruling prince of Phrā and his wife had built or rebuilt Wat Bupphārām (located northeast outside the town of Phrā). Then the prince asked Mün Nā Lang Jòm Sawan “to bring the merit” เาบุญกุฐากไป to Mün Ying so that the latter might present it to the king (in Chiang Mai, viz. Phayā Ket). The king then ordered that people and fields be assigned to the monastery.

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

Probably both *mün nā lang* were local Phrā people.

**Nā Ròt**

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

<sup>242</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

<sup>243</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām 1506. This monastery, its ruins now nearly disappeared, is identical with Wat Wisuttha Ārām Khòì Sum (see below).

<sup>244</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Sip-sòng Hòng 1516.

<sup>245</sup> 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529.

**Nā Ròt** นารอด

1500, Chiang Rāi.<sup>246</sup> He is the sixteenth in a list of 72 heads of slave families. They were *chāo yāng* farming and forest gathering people who were donated, together with their taxes from wet rice fields, oleo-resin and wax, to Wat Mahā Phōthi, just outside Chiang Rāi's former southern city wall.

**Nā Ròt Udom Mongkon** นารอด อุดมมงคล

1500, Lamphūn.<sup>247</sup> He was the head of one of 12 families donated by the king of Chiang Mai and his mother to the newly-built library of Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai.

**Hā Sip Nā Ròt** ห้าสิบ นารอด

1496, Chiang Mai province.<sup>248</sup> An official with the lowly rank of *hā sip* “50”, he is the third in a group of three persons (after a mahāthera and Sān Khāo Phan) who were witnesses to the donation of a slave to a Buddha image.

**Nā Rūan****Lām Pāk Nā Rūan Nūa** ล่ามปากนาเรือนเหนือ

1492, Phayao province.<sup>249</sup> He is the fourth and last in a list of four lay witnesses to a multiple donation consisting of slaves for the service of a Buddha image, an annual delivery of sesame oil, etc. (details lost) made by the governor of Chiang Rāi to a monastery about 12 km northwest of Phayao. Somewhat unusually, this list of lay witnesses is followed, and not preceded, by a list of three monk witnesses.

**Pāk Rat Nā Rūan** ปากรัด นาเรือน

1496, Chiang Mai province.<sup>250</sup> He is the third in a group of four persons (two ordinary citizens and two officials, in that order) who escorted a new slave, khā ข้า, of the Buddha image to the monastery. That slave himself was an official, Lām Wan ล่ามวัน.

<sup>246</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

<sup>247</sup> 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Thāt Hariphunchai 1509.

<sup>248</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Kāo Lāt 1497.

<sup>249</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām Khòì Sum 1492. See also note 260.

<sup>250</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Kāo Lāt 1497.

**Phan Nā Rūan Phò Nòi** พันนาเรือน ฟ่อน้อย

C. 1485, Müang Lò (35 km northeast of Phayao).<sup>251</sup> “Formerly a family, (viz.) the family of Āi Hao Kham Ling, had borrowed 500 silver from the Buddha image (and had defaulted on repayment). Phò Nòi, the *phan nā rūan*, poured water and donated them as slaves to the (principal Buddha) image.”

**Phuak Kham Nā Rūan** พวกคำ นาเรือน

1488, Chiang Sän.<sup>252</sup> He is the fifth in a list of nine witnesses to a donation of fields and slaves, made by the king and his mother to a monastery in Müang Chiang Sän.

**Nā Sāi****Jao Nā Sāi** เจ้านาซ้าย

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

**Lām Nā****Lām Nā Pik Mò Khwan** ล่ามนาปีก หมอขวัญ

1493, Phayao.<sup>254</sup> He is the ninth in a list of nine or eleven witnesses to a donation made to a monastery.

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

**Mün Lām Nā Hōrāthibodī** หมื่นล่ามนา โหราธิบดี

1496, Chiang Mai.<sup>255</sup> He is the second in a list of three officials who are sent by the king, Phayā Kao, to come here, write (*tòng* ต้อง “chisel”) the inscription and to set it up (to last) until the end of the Buddhist religion, in order to record the

<sup>251</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497. The date c.1485 (?) for this donation is a guess. M. Lò, also Wiang Lò, present T. Lò, A. Jün, Phayao province.

<sup>252</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488. *Phuak*, lit. “group”, meant a guild of persons doing certain kinds of work, like boatmen, etc. Their leader was usually known as *jao phuak* เจ้าพวก but sometimes was simply called *phuak*.

<sup>253</sup> 1.7.2.2 Wat Nā Luang 1793.

<sup>254</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mün 1493.

<sup>255</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496.

king's donation of fields and persons to a monastery in Müang Lò (35 km northeast of Phayao).

**Mün Lām Nā Sumethā Hōrāthibodī** หมื่นลำนา สุเมธาโหราธิบดี

1496, Chiang Mai.<sup>256</sup> He is the second in a list of 10 witnesses to the king's donation of 28 families of Chāo Yāng Nam Man people in three villages, with their fields and a forest, to a monastery in A. Jā Hom, north of Lampāng.

**Mün Lām Nā Hōrāthibodī** หมื่นลำนา โหราธิบดี

1497, Chiang Mai.<sup>257</sup> The king ordered him to organize a donation of fields and persons to a monastery in Müang Lò (35 km northeast of Phayao).

**Pāk Nā**

**Pāk Nā** ปากนา

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

**Pāk Nā Mua** ปากนา หมัว

1469, Wang Nūa, about 85 km north of Lampāng.<sup>259</sup> The son of Pāk Nā Mua is the last in a list of seven witnesses to the donation, made by the local governor, of a village and a newly built monastery to the king. The same group also came to set up the stone inscription.

**Lām Pāk Nā Rūan Nūa** ลำปากนาเรือนเหนือ

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

<sup>256</sup> 1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496.

<sup>257</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.

<sup>258</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491.

<sup>259</sup> 1.6.1.1 Wat Bān Lāng 1469.

<sup>260</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām Khòì Sum 1492. See also note 249.

### *Names and Titles with “Khāo”*

#### **Phan Khāo / Mūn Khāo / Sān Khāo**

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

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

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

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

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

#### **Phan Khāo Hò Li Mān** พันข้าว ท่อลิแหมน

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

<sup>261</sup> McGilvary 1912 A Half Century: 195.

<sup>262</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya 1495. For the two kings, see above under Mūn Nā Lang Thep.

Phan Khāo Hò Li Măn /พนะเขาหฺลิแห่มน/, judging by his name, was not a Thai. Perhaps he was a Chinese Hò, possibly a Muslim trader from southern China, presumably Yünnan which is called Müang Măn in Lān Nā, though spelt differently: แมน; or perhaps he was from northern Laos - Vietnam, the location of the Măn (Mène) people, a Thai group.

**Phan Khāo Phut** พันข้าว พุด

1502, Chiang Mai.<sup>263</sup> He was the last in a group of three persons who “accepted an order from the queen mother” (sc. they were ordered to handle it) and forwarded it on its administrative way to a certain Phan Nā Lang Yāna Wisā Ròt (q.v.) at Wiang Pā Pao (c. 90 km north of Chiang Mai). That official, in turn, was to arrange the queen mother’s personal donation with an accompanying inscription: 10 families to serve the Buddha image in a monastery near Wiang Pā Pao and to supply annually 11 kg lamp oil as a gift of worship for the image.

Phan Khāo Phut was in illustrious company: the first in his group was the king’s brother, and the second was Jao Phuak Yāna Khongkhā Tòng Tām, i.e. the head of the Writers and Painters Guild, *tòng tām* ต๋องแต่ม.

**Mün Khāo** see below: Sän Khāo Jäm et al., 1496.

**2 Sän Khāo** แสนข้าว ทั้ง 2

1469, Wang Nüa, about 85 km north of Lampāng.<sup>264</sup> An unnamed person (or persons) in the service of two unnamed Sän Khāo was the sixth in a list of seven witnesses to the donation, made by the local governor, of a village and a newly built monastery to the king. The same group also set up the stone inscription.

**Sän Khāo Sai** แสนข้าว ไส

**Sän Khāo In** แสนข้าว อิน

C. 1480, Chiang Mai.<sup>265</sup> They were the first and the second in a list of five lay witnesses to a donation of agricultural items made by a person whose name is lost, to the *bōt* (uposatha precinct plus its building) that was located about 5 km southeast of Chiang Mai. In that list, they preceded, in that order, a *lamphan* ลำพัน, a *pāk* ปาก in the service of a Mün Nangsü หมื่นหนังสือ of the Record Office, and an untitled person from the service of a Mün Dām Phrā หมื่นด้ามพร้า.

<sup>263</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Uthumphara Ārām 1502.

<sup>264</sup> 1.6.1.1 Wat Bān Läng 1469.

<sup>265</sup> 1.2.1.1 Kū Wat Sao Hin c. 1480.

**Sän Khāo Sòi** แสนข้าว สอย

1489, Müang Kuak, Lamphūn province.<sup>266</sup> He was the fifth in a list of seven witnesses to several donations made to a monastery, and to the setting up of a stone inscription which recorded the donations. He ranked after a *phan nā lang* (4<sup>th</sup>) and before a *ròì nā lang* (6<sup>th</sup>) and a *lamphan* (7<sup>th</sup>).

**Sän Khāo Phò Lān** แสนข้าว พ่อลาน

1489, Müang Òi, east of Phān, Chiang Rāi province.<sup>267</sup> He was one of nine witnesses to the donation of rice fields and the assignment of six families to the service of a monastery and its mahāthera. These donations had been ordered by the mother of the king (Mahā Thewī).

**Sän Khāo Yā Rangsi** แสนข้าว ญารังสี

1493, Phayao.<sup>268</sup> He is the eighth in a group of nine or eleven witnesses to a donation of slaves made to a monastery.

**Sän Khāo Phan** แสนข้าว พัน

1496, Chiang Mai province.<sup>269</sup> He was the second in a group of three persons (after a mahāthera and before Hā Sip Nā Ròt) who were witnesses to the donation of a slave to a Buddha image.

**Sän Khāo Jām** แสนข้าว แจ่ม**Mün Khāo Sòi** หมื่นข้าว ส้อย**Mün Khāo Hem** หมื่นข้าว เหม**Mün Khāo Suan Phayā** หมื่นข้าว สวนพญา<sup>270</sup>

1496, Jòm Thòng, south of Chiang Mai.<sup>271</sup> Preceded by three ordinary *mün*, they are the fourth to seventh in a group of seven witnesses (1) to the donation, made by the king, of a Buddha image to a monastery, and of rice fields as a gift of worship to the image and the monks in the monastery; and (2) to the donation, made by several other persons, of 12 slave families who were to serve the Buddha image and the monks.

<sup>266</sup> 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489.

<sup>267</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Wan 1489. Former Müang Òi, about 40 km north of Phayao and about 50 km south of Chiang Rāi, must have covered much of the eastern part of present A. Phān, Chiang Rāi province.

<sup>268</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mün 1493.

<sup>269</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Kāo Lāt 1497.

<sup>270</sup> Suan Phayā, spelt /สวนปรพญา/, P. + S. javana-prajñā, “quick-witted”.

<sup>271</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Bun Rüang 1496.

**Sān Khāo Silā** แสนข้าว สีลา

**Sān Khāo Rat** แสนข้าว รัตน์

1497, Müang Lò (35 km northeast of Phayao).<sup>272</sup> Both are witness to a donation of fields and slaves, made by the king to a monastery in Müang Lò.

**Sān Khāo Rat** แสนข้าว รัต

**Sān Khāo Mongkhon** แสนข้าว มงคล

1504, Lamphūn province.<sup>273</sup> They are the fifth and the sixth in a list of 11 lay witnesses to the transfer of a person whose occupation was changed from trimming timber for construction, to the service of the principal Buddha image in a monastery that was situated about 10 km south of Lamphūn.

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

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

**Sān Khāo Bun** แสนข้าว บุญ

1513, near Phān south of Chiang Rāi.<sup>274</sup> He is the last in a list of 11 witnesses to a land donation made by the governor of Müang Òi to a Buddha image. In that list, four monks precede seven laymen. In the laymen group, the Sān Khāo is preceded by a *phan nā lang* พันนาหลัง (the first of that group), then come a *phan nangsü* พันหนังสือ, a *thao müang* เจ้าเมือง, a *pāk nangsü* ปากหนังสือ, an ordinary *phan* พัน, and another *thao müang* เจ้าเมือง.

**Sān Khāo Thit Nòi** แสนข้าว ทิดน้อย

**Sān Khāo Mongkhon** แสนข้าว มงคล

**Sān Khāo Thòng** แสนข้าว ทอง

1520, Chiang Mai.<sup>275</sup> They are the second to fourth in a list of five persons who sponsored the consecration of an uposatha precinct (*khandhasīmā*). They fol-

<sup>272</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.

<sup>273</sup> 1.3.1.1 Wat Bun Bān 1504.

<sup>274</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513.

<sup>275</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1520.

low a Phan Nā Lang and precede an untitled but obviously otherwise important person, Nāi Suwan.

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

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

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

### **Sän Khāo Jòm** แสนข้าว จอม

C. 1530, Phayao.<sup>276</sup> He is the first in a list of four officials who were asked to testify before an investigating official with the title *phan nangsi täng müang* พันหนังสือต่างเมือง “upcountry registrar with the rank of one thousand”. The inspector had been sent by the king of Chiang Mai. His mission was about a case in which slaves of the Buddha image of Wat Khwāng near Phayao had left the image and had themselves set up as freemen, even having their own rice fields. The testimony of Sän Khāo Jòm and the three others as persons who “knew”, i.e. as witnesses familiar with the local situation, made the investigating official return the slaves to the Buddha image.

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

#### **Phan Chāng Ārī** พันฉาง อารี

1490, Phayao.<sup>277</sup> A public collection for the construction of a wihān resulted in 3,000 silver. The state granary official Phan Chāng Ārī was the first in a group of four donors whose donations were listed apart from the public collection. These donors were mentioned separately and by name; he himself had donated 1,000 silver.

<sup>276</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng c.1530.

<sup>277</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Klāng 1490.

## 7. Some Rice Field Statistics

### a. Fields and their Seed-Rice

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

Date	Amount	Region / Province
1411	Nā 21,685 khāo	Phayao <sup>228</sup>
1411	Nā 100 khāo	Phayao <sup>229</sup>
1411	Nā 975 khāo	Phayao <sup>230</sup>
1412	(Nā) 500 khāo	Phayao <sup>231</sup>
1466	Nā 30 khāo	Chiang Rāi <sup>232</sup>
1476	Nā 200 khāo	Lampāng <sup>233</sup>
1476	Nā 100 khāo	Lampāng <sup>234</sup>
1479	Nā 20 khāo	Chiang Rāi <sup>235</sup>
c. 1480	Nā 250 khāo	Chiang Mai <sup>236</sup>
c.1480	Nā 100 khāo	Phayao <sup>237</sup>
1489	Nā 200 khāo	Phayao <sup>238</sup>
1491	Nā 30 khāo	Phayao <sup>239</sup>
1493	Nā 5 khāo	Phayao <sup>240</sup>
1495	Nā [825] khāo	Phayao <sup>241</sup>

<sup>228</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.

<sup>229</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phayao 1411.

<sup>230</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wiang Kao Phayao 1411.

<sup>231</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yòt 1412.

<sup>232</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513.

<sup>233</sup> 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1476.

<sup>234</sup> 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1476.

<sup>235</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479.

<sup>236</sup> 1.2.1.1 Kū Wat Sao Hin c. 1480

<sup>237</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.

<sup>238</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.

<sup>239</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491.

<sup>240</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493.

<sup>241</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495. “Nā 825 khāo” was the sum total of the holdings of the monastery. Hereafter the inscription listed the individual fields but these details are now incomplete because part of the text has become illegible.

	Nā 100 khāo	
	Nā 175 (khāo)	
	Nā 100 khāo	
	(Nā) 40 khāo	
	Nā 25 khāo	
1498	Nā 200 khāo	Phayao <sup>242</sup>
	Nā 100 (khāo)	
	Nā 50 (khāo)	
	Nā 12 (khāo)	
	Nā 12 khāo	
	Nā 100 khāo	
	Nā 12 khāo	
	Nā 6 rai 12 khāo <sup>243</sup>	
	Nā 12 khāo	
	Nā 12 khāo	
	Nā 30 (khāo)	
	Nā 12 khāo	
	Nā 12 khāo	
	Nā 50 (khāo)	
	Nā 50 (khāo)	
	Nā 10 (khāo)	
	Nā 50 (khāo)	
	Nā 500 (khāo)	
	Nā 100 (khāo)	
	(Nā) 100 (khāo)	
	Nā 1[0] (khāo)	
	Nā 100 (khāo)	
	Nā 100 khāo	
	Nā 30 khāo	
	Nā 20 khāo	
	Nā 50 khāo	
	Nā 100 (khāo)	
	Nā 50 (khāo)	
	Nā 100 (khāo)	

<sup>242</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498. This inscription lists many individual fields.

<sup>243</sup> A very rare statement: *rai* “plot” and *khāo* “seed-rice”.

1498	Nā 100 khāo	Phayao <sup>244</sup>
	In the inscription corrected to: 200 khāo	
1500	Nā 10 khāo	Nān <sup>245</sup>
1500	Nā 50 khāo	Nān <sup>246</sup>
1504	Khāo 10,000	Lampāng <sup>247</sup>
	Probable intention: Nā 10,000 khāo.	
1504	Nā 200 khāo	Lampāng <sup>248</sup>
1529	Nā 1,000 khāo	Phrā <sup>249</sup>
1554	Nā 50 khāo	Chiang Mai <sup>250</sup>
	Nā 50 khāo	
	Nā 30 khāo	
	Nā 50 khāo	

### b. Rice Field Taxes

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

Year A.D.	Tax เบี้ย	Indiv. Field	Total Amount	Region
c. 1290	620,000		x	Chiang Mai <sup>251</sup>
c. 1290	500,000		x	Chiang Mai <sup>252</sup>
1411	4,686,000		x	Phayao <sup>253</sup>
1466	9,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>254</sup>
1479	5,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>255</sup>
1484	50,000		x	Chiang Rāi <sup>256</sup>

<sup>244</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Phāyā Ruang 1498.

<sup>245</sup> 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500.

<sup>246</sup> 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Kōt 1500.

<sup>247</sup> 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504.

<sup>248</sup> 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504.

<sup>249</sup> 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529.

<sup>250</sup> 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554. This inscription lists four individual (groups of) fields.

<sup>251</sup> CMA.N: 53; HPms: 2.8 R; W: 39, U: 31.f

<sup>252</sup> CMA. N: 53; HPms: 2.8R; W: 39; U: 31.

<sup>253</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.

<sup>254</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513.

<sup>255</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479.

<sup>256</sup> 1.4.1.1 Dòì Tham Phra 1484. Previous holdings.

Year A.D.	Tax เบี้ย	Indiv. Field	Total Amount	Region
1484	82,000		x	Chiang Rāi <sup>257</sup>
1488	2,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>258</sup>
1488	1,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>259</sup>
1488	5,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>260</sup>
1488	2,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>261</sup>
1488	6,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>262</sup>
1488	500	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>263</sup>
1488	1,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>264</sup>
1488	1,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>265</sup>
1488	1,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>266</sup>
1488	1,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>267</sup>
1488	2,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>268</sup>
1488	2,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>268</sup>
1488	2,000	x		Chiang Rāi <sup>270</sup>
1488	600,000		x	Chiang Sān <sup>271</sup>
1492	3,051,000		x	Chiang Mai <sup>272</sup>
1493	2,500	x		Phayao <sup>273</sup>
1495	[370,000]	x		Phayao <sup>274</sup>
1495	[22,000]	x		Phayao <sup>275</sup>

<sup>257</sup> 1.4.1.1 Dòì Tham Phra 1484. A new donation.

<sup>258</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>259</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>260</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>261</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>262</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>263</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>264</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>265</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>266</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>267</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>268</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>269</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>270</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.

<sup>271</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488. The original order by the king called for 600,000 cowries field tax. However, for unstated reasons, court and local administrators changed this to 593,000 cowries field tax plus 7,000 cowries tax from a village.

<sup>272</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492.

<sup>273</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493.

<sup>274</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>275</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

Year A.D.	Tax เบี้ย	Indiv. Field	Total Amount	Region
1495	45,000	x		Phayao <sup>276</sup>
1495	45,000	x		ditto
1495	45,000	x		ditto
1495	45,000	x		ditto
1495	45,000	x		ditto
1445	96,800	x		Phayao <sup>277</sup>
1445	55,000	x		Phayao <sup>278</sup>
1495	27,500	x		Phayao <sup>279</sup>
1495	5,500	x		Phayao <sup>280</sup>
1496	500,000		x	Chiang Mai <sup>281</sup>
1496	300,000		x	Phayao <sup>282</sup>
1496	100,000		x	Phayao <sup>283</sup>
1496	90,000		x	Lampāng <sup>284</sup>
1497	400,000		x	Phayao <sup>285</sup>
1500	1,200,00		x	Chiang Rāi <sup>286</sup>
1509	100,000		x	Chiang Mai <sup>287</sup>
1509	2,000,000		x	Lamphūn <sup>288</sup>
1502	1,000,000		x	Lamphūn <sup>289</sup>
1512	500,000	x		Lamphūn <sup>290</sup>
1512	100,000	x		Lamphūn <sup>291</sup>
1512	100,000	x		Lamphūn <sup>292</sup>

<sup>276</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495. This monastery had five (groups of) fields each taxed with 45,000 cowries.

<sup>277</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>278</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>279</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>280</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>281</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Bun Rūang 1496.

<sup>282</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496.

<sup>283</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496.

<sup>284</sup> 1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496. This is for 28 families in three villages.

<sup>285</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497.

<sup>286</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500.

<sup>287</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Suphan 1509.

<sup>288</sup> 1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509.

<sup>289</sup> 1.3.1.1 Dòì Jam Tham 1502.

<sup>290</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

<sup>291</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

<sup>292</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

Year A.D.	Tax เบี้ย	Indiv. Field	Total Amount	Region
1512	100,000	x		Lamphūn <sup>293</sup>
1512	100,000	x		Lamphūn <sup>294</sup>
1512	100,000	x		Lamphūn <sup>295</sup>
1512	25,000	x		Lamphūn <sup>295</sup>
1520	6,000	x		Chiang Mai <sup>297</sup>
1523	60,000		x	Chiang Mai <sup>298</sup>
1554	81,800		x	Chiang Khòng <sup>299</sup>
1554	50,000	x		Chiang Mai <sup>300</sup>
1554	50,000	x		ditto
1554	50,000	x		ditto
1554	50,000	x		ditto

**For Comparison:**

1484	7,000	Bān Tham	Chiang Rāi <sup>301</sup>
1488	400	Bān Kong	Chiang Rāi <sup>302</sup>
1488	100	Bān Klòng	Chiang Rāi <sup>303</sup>
1488	7,000	Bān unnamed	Phayao <sup>304</sup>
1495	2,000	Bān Phlao with 2 areca trees	Phayao <sup>305</sup>
1495	6,500	Bān Dòn	Phayao <sup>306</sup>
1567	500 silver	Bān Pā	Chiang Mai <sup>307</sup>

<sup>293</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.<sup>294</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.<sup>295</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.<sup>296</sup> 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.<sup>297</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Phra Kòt 1520.<sup>298</sup> 1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523.<sup>299</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554.<sup>300</sup> 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554. The monastery had four individual (groups of) fields each taxed with 50,000 cowries. These taxes, however, may have included also village and other taxes; cf. below Wat Jula Khirī, footnote 320.<sup>301</sup> 1.4.1.1 Dòi Tham Phra 1484.<sup>302</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.<sup>303</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488.<sup>304</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488.<sup>305</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya 1495.<sup>306</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.<sup>307</sup> 1.2.3.1 Wat Wisutthārām 1567.

### c. Field Fertility The Ratio between Seed Rice and Tax

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

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

<sup>308</sup> 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411.

<sup>309</sup> 2.2.1.1 Sunanthārām 1459. Bān Huai Sāi is in Laos opposite Chiang Kham. But the inscription may originally have belonged to a monastery in eastern Lān Nā.

<sup>310</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513.

<sup>311</sup> 1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479.

<sup>312</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493.

<sup>313</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495. This is the total amount of the fields owned by the monastery. The following items of Wat Lī are the data of certain individual fields.

<sup>314</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>315</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>316</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>317</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>318</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>319</sup> 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495.

<sup>320</sup> 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554. This monastery had four individual (groups of) fields. The very high tax for these four fields cannot be explained by their good fertility alone. It must have either included four villages and other items (the text is not clear) or else it reflects a steep tax increase or an inflation from c. 1495 on.

Year A.D.	Seed Rice ข้าว	Tax เบี้ย	Ratio Seed Rice : Tax	Region
1554	50	50,000	1:1,000	ditto
1554	30	50,000	1:1,666	ditto
1554	50	50,000	1:1,000	ditto

## 8. Bibliography

### a. General Abbreviations

- A.D. Anno domini “in the year of the Lord”, i.e. the now internationally used era.
- ALI Archive of Lan Na Inscriptions, Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University.
- BEFEO Bulletin de l’Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient.
- B.S. Buddhasakkarāja พุทธศักราช (พ.ศ.). The era presently used in Thailand, beginning on 1. January, also misleadingly called Buddhist Era (B.E.). Subtracting 543 will give A.D.
- JPTS Journal of the Pali Text Society.
- JSS Journal of the Siam Society.
- N.S. Nibbānasakkarāja. An era used in mediaeval Lān Nā and other regions, counted from the death of the Buddha on the full moon of Visākha (appr. May). Subtracting 544 will give approximately A.D.
- PED T.W. Rhys Davids / William Stede: The Pali Text Society’s Pali-English Dictionary. London, 1966.

### b. Inscriptions

#### Inscr. # 14 Wat Khemā, Sukhōthai, 1536

- Griswold / Prasöt 1975 Inscr. Wat Khemā

#### Inscr. # 49 Wat Sòrasak, Sukhōthai, c.1418.

- Griswold / Prasöt 1968 A Declaration of Independence: 230-242.

#### Inscr. # 93 Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, 1399+.<sup>321</sup>

- Griswold / Prasöt 1969 Asokārāma Inscription.

#### 1.1.1.1 Ārām Sī Köt 1490

- Penth 1976 Jārük Wat Sī Köt

<sup>321</sup>The inscription was written after 1399, perhaps between 1413-20.

1.2.1.1 Kū Wat Sao Hin c. 1480

- Penth et al. 2001 Corpus 4: 47-64

1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492

- Schmitt 1898 No.6 Inscription Vat Lampoeung
- Prasān/Prasöt 1970 Jārük Wat Tapōthārām

1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Bun Rüang 1496

- Thöm / Prasān 1971 Jārük C.S. 858 WPT Sī Jòm Thòng

1.2.1.1 Wat Kāo Lāt 1497

- Thöm / Prasān 1971 Jārük C.S. 859
- Penth et al. 2001 Corpus 4: 77-93

1.2.1.1 Wat Kān Thöm 1499

- Penth 1994 Jārük Wat Kān Thöm 2042
- Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: 17-34

1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Suphan 1509

- Schmitt 1898 No.5 Inscription Vat Suvarna Arama

1.2.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1520

- Penth et al. 2001 Corpus 4: 95-109

1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523

- Penth 1975 Jārük Wat Phan Tao
- Penth 1975 Steininschrift vom Kloster Phan Tao

1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554

- Penth 1985 Jārük Jula Khirī 1554

1.2.1.1 Wat Hua Nòng

- Penth 1994 Jārük Wat Hua Nòng

1.2.2.2 W. Dòk Kham 1783

- Penth 1976 Jārük phra Phuttha rūp: No.25

1.2.3.1 Wat Wisutthārām 1567

- Unpublished

1.2.3.2 Wat Rai Hòm 1514

- Penth 1976 Jārük phra Phuttha rūp: No.17

1.2.3.2 Wat Mùn Tum 1563

- Penth 1976 Jārük phra Phuttha rūp: No.21

1.3.1.1 Wat Kū Kut 1218

- Halliday 1930 Inscriptions môn: 91-95.

1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yün 1370

- Cham 1965 Lak thī 62
- Griswold / Prasöt 1974 Inscription Wat Phra Yün
- Cham 1983 Jārük Wat Phra Yün

1.3.1.1 Weluwan Ārām 1488

- Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: 49-62

1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kao 1489

- Cham 1957 Jārük Wat Nòng Nām
- Cham 1965 Lak thī
- Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: 63-81

1.3.1.1 Dòi Jam Tham 1502

- Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Jārük sālā klāng Jangwat Lampāng

1.3.1.1 Wat Bun Bān 1504

- Thöm / Prasān 1978 Jārük Wat Bun Bān Lò Phò./20
- Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: 83-95

1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509

- Schmitt 1898 No.18 Inscription Vat Louang
- Cham 1958 Jārük Wat Phra Thāt C.S. 862
- Cham 1965 Lak thī 71
- Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: 111-134

1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512

- Cham 1960 Jārük Wat Suwannārām
- Cham 1965 Lak thī 73 Suwannārām
- Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: 135-151

1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479

- Penth 1976 Jārük Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Chò Rò. 33
- Penth et al. 1997 Corpus 1: 25-32

1.4.1.1 Dòi Tham Phra 1484

- Schmitt 1898 No.9 Inscription de la caverne
- Th?m / Prasān 1974 Jārük Lò Phò./21
- Anonymous 1985 Lak thī 66

1.4.1.1 Wat Phū Khing 1488

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Chò Rò. 61
- Penth et al. 1997 Corpus 1: 47-59

1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488

- Cham 1963 Jārük Chiang Rāi C.S. 850
- Cham 1970 Lak thī 87

1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Wan 1489

- Penth 1983 Jārük Wat Mahā Wan 1489
- Penth et al. 1997 Corpus 1: 61-75

1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496

- Schmitt 1895 No.3 Inscription Xieng Sën
- Cham 1938 Jārük Wat Prāsāt
- Cham 1965 Lak thī 69
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Chò Rò.3
- Penth et al. 1997 Corpus 1: 77-90.

1.4.1.1 Wat Sī Sutthāwāt 1496

- Schmitt 1898 No.27 Inscription Vat Chay Die Suphan
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Chò Rò. 2

1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500

- Schmitt 1898 No.20 Inscription Vat Chetyot
- Thöm / Prasān 1974 Jārük Lò Phò./26

1.4.1.1 Wat Uthumphara Ārām 1502

- Penth et al. 2001 Corpus 4: 199-214

1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513

- Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārük Wat Sī Umōng Kham
- Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 99
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 1

1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554

- Penth 1988 Jārük Wat Chiang Sā 1553.<sup>322</sup>
- Penth et al. 2000 Corpus 4: 215-235

1.4.1.1 Mahā Thāt Chiang Lā 1611

- Thöm / Prasān 1978 Jārük Lò Phò. 17
- Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: 233-246

1.4.1.1 Wat Phā Khāo Pān 1617

- Prasān / Prasöt 1971 Jārük Wat Phā Khāo Pān
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Chò Rò. 7
- Penth et al. 1997 Corpus 1: 127-140

1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411

- Thöm et al. 1980 Jārük kasat Lò Phò./9
- Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: Lò Phò. 9
- Winai et al. 1991 Lak thī 301

1.5.1.1 Phayao 1411

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 19
- Thöm 1995 Phò Yò.19

1.5.1.1 Wiang Kao Phayao 1411

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 47
- Thöm 1995 Phò Yò.47

1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yòt 1412

- Thöm / Prasān 1974 Jārük Wat Kao Yòt Lò Phò./27
- Thöm / Prasān 1995 Lò Phò.27

1.5.1.1 Bān Nòng Tao 1474

- Prasān / Prasöt 1969 Kham ān silā jārük

<sup>322</sup> When the inscription was first published, its date was thought to fall in A.D.1553. Only later it was found that the date actually corresponds to 4 January 1554.

- Thöm et al. 1970 Lak thī 302
- Prasān et al. 1995 Lò Phò. 24
- Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3: 247-259

1.5.1.1 Wat Dòn Khrām 1488

- Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārük Wat Sī Umōng Kham
- Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 100
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 2
- Prasān / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò. 2

1.5.1.1 Wat Klāng 1490

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 57
- Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 57

1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491

- Prasān / Thöm 1977 Silā Jārük Phò.Yò./3
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 3
- Prasān / Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 3

1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491 (2)

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 46
- Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 3

1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām Khòì Sum 1492

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 4
- Thöm / Prasān 1995 Phò Yò. 4

1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mùn 1493

- Prasān 1973 Jārük Bān Mā Nā Rūa
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 6
- Prasān 1995 Phò Yò. 6

1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Nòì 1494

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 26

1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya 1495

- Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārük Wat Sī Khōm Kham
- Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 103
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 7
- Prasān / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò. 7

1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 27
- Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 27

1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496

- Thöm / Prasān 1970 Jārük C.S. 858
- Penth 1995 Lò Phò. 6

1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Kham 1496

- Thöm 1995 Lò Phò. 10

1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497

- Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Silā Jārük Wat Sī Umōng Kham
- Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 101
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 8
- Prasān / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò. 8

1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Ruang 1498

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 9<sup>323</sup>
- Thöm 1995 Phò Yò.9

1.5.1.1 Wat Mün Lò 1498

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 59.
- Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 59

1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha-Ārām 1506

- Thöm / Prasān 1973 Silā Jārük Lò Phò./22
- Thöm / Prasān 1995 Lò Phò. 22

1.5.1.1 Wat Sip-sòng Hòng 1516

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 13
- Thöm / Prasān 1995 Phò Yò. 13

1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng c. 1530

- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Yò. 48
- Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 48

1.6.1.1 Wat Bān Läng 1469

- Prasān 1969 Jārük Wat Bān Läng
- Penth et al. 1997 Corpus 1: 211-218

1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1476

- Cham 1952 Jārük Jangwat Lampāng C.S. 838
- Cham 1965 Lak thī 65

1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496

- Penth 1985 Jārük Wat Pā Bong 1496

1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504

- Cham 1961 Jārük WPT Lampāng Luang C.S.858
- Cham 1965 Lak thī 70

1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500

- Cham 1959 Jārük Wat Chāng Kham C.S.862.
- Cham 1965 Lak thī 72.
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Nò Nò. 2

1.7.2.2 Wat Nā Luang 1793

- Unpublished

<sup>323</sup> Formerly this inscription was also known both as  $\text{๙๙.12}$  and  $\text{๙๙./พ.13}$ .

1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529

- Penth 1983 Jārük Wat Bupphārām 1529
- Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārük Lān Nā (1): Phò Rò. 9

2.2.1.1 Sunanthārām 1459

- Kannikā 1991 Jārük Bān Huai Sāi
- Winai / Kannikā 1991 Lak thī 318

2.3.1.1 Wat Pā Luang 1808

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

**c. Chronicles and other texts****CMA**

The Chronicle of Chiang Mai.

**CMA.HPms**

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

**CMA.N**

See: Notton 1932 Annales (3).

**CMA.NL**

A copy of CMA, probably in the Wachirayān National Library, written in a leporello book or *pap sā*, photograph in: Coedès 1929 Tamnān aksòn thai, p.20.

**CMA.T**

See: Thon 1971 Chronicle of Chiang Mai.

**CMA.U**

See: Udom 1996 Chronicle of Chiang Mai.

**CMA.W (CMA.W'1998)**

See: Wyatt / Arunrat 1995 (1998) Chronicle of Chiang Mai.

**CMA.NL**

A copy of CMA, probably in the Wachirayān National Library, written in a leporello book or *pap sā*, photograph in: Coedès 1929 Tamnān aksòn thai, p.20.

Khana Panja 5 Jamphuak คณปัญจ 5 จำพวก “The 5 Measurements”

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

MRS

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

MRS.CK

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

MRS.CKcy.A+W

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

In: Arunrat / Wijeyewardene 1986 Laws of Mang Rāi.

MS

The chronicle Mūlasāsanā.

MS.P

Text edition of MS in modern Thai by Prasöt na Nakhòn (Prasert na Nagara), based on MS.S+P and collated with other MS manuscripts.

In: Prasöt 1975 Mūlasāsanā.

MS.S+P

See: Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā.

PAY

The chronicle of Phayao.

PAY.PP

Historical events concerning Phayao included in a ms under the misleading title “Chronicle of Müang Ngön Yāng Chiang Sān” ตำนานเมืองเงินยางเชียงแสน.

In: ประชุมพงศาวดาร, 61, 2497 (1954), 1-55.

**PAY.WSB**

A version of PAY in a ms kept at Wat Sī Bun Rūang, Phayao, copied in 1935.

“หนังสือพื้นเมืองพะยา” วัดศรีบุญเรือง, ต.ตุน, อ.เมือง พะเยา.

See: SRI microfilm 80.047.05.022-022. Unpublished.

**d. Articles and Books**

Anonymous 1985 Lak thī 66

(ไม่ปรากฏชื่อผู้แต่ง) “หลักที่ 66 ศิลจารึกดอยถ้ำพระ จังหวัดเชียงราย จ.ศ. 846 พ.ศ. 2027” ประชุม  
ศิลปจารึก, 3, 2508, 156-159

- 1.4.1.1 Dòì Tham Phra 1484

Arunrat / Wijeyewardene 1986 Laws of Mang Rāi

Aroonrut Wichienkeo / Gehan Wijeyewardene: The Laws of King Mangrai  
(Mangrayatham- masart). Canberra, Dept. of Anthropology, ANU., 1986.

Bechert 1992 Writing down the Tripiṭaka

Heinz Bechert: The Writing down of the Tripiṭaka in Pāli. Wiener Zeitschr. f.d.  
Kunde Südasiens, 36, 1992, 45-53.

Bock 1884 / 1985 Temples

Carl Bock: Temples and Elephants. London, 1884 (Reprint: Bangkok, White  
Orchid Press, 1985).

Bock 1885 Im Reiche

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

Cham 1938 Jārük Wat Prāsāt

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “คำอ่านจารึก วัดปราสาท จังหวัดเชียงราย จ.ศ. 858” ศิลปากร, 2.5, 2481 (1938),  
35-42.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496

Cham 1952 Jārük Jangwat Lampāng C.S. 838

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “คำอ่านจารึก จังหวัดลำปาง จ.ศ. 838” ศิลปากร, 6.3, 2495 / 1952, 89-93.

- 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1476

Cham 1957 Jārük Wat Nòng Nām

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “คำอ่านจารึกวัดหนองหนาม ... จ.ศ. 851” ศิลปากร, 1.2, 2500 / 1957, 84-92.

- 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489

## Cham 1958 Jārūk Wat Phra Thāt C.S. 862

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “คำอ่านศิลาจารึกวัดพระธาตุ มุมตะวันออกเฉียงเหนือ จังหวัดลำพูน จ.ศ. 862” ศิลปากร, 1.6, 2501 (1958), 60-68.

- 1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509

## Cham 1959 Jārūk Wat Chāng Kham C.S. 862

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “แผ่นศิลาจารึก ... จ.ศ. 862 ... วัดช้างค้ำ” ศิลปากร, 3.4, 2502 / 1959, 65-68.

- 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500

## Cham 1960 Jārūk Wat Suwannārām

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “คำจารึกอักษรไทย ... จ.ศ. 874 วัดสุวรรณาราม” ศิลปากร, 4.2, 2503 / 1960, 63-65.

- 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

## Cham 1961 Jārūk WPT Lampāng Luang C.S. 858

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... วัดพระธาตุลำปางหลวง ... จ.ศ. 858” ศิลปากร, 4.5, 2504 / 1961, 73-79.

- 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504

## Cham 1963 Jārūk Chiang Rāi C.S. 850

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “คำอ่านจารึกจังหวัดเชียงราย จ.ศ. 850” ศิลปากร, 7.1, 2506 (1963), 59-64.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488

## Cham 1965 Lak thī 62

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 62 ... ศิลาจารึกวัดพระยืน จังหวัด ลำพูน” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 3, 2508 (1965), 136-144.

- 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yün 1370

## Cham 1965 Lak thī 65

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 65 ศิลาจารึกจังหวัดลำปาง” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 3, 2508 (1965), 152-155.

- 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1476

## Cham 1965 Lak thī 68

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 68 ศิลาจารึกวัดหนองหนาม ... จ.ศ. 851” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 3, 2508 (1965), 166-173.

- 1.3.1.1 Wat Khuang Chum Kāo 1489

## Cham 1965 Lak thī 69

ฉำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 69 ศิลาจารึกวัดปราสาท” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 3, 2508 (1965), 174-178.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496

## Cham 1965 Lak thī 70

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 70 ศิลจารึกที่วิหารวัดพระธาตุลำปางหลวง ... จ.ศ. 858” ประชุมศิลปจารึก, 3, 2508 (1965), 179-184.

- 1.6.1.1 WPT Lampāng Luang 1504

## Cham 1965 Lak thī 71

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 71 ... ศิลจารึกวัดพระธาตุ มุมตะวันออกเฉียงเหนือ จังหวัดลำพูน จ.ศ. 862” ประชุมศิลปจารึก, 3, 2508 (1965), 185-194.

- 1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509

## Cham 1965 Lak thī 72

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 72 ... วัดช้างค้ำ” ประชุมศิลปจารึก, 3, 2508 (1965), 195-197.

- 1.7.1.1 Wat Phra Köt 1500

## Cham 1965 Lak thī 73 Suwannārām

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 73 ... สุวรรณาราม” ประชุมศิลปจารึก, 3, 2508 (1965), 198-201.

- 1.3.1.1 Suwanna Ārām 1512.

## Cham 1970 Lak thī 87

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “หลักที่ 87 ศิลจารึกจังหวัดเชียงราย” ประชุมศิลปจารึก, 4, 2513 (1970), 16-21.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Phan Tòng Tām 1488

## Cham 1983 Jārük Wat Phra Yün

น้ำ ทองคำวรรณ “ศิลปจารึกวัดพระยืน” ใน กรมศิลปากร (จัดพิมพ์) “จารึกสมัยสุโขทัย” กรุงเทพฯ 2526 (1983), 92-101.

- 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yün 1370

## Coedès 1925 Tamnān aksòn Thai

ยอช เซเดส์ “ตำนานอักษรไทย” กรุงเทพฯ 2468 (<sup>3</sup>2472/1929)

## Coedès 1956 Le 2500e anniversaire

G. Coedès: Le 2500e anniversaire du Bouddha. Diogenè (Paris), 15, 1956.

## Credner 1935 / 1966 Siam

Wilhelm Credner: Siam. Das Land der Tai. Leipzig, 1935. Osnabrück, 1966 (reprint of the 1935 edition).

## Falk 1998 The Discovery of Lumbinī

Harry Falk: The Discovery of Lumbinī. Lumbini, 1998 (Lumbini Internat. Res. Institute, Occasional Papers 1).

## Geiger 1953 Cūlav. Translation

Wilhelm Geiger: Cūlavamsa, being the more Recent Part of the Mahāvamsa. 2 Vols. Colombo, 1953 (2nd edition).

## Griswold / Prasöt 1968 A Declaration of Independence

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: A Declaration of Independence and its Consequences. JSS, 56.2, 1968, 207-249.

- Inscr. # 49 Wat Sòrasak, Sukhōthai, c.1418.

## Griswold / Prasöt 1969 Asokārāma Inscription

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The Asokārāma Inscription of 1399 A.D. JSS, 57.1, 1969, 29-56.

- Inscr. # 93 Asokārāma, Sukhōthai, 1399+. <sup>324</sup>

## Griswold / Prasöt 1973 Epigraphy Mahā-dharmarājā I (1)

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The Epigraphy of Mahādharma-rajā I of Sukhodaya; EHS No.11.1. JSS, 61.1, 1973, 71-179.

## Griswold / Prasöt 1974 Inscription Wat Phra Yün

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The Inscription of Wat Pra Yün. EHS No. 13. JSS, 62.1, 1974, 123-141.

- 1.3.1.1 Wat Phra Yün 1370

## Griswold / Prasöt 1975 Inscr. Wat Khemā

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

- Inscr. # 14 Wat Khemā, Sukhōthai, 1536

## Griswold / Prasöt 1977 Judgments

A.B. Griswold / Prasert na Nagara: The 'Judgments of King Mañ Rāi'. EHS No. 17. JSS (65.1) 1977 p.137-160.

## Guignard 1912/1971 Dictionnaire

Théodore Guignard: Dictionnaire laotien-français. Hongkong 1912. Reprint: Westmead 1971.

## Halliday 1930 Inscriptions môn

R. Halliday: Les inscriptions môn du Siam. BEFEO, 30.1-2, 1930, 81-105.

<sup>324</sup>The inscription was written after 1399, perhaps between 1413-20.

## Hardy 1850 Eastern Monachism

R. Spence Hardy: Eastern Monachism. London, 1850.

## v. Hinüber 1990 On some Colophons

Oskar von Hinüber: On some Colophons of Old Lanna Pāli Manuscripts. Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Thai Studies, Kunming, 11-13 May 1990, Vol. IV, p. 56-77.

## v. Hinüber 1996 Chips

Oskar von Hinüber: Chips from Buddhist Workshops. Scribes and Manuscripts from Northern Thailand. JPTS, 22, 1996, 35-57.

## Kannikā 1991 Jārūk Bān Huai Sāi

กรรณิการ์ วิมลเกษม “จารึกบ้านห้วยทราย” ภาษา-จารึก, 3, 2534 (1991), 9-23.

- 2.2.1.1 Sunanthārām 1459

## Kannikā et al. 1991 Jārūk Lān Nā

กรรณิการ์ วิมลเกษม ฯลฯ (บรรณาธิการ) “จารึกล้านนา”, ภาค 1 เล่ม 1 จารึกจังหวัดเชียงราย น่าน พะเยาแพร่, ภาคที่ 2 ภาพ, กรุงเทพฯ 2534. / Lan Na Inscriptions, Part 1, Vol.1: Inscriptions from Chiang Rai, Nan, Phayao and Phrae. Vol. 2: Plates. (Bangkok 1991.)

## Kasem 1964 Tamnān Wat Phra Thāt Lampāng Luang

เกษม เกาะปิ่นะ “ตำนานพระธาตุลำปางหลวง” ใน อริยะ เลิศรัตนกร “ตำนานพระธาตุลำปางหลวง, ตำนานพระแก้วมรกต, ตำนานเจ้าเจ็ดตน” วพธ ลำปางหลวง 72511, p. 5-31.

## Kraisī 1984 Felicitation Volume

(ไม่ปรากฏชื่อบรรณาธิการ) “ลายคราม เพื่อเฉลิมฉลองอายุครบ 6 รอบ นายไกรศรี นิมมานเหมินท์” เชียงใหม่ 2527 (A.D.1984)

## Kraisī 1984 Kep phak sai sā

ไกรศรี นิมมานเหมินท์ “เก็บผักใส่ซ้า เก็บข้าใส่เมือง”. In: Krais(tm) 1984 Felicitation Volume: 127-

## Lamotte 1958 Histoire

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

## Lingat 1931 Esclavage privée

R. Lingat: L’esclavage privée dans le vieux droit siamois. Paris, 1931.

Manī 1982 Dic.

มณี พยอมยงค์ “พจนานุกรม ลานนาไทย” เชียงใหม่ 2525 (A.D. 1982)

McGilvary 1912 A Half Century

Daniel McGilvary: A Half Century Among the Siamese and the Lāo. New York 1912.

v. Mehren / Sawers 1992 Revitalizing

Philip von Mehren / Tim Sawers: Revitalizing the Law and Development Movement. A Case Study on Land Law in Thailand. JSS, 80.2, 1992, 33-57.

Met 1965 Dic.

เมธ รัตนประสิทธิ์ “พจนานุกรมไทยยวน-ไทย-อังกฤษ” (กรุงเทพฯ) 2508 (A.D. 1965)

Nai 1992 Dhammasāt Texts

Nai Pan Hla / Ryuji Okudeira (coll.): Eleven Mon Dhammasāt Texts. Tokyo, The Toyo Bunko, 1992.

Nattier 1991 Once Upon a Future Time

J. Nattier: Once Upon a Future Time. Studies in a Buddhist Prophecy of Decline. Berkeley, 1991.

Notton 1932 Chronique de Xieng Mai

Camille Notton: Annales du Siam, 3e volume: Chronique de Xieng Mai. Paris 1932.

Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2)

Auguste Pavie: Mission Pavie. Etudes diverses (2): Recherches sur l’histoire du Cambodge, du Laos et du Siam. Paris 1898.

Penth 1975 Jārük Wat Phan Tao

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “ศิลาจารึกจากวัดพันเตา เชียงใหม่” ศิลปากร, 19.2, 2518 (1975), 103-104.

- 1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523.

Penth 1975 Steininschrift vom Kloster Phan Tao

Hans Penth: Eine Steininschrift vom Kloster Phan Tao (Chiang Mai). ZdMG 125.1, 1975: 140-143.

- 1.2.1.1 Wat Yāng Num 1523.

### Penth 1976 Jārük phra Phuttha rūp

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “คำจารึกที่ฐานพระพุทธรูปในนครเชียงใหม่” กรุงเทพฯ สำนักนายกรัฐมนตรี 2519 (1976).

### Penth 1976 Jārük Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “ศิลาจารึกจากวัดบ้านยางหมากม่วง (พ.ศ. 2022)” ศิลปากร, 20.3, 2529 (1976), 38-40.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Bān Yāng Māk Muang 1479

### Penth 1976 Jārük Wat Sī Köt

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “ศิลาจารึกวัดศรีเกิด อำเภอป่า จังหวัดแม่ฮ่องสอน พ.ศ. 2032-2033” ศิลปากร, 19.6, 2519 (1976), 72-76.

- 1.1.1.1 Ārām Sī Köt 1490

### Penth 1980 The Toponym Lān Nā

Hans Penth: The Orthography of the Toponym Lān Nā. JSS, 68.1, 1980, 128.

### Penth 1983 Jārük Wat Bupphārām 1529

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “การสำรวจและวิจัยจารึก 1.8.1.1 วัดบุพผาราม พ.ศ. 2072 / ค.ศ. 1529” ศิลปากร, 27.3, 2526 (1983), 73-77.

- 1.8.1.1 Wat Bupphārām 1529

### Penth 1983 Jārük Wat Mahā Wan 1489

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “การสำรวจและวิจัยจารึก 1.4.1.1 วัดมหาวัน พ.ศ. 2032 / ค.ศ. 1489” ศิลปากร, 22.4, 2526 (1983), 71-81.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Wan 1489

### Penth 1985 Jārük Jula Khirī 1554

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “การสำรวจและวิจัยจารึก 1.2.1.1 จุลคีรี พ.ศ. 2097 / ค.ศ. 1554” ศิลปากร, 28.6, 2528 (1985), 20-26.

- 1.2.1.1 Jula Khirī 1554

### Penth 1985 Jārük Wat Pā Bong 1496

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “การสำรวจและวิจัยจารึก 1.6.1.1 วัดป่าบง พ.ศ. 2039 / ค.ศ. 1496” ศิลปากร, 29.2, 2528 (1985), 65-69.

- 1.6.1.1 Wat Pā Bong 1496

### Penth 1988 Jārük Wat Chiang Sā 1553

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “การสำรวจและวิจัยจารึก 1.4.1.1 วัดเชียงสา พ.ศ. 2096 / ค.ศ. 1553” ศิลปากร, 32.2, 2531, 43-48.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Chiang Sā 1554

## Penth 1994 Jinakālamālī Index

Hans Penth: Jinakālamālī Index. An Annotated Index to the Thailand Part of Ratanapañña's Chronicle Jinakālamālī. Oxford (Pali Text Society) / Chiang Mai (Silkworm Books), 1994.

## Penth 1994 Jārük Wat Kān Thōm 2042

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “จารึก 1.2.1.1 วัดวัดกานโถม พ.ศ. 2042” ใน สรัสวดี อ๋องสกุล “เวียงกุมกาม” เชียงใหม่ 2537 (1994) หน้า 101-107.

## • 1.2.1.1 Wat Kān Thōm 1499

## Penth 1994 Jārük Wat Hua Nòng

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “จารึก 1.2.1.1 วัดหัวหนอง” ใน สรัสวดี อ๋องสกุล “เวียงกุมกาม” เชียงใหม่ 2537 (1994) หน้า 108-

## • 1.2.1.1 Wat Hua Nòng

## Penth 1995 Lò Phò. 6

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “พ.ย. 27” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 190-195.

## • 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496

## Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 27

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “พ.ย. 27” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 153-164.

## • 1.5.1.1 Wat Lī 1495

## Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 48

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “พ.ย. 48” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 325-331.

## • 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng c. 1530

## Penth 1995 Phò Yò. 59

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ “พ.ย. 59” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 210-219.

## • 1.5.1.1 Wat Mūn Lò 1498

## Penth et al. 1997 Corpus 1

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ / พรรณเพ็ญ เครือไทย / ศรีเลา เกษพรหม ผู้ช่วยบรรณาธิการ “ประชุมจารึกล้านนา, เล่ม 1, จารึกในพิพิธภัณฑ์ เชียงแสน” สถาบันวิจัยสังคม มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ 2540. - English title: Hans Penth, Phanphen Khruathai, Silao Ketphrom: Corpus of Lān Nā Inscriptions, Vol. 1, Inscriptions in the Chiang Sān Museum. Chiang Mai, Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University, 1997, 218 pp.

### Penth et al. 1999 Corpus 3

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ / พรรณเพ็ญ เครือไทย / ศรีเลา เกษพรหม ผู้ช่วยบรรณาธิการ “ประชุมจารึกล้านนา, เล่ม 3, จารึกในพิพิธภัณฑสถานฯ ลำพูน” สถาบันวิจัยสังคม มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ 2542. - English title: Hans Penth, Phanphen Khruathai, Silao Ketphrom: Corpus of Lān Nā Inscriptions, Vol. 3, Inscriptions in the Lamphūn Museum. Chiang Mai, Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University, 1999, 362 pp.

### Penth et al. 2000 Corpus 4

ฮันส์ เพนธ์ / พรรณเพ็ญ เครือไทย / ศรีเลา เกษพรหม ผู้ช่วยบรรณาธิการ “ประชุมจารึกล้านนา, เล่ม 4, จารึกในพิพิธภัณฑสถานฯ เชียงใหม่” สถาบันวิจัยสังคม มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่ 2543. - English title: Hans Penth, Phanphen Khruathai, Silao Ketphrom: Corpus of Lān Nā Inscriptions, Vol. 4, Inscriptions in the Chiang Mai Museum. Chiang Mai, Social Research Institute, Chiang Mai University, 2000, 313 pp.

### Phrāphithayā 1964 Dic.

บริษัทแพรวพิทยาวังบูรพา รวบรวมโดย มานิต มานิตเจริญ “พจนานุกรมไทย” กรุงเทพฯ<sup>3</sup>2507.

### Prasān 1969 Jārük Wat Bān Läng

ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... ได้มาจากวัดบ้านแลง ...” ศิลปากร, 13.3, 2512, 1969, 114-116.

- 1.6.1.1 Wat Bān Läng 1469

### Prasān 1973 Jārük Bān Mā Nā Rūa

ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... ได้มาจากวัดแม่เนาเรือ ...” ศิลปากร, 17.4, 2516 / 1973, 105-108.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493

### Prasān 1995 Phò Yò. 6

ประสาร บุญประคอง “พ.ย. 6” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 134-139.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Nāng Mūn 1493

### Prasān et al. 1995 Lò Phò. 24

ประสาร บุญประคอง / เติม มีเต็ม / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร” ลพ. 24 จารึกพระยาสองแคว” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 83-86.

- 1.5.1.1 Bān Nòng Tao 1474

### Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārük Wat Sī Umōng Kham

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... ได้มาจากวัดศรีอุโมงค์คำ ...” ศิลปากร, 8.6, 2508 / 1965, 76-80.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513

## Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārük Wat Sī Umōng Kham

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... ได้มาจากวัดศรีอุโมงค์คำ ...” ศิลปากร, 9.1, 2508 / 1965, 46-52.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497

## Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Silā Jārük Wat Sī Umōng Kham

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... ได้มาจากวัดศรีอุโมงค์คำ ...” ศิลปากร, 9.2, 2508 / 1965, 68-71.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Dòn Khrām 1488

## Prasān / Prasöt 1965 Jārük Wat Sī Khōm Kham

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... ได้มาจากวัดศรีโคมคำ ...” ศิลปากร, 9.4, 2508 / 1965, 58-63.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya 1495

## Prasān / Prasöt 1969 Kham ān silā jārük

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ” ศิลปากร, 13.4, 2512 / 1969, 77-79. (only lines 1-8)

- 1.5.1.1 Bān Nòng Tao 1474

## Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 99

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 99 ศิลาจารึกวัดหนองขวาง” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 4, 2513 (1970), 81-85.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Nòng Kwāng 1513

## Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 100

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 100 ศิลาจารึกวัดดอนคราม” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 4, 2513 (1970), 86-89.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Dòn Khrām 1488

## Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 101

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 101 ศิลาจารึกวัดป่าใหม่” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 4, 2513 (1970), 90-96.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497

## Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Lak thī 103

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 103 ศิลาจารึกวัดศรีโคมคำ” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 4, 2513 (1970), 105-110.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya

Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Jārük Wat Tapōthārām

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ฦ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... ได้มาจากวัดตะโปธาราม...” ศิลปากร, 13.6, 2513 (1970), 95-100.

- 1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492

Prasān / Prasöt 1970 Jārük sālā klāng Jangwat Lampāng

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ฦ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... หน้าศาลากลางจังหวัดลำปาง” ศิลปากร, 14.3, 2513 (1970), 87-93.

- 1.3.1.1 Dòì Jam Tham 1502

Prasān / Prasöt 1971 Jārük Wat Phā Khāo Pān

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ฦ นคร “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... วัดฟ้าขาวบ้าน” ศิลปากร, 15.2, 2514 (1971), 89-94.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Phā Khāo Pān 1617

Prasān / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò. 2

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ฦ นคร “พ.ย. 2 จารึกวัดดอนคราม” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 105-109.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Dòn Khrām 1488

Prasān / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò. 7

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ฦ นคร “พ.ย. 7 จารึกวัดป่าญะ” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 165-172.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Ārām Pā Ya 1495

Prasān / Prasöt 1995 Phò Yò. 8

ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ฦ นคร “พ.ย. 8” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 202-209.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Pā Mai 1497

Prasān / Thöm 1977 Phò. Yò./3

ประสาร บุญประคอง / เทิม มีเต็ม “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... พ.ย./3” ศิลปากร, 21.3, 2520, 26-28.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491

Prasān / Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 3

ประสาร บุญประคอง / เทิม มีเต็ม “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... พ.ย./3” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 110-115.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491

## Prasöt 1971 Mang Rāi Sāt

ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “มังรายศาสตร์” กรุงเทพฯ 2514.

## Prasöt 1975 Mūlasāsanā

ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “ตำนานมูลศาสนา” กรุงเทพฯ 2518.

## Purnell 1963 Dic.

Herbert C. Purnell: A Short Northern Thai - English Dictionary (Tai Yuan). Chiang Mai, 1963

## Rispaud 1937 Les noms

Jean Rispaud: Les noms à éléments numériques des principautés tai. JSS, 29.2, 1937, 77-122.

## Sarasin 1933 (1959) Prehistorical Researches

Fritz Sarasin: Prehistorical Researches in Siam. JSS, 26.2, 1933 p. 171-202. - Reprint: The Siam Society: Selected Articles from The Siam Society Journal, vol.3, Bangkok, 1959, p.101-132.

## Schmitt 1895 No. 3 Inscription Xieng Sën

Schmitt: No.III. Inscription thaie de Xieng Sën ...; in: Lucien Fournereau: Le Siam ancien, Première partie, Paris, 1895, p.142-145 + 2 pl.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Prāsāt 1496

## Schmitt 1898 No. 5 Inscription Vat Suvarna Arama

Schmitt: V. Inscription thaie du roi de Xieng-Mai Somdec Pavitra Matra Raja Chao du Vat Suvarna Arama. In: Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2): 261-275.

- 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Suphan 1509

## Schmitt 1898 No. 6 Inscription Vat Lampoeung

Schmitt: VI. Inscription ... du Vat Lampoeung. In: Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2): 277-295.

- 1.2.1.1 Wat Tapōthārām 1492

## Schmitt 1898 No. 9 Inscription de la caverne

Schmitt: IX. Inscription thaie ... de la caverne du mont Doi-tham-phra ... In: Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2): 331-339.

- 1.4.1.1 Dòì Tham Phra 1484

Schmitt 1898 No.18 Inscription Vat Louang

Schmitt: XVIII. Inscriptions thaïes de Lampoun-Haripuñjayapura. Vat Louang ...

In: Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2): 399-405.

- 1.3.1.1 WPT Hariphunchai 1509

Schmitt 1898 No. 20 Inscription Vat Chetyot

Schmitt: XX. Inscriptions thaïes du Vat Chay Die Chetyot (Cheti Cet Yot) ... In:

Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2): 411-423.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phōthi 1500

Schmitt 1898 No. 27 Inscription Vat Chay Die Suphan

Schmitt: XXVII Inscription thaïe du Vat Chay Die Suphan. In: Pavie 1898 Etudes diverses (2): 447-448, 459-463.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Sī Sutthāwāt 1496

Shorto 1971 Dic. Mon Inscriptions

H.L. Shorto: A Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions from the Sixth to the Sixteenth Centuries. London, OUP, 1971.

Suárez 1999 Early Mapping

Thomas Suárez: Early Mapping of Southeast Asia. Singapore, Periplus Editions, 1999.

Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao

สุจิตต์ วงษ์เทศ (บรรณานุกรม) “ประชุมจารึกเมืองพะเยา, Inscriptural History of Phayao” กรุงเทพฯ มติชน 2538 (1995).

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

Sut / Phrom 1939 Mūlasāsanā

สุด ศรีสมวงศ์ / พรหม ขมาลา “ตำนานมูลศาสนา” กรุงเทพฯ กรมศิลปากร 2482.

Tavernier 1718 Les six voyages

Jean Baptiste Tavernier: Les six voyages ... en Turquie, en Perse, et aux Indes, pendant espace de quarante ans ... La Haye, 1718. (2 vols)

## Thawat 1987/88 Jārük Wat Pā Yai 2

ธวัช ปุณโณทก “ศิลาจารึกอีสานสมัยไทย-ลาว” กรุงเทพฯ (Vol. 1, Texts) 2530 (1987),  
หน้า 372-376; (Vol.2, Illustrations) “สมุดภาพศิลาจารึกอีสาน” กรุงเทพฯ 2531 (1988)  
หน้า 105 (“จารึกวัดป่าใหญ่ 2”)

- 2.3.1.1 Wat Pā Luang 1808

## Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 3

เทิม มีเต็ม “พ.ย. 3” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 116-120.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Khwāng 1491 (2)

## Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 9

เทิม มีเต็ม “พ.ย. 9, จารึกวัดพญาร่วง” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 228-233.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Ruang 1498

## Thöm 1995 Lò Phò. 10

เทิม มีเต็ม “ลพ. 10, จารึกวัดพระคำ” In: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 173-183.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Phra Kham 1496

## Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 19

เทิม มีเต็ม “พ.ย. 19, จารึกคำสาปแข่ง” In: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 385-389

- 1.5.1.1 Phayao 1411

## Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 47

เทิม มีเต็ม “พ.ย. 47, จารึกเจ้าหมื่นเลี้ยง เป็นเจ้าสี่หมื่นเมืองพยาว” In: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 64-67

- 1.5.1.1 Wiang Kao Phayao 1411

## Thöm 1995 Phò Yò. 57

เทิม มีเต็ม “พ.ย. 57” In: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 122-127

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Klāng 1490

## Thöm et al. 1991 Lak thī 302

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “หลักที่ 302 จารึกพระยาสองแคว” ประชุม  
ศิลาจารึก ภาคที่ 7 กรุงเทพฯ 2534 (1991) หน้า 99-101 (only lines 1-8).

- 1.5.1.1 Bān Nòng Tao 1474

## Thöm / Prasān 1970 Jārük C.S. 858

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... จ.ศ. 858 ... ลป/พิเศษ 1” ศิลปากร, 14.4, 2513  
(1970), 95-100.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Bān Dān 1496

## Thöm / Prasān 1971 Jārük C.S. 859

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... จ.ศ. 859” ศิลปากร, 14.5, 2514 (1971), 115-119.

- 1.2.1.1 Wat Kao Lāt 1497

## Thöm / Prasān 1971 Jārük C.S. 858 WPT Sī Jòm Thòng

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ... จ.ศ. 585 ... วัดพระธาตุศรีจอมทอง” ศิลปากร, 14.6, 2514 (1971), 82-87.

- 1.2.1.1 Wat Sī Bun Rüang 1496

## Thöm / Prasān 1973 Jārük Lò Phò./22

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ลพ./22” ศิลปากร, 17.1, 2517 / 1973, 92-96.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha-Ārām 1506

## Thöm / Prasān 1974 Jārük Lò Phò./21

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ลพ./21” ศิลปากร, 18.3, 2517, 15-17.

- 1.4.1.1 Dòi Tham Phra 1484

## Thöm / Prasān 1974 Jārük Lò Phò./26

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านจารึก พิพิธภัณฑฯ ลพ./26” ศิลปากร, 18.4, 2517 (1974), 85-88.

- 1.4.1.1 Wat Mahā Phīthi 1500

## Thöm / Prasān 1974 Jārük Wat Kao Yòt Lò Phò./27

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก วัดเก้ายอด ลพ./27” ศิลปากร, 18.1, 2517, 76-79.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yòt 1412

## Thöm / Prasān 1978 Jārük Wat Bun Bān Lò Phò./20

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก วัดขุนบาน ลพ./20” ศิลปากร, 22.1, 2521, 51-53.

- 1.3.1.1 Wat Bun Bān 1504

## Thöm / Prasān 1978 Jārük Lò Phò. 17

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “คำอ่านศิลาจารึก ลพ. 17” ศิลปากร, 22.3, 2521, 68-71.

- 1.4.1.1 Mahā Thāt Chiang Lā 1611

## Thöm / Prasān 1981 Jārük Phra Jao In Päng

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “ศิลาจารึก พระเจ้าอินแปลง อบ./14” ศิลปากร 24.6, 2524 / 1981, 56-64.

- 2.3.1.1 Wat Pā Luang 1808

Thöm / Prasān 1995 Lò Phò. 22

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “ลพ. 22 จารึกวัดวิสุทธอาราม” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 265-272.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām 1506

Thöm / Prasān 1995 Lò Phò. 27

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “ลพ. 27 จารึกวัดเก้ายอด” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 72-78.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Kao Yòt 1412

Thöm / Prasān 1995 Phò Yò. 4

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “พ.ย. 4 จารึกวัดวิสุทธอาราม” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 128-133.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Wisuttha Ārām Khòì Sum 1492

Thöm / Prasān 1995 Phò Yò. 13

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “พ.ย. 13 จารึกวัดสิบสองห้อง” in: Sujit 1995 Prachum Jārük Phayao: 296-305.

- 1.5.1.1 Wat Sip-sòng Hòng 1516

Thöm et al. 1980 Jārük kasat Lò Phò./9

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “ศิลาจารึกกษัตริย์ราชวงศ์มังราย ลพ./9” ศิลปากร, 24.2, 2523, 46-51, 3 figs.

- 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411

Thöm et al. 1986 Jārük Phra Jao In Päng

เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง / ประเสริฐ ณ นคร “จารึกพระเจ้าอินแปลง” ใน: หอสมุดแห่งชาติ (จัดพิมพ์) “จารึกในประเทศไทย”, เล่ม 5, 2529 (1986), 253-257. (No footnotes).

- 2.3.1.1 Wat Pā Luang 1808

Thon 1971 Chronicle of Chiang Mai

ทน ตนมั่น (ปริวรรต) “ตำนานพื้นเมืองเชียงใหม่” กรุงเทพฯ สำนักนายกรัฐมนตรี 2514.

Udom 1991 Dic.

อุดม รุ่งเรืองศรี “พจนานุกรมล้านนา-ไทย” กรุงเทพฯ 2534. (A.D. 1991)

Udom 1996 Chronicle of Chiang Mai

อุดม รุ่งเรืองศรี “ตำนานพื้นเมืองเชียงใหม่ ฉบับ 700 ปี” เชียงใหม่ ศูนย์วัฒนธรรมจังหวัดเชียงใหม่ สถาบันราชภัฏเชียงใหม่ 2539.

Wershoven c. 1900 Lehrbuch

F.J. Wershoven: Lehr- und Lesebuch der Siamesischen Sprache. Hartleben, Wien, Pest, Leipzig, no date. Appr. 1900.

Winai et al. 1991 Lak thī 301

วินัย พงศ์ศรีเพียร / เทิม มีเต็ม / ประสาร บุญประคอง “หลักที่ 301 จารึกวัดสุวรรณมหาวิหารพะเยา” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 7, 2534 (1991), 2534, 89-98.

- 1.5.1.1 Phra Suwanna Mahā Wihān 1411

Winai / Kannikā 1991 Lak thī 318

วินัย พงศ์ศรีเพียร / กรรณิการ์ วิมลเกษม “หลักที่ 318, จารึกเจ้าหมื่นคำนคร บ้านห้วยทรายลาว” ประชุมศิลาจารึก, 7, 2534 (1991), 168-174.

- 2.2.1.1 Sunanthārām 1459

Wyatt / Arunrat 1995 Chronicle of Chiang Mai

David K. Wyatt / Aroonrut Wichienkeo: The Chiang Mai Chronicle. Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books, 1995; second ed. 1998.