

### **On Traibhūmikathā**

*Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 79, Part 2, 1991, pp. 24-36.

Some years ago I published a short note on "The Date of the *Traibhūmikathā*" (*TBK*), a work which I considered at the time to be a curio at the fringe of Thai historiography, and to which I had given only the slight attention evidenced by my note.<sup>1</sup>

My note, moreover, was strictly concerned with dates mentioned in the exordium and colophon, which had been used as indications of a mid-14th-century Sukhothai origin for the text. I had scarcely looked at *TBK* as a whole, just enough to hope that I would never be forced to try to read it in its entirety; and I explicitly reserved judgement on the date of the text itself, which might conceivably, in spite of the garbled chronological statements accompanying it, be a 14th-century Sukhothai work, as had traditionally been assumed.

My conclusion was that some elements of the dates expressed in the exordium and colophon derived from a misapprehension, that the royal genealogy found in the colophon, if read without prejudice, suggested the reign of Sai Līdaiy in the early 15th century, that "the date in the exordium and colophon, whatever the age of the text as a whole, is due to an Ayutthaya period copyist at a time when true knowledge of Sukhothai chronology had been lost",<sup>2</sup> and that until the language of the entire text was studied comparatively with other early Thai material, no date earlier than that (1778) at which the extant text was allegedly copied could be accepted for its date of composition.

The first reaction to my sally was the manuscript of a proposed article, sent to me for pre-publication comment by someone who requested anonymity, defending the traditional view of *Traibhūmikathā*'s date, and which deserves notice here, even though anonymous, because of the relationship of some of the author's arguments to points which have appeared in subsequent publications. It was argued there that whatever the anomalies of the exordium and colophon, the authenticity of *Traibhūmikathā* as a Sukhothai period work composed by King Līdaiy is demonstrated by the Pali 'Stanzas of Homage' (*Gatā namāsakār*) preceding the exordium at the beginning of the work. These 'Stanzas', according to that writer, when compared with the eulogies of King Līdaiy in his inscriptions, can be seen to have been designed to refer specifically to Līdaiy, and moreover they contain the only correct Pali form of his name, Lideyya, found in *TBK*. Since those 'Stanzas' allegedly prove the early date and authenticity of the text, the author then found it possible to conjecture what he felt must have been the original Līdaiy-period exordium and colophon, which had been corrupted by later copyists. He also tried to reconstruct the day and month dates associated with *śakarāj 23*' of the exordium and colophon to make them fit the Līdaiy period, and asserted that *śakarāj 23* was merely an interesting puzzle, of no real significance.

Another point made by that person, in a mistaken belief that I was proposing Sai Līdaiy as author or patron, was that in his inscription no. 45 of A.D. 1393 the "cosmology was in a dreadful muddle...very different from the orderly presentation of the subject in *TBK*....The man who composed Inscription 45 could not possibly be the author of *TBK*,

<sup>1</sup> Michael Vickery, "A Note on the Date of the *Traibhūmikathā*"

<sup>2</sup> Vickery, "A Note", p. 283.

though he had doubtless read that work, and set down helter-skelter whatever he could remember of it".

My response was that "[t]here is no reason to believe that the correct form 'Lideyya' was not known long after his reign...[n]either can I agree that the eulogy of these Pali verses is sufficiently personal to be related to the passages of inscriptions 3 to 6...They seem to me to be very conventional and I do not think conclusions about authorship may be drawn from them".<sup>3</sup> As for using Inscription 3 to reconstruct the exordium and colophon, "it seems to me that you have merely assumed that the two latter must have contained certain information and you have revised them in that sense. I feel that this is the wrong method to use in studying such texts, for it opens up the way to conjectures which are little better than historical fiction". The problem of *śakarāj* 23 cannot be dismissed, because "the era of *Nān nabhamās* is the only system to which *śakarāj* 23 can be related, and that is the real proof that the exordium and colophon are corrupt, not just with respect to isolated names, but in their entire view of the Sukhothai period, showing a writer who believed that the famous Sukhothai kings had lived at the beginning of the *cula* era".<sup>4</sup>

I again emphasized that dating of the text must depend on thorough comparison of its language with genuine Sukhothai language from the inscriptions, something which had never been done, and which I then had no intention of undertaking. At that time I did not make the point, although I now think it deserves attention, that inscription no. 45, rather than showing muddled misunderstanding of Līdaiy's alleged work only 10 years or so after his death, indicates that it, not extant *TBK*, may represent the true 14th-century Sukhothai cosmology.<sup>5</sup>

I had hoped that my note would spur some literary scholar to undertake the requisite linguistic comparison, and I was intensely flattered, therefore, when Frank and Mani Reynolds, in their *Three Worlds According to King Ruang (TW)*, saw fit to devote a special little chapter, "Translators' Appendix 1", to "the works of Vickery, Coedès and Archaimbault".<sup>6</sup>

They take up the emphasis which my unnamed correspondent had placed on the "Stanzas of Homage", rendered by the Reynolds as "Words of Praise", but they go beyond him and assert erroneously that the dating of the *Traibhūmikathā* had "never depended on the belief that the exordium and/or colophon were written in the Sukhothai context...the most important evidence comes not from the exordium or the colophon, but from the Pali 'Words of Praise', to which Vickery surprisingly makes no reference whatsoever".<sup>7</sup> I am surprised at their surprise, for the dating of *Traibhūmikathā* had indeed always been made on the basis of the exordium and colophon, not because they were necessarily believed to

<sup>3</sup> The name 'Lideyyarāja' for a king of Sukhothai is also found in the 16th-century *Jinakālamālīpakaraṇaṃ* (see Coedès, "Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental"), a text which, like *Traibhūmi*, received special attention at the beginning of the Cakri Dynasty.

<sup>4</sup> Michael Vickery, letter dated 5 May 1978.

<sup>5</sup> See Vickery, "A Guide Through Some Recent Sukhothai Historiography", pp. 221-239, for discussion of the date of Līdaiy's death. My response must have satisfied the objections of that person to my first treatment of the *Traibhūmikathā*'s date, for I heard no more from him, and the proposed article was never offered for publication.

<sup>6</sup> Frank E. and Mani B. Reynolds, *Three Worlds According to King Ruang (TW)*

<sup>7</sup> *TW*, p. 354.

have been written "in the Sukhothai context", whatever that red-herring formulation is supposed to mean, but because they were believed to supply true facts about Līdaiy's authorship. So far as I can determine, all the sudden attention to the "Stanzas of Homage/Words of Praise" came about in reaction to my demolition of the exordium and colophon.

In their references to *TBK* before the appearance of my "Note", A. B. Griswold and Dr. Prasert ṇa Nagara had always referred to the exordium and colophon as authority for its date.<sup>8</sup> This was also the the important detail for George Coedès from the very beginning of his interest in the work. In 1913 Coedès identified Līdaiy as author on the basis of details from the exordium. The author was "a prince of Sajjanālaya named Ledaiya, son of Lelidaiya...and grandson of Rāmarāja"; and "according to the exordium of this work King Ledaiya had reigned in Sajjanālaya for 6 years when he had [it] compiled in the year 2[3] of an unknown era", which "would be a new era invented by the king, or the 23rd year from his birth", unless [my emphasis--MV] "it is a late interpolation, dating from a time when the *Traibhūmi* was attributed to Braḥ Ruan, inventor of the Little [Chula] Era".<sup>9</sup> No importance at all was given by Coedès to the "Words of Praise"; and in their *Trois mondes (TM)* Coedès and Archambault continued to base their dating on the details of the exordium and colophon.<sup>10</sup>

Moreover, the very fathers of modern Thai historiography, although believing that the *Traibhūmikathā* was a Sukhothai work, based this belief on the exordium, and considered that the "Words of Praise" *gatā* was a badly composed late interpolation of hardly any relevance for study of the real *Traibhūmikathā*.

In a letter to Prince Naris in October 1937 Prince Damrong wrote, "the origin of the *Traibhūmi* is clearly stated in the commentary at the beginning of the *Traibhūmi braḥ Ruan*, that Braḥ Mahā Dharrmarājā (Bra:yā Lidáy), the 5th ruler of the Kingdom of Sukhothai, composed it; it states in detail the names of the various scriptures of the *Tripitaka* which were studied and excerpted to compose it".<sup>11</sup>

The following year Prince Damrong took up the subject again, writing, "I consider that the *Traibhūmi* is a Thai work composed in the Sukhothai period and is the work of Braḥ Mahā Dharrmarājā (Braḥ Lidáy) who was the grandson of Braḥ Cau Rām Khāmhaeng Mahārāj...in its exordium (*pān bnaek*) it says Braḥ Mahā Dharrmarājā had excerpted various scriptures in the *Tripitaka*". Prince Damrong added, "Except for the inscriptions it is the oldest book in Thai, both as to vocabulary and syntax. It may really be accepted as the Thai language which was used in the Sukhothai period".

<sup>8</sup> A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara, "Epigraphic and Historical Studies" (EHS) 10, p. 61, n. 34; EHS 11, part 1, pp. 71-72, nn. 3-4; Prasert ṇa Nagara, "Kār jāṃraḥ praḥvatisāstr Sukhodāy", p. 46; Prasert ṇa Nagara, "Vivāḍhanākār varṇakarm samāy sukhodāy".

<sup>9</sup> G. Coedès, "Documents sur la dynastie de Sukhodaya", pp. 4- 5, 8, and footnote 4. On his page 8 Coedès erroneously wrote '25' for '23'.

<sup>10</sup> George Coedès et Charles Archambault, *Les trois mondes (Traibhūmi Braḥ Rvan (TM)*, Paris: EFEO, 1973.

<sup>11</sup> Prince Damrong to Prince Naris, 21 October 1937, *Sāsn samtec*, Guru Sabhā edition, vol. 11, p. 320. Anthony Diller called my attention to these sections of *Sāsn Samtec*, and kindly provided photocopies. Although Prince Damrong referred to the "commentary at the beginning", rather than *pān bnaek*, the fact that it included the names of the sources for composition of *Traibhūmikathā* proves that it was the exordium and not the "Stanzas/Words" [*gathā*] which was at issue.

Furthermore, and now of particular pertinence, "His Holiness the Supreme Patriarch [Prince Vajirañān] was dubious only about the *gathā* at the beginning, saying that they were in a new style and had been composed and added later".<sup>12</sup>

A few days later Prince Naris answered, "originally there was only the text of the *Traibhūmi*; the exordium was added later...but was not composed much later; but the *gathā* of homage/praise [*namāskār*] at the beginning seem to have been done even later...they are incomplete...fragmentary...the person who wrote them seems to have been deficient in learning; at the end [colophon] it also says who wrote it, repeating what is in the exordium, and this appears to have been added last of all".<sup>13</sup>

I thus emphasize again that the "Words of Praise" were rejected by *Traibūmi* specialists until evidence undermining the exordium and colophon was produced.

In spite of the the flattery which I felt at being included by the Reynolds in a context along with Coedès and Archaimbault, I was disappointed that they entirely ignored what I considered my most important observation, that the language of *TBK* must be studied before conclusions about its origins may be drawn. The Reynolds have merely reiterated the view that it is old Sukhothai, "vocabulary and style that is characteristic of the ancient Sukhothai kingdom", though with the interesting corollary that "it is perhaps worth noting that much of the vocabulary has close associations with the dialects of Thai presently spoken in northern and northeastern Thailand",<sup>14</sup> which may or may not help corroborate a Sukhothai origin of the *Traibhūmi*. Old Sukhothai Thai did have features relating it to the languages now called 'Lao', but not all northern or northeastern features correspond to Old Sukhothai, and once this issue was raised it was irresponsible not to carry the discussion further.<sup>15</sup>

The lack of attention to the language, in a textual study of a work in an allegedly ancient and dead dialect is one of the first things which strikes an historically-oriented reader, and in itself indicates a problem which is being carefully skirted. Such avoidance was even more palpable in the French translation by George Coedès and Charles Archaimbault, two scholars who in their previous work had evinced primary concern and sensitivity for problems of language. Indeed, the absence of any discussion of the Thai language of *Traibhūmikathā* was such a remarkable feature of Coedès' and Archaimbault's French translation and commentary (*TM*), that one might almost say it seemed a deliberate avoidance of the issue, as though they feared the results of such study might prove embarrassing.<sup>16</sup>

A careful reading of Archaimbault's introduction ("Avant- propos") is not without interest. The only reference to the state of the Thai language of *Traibhūmikathā* is Coedès' 1948 opinion, when they were just beginning their work, that *TBK* was the only example of Sukhothai language except the inscriptions (p. ix).

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, Volume 13, pp. 1-3, Prince Damrong to Prince Naris, 21 April 1938.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, Volume 13, pp. 18-19, Prince Naris to Prince Damrong, 30 April 1938.

<sup>14</sup> Reynolds, *Three Worlds*, p. 39 and note 50.

<sup>15</sup> James Chamberlain, "A New Look at the History and Classification of the Tai Languages".

<sup>16</sup> The copious notes accompanying *TM* are nearly all on the Indic terminology, with some emendations of Thai to make incomprehensible phrases comprehensible. I wish to thank Mr Archaimbault for permitting examination of the pre-publication proofs of *TM*, thus making available some of the material which has been incorporated here.

Then, an undated comment from apparently some years later near the completion of their work suggests that Coedès may have modified his opinion, at least with respect to the extant text, saying their translation should be accompanied by "some phrase indicating that this poor king Lidaiya...will not have better luck with his translators than he had with the generations of copyists....[w]hat have we really done but substitute our own misconstruals for those of the scribes?" Obviously, if there have been too many generations of copyists, each piling misapprehension upon misapprehension, then we no longer have a 14th-century text by King Līdaiya, assuming there once was such a text. In fact, in his last conversation with me, after publication of *TM*, Archaimbault said that in the end they did not believe that *TP* was a Sukhothai work, but did not say this for fear of offending Thai opinion (note my introductory comment to this collection).

In a much earlier work Coedès had suggested that some of the missing portions of inscription no. 3 might be hypothetically recreated from similar contexts of *TBK*, and this was taken up by Griswold and Prasert in their publication of the same inscription. The contexts in question, however, are too general to be decisive, contain no vocabulary which is specifically Sukhothai, and the phrases from *TBK* used by Coedès, even if similar in content, are too long to fit into the lacunae of inscription no. 3.<sup>17</sup> Likewise, the phrases brought forth for comparison by Dr. Prasert to show that the language of *TBK* resembles that of "the inscriptions of Sukhothai or of early Ayutthaya" are too general, particularly with respect to the question at hand, the dating of *TBK* precisely to the reign, and writing table, of Līdaiy.<sup>18</sup>

Since the Reynolds's remarks on the dating of *TBK* were a direct challenge to me, even though more a challenge to what I had not said than to what I had actually written, I have decided to undertake what I had hoped others would do--examine the text of *TBK* for clues to the date of its language and composition. I do this with some trepidation, fearful of engaging in what Etienne Balazs castigated as "disquisitions on philological trifles, expensive trips in abstruse provinces, bickering about the restitution of the name of unknown persons, and other delightfully antiquated occupations".<sup>19</sup>

But now, since *TBK* has been used in several scholarly works and Ph.D. dissertations as a basis on which to tease out traditions of state ideology in the Ayutthaya and early Bangkok periods, study of it for itself, and determination of its precise historical and philological status no longer represent mere antiquarianism.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>17</sup> G. Coedès, "L'Inscription de Nagara Jum", p. 41; Griswold and Prasert, *EHS* 11, Part 1, p. 109, nn. 135-136.

<sup>18</sup> Prasert *ṇa Nagara*, "Vivāḍhanākār varṇakarm samāy sukhodāy", p. 10.

<sup>19</sup> Balazs, title *Journal of Asian Studies* 19 (1960), pp. 321-325, in a review of a work which he considered a contrast "in the most pleasant way" to such a characterization, and which marked the "coming of age of sinological studies in the United States", *Chinese Thought and Institutions*, ed. by John K. Fairbank. One wonders what Balazs would have said about the nearly superstitious faith which some foreign historians of Thailand have shown toward traditions of that culture not their own, indeed a form of reverse orientalism.

<sup>20</sup> Lorraine Marie Gesick, "Kingship and Political Integration in Traditional Siam, 1767-1824", p. 50, the cosmological order of Ayutthayan kingship "was clearly expressed in the Traiphum...composed in the mid-fourteenth century..."; and with respect to my "Note", added, f.n. 1, "Dr. Prasert convinced me that such a date was indeed correct and he...computed it for me to Thursday, 10 November 1345 A.D.". See also Craig J. Reynolds, "Buddhist Cosmography in Thai History"; and Chonthira Klatyu, "'Traibhūmi braḥ rvaṇi rākṭhān khòṇ utamkārkmōaṇ daiy", *Vārasār dharmasāstr* IV, 1 (1974), pp. 106-121.

In one of these studies, that of Craig Reynolds, some attention was given to questions of language and content as evidence for dating *TBK*. Referring to comparisons made by Coedès, Griswold, and Prasert, C. Reynolds realized, however, that "such stock phrases describing ideal kingship might have been common in Siamese parlance...[and t]here is no way of ascertaining if these phrases dated from Lidaiya's reign". They, and mention of the Chakravartin's jeweled disk, are "suggestive but inconclusive evidence". As he continued, the "mere listing of terms in the fourteenth-century epigraphy is insufficient evidence to place the entire text...[of *TBK*] in that period".

C. Reynolds's more positive remark on the significance of the appearance of "these attributes typical of the Universal Monarch...in the epigraphy of the putative author of...[*TBK*, but] not discernible in Sukhodaya epigraphy before 1345", is hardly relevant, for the only epigraphy attributed to a time before 1345 is inscription no. 1 (Rām Khāmhaeng), with its own serious and unresolved problems of dating, and the undated inscription no. 107 which is too short to be taken as evidence on this point.<sup>21</sup> As for the fact that "in the epigraphy, as in the cosmography text, gender is conditioned by *karma*", as evidenced by the wish of a female in inscription no. 93, A.D. 1399, to be reborn as a man, such wishes were not just consistent with "fourteenth-century Siamese religious practice", but with Buddhist practice in a wider area; and it does not contribute to the search for Sukhothai practices in *TBK*. In the so-called "Modern Inscriptions of Angkor Wat", a queen asked in 1579 to be reborn as a man in future lives.<sup>22</sup>

For C. Reynolds, "[t]he most convincing external evidence that the *Traibhūmi* cosmography dates in some form from the fourteenth century" [my emphasis--MV] is "an inscription of 1393", no. 45, which "names several of the beasts found in the *Traibhūmi*, as well as the six heavens...the four levels of formless *brahma* deities...the sixteen levels of the *brahma* deities of form, the divinities of the nine planets...the four continents and the chief mountains of cosmic geography". This suggestion by C. Reynolds would be opposed by my unnamed correspondent above who considered the beastly evidence of inscription 45 as embarrassing for the association of its author with *TBK*.

On this point, however, in particular the statement I have underlined above, I agree with C. Reynolds about this evidence for the origin of some form of *Traibhūmi* "in the Sukhothai context", to adopt the expression of Frank and Mani Reynolds. This, however, conflicts with the traditional purist view that *TBK* was written by Līdaiy, and that the extant version is his text.

In what follows I shall not attempt to settle the identity of the author(s) of *TBK*, nor even the period of composition of the original, beyond indicating certain details which argue against Līdaiy and the 14th century. My unnamed correspondent erroneously attributed to me the belief that the author had been Sai Līdaiy (1379/80 or 1398/90-1419), grandson of Līdaiy. This was not what I wrote in "Note". What I said there was that analysis of the exordium and colophon indicated that their author(s) may have believed Līdaiy's grandson to have been author of *TBK*, or more likely, had no clear idea of

<sup>21</sup> On Inscription no. 1 see Michael Vickery, "The Rām Khāmhaeng Inscription: A Piltdown Skull of Southeast Asian History?"; Vickery, "Piltdown Skull--Installment 2"; and Vickery, "Piltdown 3—Further Discussion of the Rām Khāmhaeng Inscription". Number 107 was studied by Griswold and Prasert in their EHS 21, JSS 67, 1 (January 1979), pp. 63-67.

<sup>22</sup> Craig Reynolds, *op. cit.*, p. 208; *Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor*, Éditions de l'Institut Bouddhique (Phnom Penh, 1958), no. 2.

Sukhothai dynastic history. If the writer of the colophon was an Ayutthayan at a significantly later date, as the Reynolds seem to accept, then his belief, whatever it was, about the identity of the author of *TBK*, is of little value.<sup>23</sup>

The Reynolds based their translation on two Thai editions, "a Thai script version of the Mahachuai copy, which was edited by Prince Damrong Rachanuphab and originally published in 1912; and the second...the much more critical edition recently prepared by Acharn Pitoon Maliwan". My comments below are based on the 8th printing of the 1912 edition, which I shall designate '*TP*'.<sup>24</sup> I have not been able to consult the Maliwan edition, but it seems obvious from the Reynolds's translation that nothing in it affects the points which are treated below.

Besides the lack of any section discussing the language of *TBK* and Sukhothai Thai, a defect which *TW* shares with *TM*, it is doubly astonishing to find hardly any notes referring to language difficulties or translation problems in this text which has always been acknowledged as particularly difficult.

This defect is particularly noticeable in the Reynolds's treatment of the Prologue/exordium (p. 45) and Epilogue/colophon (p.349), the sections to which I had given attention in my "Note". They have chosen to slide over the difficulties with arbitrary emendation and suspension of disbelief.

Their translations of both sections give the author's genealogy as L̄idaiy, son of Lelithai and grandson of Rām Khāmhaeng, which is in neither place an accurate translation, but an assimilation of the text of *TBK* to "what seems to have been, from the inscriptions, the actual historical situation" (p. 349, n. 1). This is certainly not the way in which difficult ancient literature should be treated, particularly in the first generation of textual studies which should strive to present the most accurate rendition of what the text says, not what we think it ought to mean. Moreover, it is not even superficially true. The name 'Rām Khāmhaeng' is not what appears in the Prologue and Epilogue, nor is it to be found in the relevant inscriptions, those of the reign of L̄idaiy, all of which use 'Rāmarāj' for the Sukhothai ruler in the period in question.

The Prologue and Epilogue in fact provide differing identities for the author of *TBK*, either of which could be construed as agreeing with an "actual historical situation" as determined from inscriptions, but neither of which fits the conventional wisdom about *TBK*.

The Prologue/exordium says the author was *cau brahyā* Ledaïy who was son of *cau brahyā* Lelidaïy, and "this *cau brahyā* Lelidaïy was grandson of *cau brahyā* Rāmarāj". This implies that Lelidaïy was the king now known conventionally as L̄idaiy (r. 1347-1370s/1380s) and that it was his son, Ledaïy, a name which may be construed as either L̄idaiy or Lödáy, who was author.<sup>25</sup> This genealogy is in accord with a careful reading of

<sup>23</sup> See *TW*, p. 354; Vickery, "A Guide Through Some Recent Sukhothai Historiography", pp. 221-239, for discussion of Sai L̄idaiy 's reign period.

<sup>24</sup> Silpākorn edition [Krom Silpākorn Preface dated 25 February 2515], 8th printing, 2515 [1972]. In contrast to *TBK* which I use to indicate the *Traibhūmi* work without reference to any particular text or edition, the abbreviation *TP* will indicate this Thai text which I have used. Note that the originals extant in 1778 and from which the Mahachuai copy was made, were in Khmer script.

<sup>25</sup> For discussion of the regnal dates of L̄idaiy see, Vickery, "A Guide", pp. 216-221. In my "Note", p. 276, I ignored this detail of the exordium, for I had been working with a text of *TP* (4th printing of the 1912 edition) in which it was omitted, and I relied on Coedès' and Archaimbault's translation which misled me into remarking that "[t]his shows a genealogy which generally conforms to that of the inscriptions". Coedès

the Sukhothai inscriptions which establishes that Ḷīdaiy had a son named Lödáy who may have been Mahādharmarāja II.<sup>26</sup>

The Epilogue/colophon says the author was *braḥṇā* Ḷīdaiy, who was grandson of *braḥṇā* Ḷīdaiy, who was grandson of *braḥ* Rāmarāj, which, as I have written, "reflects a belief that the *Traibhūmikathā* was composed by Mahādharmarāja III", Sai Ḷīdaiy.<sup>27</sup>

As to the date of composition the Reynolds were confident that it should be given as Thursday, 4th month, in the year 23 of the era, which "most likely...refers to a new era that, from evidence included in the northern Thai chronicles and a very old Thai literary work known as *Nang Nophamat*, was instituted by one of the members of the Ruang dynasty" (p. 45, n. 1).<sup>28</sup>

The Prologue in fact says 4th month, but the Epilogue 10th month, and with a cryptic "since the second time [that in the Epilogue] did not actually occur", the Reynolds have "followed a suggestion made by Acharn Pitoon...and changed the phrase 'the tenth month' [of the Epilogue] to 'the fourth month'".

A quite different emendation, and which negates the reasoning offered above, was proposed by Dr. Prasert ṇa Nagara. He considered that the date in the original Sukhothai-period text was *dōanāy*, first lunar month, written with a figure '1' followed by a full stop, which was misread as figure '10' and corrupted in a later copying to *sip* (10), then miscopied once again as *sī* (4). This accounts for the November date which he supplied to Lorraine Gesick.<sup>29</sup>

Now with sufficient tinkering, one can make such obscure details fit any scheme desired. Although it is true that confusion between 'four' and 'ten' may occur, that in itself would only be convincing if all the experts could agree on a definitive interpretation, but Dr. Prasert's explanation for the month contradicts that of Achar Pitoon.

The crucial detail which shows that none of these considerations is relevant is the year 23, and here the Reynolds's explanation is at its weakest, and quite unacceptable. Almost all scholars, Thai and foreign, and starting as early as Prince Damrong, have recognized that *Nān nabhamās/Nang Nophamat* was at least in part a hoax, written long after the Sukhothai period, probably as late as the reign of King Rama I (1782-1809). It is not at all "a very old Thai literary work", although it does indeed indicate a belief that the era including year 23 was "instituted by one of the members of the Ruang dynasty", but that this era was the *cula* era beginning in A.D. 638, and that *Traibhūmikathā* was written in *cula* 23=A.D. 661.<sup>30</sup> Because of this none of the dating elements of the Prologue or Epilogue may be doctored into acceptability and *Traibhūmikathā* must be dated by the internal evidence of its text.

One of the rare notes in *TW* that does relate to a textual or translation problem seems to reveal that the Reynolds, in spite of native fluency in modern Thai, had not

---

and Archaimbault seem also to have replaced the original text here with what they believed to have been the 'actual historical situation', although not so drastically as the Reynolds.

<sup>26</sup> Vickery, "A Guide", pp. 229-230, 235-239.

<sup>27</sup> Vickery, "Note", p. 277.

<sup>28</sup> I shall not depart from my subject to comment here on the historical fiction of the 'Ruang dynasty'. See my remarks in Vickery, "Guide", p. 194.

<sup>29</sup> Prasert ṇa Nagara, "Vivāḍhanākār", p. 9; and see note 20 above.

<sup>30</sup> For detailed explanation see Vickery, "Note", pp. 279-283.



previously given much attention to texts from older periods of the language which might have been relevant for an understanding of *TBK*.

On their page 173, n. 44 they naively remark, "Here and at several other points...King Dhammāsoka is referred to as 'the foot of King Dhammāsoka'...it has been omitted in the translation". This astonishing statement about what is really a non-problem is in reference to the title *braḥ pāda braḥ cau s'rī dharmāsokarāj*, with the expression *braḥ pāda* which is one of the first terms in most kings' titles of the Khmer-Ayutthayan area since Angkor times, and as such is familiar to all historians.<sup>31</sup> Its familiarity is such that omission from translations is conventionally accepted, but if it is rendered, it is as a conventional 'His Majesty', or if one insisted on literalness it would be 'the August Feet, King...', not 'the feet'.... In *TM* (p. 112), for instance, it was rendered as simply 'Le Monarque'.

What the Reynolds should really have noticed on that page (*TP*, p. 145), and signalled to the reader, was the presence in a single context of two styles of royal title, *braḥṇā s'rī dharmāsokarāj* and *braḥ pāda braḥ cau s'rī dharmāsokarāj*, two styles which (1) are never found together in any genuine document, and (2) the second of which juxtaposes two expressions, *braḥ pāda braḥ cau* which are themselves never placed together in that way in genuine titles.<sup>32</sup>

Both *braḥṇā* (correctly *braṇā*)<sup>33</sup> and *braḥ pāda* are genuine Sukhothai titles of the time of Ḷīdaiy. In his inscription no. 3 he is first styled *braṇā Ḷdaiyrāja*, then crowned as *śrī sūryabaṅśmahādhammarājādhirāja*, followed later in the text with the complete title *braṇā śrī sūryabaṅśmahādhammarājādhirāja*, repeated without *braṇā śrī* in no. 8, and with the addition of *rāma* after *sūryabaṅś* in his no. 5 of 1361.<sup>34</sup>

In his no. 4, contemporary with no. 5, the titles are *braḥ pāda kamrateṅ añ śrī sūryabaṅś āmamahādhammarājādhirāj* (lines 12-13). The difference is because no. 4 is in Khmer and Ḷīdaiy is styling himself as a Khmer king, consonant with the entire tenor of that inscription. This is the only occurrence in Sukhothai of *braḥ pāda*, found again in the more Khmerized culture of Ayutthaya.<sup>35</sup>

In the Ḷīdaiy period *cau*, a pan-Tai term for 'master', 'lord', 'prince', 'ruler',<sup>36</sup> is used differently. The only example in Ḷīdaiy's own reign is from inscription no. 8 where the title 'cau braṇā' is accorded the *cau mōaṅ* of Nan, a subordinate of Sukhothai, and to another chief called 'younger brother' of the Nan chief(?). In inscriptions nos. 45 and 49 of

<sup>31</sup> See further discussion of *braḥ pāda* below.

<sup>32</sup> Note that the Reynolds have substituted the Pali form *dhammāsoka* for the partially Sanskrit form *dharmāsoka* of the published *TBK*.

<sup>33</sup> Vickery, review of Robert B. Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks* pp. 169-170.

<sup>34</sup> Inscriptions no. 3, face 1, lines 1-7, 66-67; no. 8, side 1, line 28; no. 5, face 1, lines 13-14.

<sup>35</sup> The title *vraḥ/braḥ pāda* was common in Cambodia throughout the Angkor period. Its earliest use by Ayutthayan kings is uncertain. It forms part of the royal titles in most of the laws of the *Three Seals* code, but because they are not original contemporary documents their evidence on this point is not sufficient (see Vickery, "Prolegomena to Methods for Using the Ayutthayan Laws as Historical Source Material" (particularly the tables). *Braḥ pāda* is not part of the titles of the 15th-century king known conventionally as Trailokanāth in the extant inscriptions from his reign, even though they are in Khmer (see Vickery, "The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim. The earliest extant contemporary evidence for */braḥ pāda* seems to be Face II of the 1563 Dansai inscription for the Ayutthayan King Mahācakrabarti (See Griswold and Prasert, EHS 24, "An Inscription of 1563 Recording A Treaty Between Laos and Ayodhya" in 1560", p. 56, line 6).

<sup>36</sup> Fang Kuei Li, *A Handbook of Comparative Tai*, pp. 164-167.

1393 and 1418 reference is made to *cau brañā/brah̥yā* 'the grandson/nephew', whom Griswold and Prasert have identified as Sai Līdaiy; but the first Sukhothai use of *cau* in titles which look like those of someone claiming kingship are in the early 16th century. In no. 13 of 1510 from Kampheng Phet the author, who addresses the public as ruler, calls himself *cau brañā śrī dharmāsokarāja*. At the end he offers merits from his good works to 'the two' *samtec pabitra brah̥ cau ayū hua*, a title which also must mean 'king', and which illustrates the proper conventional use of *cau* as a king's title at that time. One more late Sukhothai period use of *cau* 'ruler' is *samtec cau brañā*, found in no. 40 of controversial date and meaning and in a short inscription from Nan dated 1426.<sup>37</sup>

These anachronisms in *TBK*, even if in themselves not enough to discredit a Sukhothai origin, at least indicate tampering with the text by a later copyist or editor, and they should have been noted, with attempts at explanation, by the translators.

There are also more certain clues to dating. Within the *Traibhūmi* there are three statements in which dates are given in old Thai style. In the final chapter, 11, the date of the Buddha's enlightenment is given as: "monkey (*vòk*) year, 6th month, the full moon, Wednesday (*ván buddh*), near dawn of Thursday, Thai [style] day, the Lao say *tauyī* day"; then when the Buddha entered Nibbana it was, "snake (*maseñ*) year, 6th month, full moon, Tuesday (*ván aingār*) Thai [style], the Lao say *kāpyī* day"; and finally when all the relics shall come together under the Bodhi tree and become the body of the Buddha who shall preach the Dhamma and then enter Nibbana, it will be, "rat (*jvat*) year, 6th month, full moon, the lunar mansion *baisakh*, Thai *vāysán*".<sup>38</sup>

First, an explanation of the third date is required. As I have transcribed it from the Thai text the term *vāysán* is incoherent, and the incoherence must be common to all manuscripts since both the Reynolds and Coedès and Archaibault have found emendation necessary. The latter, without explanation, wrote, "le jour que [les Laotiens] appellent [Kapsan]", while the former preferred "the day which the Lao call Hawaya San", with their note 3 explaining that although the various manuscripts make reference to Thai rather than Lao, "we have chosen to make the change to Lao in order to bring this clause into conformity with the obviously parallel [preceding] clauses". To the extent that the emendations involved insertion of 'which the Lao call' they are certainly correct, but none of the translators seems to have realized the nature of the problem, which is simply that a copyist at some stage before the states of the extant manuscript omitted part of the stock phrase from 'Thai' to the Lao day name. The Thai text seems to indicate that *hawāy/rawāy san* was indeed the original, and the choice of *kapsán* [kāpsan] in *TM* requires justification. Perhaps it was made on the basis of new calendrical calculations, but the problem is of no concern here, particularly since it involves a totally fictitious day in the future.

Now the truly interesting feature of these dates is in their labeling of certain terms as Thai or Lao. The former are the Sanskritic day names still used in modern Thai, Khmer and standard Lao, while the 'Lao' names are those of the 60-year or 60-day cycle known

<sup>37</sup> Vickery, review of Jones, *Thai Titles and Ranks*, p. 170.

<sup>38</sup> TP, pp. 315-316; *TW*, pp. 329-331; *TM*, p. 234.

from China, Vietnam, and some Thai language areas, and used particularly in northern and northeastern varieties of Thai.<sup>39</sup>

The *Traibhūmi* usage, however, is quite unique. In the entire corpus of Sukhothai, northern Thai, Lao, and Ayutthayan inscriptions from 14th to 18th century, the 60-day/year cycle terms, if ethnically labeled, are always called Thai, never Lao, while the Sanskritic terms, if labeled, are called *khôm*, *khmer*, *kambuja*, or *meñ*, not Thai.<sup>40</sup> In Laos proper, into the 19th-century at least, the 60-year/day cycle was used as principal dating system, without ethnic tag, meaning that the Lao accepted it as their own, without need to specify its ethnicity. This feature of the *Traibhūmi*, then, is definitely not Sukhothai, nor any other recorded early Thai style. The most likely conjectural explanation for its appearance is that it would have been devised by a non-Lao Thai writer at a time and place when the 60-year/day cycle was considered part of an exotic culture not his own, used in the 'Lao' regions which, we will recall, included northern and northeastern Thailand until the reforms in provincial administration of King Chulalongkorn and Prince Damrong at the end of the 19th century.<sup>41</sup> These dates, then, even if an original *Traibhūmi* is earlier, were devised by a post-Sukhothai Ayutthayan writer probably rewriting an older text with double dating, and who assumed that the Sanskritic terms which he considered normal were Thai, while the more genuine old Thai system was known to him as the dating system of the Lao, but not of old Sukhothai.<sup>42</sup>

Another chronological clue in the dates included in the *Traibhūmi* is the expression for full moon, on which day each of the dated events is said to occur. There 'full moon' is rendered *beñ pūrṇami* in the first case and *beñ pūrṇ* in the other two instances. The two terms are respectively Khmer *beñ* and Sanskrit *pūrṇami*, a variant of *pūrṇama*, 'full-moon day',<sup>43</sup> and the expression *beñ pūrṇ (ami)* is familiar in modern Khmer, but not in the epigraphy of Sukhothai in the time of Līdaiy. Those inscriptions use only the Sanskrit *pūrṇami*.<sup>44</sup> The first to show the Khmer *beñ*, 'full' is no. 10 of AD 1404, while the Thai deformation *beñ* first appears in no. 68 of AD 1489 from Lamphun. Thereafter *beñ* appears regularly in the inscriptions, but not *beñ pūrṇ* as in *Traibhūmi*, where the expression 'full moon' occurs not only in the dates but metaphorically in

<sup>39</sup> For explanations of this system see Roger Billard, "Les cycles chronographiques chinois dans les inscriptions thaïes" ; Vickery, "The Lion Prince and Related Remarks on Northern History", pp. 341-344; Sao Saimōng, "Cula Sakarāj and the Sixty Cyclical Year Names".

<sup>40</sup> This statement is based on examination of the inscriptions in Parts 1-6 of *Prajum śilā cārūk* (Collected Inscriptions), *Cārūk samāy sukhodāy* (Inscriptions of the Sukhothai Period), *Cārūk nai pra:deś daiy* (Inscriptions in Thailand), and other pre-19th century inscriptions and documents, both published and unpublished, which have come to my attention.

<sup>41</sup> Vickery, "Thai Regional Elites and the Reforms of King Chulalongkorn". Note also George Coedès' then conventional treatment of Lanna as 'Western Laos', in his study of "Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental". See also Larry Sternstein, "Low's Description of the Siamese Empire in 1824", p. 20.

<sup>42</sup> Note the academic agreement that Ayutthaya and early Bangkok intelligentsia would have been rather ignorant of Sukhothai. Charnvit Kaset Siri, *The Rise of Ayudhya, A History of Siam in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries*, p. 14.

<sup>43</sup> George Bradley McFarland, *Thai-English Dictionary* (1956), p. 596, "beñ...Cam.adj. full, whole:", p. 595, "beñ incorrect spelling for beñ"; *Royal Institute Dictionary [in Thai]* (2525/1982), p. 591, "beñ...full, as full [moon] day. (from beñ)"; Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, p. 642.

<sup>44</sup> Inscriptions nos. 3, of A.D. 1357; 106 of A.D. 1383 (*pvarṇami*); 45 of A.D. 1392; and 38 of uncertain date.

descriptions of the facial features of the inhabitants of Purbavideha and Uarakuru. In the former instance the expression is *tōan beñ*, and in the latter *beñ pūrṇ*.<sup>45</sup>

This feature in its original form, while not as late as 'Lao' versus 'Thai' style seems to be, is 15th century, long after Līdaiy 's time, and the *Traibhūmi*'s deformation ' *pūrṇ*' suggests borrowing from even later Cambodian usage.

Still another chronological marker is the terminology for expressing waxing or waning of the moon in dates. In modern Thai terminology the terms are *khün* (waxing) and *reem* (waning), but in early Sukhothai, the time of Līdaiy, the expressions were respectively *òk* and *reem*. The first inscriptions showing *khün* are from the 15th and 16th centuries (No. 49/A.D. 1412, No. 13/1510), and thus the *dōan khün 8 gām* of *TBK* (*TP*, p. 155), represents post-Līdaiy usage.

Clearly the chronological details within the text of *TBK* argue against composition in the reign of Līdaiy, perhaps even against composition at Sukhothai.

The contexts in which these details occur may be interestingly compared with the indubitably classical Sukhothai language of King Līdaiy in his inscription number 3, in which a description of two stages of the Buddhist religion is given. The first stage in both inscription 3 and *TBK*, at the identical date, is the enlightenment; the second in *TP*, Nirvana, is not included in inscription no. 3; and the date of the third stage of *TP*, the '*dhātu* Nirvana', is associated with the end of the religion in inscription no. 3.<sup>46</sup>

*Traibhūmi* (*TP*), pp. 315-6  
braḥ buddhacau rau tai trás  
kee sabbaññutaññān tai ton  
braḥ ratnamahābodhi nán nai ...  
pī vòk tōan 6 beñ būrnamī  
vān budh yām ca: klai ruñ  
khūnvān brhāsbatī vāndaiy  
lāv vā vān tauyī

mōa braḥ buddhacau srec khau  
*sū* nibbān nán nai pī maseñ  
tōan 6 beñ būrṇ vān ángār  
vān daiy lāv vā vān kāpyā  
yām ca: klai ruñsvoey ṛkṣ  
baisākh...

mōa braḥ dhātu dān hlāy  
dān mual ca: mā mīl kǎn nai  
tai ton braḥ mahābodhi lee  
ca: kōt pen aṅg braḥ buddha  
cau gūn lee ca: trás deśanā

Inscription 3 (line nos.)  
(10-11) braḥ s'rī mahā bodhi ann braḥ  
buddhacau rau stec ayū tai ton lee  
kee sarbbejñuteññān pen braḥ  
buddha...(27-8) braḥ tai pen braḥ  
buddh nann nai pīvòk...tōan ann  
braḥ tai pen braḥ buddh nann nai  
tōan hok būrṇami (30) nai vann budh  
vann hon dai vann tauñī

(46) mōa pi ann cakk sīn sāsānā  
braḥ buddh pen cau disut dānñ hlāy  
ann (47) pī juat tōan hok būrṇami  
vann saur vann dai vān rāysann  
baisāk (48) ṛkṣ thiñ mōa vann

<sup>45</sup> *TP*, pp. 80, 86. More occurrences of *tōan beñ* or *biñ pūrṇ* are on pages 64, 65, 83, 95, 97, 99, 105 (this is not a complete list).

<sup>46</sup> For full translations see respectively *TW*, pp. 330-331; *TM*, p. 234; and Griswold and Prasert, EHS 11, Part I, pp. 96-101.

dharrm prot debāmanuṣy dān  
 hlāy leev braḥ cau ciñ srec  
 khau nibbān nān *nai* pī juat  
 tōan 6 beñ būṛṇ tai ṛkṣ baiśākh  
 daiy vāy sān...mōa tañ  
 nān jūa dhātu nibbān thōn  
 kee braḥ buddhacau lee

taññ nann tee braḥ dhātu daññ hlāy  
 ann mi *nai* pheendin  
 ni koti *nai* teblok koti *nai*  
 nāglok koti hoḥpai klān hāv lee  
 pai phjum kann *nai* lañkādvip khau  
 ayū nai klvañ ratnamālikamahāstupa  
 leev ciñ cakk hoḥ pai ayū *nai* ton  
 braḥ śrī mahābhodhī di braḥ  
 budh pen cau trass kee...ciñ cakk kāl  
*fai* hmai braḥ dhātu daññ ann sīn  
 lee...sāsnā braḥ budh cakk sīn  
 nai vann taññ klāv..daññ ann lee...sāsnā  
 budh cakk sīn nai vann taññ klāv...

In the first instance the dates are identical, but the technical term for the Buddha's enlightenment, or attainment of omniscience, differs. In *TBK* it is *sabbaññutaññān*, but in Inscription 3 *sarbbejñuteññān*, and it seems unlikely that such an important Buddhist technical term would differ in two works by the same author.

Attention should also be given to what is possibly a linguistic marker for the Sukhothai language, the relative pronoun *ann*, which occurs six times in the citations above from Inscription 3, but is not found at all in that part of *TBK*.

The final stage in which all of the Buddha's relics are gathered together shows, it seems to me, doctrinal differences which indicate that this section of *TBK* cannot possibly be of Līdaiy 's time. In Number 3 it is said that the relics will first fly through the air to the Ratnamālikamahāstupa in Lañkādvīpa, then they will fly to the tree under which the Buddha attained enlightenment. Finally the fire at the end of time (*kāl fai*= Sanskrit *kālāgni*) will burn them and it will be the end of the religion (*śāsana*).<sup>47</sup>

*TBK*, in contrast, says the relics will come together under the tree where the Buddha attained enlightenment and the Buddha will be reconstituted from them, after which he will "preach the Dhamma in order to benefit the *devatā* and human beings", and enter Nirvana again, in what is termed the '*dhātunirvāna*'.<sup>48</sup> There is no question in this context of the end of the religion. The identical dates, and the gathering of the relics indicate that equivalent events are in question, but the differences indicate that two distinct versions of Buddhist lore are in question.

Other indications of doctrinal differences are found in the treatments of development and decline of the world. As Griswold and Prasert noted, Līdaiy 's discussion of the supposed decline in human life span from 100 years "at the time our Lord attained Buddhahood" to 99 years in Līdaiy 's own time, demonstrates his belief in the Hindu *yuga* system of *mahāyuga* lasting 4,320,000 years and divided into four *yuga* of which the last, and present, is the *kaliyuga* of 432,000 years duration. Every 4320 years man's lifespan

<sup>47</sup> On *kālāgni* see Griswold and Prasert, EHS 11, Part 1, p. 101, n. 60; Coedès, "L'Inscription de Nagara Jum", p. 33, n. 52.

<sup>48</sup> Quoted passage is the Reynolds's translation, *TW* pp. 330-331.

declines by one year, until at the end of the *kaliyuga* it is only 10 years. Līdaiy also showed that he calculated the dates of the *kaliyuga* according to standard Hindu lore, and he indicated the date in the future at which the *kaliyuga* would end in a disaster at a time when the human life span was 10 years.<sup>49</sup>

The *Traibhūmi*, in contrast, shows no awareness of the *yuga* system, but treats the same subject, decline and recreation of the world, in terms of *kappa* (*kalpa*), a much longer period, equal to "one thousand yugas, a period of four thousand, three hundred and twenty millions of years of mortals, measuring the duration of the world", according to Hindu tradition; although *Traibhūmi* is less precise, saying a *kappa* cannot be counted in terms of years and months, but only estimated by analogy.<sup>50</sup> There are two different treatments of human lifespan in *TBK*. On the one hand, "the normal life-span of the people who live in this Jambu continent generally goes up and down", according to their adherence to moral precepts and *dhamma*, which is quite different from the belief expressed by Līdaiy in inscription 3 that there was an inexorable mathematically determinable decline based on *yuga* periodization. A second statement in *TBK* is that "people who are born in this first *kappa* have a life-span that extends for one period of immense duration...[then] decreases continually until it comes to the point at which people live for ten years and then die". Although the type of change is similar to that evoked in Inscriptions 3 and 7, the time period in question is different, and much longer, a *kappa* rather than a *yuga*. The gradual decline, like the fluctuations in *TBK*'s first treatment, is attributed to decline in morality, not to regular, objective cosmic determination.<sup>51</sup>

These contexts thus suggest that *Traibhūmi* and Līdaiy's Inscriptions 3 and 7 reflect differing interpretations of Buddhist doctrine, perhaps different sects, and I invite specialists in Buddhology to elucidate this matter. A phrase which is translated on p. 185 of *TW* provides clues that a Sukhothai original may have lain behind *TP*, but also shows both that the extant *TP* is a later arrangement by someone who misunderstood Sukhothai language, and that the *TW* translators were unfamiliar with old Thai administrative language, in particular as used in Sukhothai inscriptions. In a description of activities in Pataliputra in the time of King Aśoka it lists categories of royalty, officials, and commoners; and even though it refers to the India of Aśoka, there is no attempt to imitate Indic terminology other than what was already current Thai usage, and the author would obviously have used contemporary terminology from his own society. This phrase, divided to show correspondences with the translations of both *TW* and *TM* which follow is:

TP (163)...brañā śrī dharmāsokarāj|lee dāv bra:ñā sāmanta-  
rāj|tra:kūl| braḥ hlvañ khun hmün|dmun dnāy|bal|brai fā khā daiy...

*TW* "...King Dhamma-soka,|the rulers and kings of the surrounding countries,|the groups of soldiers who were on duty,|the courtiers,|the holders of successively lower ranks,|and the people who were citizens, slaves, and free men..."

<sup>49</sup> EHS 11, part 1, Inscription no. 3, p. 96, n. 31; Inscription no. 7, p. 176.

<sup>50</sup> Monier-Williams, p. 262; *TW*, 82-3.

<sup>51</sup> *TW*, pp. 124, 325; *TP*, pp. 80-81, 312-313; *TM*, pp. 78, 232.

*TM* (120 [124]) '...le Monarque Sri-Dharmasokaraja,| les feudataires,| les grands et les petits dignitaires,| les serviteurs,| le peuple...'

The second part of the Thai text, beginning "*lee dāv bra:ñā*", clearly corresponds, I do not say it is translated, to *TW* "rulers and kings of surrounding countries", while *bal* would be expected as the source of "groups of soldiers"; and 'citizens, slaves, and free men' will do for the final section, a phrase which no commentator has been able to interpret with absolute certainty. As for the rest, the terms are not in themselves entirely clear; neither is the logic of their rendering in *TW*. If '*bal*' was taken as "groups of soldiers", its literal meaning, why was the order of terms changed? Which Thai phrase did the Reynolds construe as 'the courtiers'? Did they mean 'braḥ *hlvañ khun hmün*', as one would expect, or '*dmun dnāy*', or both together as 'the holders of successively lower ranks'? They should here at least have explained their translation. In *TM* there is less doubt about the relationship to the original, although the segmentation differs from mine. It is not clear whether "*braḥ hlvañ khun hmün dmun dnāy*" were altogether construed as "les grands et les petits dignitaires", or whether 'les serviteurs' corresponds to *dmun dnāy* or *dmun dnāy bal*.

The title *dāv bra:ñā*/Thao Phraya is indeed Sukhothai usage, and in Līdaiy's time it was used in his inscriptions nos. 3 and 5 for the other rulers who consecrated him as king. But the expression '*tra:kūl*' is ambiguous, even if susceptible to reasonable interpretation. It could conceivably be analyzed as *sāmantarāj*, 'subordinate ruler', *TM*'s 'feudataires', and *trakūl*, 'lineage', the whole possibly translated as 'lineages of subordinate rulers', or as *sāmanta*, 'bordering, vassal', and *rājtra:kul*, 'royal family'. This would mean it was in fact equivalent to *dāv bra:ñā* of Līdaiy's time, but the expression does not represent Sukhothai usage as recorded in inscriptions.<sup>52</sup>

Another peculiarity is that the series of titles *braḥ hlvañ khun hmün* as a descending order of ranks below the *dāv brañā* is nowhere found in the Sukhothai records, and seems to first appear in that systematization in the *Law of Military and Provincial Ranks* traditionally ascribed to King Trailokanāth.<sup>53</sup> Indeed '*hlvañ*' and *hmün* are not found in Sukhothai inscriptions as ranks, but the former only as an adjective meaning 'large', etc., and only in inscriptions 1 and 2, and the *hmün* as the number term, 'ten thousand', in inscriptions 5, 10, 38, 45.<sup>54</sup> Although *braḥ* and *khun* are found as Sukhothai ranks, the former occurs only in the titles of kings or their immediate family, not as a second level rank as suggested by the *TBK* context. Only *khun*, which in Sukhothai records seems to mean the ruler of a major town, seems to be at the correct hierarchical level. The true Sukhothai hierarchy, insofar as these terms are concerned, was *braḥ*, *dāv brañā*, *khun*. This is sufficient to show that this list of royalty and officials in *TBK* could not have been composed during the reign of Līdaiy; and it may not be from Sukhothai at all.

<sup>52</sup> See Monier-Williams, p. 1205.

<sup>53</sup> *Three Seals*, I, p. 314.

<sup>54</sup> In no. 45, face 2, line 6, '*hmün* (written *hmin*), occurs in a title, but its sense as a number term, not a rank, still prevails. The title is 'Lām Hmin', '*lām* of 10,000, found together with 'Lām Bann', '*lām* of 1,000 (EHS 3, p. 85).

A few other contexts of *TBK* show language which may provide clues both to the Thai original and to the translation of the above passage in *TW*. *TM* versions, transcribed in italics, are included for comparison.

brai fā khā daiy rāṣaṭar (114)	common people, slaves, free men, and subjects (p.151); TM 97[88] <i>les gens du peuple</i> .
brai lee dakleev dahār soldiers (P. 115)	those who are recruited to do service ( <i>brai</i> ) and to the who are men of courage (p. 151); TM 97[88] <i>citoyens et...tous les soldats</i> .
lūk cau hñau khun dmun dnāy (126)	...princes, the courtiers, and the holders of successively lower ranks(159); TM 102[96]... <i>des princes, des dignitaires, des serviteurs</i>
lūk cau hñau khun dmun dnāy sevak (129)	princes, courtiers, the holders of successively lower ranks and their relatives (162); TM 104[98]... <i>les dignitaires, les mandarins, les serviteurs</i> .

From this it seems that in *TW* "princes, courtiers" stands for *lūk cau* and *hñau khun* respectively, while *dmun dnāy* is rendered by "holders of successively lower ranks", which explains part of the uncertain translation noted above. Puzzling is "relatives" for *sevak*, usually glossed as 'attendant, servant', or 'palace officials'.<sup>55</sup> Thus in the context with which we started, "courtiers" in *TW* must represent braḥ *hlvañ khun hmün*, although this depends on what the Reynolds meant by "groups of soldiers...on duty".<sup>56</sup> The translation offered for '*lūk cau hñau khun dmun dnāy*', however, can only be accepted as a hypothetical paraphrase, not a translation, for this ordering of rank terms is itself unknown either in Sukhothai inscriptions or in the Ayutthayan language of the *Three Seals Laws*; the terms *hñau* and *dmun* do not exist at all in those corpuses; *dnāy* is unknown in Sukhothai records, and in the *Three Seals Law* is never found in this type of context. This expression in *TBK*, in comparison with genuine Sukhothai and Ayutthayan records, is a nonsense. This terminology may nevertheless have a Sukhothai background. As an

<sup>55</sup> The *Royal Institute Dictionary* has 'khārājakār nāi rāja sāmñāk'

<sup>56</sup> "Holders of successively lower ranks" would more accurately represent braḥ *hlvañ khun hmün*, and one wonders if the Reynolds did not simply garble information provided by a Thai informant.



elucidation, the following passages from Sukhothai inscriptions should be examined, with the standard translations so far supplied by Coedès and/or Griswold and Prasert.<sup>57</sup>

Inscription

- 107 (cau khu)n munnāy [...noble rank](such as) Khun  
brai dai (lines 6-7) or Mun Nāy...the populace<sup>58</sup>
- lūk cau lūk khun nobles, officials, munnāy  
munnāy brai dai (10-11) and the populace (21,67)
- 3 brai fā khā dai (2.32) the people (11-1,109); habitants  
brai fā khā dai lūk commoners and men of rank (110);  
cau lūk khun (2.43) *un homme du peuple, un prince  
ou un chef*
- 5 brai fā khā dai (1,16) subjects (11-1,154); *sujets*  
lūk cau lūk khun(2,31) officials (157); *dignitaires*
- 38 lūk khun mun tvān officials and group chiefs  
paribar brai fā (1.15) as well as their retainers and  
all citizens (4,131-2).  
lūk khun mun nāy officials and groups chiefs  
(1.24) (4,135)
- 106 brai fā khā gan bal the populace (8,203), n.16,  
(30-31) "seems to [be] different classes  
of the population".
- 45 brai dai jān mā khā.. ...a Dai commoner or elephant  
(2.3) or horse or slave (3,85)
- 102 ...jā<sup>+</sup>n mā<sup>+</sup> khā<sup>+</sup> elephants, horses, and servants  
dai (1.16) (7,168)

This shows that in true Sukhothai terminology there was an expression *lūk cau lūk khun*, interpreted as 'nobles' or 'officials', corresponding to the misplaced and anachronistic braḥ *hlvañ khun hmün* of *TBK*; there was terminology for 'common people' sometimes *brai dai*, or *brai fā khā dai*, the full significance of which has not been elucidated; and there was a category of *mun nāy* or *mun tvān*, who have been interpreted as administrative officials ranking below the *lūk cau lūk khun*. The term *tvān* is

<sup>57</sup> The translations of Griswold and Prasert are indicated by EHS number followed by page number, Coedès' French versions of nos. 3 and 5, transcribed in italics, are from respectively "L'Inscription de Nagara Jum"; and *Receuil des inscriptions du Siam I, inscriptions de Sukhodaya*, Bangkok, 1924.

<sup>58</sup> In their note 4, p. 67, Griswold and Prasert explained "In the Ayudhyan system, the Mun Nāy were the administrators of the population in their assigned territories", an inadequate explanation, but at least indicating what the conventional scholarly view has been.

undoubtedly Mon for 'village', not unexpected at Sukhothai, which indicates that *mun tvān* at least were chiefs of villages.<sup>59</sup>

Furthermore Līdaiy's nearly parallel Khmer and Thai inscriptions nos. 4 and 5 show that *lūk cau lūk khun* (no. 5) was equivalent to the Sanskritic *āmātya mantrī* ('officials') *rājakula* ('royalty') (no. 4), for in each case they were respectively the officials who went to welcome the Mahāsāmī Saṅgharāj on his arrival in Sukhothai.

This suggests that if there was a Līdaiy-period original of *TBK*, the sequence of titles "...*sāmanta-rājtra:kūl* | braḥ *hlvañ khun hmün*...", might have read, "*āmātya mantrī rājakula lūk cau lūk khun*."

The rank terminology of *TBK* may also be compared with the old Ayutthayan law texts, which even though in their present state do not provide clear evidence for institutional dates, may give some indication of correct terminology.<sup>60</sup> There we find 194 contexts of *munnāy* (including 7 spelled *mūnnāy*), and 19 more of an obvious variant *mū lnāy*. There is no term *dmun*, and the 161 contexts of *dnāy* are not at all related to those of *mun/mulnāy*. The term *tvān* is not found, but there are 9 occurrences of *mūn/mūlnāy prajā/baṅā pān*, which seems to mean the same thing as *mun tvān*.<sup>61</sup>

There is no justification for the *dmun dnāy* of *TBK*, and even less for the rendering of it in *TW*. That expression, and in particular '*dmun*', seems to have been a unique, *ad hoc*, and meaningless adaptation by a late compiler of extant *TBK* who did not understand the terminology of the original. Perhaps the distortion, and the invention of '*dmun*', was because in late Ayutthayan times the title '*nāy*' had lost the rather high status it had represented at Sukhothai, and it was 'enhanced' with the prefix *d-*, found in the doublet *dakleev dahān*, based on the terms *kleev hāñ/hān* 'bold', and in the term *dnāy* otherwise indicating some official status, but not with any certainty related to *nāy*.<sup>62</sup> Then '*dmun dnāy*' was concocted on the basis of genuine Sukhothai and Ayutthayan '*munnāy*'.<sup>63</sup>

<sup>59</sup> It seems that the first person to point out this detail was B.J. Terviel, in "Ahom and the Study of Early Thai society", 1982. In their note 24, p. 131, Griswold and Prasert identified *tvān* as "apparently the Malay word tuan, master, equivalent to Siamese *nāy*", and the phrase as "equivalent to the more usual luk khun mun *nāy*". They also considered that *munnāy* was the Ayutthayan institution of "chiefs of territorial groups into which the population was divided", and which did not exist in Sukhothai until introduced by Ayutthayan conquerors, to one of whom they attributed inscription 38. Thus their surprise at finding the same terminology in the supposedly much earlier no. 107.

<sup>60</sup> Vickery, "Prolegomena to Methods for Using the Ayutthayan Laws as Historical Source Material".

<sup>61</sup> KWIC Index of the *Three Seals Law*, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, 1981.

<sup>62</sup> *hāñ/hān* as a term denoting 'military' may be ancient usage in Southwestern Thai (as that concept is used by Fang Kuei Li, William J. Gedney, James Chamberlain, and other contemporary linguists). In traditional Lue administration there were army officer ranks '*khun hān*, *ca hān*, and *seen hān*'. See Jacques Lemoine, "Tai Lue Historical Relations with China and the Shaping of the Sipsong Panna Political System". This would mean that the various Sanskrit-based explanations of '*dahār*/'*thahān*' are incorrect (an example, deriving it from Sanskrit *dahana* 'reducing to ashes' is in Robert K. Headley, Jr., "Some Sources of Chamic vocabulary", p. 465).

<sup>63</sup> One use of '*dnāy*' in the 19th century was for commoners appointed as trusted personal aides to high-ranking noble officials, an example being Thim Sukhayang (Luang Phatanapongpakdi), author of *Nirās nonkhāy*, and *dnāy* to Phraya Mahindrasakdidamrong, a commander of the forces sent against the Ho in Laos in 1875. See Sitthi Sri Sayam (Jit Phumisak), *Nirās nonkhāy* ((Wannakhadi thi thuk sangpaw=literature which was ordered to be burned), p. 11.

The administrative terminology in *TBK*, like the chronological statements, suggests at the very least serious rewriting of the text at a time much later than the reign of Līdaiy, perhaps the Ayutthaya, or early Ratanakosin period.

### Language features

*Traibhūmikathā* exhibits language features which distinguish it from the 14th-century Sukhothai inscriptions, and which also distinguish some parts of *TBK* itself from other parts, indicating that the entire text was not composed at the same time by a single person, or group of persons working together. I shall not attempt here to do more than indicate the nature of the problem, hoping that it will inspire experts to study the language of *TBK* more thoroughly than has been done.

Two striking examples are the expressions *diar yom* (เดือนย้อม) 'usually' and *po hon* (บ่หอน), 'not', 'never', rare in Sukhothai inscriptions, but with dozens, perhaps hundreds of examples in *TBK*. They give the Lao flavor which has been noticed, and they invite investigation to determine whether such usage can be pinpointed as to time and place.

Perhaps even more interesting is that at a certain point in the "Manussabhumi", 'Realm of Men' (*TP*, p.76), the language of *TBK* begins to make frequent use of the particle *dha* (๕), a connective which is usually untranslated, or which functions as a relative meaning roughly 'who', 'which', found only rarely in preceding sections of *TBK*. Examples are "...yāñ mī bra:ñā oṅg hnün drañ braḥ nñm jü bra:ñā śrī dharmāsokarāj dha svey rāj sampati..." (145), translated in *TW*, p. 172, "there was a king called King dhammasoka who reigned..."; and "...grāñ vā bra:ñā nāñ dha tai svey rāj sampati sai", "When he [*dha*] came into possession of his kingdom..."<sup>64</sup>

This term is found in some Sukhothai inscriptions, but not in others. It is not used in no. 1 (Rām Khāmhaeng), nor in no. 107, considered to be from the 1330s and the second oldest example of Thai writing,<sup>65</sup> nor is it in any of the long inscriptions from the Līdaiy period. Then in inscription no. 49 of 1417 it appears at least 19 times in the 35 lines of the text, written *da* (with a *mai ek* type sign), but transcribed in modern Thai as *dha*. Examples are, line 6, "...bo ayū hvva cau da ciñ bo ayū hvva cau da hai anuyāt kee nāy in", "...to the king so [*da*] the king [*da*] gave permission to Nay In...". Thai scholarly tradition has sometimes glossed this *da/dha* as *dān* the respectful third-person pronoun, but this cannot fit all cases.<sup>66</sup>

This usage is also prominent in a group of inscriptions from Chainat, like no. 49 from early in the 15th century.

In no. 48, 1408, it occurs several times, and once in no. 51 of 1412. Not only does Chainat seem closer to Ayutthayan influence than to Sukhothai, but the content of no. 48 suggests political orientation toward Ayutthaya. The language of no. 49, then, shows a feature which for its time may be more Ayutthayan than Sukhothai.

<sup>64</sup> Frequent occurrences of *dha* are on pages 78 (6 in 2 lines), 94-5 (14 on one page), 123 (9), 124 (4), 141 (6), 150 (5). Single or infrequent examples are on pages 55, 66, 80, 103, 110, 119, 137, 145, 156. This list is not exhaustive.

<sup>65</sup> On no. 107 see A.B. Griswold and Prasert n. Nagara, EHS 21, "The Second Oldest Known Writing in Siamese".

<sup>66</sup> *Pra:jum śilā cārūk bhāg 3* (Collected Inscriptions, vol. 3), p. 81, note 13. In their study of Inscription no. 49, EHS 1, pp. 230-242, Griswold and Prasert made no comment on this term.

We will recall that Griswold and Prasert in fact argued for an Ayutthayan inspiration for no. 49, an argument which I attempted to counter.<sup>67</sup> I would still maintain the political argument, but no. 49 does show a stylistic feature found elsewhere only in inscriptions associated more with Ayutthaya than with Sukhothai.

In origin this feature seems to be Khmer, the connective particle used frequently in Old Khmer from pre-Angkor times, then written *ta*, used infrequently in modern Khmer where it is written *ṭa*, because the unneeded alveolar character has been adapted for the voiced unaspirated stop.<sup>68</sup>

This connective particle, still written in the Old Khmer manner, occurs in Līdaiy's Khmer language no. 4--6 times in the first 10 lines, and at least 19 times on face 3. It is not found in lines 16-48, perhaps because of the great damage they have suffered.

Since it does not occur in Līdaiy's inscription no. 5, a Thai near doublet of no. 4, nor in Līdaiy's other inscriptions, it must have been considered at that time as strictly a Khmer feature. Later in the 15th century it was taken over by Thai writers, perhaps under Ayutthayan influence.

Its uneven incidence in *TBK* indicates that certain sections probably date from the 15th century, while other sections date from earlier or later. The variation in its usage within *TBK* is at least evidence of the "generations of copyists" to whom Coedès attributed the badly misconstrued text which he found. I now again invite historians of Thai language and literature to reexamine the text of *TBK* with a view to dating its different sections according to style, usage, and vocabulary.

In the end we may have to conclude that not only the colophon and exordium, but extant *TP* as an integrated composition, dates from after 1778, and is the work of the various commissions established by Kings Taksin and Rama I.<sup>69</sup> This will not affect its value as a source for study of the political ideology of the early Ratanakosin period (Lorraine Gesick and Craig Reynolds), but it will force serious reappraisal of *TP* as a source for Sukhothai religion, politics and ideology (Chontira Klatyu).<sup>70</sup>

The *Traibhūmikathā* as we have it today probably, along with the *Three Seals Laws*, *Nang Naphamat*, and *Phongsawadan Nōa*, represents part of the "Restoration/Gentle Revolution" of King Rama I.<sup>71</sup> It must be recalled that he showed noteworthy interest in Sukhothai, bringing hundreds of Buddha images from there and other northern *mōaṅ* to his new capital.<sup>72</sup> Probably that displacement also accounts for the strange dispersal of some of the recovered Sukhothai inscriptions at the time when modern scholars first became interested in them; and, if King Mongkut showed unusual interest in Sukhothai epigraphy, it was an interest which may have been part of the intellectual legacy of his grandfather.

<sup>67</sup> Vickery, "A Guide", pp. 233-235.

<sup>68</sup> For an explanation see Vickery, "Piltown Skull--Installment 2", pp. 55-58.

<sup>69</sup> Craig J. Reynolds, "Buddhist Cosmography", pp. 209-210.

<sup>70</sup> The works of Gesick, Reynolds, and Klatyu are listed in note 20 above.

<sup>71</sup> Klaus Wenk, *The Restoration of Thailand Under Rama I, 1782-1809*; David K. Wyatt, "'The Subtle Revolution' of King Rama I", pp. 9-52.

<sup>72</sup> *Brah̄ rāj baṅśāvātār kruṅ ratanakosindr* (National Library Edition), "Rājakāl dī 1, Glāṅ Vidayā, Bangkok (2505/1962), p. 235, when King Rama I was having Vat Braḥ jetuban (Wat Pho) constructed in 1789, he had 1248 damaged images brought from Phitsanulok, Savarngalok, Sukhothai, Lophburi, and Ayutthaya to be repaired and placed in Wat Pho.