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1.

On Thursday, February 27, 1393 (Julian), at about six o'clock in the morning, Prince Sai Ėdaiya, on behalf of his father the King of Sukhodaya, made a pact of mutual assistance with the King of Nān.¹ The two houses had been on friendly terms for generations. They were allied by intermarriage; they were drawn together by common interests; and though at times they were separated by circumstances beyond their control they were now uniting against a common danger.

The rulers of Nān belonged to the Kāv (Gāo) branch of the Dai (Tai) people. The Nān Chronicle (NC) gives a short history of them, with dates which seem on the whole reliable.² We can get a few further scraps of information from epigraphy, from the Chieng Mai Chronicle (CMC), and from the Pali Jinakalamāli (J).³

1) Cf. our Historical and Epigraphic Studies, No. 1, JSS LVI/2, p. 216 f. Cf. also Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 49 (for '1392' read '1393').

2) English translation by Prasoct Churatana, edited by David K. Wyatt, The Nan Chronicle, Ithaca, N.Y., 1966. As Professor Wyatt says (op. cit., pp. x and 16), in the dates given in NC between CS 715 and 962 there is a discrepancy of 2 years between the numeral in CS and the designation in terms of the ten and twelve year cycles. So systematic a discrepancy seems to reflect a difference between the Nān calendar and that attested elsewhere. Supposing that the Tai names of the years in the ten and twelve year cycles correspond to the years of the same name elsewhere, the CS dates in the NC have to be reduced by 2 years in order to correspond to those in use elsewhere, and the same adjustment has to be made when transposing them into the Christian Era. In the English translation of NC, Professor Wyatt has transposed them accordingly, and in the present article we shall follow him. But cf. infra, note 90.

3) For J and CMC, see infra, Abbreviations and Bibliography.
According to the NC, the Nān dynasty was founded by Cau-khun Fon (คำพน), He and his brother Cau-khun Nun (คำุ), had been adopted in infancy by the King of Bhū Gā (ปทุมกา), who was then ruling in Mōañ Yān (เมืองย่าน). When the two brothers asked to found principalities of their own, the King of Bhū Gā made them get permission from King Thera of Tēn (เทานคร). Cau-khun Nun then founded Candapuri, and Cau-khun Fon founded the town of Varanagara or Mōañ Pua (เมืองผา).

The NC gives no dates for this part of the story; the first date it gives is that of the accession of Cau-khun Fon's grandson in 1320, from which we might calculate that Pua was founded around the middle of the 13th century; but that seems very late for the arrival of the Kāv in the Nān Vallay. Perhaps the first two reigns were of 'legendary' length, i.e. in the NC they represent a larger number of reigns whose history was not known to the compiler of the chronicle. The name Bhū Gā suggests Viaṅ Bhū Gā (Vieng Pou Kha), southwest of Mōañ Sinha (Müön Sing) in Laos; and the story sounds as if the King of Bhū Gā were a vassal of the King of Tēn (Dien Bien Phu?). Candapuri is Viaṅ Cāndana (คำานาน, Vientiane) in Laos. Pua—in epigraphy Blvva or Blua (ป่าบว, ป่าบัว)—is on the Nān River 50 km. upstream from the present town of Nān. Mōañ Yān is generally identified with Ngôn Yān (Heran Nanagara), called Yāṅgapura in J, which is supposed to have occupied the present site of Chieng Sēn (founded 1327) on the Mê Kông, but which the CMC (p. 15) locates on the Mê Sai.

Yāṅgapura's most illustrious son was Maṅrāya (Mūng Rāi), who established the supremacy of the Dai Yvan (Tai Yuan) over the whole of Lān Nā. According to J, he was born in 1239, succeeded his father as king of Yāṅgapura in 1261, founded Jaṅrāyapura (Chieng Rāi) the next year, conquered Dadarapura from Kāvarāja in 1275, contracted a solemn alliance with Purachādana and Rocarāja in 1287, conquered Haripuṅjaya in 1292, and founded a new capital, Nabbisi (Chieng Mai), in 1296.

In this context, Kāvarāja, 'the King of the Kāv', must be either Cau-khun Fon or his successor, and Dadarapura must be his capital,
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Pua. Though NC says nothing about Mañrāya’s conquest of Pua, it is possible that he established his suzerainty over it without deposing the dynasty. Purachādana is Nām Mōān (น้ำ/releasespace), King of Bayāv (Payāo, between Chieng Sēn and Chieng Mai). Rocarāja is Rāma Gāmphēn of Sukhodaya.

Inscription I tells us that Rāma Gāmphēn was lord over ‘the Mā, the Kāv, the Lāv, the Dai who live under the vault of heaven, and the Dai peoples of the Khōn and the U’ (IV/2-4, มีการกลายเมื่อเทิงสูง พื้นที่...... ห้วยช้าง); and among his possessions it specifically mentions Pua (IV/25, Blvva, ปัว). He composed the inscription in 1292, but the first of the two references may be part of a postscript added after he died, and the second certainly is. His regnal dates are uncertain; the best guess is c. 1279–c. 1299. We can take it for certain that Pua and the upper Nān Valley were tributary to him at the time of his death, though we have no means of knowing how long they had been so. If Mañrāya conquered Pua in 1274, it may be that he turned it over to Rāma Gāmphēn as part of a general settlement with him and Nām Mōān in 1287.

Rāma Gāmphēn’s kingdom began to break up after his death, perhaps quite soon after it. The NC goes on to say that Fōn’s son and successor Kau Kōan, after ruling Pua for some time, was commanded by his grandfather the King of Bhū Gā, who was still ruling at Mōān Yān but was nearing death, to come and rule Mōān Yān in his place. Kau Kōan reluctantly obeyed, leaving his pregnant wife Dāv Gāmph Pin to rule Pua. Soon afterwards Pua was seized by Nām Mōān of Bayāv (Payāo). The unfortunate princess took refuge in the forest, where she gave birth to a son. When the son reached the age of sixteen he was presented to Nām Mōān, who was impressed with his demeanor. First he made him a page, then put more and more important affairs in his hands, and finally made him ruler of Mōān Prāt with the title Prince Saiyasa. Meanwhile Nām Mōān had installed one of his own wives, Ua Sim, as ruler of Pua. This lady, having taken offense at something Nām Mōān said to her, began plotting against him with Prince Saiyasa. The latter marched on Pua
at the head of a body of troops, took the city, and married Ua Sim. He was then elected ruler of Pua and given the name Cau Phã Nòň.

The NC gives Phã Nòň’s regnal dates as 1320-49, which may well be right. His accession in 1320 would put his father Kau Köan’s departure for ‘Mõaû Yăn’ around 1300, and the King of Bhû Gâ’s death a year or two later. It is hard to say where Kau Köan really went, or why; Yângapura was part of Mañrâyâ’s kingdom at that time; and it would be strange if the King of Bhû Gâ were its ruler, naming his own successor there. But the story of Näm Mõaû’s capture of Pua soon afterwards is plausible enough; he would not have dared attempt it so long as Râma Gâmphên was alive, but after his death there was little to stop him.

Phã Nòň was an independent monarch, not a vassal of Sukhodaya: by 1320 King Lôdaiya of Sukhodaya was hardly in a position to assert his suzerainty, or even to protect a ruler who offered his allegiance voluntarily.

Mañrâyâ’s death in 1311 was followed by prolonged disputes among his heirs for the succession. The alliance between Sukhodaya, Lân Nã and Bayâv was a thing of the past. J and CMC give us a glimpse of Phã Nòň’s troubles with Lân Nã, though NC is silent about them. Some time before 1334, according to J, Mañrâyâ’s great-grandson Haripyava (Gâm Fû) fought against ‘Kâvarâja’, and conquered Balanagara: Kâvarâja, ‘the Kâv King’, must mean Phã Nòň, while Balanagara means Mõaû Brê (Prê, umf).

The CMC, though its dates may be less reliable than J’s, gives us more details: the campaign began in 1338, when Gâm Fû persuaded ‘the Kâv King’ to come and help him attack Bayâv; they stormed the city but quarreled over the booty; and two years later Gâm Fû made an unsuccessful attempt to conquer Brê.4

4) CMC, pp. 81 ff. The name of the ruler of Bayâv is given as Näm Mõaû; though Näm Mõaû, the most famous of the line, was already dead, it would not be unnatural for the chronicler to use the same name for his descendants. However the Yomaka History gives his name as Brâhyâ Gâm Lîa (ñõûâ). In CMC’s account Gâm Fû has a follower called Sâm Phã Nòň, which is either a mistake or a remarkable coincidence (in CMC, however, ‘the Kâv King’ is not called Phã Nòň but remains anonymous).
We may summarize our conclusions. After the death of Rama Gāmbhēn, Sukhodaya’s possessions to the north and east of Uttaratittha split up into petty states which were frequently at odds with one another, and with Lān Nā and Bayāv as well. Pua was annexed by Bayāv, but shook loose in 1320 and became an independent kingdom under Phā Nōn, with Brè as one of its dependencies. In the 1330’s Pua helped Lān Nā conquer Bayāv but got no benefit from it. After that Lān Nā tried to take Brè away from Pua, but probably to no lasting purpose.

By the end of Lōdaiya’s reign the kingdom of Sukhodaya was on the verge of collapse; most of the vassals had broken away; and there was little left beyond the provinces of Sukhodaya and Sajjanālaya. Sajjanālaya, the second city of the kingdom, was ruled by the Uparāja Lōdaiya, Lōdaiya’s son whom he evidently regarded as his heir apparent. Lōdaiya—whose grandson Sai Lōdaiya was to make the pact with Nān in 1392 which is the subject of our article—was a man of great brilliance and vigor. Apparently his father died suddenly, c. 1346, when Lōdaiya was still at Sajjanālaya; and before he had time to reach the capital the throne was seized by a usurper, Nūa Nām Thām (Ngua Nām Tom), of whom we know almost nothing.

In 1347, as soon as he was able to muster his forces, Lōdaiya marched on the capital. According to Inscription IV (I/1 ff.), ‘he commanded all his troops to enter, to surround, to seize, to break down all the gates, and the axe smote all his enemies.’ Having ousted the usurper, Lōdaiya ‘entered the city to take supreme power in the land of Sukhodaya, as successor of his father and his grandfather.’ He quickly undertook a program of rebuilding the shattered kingdom, ensuring order and prosperity for his subjects, attracting some of the lost vassals to re-enter the fold, allying himself with others, and restoring a considerable measure of the kingdom’s former glory.

According to the NC, Phā Nōn died in 1349 and was succeeded first by his youngest son Sai, and then, upon the latter’s death two years later, by his eldest son Kūr Mōaū (nūmā, r. 1351-61). About this time Pua re-entered the orbit of Sukhodaya, not as a vassal but as an ally.
Soon after Kar Moan's accession, as we know from the NC, Lidaiya invited him to Sukhodaya to help him build a monastery. When the work was finished Kar Moan returned to Pua, taking with him seven holy relics and forty votive tablets—twenty of gold and twenty of silver—given him by Lidaiya. He built a cetiya to enshrine them at Jê Hêñ (Che Hêng), across the river from the present site of Nán, well downstream from Pua. In 1357, 'longing to be near the relics', he moved his capital to Jê Hêñ. One of his reasons, we may guess, was to be nearer Sukhodaya, and within easier range of Lidaiya's protection.

In 1359 there was some sort of trouble at Brê. Kar Moan must have requested Lidaiya's help to restore order in the vassal state; for in that year, according to Inscription IX (I/15 f.), Lidaiya 'took his army to Moan Brê and stayed there seven months.'

The trouble at Brê may have been started, or at least aggravated, by the machinations of Prince Vattitejo (Pô Ngua) of Subarñapurī. Vattitejo was the brother-in-law and vassal of King Rāmadhipati of Ayudhya, but generally at odds with him on matters of policy. Rāmadhipati was drawn to Lidaiya by inclination as well as interest; he was a Tai, descended on his mother's side from the house of Traitrīśa which was tributary to Sukhodaya; and as his grand design was to conquer Cambodia he needed Lidaiya's benevolent neutrality, if not his active cooperation. Vattitejo, on the other hand, regarded Sukhodaya as an enemy that must be crushed; he was perhaps more Môn or Khmer than Tai; and he was sufficiently powerful in his own right to dare act against his suzerain's wishes up to a certain point, though not to defy him openly.5

When Sukhodaya seemed about to collapse in 1346, Vattitejo doubtless hoped the kingdom would fall into his hands. He may have organized Nua Nam Tham's usurpation, which Lidaiya quickly brought to an end. In Inscription V, written in 1361, Lidaiya makes a rather pointed reference to persons who had tried to kill him by putting 'spells in his fish, poison in his rice' (I/24 ff.). Was he thinking of Vattitejo and his agents?

5) See our Historical and Epigraphic Studies No. 1, JSS LVI/2; also Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 31 ff.
In November 1361 Līdaiya temporarily retired from the throne in order to spend several months in the monkhood (Inscriptions IV-VI). An alarming event now occurred, of which we have somewhat conflicting accounts in two chronicles, J and SBN: they both say that Rāmādhhipati seized possession of one of Līdaiya’s principal cities and gave it to Vattitejo as an apānage, but afterwards returned it to Līdaiya and sent Vattitejo back to Subarnaṇapurī. The city in question, which J calls Jayanādapura and SBN calls Dvisākhanagara, was evidently Sōn Gvē (Sōng Kwē, i.e. Biṣṇuloka). It would be out of keeping with everything we know about Rāmādhhipati’s policy toward Sukhodaya for him to lay hold of the city. It is much more likely that the chroniclers have mistakenly attributed the vassal’s action to the sovereign; and that Vattitejo, taking advantage of Rāmādhhipati’s absence from the capital on a campaign elsewhere, and of Līdaiya’s temporary retirement, seized Sōn Gvē on his own initiative.6

At about the same time, according to the NC, a man ‘from the south’ called Khun Indā (quiūm) arrived at Nān with a valuable piece of cloth to present to the ruler. Kār Mōaṅ, not knowing the cloth was poisoned, accepted it; and as soon as he touched it he collapsed and died. The NC does not say who Khun Indā was, but we can guess he was an agent of Vattitejo.

As soon as Līdaiya returned to lay life he took action. According to a mutilated passage in Inscription VIII (III/9 ff.), he ‘led his army to the .. ... purī River to pacify [the territory], which he conquered completely, as well as the territory to the east . . . . . . as far as Braḥ Sakk, completely; then he went to stay at Sōn Gvē.’ Should the name of the river be restored as Nāndapurī, i.e. the Nān? The geographical order—first the river, then Braḥ Sakk in the Sāk Valley, then Biṣṇuloka—suggests that the campaign opened in the murdered prince’s troubled realm. At any rate, according to the NC, Kār Mōaṅ was succeeded by his son Phā Kôn, which might not have been possible without Līdaiya’s intervention.

6) Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 31 f., 37 f. The name Dvisākhanagara, ‘town at the [confluence of] two branches [of a river]’, is simply the Pali equivalent of Sōng Kwē (sōum), ‘[confluence of] two branches’. The name Jayanādapura, given in J, evidently has nothing to do with the present town or province of Jayanāda (Chaiuat, sōum), nor part of which could ever have belonged to Līdaiya; ‘Jayanāda’ was one of the old names of Biṣṇuloka (perhaps confused with Jayanāma, a town in Wang Tōng District, a little to the east of the present town of Biṣṇuloka).
The purpose of the campaign to the Sāk may have been not only to regain lost territory but also to outflank Vattitejo and show him that his position was untenable. That, plus a reminder to Rāmādhipati that his agreement with Ādaiya was being violated by his vassal’s initiative, may be what made Vattitejo retire and allow Ādaiya to take up his residence at Sōn Gvè, where, according to Inscription VIII (IV/4 f.), he remained for seven years.

The NC tells us that in 1366 Phā Kōn, finding that Jē Hēā was subject to severe droughts, moved his capital to the present site of Nān. Phā Kōn was on just as friendly terms with Sukhodaya as his father had been, and one of his daughters became Ādaiya’s chief queen.

Rāmādhipati, after invading Cambodia and taking Angkor Thom, died in 1369. He was succeeded by his son Rāmeśvara; but before a year elapsed the throne was seized by Vattitejo, who took the regnal name Paramarājā. Apparently Cambodia soon broke away; Paramarājā was obsessed with crushing Sukhodaya.

A passage in Inscription VIII (III/19-25), which dates from about 1368-70, gives the limits of Ādaiya’s kingdom. To the north, the boundary between his territory and that of ‘Cau Braña Phā Kōn, the ruler of Mōaṇ Nān and Mōaṇ Bvva’, was the River Nān (i.e. that portion of it which flows from east to west toward Uttaratittha). To the south, the same river (i.e. the lower portion, which bends westward toward Nagara Svarga) formed the boundary with another Cau Braña whose name is lost except for the first letter, which is P (Paramarājā?). To the east, the kingdom extended to the Khōn (i.e. the Mē Khoṇ), beyond which was the territory of Cau Braña Fā Ńōm (Pā Ngum, the King of Laos, r. 1353-74). The statement giving the western limit, which was presumably the mountain range west of the Ping, is illegible.

Such was the kingdom Paramarājā undertook to conquer. He had immense resources at his disposal, including the military machine Rāmādhipati had built up for the invasion of Cambodia; but he was not a very competent general, and his successes were small in proportion to his military superiority. He invaded Sukhodayan territory in
1371; in 1372 he took Nagara Svarga; in 1373 he attacked Kāṁbēṅ Bejra, but retired after inflicting severe losses on the defenders; in 1375 he attacked Biṣṇuloka.

By this time Liḍaiya had died and been succeeded by Mahādharmaṇājā II, his son by Phā Kön’s daughter. Phā Kön, as a loyal ally, helped defend Kāṁbēṅ Bejra against a new attack by Paramarāja in 1376. Though Paramarāja failed to take the city, Phā Kön’s troops were routed and he barely escaped with his life.

In 1378, upon receiving intelligence that Paramarāja was about to attack Kambēṅ Bejra for the third time, Mahādharmaṇājā II himself hastened to the defense of the city; but his forces were overwhelmed, the city fell, and he was taken prisoner. In accordance with custom Paramarāja did not depose him, but forced him to take an oath of allegiance, and sent him back to Sukhodaya to rule as his vassal.

This was a stroke of luck for Paramarāja, for it gave him suzerainty over a kingdom he was unable to conquer by military means. However reluctant Mahādharmaṇājā II might be, he felt bound to honor his oath of allegiance. Phā Kön found himself in an awkward position: to help his grandson would be to help their common enemy. Nān’s alliance with Sukhodaya necessarily lay dormant. Phā Kön died in 1386; and his son Gām Tān (Kam Đān, Nān), who succeeded him, might well hesitate to renew it. It is possible that the defeats of 1376 and 1378 had aroused mutual suspicions and recriminations. In any case Nān’s geographical position gave a certain measure of protection against Ayudhyan attack. An isolationist policy might prove to be the most prudent.

Now Mahādharmaṇājā II’s fortunes began to revive.

Paramarāja, whose endless intrigues sometimes ended badly for himself, was not content with reducing the Tai of Sukhodaya to vassalage; or perhaps he feared that his suzerainty over them would 7)

---

7) This statement requires some qualification. In 1372, according to AA/LP (sub anno 734) he took ‘Bāṅgā’ (Nēṅgā), which is generally identified with Nagara Svarga. Even if formal proof of the identification is lacking, it is clear that he must have taken Nagara Svarga before 1373, when he made his first attack on Jākāṅrāv (Kambēṅ Bejra, Nān), otherwise it is hard to see how he could have reached Jākāṅrāv.
not last long if there were any independent Tai nearby. He therefore began plotting to get a foothold in Lân Nâ. In 1385 Prince Mahâbrahma of Chieng Râi tried unsuccessfully to seize the throne of Lân Nâ from his nephew Sên Môañ Mâ (Sên Muang Mâ), then fled to Ayudhyâ to get help; Paramarâjâ invaded Lân Nâ at his request but failed to take the capital; he returned to Ayudhyâ taking Mahâbrahma with him; but he soon grew exasperated with him and made an alliance with Sên Môañ Mâ instead. Meanwhile Kâmbëên Bejra revolted and Paramarâjâ thought Sukhodaya was about to revolt. He and Sên Môañ Mâ planned to make a concerted attack on Sukhodaya from north and south; but Sên Môañ Mâ arrived first; and while he was waiting Mahadharmarâjâ II fell upon him and routed his army.

Thus Mahadharmarâjâ II, without violating his oath of allegiance to Paramarâjâ, frustrated his plan by defeating his ally, to whom he himself was under no obligation whatever. In 1388 Paramarâjâ again attacked Kâmbëên Bejra, but died on his way home.

Within a week the throne of Ayudhyâ was seized by the ex-king Râmeśvara. To him the house of Subarṇapuri had become by all odds the most dangerous enemy. Like his father, he was drawn by inclination as well as interest to the house of Sukhodaya; Mahâdharmarâjâ, whose oath of allegiance had expired with Paramarâjâ's death, probably took a new one to Râmeśvara; but so lightly did Râmeśvara hold the reins of suzerainty that Sukhodaya was to all intents an independent kingdom again. It now became possible to think about resuscitating the alliance with Nân.

Though neither Sukhodaya nor Nân had anything to fear from Râmeśvara, the house of Subarṇapuri was still dangerous. It remained strong, and a coup d'état might restore it to the Ayudhyân throne at any moment. Gâm Tân could not very well forget the assassination of his grandfather Kâr Môañ in 1361, or his father's defeat at Kâmbëên Bejra in 1376; nor could Mahâdharmarâjâ II forget his own humiliation at the hands of Paramarâjâ in 1378. It was obviously to the interest of both to insure themselves against the possibility of the house of Subarṇapuri regaining supremacy at Ayudhyâ. Except perhaps for his own hesitation, there was nothing to prevent Gâm Tân from allying himself with Sukhodaya, for he
was an independent monarch. But Mahādhamrājā II was a vassal of Ayudhyā, and therefore unable to make a treaty with a third power. However much Rāmeśvara might welcome any move aimed against the house of Subarṇapurī he could not give it his open approval without uniting Ayudhyā on the side of his enemies.

Eventually a solution was found. A pact was concluded in 1393, with Gām Tan himself acting on behalf of Nān, and Prince Sai Lidaiya acting on behalf of Sukhodaya. Presumably Mahādhammarājā II had temporarily retired from the throne and entered the monkhood, after appointing his son Sai Lidaiya, who was probably Upārāja at Sajjanālāya, as Regent of the kingdom. In the pact the King of Nān is referred to as Sai Lidaiya's 'paternal grandfather' (i.e. ), which of course cannot be taken literally as his paternal grandfather was Lidaiya himself. The only possible explanation is that the King of Nān was his paternal grand-uncle, i.e. that Mahādhammarājā II's mother—Lidaiya's chief queen—was Phā Kōn's daughter and Gām Tan's sister.

The agreement is recorded in two inscriptions, Nos. XLV and LXIV. The first, dated in 1393, was kept at Sukhodaya; the other, whose date has disappeared, was kept at Nān. Unlike the copies which are normally retained nowadays by the parties to a contract, their contents are not identical. It is hard to say why. Perhaps both inscriptions had 'annexes', e.g. in the form of inscribed gold sheets (suvarṇapātra), which were kept secret. Or perhaps there was one basic pact, followed later on by supplementary pacts, with both parties retaining identical copies of all of them, though the only ones that survive are Sukhodaya's copy of the basic pact, and Nān's copy of a supplement. No. XLV, with its unusually elaborate oath (Face I), looks like the basic contract; but, so far as we can tell in its fragmentary state, its actual provisions (Face II) were not very important. No. LXIV, on the other hand, though its oath is shorter, specifies a very close alliance between the two states, almost amounting to a merger. Perhaps we should suppose that XLV, a first tentative step after a period of mutual suspicion, led to more intimate relations and eventually to the tight alliance recorded in LXIV, which would therefore be of later date. But it cannot have been later than 1396, because Gām Tan died in that year.
Inscription XLV is engraved on a slab of stone 83 cm. in height, 37 cm. in width, and 18 cm. in thickness, which is now in the Manuscript and Inscription Division of the National Library in Bangkok. (Figs. 3-5.) It was discovered in 1956 by the Department of Fine Arts in the precinct of Vat Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya, near the main vihāra. It is not certain whether it originally stood in the vihāra or in some building nearby (the ruins of a great many are still visible). In any case in order to give contracts of this sort a solemn and binding character it would be natural to install them in some building in the precinct of the Mahādhātu, which was the spiritual and magical center of the kingdom; most of the palladia of vassal princes, it seems, were kept in the same precinct.

The text, which is in Siamese, written in the usual Sukhodayan script of the period, is engraved on the two broad faces and one of the edges of the slab of stone. A transcription by Mahā Chām Dōngāṃvarṇa, together with a version in modern Siamese spelling and some glosses, is published in Prajom Silakārik, III, pp. 62 ff. We are much indebted to his reading, which we have followed except in a few places; here and there we differ from his interpretation; and we have changed his numbering of Faces II and III. The obverse, Face I, contains 37 lines; the reverse, which we call Face II (Mahā Chām's Face III), contains 19; and the text on the edge of the slab, which we call Face III (his Face II), contains 40.

This inscription is of considerable historical importance. It contains the name of at least one hitherto unknown King of Sukhodaya, viz. Nvva Nām Thām (Ngua Nan Tom), probably a usurper who reigned briefly between Lödaiya and Lödaiya (see Prasert ṇa Nagara in Social Science Review, June 1966; Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 29). It also contains a list of the rulers of Nān, which it is instructive to compare with the list given in NC. The inscription is no less interesting from the point of view of the study of religion, for it reveals three systems in simultaneous action—Theravāda Buddhism, Śaiva Brahminism, and Tai Animism. Apart from Rāma Gāmḥèn's reference to Braṭ Khabūṭ in Inscription I, this is the first solid information we have on Animism at Sukhodaya and Nān. The spirits mentioned are of four kinds: ancestors, guardians of mountains, guardians of rivers and streams, and forest divinities.
Fig. 4. Inscription XLV, Face II.
TEXT

Face I

1. --- (ส) บัตรยกนั้นจึงให้แก่
2. --- (กรกฎ) ซอองหลักอนั้นไม่ได้แก่
3. --- (ว) คาราณพระยาแผน พระยา
4. --- ปรีดี ปุรีรัง พระพิพันธ์
5. --- (พ) ycopg พระยาคามุฟ
6. --- (พระ) ญาณกงกางิน ต่างสกวา
7. --- (ผ) สิทธิแผ่ แค่จำพงค์ ผับฝ่าน
8. --- (ผ) หมู่ทวาน ปญจัก ขนจองก์พระยา
9. (รัชทายาท) ณย พระญาปานพระยาราช ปัสด
10. กรม พระญาปานพระญาภรณ์ ปพ
11. (พระ) ญาณชารีราชา ผ่าแม่ยองเฉดไทย แ
12. (ธ) ใหม่พิชชาธิปนิธานันเต็มเฝ่ไธไน
13. (ผ) มันทงสิ้นใหญ่เชาว первуюทานผ่าน
14. (ก) แบ่งแบ่งพระสกลพระสกิจทานยอย
15. พราสาน พระมณี หมื่นหายเสนอง ทั้งปภิตพระ
16. ช่างเย็นขยน พระศรี ผ้ำพระสกลกิจอภิภิภัย
17. ทุกแห่งถึงตัดส่องพระทานสกสวัน ่มฝ่าย
18. ใครบังชีจึงมีแห่ง_APPROXניתความเป็นพระยา
๓๔. เลิศ เกิด ปาน แจ่ม ยอด อยู่ ที่ ท้าย ดง หลวง นนทบุรี
๓๕. วัชร รุจิรา วัชร กนิภิศ ปาก ปาก
๓๖. ศิริวัฒน์ นนทบุรี โภชน์ ฤทธิ์
๓๗. พรประเทศ พรสิริ บูรพimap ปาก
๓๘. ปนัส ศิริ ภูมิ เกตุ ประสงค์ บูรพimap ปาก
๓๙. สมจุริ ภูมิ ประกอบ บูรพimap ปาก
๕๐. พานสิทธิ์ พิศิษฐ์ จตุจักร ไชย ๓๙๔๐
๕๑. มหาภูมิ ไชย ๔๐๙๙ ซ่อน ปิด ปิด โน้ต โน้ต
๕๒. ติ่ง บุญ สมบูรณ์ วณรนันทบุรี
๕๓. เทศ บุญ ศิริ ภูมิ บูรพimap ปาก
๕๔. มี ใจ สุทธิราช ภูมิ บูรพimap ปาก
๕๕. บุญ (สิน) สารารีน รักษา ปาก ปาก ปาก ปาก
๕๖. เตชะ พะ มะ นา 거든 บุญ บูรพimap ปาก
๕๗. รามาน บุญ ศิริ ภูมิ บูรพimap ปาก
๕๘. กามน์ (หา) — (หา) เศรษฐ์ ศิริ ภูมิ— (หา)
๕๙. ศักดิ์ หา — — — — — —
Face II

1. อนันต์พันธุ์บุณนาค-----------------

2. โสก เบียงปั่นญกกัน-----------------

3. กิ่ง สืบไพตรrawl---

4. นิเวศวิลวิภรรคทิ้ง------------------

5. กินเมืองนอกเยียกแ懦---------------(ฏ)

6. จันทผิ่งส้ม หุ่นเส้า (พนม)--------

7. (ข้า) ชูบ่มตรี เสนาบดุ์ย(ฤทธิ์)----

8. ทรงหลายอักษรเนื้อ(รง)---------------

9. พุนมาลก่ำพวกพี้(ปิ)---------------

10. มีชื่อเก่าส่องทานปุห(ลาน)----------

11. จงสัสนานความติป ว----------------

12. วาที่เปลี่ยนพวกราชาทาก----------

13. ศักพหมดหัวกลกหัวลบ ย---------------

14. ทุ่งช่อน ก้าร่ายางแก๊ก---------------

15. สายนาขร่ายในสมเจ้าวิกกิ้น----------

16. ผู้ช่างน้ำกั้นถวิลและ-----------------

17. ส ในช่ำวิวิขวัตนาสนหล้า----------

18. ทำไช้สิ่งพินแห่งกั้น---------------(ต)

19. หยุดช่องสำริกเหลร----------------
Face III

1. ........................................
2. ........................................
3. ถ้าพระ ...... ...........................
4. (พระ) บุคคล .........................
5. โคสสังสนั้น (น) ....................
6. (พระ) บุคคล .........................
7. ก มาพรหมฤ(ราชา) .................
8. สกนธ์อุพล ...........................
9. (พระ) บุคคล ไค(ปค) .................
10. (ป) รูปสันนาในมหา(ราชา) .......
11. พระเปรกพุทธ(ต) ...................
12. กลยายน พระสุระ ว(ทร) ..........
13. (ตร) มหาราชาทูต ติ้งกา .........
14. ยืนตัว (สิ่งความคง) ..............
15. มเหสุ พระราชทัพ ...................
16. พระมิ่ง พระราชชิ้น พระ .......
17. (ย) ธีรพิร ที่จำนำ รามบรุด ...
18. (ร) บุคคล พระราชกิ พระ ......
19. ทั้งนั้นทั้ง ครบันท์กิ ถง ....
20. พระราชิ่ง พระราช
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๑๑. ——(ทั้ง)ชริน อุแหพร อรรตนทสร

๑๒. ——(เทพบ)วนา镯ะรา หวาทศร

๑๓. (ฆี่)—จ ภิช ภิชภัณฑ์ โยกินท

๑๔. ——(ครู)ท้องเขข ภิณนา ภิณนา ภัก

๑๕. ——สรรพสิทธิ์ รัศปสิทธิ์ ฟิ

๑๖. (ทายชร)— ศิริ ภูมา เทวะเทท เทพ

๑๗. ——(ยมบ)สิล มุถูกุตใหญ่บวกล ทศโลก

๑๘. ——พรหมรูปสิบหกกลวง ทง

๑๙. ——ย จุรรัปญจญะยานสหาน

๒๐. ——ซ้าบกสำเนะญจายกบน อยูญ

๒๑. (ยานญจายกบน)น อาทิญจายกบน ยนเซียว

๒๒. (แวลสอนญานะส)ญายกตังนางถาวราหมาเพรทก

๒๓. (จ้าพม่า)ราชิกา ตุทธิสหามา ทุศโดย นิม

๒๔. (มาเร็จ ปรนิมิมิค)พิศาลกิศวราชมะริน บาราน

๒๕. (ด)—โลกอาฬุ จุรบพ (สบ)ปุระพี

๒๖. (เทหะ ชมพู)สิบ อวาระยานอุดมกรุ ฟุไล

๒๗. ——(กิมม)ท โยลสฟุระสบวรพ วังก

๒๘. ——(พิ)หมาภักยะกษัมภภ หิมพ้า

๒๙. ——สบบคํอคสบบค

๓๐. ——สิริชล บ———
Face I

[I/1-2.].................. to this oath sworn between us, let [the witnesses] be [all the ancestral spirits of both our houses and] all the guardian spirits who dwell in waters and caves!

[I/3-7.].................. ancestral spirits on the side of the Braññā who is the Grandfather [as follows]: Grandfather Braññā................ Grandfather Rōñ, Grandfather Muñ, Grandfather Bōñ13, Grandfather Fā Fin, ............. [Grandfather Braññā?] Phā Kōñ14, Grandfather Braññā Gāmp Fū,.............. [and Grandfather]

8) There is a blank space at the top of Face I, showing that line 1 (of which a little over half survives) was the beginning of the text. In this face, 'the Braññā who is the Grandfather' (i.e. Gämp Tān) and he 'who is the Grandson' (Sai Liḍaiya) call on a host of spirits to witness their oath (I/1-2), viz. the ancestral spirits of the houses of Nān (I/3-7) and Sukhodaya (I/7-12), the guardian spirits of mountains, rivers, etc. proper to the houses of Nān (I/13-15) and Sukhodaya (I/15-16); they invoke curses on either party who might violate the oath (I/17-25) and blessings for remaining faithful to it (I/25-27). Then (I/27-32), after a punctuation-mark in the form of a conch or the magic syllable 'om', come the date and hour when the oath was taken (I/27-32), and finally a colophon with the names of the persons (apparently all of them monks) who composed the text on behalf of the two parties (I/32-37). The conclusion is broken off; by comparison with Face III, there would have been room for 8 or 10 more lines; but by analogy with Face II most of this space may have been left blank. In any case it seems unlikely that the bottom of Face I contained any portion of the actual provisions of the oath; they seem to begin and end on Face II.

9) We conjecture that some term with this meaning occurred in the lacuna at the beginning of I/1.

10) हास, 'namely'.

11) Our conjectural restoration of the lacuna at the beginning of I/2 is based on what follows.

12) We restore '(. )(ni)' at I/3 as 'inā'; cf. below, note 16.

13) Though we might have expected fōñ, the reading bōñ seems fairly certain; cf. infra, note 15.

14) Similarly we should have expected nōñ instead of kōñ at this point; again cf. note 15.
Braññā Phā Kôn.\textsuperscript{15} Up to this point, the ancestral spirits\textsuperscript{16} of the Kāv\textsuperscript{17},............. powerful spirits.

[I/7-12.] From here on, the throng of ancestral spirits of the house of Grandfather Phā Gām\textsuperscript{18},............. [on the side of]

\textsuperscript{15} The names on this list correspond more or less to those in the NC; see supra, pp. 58-64. The discrepancies could be due to wrong readings of the inscription, to corruptions in the chronicular text, or to an origin in a different but parallel tradition. The first name on the list (I/3-4, ‘Grandfather Braññā . . . . . . . . . . . . . .’ should correspond to the NC’s King Thera of Tōn (ﺋ ﺪ ﺭ ﺃ). The second, ‘Grandfather Rōn’, may be the King of Bhū Gā (шейнг), but it is hard to account for the name Rōn (ᡵ ﺪ) and the absence of the title Braññā. ‘Grandfather Muū’ (ﾑ ﻓ) and ‘Grandfather Bōn’ (ㄆ ﺡ) are evidently Cau-khun Nun (ㄆ ﻋ ﺜ ﻋ), the founder of Candapurī, and Cau-khun Fōn (ㄆ ﺢ), the founder of Pua (ㄆ ﺢ). ‘Grandfather Fū Fin’ (ㄆ ﺢ, for ㄆ ﺢ), judging from the position on the list, should be Fōn’s son and successor, whom the NC calls Kau Kōan (ㄆ ﺢ ﺳ ﺢ ﺪ). But the two names are not very similar. The next legible name, Phā Kôn (ㄆ ﺢ, corresponds to the NC’s Phā Nōh. Gām Fū (ㄆ ﺢ) may be the NC’s Kār Mōn (ㄆ ﺢ). The second Phā Kôn is of course Gām Tōn’s father, who was murdered in 1361; he may have been named for his grandfather (if the reading Phā Kôn at I/5 is correct).

\textsuperscript{16} The word ṚHI’1 (I/6), for ṚHI’1, which in Siamese is equivalent to פיסא, is still used in the sense of ‘ancestral spirits’ among some of the Dai (Tai) of Laos and Tongking. Cf. I/3 and I/7.

\textsuperscript{17} At the end of I/6 the printed edition has ṚHI’1, ‘Kāmɪ’, which must be a mistake for ṚHI’1, Kāv, the people of the upper Nān Valley (see p. 57).

\textsuperscript{18} Phā Gām (ㄆ ﺢ), ‘golden mountain’, looks like an equivalent of Bhū Khāy Dōn (ㄆ ﺢ, Skt. Suvarṇagiri or Hemagiri, classic designations of Mount Meru (cf. Coedès, Les Etats hindouisés d’Indochine et d’Indonésie, Paris, 1964, p. 219). At Sukhodaya the Mahādhātu was apparently sometimes called Suvarṇapacetiya (Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 20) — a Buddhist adaptation of Hemagiri? If, on the other hand, Sukhodaya’s ‘golden mountain’ was outside the city walls, as at Ayudhāyā and Bangkok, we might think of the hill which was the residence of Braññā Khabūn, which in the present inscription, at I/16, is called Yannyan (ㄤ ﺪ ﺢ ﺪ), for ㄥ ﺢ, ‘stable and brilliant’ (another suitable epithet for Mount Meru). Phā Gām, whatever its topographical significance may be, must be used here to designate the house of Braññā Rūaṅ (Pra Ruang), though we know of no other case in which this or a similar term is so used.
him who is the Grandson,19 [as follows]: Grandfather Khun Cit, Khun Côt, Grandfather Braññā Śrī [Indrāditya], Grandfather Braññā Pān, Grandfather Braññā Rāmarāja, Grandfather Sai Saṅgrāma, Grandfather Braññā Lōdai, Grandfather Braññā Nvva Nām Tham, Grandfather Braññā Mahādharmarāja, Father Nāṃ Mōaṅ, and Father Lōdaiya;20 up to this point, the spirits of Dai (Tai) noblefolk dwelling in Lōaṅ.21

[1/12-13.] If either of us is untrue, then may these shining spirits,

[1/13-15.] and also the great guardian spirits of Mount Bū Gā and Mount Phā Tān Phā Tēṅ, those who protect the waters of Brañ Sakk Brañ Sa, the guardian-spirit of Dānya-āṅbānasthāna, the ten

19) หมิน, for วมิน.

20) Khun Cit and Khun Côt were probably the father and uncle of Śrī Indrāditya, the first King of Sukhodaya. Pān is Pān Mōaṅ (Bān Māiāng). Rāmarāja is Rāma Gāṃhēṅ. Sai Saṅgrāma, if the title Braññā is omitted purposely, was perhaps a son of Rāma Gāṃhēṅ who died before him; if it is omitted by mistake, he must have reigned immediately after Rāma Gāṃhēṅ; but nothing definite is known about him. Lōdai is Lōdaiya, Rāma Gāṃhēṅ’s son, who reigned after him (or after Sai Saṅgrāma). Nvva Nāṃ Tham was a usurper (see p. 68). The last ‘Grandfather Braññā’ on the list is Mahādharmarāja (I), i.e. Lōdaiya. ‘Father Nāṃ Mōaṅ’ and ‘Father Lōdaiya’ cannot be identified; like all the other persons on both lists of ancestral spirits, they were certainly dead at the time of writing, though their descendants were still alive; since both are designated as ‘Father’, they were probably contemporaries of Mahādharmarāja II, very likely his elder brothers who died before he acceded to the throne; since neither is designated as ‘Braññā’, it seems clear they never reigned. One of them may have been named for his grandfather, the first Lōdaiya.

21) As the word lōaṅ (ล่อแอง), which means ‘shining’ or ‘splendid’, is here preceded by สรา, ‘denizens [of]’, it seems to be used as a proper name; if so, it must be an epithet of Sukhodaya not attested elsewhere. Alternatively, perhaps, we should translate the passage as ‘the splendid tribe of spirits of Dai noblefolk’. Still another possibility is that lēsā is a mistake for kēsā, and that we should translate: ‘the spirits of Dai noblefolk dwelling in the kingdom [of Sukhodaya].’
thousand towering spirits in the streams and the hundred thousand in the forest; 23

[I/15-16.] also the lordly spirit Brah Khaban of Mount Yannyan, [the spirit of Mount] Brah Sri, and the spirit of Pani Brah Sakkthi 24;

[I/16-17.] the guardians of all places, watching and observing us, the Grandfather and the Grandson, who love each other;

[I/17-23.] if either of us is untrue, may the throng of these spirits break his neck! may he not reach old age as a Brana, nor last

22) We take ំតួ to be equivalent to ឃ្លាប, 'dark and towering'.

23) The spirits listed here must be associated with the house of Nān. Bū Gā (ឃ្លាប) must be the same as Bhū Gā (cf. page 58). It is not clear whether Phat Tăn Phǎ Tən (រតាប រាបយ) is the name of one mountain or two; it is a curious coincidence that the popular name of the Śāna Debarākaṇa at Sukhodaya is ំតួពាណយ; but ឃ្លាប must have been a very usual name for mountains. Brah Sakkthi is the River Sāk, of which the portion flowing past Pani Brah Sakkthi (Băng Pra Sāk, probably near Lomsak) was evidently Sukhodayan territory (cf. I/16); but the headwaters of the river may have belonged to Nān. The expression mā brah sakk brah sa (sa=sò, 'white') might be a local name for the headwaters of the Sāk; or else the Sò could be another river. Dīnya-anbānasthāna (for Dhanyāgāvānasthāna?) sounds like the name of a forest.

24) The spirits in this list are proper to the house of Sukhodaya. Brah Khaban is the tutelary spirit of the entire kingdom, Brah Khabūn (Pra Kapuung), whose name means 'exalted' in Khmer. Rāma Gāmhōn tells us that Brah Khabūn was 'higher than all the other spirits of the land', and that he lived on a hill south of the capital (Inscription I, III/6 f.). This hill, the name of which he does not give us, is generally indentified with Khau Hlvaṇ (ឃ្លាប), 'the great hill' or 'the royal hill', which is really southwest of the city. The name Khau Hlvaṇ is perhaps an old one; if so, it might have been the popular designation of a hill which had other names or epithets as well, one of which may have been the 'Yannyan'; cf. above, note 18. Mount Brah Śrī is the hill of that name (called Siripabhata in Pali) south of Sajjanālaya, a hill on which the tutelary spirit of the viceroyal province of Sajjanālaya might well reside. Pani Brah Sakkthi (Băng Pra Sāk) on the River Sāk was probably at or near Lomsak.

25) ណែន្យឆ្នាំង (ណែន្យឆ្នាំង), 'break, pry open, and bend'. The three verbs together simply mean 'break'.

---

22) We take ំតួ to be equivalent to ឃ្លាប, 'dark and towering'.

23) The spirits listed here must be associated with the house of Nān. Bū Gā (ឃ្លាប) must be the same as Bhū Gā (cf. page 58). It is not clear whether Phat Tăn Phǎ Tən (រតាប រាបយ) is the name of one mountain or two; it is a curious coincidence that the popular name of the Śāna Debarākaṇa at Sukhodaya is ំតួពាណយ; but ឃ្លាប must have been a very usual name for mountains. Brah Sakkthi is the River Sāk, of which the portion flowing past Pani Brah Sakkthi (Băng Pra Sāk, probably near Lomsak) was evidently Sukhodayan territory (cf. I/16); but the headwaters of the river may have belonged to Nān. The expression mā brah sakk brah sa (sa=sò, 'white') might be a local name for the headwaters of the Sāk; or else the Sò could be another river. Dīnya-anbānasthāna (for Dhanyāgāvānasthāna?) sounds like the name of a forest.

24) The spirits in this list are proper to the house of Sukhodaya. Brah Khaban is the tutelary spirit of the entire kingdom, Brah Khabūn (Pra Kapuung), whose name means 'exalted' in Khmer. Rāma Gāmhōn tells us that Brah Khabūn was 'higher than all the other spirits of the land', and that he lived on a hill south of the capital (Inscription I, III/6 f.). This hill, the name of which he does not give us, is generally indentified with Khau Hlvaṇ (ឃ្លាប), 'the great hill' or 'the royal hill', which is really southwest of the city. The name Khau Hlvaṇ is perhaps an old one; if so, it might have been the popular designation of a hill which had other names or epithets as well, one of which may have been the 'Yannyan'; cf. above, note 18. Mount Brah Śrī is the hill of that name (called Siripabhata in Pali) south of Sajjanālaya, a hill on which the tutelary spirit of the viceroyal province of Sajjanālaya might well reside. Pani Brah Sakkthi (Băng Pra Sāk) on the River Sāk was probably at or near Lomsak.

25) ណែន្យឆ្នាំង (ណែន្យឆ្នាំង), 'break, pry open, and bend'. The three verbs together simply mean 'break'.

---
long as a prince! may that wicked man die with the day! may he quickly see the Abeci hell\(^\text{26}\), fall into misery and pain, and fare on the fruition of his deeds! may he never expect to see the Buddha, the Dharmra or the Saṅgha a single time! may the crime of being untrue be equivalent to that of breaking a monk’s neck\(^\text{27}\)!

\[\text{[I/23-27.]}\] From now on, let the words which the Grandfather and the Grandson have pledged to each other, as stated above, take effect immediately. Whichever of us is sincere in his intentions, may he attain his desires now and in the future, up to the heavens, the other worlds, and the pure realm of release and nirvāṇa\(^\text{28}\)!

\[\text{[I/27-32.]}\] Culaśakarāja 7\text{54}, Mahāśakarāja 1\text{314}, in Khmer a year of the monkey, in Dai a tau-sann year, on the full-moon day of the fourth month, in Khmer a Thursday, in Dai a tau-met day, the āka being Utaraphalguṇa, on the Pūrṇāṭiti, at the auspicious moment of dawn, when the lāṅga is in Pisces.\(^\text{29}\) Stability! Honor! Good Fortune! Freedom from trouble and danger! Happiness and Success!

\[\text{[I/32-27.]}\] If anyone wishes to complain, asking what dignitaries composed the text set forth in this inscription, it was Saṃtec Braḥ Mahāṭhēra Saṅgharāja Rattṇavaṇīścārya and Braḥ Mahāṭhēra Dharmmaṇeṇāpati on behalf of the Cau Brah who is the Grandson, and Mahā ................. and Mahāṭhēra Sumedha [on behalf of the Grandfather ?] .... all of them .................

26) The Avici hell.

27) Killing a monk is one of the ‘five hellish crimes’ that bring immediate retribution; see Nyānattiloka, *Buddhist Dictionary*, Colombo, 1950, p. 9.

28) mokṣanirbānasthānabisuddhi; cf. below, note 72.

29) We are indebted to Mr Roger Billard of the Ecole Française d’Extême-Orient for calculating this date in terms of the Julian calendar. It corresponds to Thursday, February 27, 1393 (Julian), at about six o’clock in the morning. Note that ‘tau-met’ is put for ‘tau-set’; cf. Ahom, in which ‘mit’ corresponds to ‘set’ in the Tai languages of Siam, whereas ‘mut’ corresponds to ‘met’; if ‘met’ meant what it usually does in Siam, ‘tau-met’ would be an impossible combination.
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Face II

[II/1-3.] This is binding on all .......... 30, not only on the side of the grandfather Braṇā, but also [on the side of the grandson].

[II/3-8.] If a Dai commoner or elephant or horse or slave the cattle shall be returned. A dispute .......... the ruler of a locality at or beyond the border .......... the throng of persons and the throng [of officials with the rank] of Lām Ḥmīn and Lām [Bann] .......... the lord's servants, [officials with the rank of] Mantrī, Senāpati or Amātya .......... all of them, as well as the Nāy Mōaṇ.31

[II/9-15.] .......... if [the people] yonder come and steal things here, or the people here go [and steal things yonder] disloyal toward the two princes, grandfather and grandson .......... willfully slandering, bent on twisting the good [into evil] .......... [making people] believe it is true without investigating, if .......... they dispute with one another, or if secretly behind [people's backs] .......... he favors the concealers of stolen goods, acting maliciously toward .......... we pledge in this inscribed stone slab that the wicked ..........

[II/16-19.] [Let] him who is disloyal, before everyone's eyes .......... now or in the future, at last .......... sink into Abeci as a friend of Devadatta32 .......... and also the Buddhantarikakalpa .......... 33

30) The entire right half of Face II is lost (compare Fig. 1 with Fig. 2). The missing portion of each line must have been about the same length as the portion that survives. As so much of the text is missing, our translation is of course conjectural.

31) The lām (~HJ, 'interpreters' or 'emissaries') acted as intermediaries between officials and the ordinary people; the lām Ḥmīn (alv) were attached to officials having the rank of Ḥmīn (a) the lām bān (alv) to officials having the rank of bān (m). The mantrī, senāpati and amātya were higher officials, though just what functions each performed is not clear; the titles may or may not have had the same meaning as in Sanskrit (mantrī, 'wise man', 'counsellor'; senāpati, 'army chief', 'general'; amītya, 'follower', 'counsellor', 'minister'). The nāy mōaṇ (um) was presumably the ruler of the locality.

32) Abeci (~m) is the Avici hell, in which the Buddha's wicked cousin Devadatta is now suffering prolonged agonies for his misdeeds toward the Buddha.

33) Buddhantarikakalpa is one of the incalculably long periods of time in which the Buddhist Doctrine has been lost and no new Buddha appears on earth to renew it. The curse in this passage is intended to prevent the evil-doer from being reborn as a human being at any time when the Buddhist Doctrine still survives, and so to prevent him from knowing how to make merit and better his condition.
[III/1-10.] ........................................................... take the holy .......... counting the men .......... levy three hundred thousand men .......... counting the troops .......... come to the holy Relics .......... many divisions .......... [counting] the holy Arahants up to eight [?]35 ...........

[III/10-14.] .......... support the religion in the36 .......... the holy Pratyekabuddhas .......... Kallyāṇa,37 a holy stupa,38 the Buddha .......... in the Relics39, for example in Ceylon .......... 


34) It is uncertain how Face III is related to the first two, if at all. Nor is its general purport clear. It reminds us, though distantly, of Mahāvamsa, Chapters XXX and XXXI. On the whole it sounds like a description of the mural paintings in a relic chamber or temple, perhaps those in the vihāra or chapel where the inscription was installed. Alternatively it might be a list of additional supernatural witnesses to the oath. We are greatly indebted to Professor Kamaleswar Bhattacharya for help in elucidating the literary and mythical allusions in Face III.

35) uṣa, 'eight' is a doubtful reading, followed by a lacuna. Supposing it is right, the number could be any that begins with the digit 8. The passage III/1-9 may perhaps refer to the contest between eight rival groups of princes to obtain the Buddha's bodily relics after his cremation, and to the intervention of the Brahmin Doṇa who averted war by dividing the relics into eight shares and awarding one to each group. (See Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, s.v. Doṇa.) On that supposition we have translated brah mahādhatu as 'the holy relics'; but if the context is something else, it could refer to the Mahādhatu at Sukhodaya.

36) The next word is probably mahādhatu, meaning either the Buddha's relics or the Mahādhatu at Sukhodaya.

37) Perhaps Kalyāṇi in Ceylon, where the Buddha preached to the Nāga King Maṇiakkhika; see Malalasekera, s.v. Kalyāṇi-cetiya.

38) The Mahāthīpa in Ceylon ?

39) Or 'in the Mahādhatu'.

40) Conjecturally restoring ṛṣu at III/14 as ṛṣu, 'yojana'.

41) Mahēśūra is Maheśvara, i.e. Śiva. Sadāśīb means 'eternal Śiva' (the final vowel is elided before a word beginning with -upa). At III/14 we read saīvāgamāgara instead of Mahā Chāṁ's sobāgamāgara which he glosses as īnmauni); the vowel could be either i or ì; and to read it as i (ai) accords better with the other allusions in this passage. 'Saīvāgamāgara' presumably stands for saīvāgamāghara (saīva-āgama-ghara) or saīvāgamāgāra (saīva-āgama-agāra), meaning, in both cases, 'house of the religion of Śiva'.
[III/15-17.] Lord Bhima, Lord Arjuna, Lord Yudhíṣṭhíra of great renown; 42

[III/17-18.] Rámá, Parasú[ráma], Bala[ráma], Lákṣa, the Lady Goddess, and Lord 43;

[III/19-20.] the Dícanádi, auspicious teachers of men:

[III/22-23.] the Debatánabagroṣha Dvādášarásí, and the Tārātāraka; 47


[III/25-26.] Sarvasiddhi, Raśisiddhi, Bi[dyadhara], 53

42) Bhíma, Arjuna and Yudhíṣṭhíra in the Mahábhárata.

43) The three Rámás—Parasúrámá, Rámacandra and Bálarama—were incarnations of Viṣṇu; the second, usually called Ráma for short, is the hero of the Ráma-yána and the Rámakirti; Lákṣmaṇa was the half-brother and faithful companion of Ráma; 'the Lady Goddess' (brah sakti, i.e. sakti) is presumably Ráma's wife Sítá.

44) Dícanádi (or perhaps we should read: dícananádi) might be a deformation of some word beginning with diś ('quarter' or 'direction') and meaning the eight Loka-pálas or Dikpálakás, the regents of the cardinal and sub-cardinal directions. śri is perhaps śri, 'auspicious'. The regents of the directions are normally listed in clockwise order, starting with the east. Probably Indra, the regent of the east, was in the lacuna at the beginning of III/20. The Lord of Fire (Khmer: brah blōn) is Agni, regent of the southeast. We should then expect Yama, regent of the south, and Súrya or Nírīti, regent of the southwest; but for some reason they are omitted (unless they appeared, out of order, in one of the lacunae); and we skip straight to Varuṇa, regent of the west. The lacuna at the beginning of III/21 must have contained the name or some epithet of Pavara or Víyú, regent of the northwest; it is not clear whether ' ... dharathā' should go with what precedes, or with Kuvera, the regent of the north. The last name on the list stands for Ardhendeśvara (Śiva), the regent of the northeast.

45) The divinities (devatā) of the nine planets (navagraha).

46) The twelve signs of the zodiac (rāśi).

47) Protective stars.

48) The supreme king of the Nágas.


50) The winged (pakkha[ra]) Kinnara and Kinnari.

51) Sarvasiddhi, 'all success'; perhaps Gapeśa.

52) Raśisiddhi? cf. Raśipa, the regent of an astrological house.

53) A class of flying divinities who are 'bearers of knowledge' (vidyādhara).

54) Perhaps Maṭi, a yaksha chief to be invoked by Buddhists in time of trouble; or else Dharaní, goddess of the Earth?
Sri, Uma, Kamedeva, ... Yamapala-mrtyu; the Catulokapala, Daśaloka; the sixteen mansions of the Brahmarūpa; the Catūrthapeṇcamadhyanasthāna, named Akāśaneṇcayattana, Avīn, [Nānañcayattana], Akīñcicayattana, and the one named [Nevasa-nānāsa] nāyattana; also the six Kāmabacara; [Catumahā]rajikā, Tāvatiṣā, Yāmā, Tussita, Nim[mānarati], and [Paranimmita]basa-bartri.

55) Sri (Lakṣmi) consort of Viṣṇu; Umā (Parvati), consort of Śiva; Kāmedeva, the god of love.
56) 'Yama, guardian of death', or perhaps Yama, keeper [of hell], and the Mrtyu.
57) The Four Lokapālas, guardians of the four cardinal directions.
58) The Ten Lokapālas, guardians of the ten directions.
59) Cf. the orthodox Pali classification of the gods in three 'worlds' (loka) or 'spheres' (āvacara), which are subdivided into smaller 'worlds' (loka) or 'realms' (āyatana), in ascending order, as follows:

I. Kāmaloka or Kāmāvācara, the 'Sensuous Sphere', which includes (in addition to hell, the animal creation, the ghost-realm, the demon-world, and the human world) six Celestial Worlds (devaloka) inhabited by:
   1. Catummahārajaṁkā
   2. Tāvatiṣā
   3. Yāmā
   4. Tussita
   5. Nim[mānarati]
   6. Paranimmitavasavatti

II. Rūpaloka or Rūpāvācara, the 'Sphere of Perceptible Form', usually said to consist of 16 Brahmālokas ('Brahma-worlds'), though the number varies. They are divided into four groups. The different heavens of the first group are attainable by persons who have achieved different degrees of skill in the first meditative trance (Pali: jhāna; Skt.: dhyāna); those of the second group by persons of varying degrees of skill in the second trance; and so on.

III. Arūpaloka or Arūpāvācara, the 'Sphere of Formlessness', containing four 'realms' (āyatana), attainable by persons skilled in the four 'immaterial trances,' i.e. the fifth to eighth jhāna, which are sometimes considered to be extensions of the fourth jhāna; in like manner these four heavens are sometimes placed in a special category of the Brahmāloka. Their names are:
   1. Akāśaneṇcāyatanas (realm of unbounded space)
   2. Viññānañcāyatanas (realm of unbounded consciousness)
   3. Akīñcicāyatanas (realm of nothingness)

The above explanation should serve to clarify the meaning of the passage at III/28-34. 'Brahmarūpa' of course means those of the Brahmālokas which are part of the Rūpāvācara. 'Catūrthapeṇcamadhyanasthāna' (Pali: catuttha-pañcama-jhāna-jhāna) must mean something like 'place of the fourth-fifth jhāna', i.e. the Arūpāvācara, reflecting the two different
[III/34.] the Svarrgamarrga and the Pātāla; 60

[III/35-40.] the regions of the world, [including] all the four continents, Pūrbabī[deha], [Jambūdī]pa, Amaragoyāṇī and Utara-kuru; 61 the mountains of the earth, [Gandhamāda, Kailāsa, Bipulaparrbatavāṅkata [the abode of ?] Brahmarakkṣayakkṣakumāra, the Himabā, 62 the Seven Rivers and Seven [Rings of Mountains], [Yugandharā]śikharapār}[rrbata] .............................................

numbering systems we have referred to. It is odd that the sixteen Brahmālokas of the Rūpāvacara should be mentioned first, then the four āyatana of the Arūpāvacara in ascending order, and finally the six heavens of the Kāmāvacara, also in ascending order; we should have expected these six to come first.


60) Svargamārga (Pali: saggamagga), 'the path to heaven'; Pātāla, the kingdom of the Nīgas in the subterranean waters.

61) The Four Continents in the Pali lists are: Pūrvavideha to the east, Jambudīpa to the south, Aparagoyāṇa to the west, and Uttarakuru to the north (see Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, II, 1344); the Sanskrit names are Pūrvavideha, Jambudvīpa, Aparagodāna, Uttarakuru.

62) 'Himabā' is the Himava or Himavanta, the name given the Himalaya in Pali mythology. One of its peaks is Gandhamādana, the favorite resort of the Pacceka-Buddhas. Another is Kēlāsa, Skt. Kailāsa, which is said in Brahmanical mythology to be the abode of Śiva. 'Bipulaparrbatavāṅkata' perhaps means Vipulapabbata-Vāṅkaka; Mount Vipula, or Vepulla, which was called Mount Vaṅkaka in the time of the Buddha Koṇāga, is the highest of the five mountains surrounding Rājagaha, and is the abode of the Yakkha Kumbhīra and his hundred thousand followers. See Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, s.v. Kēlāsa, Gandhāmadana, Himavā, Vepulla. 'Kumāra' could be a deformation, or a false reading, of Kumbhīra; brahmaraṅga may have been a polite name for a yaśa (yakkha) or demon who dwelt on a mountain; such creatures received offerings in India and Ceylon; and King Yaśovarman I of Cambodia dedicated an aśrama to Śrī-Vrahmarāṅga (see K. Bhattacharya, Les religions brahmaniques dans l'ancien Cambodge, Paris, 1961, p. 144). Yugandhara, another Himalayan range, forms the first of the seven concentric rings around Mount Sineru (Meru); see Malalasekera, op. cit., s.v. Yugandhara. The seven rings of mountains are encircled by seven concentric seas.
Inscription LXIV (Figs. 6, 7), which is also in Siamese and written in the same script as No. XLV, was discovered at Vat Jān Gām (วัดเจ้าสาม) at Nān. The reading by Mahā Chām Dōṅgātvarṇa, together with a version in modern Siamese spelling, appears at Prajum Śilācārik, III, pp. 148 ff.

Face I contains 26 lines, or fragments of lines; an unknown number of lines is missing both at the beginning and at the end. This face was apparently intended to embody the whole text of the agreement, but the engraver omitted a passage by mistake. To show where it should have been inserted, he put a pair of crosses in the second half of I/10, a punctuation mark equivalent to a caret. He then engraved the omitted passage on Face II, beginning it with a punctuation mark in the form of an X; it contains 10 short lines; and (apart from the lacunae of a few letters which can be supplied from the context) it appears to be complete. Because of this peculiar arrangement, we have not broken our translation into separate faces but give it continuously, indicating face and line in brackets as usual.
Fig. 7. Inscription LXIV, Face II.
ที่ตอบ

1. แก้เชา
2. ไม่ในป่าชายในเช่มอบหมายทำสารพิศ(ไทย)
3. คุณนายพินิชที่เกี่ยวข้องไม่ได้ผูกมนต์ทุกข์\n4. ที่แก้ไขข้อที่เกี่ยวข้องแต่กล่าวเข้า\n5. ที่ประจำพระพุทธไตรรังษ์ทรงดลโยนานกับไปจงญาติของหนึ่ง\n6. ที่ประจำพระพุทธไตรรังษ์ทรงดลโยนานกับไปจงญาติของหนึ่ง\n7. ที่ประจำพระพุทธไตรรังษ์ทรงดลโยนานกับไปจงญาติของหนึ่ง\n8. ที่ประจำพระพุทธไตรรังษ์ทรงดลโยนานกับไปจงญาติของหนึ่ง\n9. ที่ประจำพระพุทธไตรรังษ์ทรงดลโยนานกับไปจงญาติของหนึ่ง\n10. ที่ประจำพระพุทธไตรรังษ์ทรงดลโยนานกับไปจงญาติของหนึ่ง\n11. ที่ประจำพระพุทธไตรรังษ์ทรงดลโยนานกับไปจงญาติของหนึ่ง\n12. ที่ประจำพระพุทธไตรรังษ์ทรงดลโยนานกับไปจงญาติของหนึ่ง
๕๔. มีรองนายเมืองพลวัยพรูกุศลก้องภัยนระมินราชภิรมณ์ ราชพิธีปราบปราน
๕๕. ฎีกบาลเจ้าเหยีมในราชสมภพทานแล้กสัตว์เจ้าเจ้าพระญาปลูกเขา.
๕๖. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญาเป็นเจ้าคุณทรงธรรม
ราชทานเป็น
๕๗. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญาเป็นเจ้าคุณทรงฟุ้กสุขใจไปสู่
พระราช
๕๘. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญาเป็นเจ้าคุณทรงฟุ้กสุขใจไปสู่
เมืองพระญา
๕๙. กฎพระญาพานพรุastosดิริรกิจ
เจ้าคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญา
๖๐. (ไป) สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญา แต่ง
พวก
๖๑. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญา กีจ
ทางกิจให้กิจลาก
๖๒. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญา ณ บ้าน
มิว interes
๖๓. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญา ณ บ้าน
พระราช
๖๔. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญา ณ บ้าน
พระราช
๖๕. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญา ณ บ้าน
พระราช
๖๖. สวัสดีคุณเจ้าเจ้าพระญา ณ บ้าน
พระราช

..............................................
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Face II

๑. อุทุมหลาน
๒. คุรุพะยอ(ย)
๓. กลอยแบ่ง(ง)
๔. ตุ่งราวาน
๕. ง ยวนแบ่
๖. ทุดอยคอ
๗. (ก) วามแพร
๘. ทากทาง
๙. ทุราแท่งปะ
๑๐. ลานปะชอ(ย)
TRANSLATION

[Several lines missing at the top.] .......... 

[I/1-4.] to the Cau63 ........................................... [those who try to kill him by putting] spells in his fish, poison in his rice64, and to do by trickery all sorts of evil65 ................................ the Cau's friendship. Furthermore, if there is trouble in the Cau's kingdom and the Grandfather does not consider the same as if it were in Mōañ Nān Mōañ [Blua]66 ....................67 We who were separated68 are bound together and united in the text of this inscription.

[I/4-8.] If I am untrue in this oath, [may I not know] the names of the Śaiva tradition, nor of the Buddhas, the Dharmas and the Saṅghas of the past, may I not know the names of the throng of Buddhas who are still to come in the future, may I know neither the [Buddhist] religion nor the religion of Śīva69, may I know neither the treatises70 nor the names of the theras and mahātheras which I desire to know! May it be exactly as if I cut off [a monk's] head71! If, however, the Cau Brañā does not intend to love his grandfather

63) As we learn from I/8, the person speaking up to that point is Gām Tān. The person referred to as 'the Cau' (I/1, I/3) or 'the Cau Brañā' (I/7) is therefore Sai Līdaiya.

64) (Lisa)namahādān, the same phrase used by King Līdaiya in 1361, when he speaks of attempts on his own life (Inscription V, I/24 f.).

65) Gām Tān is pledging himself to come to the aid of Sukhodaya in the event that an enemy (an agent of Subarqapuri ?) tries to assassinate Sai Līdaiya, etc.

66) We have supplied the missing toponym, as Gām Tān was King of Nān and Blua.

67) The lacuna must have contained something that would turn the preceding clause into a pledge that Gām Tān would indeed regard trouble at Sukhodaya in exactly the same light as trouble in his own kingdom.

68) Conjectural translation.

69) Saibāgama, i.e. Śaivāgama, the āgama (tradition or religion) of Śīva. The oath was probably administered by Court Brahmins of Śaiva faith. cf. note 41, supra.

70) upastra, i.e. ātrastra.

71) rājācākka i.e. jñātikāko, 'exactly as if I severed the neck'. Killing a monk was one of the five 'hellish crimes'; see above, note 27.
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sincerely, then may not a single one of the retributions named in this oath befall the Grandfather!

[I/8.] Up to here, the words of the Grandfather’s oath.

[I/8-10.] I who speak [from here on], and who am named Braña Lidaiya, will act with love, devotion and friendship toward my grandfather the Braña pen Cau until I attain the final release of Nirvāṇa.72. The oath is as follows. If my grandfather the Braña pen Cau loves me sincerely, [II/1-10] I the grandson will then respect him; but if he turns afterwards to abuse, injure or cheat me, thinking only of victory [for himself], [then] if there is some dispute or something to harm my grandfather, [I] the grandson will not help him.73

[I/10-13.] Whatever trouble or danger befalls me, he will help me with his troops and forces to overcome and destroy it. If there is no trouble, but if there should be ......................74 If I need much, my grandfather will give me much, and if I need a little he will give me a little.

[I/13-18.] Furthermore my grandfather the Braña considers my whole country as one with Mōañ Blē, Mōañ Nāv, Mōañ Nān and Mōañ Blua.75 My grandfather the Braña pen Cau will consider

---

72) mokkanibbāna, for Pali mokkhanibbāna or Skt. mokṣanīrṇāṇa. Like nibbāna, mokkha or moka means release from the round of rebirths. Hence in a Buddhist sense mokkhanibbāna means practically the same as nibbāna alone. But while both parties to the oath were Buddhists, the oath was apparently administered by Śaiva Brahmīns; and by analogy with the pairs of terms at I/6 f. (the [Buddhist] religion and the religion of Śiva, the [Brahmanical] śāstras and the names of the [Buddhist] theras and mahātheras), we should perhaps conclude that a pair is intended here: mokṣa (Brahmanical) and nibbāna (Buddhist).

73) The passage on Face II, which the engraver omitted from Face I, is Prince Sai Lidaiya's 'escape clause', corresponding to Gām Tān's at I/7 f. Each of the two parties calls down a lot of supernatural retributions on himself in case he should prove false to the oath; but each naturally intends them to be null and void if the other party breaks the oath first.

74) We have not attempted to translate hīnibhiṇāna at I/12 nor the doubtful reading līn which Mahā Chām supplies following it. He conjectures that hīnibhiṇāna (hiṛibhiṇāna) stands for hiribhiṇā, which he glosses as 'a witness who is ashamed of wrongdoing.' Alternatively, whatever hīnī may mean, we might take 'braña' as 'braña' followed by a word beginning with na-, which was completed by something that might be explained by a better reading than līn.

75) Nān and Blua were Gām Tān's two principal cities; this passage proves that he was also suzerain over Brē (Prē) and Nāv (Ngāo). Brē had been a dependency of Blua (Pua) since around 1320 and remained so during most of the intervening period; King Lidaiya had helped to restore order there in 1359 for his ally Kār Mōañ of Nān; see pp. 61, 62. Nāv, which is almost due north of Brē and west of Nān, may have been ruled by a vassal of Brē under the suzerainty of Nān; but we have little information about it at this time.
danger to my kingdom to be [a danger] to his kingdom. If my
grandfather the Saṃtec Braṇā supports\textsuperscript{76} me .................. then I
will look upon my grandfather the Saṃtec Braṇā pen Cau as
Mahādharmarājā\textsuperscript{77} who was ...................... throughout the period
of the dynasty of Sukhodaiya. Let there be no estrangement! Let
me enter the house of my grandfather the Braṇā! ......................
Let him not be estranged!

[I/18-19.] Furthermore if there is trouble in the land of my
grandfather the Braṇā ................. [I will go to his aid] in like
manner with all my strength of mind and body.

[I/19-26.] Furthermore the throng of lords and gentlefolk
...................... [say?] they cannot find any fault in my heart,
not a single one; but if they tell lies ...................... Furthermore, whether my grandfather the Braṇā himself, or [his]
lords and gentlefolk, and I ...................... in them, doing all sorts
of evil. Furthermore, in quoting the Cau ...................... tradition,
supporting me as I support\textsuperscript{78} my grandfather the Braṇā .................
[If I am false to my oath?] then let the names of the Buddha, the
Dharmma and the Saṅgha [be unknown to me]! ......................
Let me eat the fruit of my deeds in the four hells as if I [had cut off
a monk's head] ...................... sincere, punishment\textsuperscript{79} .........

[Several lines missing.]

\textsuperscript{76} Conjectural translation of तिन, which usually means 'to plant' or 'to build'.
Here it may have a sense more like तिनम्, 'to establish someone in a career'
or 'to arrange a marriage for someone'. If, as we may guess from I/17,
Sai Liḍaiya is being adopted into the house of Nān, it would be natural for
Gūm Tūn to give him a princess of that house in marriage.

\textsuperscript{77} Probably used in a double sense. Mahādharmarājā means a sovereign who
rules in accordance with the Dharma. It was also more specifically the
title assumed by King Liḍaiya (Mahādharmarājā I). Sai Liḍaiya apparently
means that he will regard his 'grandfather' Gūm Tūn (really his great-
uncle) in the same light as his real grandfather Liḍaiya.

\textsuperscript{78} घृणाः (I/23) is probably equivalent to घृणा, घृण, घृणा, etc., 'to support'.
We have omitted from our translation the (inadvertent?) repetition of घृणा
at I/23.

\textsuperscript{79} Though the text from I/22 on is too fragmentary to make any connected
sense, the latter portion was obviously a curse on the speaker if he should
ever violate his oath.
We know of at least three occasions during the next half century when Sukhodaya came to the aid of the house of Nān, so we may take it for granted that the pact remained in effect and that Nān fulfilled its obligations loyally, though we have no details.

In 1395 Rāmarāja succeeded to the throne of Ayudhā upon the death of his father Rāmesvara. He was not a man of strong character. The Subarnapurī faction were not yet ready to risk civil war by attempting to seize his throne; but they redoubled their plots, forced or persuaded him to appoint their own men to positions of authority, and put him under increasing pressure to comply with their policies.

In 1396, according to the NC, Gām Tān was poisoned by ‘a southern brahīya called Khun Hlvaṅ.’80 The designation is vague, but it almost certainly means an agent of the house of Subarṇpurī.81

80) พระยาน้อยหรูหรา. ‘Brahīya (บราฮียะ) is of course brahā (บราห์); the spelling in the printed edition of NC is modernized.
81) The NC says he came to Nān to perform the rājābhiseka ceremony on Gām Tān and killed him by pouring lustral water (‘buddhabhiseka water’) containing poison on his head. This is hard to believe. If we can judge by the example of Līdaiya in 1347, an independent monarch would receive the rājābhiseka from his vassals, and he would receive it within a reasonably short time after ascending the throne. Gām Tān had already been reigning for ten years; so far as we know, he was an independent monarch; and there was no ‘southern brahīya’ who by any stretch of the imagination could have been his vassal. If, on the contrary, Gām Tān were a vassal of the ‘southern brahīya’, he might indeed have received the abhiseka from his overlord; but who could the overlord have been? A little further on in the NC, ‘the south country’ means Sukhodaya, and more particularly Sajjanālaya; but Gām Tān was not a vassal of Sukhodaya; and in any case it is impossible to imagine him being poisoned by the King of Sukhodaya. As Professor Wyatt says in the English translation of NC (p. 16, note e), ‘the south’ most often means Ayudhya (and later Bangkok) to the author of the chronicle. It would therefore be normal to identify the Khun Hlvaṅ with the King of Ayudhya, Rāmarāja; but there is no evidence that Ayudhya had any claim to suzerainty over Nān; and in any case it is hard to believe Rāmarāja would go in person to Nān to poison the ruler. The chronicler, however, may well be attributing the deed of an agent to the principal. As Professor Wyatt observes (ibid.),
The assassin took flight, and Gām Tān's son Śrī Canda succeeded to the throne.

Not long afterwards Nān was attacked by two brothers who belonged to the ruling house of Brē, named Thera and Un Mōān; Śrī Canda was killed; and Thera mounted the throne. Upon Thera's death a half-year later Un Mōān succeeded.

Meanwhile Śrī Canda's younger brother, Cau Huṅ, had managed to escape and take refuge with 'Braḥya Jahliān in the south country.' The 'south country' in this context has nothing to do with Subarṣapuri. 'Jahliān' (Chalieng)—the Jalyān of the inscriptions—is an alternative name for Sajjanālaya.82 ‘Braḥya Jahliān', the Uparāja who ruled Sajjanālaya, was almost certainly Prince Sai Ėdaiya, for it was the usual custom for the heir-apparent to the throne of Sukhodaya to be appointed to that post. It would take courage for him to intervene on behalf of the refugee prince, but Sai Ėdaiya had plenty of it. With his assistance Huṅ raised an army, with which he returned to Nān in 1398. He defeated Un Mōān in battle, took him prisoner, and

Paramārjādhirāja had borne the title Khun Hlvaṅ when he was still Prince of Subarṣapuri, before seizing the throne of Ayudhyā. It is therefore likely that his nephew Indarāja, Prince of Subarṣapuri, bore the same title in 1396; and while it is unlikely that he himself would go to Nān to poison Gām Tān it is quite possible that he would send an agent to do so. But we still cannot understand how administering the rājābhisēka could have furnished an acceptable pretext. Perhaps the most likely explanation is that Gām Tān was poisoned by an agent of Subarṣapuri but that the circumstances are wrongly stated: the MS from which the chronicler worked may have had a marginal note, added by some unknown commentator from a tradition that properly applied to some later ruler of Nān, such as Pū Khēṅ (1405-15; see below, p. 102), and that he mistook it for an integral part of the text. We are aware that 'interpreting' a chronicle in this fashion is an arbitrary business; but the passage will not do as it stands; if we cannot interpret it plausibly we must reject it altogether, which we are reluctant to do.

82) Sometimes there is a distinction between Sajjanālaya, the seat of the Uparāja, and Jalyān, the place about 2 km. east of it where Vat Mahādhatu (Vat braṅ Prāṅg Jaliān) now stands. Jalyān had been the seat of Khmer administration in the province before Sukhodaya became an independent kingdom, but in the late 13th and the 14th centuries it was overshadowed by Sajjanālaya proper. Ayudhyā, however, seems to have preferred the name Jalyān and applied it indiscriminately to both parts of the town; and if Sukhodaya was still tributary to Ayudhyā it would be natural for the Uparāja to be called Braṅ Balyān.
Fig. 8. Inscription at Vat Brahyā Bhū, Nān.
sent him as a present to his ally at Sajjanālaya. Then he mounted the throne of his ancestors.\textsuperscript{83}

On April 12, 1397, Rāmarāja, during the course of a state visit to Sukhodaya, issued a proclamation reasserting Ayudhyān suzerainty over Mahādharmarājā II's kingdom.\textsuperscript{84} He was probably acting under pressure from the Subarṇapurī faction; and as the proclamation was issued just before Huṅ's return to Nāṇ it may be guessed that Sai Līdaiya's intervention in Huṅ's behalf had caused some uneasiness about Sukhodayan intentions. Mahādharmarājā II, who had apparently been made to renew his oath of allegiance to Ayudhyā, could do nothing; but he died a year or two later and Sai Līdaiya succeeded to his throne as Mahādharmarājā III.

The new king somehow or other managed to avoid taking the oath of allegiance. In 1400 he seized the province of Nagara Svarga, which his father had lost to Paramarājā in 1372, and which had presumably been under the direct control of the house of Subarṇapurī ever since; then he hastened to the north and conquered Brē; finally he returned to Sukhodaya, where he threw off all bonds of vassalage and declared himself an independent monarch.\textsuperscript{85}

Though the NC says nothing about it, we may assume that Mahādharmarājā III's subjugation of Brē was designed to end a recurrent threat to his ally King Huṅ of Nāṇ, and to restore its relation of vassalage to Nāṇ which had been temporarily reversed by Thera and remained in suspense after Un Mōañ was captured by Huṅ.

\textsuperscript{83} The NC adds that Un Mōañ remained in 'the south country' (i.e. Sajjanālaya) until his death ten years later. We are not told the circumstances of his residence there. Probably, in accordance with custom, he was made to swear allegiance, given a small apānage, and kept under surveillance.

\textsuperscript{84} See our Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 4, infra.

\textsuperscript{85} See our Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 1, JSS LVI/2, p. 221 ff.; also Griswold, \textit{Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art}, p. 50 f.
In 1405 Huñ was succeeded by his son Pū Khêñ (Pū Khêñ), of whom the NC tells us nothing except that he died of diarrhea in 1415. Was his illness the result of poisoning? It is not impossible, for by this time Sukhodaya was no longer capable of intervening on behalf of the house of Nān. Mahādharmarājā III’s rashness had set off a chain of events in the kingdom of Ayudhya which proved his undoing. In 1409 Prince Indarājā of Subarna-pruti seized the Ayudhyān throne, and some time before 1412 he reduced Sukhodaya to vassalage. He would certainly want to add Nān to his possessions; but an invasion of so remote and wild a region would have been far beyond his power; the next best thing would be to create consternation among the sturdy Kāv. Unfortunately we have no information about what really happened.

The NC tells us nothing about the next two rulers of Nān except their names and regnal dates. Bāñ Tan (Bāñ Tan), Pū Khêñ’s son, ruled 1415-24. His son Nua Phā Sum (Nua Phā Sum) ruled 1424-31.

We know something of Nua Phā Sum from another source. In 1426 he cast five bronze statues of the Buddha in the Sukhodaya post-classic style. Two of them, representing the Buddha in the walking posture, are at Vāt Brahyyā Bhū (Vāt Brahyyā Bhū) at Nān; the third, also walking, and the fourth, which is in the standing posture, are at Vāt Jāñ Gām nearby; the fifth has disappeared. The pedestals of the first two and the fourth bear identical inscriptions (Fig. 8), while the third has lost its pedestal.

86) We have conjectured above (note 81) that the story of the poisoned lustral water is really applicable to Pū Khêñ. If that is right, we should perhaps assume that Pū Khêñ, left isolated by Mahādharmarājā III’s forced capitulation to Ayudhya, agreed to accept investiture as a vassal of Indarājā. This is all guesswork; but it is hard to see how any of Pū Khêñ’s predecessors should have felt obliged to do so.

87) Two of the statues are illustrated in Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, Figs, 55-a, 55-b; all four are illustrated in Griswold, New Evidence for the Dating of Sukhodaya Art, Artibus Asiae XIX, 3/4, Figs. 1 to 6.
TEXT

1. สัตตว์เจ้าสมภูริสงครามห์กล่าวในนั้นบวชกรุงเกษมพระปฐมเจ

2. ทางกองไพรไพรโยกล่าสวดมหาวิหารพธินีเกิ่นปฐมญา้ในปี

3. เหลิงมา จักรกราชา ๗๔๕ มหาสัตกราชา ๑๖๐ เดือน ๖ วัน พุทธ

4. ปรากฏแห่งนั่นพระศรีอริยัยไม่ถึงเจ้า

TRANSLATION

Samteck Cau Braññā Nyva Phā Sum, the ruler of Nandapūra, founded five [images of the] Lord, to remain strong with the Religion throughout these five thousand years. He became Braññā in the year of the horse88, Culasakkarāja 788, Mahāsakkharāja 1970,90 in the sixth month, on Wednesday, at the seventh watch. He devoutly wishes to behold the Lord Śri Ariya Maitri.91

88) Referring to the old prophesy that the Buddhist religion is destined to disappear 5000 years after the Buddha’s parinibbāna.

89) นูน is the name used for ‘horse’ in the calendar that Sukhodaya inherited from the Khmer. พันธ, literally ‘precisely the horse’, gives the name in ordinary Tai (ไท).

90) ‘Mahāsakkharāja’, in the present context, means the Buddhist Era, in which, according to Sukhodayan practice, 1970 corresponds to AD 1426. The year in CS conforms to the Sukhodayan calendar, in which 788 was indeed a year of the horse, corresponding to BE 1970. In the system used in NC, on the contrary, CS 788 was a kāp-si year (นูน), a year of the dragon. According to NC, Nua Phā Sum succeeded to the throne upon his father’s death in CS 788, year of the dragon. At first glance this would seem to be the same event our inscription refers to: ‘he became Braññā in the year of the horse, CS 788,’ etc. As epigraphic evidence is usually to be preferred, we should perhaps suppose that NC’s dates are right in terms of CS after all, but wrong in terms of the ten and twelve year cycles, i.e. the reverse of the supposition stated supra, Note 2. If so, the years in all this portion of the NC should be transposed into the Christian Era accordingly, and we should add 2 years to the dates based on the NC in the preceding pages. Pending further study, however, it has seemed best to use the dates as transposed into the Christian Era by Professor Wyatt in the English version of the NC. In any case another explanation is possible for the discrepancy between NC and our inscription for the date of Nua Phā Sum’s accession. It is possible that he succeeded to the throne de facto in 1424 but did not receive the abhiṣeka until 1426. Our inscription implies that the five images were cast on the day when ‘he became Braññā’. That could not have been the day of his de facto accession upon his father’s death, for it would take at least several months to prepare the moulds and get everything ready for the casting.

91) i.e. Ariya Metteyya; see Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, s.v. Metteyya.
At Sukhodaya the death of Mahādharmarāja III in 1419 had been followed by serious disturbances: the claim of his son Pāl Mōān to the throne of the vassal kingdom was disputed by another prince. The King of Ayudhyā proceeded to Nagara Svarga, received the submission of both princes, and awarded the disputed throne to Pāl Mōān (Mahādharmarāja IV, called Paramapāla in Inscription XII). We may assume that he was a loyal vassal of Ayudhyā. There is some evidence that he transferred his capital from Sukhodaya to Bīṣṇuloka around 1430.92

The NC tells us something about Nua Phā Sum’s son, Inda Kēn, who succeeded him as King of Nān in 1431. The next year he was seized and imprisoned by his two brothers who wished to usurp the kingdom, but he escaped and made his way to Jaḥliān. After raising an army there with the help of the ruler, he returned to Nān in 1433 and ousted his rivals.

We do not know who was ruler of Jaḥliān (Sajjānālāya) at this time, but it must have been a member of Mahādharmarāja IV’s family. We do not know whether, in helping to restore the refugee King of Nān, he was acting independently or with Ayudhyā’s consent.

Upon the death of Mahādharmarāja IV in 1438, the vassal kingdom of Sukhodaya was abolished. The Sukhodaya provinces were incorporated into the kingdom of Ayudhyā, with their administrative capital at Bīṣṇuloka, under the rule of the King of Ayudhyā’s son Rāmesvara as Viceroy. One of his vassals was Prince Yudhiṣṭhira, a scion of the house of Sukhodhaya, probably either a son or grandson of Mahādharmarāja IV.93

In 1441 the King of Lān Nā was ousted by his son Tilokarāja, who took the throne for himself. The next year the King of Ayudhyā, intent on taking advantage of the dispute, invaded Lān Nā at the head of a large army. Among the vassals accompanying him was Prince Yudhiṣṭhira, who distinguished himself by his bravery in the fighting. But despite some initial successes the invasion ended in failure.94

92) Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 53-55.
93) Griswold, Prince Yudhiṣṭhira, Artibus Asiae XXVI, 3/4, pp. 221 f.
94) Griswold, Prince Yudhiṣṭhira, p. 222.
The CMC tells a curious story, which may or may not be true, about 'Ken Dav', who is of course identical with Inda Ken, Nua Phā Sum's son, the ruler of Nān from 1431 to 1488. In 1443, according to the story, he attempted to usurp the throne of Lān Nā from Tilokarāja by means of a ruse. Pretending that Nān was threatened by an invasion of the Kēv (um, i.e. the Tai of Laos or Tongking?), he requested the assistance of Tilokarāja, who thereupon sent an army to his aid. He then invited a large number of Tilokarāja's officers and men to dinner at the palace and poisoned them all. Tilokarāja, bent on revenge, advanced with two more armies, one of them commanded by himself and one commanded by his mother. She invested Brē, and with the aid of a Kēv sorcerer received the submission of its ruler. Nān proved more difficult, but finally in 1448 Tilokarāja managed to conquer the city. Ken Dav escaped and took refuge with the 'king of the south'. His nephew Phā Sen was made to swear an oath of allegiance to Tilokarāja and placed on the throne as vassal ruler.

The NC says nothing about Inda Ken's trickery or any of the events of 1443. Its first mention of Tilokarāja is in 1448, when Inda Ken sends him a present of salt from a famous salt-well near Nān. Tilokarāja then decides to annex his kingdom, invades at the head of an army, and surrounds the city. Inda Ken, realizing he cannot withstand the siege, flees 'to the south' with his family and takes refuge with his ally the ruler of Jahliāri. Phā Sen is made King of Nān as Tilokarāja's vassal and rules until his death in 1459. After that Nān is ruled by governors appointed by Chieng Mai.

95) CMC, p. 110.