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The slab of stone on which Inscription XL is engraved is 7.5 cm. thick and 57 cm. wide, with a maximum height of 66 cm. It consists of three fragments, pieced together with cement. Two of them were found in 1956 by the Department of Fine Arts in the ruins of a small building in front of the Cetiya Hā Yôt (‘cetiya with five spires’) in the southern part of the precinct of Vāt Mabādhātu at Sukhodaya; the third was presented by Mr. Puṇḍharmā Būnasvāsti in the same year. The stone is now in the Manuscript and Inscription Division of the National Library at Bangkok.

The largest fragment has writing on both faces. The other two are fractured in such a way that while the written surface belonging to Face I survives, that belonging to Face II is lost. (Compare Figs. 1 and 2). The upper portion of the slab has disappeared, carrying away the beginning of the text of both faces save for a few illegible bits of the line that preceded I/1. The lower portion of Face I has also disappeared, carrying away an unknown amount of text. On Face II, however, the concluding lines survive in part.

Face I (Fig. 1) has been edited by Mahā Chām Dōṅgāṃvarṇa at Prajum Śilācārik, III, p. 43. It contains 29 lines of Siamese, written in Sukhodaya characters. A few letters at the beginning and the end of most lines are broken off or obliterated. Apart from that, lines 1 to 3 are virtually intact. Approximately the first half of each of the other lines survives, plus fragments of the remainder of lines 7 to 14, amounting to about 30 per cent in line 7, decreasing to about 15 per cent in line 24.

Face II (Fig. 2), edited by Mr. Prasāra Puṇpragōn, is published in Śilpākara, XI/3, 106 ff., with annotations by Prasert ṇa Nagara.

* No. 1 was published in JSS LVI ii July 1968 and nos. 2, 3 and 4 in JSS LVII i January 1969.
It has 25 lines of Siamese in the same script as Face I, in similar handwriting. Then follow three lines of mixed Sanskrit and Pali in Khmer characters (of which Mahā Sēn Manavidūra gives a Siamese translation, loc. cit., p. 109). The beginning of each line of Face II is lost, amounting to about 20 per cent in the first few lines, and as much as 40 per cent in lines 11 to 22. In addition several letters at the end of lines 27 and 28 have disappeared.

As the passage at I/12-27 was evidently almost identical to that at II/1-13, the surviving portions of each can be used to restore the losses of the other. In our translation we indicate such repairs by brackets plus an asterisk. Brackets without the asterisk, as usual, indicate conjectural reconstructions based on the context. Lacunae which we are unable to reconstruct are indicated by dots, the number of which corresponds to the estimated number of lost or illegible letters in the text.

The inscription is dated on Friday, the full-moon day of Vaisākha (April-May), in a year whose designation has disappeared (II/23 f.). The orthography and style of writing suggest the second half of the 14th century or later. The मनि appears several times, which is unusual among the Sukhodayan inscriptions.

The purpose of the text is to record a solemn agreement between two kings (braṇā), an uncle and a nephew, both of whom speak in the first person (लिं). The lost upper portion of Face I perhaps contained no more than an exordium, for the real substance of the uncle’s statement, which occupies the whole surviving portion of Face I, appears to begin at 1/1. In it he refers to the nephew as ‘Sānte Cau Braṇā.’ The nephew’s statement, the beginning of which is lost, occupies most of Face II. In it he calls himself मनि, ‘the nephew’, and refers to the other king as द्वार, ‘my uncle the Braṇā’, or, to be more precise, ‘my mother’s younger brother the Braṇā.’

The uncle makes four specific pledges (I/1-9):

(1) Not to harm the nephew’s officials if the nephew causes them to do something which was doubtless set forth in the lacuna that follows (query: to come to the uncle’s Court?);
(2) To refrain from doing something (lacuna) in case ministers or kings of foreign countries come to his Court (query: to refrain from making any disclosures to them that might be harmful to the Saṃtec Cau Braña?);

(3) To refrain from doing something else (lacuna);

(4) To give the nephew free access at all times to come and salute the Saṃtec Braḥ Mahādhātu and the relics of Mahādharmārājādhīrājāpabitra.

He then asserts his firm resolve to remain true to his oath (I/9-11); calls down the usual supernatural sanctions on his own head in case he should prove false (I/11-26); and pronounces the wish that if he remains faithful he will reign for a long time, and finally attain nirvāṇa. This appears to be the conclusion of his statement.

It seems likely that the nephew’s statement began in the lost lower portion of Face I and continued in the lost upper portion of Face II, for at II/1 he has already got to the same point in the supernatural sanctions that the uncle reached at I/12. As his statement follows the same general pattern as his uncle’s, the specific pledges he is making to him must have been set forth in the lost lower portion of Face I, so we can do no more than guess at their contents. At II/1-12 the sanctions continue in nearly the same words as the uncle used at I/12-26. At II/12-13 the nephew makes the same wish as the uncle did at I/26-27, that if he remains faithful he will reign for a long time.

At II/13-18 the text continues without a break, and the nephew is evidently still speaking; but this part of his statement consists of matter which is lacking in the uncle’s: a wish that the uncle and the nephew shall be bound together by friendship; a wish that there shall never be any anger or hostility between them; a mutilated passage in which, as well as we can make out, the nephew refers to an earlier pact he had made with ‘the grandfather Braña’, saying that he is now pledging the same thing to the uncle; and so on.

From II/19 on the two kings seem to be speaking jointly, or perhaps a third person is speaking on behalf of both. At II/19-25 comes a declaration that the mahāsubarṇapatra, i.e. the document
containing the oath, has been duly executed.1 At 11/21-25 the exact moment is given at which the inscription recording it is to be erected at the Brah Śrī Ratanamahādhātu Cau.

The last three lines, in mixed Sanskrit and Pali, appear to be a magic formula intended to make the oath endure forever.

Obviously the ‘Brah Śrī Ratanamahādhātu’ where the inscription is to be erected is Vāt Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya, where it was actually discovered. The ‘Saṃtec Braḥ Mahādhātu’, which the nephew will be allowed to salute whenever he wishes, is its principal monument, the magico-religious center of the kingdom. The expression also refers to the Buddha relics it contained.2 ‘Mahādharmarājājāhirajā-pabitra’, whose relics the nephew will be permitted to salute at all times, is Mahādharmarāja I of Sukhodaya, i.e. Lidaiya (Lū Tai), who came to the throne in 1347 and died some time between 1368 and 1374.3 The remains of many funerary monuments can still be seen in the precinct of Vāt Mahādhātu, and his relics were doubtless enshrined in one of them.

Who are the uncle and the nephew in our inscription? The uncle is necessarily a king of Sukhodaya, since no one else could guarantee the nephew access to the Mahādhātu; and he is necessarily one of Lidaiya’s successors, since the reference to the relics shows that Lidaiya is already dead. The nephew, judging from his title Saṃtec Cau Braṭa, is a king of Ayudhyā.

Lidaiya had only three successors—Mahādharmarāja II, III and IV. His immediate successor, Mahādharmarāja II, who reigned from Lidaiya’s death until c. 1398, was an independent monarch during part of his career, and a vassal of Ayudhyā during part of it. The same is true of Mahādharmarāja III, who reigned from c. 1398 to 1419. Mahādharmarāja IV (r. 1419-38), was a vassal of Ayudhyā throughout.

---

1) See below, note 30.
2) Two of them had been brought from Ceylon around 1343; see Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, pp. 17-20; for the magico-religious importance of the monument, see ibid., pp. 20-22, 33-34.
3) For Lidaiya’s dates, see ibid., pp. 29, 30, 39, 40 and note 108 (observe that the date 1357, ibid., p. 29, line 36, is a misprint for 1347); cf. Prasert ṇa Nagarā in SSR, June 1966, p. 50.
his reign, and after his death the kingdom of Sukhodaya was abolished. These facts may help us to identify the uncle in the inscription.

If the uncle were the nephew's vassal, we should expect him to swear allegiance to him unilaterally, without receiving any reciprocal undertaking at all. But both parties to Inscription XL swear oaths, and both invoke sanctions of the sort invoked in the treaty of 1393 between Sukhodaya and Nān, which has every appearance of being a pact between two sovereign states. Though the specific pledges made by the nephew in Inscription XL are lost, it may be suspected that they were of the same character as the uncle's; even if they were not, they must have constituted a real quid pro quo, for they are backed up by no less solemn sanctions than the uncle's. On these grounds alone we should probably be justified in concluding that both parties to the pact are sovereign monarchs; and there is evidence in the sanctions which seems to prove it. Each party pronounces the wish that, in case he should prove false, 'the upholders of pure righteousness' (i.e. the monks), will accept no alms from him—a grave penalty, as it would exclude him from an important means of making merit, and so lessen his chances of happiness in future

4) For the history of Sukhodaya in the reigns of Mahādharmarāja II, III and IV, see Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara, Epigraphic and Historical Studies, Numbers 1 to 4 (No. 1: USS LVI/2; Nos. 2-4: JSS LVII/1); cf. Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 47-55; Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara, On Kingship and Society at Sukhodaya, to appear in Felicitation Volume for Professor Lauriston Sharp, Ithaca, 1969.

5) Cf. the oaths of allegiance in 12th-century Cambodia, and the oaths that accompanied the drinking of the water of allegiance in Siam in the late Ayudhya and early Bangkok periods (Coedès, Le serment des fonctionnaires de Suryavarman I, BEFEO XIII/6, p. 11 ff.; Quaritch Wales, Siamese State Ceremonies, London, 1931, p. 194 ff.). These oaths were unilateral; the first monarch to give a reciprocal pledge to the people was Rāma IV (see Frankfurter, King Mongkut, JSS I/2, p. 204). An order of appointment ('sanad') issued by a suzerain to a vassal was presumably unilateral in the other direction, with the vassal taking no part in it; see Sao Saimong Mangrai, The Shan States and the British Annexation, Ithaca, 1965, Appendix VII, pp. xxxi ff.

6) See Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara, Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 3, JSS LVII/1, pp. 57 ff.
births. 'The upholders of pure righteousness,' exclaims the uncle, 'whether living in my land, or in the land of the Cau Braña, or in any other land, may they not accept anything from my hand, may they not accept any alms from me at all!' (I/23-24), while the nephew exclaims the same thing, but with the substitution: 'whether living in my land, or in my uncle's land, or in any other land' (II/10-11). These expressions, which are obviously intended to make the coverage as broad as possible, would be inappropriate if the uncle were the nephew's vassal.

* * *

These observations show that the uncle is either Mahâdharmarâjâ II or III, and that the pact dates from one of the times that Sukhodaya was an independent kingdom.

Let us review the kingdom's relations with Ayudhya.

Kâdaiya was on very friendly terms with the founder of Ayudhya, Râmâdhipati I. Interest as well as inclination drew them together. Kâdaiya needed peace in order to rebuild the political and economic fortunes of Sukhodaya after the losses sustained in his father's reign; Râmâdhipati, whose grand design was to conquer Cambodia, needed Sukhodaya's benevolent neutrality in order to launch his campaigns in that direction without exposing his northern flank. They must have had an understanding to respect each other's frontiers; they may have had a formal alliance; and they certainly wanted their descendants to carry on the policy of friendship between the two kingdoms. Râmâdhipati died in 1369, and was succeeded by his son Râmesvara, the Prince of Labpurî. Râmesvara was no less amicably disposed toward Sukhodaya than his father; but he was deposed the following year by Paramârâjâ, the Prince of Subarnapurî, who sent him back to his former post at Labpurî and seized the throne for himself.

Paramârâjâ, believing that Sukhodaya's independence was an obstacle to Ayudhya's greatness, quickly undertook a series of armed
attacks against the kingdom in the hope of reducing it to vassalage. As he possessed the military machine with which Ramādhīpīti had conquered Cambodia, it ought to have been easy for him to overwhelm Sukhodaya; but he was not a very capable general. Līdāiyā's successor Mahādharmarājā II managed to maintain his independence until 1378, when Paramarājā had the good fortune to take him prisoner at Kāmbēṅ Bejra, made him swear an oath of allegiance, and sent him back to Sukhodaya to rule the kingdom as his vassal. Mahādharmarājā II, no matter how unwillingly, seems to have remained loyal to his oath; but the forces of freedom gradually gathered strength; and Paramarājā died ten years later without having been able to pacify the kingdom. His costly but inconclusive campaigns, in contrast to Ramādhīpīti's successes, may have discredited the house of Subarṇapurī in Ayudhyan eyes: at any rate, a few days after his death, the ex-king Rāmesvara regained the throne by a coup d'état (second reign: 1388-95).

Rāmesvara quickly reverted to the policy of friendship with Sukhodaya. His father would have wished it; in addition, he and Mahādharmarājā needed each other's good will, for the house of Subarṇapurī was an equal menace to both. We have guessed elsewhere that Mahādharmarājā II, whose oath of allegiance expired with Paramarājā's death, swore allegiance to Rāmesvara, in exchange for which he received virtual independence from 1390 on. Now we are doubtful: it is equally possible that Rāmesvara, preferring an easy alliance to an uneasy suzerainty, recognized Mahādharmarājā's complete independence in 1390, de jure as well as de facto. But trouble was on the way.


8) Griswold and Prasert pha Nagara, Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 1, JSS LVII/2, p. 216; No. 2, JSS LVII/1, p. 66.

9) In 1393 Mahādharmarājā II's son Prince Sai Līdāiyā, acting on his father's behalf, concluded a treaty with Nāṅ which appears to be a pact between two sovereign states. See our Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 3, JSS LVII/1, pp. 57 ff. In that article we argued that Mahādharmarājā II was at
Rāmeśvara's son and successor Rāmarāja (r. 1395-1409), whatever his personal inclinations may have been, soon showed that Sukhodaya could not count on his friendship. It seems likely that the Subarṇapurī faction compelled or persuaded him to do some things he would not have done if left to his own devices. Somehow or other—whether by force of arms, diplomatic pressure, or a trick—he or his Subarṇapurī advisors succeeded in getting Mahādharmarājā II to capitulate; for in 1397 Rāmarāja made a state visit to Sukhodaya, and formally proclaimed himself suzerain over the kingdom on Thursday the full-moon day of Vaiśākha (April 12 in the Julian calendar). Mahādharmarājā II died less than two years later.

His son and successor Mahādharmarājā III (Sai ṉidaiya) invaded Ayudhyan territory at the head of an army in 1400, took possession of the province of Nagara Svarga, and declared himself independent. Rāmarāja's humiliation at the hands of a former vassal state must have strengthened the Subarṇapurī faction and enabled them to increase their pressure on him. Finally in 1409 he tried to regain his freedom of action by dismissing his chief minister, who was in league with the house of Subarṇapurī; but it was too late. The minister organized a coup d'état which deposed Rāmarāja and placed Prince Indarājā of Subarṇapurī on the throne in his stead. Indarājā was faithful to the traditional policy of his house. At an unknown date between 1409 and 1412, he reduced Mahādharmarājā III to vassalage. That was the end of Sukhodaya as an independent kingdom.

* * * *

The uncle in Inscription XL might therefore be Mahādharmarājā II, acting as an independent monarch either before 1378 or else between

least nominally a vassal of Rāmeśvara, and that he therefore stepped aside temporarily and allowed his son Sai ṉidaiya to make the treaty with Nān on his behalf. But we can easily imagine other reasons why he might have done so.

10) See our Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 4, JSS LVII/1, pp. 109 ff.
11) See our Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 1, JSS LVII/2, p. 221.
12) See our Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 1, JSS LVII/2, p. 221.
1390 and 1397; or he might be Mahādharmarājā III, who was independent from 1400 to some time between 1409 and 1412. As far as we can see, there are no other possibilities.

Whichever he was, the Saṁtec Cau Brañā calls him u, ‘my mother’s younger brother.’ While several terms denoting family relationships are loosely used in the Sukhodayan inscriptions, this one is so specific that the speaker seems unlikely to have chosen it unless his mother, or, at the very least, his foster-mother, really was an elder sister of the King of Sukhodaya with whom he is making the pact, and hence either a daughter or a granddaughter of Liḍaiya.

We can therefore be pretty sure that the Saṁtec Cau Brañā is neither Paramarājā nor Indarājā, both of them usurpers from Subarṇapuri, who are very unlikely to have been related to Liḍaiya in any way. That means the inscription was composed some time between Paramarājā’s death in 1388 and Indarājā’s accession in 1409, in other words either during Rāmeśvara’s second reign (1388-95) or in Rāmarājā’s reign (1395-1409). Which is more likely?

Intermarriage between the houses of Rāmadhipati and Sukhodaya must have been fairly frequent, though we have no real information on the subject. Rāmeśvara’s own mother, it is generally believed, was Rāmadhipati’s chief queen, the former Princess of Subarṇapuri (Paramarājā’s sister); but we know almost nothing about that lady; she may have died young and been replaced by a daughter of Rāmadhipati’s friend Liḍaiya, and the latter lady may have become Rāmeśvara’s foster-mother. On the other hand it is possible, and even probable, that Rāmeśvara himself married a daughter or granddaughter of Liḍaiya, and that Rāmarājā was an offspring of the marriage.

As two different identifications are possible for each of the parties to the pact in Inscription XL, three possible combinations must be considered.

13) In addition, Paramarājā, who must have been roughly the same age as Liḍaiya, could not possibly have had a daughter of Liḍaiya as his mother or foster-mother.
If they are Mahādhammarāja II and Rāmeśvara, the genealogy would be as
follows (the dotted line representing a foster-relationship):

\[ \text{Princess of Subarṇapuri} \quad m. \quad \text{Rāmādhipati}\]
\[ \text{m. daughter} \quad \text{MAHĀDHIHMARĀJA II} \]

\[ \text{RĀMEŚVARA} \]

There is much to be said in favor of this identification. At
II/13-14 the Saṃtec Cau Braṇā expresses the wish that he and his
uncle shall be bound together by friendship, avoiding all anger and
hostility; then he continues: 'In my oath to the grandfather Braṇā, I
spoke sincerely.' The most natural interpretation of the expression

\[ \text{\textit{nyūm}} \]

which we have translated as 'the grandfather Braṇā' in order not
to prejudice the case, would be 'my grandfather the Braṇā'. In
modern Siamese, the term \[ \text{\textit{nd}} \] (here written \[ \text{\textit{nd}} \]) means 'paternal grandfa-
ter', but it is more loosely used in the Sukhodayan inscriptions.14
In the present context it could easily mean 'my foster-mother's father',
i.e. Līdaiya. As Līdaiya died in 1374 at the latest, the only time that
Rāmeśvara could have made a pact with him was during his own brief
reign, 1369-70, for it stands to reason that he would not have done so
before coming to the throne, or after being deposed. Other than the
retrospective allusion at II/14-15, we have no knowledge of such a
pact; but (if we accept Jinaṅkālamāli's statement that Līdaiya outlived
Rāmādhipati, and not the view of some scholars that he died in 136815)
there is no reason to doubt that there was one. We may guess that it
was intended to perpetuate the good relations between Sukhodaya and
Ayudhyā that had prevailed in Rāmādhipati's time, and to make sure
that Rāmādhipati's death would not invite aggressive designs on
either side; indeed it may have been an even closer alliance.

14) Sometimes it means any paternal ancestor (Inscr. XLV, I/3-10); sometimes
it means 'maternal great-uncle' (Inscr. XLV, I/23, et passim; Inscr. LXIV,
I/3 et passim); etc.

15) See above, note 3.
Paramarājā’s usurpation in 1370 made this pact a dead letter; his aggressions forced Sukhodaya into a long war; and even Mahādharmarājā II’s capitulation in 1378 did not put an end to the bloodshed (p. 95). But Mahādharmarājā II was released from his oath of allegiance by Paramarājā’s death in 1388, and Rāmesvara’s accession in the same year would raise anew the whole question of Sukhodaya’s relations with Ayudhya.

The purpose of Inscription XL may be to define these relations precisely. If so, we can see the significance of the passage at II/14-16, in which the Saṃtec Cau Braññā, after alluding to his sincerity in taking his oath to the grandfather Braññā, adds: ‘that thing I also pledge as stated in this document’ (i.e. the pact recorded in Inscription XL). The passage would mean that Rāmesvara is now making exactly the same pledge to Mahādharmarājā II as he had made long ago to Lidaiya, including a guarantee to respect his sovereignty. In the succeeding passage (II/16-17), though it is too much mutilated to be clear, he may be asking his uncle to accept his assurance of good faith, and excusing himself for having been prevented by Paramarājā’s usurpation from carrying out his pledge to Lidaiya. Mahādharmarājā II, for his part, gives Rāmesvara the four specific pledges cited above (p. 90), and a general pledge of love and friendship (I/10-11). The allusion to the worship of Lidaiya’s relics would be a kind of psychological reminder that the miseries inflicted on Sukhodaya by Paramarājā are now at an end, and the happy conditions that prevailed in the time of Rāmāddhipati and Lidaiya are to be restored.

There seems to be an echo of the same idea in the Asokarāma Inscription, composed in 1399 after Mahādharmarājā II’s death.16 The Pali face, composed on behalf of his widow by her younger brother, contains a short eulogy of the deceased monarch. If we interpret this mutilated passage correctly, it alludes to his marriage,

16) See our Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No, 2, JSS LVII/1, pp. 49-52.
at the age of 16, in the year 1368; then it skips straight to the time when he was 38, i.e. in 1390. At that time, we are told, 'his kingdom was broad and free from danger'; the limits of his kingdom are then given; and the eulogy concludes: 'having established the boundaries of his kingdom, he who gave joy to all creatures [was honored] both by gods and by men.' He is referred to as Mahādhammarājādhirāja, which seems to imply a sovereign monarch with vassals of his own; there is no hint that he himself was anybody's vassal in 1390; and the years when he was a vassal of Paramarājā are passed over in discreet silence.

There is nothing surprising in the allusion to his marriage at the age of 16; that was one of the events that would be uppermost in his widow's mind. But it is less clear why the author chooses the year 1390 to describe the happy condition of the kingdom and to specify its limits. Perhaps the best explanation is that that was the year when he became independent de jure.

If we construe Inscription XL as recording the formal instrument by which Rāmeśvara recognized Mahādharmarājā II's independence in 1390, it is an historical document of considerable importance. But the lacunae in the uncle's specific pledges, and the total of loss the nephew's, leave us in doubt.

2

Here is the genealogy if the two parties are Mahādharmarājā II and Rāmarājā:

Princess of Subarṇapurī m. Rāmādhipati

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lidaiya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Rāmeśvara m. daughter

MAHĀDHARMARĀJĀ II

RĀMARĀJΑ
The main difficulty is the allusion at II/14-15 to the earlier pact the Sāṃteca Cau Brañña made with 'the grandfather Brañña' for it is hard to see how Rāmarāja could have made a pact with his grandfather Ādaiya, who had died more than twenty years before Rāmarāja's accession: the only explanation that occurs to us is that he could have made it on behalf of his father Rāmesvara in 1369-70, much as Prince Sai Ādaiya made the pact with Nān on his father's behalf in 1393 (see above, note 9).

For the rest, we could build up a plausible story. Inscription XL would date from some time after Rāmarāja's accession in 1395 and his formal assertion of suzerainty over Sukhodaya in 1397, since the uncle is still a sovereign monarch. As both Inscription XL and the assertion of suzerainty are dated on the full-moon day of Vaiśākha, the first in an unknown year when the day fell on a Friday, the second in 1397 when it fell on a Thursday, we might well suspect that the first was in 1396.17 We might guess that in 1396 Rāmarāja—or rather the members of the Subarṇapuri faction who controlled him—did not yet feel strong enough to extort a full oath of allegiance from Mahādharma Raja II after his six years of independence, and instead extorted certain rights which would make it easier the next year. If Rāmarāja was a grandson of Ādaiya, it would be perfectly natural for him to wish to salute his relics—or, under pressure from the Subarṇapuri faction, to use such a wish as a pretext to gain access to Sukhodaya whenever he liked, without letting his uncle suspect a plot against his independence.

17 If CS 758 (corresponding mainly to A.D. 1396) a year with an intercalary month, the full-moon day of Vaiśākha would indeed fall on a Friday in 1396. But it is doubtful whether the date in the lacuna at II/23 could have been 758 after all. CS 758 was a year of the rat (कुन), whereas the fragmentary letter at the end of the lacuna appears to have been either u, w or v; and if that is right, the date must have been in a year of the tiger (गृह), the horse (गौ), the goat (कृत), or the boar (कृत).
If Mahādharmārāja III and Rāmarāja are the parties to the pact, we must suppose them to be related as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rāmadhipati</th>
<th>Līdaiya</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rāmeśvara m. daughter</td>
<td>Mahādharmārāja II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHĀDHARMARĀJA III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mahādharmārāja II was born in 1352; and if we allow 14 years as the minimum age at which a boy or girl was likely to become a parent, he would not have a grandson before 1380. Rāmarāja would therefore be no more than 15 years old at the time of his accession, and perhaps a good deal less. That, indeed, might account for the Subarṇapurī faction’s ability to manipulate him.

The ‘grandfather Braṇā’ in the allusion to an earlier pact (II/14-15) would be Rāmarāja’s grandfather Mahādharmārāja II. It is likely enough that Rāmeśvara expressed the wish before he died that Rāmarāja should make just such a pact; it is possible that, for a year or two after his accession, Rāmarāja still had enough freedom of action to do so; and it is possible that a lad of 15 or 16 would take the initiative. It is more likely that he was a good deal younger; but in the first two years of his reign he would probably be surrounded by advisors his father had appointed, or be under the guardianship of a regent named by his father. By 1397, however, it seems probable that

---

18) Theoretically the ‘grandfather Braṇā’ might be Mahādharmārāja III’s grandfather Līdaiya (in Inscription IX, for example, which dates from 1406, Līdaiya is called ‘Mahādharmārāja the grandfather’ (Mahādharmārāja ṛ̥̣⟩̣⟩) at I/11, I/15, I/29-30, and II/3, to distinguish him from the reigning monarch, Mahādharmārāja III, who is called ‘Mahādharmārājaḍhīrāja the grandson’ (Mahādharmārājaḍhīrāja ṛ̣⟩̣⟩), but if Rāmarāja was not born before 1380 he could obviously never have sworn an oath to Līdaiya.
that the Subarṇapurī party had somehow or other managed to replace Rāmeśvara’s appointees with persons of their own choosing, and so to engineer the assertion of suzerainty over Sukhodaya in 1397.

This reconstruction of events has its weaknesses; but if it is right, the pact in Inscription XL would date from some years after Mahādharmanāja III’s declaration of independence in 1400. By that time Rāmarāja may have felt the need of his uncle’s friendship, for his own situation was growing more and more precarious as the Subarṇapurī party increased their pressure on him. It would be natural for him to want to salute his grandfather’s relics, and to excuse himself to his uncle for not having been able to carry out the earlier pact with his grandfather (II/15-17): the ‘ministers and retainers’ in the mutilated passage at II/18 might be the advisors the Subarṇapurī party imposed on him. But would the Subarṇapurī party have allowed him out of their clutches long enough for him to make the pact recorded in Inscription XL? An alternative explanation is that they were forcing him to play a trick on his uncle: it may have been the prelude to the unknown events that extinguished Mahādharmanāja III’s independence some time between 1409 and 1412.

Conclusion

It is difficult to choose between the three alternatives we have suggested. On the whole the first seems the most likely; but the lacunae and obscurities in the inscription make it impossible to be certain. In the present state of our knowledge, it would be more prudent to avoid trying to reach a definitive choice.
1. .... โปรญาจรุศิยานานปรมาณะโองเคือนสามเคีกอ.....
2. กั๊มมี่ส่งขามกั้นแล้เก้เจ้าปราญาโม่โหม กั้นปราษะชิ้นไฟผู่ผูรวม

3. .... ด้วยบริพารถเก้า เก้าเบิ้มกิ้งก้าเปนหนอนตรายอนง..... มันเครือ...

4. .... โปรญาอะสบายมาสันคนเก้าเก้าบ่ม (ก้า)......................
5. คนเด็กเจ้าปราญาโคนิงเพลเมือโคแจดเก้(เจ)......................
6. ........ หว้าแตกิมณท ควักเก้าเก้าเบิ้มหมอจก (เผา)......................
7. .... เก้าเก้าเจ้าปราญาโม่โหมโคกล่เจ(เจ้าพร)ญักร์ใครโใจ
มาไหว้ จั้บ
8. ษพ(นะ) มหาชาตึกตังมหาทรมราชรัฐวิปพิศ(รัฐบเวป)
มือจกทำการพ้อมทำการ
9. พระราชเก้าเจ้าปราญาอนิคสำนักที่ปรึกษา(ญนำ)......(ม) พระราช
หลายเก้าลาดวน
10. เก้าเก้าเจ้าปราญาโม่โหมกิ้งปติโพรป......(ก้า)เปนหนอนทรัพ
เกษตร
11. เดวิลลาจผานแตรหลังย 답งก้างเจ้า......เคุร์รายยินปักผัวค้ำ
12. ผู้ถามญญี่จากหลังบวคเณนิศกียน......ยุกยำถกการพ้อมวชิรา
13. พระราชอนิมมไณิในประเทศย์ปรึกษา......พระสัณฑ์ที่หลายจุก
14. ละขาวเก้าแก่ให้แต่เก้าเจ้าปราญาไว......กิ้งปติโพรปแต่เจ้า
15. เก้าเก้าปราษะสำาห์สิริสริงราวเข้าพรชราว......คีญขันสิ่งคงหมาตี้อ
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16. เรียนว่าศิษย์หัวหลายเป็นก้าวพิชญานะ.............. (ก) งี้เจียชีอิเอสขี้ปร
คิชญา

17. ในพระวรมหาสุรธรรมปิย์แก่เราเอาไว้ (มีครี)............ โละพวก
นอกใจโดย

18. กษัตริย์บังคับกีฬาวันนี้ให้จริง.......... (สรรพ) โทษนานราย
ในทันยา

19. ประหยัดกันทุกนายได้เป็นห้าวเปน (พระยา) ............ เมื่อหน้าพวก
เมื่อไปใน

20. บรรโลกกีย์ หนทางทุรก้อนนั้นผ่าน........... แก่เราณวายบาง
ทาง

21. ลายอนั้นหากม่ายบินทนเป็นคนบัญญัต (จานนครก) ....... (หน) กษัตริย์มีแก่เราณ

22. งดงนั้นทางสายสะทุบบุตรที่หลาย... (ไป) พบไปเห็นแปลนนว

............... 

23. มีกูมณ์นอนถึงการแก่เราณ์ใจไอกเทา...................... (บริ) สุขสีติ
อนันต์ (ด)

24. อ่านนำในประเทศเรากื้ี ประเทศเข้าพระยา......................... (ก)
บัทธาแร

25. เราย่าให้เอาบินกิบการแก่เราณ์หัน... ยก....................

26. ท่านรบเราณ์มีใจใส่ใจเล็กเทา..............................

27. เราย่าศิวิทยพราภารกิย์อานาจกุสสทัย......................

28. แควโปรดกษ์หลายในอินทิส

29. ........... ราดเข้าย่างบ่กโมกษ

...
 Face II

1. ............ (ฝ่ายใช้จากหลักยับคืนเสริม) ............

2. ............ท่าน (สรพทิยา) นั่งอยู่หน้าไม้ในพระสังข์ปKinชฎา

3. ............ (ค) บัตตาบานเรียกไข่ในนั่งพระสังข์นิล

4. ............ หมาสหวิชสังข์ราชพินิตหน้าเท้าจักรีนิลใน

5. ............ ฟื้นฟูภูมิและที่แท้เรียงไข่ให้ถิ่นไหลหน้า

6. (พระนั่งเศษ) ตัวเร้าไม่ตรึงมาก ให้เป็นโภชนาเอกสาร

7. ............ ใหญ่เคยจริยศาสตร์พิษณุโลกในเจดีย์

8. ............ (ณ) นำพายมือไปในปิยะโลกกิจทุรกันต์

9. ............ หมายถึงพื้นแผนที่ปรับดุยานกิจเกิดกัน

10. ............. ฉันทรงธรรมการในประเทศไทยกับประเทศอังกฤษ

11. (น) ............ นำให้เอามันไม้กระแทคว่าเรื่อย,ดินให้ค้างสอน

เคยชิน
A PACT BETWEEN UNCLE AND NEPHEW

26. ...............(me)rūraṣa rāja’iuratnabhavanadvadhi sutāra-kāna va tāva tiṣṭhatā’aṣtu

27. ...............trika cālurvijayassa tataṁ varena // merukula-girirāja ............

28. ...............rājassa yaśodharādhīpassa ca tāva tiṣṭha . . . .

..............
TRANSLATION

Face I

[I/1.] May it be known to the [Samtec Cau] Brañā:

[I/1-3.] Whether for a period of two months or three months, whether ........... , or whether there is no war, if the Samtec Cau Brañā causes his ministers and royal counsellors, his officials of high or middle rank to ........... with their retainers, I will do nothing to endanger them.

[I/3-5.] Furthermore ...... if ministers ................. or rulers of foreign countries, come to my Court, I cannot make ........ for the Samtec Cau Brañā's people.

[I/5-7.] Furthermore, whenever to the Samtec Cau Brañā ............. or whether taking pleasure together, I will not venture to ............. to the Samtec Cau Brañā.

[I/7-9.] Furthermore, whenever the Samtec Cau Brañā desires to come and salute the Samtec Brañ Mahādhātu, or the relics of Mahādañmarādhīrapattra, [I will not] venture to cause any sort of distress or danger to the Samtec Cau Brañā.

[I/9-11.] The words .... of this solemn oath .... all the clauses as stated above to the Samtec Cau Brañā, earnestly, with love and friendship, in accordance with ... are established to remain firm and durable.

19) sc. 'whether there is war'.
20) We assume that ān is the pronoun, 'their', rather than the verb ān, 'to enter'. Conjecturally reconstructing the lacuna, the passage may have meant: 'if the Samtec Cau Brañā sends his ministers (etc.) to my Court with their retainers'.
21) We assume that the skeleton of the main clause is 712771. Perhaps the uncle is promising that he will not make any disclosures that would be harmful to the Samtec Cau Brañā.
22) harsābhimata (Skt. harsa, 'pleasure', etc. + abhimata, 'agreed', 'desired', 'a wish', etc.
23) The meaning of sāpnī (lī, I/9) is obscure. Is it equivalent to sām, 'to do something in exchange'? etc.
24) satyapratijī (ān), for satyapratijī (I/19).
[I/11-26.] Then if I should waver and try to find fault, saying that the Cau [Brāṇa] . . . . . . . . , because I hear it from the mouth of a malicious man who utters the words; if I am faithless to any contracts or oaths . . . . . . . . , causing by trickery any sort of harm or danger which is cited in the solemn oath [*in this great golden document,25] or the various promises, stated above, which I am giving to the Samtec Cau Brāṇa [*in the presence of] the Three Gems, and to the Patriarch26 Brah Mahāsvāmi Śrī Saṅgharāja Brah [*Mahāthera Darmaḍar]si27, as well as the assembly of all the Village-Dwelling and Forest-Dwelling monks28 as witnesses;29 [*or if in truth I am not] sincere in taking the solemn oath in this great golden document,30 but am using friendship [*as a screen to give] a fine outward appearance while in my heart I am bent on doing all sorts of harm referred to above; then indeed [*may] all sorts of harm and danger come upon me instantly,31 for everyone to see! May I never be a king32 . . . . . . . . . . in the future! When I go to the next world, may the woeful path [to hell and Abici33] be mine. May the retributions for all the evil deeds which people34 say are the most grave, for example the five [*most terrible hellish crimes35], be mine! Furthermore, the path which all virtuous people will find and see, may it be hidden from me in my

25) See infra, note 30.
26) ṛeva (I/15, i.e. ṛeva), 'root' (the chief of the monkhood) or 'sprout' (someone who has taken the vow to achieve Buddhahood in some future incarnation); our translation 'patriarch' dodges the issue.
27) i.e. Dharmadāsī.
28) saṅgha gāmavasi areṇavāśi (for areṇavāśi); I/15-16.
29) प्रवेणविज्ञान (I/16), 'possessing divine wisdom' (divyavijñāna).
30) brah mahāsubbarāṇapāra (I/17), the usual meaning of which is a gold sheet or tablet with official writing on it. Here we should perhaps understand that the official text of the pact was written on just such a sheet, and a copy of it engraved on the stone slab. Or else, but less probably, the term might be used by extension for the stone inscription itself.
31) yalapraṇayaṣa (I/18-19).
32) Sāmmlaṇavatē (I/19).
33) See infra, note 41.
34) भु (for भु), I/21.
35) See infra, note 42.
blindness and folly! Furthermore ............... [the upholders of] pure righteousness36, whether living in my land, or in the land of the Cau Braña, [*or in any other land], [may they not accept anything] from my hand, may they not accept any alms from me at all! [*These] evil [*acts which deserve to be condemned] ................. [all] the kings37 there are in this world!

[I/26-29.] In reality [*if I remain staunch in my oath.] [may] I be a long-enduring firmly-established king38 by the power of merit and truth139 ...................... to all enemies in the eight directions. ......................... relics, enter Nirvāṇa!40

36) parisudhasila (I/23), i.e. the monks.
37) ','$u6-
38) pu$hva(l/27), for sthiradirgharāja.
39) The speaker is making a saccakiriyā, an 'act of truth', which always included a declaration and a wish. Provided he had earned sufficient merit (e.g. in his past lives), and provided the declaration was scrupulously true, he could then be certain that the wish would come true too. See Mahāvamsa, translated by W. Geiger, Colombo, 1950, p. 125 note 3.
40) mokṣa, 'release from the round of rebirth', i.e. Nirvāṇa.
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[II/1-12.] .................. [*if I am faithless to any contracts or oaths ............,] causing [*by trickery any sort of harm or] danger which is cited in the solemn oath in this great [golden document], [*or the various promises,] stated above, which I am giving to my uncle the Brañña in the presence of the Three Gems, [*and to the Patriarch Braḥ] Mahāsvāmī Śrī Saṅgharāja Braḥ Mahāthera Daṅmadārśi, as well as the assembly of [*all] the Village-Dwelling and Forest-Dwelling monks as witnesses; or if in truth I am not sincere in taking the solemn oath in this great golden document, but am using friendship as a screen to give a fine outward appearance while in my heart I am bent on doing all sorts of harm [*referred to above]; then indeed may all sorts of harm and danger come upon me instantly, for everyone to see. May I never be a king ..................... in the future. When I go to the next world, may the woeful path to hell and Abīṣi be mine. [*May the retributions for all the evil deeds which people say are] the most grave, for example the five most terrible hellish crimes, be mine! [*Furthermore .......... the upholders of pure righteousness,] whether living in my land, or in my uncle’s land, or in any other land, [*may they not accept anything from my hand], may they not accept any alms from me at all. These evil acts which deserve to be condemned ............... all the kings there are in this world!

[II/12-13.] In reality if I remain staunch in my oath, [*may I be a long-enduring firmly-established king] by the power of merit and truth!

[II/13-14.] May the two of us, uncle and nephew, be bound together by friendship ............................. 43 May there be no anger or hostility at all between us for a single moment!

41) The Abīṣi hell.
42) pañcāñnantarika (II/9). The pañcāñnantarikakamma are the five heinous ‘actions bringing immediate retribution’, namely patricide, matricide, killing an arahat, wounding a Buddha, and causing schism in the saṅgha.
43) We have not attempted to translate -entity at the beginning of the lacuna and -entity at the end of it (II/13-14).
[II/14-16.] In my [oath] to the grandfather Brañña, I spoke sincerely that thing I also pledge as stated in this document.

[II/16-17.] If my uncle the Brañña this document.

[II/17-19.] If he shall say that I myself infringed it in great measure, then it is evident, knowing every accessory to (?) all the ministers and retainers ...........

[II/19-25.] [The great golden] document of our oath has been executed in full, on the basis of friendship. It is binding ........ witness. It is complete in all respects. The reason that the Samtec ............... May our friendship not waver. This slab will therefore be erected ........... at the Brañ Śrī Ratanamahādhātu Cau at the exact moment when the great ............... in the year .... at the full moon of the month of Baisākha, at the auspicious ṛkṣa of Viśākha, on Friday .... ........... at the first watch of the night, when the moon rises to dispel the darkness ...........

[II/26-28; in mixed Sanskrit and Pali] May ............... endure as long as King Meru, the source of bright starry

44) The context shows that (II/14-15) was some word meaning 'oath' or the like; probably (cf. 1/2, etc.), Skt. pratijñā, 'a promise' 'a vow'.

45) Being unable to determine the meaning of निश्चयीति (II/15, conjectural reading), we have omitted it from our translation. Perhaps we should understand it as निश्चयीति (II/15; (II/15, conjectural reading)), which would turn the preceding words into a conditional clause: 'If in my oath to the Grandfather Brañña I spoke sincerely, then it is fitting that there should be an abundance or a moderate amount of ...... ?

46) Conjectural translation of नामाषुष्ठां कुलकुल (II/17; Pali?.

47) Or else, if नाम चतुष्ठां (II/17; Mt, 'with much friendship'.

48) We are indebted to Professor Kamaleswar Bhattacharya of the Centre National de Recherche Scientifique in Paris for help in interpreting this peroration. It is written in an odd mixture of Sanskrit and Pali; most of the words in it could be either; among the others, Sanskritic and Pali forms are about equally divided, with Pali case-endings in the majority. The syntax is eccentric.

49) sc. 'our friendship,'?

50) Mount Meru.
jewels, and\textsuperscript{51} [as long as] the stars! May \textellipsis \textsuperscript{52} sweet\textsuperscript{53} victory \textellipsis by good fortune at all times! As long as Meru, the King of the Kulagiri\textsuperscript{54}, so long may [the friendship?] of the King of \textellipsis \textsuperscript{55} and of the Glory-Bearing Sovereign\textsuperscript{56} endure! \textellipsis \textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{51} We suspect that \textit{sutārakāśva} is intended for \textit{sutārakāśca}, and have translated accordingly.
\textsuperscript{52} Our translation omits \textit{trīka}, which may be only part of a word.
\textsuperscript{53} We assume that \textit{cālu} stands for \textit{cāru}.
\textsuperscript{54} The Kulagiri are the seven chief mountain ranges of India (Mahendra, Malaya, Sahya, Suktimat, Rākṣa, Vindhya, and Pāryātra), or else, in a more specifically Buddhist context, the seven ranges surrounding Mount Meru, viz. Yugandhara, Īsadhara, Karavika, Sudassana, Nemindhara, Vinataka and Assakāṇṇa.
\textsuperscript{55} sc. Sukhodaya?
\textsuperscript{56} Or 'of the Sovereign Yasodhara'? Yasodharapura usually means Angkor Thom, but here Yasodharādhipa appears to mean the King of Ayudhya.
\textsuperscript{57} The general sense of the peroration, omitting the rhetorical flourishes, must be something like the following: 'May our friendship endure as long as Mount Meru and as long as the stars! May sweet victory be ours at all times! May the friendship of the King of Sukhodaya and the King of Ayudhya endure as long as Mount Meru!'
Fig. 2. Inscription XL, Face II