THE INSCRIPTION OF VAT Trabăñ Jañ Phōak
(Face I, 1380 A.D.; Face II, 14th century, date uncertain)
Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 7
by
A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara

A few years ago, while escorting some distinguished European visitors on a tour of the gardens of the Grand Palace at Bangkok, Prince Subhadradis Diskul noticed two old stone inscriptions standing in the ‘grotto’ of the artificial hill known as Mount Krailāsa. He later called them to the attention of Mr Prasāra Puṇipragōṇ of the National Library, and Prasert ṇa Nagara. They are still in the place where Prince Subhadradis found them. We are indebted to the kindness of H.H. Prince Dhāninivat Kramahmūn Bidyalābha for taking us to inspect them in February 1970, and for obtaining the gracious permission of H.M. the King to photograph them. We must thank Professor Hans Penth of the University of Chiang Mai for taking the photographs for us.

In the present article we shall discuss the larger of the two inscriptions. As Prasert ṇa Nagara observed, this is the long-lost inscription discovered in 1908 by the Crown Prince Vajirāvudh, the future King Rāma VI, in a ruined monastery west of Sukhodaya known as Vat Trabăñ Jāñ Phōak (เวททระบาน ฉาน พ้อก), ‘the Monastery of the White Elephant’s Pond’.

The stone, which is 1.29 m. in height, 51 cm. in width, and 19 cm. in thickness, with a tenon 39.6 cm. wide at the bottom, is fractured in such a way that the rounded top is preserved only on Face II. A large amount of Face I is missing, including the top and much of the left side. Face I (Fig. 1) has 40 lines, or fragments of lines, of Siamese, written in the Sukhodayan script; it is impossible to say how many more lines are missing at the top. Face II (Fig. 2), which is virtually complete, has 17 lines of Pali verse written in the Khmer

1) We hope to publish the other one later.
script called Khôm. Both faces, transcribed by Mr Prasāra Puṇpragōṇ into modern Siamese letters, are published in Śilpākara, XII/3, p. 94 ff. To his transcription of Face I, he has added a version in modernized spelling, and Prasert nā Nagara has contributed a number of glosses; to Face II, Mr Prasāra has added a version in which the text is divided into hemistichs and pādas, while Mahā Sēn Manavidūra provides a Siamese translation.

Prince Vajirāvudh, in his ‘Account of a Tour in the Land of Brah Ravā’, tells how he discovered this inscription. Upon leaving Vat Sabān Hin (No. 21 on Map 3, JSS LVII/1, p. 33), he and his party retraced their steps to go and see Vat Trabān Jān Phōak, which stood beside the footpath leading up to the Lesser Footprint Hill (Khau Brah Pāda Nōy; ibid., No. 22). There they found the ruins of a small stupa; several laterite columns, with lotus capitals, ‘of rather medio­cre workmanship’, which were all that remained of the uposathāgāra; a two-tiered pedestal which may have been intended for a large Buddha image; and, lying half-buried in the earth among the bushes, an old stone inscription. The stone was rounded at the top; its height was a little over two cubits (mea) and a span (mō), i.e. a little over 1.25 m.; its width, one cubit, i.e. 50 cm.; and its thickness, 8 inches, i.e. 19 cm.; the width of the tenon at the bottom was one span and 7 inches, i.e. about 40 cm. There was writing on both faces. On the face that had been sunk in the ground the writing was quite well preserved; it was in Khôm script; and later on, when the Prince Patriarch Vajirānāṇa was consulted, he said the text was a description of a Buddhāpāda (Buddha’s Footprint), written in characters of Rāmaṇ type, and with several mistakes in spelling. The other face, which was in Old Siamese, was very difficult to read, as it was broken in several places and partly obliterated by rain. In order to decipher it Prince Vajirāvudh enlisted the aid of the Brah Garū Cau Gaṇaḥ Sukhodaya, the primate of the monkhood in the Sukhodaya region, who had had some experience in reading Old Siamese; but he was not able to make very much out of it. At the beginning there was an

---

2) สมเด็จพระสังฆราชเจ้าสุทธิสารธรรม กรุณาธิachsen, เวียงจันทน์พระเจ้าวรวงศ์เธอ รัชทิยาภรณ์ศักดิ์ ๓๒, Chapter VI (p. 85 ff. of the 1909 edition).
date: ศก. 1296 ปี จันทร, 'สาการาจ 1296, year of the tiger'; the designation of the month was illegible; then came 'nine day'; then a lacuna; then ราชสมภพ ................. เท็จสิ่งไว้ ถึงปัตติแล้ว, '.................

ราน Mahādharmā .......... died.' Further on there was a name, หมานมดิน, 'ฮานี กาป, the wife', but her husband's name was illegible. Lower down there was a reference to หมานมดิน, 'Vat Hanī Gām'. They concluded that Vat Hanī Gām was the old name of Vat Traṭbān Jān Phoak, and that it had been founded by that lady. They also noted that the date sakaraṇa 1296 (=1374/5 A.D.) was just 13 years after Mahādharmarājā invited the Mahāthera Mahāsāmi to come from Rāmaṇādesa to settle at the Mango Grove Monastery at Sukhodaya. They concluded, further, that the text describing the Footprint must have been copied from some old book, but the copyist, not being a learned man, copied it blindly and made several mistakes. He was perhaps a Môn, or else someone who had studied under Môn teachers, because at that time (i.e. since the arrival of the Mahāthera Mahāsāmi) the Môn monks, who had learned to imitate the practices of Sinhalese orthodoxy, were held in great respect at Sukhodaya. Apart from these conclusions, Prince Vajirāvudh believed that the inscription was of little or no historical value.

Nevertheless he must have sent it to Bangkok, just as he did with other inscriptions discovered in the course of the same trip; for there can be no possible doubt that it is the same stone which now stands in the grotto of the artificial hill in the grounds of the Royal Palace. The dimensions of the latter are practically identical to those given by Prince Vajirāvudh; and just as he says, the face written in 'Khôm' script is in good condition, while that in Siamese is badly mutilated. Evidently the stone suffered some further fracture, either in transit to Bangkok or after its arrival, for the date at the beginning has vanished except for the words (3) 1/4, 'in the third month, on the ninth day of the waxing moon', corresponding to the illegible designation of the month, followed by 'nine day', in Prince Vajirāvudh's account; and the statement about the death of

3) For the Mahāsāmi's arrival at Sukhodaya, and other events of 1361, see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art (Bangkok, 1967), pp. 35-37.
'Mahādharmarāja........' has vanished too. महाधर्मराज, 'Hnān Gām, the wife,' is a false reading of महाधर्मराज, 'the Aunt Princess Gām did' at I/8 (in the Sukhodayan script, ँ can easily be confused with ं, and ं with ः). In the portions of the stone that now survive, there is nothing that looks like 'Vat Hnān Gām'; but perhaps there was once a reference to महाधर्मराज, 'Monastery of the Aunt Princess Gām', now lost. As we shall see, the Princess was not the founder of the monastery, but its restorer.

We are indebted to the kindness of Mr Roger Billard of the Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient for calculating the opening date. Supposing that the Brah Gari read it correctly, Mr Billard informs us, it should correspond to Thursday, January 11, 1375 A.D. (Julian), or perhaps either one day earlier or one day later; but he adds that he has not enough comparative material for this period to be certain.

It is a pity that the portions of this date which the Brah Gari saw have disappeared, as well as the reference to the King's death. If they had been preserved, they might settle the controverted question of the date of Mahādharmarājā I's death.4

Of course we cannot rely on the Brah Gari's reading of the lost passage, since we know that he went wrong in some of those that survive; besides, even if we accept it, we have no guarantee that the inscription ever said the King died in that year. Nevertheless the various elements of the date in the Brah Gari's reading, plus what we can now read, make a coherent whole, somewhere between January 10 and 12, 1375 A.D. (Julian), and we know of no definite evidence that Mahādharmarājā I did not die at that time. On the one hand the earliest possible date for his death is 1368; on the other, as we shall see in a moment, it is clear from the passage at I/22 ff. that he must have died some years before 1380.

---

4) See Prasert ṇa Nagarā in Social Science Review, June 1966, p. 50; Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 39 f. According to Jinakālamalī, Mahādharmarājā I's death occurred after Paramarājā conquered Kārpboja (in this context, Lopburī; the event must be his seizure of the throne of Ayudhya in 1370), but before he took Jayānādapūra (in this context; Bīṣṇuloka, which he did in 1375); see BEFEQ XXV, pp. 47 and 100.
The purpose of Face I is to record the dedication of a new vihāra, apparently the building whose ruins Prince Vajirāvudh took to be the remains of an uposathāgāra. The stone would naturally be set up beside it, which is where the Prince discovered it.

In the inscription (I/22) the place is designated as an 'arañika' (=araññaka), a Forest Monastery, i.e. an establishment of Araññavāsi or Forest-Dwelling monks. Its location, nearly 3 km. from the walled city of Sukhodaya, would easily qualify it as such; and its proximity to Vat Sabān Hin which Rāma Gāmhēn designates as an 'arañika' in Inscription I, suggests that it may have had some connection with it.

According to I/28 f., the vihāra was dedicated in mahāsakarāja 1301, culasakarāja 741, a year of the goat, on the second day of the waning moon of the eleventh month, Wednesday in the Khmer reckoning, and a 'Piök sān' day in the Tai reckoning. Mr Roger Billard, to whom we are again indebted, informs us that the year in mahāsakarāja and culasakarāja, the day of the week, and the Tai name of the day are all in accord with one another, and correspond to Wednesday February 22, 1380 A.D. (Julian), and there is a discrepancy in the designation of the month, which, in order to agree with the other elements, should be fourth, not eleventh. Mr Billard therefore suggests that 2nd day of the waning moon of the eleventh month, might be a false reading for 2nd day of the waning moon of the fourth month. As an examination of the stone shows that the reading is fairly certain, we conclude that the engraver must have made a mistake, and that the vihāra are really dedicated on Wednesday February 22, 1380 A.D. (Julian).

The ruler of Sukhodaya at that time was Mahādharmarājā II, who had been forced to capitulate to King Paramarājā I of Ayudhya a year or two before. He was therefore reigning as a vassal of Para-

5) Letter from Mr Billard, dated March 1, 1970.
marājā at the time the inscription was composed. That is why he is referred to simply as 'the Ruler' (I/24, I/30), rather than by some more elaborate title such as those used by his father Mahādharma mahārāja I.

The dedication of the vihāra was preceded by a series of works of restoration and maintenance, which began on the opening date of the inscription, probably, as we have seen, around January 11, 1375 A.D. (Julian). The building which housed the principal statue of the Buddha was evidently badly decayed, so that the statue was exposed to the weather. First an honorific parasol (chattra) was made for the statue; then a vihāra was built to shelter it; the statue was restored; several families were assigned as servants to look after the monastery; and provision was made for 'the Buddha image, the stupa and the cetiya' to be cleaned regularly.

* * *

Princess Gām, who appears to be taking the lead in the operations, is termed ṛṣh, i.e. ṛṣh, the Aunt, or, to be more precise, the elder sister or half-sister of either parent. We are not told whose ṛṣh she was; but when an inscription calls a person by a relationship-term without further qualification it can generally be assumed that the person is related in that manner either to the author of the inscription, which does not make sense in this context, or else to the Ruler. Princess Gām would therefore be the elder sister or half-sister of the Ruler's father Mahādharmanājā I (Lō Tai), or else of his mother, who was a princess of Nān. If we adopt the first supposition, which seems the more probable, Princess Gām was a daughter of King Lō Tai.

Someone else, who speaks in the first person (m) at I/12 f., also participates in the operations at the monastery, apparently as a joint donor with Princess Gām: he is probably her husband. He seems to be the same man who is described as ṛṣum, 'the Ruler's uncle' at I/24 and I/30 (in the first case, after Princess Gām; in the second case, before

6) See JSS LVII/1, p. 67.
her). In the context the designation ṛṣa, which, strictly speaking, means 'a parent's elder brother', may be given him simply because he is the husband of the Ruler's ṛṣi, aunt, though it is probable that he too is related to the Ruler. If he seems to be playing a lesser role in the operations, it may be because Princess Gām is of higher rank.

'This Forest Monastery,' says a mutilated passage (I/22-23), 'had been falling into ruin since the time of the late Mahādharmarājā. This ....... merit to [or: meritorious work of?] the eldest brother, His Highness (rn, for ṛṣi), Brahi Śrī Rāja-orasa, the lord of this Möaṅ Sukhodaya, .......' (. ..). If he himself had founded it, we should have expected him to keep it going as long as he lived, and to provide whatever maintenance might be needed. So we shall probably be safe in assuming that someone else had founded it before Mahādharmarājā I came to the throne.

The first statement shows that the monastery had been abandoned during the reign of Mahādharmarājā I, which began in 1347. If he himself had founded it, we should have expected him to keep it going as long as he lived, and to provide whatever maintenance might be needed. So we shall probably be safe in assuming that someone else had founded it before Mahādharmarājā I came to the throne.

The rest of the passage, because of the lacunae, lends itself to two entirely different interpretations.

If ṛṣi refers to Princess Gām's work of restoring the monastery, the author doubtless means that the merit resulting from her work is to be transferred to His Highness Brahi Śrī. Merit of this sort is usually transferred to someone who is dead; ṛṣi (ṛṣi) would mean an elder brother of the Ruler; and Mahādharmarājā II may easily have had an elder brother who died before he himself came to the throne, though we have no knowledge of such a person. The name Śrī is too commonplace to help identify him. Rāja-orasa, 'king's son', would mean he was a son of Mahādharmarājā I; and the title 'lord of this Möaṅ Sukhodaya' might mean that Mahādharmarājā I, while still ruling the kingdom, had turned over the administration of the city or province of Sukhodaya to him.
On the other hand นั้น could refer to the forest monastery, and the author could mean that it was the meritorious work (บุญ) of H.H. Brah ศรี, i.e. it had been founded by him. In that case, if the monastery was founded before 1347 (as we have suggested), Brah ศรี would be too old to be a son of Mahādharma raja I; he would have to be a son of Lō Tai; and we should understand น้า to mean the eldest brother or half-brother of Princess Gām. We know that in 1340 Lō Tai appointed his son Lū Tai (Mahādharma raja I)—who was apparently his eldest son by his chief queen— to be uparāja at Sri Sajjanālaya, where he completed his celebrated treatise Traibhūmi-atthakathā in 1345.7 Lō Tai may have appointed another son, Brah ศรี, as lord of the city or province of Sukhodaya at about the same time. If these guesses seem plausible, we might be tempted to identify Brah ศรี with the mysterious หน้า Nām Thām (Ngua Nam Tom), who seized the throne around 1346 and reigned until he was dislodged by Lū Tai in a sharp battle in 1347.8 That is no more than a guess, but it might explain why Mahādharma raja I (Lū Tai) allowed the monastery to fall into ruin, and why no one dared restore it until after his death.

We may recapitulate the chronological probabilities: the monastery had been founded some time before 1347; Princess Gām started to restore it in 1375; and the culminating act, the dedication of the vihāra, occurred in 1380.

7) See Coedes, BEFEO XVII/2, pp. 8, 9, and note 4 p. 8.
8) Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 29 f. The term ngua (หน้า), which shows that he was the fifth son of his father, might appear to be an obstacle to the proposed identification. But if he was the eldest son of Lō Tai by the same mother as Princess Gām, while Lō Tai’s first four sons were by different mothers, Princess Gām might still call him her eldest brother, น้า.
TEXT

คำอาคร

๑. ........................................ พ...

๒. ........................................ แกม

๓. ........................................ มาหาสำคก

๔. ........................................ (ส)มอบแก่

๕. ........................................ (ก) ตีก้าไก่ ๗ ๗

๖. ........................................ พระที่สัมฤทธิ์

๗. ........................................ เมืองสกุลใหญ่

๘. ........................................ ผูกโบกนางคำยี่

๙. ........................................ ทรงพระนิลเก็น

๑๐. ......................................... หนินครธง

๑๑. ......................................... เอกยอดพระ

๑๒. ......................................... หนน. เวลาท่านเป็นโลกnęก

๑๓. ................. เราลวงภูมิเยียว.. ประชำนามภาวะสงคราม

๑๔. ................. (พ) ราชพฤษภวิเศษ กรกิจที่สิ้นศุภ

๑๕. ................. จึงภูมิญญาภิปรณัสดาจึง.... ถวายใน

๑๖. ................. ชาวม่าเข้าที่ทางน้ำบานแก่นซึ่งมีเจริญรา

๑๗. ................. จก. ศรีวิศวกร项链พระพุทธชุบเจริญ

๑๘. ................. รัฐบาลบ้านกั้นใจให้ความรัฐปกครองพระ

๑๙. ................. มหาสงฆ์ชาวเขาขบพแล้วจึงไปตามหัว ชี.
๒๐. ......... ระดับชีววิทยาเฉพาะกิจพื้นที่กระชับสิ่งทวีชีววิทยา
๒๑. ......... พระท่านเร่ง ใช้หรือถึงชีววิทยาของมันชีววิทยา
๒๒. ......... รูปแบบของแท้ที่เป็นการกระชับสิ่งทวีชีววิทยา
๒๓. ......... บุพเพสั�ตว์ที่มีجماสังเขปที่จะถูกเลือกนั่น
๒๔. ......... ก้าวเรื่องเหล่า앰เนท ใช้เทคโนโลยีที่ดีที่สุด
๒๕. ......... ยุทธศาสตร์ทั้งหมดที่จะเกิดขึ้นพึงไทย
๒๖. ......... กำกับการเฉพาะเจาะจงในบริบทที่แตกต่าง
๒๗. ......... งบประมาณในบริบทรูปแบบที่แตกต่าง
๒๘. ......... ปราบกำกับการในเบื้องที่ที่ส่งผ่านข้อมูล
๒๙. ......... (ชุด) สตรีภัตตาธิการ ๓๔ ปี เบื้องต้นมีแผนส่งกำกับข้อมูล
๓๐. ทดแทนให้เสียงเป็นกลุ่มคนอื่น ที่เกี่ยวข้องกับภูมิ.
๓๑. แสดงคำมั่นใจต่อสถานะที่เรามีสังคมในพื้นที่(เป็นเจ้าของ)กิ
๓๒. ถูกสั่งการจ้างหน้าทางที่เชื่อมโยงสิ่งที่กิจวัสดุ.......
๓๓. แจ้งให้ที่พัก (สูง) แสดงสามารถเปลี่ยนแปลงน้ำมัน (ให้วัน)
๓๔. ไม่
๓๕. วางแผนการจัดหน้าทางหน้าของห้องบริการ
๓๖. ร่วมสมานศึกษาด้วยเป้าหมายทั้งหมดที่ควบคุม
๓๗. หา..............พักพินเทา (ทรง) พลูล..............
๓๘. .......... narath.............สวรรค์ในพยาบาล
๓๙. ณ..................สถานพยาบาล........ (น) ไปเดินรู้จักใหม่
๔๐. ...............รู้อินเฝ้าไปใส่........
Translation

[First two lines illegible except for a few letters at the end.]
[I/3-8.] ........................................ Mahāsakka
[rāja] ........................................ in the third month, on
the ninth day of the waxing moon9 ............................... 
..... kūṭi valued at 89 ......10 ............................ the
Ten Royal Qualities11 ................................. Mōani
Sukhodaiya, which .................................. Forest-Dwellers.

[I/8-15.] The Aunt, Princess Gām12, .............................. 
..... and also this holy statue. She obtained a stone of a thick-
ness of .............................. Feeling compassion for the
statue of the Lord, ............................. I took13 [the stone?],
and, after talking14 with the monk15 and with the Aunt Princess [Gām]
.............................., I cut it to make a parasol16 to shelter
[the statue] ........................... I gazed upon the statue, ... [the perfection]17
of pure wisdom, and said it was splendidly beautiful ..................18,
as if the image of the Buddha were about to converse and smile and
and laugh with [us].

9) Probably January 11, 1375; see above, p. 160.
10) There is no way of telling whether there was one kūṭi (hut for a monk to
live in) or several; perhaps the plural is more likely (I/5). Nor is there
any way to guess the value, since only the first two digits (89) survive.
11) The Dasabuddharājadharmā are the ten qualities which a king is supposed
to exhibit.
12) The name means 'gold'. In several passages, but not all, the lady’s name
is followed by the word yā (yla, ‘to do’, ‘to make’). It may be, therefore
that her name was Gām Yia; but in most cases yla seems to be a verb, or an
intensive auxiliary (‘did’ perform such and such an action). Cf. below,
note 23.
13) We have supplied the pronoun before ‘took’ (iā, I/11), since the speaker is
obviously the same man who speaks in the first person at I/13.
14) Conjecturally restoring ṣaḥ (I/11) as sāḥ.
15) Or monks. If the singular is intended, it may be the Thera Dharmavisāla
mentioned at I/32.
16) Perhaps the parasol (chattra) was like the spire of a Sukhodayan stupa—a tall
inverted cone, ringed with mouldings to represent the tiers of an honorific
parasol. It would be made mainly of masonry, covered with stucco, but the
lowest tier would be made of a thick stone to support the weight above it.
17) We conjecture that yā ... at I/13 should be restored as something like yā, ‘example’, yāvasu, ‘most excellent’, or yāvus, ‘most beautiful’.
18) sc. ‘and life-like’?
[I/15-16.] ........... Then, making the five-fold prostration, the Aunt Princess Gām said that all her elephants, horses and servants.

[I/16-21.] The Aunt Princess Gām, her heart filled with very great zeal, desired to build a vihāra as a residence for the image of the Lord Buddha, making it beautiful. The Aunt Princess Gām then sent word asking to consult with the Brahmā Thera saṅgharāja. The Brahmā Mahātherasaṅgharāja, saying he approved, sent for a thera named and a thera named Thera Ni. Then the Brahmā Mahātherasaṅgharāja himself came to the statue. He ordered a craftsman named Īvva to design a left eye and model it.

[I/22-23.] ........... This Forest Monastery had been falling into ruin since the time of the late Mōhādharmārajā. This merit to or: meritorious work of? the eldest brother, His Highness Brahmā Śrī Rāja-orasa, lord of this Mōañ Sukhodai.

[I/24-28.] [The Aunt Princess] Gām and the Ruler's Uncle assigned a certain overseer named Āyinda to clean the Buddha image, the stupa, and the cetiya, as well as the vihāra

19) peñcāṅgapratiśṭha (I/19), a prostration performed with forehead, forearms, and knees touching the ground.
20) sc. 'was presenting the monastery with'?
21) The lacuna at I/18, ending with ṯa, should perhaps be restored as or the like. The expression which we have rendered as 'making it... beautiful' takes the form of a wish in the original: 'May it (the vihāra) be (lasting and) beautiful!'
22) māriṣa (I/18); mū, 'to ask'; mi, 'to consider'; pi, 'to decide', to 'aim'. Or perhaps (a = o), 'to join', and b, 'to plan'.
23) rā (I/20), 'did come'. The word rā, 'to make', is used several times in this inscription as an emphatic auxiliary, which may best be omitted in translation. Cf. u, above, note 12.
24) sc. 'to inspect'?
25) Probably the statue was made of brick and stucco, and its left eye had been damaged. The craftsman was told to design (mū, literally 'to draw') a new left eye and to execute (mū, 'to make', 'to build') it in the proper material.
26) i (I/24), if that is the right reading; a possible meaning of the word is 'and', which fits the context.
27) ceti (I/25), i.e. cetiya. The word 'cetiya', though often used interchangeably with 'stupa', means any reminder of the Buddha, such as a bodhi tree, a Footprint, a stupa, or an image. In the present context it probably means the Footprint (see p. 170), since it can hardly mean either the statue or the stupa, both of which have just been mentioned.
assigned ten families as caretakers to sweep the monastery and to brush the ... [every] night and every morning, assigned one family to take food to the monks, and each person then ...

[I/28-37.] The Aunt Princess Gām built the vihāra in the year of the goat, Mahāsakarāja 1301, [Cu] lasakarāja 741, in the eleventh month, on the second day of the waning moon, Wednesday in the Khmer reckoning, a ‘plök sann’ day in the Tai reckoning, which was an extremely auspicious day, when the time of good omen arrived ... With hearts full of very great zeal to uplift the religion of the Lord Buddha, the Ruler's Uncle and the Aunt Princess Gām, and also the monk named Thera Dharmavisāla who receives almsfood from them ........ a single day.29 Then, having invited monks, theras and anutheras from all over the kingdom, they came to do homage to them for a day, and to present them with food in the āvāsa; the dedication ceremony was held; they offered the monks alms [consisting of] the Three Garments and the Accessories in full30; they listened to the Dharmma of the Daijāti, which is extremely sweet to hear; ............ xylophone, viṇa and conch-trumpets; fireworks ......................... refuge ............ heaven and nirvāṇa!

[I/37-40.] This place ........ in the future32 ........ [Whatever kings33] succeed to the throne, may they uphold34 ............ this Forest Monastery! May it not be ............ !

28) The word lâ, which usually means 'in', is sometimes used for 'of', especially in reference to exalted personages. This usage derives from Khmer, in which nāi is equivalent to Siamese ว่า. See Guesdon, Dictionnaire cambogien-français, II, 907; Coedes, Inscriptions du Cambodge, III, Paris, 1951, p. 20 note 7.
29) sc. they give him almsfood without missing a single day?
30) A monk’s Three Garments (kānā-kā, I/34; Pali, tiṅvāra) are the undercloth (antaravāsaka), the robe (uttarāsaṅga) and the shawl (sāṅghātī). The Eight Accessories (parikkhāra) consist of the Three Garments plus the following: almsbowl; razor or nail clipper; needle; belt; water-filter.
31) The last ten Jātakas.
32) Restoring นว ... (I/38) as นว. In spite of the lacunae, it is not difficult to recognize the passage I/37-40 as an exhortation to future rulers to maintain and protect the monastery which the Princess has just restored. Such exhortations frequently conclude inscriptions which record the founding or restoration of religious establishments.
33) Conjectural restoration; see the preceding note. (The word นว cannot refer to Princess Gām, as there is no room for the word น.)
34) ภ (I/37) is equivalent to ภ, 'uphold'.
The text of Face II, written in Pali verse (anuṭṭhupha), describes a Buddhapāda, a replica of the Buddha’s Footprint. The concluding passage transforms the description into a declaration of homage to the Buddhapāda, which was very likely recited at the ceremony when it was dedicated.

The Buddhapāda itself has disappeared, but it seems to be mentioned at I/25: it was doubtless the ‘cetiya’ which, together with the statue of the Buddha and the stupa, Princess Gām made provision to have cleaned regularly (see p. 168 and note 27).

Face II is not necessarily contemporary with Face I. We doubt if it should be attributed to the influence of the Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja who came to Sukhodaya from Rāmaṇīadesa in 1361 (called Mahāsāmi Mahāthera in Prince Vajirāvuḍh’s book). Inscription VI, which he composed, is in very good Pali, while the Pali of the present inscription, as the Prince Patriarch Vajiraṅgāna observed, is faulty. This kind of Pali reminds us more of the Mahāthera Sumana, a Sukhodayan monk who studied in Rāmaṇīadesa much earlier, and who established, the first Order of Forest-Dwelling Sihalabhikkhus at Sukhodaya in 1341 at the request of Lö Taî.

Mahādharmarāja I founded quite a number of Footprints, but it is unlikely that he founded this one, for he was too well acquainted with Pali literature for us to believe that he would install such a poorly written text beside it. Most likely it was founded before his accession, though not very long before. It is doubtful if the cult of Footprints was known at all at Sukhodaya before Sumana’s time, he and his companions probably introduced it there, for the traditions of the Sihalabhikkhus of Rāmaṇīadesa, among whom they studied,


36) Recueil des inscriptions du Siam, Vol. I, p. 111 ff. This inscription, which was apparently not known to Prince Vajirāvuḍh when he wrote his book, was brought to Bangkok in 1909.

37) See Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 15, 16, 41. For Sumana’s incompetence in Pali, see Professor Coedes’s comment at BEFEO XXV, p. 195, paragraph 5.
stemmed in large part from Pagan, where it is well attested as early as the 11th century.

We conclude that the Buddhapāda described in Face II was founded after Sumana's return to Sukkhdaya from Rāmaṇadesa, but before Mahādharmarāja I's accession. We have already concluded, on the evidence of Face I, that the monastery was founded before his accession. We now suggest that the Buddhapāda was founded at the same time as the monastery, at a date between 1341 and 1347.

If the Pali verses were recited when it was dedicated, they would naturally be inscribed on a stone slab which would then be set up beside it. Supposing this was the same slab shown in Fig. 1, which is possible but not certain, we should assume that Face II was inscribed between 1341 and 1347, and that Face I was left blank until 1379 when Princess Gaṣm used it to record her work in restoring the monastery.

It may be objected, however, that the writing on Face II occupies less than half the prepared surface, whereas that on Face I occupies practically all of it. Would the original founder of the monastery have selected such a large stone for a relatively short inscription, and then left so much of the surface unused? It seems more likely that he set up another slab, now lost, one face of which he inscribed with a record of his meritorious work in founding the monastery, and the other with the Pali verses describing the Buddhapāda. If that is right, we should assume that his inscription was broken or defaced by the time Princess Gaṣm restored the monastery, that she caused her own work to be recorded on a new slab (Fig. 1), and that she used the other side of this new slab (Fig. 2) to have the Pali text copied out from the old one.
TEXT

๑. ฯ ป้าเทสู ยสส ชาวคบ เข้า ถูกัน เมทธีโน่ เอกมะก
๒. มุ่ฟ เอกสู ศทสราว สมภัก สพุกขภาพ สมปน ศุ-
๓. สมุชาน สมกิศตส ปรากฏเสวาร สมกุกาน อิมาน จ
๔. ศิระฉุนใจ ใจ โศกุลิ นหนีภูมิภูมสัก อยุ ใส เจร ปราสาโท
๕. ฯ ยงุจรุ่มนานก เสวดมคุณใจ ขุดใจ จ ต้าว่้ามใจ จ วิชิณ
๖. ไมรักคุณภูมิสิ ปุ่มใ ทางมินิปี่ อู่ปั่น นิสคุก-
๗. ฯ ปุ่มมุ่น ตกใจ ง สมทุกิป ปุ่มบกมิปุ่ม ปุ่มแมงปู อ จ
๘. ที่ฝ่า ถูกว่าพา จ นฤทุข มาฤสิยชูนิمية จูโถ จ มหาค-
๙. (ปา) ทวิสทศสปริบุรกษา ทำกินนำภูมิสิกุจ ข ปริโส ถูกวุติ จ
๑๐. ยมก เหมมจลลุย ถูกวุรุษนุษ ถูกิโคน สทุกคุรุา มหาสลา
๑๑. ทำ สกตตลาดคาระะ ปฏูอาท ผู้สุปรากิ สว่างษาภิชช zu
๑๒. สุวัฒนศัยนำควริจ จ วะที อสุจิปสิโคะ วาระไ
๑๓. ปี สมพุทธ เท ราชสุภักผัน อุรุยา เกลาประสงค์โฬ ハウス
๑๔. ขาดกายใจ วาสุกิ เยาวาโอด กริโคน สุวัฒนสิกุจ.....
๑๕. ถูกกุสโตร โกยูจิ หนันวา ถูกมุชา กิยณไณี กิยณิเวปุกิ
ชวิตชีวิ-
๑๖. วกนามการ ตกมาตรสา โลกา พรุหุ่มโลกา จ ใสพส อยุจำขว-
๑๗. สกต ศัพตสมุนภาน อิมาน จ ปริวารานิ ถูกสุสด ถูกปลาย นามมิหัน ๆ
Text Romanized

(1) pādesu yassa jātani ekameka(2)mpi etesu sabbākārehi sampannanā tassa pādatale s'eva (4) sirivaccho ca sovatthi ānkuso c'eva pāśādo setachattaṇca khaggo ca (6) morahattakamuṇhisaṁ uppalam nilaratta(7)āca samuddo punnapāṭiṇca cakkavāla ca nakhattā catturo ca mabādi(9) (pā) dakkhiṇavatṭasaṅkho ca (10) yamakam hemamacchaṇca sattagaṅgā mahāselā pāṭāko suṃsu pāṭaṅki (12) suvanṇasabhagyaggo ca vāraṇo (13) pica sabbe te kelāsapabbato haṅso erāvaṇo karaviko .... (15) kukkusūro koīco kinṭaro kinṭaripakkhi chakāmāvacaraloṅkā aṭṭhuttara(17)sataṁ tassa parivārāṇi cakkassa
dve cakkāni mahēsino sahassarāṃ sanemikāṃ su(3)saṅṭhānaṁ saṁabhikaṁ sambhutani imāni ca nandivaṭṭavānāsakaṁ (5) ... āca38 vuddhamānakaṁ tālavaṇṭaṁ ca vijini patto dāma maṇīmpica padumampi tath'eva ca puṃṇaghato ca (8) himavā meru suriyacandimā dvisahassaparittakā sapariso cakkavatti ca cakka dhajjaṅca kumbhilo (11) tathā sattamabhāsarā suvaṇṇavālabijani (14) cākavāko ca vāsuki valāho-ass'uosatho-rājasaddena avhayā suvaṇṇabhamaro... (15) jivāṅji(16)vakāṇāmaka brahmālokā ca sūlaṃ maṅgalāni imāni ca cakkapādaṁ namāmihaṁ//40

38) For possible restorations of the lacuna at the beginning of II/5, see below, p. 180, no. 7.
39) For a possible restoration of the lacuna at the end of II/14, see below, p. 187, nos. 77, 78.
40) The ha is several times written as a ṣaṅgī over the consonant that follows: vataṅsakaṁ (line 4), ānkuso (ibid.), saṅkho (line 9), suṃsupāṭaṅki (line 11), haṅso (line 13); but it is written as a conjunct in gaṅgā (line 10), maṅgalāni (line 17). Maṇi, pāṭi and dhaja are construed as neuters (maṇīmpica, line 6; pūṭiṇca, line 7; dhajjaṅca, line 10).
On the footsole of the Great Sage, on each of whose feet there is a wheel having a thousand spokes, with tyre and hub, and in every way complete and well made, these things appear:

Sirivaccho and sovatthi, nandivatthta, vatañsakamp, ankusos as well as päsādo and ..., vuddhamañakañ and setachattam and khago and tālavanntam and vijinī, morahatthakañ, uñhisam, patto, dāma and also mañī, and uppalañ-nilarrattam and likewise paduman, samuddo and puñnapatti and puññaghato, himava and cakkavāla, nakkhattā, meru, suriyacandima and catro-mahādīpa, dvisahassaparittaka, and dakkhināvattasaṅkho and saparisisocakkavatti and yamakañ-hemamacchañ, cakka and dhaja, kumbhilo, sattagaṅga, mahāselā, likewise sattamahāsara, pātāko, sumsu, pātañki, suvañnavālabijani, suvaññasīha and byaggho and valāho-asso and likewise uposathovārañño, all (four) called by the name of King, kelāsapabbato, hañso and cākavāko, vāsukī, erāvaño, karaviko, suvaññabhamaro, ......, kukkusūro, koñco, harināva, catummukkhā, the birds kinnaro and kinnari, (the bird) named jivañjivaka, the six kāmāvacaraloka, and the sixteen brahmaloka.

These are the hundred and eight auspicious marks, and they are accessory to that wheel.

I make obeisance to the wheel-marked Foot.
Interpretation

In the Canonical accounts in the Dighanikāya—the Lakkhaṇa-suttanta and the Mahāpadānasuttanta—only one mark on the Buddha’s footsoles is mentioned: a wheel ‘with a thousand spokes, with tyre and hub, and in every way complete and well divided.’ The Commentarial literature, however, adds a lot of accessory marks. The Mahāpadānasuttanta-aṭṭhakathā, which we shall refer to as MASA, lists nearly 40 and implies that there are many others. The complete list of 108 is given in the Jinālaṅkāra-ṭīkā (abbrev.: JT). This work, a sub-commentary on the Pali poem Jinālaṅkāra or ‘Adornments of the Conqueror’, is thought to have been composed in Ceylon between the 8th and the 11th century.

JT evidently served as a guide for many generations of designers of carved or painted Footprints in Southeast Asia. As a rule the Footprints made at Pagan in Burma from the 11th to the 13th century (Fig. 3), and in Siam from the 14th century on (Fig 4), have the wheel as the most conspicuous mark, with the accessory marks placed around it in rectangular compartments arranged in rows (or, less often, in concentric circles). It seems the marks were based more on the lists in JT and similar texts than on direct imitation of any one model. While they are usually 108 in number, they are not necessarily placed in the same order; and indeed not all the marks are the same from one Footprint to another, for a fair number of the Pali terms on the list can be construed in more than one way.

The archeologist U Mya has made a detailed study of several stone Footprints carved at Pagan in the 11th and 12th century (e.g. Figs. 3-a, b), comparing the marks on them one by one with the list in JT, and with a similar list in the Anāgatavamsa-aṭṭhakathā (AVA). The latter, a commentary on the Anāgatavamsa or ‘History of the

Future, lists only 107 accessory marks, but is otherwise similar to JT, using either an identical or a synonymous term for almost every mark. U Mya gives the meaning of the terms as they are generally glossed in Burma, and shows that, when they are understood in this way, the marks on the Footprints correspond very closely to them. In themselves, as he observes, a good many of these terms are ambiguous: without the glosses and the Footprints to refer to, he would often have been left in doubt as to their interpretation. Some of the terms are construed in the Burma glosses as compounds referring to a single mark, but could equally well be split up and construed as referring to more than one; and a name that meant one sort of object to the author of JT might mean another sort to the designer of a Footprint. Such differences in interpretation and depiction would make it easy for divergent traditions to grow up at different times and places.

The later Siamese tradition, while agreeing with the Burmese in the main, differs from it in a number of instances. The two best-known texts in Siam that deal with the marks on the Buddha’s footsoles were both composed in Bangkok in the 19th century. The first, entitled Brahma Purusalaksana, was composed at Vat Rajapura in 1814 by Samtec Brahma Vanaratta (abbrev. SV), who later became Sangharaja and resided at Vat Mahadhata. The second, entitled Brah Paṭhamasambodhikathā, was composed at Vat Jetubanarama in 1845 by the Prince Patriarch Paramanujita Jinorasa (abbrev.: PJ). The first is said to be based on JT, while the sources of the second are not given.

SV gives a list of the marks in Pali, with a gloss in Siamese for each; PJ gives them in Siamese only. They are not numbered in either SV or PJ, but we have assigned them numbers as best we could.

45) Both will be found in VARAPRATI, Bangkok, 1958, printed for Vat Caroon Sukhāravaharavihāra, Pan Gāndhi, Samudrasaṅgrāma; on sale at the National Library in Bangkok.
SV omits four of JT's terms, but he manages to keep the total at 108 by splitting three others, and adding a new one of his own.\footnote{46} He usually follows JT's terminology, but in a few cases prefers AVA. The majority of his glosses are the same in meaning as those given by U Mya, or nearly so, but there are a few notable exceptions.\footnote{47}

Most of the terms in PJ's list are identifiable as translations of those in JT, but there are several discrepancies, and not all the interpretations agree with those in U Mya or SV. In spite of a number of additions and omissions, the total remains at 108 if certain 'composite' marks are counted as single ones.\footnote{48}

While the list in JT was evidently considered the most authoritative, at least in learned circles, it was certainly not the only one used as a guide in designing Footprints. JT's terminology is too ornamental and complex to be easily committed to memory; and a simplified paraphrase in mnemonic verse might serve more readily.

\footnote{46} We base this calculation on the printed edition, which admittedly contains some imperfections (the most glaring one may be corrected by eliminating the words umbnails of figures from the fourth line of p. 5). SV omits the following: aṅkusa (No. 8 on U Mya's list), patta (No. 17), mañj, (No. 18), nakkhatta (No. 33); but he apparently counts 'the four great continents surrounded by small islands' (U Mya, 34-37) as five marks (SV 31-35) by separating the 'small islands' from the four continents, and counts dhajapati (U Mya, 65) as two marks (SV 63, 64); he splits catumukha-suvāṇanāvā (golden boat with four figureheads', U Mya 78) into two marks, catumukhamahābrahma, 'Brahmā with four faces' (SV 77) and suvaṇḍanāvā, 'golden boat' (SV 78); and he adds, after punnagāto and pūnāpāti (SV 22, 23), suvaṇḍakalalasampūnāpattā (SV 24), which he glosses as a bowl full of golden husks'. Some of the other divergencies are foreshadowed by U Mya (loc. cit., pp. 328-330).

\footnote{47} See below, note

\footnote{48} PJ omits one of JT's marks (mañj, no. 18); adds a chair (PJ 63), a tortoise (78) and a water-cock (86); makes the elephant Upoṣathachaddantahaththi-rajā (U Mya no. 72) into two marks, the elephant Upoṣatha (PJ 73) and the elephant Chaddanta (PJ 74); and (like SV) splits catumukha-suvāṇanāvā (U Mya 78) into two (PJ 76, 77; cf. SV 77, 78). (For the last two interpretations, cf. U Mya, loc. cit., pp. 329-330.) In order to keep the total down to 108, the four continents with their surrounding islands must be counted as a single mark; and the sun and moon must also be counted as only one, as if 'sun-and-moon.'
Such a paraphrase seems to have guided the designer of the Buddhapāda at the Araññaka monastery, and to have been embodied in Face II of our inscription. The person who supervised the engraving of the inscription which was set up beside the Buddhapāda (either Face II itself, or the inscription of which Face II is a copy) was probably not the author of the text. While he was not a very good Pali scholar, we cannot say whether the author was any better, because we have not seen this particular text anywhere else. But it was doubtless well known in the 14th century, and may have guided the designers of Footprints in Rāmaññadesa and elsewhere over a long period of time.

In trying to interpret the names of the marks in Face II we are hampered by the disappearance of the Buddhapāda it describes. That is why, in our translation (p. 174), we have left them in the same form the inscription gives, preferring to comment on them below. Disregarding small variations in spelling, most of the terms on our list—whatever the author may have intended them to mean—are the same as those on U Mya’s list or synonymous with them, but there are several exceptions. Some of those on U Mya’s list are lacking in ours, and vice versa. Those which are similar are given in a different order, though not completely different, as several groups of names follow the same sequence as in JT.

In the list that follows, we have numbered the terms on Face II for convenience, in the order in which they occur; but without any conviction that we have divided them properly; the scribe’s use of case-endings, or disregard of them, seems to be no criterion for determining when a given combination of words is to be construed as compound and when it should be split up.

It is hard to say which set of interpretations—the Burmese or the Siamese—corresponds more closely to the intentions of the person who composed the text embodied in Face II. In the absence of the Buddhapāda which it describes, the best we can do is to compare the terms on Face II with U Mya’s results, and with the meanings given in SV and PJ when they differ substantially from U Mya, adding in
some cases the glosses given by Mahā Sēṇ Manavidūra (abbrev.: SM) in his Siamese translation of Face II (Śīlpākara, XII/3, p. 102).

Here are the names of the marks in Face II, with English equivalents;\(^{49}\) comparisons with the names in JT and AVA as interpreted by U Mya; references to SV and PJ; and comparisons with several to glosses given by Mahā Sēṇ Manavidūra (abbrev.: SM) in his Siamese translation of the Pali text (Śīlpākara, XII/3, p. 102).

[1] sirivaccho. Equivalent to Skt. śrivatsa, an auspicious mark or curl of hair on the breast, etc.; represented in various forms. U Mya, no. 2, sirivaccha; see his discussion in *A Note on the Buddha's Foot-prints in Burma*, loc. cit., p. 327. — SV no. 2, sirivaccho, glossed as 'a mirror'; PJ no. 2, 'a mirror'; SM glosses the term as विन्दु, i.e. 'a goddess', but adds that, according to some, it means a mirror, while according to others it means a goddess looking into a mirror.

[2] sovatthi. An auspicious mark. U Mya, no. 4, sovatthika. Discussion by U Mya, ibid.; glossed in the Burmese nissayas as 'three folds in the neck' or 'three whorls [of a spiral?]', and shown in the Burma Footprints cited by him as 'a spirally shaped object in three whorls tapering to the top', or else 'three crescent-shaped objects'. U Mya is tempted to take the word sovatthika as the Pali equivalent of Skt. svastika, but hesitates because of the Burmese nissayas and the form of the mark on the Burma Footprints. Despite his hesitation, however, it seems necessary to equate sovatthika with Skt. svastika, any kind of lucky object or mark, more particularly the svastika which has the form of a Greek cross with the arms bent (usually to the right); for the etymology, see *Pali Text Society Dictionary*, s.v. sovatthika. Another form of sovatthika is mentioned in Buddhādatta Mahāthera's *Concise Pali-English Dictionary* (p. 291), where the word is glossed as: 'a svastika; a mark like an S on a cobra's hood.' — SV no. 4, sovatthikā, glossed as निर्म, i.e. a necklace, bracelet or sash; PJ no. 4, निर्म. SM combines sovatthi with the following term, making them into a single mark, sovatthi-nandivāṭṭa, which he glosses as सृष्टिकामायिन्तु, i.e. a svastika with arms turning to the right.

\(^{49}\) We are indebted to Professor Kamaleswar Bhattacharya, of the Centre National de Recherche Scientifique of Paris, for much help in analyzing these terms.
[3] nandivatā. For nandiyāvattā, ‘turning auspiciously’ (i.e. to the right; see P.T.S. Dict., s.v. nandi). U Mya, no. 3, nandiyāvattā; discussion, loc. cit., p. 327; an auspicious object made in the form of a flower (a periwinkle?) with petals turning to the right, or in the form of a crow’s foot; a rosette. — SV no. 3, croft, PJ no. 3, ḍvamā, a gardenia. For SM’s construction, see the preceding.

[4] vatamsakaṃ. The PTS Dictionary glosses this word as a kind of head ornament, perhaps an ear-ring, or a garland worn around the forehead; Buddhadatta’s Concise Pali-English Dictionary glosses it as a wreath for the head. U Mya, no. 5: vatamsaka, an ear-ornament. — SV no. 5: vatamsakaṃ, an ear-ring; PJ no. 5, ḍvam, i.e. an ornament of gold or silver chains worn from both shoulders across the breast; SM, a wreath for the head.


[7] . . . . (illegible). The editor of the inscription (Śilpakara, XII/3, p. 99) restores the lacuna as 有意义 and reads: jīvañca (=jīvam+ca); but the term seems out of place here, as it is given in more complete form at II/15-16, jīvañjivaka (no. 85). SM, accepting the editor’s reconstruction jīvañca at II/5, glosses jīvam as जिवान, i.e. a water cock (gallicrex cinereus) or a pheasant-tailed jacana (hydrophasianus chirurgus); cf. PJ no. 86. For the moment, we prefer to leave the lacuna unsolved; but see below (p. 188).

[8] vuddhamānakam. For vaḍḍhamānakam, from vaḍḍhati, to prosper; cf. Skt. varṣhamāna, which has numerous meanings, including a dish or platter, a mystical figure or diagram, a palace or temple built in the form of such a diagram, the castor-oil plant, and the sweet citron. U Mya no. 6, vaḍḍhamānakā, generally understood as a receptacle or cup for food, though at least one Burma authority considers that vaḍḍhamāna means a kind of headdress for a man. — SV no. 6, vaḍḍhamānam, glossed as वट्ठड्डहमान, flower (s) used as
an ornament; PJ no. 6, a golden dish; SM, vuḍḍhāmānakām, gardenia (s).


[11] tālavaṇṭaṃ. The Concise P.-E. Dict. defines the word as a fan, literally the stem of a palm-leaf, the word being a corruption of tālavaṭṭa, a circle made of palm-leaf; tāla is the palmyra tree, *borassus flabelliformis* (P.T.S. Dict., p. 299). U Mya no. 13, a talipot fan. — SV no. 12; PJ no. 14; SM tālavaṇṭaṃ, a cupboard for sugar-palm fruits, or a cupboard with sugar-palm fruits.

[12] vijini. For vijani, a fan. Corresponds to JT no. 15, cāmara (lacking in AVA). Cāmara, from camara, the yak or *bos grunniens*, is a yak’s tail used as a fly whisk. U Mya no. 15. As U Mya says (loc. cit., p. 328), the MASA uses the term vālibijani, for it, which according to the ṭika, means cāmarivāla, yak’s tail. U Mya adds that vālabijani, or a term nearly equivalent to it, occurs twice in JT (no. 15, and again at no. 67), but only once in the lists supplied by MASA and AVA. — SV no. 14, cāmaraṃ, fan made of yak’s hair; PJ no. 16; SM, vijani, a fan.


[14] uṇhisam. For uṇhīsaṃ, a turban (=Skt. uṣṇīsa). U Mya no. 16, a headdress. — SV no. 15, uṇhīsaṃ, glossed as uṇqo, a crown; PJ no. 17, a crown; SM, a turban or crown.

[16] dāma. A garland. U Mya no. 19, sumanadāma, a garland. — SV no. 16, sumanadāma, a garland of jasmine; PJ no.19, a bunch of jasmine; for SM, see the following entry.

[17] manī. A jewel. U Mya no. 18; U Mya observes that manī comes before patta in MASA, and the designers of some Burma Footprints, evidently taking manipatta as a compound signifying a single mark, a 'jewel-cup' or 'jewel-bowl', have represented it so. — Lacking in SV and PJ. SM takes manī as the second element in a compound with the preceding, reads ‘dāmamanī’, and glosses as नेलमाना, a string of jewels.

[18-20] uppalaṁ nilarattāṇca padumampi. ‘A blue and a red water-lily, and also a lotus.’ We can see no way to make this expression into more than three sorts of plant, though we might guess, by analogy with all the other lists, that five were intended; U Mya, nos. 20-24, niluppala, rattuppala, rattapaduma, punḍharika (JT); rattuppala, setuppala, niluppala, rattapunḍharika, setapunḍharika (AVA). Though both these lists confuse the lotus with the water-lily, the intent is clear enough. It is more coherently expressed in MASA: niluppala, rattuppala, setuppala, paduma, punḍarika (see U Mya, loc. cit., p. 323), a blue, a red and a white water-lily; a (pink) lotus and a white lotus. — SV, nos. 17-21, gives niluppalaṁ, setuppalaṁ, rattuppalaṁ, rattapadumam, setapadumam, which he glosses as: a green (i.e. blue) water-lily, a white water-lily, a red water-lily, a red (i.e. pink) lotus, and a white lotus. PJ, nos. 20-24, follows SV.

[21] samuddo. An ocean. U Mya, no. 27. — SV no. 25; PJ, no. 27 (despite the singular, samuddo, PJ translates: नासुधूरी, ‘the four great oceans’).

[22] puṇḍapāti. A full bowl or dish. U Mya, no. 26, puṇḍapatta (JT), puṇḍapāti, (AVA), which U Mya glosses as a full cup. — SV no. 23: puṇḍapāthi, glossed as a dish full of water; PJ no. 26, a dish full of water.
[23] puṇṇaghaṭo. A full pot, a vase of plenty. U Mya, no. 25, puṇṇakalasa (JT), puṇṇaghaṭa (AVA), a full vase. — SV no. 22: puṇṇaghaṭo, glossed as a pot full of water; PJ no. 25. Note. SV no. 24 (following SV 22, puṇṇaghaṭo, and SV 23, puṇṇapaṭhi, is suvaṇṇakalasampuṇṇapattām, glossed as puṇṇapatti (pātra), 'a bowl (pātra) full of golden husks'. This unexpected intrusion, which is lacking in PJ and all other lists known to us, is hard to explain unless we suppose it is a repetition, in garbled form, of the two preceding marks, for which SV follows AVA's terminology in reverse (SV 22 puṇṇapatti = AVA punnapati, U Mya no. 26; SV 23, puṇṇaghaṭo = AVA puṇṇaghaṭa, U Mya 25). SV may then have decided that it was necessary to insert another, suvaṇṇakalasampuṇṇapattām (SV 24), based on his (partly false) reading of JT's puṇṇakalasaṃ (U Mya 25), puṇṇapattām (U Mya 26), and to add a gloss to explain it. (Pali kala, 'mud', 'residue' etc., whence Siamese naa, 'semen', interpreted as sàthi, 'rind, husk, bark, shell, peelings').

[24] himavā. The Buddhist fairyland, supposed to be located in the Himālayas. U Mya, no. 29, himavantapabbata (JT), himavā (AVA). — SV no. 27: himavantapabbato, the Himavanta mountain. PJ no. 29 has himavā, the Himavanta forest.

[25] cakkavāḷa. The circle of rocks surrounding the earth; a world-circle; a universe. U Mya, no. 28, cakkavāḷapabbata (JT), cakkavāḷa (AVA). — SV no. 26: cakkavāḷapabbato; PJ no. 28, the Cakravāḷa mountain range.


[27] meru. Mount Meru, the highest mountain in the world. U Mya, no. 30: merupabbata (JT), meru (AVA). — SV no. 28: merupabbato; PJ no. 30, Mount Sineru.

[30-34] caturo mahādīpā dvisaḥassaporittakā. The four great continents, surrounded by 2000 small islands. U Mya, nos. 34-37, saparivāra-catumahādīpā (JT); U Mya, loc. cit., p. 329, says that it is clear from JT and AVA, as well as MASA, that these marks should be counted as four, each consisting of one continent with its neighboring islands, but in the Footprints they often count as five. — SV nos. 31-35, saparivāra-catumahādīpā; PJ no. 33.

[35] dakkhināvattasaṅkho. A conch shell whose volutes turn to the right (i.e. clockwise, the auspicious direction). U Mya no. 39, dakkhināvattasetasaṅkha. — SV no. 37; PJ no. 35.

[36] saparisocakkavatti. A cakravartin (world monarch) with his suite. U Mya, no. 38, saparivāro sattaratanasamaṅgi cakkavatti (JT), a cakravartin surrounded by his seven treasures; saparisocakkavatti (AVA). — SV no. 36, sapariso sattaratanasamaṅgi cakkavatti; PJ no. 34.

[37] yamakām hemamaccham. A pair of golden fishes. U Mya, no. 40, suvaṇṇamacchayugalām (JT, AVA), a pair of golden fishes. — SV no. 38, suvaṇṇamacchayugalaṃ; PJ (twice), nos. 8 and 36 (presumably based on the order given in MASA and JT respectively).

[38] cakka. A wheel or discus (one of the principal treasures of the cakravartin). U Mya, no. 41, cakkāvudham (JT), a discus used as a weapon; cakka (AVA). — SV no. 39, cakkāvudham; PJ no. 37 аркак, a pair of cakras.

[39] dhajja. A flag. Cf. below, no. 62, paṭāko, a flag. U Mya, no. 65, dhajapāṭāka (JT, AVA). U Mya (loc. cit., p. 329) says that dhajapāṭāka is represented in the Footprints as two flags in one compartment. In the illustrations accompanying U Mya’s article (loc. cit., pl. CLIII a, b) one of the flags is a banner, attached to the side of its staff; the other is a pennant, floating downward from the curved upper end of its staff. It is not clear which is dhaja and which is paṭāka; the dictionaries do not help, but say that the two words are often put together into a compound. — SV nos. 63, 64: dhaja-
paṭākam, glossed as two separate things, पवान and मुर्गी; PJ no. 61: पवानसमुद्रतात्त्वः

[40] kumbhilo. A crocodile. U Mya, no. 64: suṃsumāra, literally 'child-killing', i.s. a crocodile (see P.T.S. Dict., p. 715.) — SV no. 62: suṃsumārarāja; PJ no. 60.


[48-54] mahāselā. The (seven) great mountains, i.e. the seven concentric mountain ranges, separated by seven seas, surrounding Mount Meru. U Mya, nos. 49-55, sattakulapabbatā (JṬ), sattamahāselā (AVA). — SV nos. 47-53, sattakulapabbatā; PJ nos. 52-58.

[55-61] sattamahasara. The seven great lakes, i.e. the seas separating the seven great mountain ranges, or else perhaps the seven great lakes of the Himavā. U Mya, nos. 56-62, sattasidantasāgarā (JṬ), sattamahasara (AVA). — SV nos. 54-60, sattasīdaṇtasāgarā; PJ 45-51.


[63] suṃsu? The reading is doubtful, and we cannot equate this term with any on the other lists. SM glosses it as शमसु, a shark, but we cannot find it in the dictionaries. The P.T.S. Dict. (p. 715, s.v. suṃsumāra) equates suṃsu with Skt. शिशु, a child. In the present context the word, whatever it may be, should perhaps be construed as part of a compound with the following.


A.B. Griswold and Prasert Na Nagara

No. 12, supra. — SV no. 66, suvaṇṇabālalavijjani; lacking in PJ? (but cf. his no 16).

[66-69] suvaṇṇasihabyaggho ca valaho-ass 'uosathovāraṇopica sabbe te rājasaddena avhayā. ‘The golden lion and tiger, the horse Valāha, and the elephant Uposatha, all called by the name of King’. U Mya, nos. 69-72: sīharājā, lion king; byaggarājā, tiger king; valāhaka assarājā (JT) or valāhoassarājā (AVA), Valāha or Valāhaka king of horses; uposathachaddantahathirājā (JT) or uposathavāranarājā (AVA), Uposathachaddanta or Uposatha king of elephants (for the last, cf. U Mya’s remarks, loc. cit., p. 329.) — SV 68-71: sīharājā, byaggarājā, balāhako-assarājā, uposathahatthirājā; PJ 65 sīharājā, 70 byaggarājā, 68 Balāhaka king of horses; 73 Uposatha king of elephants; 74 Chaddanta king of elephants (cf. note 48).

[70] kelāsapabbato. Mount Kailāsa (the paradise of Śiva). U Mya, no. 68, kelāsapabbata. — SV no. 67, kelāsapabbato; PJ, no. 64.

[71] haṅso. A haṅsa or wild goose. U Mya, no. 74, haṃsarājā (JT, AVA); cf. U Mya no. 63, where JT gives the redundant ‘suvaṇṇahamsarājā’ while AVA gives, rightly, suvaṇṇarājā. — SV no. 61, suvaṇṇahamsarājā: PJ no. 70.

[72] cākavāko. For cakkavāka, the ruddy goose (anas casarca). U Mya, no. 85, cakkavākarājā, ruddy goose king. — SV no. 86, cakāvākarājā; PJ no. 85, annaṃgaram.

[73] vāsuki. Vāsuki (the nāga king). U Mya, no. 73: vāsukīnāgarājā (JT) or Bāsuki-uragarājā (AVA), Vāsuki king of serpents. — SV no. 72, bāsukīnāgarājā; PJ no. 69.

[74] erāvaṇo. Indra’s three-headed elephant. U Mya, no 76, erāvaṇahatthirājā (JT) or erāvaṇonāgarājā (AVA), Erāvaṇa, the elephant king. — SV no. 75, erāvaṇṇahatthirājā, Erāvaṇa king of elephants; PJ no. 67, the elephant Erāvaṇa.

[75] karaviko. The Indian cuckoo. U Mya, no. 82 — SV no. 82, karaviko, glossed as ‘the kāraveka bird’; PJ 82, translates accordingly.
[76] suvaṇṇabhamaro. A golden bee. Not found in JT, AVA or SV, this term seems to be either a false reading, or a substitute, for suvaṇṇamakaro, golden makara (JT, no. 77), which does not appear elsewhere on our list. See U mya, no. 77, suvaṇṇamakara; SV 76, suvaṇṇamaṅkaro; PJ 79, mukkusa, golden makara. Of uncertain relevance is PJ 78, mukkusa, a golden tortoise, apparently a translation of some such term as suvaṇṇakacchapo, of which no equivalent is found in JT, AVA or SV. SM accepts the reading suvaṇṇabhamaro, and glosses the term as mukkusa, golden carpenter-bee.

[77] ...... (lacuna). The editor of the inscription proposes no reconstruction. SV 73, suvaṇṇaraja.

[78] ...... (lacuna). The editor of the inscription proposes no reconstruction. SV 74, usabharaja.

[79] kukkusūro. A (bird with a) spotted breast? (kukkus’uro, from kukkusa, spotted, and uro, breast). SM glosses kukkusuro as hAMaM, jungle-fowl, wild cock. No obvious equivalent found in JT, AVA, or SV; but PJ also has mukkusa (no. 71). Perhaps a false reading? cf. mayūro (U Mya 83, mayūrarāja, peacock king; SV 83, mayūrarāja, PJ 84, mayūra, a peacock), not found elsewhere in Face II of our inscription.

[80] koṇico. A heron. U Mya, no. 84, koṇcarāja (JT, AVA), a heron king. —— SV 84, koṇcarāja; PJ 83, mukkusa, i.e. a sarus crane, grus antigone; SM glosses koṇico as mukkusa.

[81] harināvā. A golden boat. For JT and AVA suvaṇṇanāvā, cf, the next entry. —— SV 78, suvaṇṇanāvā, a golden boat; PJ 77. SM glosses harināvā as mukkusa, a golden boat.

[82] catummukkha. (Brahmā with) four faces. Glossed by SM as mukkusa, a mukkha, ‘Mahābrahma with four faces,’ SV 77, catummukha-mahābrahma, Mahābrahma with four faces; PJ 76. Note. U Mya, no. 78, combines this term with the preceding, and gives: catummukha suvaṇṇanāvā (JT), catummukkhaṇi suvaṇṇanāvā (AVA), a golden boat with four bows. We take it that JT and AVA mean a gilded barge with a quadruple figurehead, possibly a figurehead in the form of
Brahmā with four faces. In any case, according to U Mya (loc. cit., p. 330) this should be only one mark, and that is how it was shown in the Footprints carved at Pagan in the 11th-12th century. In some later Footprints, U Mya says, this mark is treated as two: a boat in one compartment, and four heads in another; and he adds that one author considers, erroneously, that catumukha or catumukhāni should be represented by a figure of Brahmā with four heads (sc. four faces). We observe that this 'erroneous' interpretation was evidently accepted by the author of our text; and the tradition found its way into SV and PJ.

(83, 84) kinnaro-kinnari-pakkhi. The birds kinnara and kinnari (the male and female, respectively, of the mythical creature which is part bird and part human in form). U Mya 80, kimpurisa (JT) or kinnaro (AVA); 81, kinnari. —— SV 80-81, kimpuriso; kinnari; PJ 80, 81.

[85] jivanjivakanamakā. (The bird) named jivanjivaka. Glossed by SM as unnu~nltH, i.e. ferruginous wood partridge, caloperdix oculea, or red-crested hill-partridge, rollulus rouloul. The P.T.S. Dict. glosses jivanjivaka as the name of a bird, a sort of pheasant (or partridge?) which utters a not sounding like 'jivan jiva;' not found in the Concise P.-E. Dict. —— U Mya, no. 86, jivanjivakarājā (JT), jivanjivakarājā (AVA), a pheasant king. —— SV 85, jivanjivakarājā, glossed as unnu~nltH, cf. PJ 86, unnu~n, the water-cock, gallicrex cinereus.

[86-91] chakamāvacarālokā. The six realms (avacarālokā) of desire (kāma), i.e. the six deva heavens. U Mya, nos. 87-92, chadevalokā (JT) or chakamāvacaradevalokā (AVA), six devalokas or heavens. —— SV 87-92, chadevalokā; PJ 87-92, chakamābacaradevalokā.

Fig. 1. The Inscription of Vat Trabăn Jăn Phoak, Face I.
1 a. Face I.
1 b. Face I, upper portion.
Fig. 2. The Inscription of Việt Trùng Jän Phöak, Face II.
Fig. 3. Drawings of two stone Footprints from Pagán. After U Mya, ASIAR 1930-34, Pl. CLIII.
3 a. From the Lokananda.
3 b. From the Shwézigón.
Fig. 4. Footprint, formerly in the Văn Như Museum, Bangkok. Length, 1.54 m.; width, 58 cm. After Fournereau, *Le Siam Ancien*, Paris, 1895, Pl. XXI.