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An inscribed stone slab, now in the Manuscript and Inscription Division of the National Library at Bangkok, was discovered at an unrecorded date among the ruins of a monastery now known as Vāṭ Jāṅ Lōm (วัดจำลอง), outside the walled city of Sukhodaya. The stone, which is 1.70 m. high, 36 cm. wide and 18 cm. thick, is inscribed on both faces and one of the edges. The text is in Siamese, written in Sukhodayan characters of the 14th century. A transcript into modern Siamese letters by Mr Prasāra Puñpragôn is published in Silpākara, X/1, together with a version in modernized spelling and a short glossary.

The inscription records the founding of the monastery, and the accomplishment of other meritorious works, by a man called ‘the Foster-Father Sai Tām,’ พระเจ้า (I/6, III/12), i.e. พระเจ้า ‘Sai’ means he was the fourth son of his father, and his personal name was Tām (ตํ้า), ‘black’. Though the expression ṣī (ใน) is unusual, it obviously means ‘foster-father’, because we are told at II/34 and III/13 that he was the husband of ‘the Foster-Mother Det’ พระเจ้า ‘Here, since it is used without further qualification, it presumably means that Lady Det had been the wet-nurse or foster-mother of the ruler of Sukhodaya. The reference at II/33 f., in which her spirit is included among those whom the Foster-Father helped (by transferring a share of his merits to them), shows that she died before the inscription was composed. There can be little doubt that it was composed by the Foster-Father himself, though it always refers to him in the third person.

The main purpose of practically all the Sukhodayan inscriptions, no matter how much additional information they may give, is to commemorate a ceremony which accompanied some specific act, such
as the installation of a throne, an oath of friendship between two rulers, the promulgation of a law, the exoneration of a monk who had been falsely accused, the founding or dedication of a monastery or of a cetiya, vihāra or statue, or some other donation to religion. When it was the founding or dedication of a monastery, the inscription would naturally be set up near the entrance, so that anyone entering it would know whose 'meritorious action' it sprang from. The monastery founded by the Foster-Father is of course that in whose ruins it was found, now known as Vat Jān Lôm.

The opening date, which comes at 1/3 ff., just after the exordium, is Wednesday, the full-moon day of the sixth month, B.E. 1927, year of the rat; in other words the day of the great Buddhist festival of Visākhāpūjā, C.S. 746, year of the rat, Mr Roger Billard of the Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, to whom we are indebted for calculating this date, informs us that it corresponds to Wednesday, May 4, 1384 A.D. (Julian).

This is almost certainly the date when the monastery was dedicated, though the text does not actually say so. As we learn at 1/36 f., the Foster-Father had founded it in the fifth month in a year of the serpent. No numeral is given for that year, but it must have been the nearest year of the serpent preceding C.S. 746, namely C.S. 739 or A.D. 1377. Seven years is an unusually long time to elapse between the founding and the dedication of a monastery. It may have taken the Foster-Father all that time to finish building and equipping it.

In 1384, in connection with the dedication ceremony, the Foster-Father took the 'great resolve' to attain Buddhahood in some future incarnation. After telling us about this (I/3-8), he says he will give an account of the moral virtues, energy and wisdom which are required to attain such a goal. What he actually gives us from here on is his autobiography, with the chief emphasis on the works of merit he has performed during the course of his life.

First he skips far backward in time to tell us that, when the Mahāsangharāja came to teach (at Sukhodaya), Samtec Mahādharr-
marājā gave up his throne and went to be ordained as a monk at the Mango Grove; whereupon the earth quaked (I/10 ff.).

Though no date is given for these events, they are well known to us from other sources.

In 1361, as we know from Inscriptions IV and V, Mahādhammarājā I (Liḍaiya, Li Tat) invited an eminent monk from Bann (μυη, i.e. ￼￼; near Martaban in Lower Burma) to come and settle at Sukhodaya. This monk, who is designated only by his title Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja, was apparently a Môn. He had studied in Ceylon; he had a thorough knowledge of the Tipiṭaka (Inscr. IV, II/13; Inscr. V, II/20); and his linguistic competence can be judged from the graceful Pali verses he composed in honor of Mahādhammarājā I (Inscription VI). The King received him with great honor, took him to the Monastery of the Mango Grove (No. 26 on Map 3, JSS LVII/1, p. 34) to spend the three months of the rainy season in retreat. At the end of that time, on the evening of Wednesday September 22, 1361 A.D. (Julian), after giving a festival for the inauguration of a great statue of the Buddha at the Royal Palace, the King invited the Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja and all the monks to enter the palace, where he requested ordination as a saṃānera. Donning the yellow robe, he took the ‘great resolve’ to become a Buddha in some future life, whereupon the earth quaked in acknowledgment of his vow. After being ordained as a saṃānera, he proceeded on foot all the way to the Mango Grove. There, as we

1) For these events see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 35-37; a correction is required at lines 19-20, p. 35: instead of ‘the 23rd day of the month of kārtika, M.S. 1283, i.e. in November 1361,’ read: ‘the 23rd day of a month whose designation is illegible, M.S. 1283, corresponding to September 22, 1361.’ We are much indebted to Mr. Roger Billard for calculating this date for us. It is given in Khmer in Inscription IV as Wednesday the 8th day of the waning moon, in the rksa of Punaṛvasu, 1283 saka, year of the ox (II/11). It is given in Siamese in Inscription V as Wednesday, a ‘rvah plau’ day in the Tai reckoning, pū (nar) bhasunakṣattra, towards evening, 1905 years or 695, 601 days after the Buddha entered nirvāṇa (II/23 f.). Mr. Billard informs us that all the elements of these dates correspond to Wednesday September 22, 1361 A.D. (Julian), and make the date a certainty. He adds that the conjectural reading of the name of the month as ‘kattika’ in Inscription VI (I/2) does not fit with the other information.
know from Inscription VI, he received the upasampada as a bhikkhu the next day. We do not know how long he remained a monk; it was probably at least three months, perhaps six; after that he returned to lay life and remounted the throne.

While the King was still at the Mango Grove, as we learn from the present inscription (I/17 f.), the Foster-Father joined him and had himself ordained at the same place. He too returned to lay life later.

After Mahādhamarājā's death, the Foster-Father again became a monk, this time in a monastery which was headed by the Mahāthera Buddhāsāgara, and distributed the merit accruing from his pious act to his father and mother, his brothers and sisters, and all his deceased relatives (I/20-26). This may give us a clue to his own identity. The recently deceased Mahādhamarājā I would certainly be one of the chief recipients of the distribution; as he is not specifically mentioned as such, we may assume that the Foster-Father was either his brother or his son; and as the inscription seems to imply that he was Mahādhamarājā I's near-contemporary, we are inclined to think he was his brother, or at least his half-brother. It is a pity that no date is given for Mahādhamarājā I's death; we know from other sources that it occurred some time between 1368 and 1374, but it would have been helpful if we could pinpoint it. At that date, whatever it may have been, he was succeeded by his son Mahādhamarājā II, who was probably born in 1352.

Very likely Mahādhamarājā II was nursed as a child by 'the Foster-Mother Dēt', and in his boyhood his education may have been taken in charge by her husband the 'Foster-Father', especially during the 'seven years' (beginning some time between 1362 and 1364) when his own father was absent at Būpuloka.

2) Perhaps the same Buddhāsāgara who is mentioned in the Asokārāma inscription; see JSS LVII/1, pp. 46 and 55.
3) See JSS LVII/1, p. 50, note 54.
4) For the probable dates of Mahādhamarājā I's sojourn at Būpuloka, see Griswold, Toward a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 38.
Upon the death of 'Mahādevī', the inscription tells us, the Foster-Father again entered the monkhood (I/26 ff.), this time at a monastery headed by a Sinhalese Mahāthera named Anurādha (cf. Anurādhapura, the old capital of Ceylon). We are not told who 'Mahādevī' was or when she died. Probably she was Mahādharmarāja I's queen or else his sister, perhaps a half-sister who was also his queen. If she was his younger sister, she may have been the same 'Mahādevī' whom he had named as regent at Sukhodaya when he went to reside at Biṣṇuloka.5

We do not know how long the Foster-Father remained at Anurādha's monastery. His sojourn there ended when, as we learn at I/28 ff., 'Brana Śri Debāhūrāja took him out (of the monkhood) to help build up the kingdom ... in order that the populace should not be distressed, that their sufferings should be brought to an end, and their desires fulfilled.'

Who was Braṇā Śri Debāhūrāja? 'Debāhūrāja' looks like a deformation of Devabāhūrāja, 'ruler with god-like arm' (?); but apart from this inscription we have no knowledge of anyone with such a name. In this context, however, 'Braṇā' certainly means a king, and it is hard to see how any other king than Mahādharmarāja II can be meant, though unfortunately we have no means of knowing whether or not 'Śri Debāhūrāja' was part of his titulature. The expression about helping to build up the kingdom and relieving the sufferings of the populace sounds as if the Foster-Father were being summoned to act as chief minister, or perhaps as regent; or at the very least as if he were being entrusted with an important political mission.

The inscription goes on to say that the Foster-Father, after due reflection, converted his own home into a monastery in the fifth month of the year of the serpent (I/35 ff.). If this means C.S. 739, as appears likely (p. 190), the date would be in March or April, 1377 A.D. (Julian). The inscriptions of Pagān cite more than one instance of a princely personage converting his home into a monastery in the

5) See Jinakālamālī, in Coedes, Documents sur l'histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental, BEFEO XXV, pp. 47 and 100.
12th and 13th centuries. The Foster-Father very likely got the idea from some of the Môn monks from Lower Burma, most of whom belonged to sects whose tradition stemmed from Pagan.

Among the ruins now known as Vat Jān Lôm, where the Foster-Father’s home must have been, the most conspicuous feature today is a stupa surrounded by masonry elephants; but the inscription does not mention it when enumerating the Foster-Father’s works at the newly-founded monastery; perhaps it was built later. We are told (I/37 ff.) that he founded a statue of the Buddha, decorated the premises, erected kuṭis for monks, built a library for the Tipiṭaka, installed a Chinese cloth picture of the Buddha, planted a Bodhi tree, and transferred the merit to Saṃtec Mahādharmarājā, i.e. Mahādhar-marājā I. He also made a stone statue of the Buddha and transferred the merit to Mahādevī.

Some relics now appeared in the sky and performed a miracle above the monastery (II/6 ff.). It seems they had been enshrined in a cetiya built by Mahādhar-marājā I, and, as usual in such miracles, they must have sprung out of it and darted around in the sky. The Foster-Father coiled up his hair and (so it seems, but the passage is not clear) cut it off in token of abandoning the lay life. Then he took a gold necklace and beat it into gold leaf with which to gild the statue of the Buddha.

The miracle apparently reminded him of one he had seen some years earlier, so he digresses to describe it (II/12 ff.). Brāñā Śrī Debāhārāja had sent him to the Court of the Maharāja, and he saw some relics performing a miracle at Rabūṇ. ‘Mahārāja’ was the usual title of the kings of Lān Nā Tai; and we are safe in assuming that the reference is to Kilanā (Gū Nā), who ruled that kingdom from 1355 to 1385. Rabūṇ is Harippūnjaya (Lāmbūn, Lamphun), which was still the cultural capital of Lān Nā, though Chieng Mai, was the administrative capital. If the Foster-Father went on a mission to Chieng Mai, nothing would be more natural than for him to make the short journey to Harippūnjaya to worship the relics enshrined in the Mahādhātu, the principal cetiya of the town.
Let us see if we can determine the approximate date of the Foster-Father's mission. When Braññā Śri Deśāhūrāja took him out of the monkhood, the Foster-Father was residing at Anurādha's monastery, which he had entered after the death of Mahādevī. Mahādevī was still alive when Mahādharmarāja I died (1/20 ff.), some time between 1368 and 1375; so the date of the mission cannot have been before 1368 at the earliest, and was probably several years later. But as the Foster-Father was still at Anurādha's monastery when he left the monkhood to set out on his mission, it was before 1377, the year the Foster-Father founded his own monastery.

In 1371 Paramarāja I of Ayudhyā began a series of attacks against the kingdom of Sukhodaya, which continued intermittently for the next seven years. It was probably during this period, perhaps around 1375, that the Foster-Father went on his mission to Kilanā. The purpose of the mission was very likely to get help for Mahādharmarāja II against Paramarāja. Kilanā owed a debt of gratitude to the memory of Mahādharmarāja I, who had helped him establish the 'Sinhalese' monastic order in Lān Nā by persuading the Mahāthera Sumana in 1369 to go there to settle. We do not know whether or not Kilanā actually gave Sukhodaya any help. If he did, it was unavailing, for in 1378 Paramarāja took Mahādharmarāja II prisoner and reduced him to vassalage.

After the digression about his mission to the Maharāja, the Foster-Father returns to the point where he interrupted himself, repeats the statement about beating the necklace into gold leaf (II/19 ff.), and continues his account of his benefactions to the monastery. These fill all the rest of Face II and most of Face III.

6) See Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya, p. 41.
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คำจรรยา

1. สิรินโมพุทธายสิทธิ์ สมฤทธิ์ เทพสรรพ
2. พรทิพยธรรมพระสมเด็จจุฬาโปรดอนภูมิ
3. นางศรีราชา นาย 0 ศรีราชา เทพรัตนย์
4. พระไคพานที่อยู่ฝั่งบ้านภูมิ
5. ปีชวัลกิณกมภูมิที่พระบาท
6. พระนิโอคำเอ่ยอิ่งปัครชรา
7. คิริโคนเนทีศรีสกฤศย์เพียงกัน
8. ข้ามจากสมเด็จอยู่บ้านที่นิม
9. นำเน้นพระนามเกียรติยศพระบาท
10. ญาณหสถางปราชญาสุกุลผึ่งแสงย์นิม
11. กรมทัพราชฯ มหาทัพราชช้างอริน
12. สมกษัตริย์สมเด็จฯ ใบตรจสมุทร
13. บริลุทธิ์ จงโปร่งพระธำรย์สมบัติภพ
14. สกายต้องภูมิเสียดสอดภูมิภูมิ
15. ยกผลยอกพิบูลย์สมบัติย์ในปัจจุบัน 0 เหล
16. ผู้คืนหน้าหลังกลสลับบ้านเพิ่ม 0
17. ผู้เนืองใจน้ํากลายภูมิเสียด
18. ราชกิจจานุเบกษ์พร้อมหน้าคารพ
19. นับเข้าบวชทรงช่วยสมบัติภพ
20. มหาทัพราชอาน้อยขึ้นกลทิพย์ธรรมชาต
๒๑. ชนะเข้าป่าโดยโคนจากพากเสียพน
๒๒. เข้าป่าสถิตในสวนอกมาจากทุ่งกระสาง
๒๓. ย้ายที่นั่งเป็นไปค่ายเถรนาเวททาง
๒๔. ลายไปบนไปแก่พื้นยี่พวก
๒๕. ผ่องแก่พระอนงหน้าเขาใหญ่นาย
๒๖. ปั้นเป็นพืชุณ ๐ ตกถนนมหาเทวสว
๒๗. รักษาใส่ไปใส่ ๐ พนั่งเข้าป่าสถิตในสวนอก
๒๘. ทำเครื่องบ่อนนักเก็งสิงห์ยาม ๐ พ
๒๙. ปรากฏที่พยาธิเสียออกมะขามอย่าง
๓๐. บานเสวยเมือง ๐ ไปไหนเก็งใจพั่ง
๓๑. ข้อผิดทางท้ายใหญ่ที่ตูด...
๓๒. หน้า ๐ พนั่งวัฒนำกันตกเป็นบุญภู (ณ)
๓๓. ปรโยธปั้นตรงท่านตรงท่านตรง...
๓๔. หางผิวอย่างใจหลุดในสงสารพ (วทุ)
๓๕. ทุน ๐ พนพิสารเนื้อยิงในคนแลว
๓๖. จิ๋งแห่งที่เรียกเป็นพระสำรัทธในปี
๓๗. มาเณกขึ้นที่จักรตกผ่านพุทปรก
๓๘. ถ้า ๐ ทหารอย่างกันวิเคราะห์
๓๙. กระหน่ำพยาธิสุร ๐ บัวภัยผู้อยู่รูบทาง (ง)
๔๐. ลาย พยากรณ์วั่นแห่ง ๐ กระจกลูกศิลป์
๔๑. บัวเสวจิ้งมากองทำที่พระบัจจุบัน
๔๒. สงวนรั้วจิตอางะธิบรมบกพาย
คำนิยม ๒

๑. ระบกขึ้นมาไว้กับพุทธพระสิริ (หาโม)
๒. พร้อมแปอลอมบุณยอมสิริ
๓. พระบลอนหนึ่งกษวยสูงได้สิบสิบสอง (กก)
๔. ทำใหญ่บูรณะแก่สิ้นสมหารัตน์ (ราชา)
๕. ทำพระติยอนหนึ่งใหญ่ไปแยเง (มเหตุ)
๖. ราศี ๐ แลวรสารพระกษรากณากร (หนู)
๗. สิ่งสมหารัตน์ราชจากการทำปฏิทิมการ...
๘. สายเวียนคนคงดวงสว่างแทนผืนอาทิ (เท)
๙. น้องกลางทางภราภุมภรมกุณีใจ (ศ)
๑๐. บรรยายถึงกันเป็นใจ...ภายเป็น (น)
๑๑. บูชาจึงมาเอาฮอยท้อ (ว) เลย (ว) นิ่งกิจโสร์ (พ)
๑๒. ยกพระเจ้า ๐ พรหมสิริเทา (พ่า) ทางขึ้น...
๑๓. ให้ปฏิทิมราชสมหารัตน์ (รัช) กอนสาคร (ก)
๑๔. ทำปฏิทิมการในพระธุบงอกตงลาก (นา)
๑๕. หงษ์พุนังยอกหกถูกพันสมบทเทา (ตุ)
๑๖. ภูทรราชเอาโยงกษม์หอกต่อกทัน (กหา)
๑๗. ขยายในกลางดวงผ่านหน้านั้นชูรามชก
๑๘. หน้าเห็นกงเผาเป็นใจสมหารณาภะตัด
๑๙. นำเออกายของแล้วเนี่ยงติดพอกพระเจ้า
๒๐. แล้วขาดที่ผ่านถด (อนุป) ผ่านหนับช้าง
๒๑. อายเร่ ๐ กแบบที่พักครั้งขัง ๐ แห่ง
๒๒. ที่นิงพระเจ้า ๐ จารมณ์อนันต์เนื่อง ๐ ฟู
๒๓. กอนนี้ ๐ หมอนอนนี้ ๐ บังบาลนน
๒๔. นี่ง ๐ เท่าปูอนนี้ ๐ รองอนนี้ ๐ ประที
๒๕. บ ๐ ตีล่ะยน ๐ ประฐูป ๐ กึง ๐ ให้คนใดค้อ
๒๖. กิณไม่ ๐ วาคนเรียนนี้แต่งหุ่งห่วน
๒๗. พระเจ้า ๐ พาหุ้นฝ่ายข้างเรียนตั้งบ
๒๘. เรียงพระเจ้า ๐ คงส่องบอนนตกอย่า
๒๙. มอน ๐ ตระส่งข้าราชการแท้ใจวิวา
๓๐. ยกแก่พระเจ้า ๐ แล้วมวลเมีย ๐ บวสุก ๐ บ
๓๑. วสุทัน ๐ บวสุขา ๐ ข้าแต่ เมียนยกนนให้
๓๒. ขนาดก้นไปแป้นไห้ไหลวยแม่หญาย
๓๓. อนนี่งโยคพุนไญภพพิพิธแม่ ฝึกแม่
๓๔. น้ำตกไปแป้นเมีย ๐ อนนี่งโยคพุน
๓๕. เมอกัน ๐ รายภพพ่อหูปรญภพพ่อธิย
๓๖. ยูสุขภพพ่อเท่าผ่านแก่แห่งก่อน
๓๗. นำมาจากที่ไซญเปด MOCK ขายทานะ
๓๘. ลงสิ้นกันถึง ๐ เงินฟานสาม ๐ จี้พระสิบ
๓๙. สามผืน ๐ สลดบากภูดิบ ๐ บารทสอยรอง ๐ ผ (ก)
๔๐. นบพระรอยแก่สิบ ๐ เรียลองเนื่อง...
๔๑. แก่นั้น ๐ แซมลายส่อง ๐ แซมเกลาก...
๔๒. อนนี่ง ๐ หลอกน้ำสิบ ๐ หลอกเชิงท้า...
๔๓. เก่าอย่าเทาน์ปั้นใดภัยเส้นเสรี
๑. หมื่น ᄆ แต่งส่งชื่อนпу
๒. พิเศษใส่เททองกว่า
๓. ดักลิง ᄆ เวิงทองก่อน
๔. รววงทองก็เข้าแล้วกัก
๕. วอน ᄆ ซึ่งสามทันแล้ว
๖. ให้ทองต่ำลิง ᄆ ผู้สุ
๗. องบวกมี ᄆ ผู้บวกปลาย
๘. ยกมี ᄆ ทำพระสิริวิช
๙. อนหนึง ᄆ บัพทงปลาย
๑๐. กรวยทองเกลี้ยบุ
๑๑. งาเปแงเจ้าฟรุ่ง
๑๒. สารบัตรพัฒนาใส่ก้าน
๑๓. วิ่ฒน์เทคนิก
๑๔. ธนาคารตกแม่
๑๕. ลิปต์เปะพันธุ์ (จ)
๑๖. ศิลปะทางหลาย
๑๗. ไว้กับภูพพิพิธ
๑๘. ธนธรรมยารุ่ง
๑๙. ทำพระญาอนุมิ
๒๐. บุญสั่งพระธารธาร
๒๑. ฯ
๒๒. ฯ
๒๔. อนุโกรไพรพระยาภูส
๒๕. สำเริสงโยชั้นยอดหน้า
๒๖. อนุผังบูรย์ให้มากับ
๒๗. หลักมาจากประนีแห่ง
๒๘. ประสพศักดิ์บุรฉอนแล้ว
๒๙. อุทิศกษัตริย์กิจราช
๓๐. ทำศีรษ์ตัวการอาญบุ
๓๑. กล่าแกงหลายกิจ
๓๒. จุ่งญาให้มีฉุกเฉิน
๓๓. เกิดในภูธร
๓๔. ทานาพนเสกขอน
๓๕. เกี๊ยว
A.B. Griswold and Prasert Na Nagara

Translation

[I/1-3.] Good fortune! Homage to the Buddha! May the success, honor, glory and austerities of the Buddha, the Dharrma and the Saṅgha be a charm to relieve us of all danger!

[I/3-10.] In the year one thousand nine hundred twenty-seven since the Lord entered Nirvāṇa, a year of the rat, on Wednesday, the full-moon day of the sixth month, the Foster-Father Sai Tām, who [is about to] discuss moral virtue, energy and wisdom, set his mind upon faith and joy in the immense benevolence of the Sākyan, because of his desire to cross beyond the round of transmigrations and attain the goal of Nirvāṇa.

[I/10-20.] When the Mahāsaṅgharājā . . . came to teach the Sāmtec Mahādharrmarājā, the latter, full of devotion to the religion and his faith in the purity of the Three Refuges, gave up his throne, removed his royal attire, and, sweeping way all difficulties, went to be ordained as a bhikṣu at the Mango Grove. * The dense earth quivered, rumbled, and rocked uncertainly. * The Foster-Father was overjoyed at the sight. Filled with the boundless delight of faith and immense benevolence, he went rejoicing and worshiping to be ordained as a bhikṣu in Mahādharrmarājā’s community. 7

---

7) Written nyarbāna. The date corresponds to May 4, 1384 A.D. (Julian); see above, p. 190.
8) Pūrabhāsī (I/9-10); i.e. sīla, viriyā, paññā; the three qualities required to attain Buddhahood. Probably the Foster-Father means his own sīla, viriyā and paññā, though he might be referring to these qualities in a more general way.
9) The Buddha.
10) The word we have omitted appears to be ṣū, sukalum, the meaning of which is unknown to us. If it were a monastic name, we should expect it to be in Pali. Query: Sukhuma? (= subtle, exquisite).
11) tissābrahāṇītha, for tisarāpanāṇa.
12) rājasampatti.
13) We have omitted from our translation the word nāv (I/15), which signifies a change of condition (in this case, from king to monk); cf. JSS LVII/1, p. 130, note 18.
14) The word ṭhāna, which now means a dwelling-place, office, etc., can also mean a place where some particular doctrine is taught. Depending on the context, it could be either a monastery or else an ashram, hermitage or seminary. For want of a better term, we translate it as 'community'. In the present context it of course refers to the Monastery of the Mango Grove.
[I/20-26.] When Saṃtec Mahādharmarāja was separated from him by death, the Foster-Father went to be ordained in the community of the Mahāthera Buddhassagor, where there was a great assemblage of theras and anuphers, and he distributed the merit to his father and mother, his brothers and sisters, and all his relatives of royal lineage who have gone to the other world.

[I/26-28.] Then the Mahādevi died too. * The Foster-Father went to be ordained in the community of the Mahāthera Anurādhā, who came here from Siṃhala.

[I/28-32.] Braṇā Śrī Debhūraja took him out of the monastery to help build up the kingdom. * He did so in order that the populace should not be distressed, that their sufferings should be brought to an end, and their desires fulfilled.

[I/32-42.] The Foster-Father reflected on what might be meritorious, useful, and beneficial to others as well as himself, and to the living as well as the dead, in order that they might not be lost in this Buddha’s saṃsāra. * The Foster-Father, having reflected in his heart, converted his home into a monastery in the year of the serpent, in the fifth month, and then founded a statue of the Buddha. * He summoned a group of persons skilled in designing pictures, to come and compose paintings of devatās and asūras and of an ordination together with a throng of monks, beautiful in every detail.

15) Buddhasagara; see above, p. 192.
16) The expression วิจิตรณัท (I/20-21), i.e. วิจิตรณัท seems to designate different classes of the population.
17) ज्ञ (I/31), probably for ज्ञात, ‘sufferings’.
18) Restoring ... ज्ञ (I/32) as ज्ञात, ‘as desired’; cf. cintāmaṇi, ‘wish-fulfilling gem.’
19) That portion of the round of transmigration (saṃsāra) that will occur between the present day and the year 5000 of the Buddhist Era, in other words while the teachings of ‘this Buddha’ (Gotama) are still extant, at least in part.
20) The syntax of the passage I/38-40 is obscure, but the general meaning must be close to what we have given. We assume that राज (I/28) stands for राज, which in Siamese means ‘pictures’ (rather than the usual senses of bhāva or bhāvyā in Sanskrit). At I/28-29, राज is Pali racita, the past participle of racayati, ‘to arrange’, ‘to compose’, ‘to prepare’; राज may be Pali racanā, ‘arrangement’, ‘composition’, or else a mistake for Pali rajana, ‘coloring’ (in either case, with A altered to E before a palatal sound, as it sometimes is in the Sukhodayan inscriptions, e.g. Sejanalai, for Sajjanalaya). At I/39 राज is the classifier for monks, rather than the word for pictures. The ordination mentioned at I/39-40 seems to be part of the painting, since the reference to it is followed by the words ๐๙, for which we have hazarded the translation ‘beautiful in every detail’.
* He also erected kutis for monks. Then he had a hall built for the Pitakadharrma, concentrating his mind on the worship of the Abhidharrma, and also had [II/1-12] a Chinese cloth picture of the Buddha brought and installed; he planted a bodhi tree to be a great source of merit and a great source of good fortune; he raised up cloth picture of the Buddha to a height of 14 cubits; and he transferred the merit [from all these works] to Sântec Mahâdharrmarâjâ. He made a stone statue of the Buddha, transferring the merit to Mahâdevî. * Then he saw the holy precious relics, which were [enshrined in a cetiya] built by Sântec Mahâdharrmarâjâ, perform a miracle passing over his own house, appearing like silver wire as big as a mat in the middle of the sky, crystalline and exceedingly beautiful. [The Foster-Father], with heart full of faith, coiled his hair into a ... and gave it as an offering. Then he took a gold necklace and beat it into gold leaf to gild the statue of the Buddha.

[II/12-19.] Braññâ Sri Debahûrâja... sent him to the Court of the Mahârâja. He saw the holy precious relics perform a miracle at Rabûni, darting out like balls of fire the size of persimmons and

21) i.e. a library for the Tipiṭaka (Scriptures).
22) We assume that vr̥ta (I/42-II/1) is vr̥ta (brah pata), a painting of the Buddha on cloth.
23) Sûrattanadhatu (II/6) means holy precious relics (of the Buddha) and also the cetiya in which they were enshrined.
24) Restoring u...ũ (II/7-8) as mahamāra (for maha).
25) The Foster-Father's own house, which has now become part of the monastery.
26) mahamāra (II/8); presumably the silver wire was thought of as a kind of mesh.
27) We cannot say how he should be restored. The sense seems to be that he is preparing to cut off his hair in token of forsaking the layman's life, just as Gotama did after leaving his palace in order to become an ascetic.
28) vr̥ta, for vr̥ta, modern vr̥ta, 'to coat'; vr̥ta, 'to cover in layers.' The usual method of gilding an image is to coat it first with adhesive lacquer and then with gold leaf.
29) Literally 'like someone playing with fireworks'; vr̥ta (II/15) is an expanded form of vr̥ta.
30) vr̥ta (II/15) is the expanded form of vr̥ta; either diospyros embryopteris or diospyros kaki.
buddharāthasaṃ (II/16) is put for buddharaksā (canna sp.).

32) ṛṣi (II/17), modern ṛṣu. The word now means ‘green’, but in the Sukho­
dayan inscriptions it is used indifferently for green or blue. Here we
translate it as ‘blue’, since the color is compared to indigo-dyed cloth.

33) Except for the omission of ḍhatu, the passage at II/19 is a verbatim repeti­tion of that at II/11-12.

34) ṭihā (II/20) looks like an equivalent to ṭihā, ‘a notice’; and we have so
translated it. If that is right, the Foster-Father must mean a notice regard­ing the acts of merit he is about to perform. But a tempting alternative
is to regard ṭihā as a contraction of ṭihā (ṭī, cloth; Pali, kāsīya, ‘dyed with
yellow or orange cloth’, as for a monk’s robes; this interpretation, though
linguistically questionable, yields better sense: sc. he made some yellow
cloth, and after cutting it into strips in the orthodox fashion, sewed the
strips together into a monastic garment to lay over the base of the statue.

35) i.e. he presented the statue with a tiśapātra, a monk’s ceremonial ‘fan’
(really an eye-screen) such as is used when reciting the Dhamma.

36) i.e. a pedestal for the statue.

37) cāttāri (II/22), for cammakhaṇḍa.

38) i.e. the lime paste with which areca nuts and betel leaves are chewed.

39) venience, here used as a pronoun of the third person plural.
man's mother. Furthermore the Foster-Father helped the spirit of his mother and the spirit of his father; he helped the spirit of his wife, the Foster-Mother Det, and the spirits of those who were of his mother's rank; he helped the spirit of his eldest brother and the spirit of his second brother; he helped the spirit of his eldest sister; he helped the spirits of the children and grandchildren of his own ancestors; and the spirits of his relatives by marriage he helped too.

[II/37-43.] Of gold, he gave ten tämlīṅ; of silver, one thousand three hundred; monastic robes, thirteen; slings for almsbowls, twenty; almsbowls, two hundred; cloths for saluting the Buddha, a hundred and ninety; a cup for sweets; a mirror; two painted dishes; six small dishes; ten bowls for drinking water; five bowls with pedestals. Of cowries, he gave one million four hundred and forty thousand. [III/1-11.] As for the group of special artists, he gave them a whole tämlīṅ of gold, a

40) The passage at II/31-37 is a digression which, like the one at II/12-19, seems to have been introduced because the preceding sentence reminded the Foster-Father of a remarkable incident in his life. Having just said that he caused his wives, children, grandchildren and servants to be ordained, he recalls that once, when one of his wives fell in love with a servant, he set them both free so that they might marry and look after the man's mother. Normally, it may be guessed, they would both have been punished severely, so the Foster-Father's generous action would be conspicuously meritorious. By a natural transition he then goes on to enumerate acts of merit he performed for the benefit of other relatives (II/33-37). Finally, at II/37, the digression comes to an end, and he goes on listing his benefactions to the monastery.

41) The word we have translated as 'helped' is ān, i.e. ān, 'to raise up'. The Foster-Father means that all these deceased persons will have their status in future incarnations improved by receiving shares of the merit he has earned.

42) About 600 grams. A tämlīṅ is a weight equal to 4 ticals; one tical is now standardized at 15 grams.

43) About 1.77 kilograms.

44) Or for saluting the monks?

45) Cf. the painted wares from the kilns at Sukhodaya and Sajjanālaya (Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 13-14).

46) The number, which is truncated, was perhaps more likely sixty.

47) Or perhaps fifty.

48) Those mentioned at I/38 ff.
piece of silver, a pair of cows and a full cartload of rice. He made gifts to three monks, to one of them one tāmliṅ of gold, to one he gave two ticals, to one a little over a tical. He made a bronze statue of the Buddha and also banners and small flags, giving the merit to Cau Braṃ Jai⁴⁹.

⁴⁹) Who was this Prince Braṃ Jai? Regularizing the spelling the name is Brahmajaya; and the only person of that name known to us in Sukhodayan history is one to whom Jinakālamāḷī devotes a single sentence. See Coedès, Documents..., BEFEO XXV, pp. 47 and 100. No date is given, but it can easily be estimated if Jinakālamāḷī gives the right sequence of events. The passage immediately preceding the sentence in question runs as follows: ‘Upon the death of King Rāmādhhipati, ruler of Kāmboja and Ayojjāpura, Vattitejo left Suvaṇṇabhūmi and conquered the kingdom of Kāmboja. Then Dhammarāja having died at Jayanādapura, Vattitejo left Ayojjāpura, took Jayanādapura, and removed the statue of Sīhaḷa to Ayojjāpura, where he continued to worship it.’ In this passage Kāmboja must mean Labpurī; Ayojjāpura is of course Ayudhya; Suvaṇṇabhūmi is Subarṇapuri; and Jayanādapura is Bīṣṇuloka (for the last identification, see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 37 note 102); Rāmādhhipati is the founder of Ayudhya; Vattitejo is his brother-in-law Paramarājā, Prince of Subarṇapuri (afterward Paramarājā I of Ayudhya); Dhammarāja is Mahādharmarājā I of Sukhodaya. Rāmādhhipati died in 1369. Paramarājā seized the throne of Ayudhya in 1370, and took possession of Bīṣṇuloka in 1375. That would mean that Mahādharmarājā I died some time between 1370 and 1375, and that the action attributed to Brahmajaya occurred after that. Here is the sentence describing it: brahmajeyyo ca mahāmacco sukhodayoṃ gaṇhi, ‘the Chief Minister Brahmajaya took Sukhodaya.’

Supposing that this mysterious person who ‘took Sukhodaya’ is the same as the Cau Braṃ Jai of our inscription, which is plausible enough but not certain, he must have been a Sukhodayan patriot, for otherwise the Foster-Father would not have offered him a share of merit. Though we do not know what really happened, it is quite possible that Paramarājā, after seizing Bīṣṇuloka in 1375, organized a coup d'état to seize Sukhodaya, but that Brahmajaya foiled it by quick action. If so, the Foster-Father would have good reason to remember him with gratitude for saving the throne for Mahādharmarājā II. Alternatively Brahmajaya’s action may have occurred later, resulting in a restoration of de facto sovereignty for Mahādharmarājā II some time after he had been forced to submit to Ayudhya in 1378.
In this inscription the Foster-Father Sai Tām [who was] the husband of the Foster-Mother Det, [and who now, as] Abbot of the monastery 50, is named Thera Debamoli, entrusts all his descendants 51 to this monastery 52 and this chapter of monks 53. Whatever kings who have stored up merit from past deeds * shall succeed to the throne of this [land of] Sukhodaya, * may they reign for a long time 54, sharing the benefits of the merit which the Foster-Father has stored up in abundance! May they not differ from the dynasty of upright men who ruled [the kingdom] in the past and gained the devoted loyalty [of their subjects]! Of all noble persons like this, may none ever have cause to be vexed or angry with the Foster-Father's family or descendants!

50) พจน (II/13-14), for พะนะ or ประต 'Abbot'. Apparently when the monastery was dedicated the Foster-Father became its Abbot, with the monastic appellation Thera Debamoli (Devamoli).

51) พระบรมวงศานุวงศ์ (III/15-16), for Skt. praveni-jñāti-vamsa or Pali paveni-nāti-vamsa (Pali: paveni, 'tradition,' 'succession,' 'lineage'; nāti, 'kinsmen'; vamsa, 'dynasty').

52) ติมทีติรกรรม

53) Perhaps the Foster-Father means he hopes his descendants will be protected by the beneficent influences of the merit he has earned by founding and equipping the monastery.

54) จันทรเมตร (III/25); dyargharāja is for Skt. dirgharāja, 'a long-lived king'.
Fig. 1. The Inscription of Vat Jäh Lôm, Face I.
1 a. Upper portion.
1 b. Lower portion.
Fig. 2. The Inscription of Vạt Jän Lôm, Face II.
2 a. Upper portion.
1 b. Lower portion.
Fig. 3. The Inscription of Vat Jän Lôm, Face III.
3 a. Upper portion.
CORRIGENDA

In our article on Vat Pa Mok in the Siam Society's volume, In Memoriam Phya Anuman Rajadhon (Bangkok, 1970), two changes should be made. On page 187, ฉันทมิฬ in the first line of Stanza 2 should be corrected to ฉันทมิฬ. On page 199, the translation of Stanza 2 should read:

2. But the river-current is cutting into the west bank, eating it away here and there so that it is collapsing into the water. Weirs are built to divert (the current) from the edge of the foundations, but the walls break apart repeatedly and the statue is cracking.

In the same article, several of the photographs are printed with the caption at the wrong side of the picture. In Figs. 11-1, 11-b and 13-c the bottom of the picture, and hence the caption, should be at the left; in Figs. 12 and 13-d the bottom of the picture, and hence the caption, should be at the right; in Fig. 13-e the picture is correctly printed, but the caption should be at the bottom of the page instead of on the right.

In our Epigraphic and Historical Studies No. 5, JSS LVIII/1, the photograph in Fig. 1 (following p. 113), is printed upside down.

A.B. Griswold and Prasert Na Nagara