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On February 2, 1299, according to the Yuan-shih, missions arrived at the Mongol Court from Sukhodaya ('Hisien'), Malayu ('Mo-la-yu') and Lavo ('Lo-hu'). The Emperor bestowed a Tiger-talisman on the Sukhodayan Heir Apparent, who it seems was present in person. In the same year the King of Sukhodaya sent a petition to the Emperor, probably through the Heir Apparent, saying that during his father's reign the Mongol Court used to bestow saddles, bridles, bits, white horses and golden-threaded garments on him, and asking that such gifts be continued in his own reign.

The request shows that a king of Sukhodaya had recently died and been succeeded by his son. The late king can only have been Rāma Gamheil, and as the mission surely took more than a month to reach Peking we can take it for granted that the year of his death was 1298. The son who succeeded him was almost certainly Lözaiya (Lö Tai).

1) Flood, Sukhotal-Mongol Relations, JSS LVII/2, p. 225 f., 248 ff. (note that '1348' at line 4 on p. 253 is a mistake for 1347).
2) Coedes recognizes the force of this argument, but cites an objection to it raised by Prince Damrong. While the petition appears to have been sent by a new king, says Coedès, the succession of Rāma Gahheil's successor before 1299 seems difficult to reconcile with the statement in Rājadhārāja, the History of Mṛtaban, that when Wareru (Fü-Rua) died in 1313 his successor received from King Pratistha of Sukhodaya the title Rāmapratistha, 'established by Rāma', which could hardly have been conferred by anyone other than Rāma Gamhēil (Coedès, Les Etats indouaisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie, Paris, 1964, p. 396; cf. Prince Damrong, Miscellaneous Articles, p. 80). But this objection would be groundless if, as is quite possible, Lözaiya also had 'Rāma' as part of his titulature; and the name 'Pratistha', though usually designating Rāma Gahheil, is sometimes indiscriminately used for other members of the dynasty. Furthermore the date when Wareru's successor came to the throne is uncertain; according to Rājadhārāja, it was 1313, but according to Phayre it was 1306, and according to Harvey it was 1296. See Table II.
3) The list of ancestors of the Sukhodayan royal family in Inscription 45 (1392 A.D.) contains the following: 'Grandfather Brāņa Rāma āraja' (i.e. Rāma Gahheil); 'Grandfather Sāi Saṅgrāma'; 'Grandfather Brāņa Lödaiya' (i.e. Lözaiya); which might lead us to believe that Sāi Saṅgrāma—of whom nothing is known—reigned after Rāma Gahheil and before Lözaiya. But it seems unlikely because his name is not preceded by 'brāņ' ('king'), see Griswold and Prasert, JSS LVII/1, pp. 75, 82 and note 20. In the eulogies in Inscription 2, furthermore, Rāma āraja is followed directly by Dharmāraja (see below, Section 7, note 46).
### TABLE I

**Dates of the First Six Kings of Sukhodaya**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acceded</th>
<th>Died</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Śrī Indrāditya</td>
<td>Before 1250</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pāl Mōaḥ</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1279 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rāma Gaṅghēn</td>
<td>1279 ?</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lōdaiya</td>
<td>1298</td>
<td>1346/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nyva Nām Thañ</td>
<td>1346/7</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mahādharmarājē I (Lōdaiya)</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>Between 1368 and 1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rājadhirāja</td>
<td>Phayre (p. 290)</td>
<td>Harvey (p. 368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Makado 1281-1313 (Jao Fà-rua)</td>
<td>Warēru 1287*-1306</td>
<td>Warēru 1287*-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Makatā 1313-14 (Rāmapratīṣṭha) brother of 1</td>
<td>Khun-lau 1306-10 (Ranbyakeit), brother of 1</td>
<td>Hkun Law, 1296-1310 brother of 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jao Ao 1314-19 (Sēn Mōng Ming) nephew of 1 and 2</td>
<td>Dzāu-āu 1310-23 (Theng-mhaing), nephew of 1 and 2</td>
<td>Saw O, 1310-24 nephew of 1 and 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chi Pom 1327</td>
<td>Dibbān Meng 1330</td>
<td>Zein Pun 1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Āi Gam Gòng, 1327 son of 3</td>
<td>Egānkān 1330</td>
<td>Saw E Gan Gaung, 1331 nephew of 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The discrepancy in these dates is only apparent. Makado became King of Martaban in 1281 and King of Rāmaṇādesa in 1287.*
TABLE III

Proposed Chronology taking both Epigraphic and Chronicular Evidence into Account

[The asterisks indicate dates for which we have direct evidence, the others are estimates.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lōdaiya’s accession</td>
<td>1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śriśraddhā’s birth</td>
<td>c. 1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumana’s birth</td>
<td>c. 1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumana’s ordination in the community of Mahā Pabbata</td>
<td>c. 1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumana and Anomadassī study at Ayodhya: some time in the 1320’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śriśraddhā’s ordination</td>
<td>1330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Udumbara arrives at Martaban</td>
<td>1331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumana and Anomadassī are ordained in the community of Udumbara’s Sihalabhikkhus at Martaban and take up their residence there</td>
<td>1331/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śriśraddhā sets out for Martaban and India</td>
<td>c. 1331/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śriśraddhā’s sojourn in Ceylon</td>
<td>from c. 1333 to c. 1343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumana and Anomadassī go back to Sukhodaya</td>
<td>1336/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lōdaiya appointed viceroy of Sajjanālāya</td>
<td>1340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lōdaiya’s request to Udumbara for a qualified monk</td>
<td>c. 1340/41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumana and Anomadassī return to Martaban for three months, become Theras in Udumbara’s community, and then go to Sukhodaya and Sajjanālāya respectively</td>
<td>1341/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumana discovers the relic</td>
<td>1342/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Śriśraddhā returns to Sukhodaya</td>
<td>1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya begins</td>
<td>c. 1344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mahādhātu completed and dedicated</td>
<td>c. 1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lōdaiya’s death</td>
<td>1346/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lōdaiya’s accession to the throne</td>
<td>1347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Death of Śriśraddhā</td>
<td>after 1376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have no clue to the identity of the Heir Apparent at that time; Lōdaiya's son Lōdaiya (Lō Tai), whom he later regarded as heir apparent, was not yet born.

Lōdaiya bore the title Dharmarāja. Though his reign seems to have lasted almost half a century, we have little definite knowledge of its political history. He lost nearly all the vast territories Rāma Gaṃhēn had added to the kingdom, and by the end of his reign it was on the verge of collapse. In 1340 he appointed his son Lōdaiya to the post of Uparāja at Sajjanālaya, where Lōdaiya finished composing his work on Buddhist cosmology and ethics, the Traibhāmīkātha, in 1345. It appears that Lōdaiya died suddenly, in 1346 or 1347. Lōdaiya was still at Sajjanālaya at the time, and if he had even a day's notice that his father was seriously ill he would certainly have been present at his death-bed. The throne was thereupon seized by a usurper named Nvva Nām Tham (Nguy Nam Tom). Hastily mustering his forces, Lōdaiya marched on the capital, took it by storm, and mounted the throne. We know from Inscription 4 that Lōdaiya acceded in 1347; and the circumstances of his accession, as recounted in that text, suggest that Nvva Nām Tham reigned no more than a few months at the most. Hence our estimated date for Lōdaiya's death.

4) For the spelling 'Lōdaiya', cf. Coedes, Documents sur la dynastie de Sukhodaya, BEFEO XVII/2, pp. 5-7. In Inscription 45 the name is written 'Lōdai' at I/10 and (applied to a different person) 'Lōdaiya' at I/11; see Griswold and Prasert na Naga, JSS LVII/1, pp. 75, 82. Lōdaiya is called Dharmarāja in Inscription 2, Dharmarāja in Mīlasāsana, and Dhammarāja in Jinakālāmālī. As there is no evidence that he ever bore the title Mahādhammarāja or Mahādharmarāja, we shall follow the usual practice of counting Lōdaiya and his successors as Mahādhammarāja I, II, III and IV, and take it for granted that Lōdaiya was simply Dharmarāja.

5) Brief notices in the Yiṣa-phib record missions from Sukhodaya to the Mongol Court in 1300, 1314, 1319 and 1323. See Flood, op. cit., p. 226 f.

6) Coedes in BEFEO XVII/2, pp. 4-9, 45; Coedes, The Traibhāmīkātha, Buddhist Cosmology and Treatise on Ethics, East and West, VII, 1937, 349 ff.

7) Griswold and Prasert, JSS LVII/1, 68, 82 and note 20.

8) Coedes, Recueil des inscriptions du Siam, I, 93, 97.
Though we have little direct information about the political events of Lodaiya’s reign, we have some collateral evidences that may help us to estimate the chronology of his losses. Before reviewing them, let us go back for a moment to define the limits of the little kingdom which Rāma Gamhēn inherited, and the extent to which it expanded during his reign.

The second postscript to Inscription I gives a list of the principalities which made their submission to Rāma Gamhēn. The names are given radially, first to the east, then to the south, west and north, in the order of increasing distance from the capital in each of the four directions. To the east, the first place mentioned is Sralvañ, perhaps in the district of Brahmani (Bān Prompirām) between Bijaya (Pīchāi) and Bīşūlōka; to the south, Gandī (now Śāmañ, on the Ping about 25 km. downstream from Gampēng Pet); to the west, Chōṭ (now Mē Sōt); to the north, Brē (Prē).\(^1\) As these are the nearest places whose submission he received, it stands to reason that they were just beyond the frontiers of the kingdom he inherited. The latter must therefore have consisted of little more than the provinces of Sukhodaña, Sajjanālaya, Uttaratītha, Gampēng Pet and Trāk.

By the end of his reign Rāma Gamhēn was suzerain over the greater part of Siam, the whole of the Malay Peninsula and the kingdom of Rāmahnādesa in Lower Burma, and a considerable part of Laos. The first postscript to Inscription I names some of the Tai peoples who were tributary to him: all of those listed were located either between Sukhodaña and Laos or else in Laos itself, which suggests that his ancestors had come from there and that he still had bonds of affection with the people along the way, particularly in the Upper Nān Valley.\(^2\) It also suggests that the main concentration of Tai in his kingdom was in that direction, whereas farther to the south the Tai were probably outnumbered, and many of Rāma Gamhēn’s vassals south of Nagara Svarga were Mōn, Khmer or Malay rather than Tai.

\(^{1}\) See Griswold and Prasert in JSS LXI/2, p. 218 f.; also Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaña Art*, Map 4.

Let us now consider some of Rāma Gāmphēn’s dependencies, and try to see what happened to them after his death. We shall also discuss some other places which, though they were not tributary to him, are pertinent to our subject.

North

Brē (now) submitted to Rāma Gāmphēn; so did the principality of Nān and Blua (modern Pua, in, on the River Nān about 50 km. north of the present town of Nān); so did Luang Prabang in Laos.

His northern flank was protected by a firm treaty of alliance which he made in 1287 with King Mairäya (Mang Rāi) of Lān Nā and King Nām Māan (Ngām Muāng) of Bayāv (Payāv). This treaty helped Rāma Gāmphēn to maintain his suzerainty over the Upper Nān Valley and gave him access to his dependencies in Upper Laos. At the same time it enabled Nām Māan to keep his own independence and Mairäya to consolidate his power over Lān Nā.

In Lōdaiya’s time the treaty became a dead letter. Blua, the old seat of the Princes of Nān, was annexed by Bayāv soon after Lōdaiya’s accession, but shook loose in 1320 and became an independent kingdom with Brē as one of its dependencies. Some time before 1334 Prince Kam Fū of Lān Nā conquered Brē. The Prince of Nān drifted into the orbit of Lān Nā, helped Kam Fū to subjugate Bayāv, quarreled with him over the booty, pursued him back and forth, and finally fought him in a battle of which the Chieng Mai Chronicle gives a very confused account.

We gather that within a decade or two of Rāma Gāmphēn’s death all of Sukhodaya’s dependencies beyond Uttaratittha split up into petty states that were frequently at odds with one another, and with Lān Nā

3) Griswold and Prasert, JSS LIX/2, p. 219 f. and note 132.
4) Coedēs in BEFEO XXV/1, p. 88.
5) Griswold and Prasert, JSS LVII/1, pp. 59-61.
6) Coedēs, BEFEO XXV/1, p. 94 (in line 3, ‘1324 A.D.’ is a mistake for ‘1309 A.D.’ and ‘apres douze ans’ a mistake for ‘apres deux ans’). Jinakalamulī, it will be observed, places this campaign before the death of Sīn Pī in 1334 (ibid., p. 94; cf. p. 93). It can hardly be the same one that the Chieng Mai Chronicle places in 1340 (Notton, Annales du Siam, III, p. 81), which we are specifically told ended disastrously. The Yomula History, however, considers it to be the same one, and solves the difficulty by giving it a happy ending (see Coedēs, ibid., p. 94 note 2).
7) Notton, ibid., p. 82.
and Bayă as well. Lodaiya was no longer in a position to assert his suzerainty over them, much less over any part of Upper Laos, from which he was now cut off. What happened to the towns near the present site of Uttaratittha, such as Phăn, is uncertain; perhaps they were ruled by princes who were at least friendly toward Sukhodaya.

East

Rāma Garphēn received the submission of Sralvañ, Sŏn Gvĕ (Bisguloka), Lum Pă Cāy (Old Lom Sak, in the upper valley of the Śīk), Sāgā (also in the upper valley of the Śīk?), the banks of the Khōng (Mē Kōng), and Vyān Cann Vyān Giăm (Vieng Jan, usually written Viêtnam on Western maps), which is the farthest place9. There is no reason to believe that his authority extended very far south or east of the principality of Vieng Jan; the Mē Kōng downstream from Vieng Jan, together with a large amount of territory between the Mē Kōng and the Śīk, was still in the orbit of Cambodia.10

After Rāma Garphēn’s death Vieng Jan probably became independent.11 We do not know what happened to the upper Śīk valley, but it is hardly likely that Lodaiya could keep it very long. Perhaps he managed to retain Sŏn Gvĕ, and he probably retained Sralvañ.

8) It is possible that he sought an alliance with the Vietnamese against his Tai tormentors. In 1335, says H. Maspero on the basis of information in the Vietnamese Annals, when the Emperor of Viet Nam, in a victorious expedition against the Tai kingdom of Aï-lào, advanced to Chia-râo in the Vietnamese Mountains east of Xieng Khouang, and received delegations there from all the neighboring sovereigns who were coming to pay homage to him, Cambodia and Sukhodaya both sent ambassadors to congratulate him. See H. Maspero in BEFEO XVIII/3, p. 35; Coedès, États hindouisés, p. 397-8.

9) Griswold and Prasert, JSS LIX/2, p. 218 and note 129.

10) Coedès, États hindouisés, p. 403.

11) It was apparently independent when Pā Nūn received its submission in the 1340’s (7); cf. Coedès, États hindouisés, pp. 405-407. We are inclined to believe that Lodaiya, faced with so many troubles much nearer home, lost control of it long before that. We do not know how to construe the statements in the Vietnamese Annals regarding Siamese attacks on Champa between 1313 and 1330. On the basis of these statements G. Maspero says that bands of Siamese made raids in Champa in 1313 (G. Maspero, Le royaume de Champa, Paris, 1928, pp. 196-7), which he interprets as attacks by the armies of the king of Sukhodaya (G. Maspero, Un empire colonial français, l’Indochine, Paris, 1928, p. 110; cf. Coedès, Les États hindouisés, p. 397). Maspero adds that in 1330 the Emperor of Viet Nam, who was kept busy defending his western frontiers where the armies of Phraya Siia Thai [read: Lodaiya] were becoming more and more aggressive, planned to conduct a campaign to the shores of the Mē Kōng to pacify the country, but died before he could do so (G. Maspero, Un empire colonial français, p. 110). Whatever the Vietnamese Annals may mean, it is hard for us to believe that Lodaiya could have undertaken a campaign so far away from home in 1313, much less around 1330.
South

The principalities of Gandi (on the Ping, 25 km. downstream from Gampêng Pet), Brah Păn (Nagara Svarga), Brêk (Old Jayanâda), Subarnabhûm (Subarnapuri), Râjapuri, Bejrapuri and Nagara Sri Dharmarâja all submitted to Râma Gamhêñ, as well as 'the sea-coast, which is the farthest place'.

As Gampêng Pet itself is not mentioned, we may assume that it was one of the tributaries Râma Gamhêñ inherited. The same is true of Traitiṟiñsa, on the right bank of the Ping 15 km. downstream from Gampêng Pet.

Prince Paramânujita Jinorasa’s Sânkhepa History gives the following account of the origin of Traitiṟiñsa. At an unstated date a king of Jinârây (Chîng Rûi) named Jayasiri, having been defeated in battle, fled southward with his followers, crossed the River Bo [‘Bo’, preserved in the toponym Pâk-nâm Bo, is the old name of the Ping from its confluence with the Wang down to Nagara Svarga], and discovered a deserted city called Mônê Pîp on the opposite bank of the river from Gampêng Pet. Here he built a new capital, which he named Traitiṟiñsa after Indra’s heaven [Skt. trayastriñsa, Pali tâvattima]. He reigned in that city until his death, and his sons and grandsons ruled and carried on the family for four generations. As we shall see, the fourth generation of the dynasty was reigning in the early 14th century, so it may be guessed that Jayasiri established his capital there in the first half of the 13th, perhaps as a sub-vassal of the Khmer.

Gandi and Brah Păn may have submitted to Râma Gamhêñ fairly early in his reign, and Nagara Sri Dharmarâja not very long afterward;

12) Griswold and Prasert, JS 1959/2, p. 218 f. and note 130.
13) A brief account of the ruins of Traitiṟiñsa will be found in Silpakara, 11/2, p. 83.
14) Saṅkhepa History (สารัคประวัติเกี่ยวกษัตริย์ต่างสุนทรศัพท์) Bangkok, 1961, p. 281 f.; cf. Prince Damrong, Miscellaneous Articles, pp. 69 ff. Professor D.K. Wyatt of Cornell University has kindly given us access to his unpublished translation of the Saṅkhepa History, which he entitles The Shortened Chronicle of Ayudhya.
but we are inclined to think he did not receive the submission of Jayanāda, Subārapūrī, Rājapūrī and Bejrapūrī until three or four years before his death.\footnote{15}

As Professor Boisselier has shown, Ü Tong (ţiţtu) in Subārapūrī province was one of the chief cities of Dvāravatī between the 7th and the 10th century, but was abandoned in the 11th\footnote{16}. The provinces of Rājapūrī and Bejrapūrī, as well as Subārapūrī, were deeply impregnated with the Môn culture of Dvāravatī. In the 12th century a part of this territory belonged to a kingdom which was known to the Chinese as Chên-li-fu. In 1181 the ruler of Chên-li-fu was a vassal of Jayavarman VII of Cambodia, but apparently became independent a few years later.\footnote{17}

We do not know exactly where the ruler of Subārapūrī had his capital in the late 13th century, though it was presumably not very far from Ü Tong and the present city of Subārapūrī (which was founded later). Nor do we know the origin of the Subārapūrī dynasty which submitted to Sukhodaya. While it is possible that they stemmed from a Tai conqueror, it seems more likely that they were Môn princes, or princes of mixed Môn and Khmer blood, who had ruled for many generations, and who submitted reluctantly to Rāma Gâmpheñ when the withdrawal of Khmer power left them unprotected. They may well have regarded themselves as defenders of an ancient tradition and being resentful of Tai intruders. Their hostility to Sukhodaya in the second half of the 14th century suggests very deep-seated causes of antipathy, perhaps based on a rival outlook toward the world.

Conspicuously absent from the list of countries that submitted to Rāma Gâmpheñ is Lavo, which had its capital at Labapūrī (Lopburi). Most likely it is omitted not because he inherited it, but because it never came into his possession at all. As early as the 7th century this state

\footnote{15} Cf. Coedès, États indochinois, p. 373; and Flood in JSS LVII/2, pp. 223, 224, 245, 246, and note 88.


\footnote{17} O.W. Wolters, Chên li-fu, JSS XLVIII/2, pp. 1-21.
was an important center of Mon culture. It may or may not have been part of the kingdom of Dvaravati, but it was in the same cultural orbit. The rulers of Lavo, or at least some of them, bore the Sanskrit title Cakravarti (Pali: Cakkavatti). According to tradition Princess Cammadevi, the first ruler of Haripunjaya, was a daughter of King Cakkavatti of Lavo and wife of the King of Rāmaññadesa: the date is uncertain but Coedès has plausibly estimated it to be in the 8th century, and there is some reason to believe that the year in which the princess was offered the throne of Haripunjaya was 768 A.D. Around the year 1000 a Malay prince, Jayaviravarman, conquered Lavo, and then, apparently using Lavo as a base, seized power at Angkor. He was later expelled by Suryavarman I of Cambodin, a Khmer, who next took possession of Lavo. After that, though Lavo at times regained its independence, it was for substantial periods the chief stronghold of Khmer power in central Siam; and its importance to the Khmer may be judged from Jayavarman VII’s appointment of one of his own sons to be its ruler at the end of the 12th century. In the last quarter of the 13th, Lavo was apparently an independent kingdom, for it sent a series of embassies to the Mongol Court, the first probably between 1278 and 1281, and the others in 1289, 1291, 1296 and 1299. Its ruler, though we do not know who he was, must have been friendly to Sukhodaya, for otherwise Rāma


19) For the account in Jinakalamali, see Coedès in BEFEO XXV/1, pp. 75, 76; cf. ibid., p. 76 note 1; for the date proposed by Coedès, see ibid., p. 25. For the account in the Lampañ Chronicle, see Nottion, Annales du Siam, II, pp. 17, 18; cf. p. 18 note 2. The Lampañ Chronicle gives the date Cammadevi received the invitation as 690 of the Era, a pñkśan year, or 1071 of the Buddhist Era; the date given in the Buddhist Era is obviously nonsense, but 690 Mahāsarakajā was indeed a pñkśan year, equivalent to 768 A.D. (which accords very well with Coedès’s estimate).


22) Flood, JSS LVII/2, pp. 220-225; Pelliot, BEFEO IV, pp. 241-243.
Garphéén would not have been able to reach Cambodia for the crippling attack which, as we know from Chou Ta-kuan, he made on that country around 1295.23

At that time the city of Ayodhyā (now Ayudhya), some 50 km. south of Labapúrī, was doubtless a dependency of Lavo. It too had been in the cultural orbit of Dvāravatī, and later fell under Khmer domination. The old town is thought to have been on the mainland east and south of the present one, which is situated on an island in the Jao Payā River.

What happened to all these territories after Rāma Garphéén’s death?

Subarṇāpūrī, which we have guessed did not submit to him until near the end of his reign, may have broken away soon after Lōdaiya’s accession. With Subarṇāpūrī gone, Lōdaiya could have no hope of holding Rājapūrī, Bējrapūrī or the Malay Peninsula. Jayanāda, which had presumably been much longer in the orbit of Subarṇāpūrī than of Sukhodaya, probably broke away about the same time.

Rāmādhīpati I, founder of the kingdom of Ayudhya, was born in 1315.24 According to the Sakhhepa History, his mother was a daughter of the ruling prince of Traiṭrīṇa in the fourth generation after the founding of the city, while the identity of the child’s father was a mystery. On consulting the omens, it was discovered that the father was a cultivator named Nāi Śen Pam (nāi sēn pam), whose body was covered with carbuncles, and who grew vegetables on the bank of the river. The ruler, overcome with shame, sent his daughter and grandson away from the city with Nāi Śen Pam. They left by boat and rowed downstream to Nāi Śen Pam’s hut, where the god Indra gave him a magic drum to strike whenever he wanted anything. When he struck it the carbuncles disappeared from his body and he immediately became handsome. When his wife struck it a golden cradle for their son miraculously appeared, so the


24) The Astrologers’ Record gives the date as a year of the tiger, C.S. 676, Monday, the 8th day of the 5th month (p. 2). This accords with the statement of the Sakhhepa History that he was 37 years old when the dedication ceremony of the new capital was held.
boy was given the name Jao Ū Tông (cau ū dön), ‘Prince Golden Cradle.’ In 681 of the Era, a year of the goat, first of the decade [A.D. 1319/20], when Nai Şen Pom struck the drum again, a great city came instantly into being, complete with a royal palace, ramparts, gates and fortifications. He named it Debanagara, ‘City of the Gods,’ because the gods had created it. He assumed the name King Sirijaya Jian Şen (Chiang Şen), and reigned over Debanagara until his death in 706 of the Era, a year of the monkey, sixth of the decade [A.D. 1344/45]. He was succeeded by his son Jao Ü Tông. The latter, not long after becoming King of Debanagara, decided to move his capital, so he commanded his officers to look for a suitable site where there was an abundance of fish [sc. to feed a large population]. They went southward (lembak), discovered a site in the area of Sano Pond which was replete with all kinds of fish, and returned to Debanagara to report to the King. He then went to inspect the place himself, gave it his approval, and built a temporary dwelling for himself at Viān Hlek (‘the Iron Fort’). Then he began constructing the new city. After it was completed, the dedication ceremony was held, in C.S. 712, on Friday the sixth day of the waxing moon of the fifth month, at nine pādas past the third nālkā [i.e. Friday, March 4, 1351 A.D. (Julian), at about 7.40 in the morning].25 The King, who was then thirty-seven years old, assumed the regnal name of Rāmadhipati. He named the new capital Kruṅ Debamahānagara Pavarā Dvāravatī Śrī Ayudhya Mahātitaka Bhābanaśravatī Rajadhiśā Purārmaya Utamaśravatī Janivēśa-mahāśāhāna, taking the name Debamahānagara from his former capital Debanagara, the name Dvāravatī because the site was surrounded by water like ancient Dvāravatī, and the name Ayudhya after the city of Nārāyaṇa’s avatāra, King Rāma.26

25) Both the Saṅkheda History and the Astrologers’ Record give this date. We are indebted to Mr Roger Billard of the École Française d’Extrême-Orient for calculating the equivalent in the Christian Era for us.

26) Saṅkheda History, pp. 282-5. In this context, ‘ancient Dvāravatī’ means the legendary city of the god Kṛṣṇa, the eighth avatāra of Viṣṇu, though there is doubtless also a paronomastic reference to the old kingdom of Dvāravatī in Siam, whose glories it was hoped the new capital would inherit. The name Ayudhya [Ayodhya] was taken from the city of Rāma, the seventh avatāra of Nārāyaṇa [Viṣṇu] and hero of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Rāmākirti, with whom Rāmadhipati himself was paronomastically identified. For a discussion of the complete name of the capital, see Prince Dhani Nivat, The City of Thewa-ravatī Śrī Ayudhya, ISS XXXI/2, p. 147 ff.
This story has its weaknesses, but they are of little consequence in comparison with the useful information it gives. We conclude that Ramadhipati was the son of a traitrīśa princess by a man who four or five years later became ruler of a principality called Debanagara.

Prince Damrong has shown that Ramadhipati married a daughter of the ruler of Subarnapuri and inherited the principality upon his father-in-law’s death. Of course there is no merit in the Sākhēpa History’s explanation of the name Jao Ū Tong. While it could mean ‘Prince Golden Cradle’, the alternative interpretation proposed by Prince Damrong is much more plausible: it simply means the Prince of Ū Tong or Subarnapuri (as a place-name ‘Ū Tong’ means ‘source of gold’, and is a doublet of Skt. Subarnaśāhumi, the old name of Subarnapuri). Ramadhipati’s personal name is not known, but we shall refer to him as ‘Ramadhipati’ for convenience, even though it is an anachronism before 1351, just as it is an anachronism to call him ‘Jao Ū Tong’ before his father-in-law’s death.

As the usual age for a prince to marry was sixteen, we may guess that Ramadhipati married the Subarnapuri princess around 1331, when his father was ruling at Debanagara, and that he inherited the principality of Subarnapuri (Ū Tong) some time after that, but before his own father’s death in 1344/45.

Why did the ruler of Subarnapuri leave his principality to Ramadhipati rather than to one of his own sons? Perhaps his sons were children of minor wives, whereas his daughter was the child of his chief consort, a lady of high rank; perhaps he chose Ramadhipati as his son-in-law because he observed his unusual ability and decided to designate him as his successor; at least that is Prince Damrong’s suggestion, and it has much to recommend it.

In addition a comparison with some of Subarnapuri’s neighbors may throw light on this type of succession. In Ramanāndesā, as Professor Shorto tells us, the Môn chiefdoms were transmitted through the female

28) ibid., p. 71.
29) ibid., p. 87.
Madame Poree-Maspero's investigation of Khmer royal genealogies shows that, while the line of succession was sometimes from father to son, it was often from maternal uncle to nephew or from father-in-law to son-in-law. Some of the rulers belonged to families claiming descent from the 'Solar race', others from the 'Lunar race'; and it seems that matrilinear succession was connected with marriages between a man of a Solar family and a woman of a Lunar family, or vice versa. The corollary would be that a prince belonging to a Lunar family by birth could become a Solar king by marrying a Solar princess and uniting his domain to hers, or a Solar prince could become a Lunar king by marrying a Lunar princess. That would explain why history so often shows Cambodia suddenly expanding in size and losing large territories just as quickly.

Madame Thierry finds echoes of this practice in Cambodian customs and folklore: traditionally a bridegroom had to build a temporary house for himself and his bride on her parents' property, and work under their authority for a certain number of months or years; when the time was up, the couple would move elsewhere and the husband would be the master. The Mon tradition is rather similar: the bridegroom brings his belongings and settles down in the bride's father's house; he has to help his father-in-law for three years, the father-in-law for his part being bound to provide him with work; and at the end of the period he can, if he chooses, build a house and set up a separate household.

In the same way Rāmadehipati must have served a kind of apprenticeship in statecraft under his father-in-law before inheriting the principality of Subarṇapuri.

Why does the Sūkhākhepa History say nothing about Rāmadehipati's marriage or his reign at Subarṇapuri? Perhaps the manuscript used by the compiler for the part of the history dealing with Rāmadehipati's life before 1351 was defective, having been copied from an earlier manuscript from which a page or two had dropped out, or been purposely omitted.

in the process of being ‘shortened’ (for such is the meaning of ‘saṅkhepa’), and the fanciful explanation of the name Jao Ú Tong was interpolated by some later copyist who did not know what it really meant. We can believe this the more easily because a later passage in the Saṅkhepa History says that after Rāmadhipati mounted the throne of Ayudhya he appointed Kun Luang Pò Ngua, who was his Queen's elder brother, to rule Subarnaṇapuri, giving him the title Šamtee Paramarājādhirāja, at the same time appointing his own son Rāmesvara to rule Labapuri. This passage, which assumes the reader has already been told about Rāmadhipati's earlier relationships with Subarnaṇapuri, seems inconsistent with the omission.

The omission to tell us where Debanagara was located may be due to similar causes. In its present form the Saṅkhepa History implies that Nāi Šen Pöm's house—the site on which Debanagara arose—was only a short distance downstream from Traṅkrāsa; but in reality, as Prince Damrong observed, Debanagara must have been much nearer Subaraṇapuri. Prince Damrong tried to solve the difficulty by supposing that Rāmadhipati's maternal grandfather was not reigning at the city near Gampeng Pet where the dynasty was first established, but that one of his forebears, at some unknown date, had moved the capital to Nagara Paṭhama, the old name of which was Nagara Jayasri. As Skt. śri and Pali sīri are the same, Prince Damrong thought there might be a connection between Nagara Jayasri and the name of the founding ancestor Jayasri. The Traṅkrāsa where Rāmadhipati was born would then be at Nagara Paṭhama, and Debanagara would be a short distance downstream from it on the Nagara Jayasri River. This hypothesis implies the loss of one more passage in the manuscript used by the compiler of the Saṅkhepa History, which is fair enough; but there is another difficulty. The History says that when Rāmadhipati, who was reigning at Debanagara, sent his officers to search for a suitable site for his new capital, they went ‘south’, and the site they chose was in the area of Sano Pond (Mu 111u). This is of course the old name of Ṣaṅvṛtira, ‘Lord Rāma’s swamp’, on the island in the Jao Payā river which is the present site of Ayudhya. It is clear, then, that Debanagara was north of Ayudhya, not at Nagara Paṭhama, which is southwest of Ayudhya.

34) sub anno 712; cf. Prince Damrong, Miscellaneous Articles, pp. 72, 73.
We can hardly avoid the conclusion that Debanagara was Labapuri (Lopburi), 50 km. north of Ayudhaya and 60 km. northeast of Subarnapuri. We know that Ramadhipati possessed the province of Labapuri when he founded his new capital, for he gave it to his son Râmaśvara to rule. It seems likely that the domain Ramadhipati inherited from Sirijaya Jiañ Sên was approximately the same territory that belonged to the kingdom of Lavo in Râma Gaṅghê's time, which almost certainly included the old city of Ayodhya. How Sirijaya Jiañ Sên gained possession of Lavo can only be guessed—for the moment we can suggest no improvement over the story of the magic drum—but the date 1349/20 seems plausible enough.

The 'Luang Prasert' Recension of the Annals of Ayudhya records nothing before 1351 except the founding of a statue called Buñ Jôn in 1324. This is of course the colossal seated Buddha at Viś Buñ Jôn (as the name is now written) on the mainland south of the present city; but we can learn nothing from it, as the original statue is hidden inside a much larger stucco statue of later date. Presumably the original statue was founded by Sirijaya Jiañ Sên or one of his vassals. We shall see below that two monks from Sukhodaya went to study at Ayodhya in the 1320's, so that city must have been a religious center of some standing at the time.

In 1349, says the Chinese writer Wang Ta-yuan, 'Hsien submitted to Lo-hu.' As Lo-hu means Lavo, and Hsien (Siam) means Sukhodaya in earlier works, the statement has generally been taken to mean that Sukhodaya submitted to Ramadhipati in 1349. This view seemed to be confirmed by the list of sixteen states which, according to the Saṅkhêpa History and several other versions of the Annals of Ayudhya (but not the most reliable one, the 'Luang Prasert' Recension), were tributary to Ramadhipati when he received the abhiṣeka at Ayudhya in 1351, for the list includes Sukhodaya and Svargaloka (Sajjanalaya). But the list, at least in part, appears to be a later interpolation; and in any case everything that we have learned in recent years about Sukhodayan history

35) Cf. Griswold and Prasert, On Kingship and Society at Sukhodaya, where we suggested that Sirijaya Jiañ Sên's city of Debanagara was Ayodhya itself or in its immediate neighborhood. We no longer think that probable.
36) AA/LP, sub anno 686.
shows that the kingdom of Sukhodaya, despite its losses, remained independent until 1378. Professor Wolters, by demonstrating that in Wang Ta-yuan's statement 'Hsien' means Subarna-puri, has given us an explanation that fits the facts much better: Wang Ta-yuan is simply referring to Rāmaḍhipati's consolidation of his two inheritances. Subarna-puri was a larger and richer principality than Lavo, for by this time it included Jaya-nāda, Rājapuri and Bejrāpuri, and also had as tributaries much, if not all, of the Malay Peninsula, as well as Taxoy and Tenasserim, which would explain why 'Hsien' comes first in the combined term 'Hsien-Lo' used by the Chinese for the kingdom of Siam from about that time on. But Ayudhya was better located strategically and economically, which explains why Rāmaḍhipati established the capital of the combined kingdom there.

Rāmaḍhipati's appointment of his brother-in-law Pō Ngua as vassal ruler of Subarna-puri was doubtless a recognition of the power the House of Subarna-puri already had there, and an attempt to assure himself of Pō Ngua's loyalty. His appointment of his own son Rāmeśvara to rule Lopburi recognized the influence the House of Sirijaya Jiat Sen had established at Lavo, which he hoped his son Rāmeśvara would retain as his deputy. In addition the nomenclature offered auspicious perspectives. Rāmaḍhipati, namesake of the legendary Rāma, ruled a city of the same name, Ayodhya. The legendary Rāma had a son called Lava or Laba (Lop), whose name reappears, perhaps by a play on words, in that of Labapuri, 'city of Lava', or as it is called in the inscription of Prah Khan of Angkor, Lavodayapura, 'city of the origin of Lava';38 While Rāmaḍhipati doubtless gave Labapuri to his son for reasons of statecraft, magic would regard it as an apt choice.39

37) Wolters, A Western Teacher and the History of Early Ayudhya, Social Science Review, June 1966, pp. 88 ff., especially pp. 95 ff. Alternatively we might draw another conclusion from Professor Wolters' demonstration: that after the death of Rāmaḍhipati's father-in-law, Kim Luang Pō Ngua tried to seize Subarna-puri, and that Rāmaḍhipati (ruling at Lavo since his own father's death) brought him to heel in 1349.

38) BEFEO XLI, p. 296. The name is given as Lavodaya in the Phimanakas Inscription; see Coedès, Inscriptions du Cambodge II, p. 176.

39) It is tempting to think there may also be a reference to Labapuri in the official title of Ayodhya (see above, p. 33). Labapuri (Lopburi) had an alternative name, Nabapuri (Nabpur), which survived into the late 19th century, and which was usually taken to mean 'New City' since naba = Skt. nava, 'new'. But nava can equally well mean 'nine', and Navapuri could be an abbreviation of Navaratna-rajadhani-puriramya 'royal city of the nine jewels' (given in the Sāṅkhēpa History in the form Bhabanabaratna Rajadhani Puriramya).
Let us recapitulate the probabilities. Rāmādhhipati was born in 1315 at Traītrimśa, a little principality which had long been tributary to Sukhodaya and probably still was. His father was a man of obscure origin, while his maternal grandfather was the Tai ruler of Traītrimśa, who may well have been related to the royal family of Sukhodaya. In 1319 Rāmādhhipati’s father, having gained possession of Lavo in circumstances of which we know nothing, moved to Labapuri, which he re-named Debanagara. Around 1331 Rāmādhhipati married the daughter of the ruler of Subārṇapuri, moved to his father-in-law’s seat, and helped him expand his domain until it included Jayanāda, Rājapuri, Bejarapuri, Tavoy, Tenasserim, and a good deal of the Malay Peninsula. Upon the ruler’s death, presumably in the 1330’s, Rāmādhhipati inherited his father-in-law’s domain and became known as Jao Ū Tōng. Upon his father’s death in 1344/5, Rāmādhhipati inherited the principality of Lavo and moved to Labapuri. He then consolidated his two inheritances into a great kingdom, chose Ayodhyā as the site for a new capital because of its abundant resources, and received the investiture as King in 1351.

In order to seek, in events recorded for a time a little after 1347, evidence for the biography of Rāmādhhipati before that date, we have passed beyond the chronological limits proper to the subject matter of the present paper. Now we must go no further, but turn to the territories west of Sukhodaya which were tributary to Rāma Gāṃphēn, and see what happened to them after his death.

West

Tāk, on the right bank of the Ping 25 km. upstream from the present town of that name, seems to have been a tributary of Sukhodaya ever since the establishment of the kingdom. In the reign of Rāma Gāṃphēn’s father Śrī Indrāditya, Tāk was attacked by the ruler of Chōt (Mē Sōt), a state which lay in the mountains on the Burma frontier 75 km. to the southwest. Rāma Gāṃphēn, who was only nineteen years old at the time, went with his father to the defence of Tāk and drove off the attacker. Evidently Tāk was among the dependencies inherited by Rāma Gāṃphēn.
when he came to the throne, as well as the other cities in the Ping valley from there down to Traitéripsa (see above, pp. 29, 32); but Chôt remained safe in its mountain fastnesses.

We do not know how or when Chôt fell into his hands; but it would be characteristic of him to select his old enemy's stronghold as his first target after his accession. A military expedition to Chôt would require courage and skill; and the success of such an operation might impress some of the neighboring rulers enough to induce them to seek protection as vassals of Sukhodaya.

The postscript to Inscription I tells us that Rama Gamphên received the submission of Mōn Chôt, Mōn ... n, Hanśābati and the territory as far as the seacoast.41

The mutilated name between Chôt and Hanśābati was almost certainly Mōn Bann (mən), i.e. Bān (bən), which will reappear frequently in the course of this paper. It was the name used at Sukhodaya for Martaban,42 the capital of Rāmaṇnadesa for most of the period from 1287 to

---

41) ibid., p. 219 and note 131.
42) It seems certain that Bān means Martaban; if it did not, Martaban would not be mentioned in this passage at all. It would be impossible to account for its omission, because it became tributary to Rāma Gamphên in the 1280's, and it remained the capital of Rāmaṇnadesa after the whole country became tributary to him (see below, pp. 42-43). In the portion of Mālasānā that deals with the first half of the 14th century the King of Rāmaṇnadesa seems to be residing at Bān (see below, p. 50). For these reasons we conclude that Bān was the Siamese name of Martaban in the Sukhodaya period; but we have not been able to discover what Burmese or Môn name it represents. The similarity between 'Bān' and the last syllable of 'Martaban' is probably no more than a coincidence, as 'Martaban' is thought to be a European corruption of one of the variants of the Môn name (given as Mut-ta-man in Yule and Burnell, Hebron-Joseph, London, 1886, p. 428). A Burmese inscription of 1151 gives the name as Mutτma (Luce, Old Burma, Locust Valley, 1969, Vol. I, p. 84 note 12); the Môn faces of the Kalyāñi Inscription give it as Mattma, the Pali faces as Mutτmanagara (Epigraphia Birmiana, III/ii, p. 199 ff.; Taw Sein Ko, The Kalyāñi Inscriptions Erected by King Dhammaceti at Pagsa in 1476 A.D., Rangoon, 1892); and the Siamese version of Rājādhīrāju, translated from Môn in 1785, gives it as Maubṭhāmah (mawān).
1363.\textsuperscript{43} Hānsābati is Hamsāvati (Pegu, about 80 km. north-northeast of Rangoon), an old and important city which became the capital of Rāmaññadesa in 1369.

The extension of Rāma Gaññē's power westward to Martaban and Hamsāvati was due less to his own arms than to the machinations of a man named Makado (Magatō) from Lower Burma. One account calls him a Môn, but others say he was a Tai, which seems much more probable, though he may have been of mixed blood.

The Siamese version of the Rājādhārāja, which we shall refer to as R/S, recounts the story of Makado's career at length. He was born in the province of Martaban where his father was a merchant. When he was fourteen or fifteen years old his father died, so he took over the business. He had a younger sister named Un Rūm and a younger brother named Maka†.

One day he set out with thirty followers for Sukhodaya on a trading venture. While they were crossing the mountains there was a violent thunderstorm although it was not the rainy season. Makado had a vision of brilliant light to the east, and of a royal palace to the west. He consulted a seer, who told him the visions signified that, as a result of merits accumulated in past lives, he would rise to a high position somewhere to the east and become a king somewhere to the west. He and his companions then went on to Sukhodaya. When they had finished selling their goods he sent his followers home, but he himself decided to stay at Sukhodaya. He took service in the elephant stables of King 'Pra Ruang' [in this context certainly Rāma Gaññē] where he soon attracted the King's notice by his energy and diligence. After a time he was appointed governor of the palace. In this post he served the King with such devotion that he was regarded almost as an adopted son, and enjoyed great power and influence.

\textsuperscript{43} We take these dates from Harvey, \textit{History of Burma}, London, 1925, p. 368, who gives the capital as Martaban, 1287-1363; Donwun, 1363-9; Pegu, 1369-1539. According to Phayre, \textit{History of Burma}, London, 1883, p. 66 ff., it was Martaban from 1287 to some time in the 1320's, then Pegu until soon after 1348, then Martaban again, and finally Pegu.
Not long afterward the King received a letter from one of his vassals asking for help because he was about to be attacked by a large force of ‘Khék Java’ [Javanese or Malays]. The King set out at the head of an army to drive the enemy off, leaving Makado to look after the palace in his absence. While he was away Makado fell in love with one of the King’s daughters and took to meeting her in secret. He was discovered by a friend of his, who warned him to stop at once, because if the King learned of it he would surely put Makado to death. Makado then talked with the Princess and asked her to elope with him. She agreed to do so, and gathered a lot of clothing and valuables to take with her which they could sell. They also recruited seventy men of the palace guard and over a hundred ordinary citizens who had faith in him. They left Sukhodaya, with the Princess riding on a she-elephant, and started toward Martaban. But Makado kept thinking of his sovereign; and at one of their halts, turning his face toward Sukhodaya, he prostrated himself as if doing homage to him. He also wrote him a letter, apologizing for his wrongdoing, telling the story of the omens he had seen on the way to Sukhodaya, saying that the prophecy based on the vision to the east had already been fulfilled by His Majesty’s kindness, explaining that his present actions were necessary in order to fulfill the rest of it, and begging for mercy. When the King returned to Sukhodaya and heard the news he was naturally furious; but as soon as he read the letter and learned that Makado was destined to be a king in the Môn country his anger vanished, and he sent Makado his blessings.

In 1281 Makado arrived home with his wife and followers, and was welcomed by all his relatives. Soon afterward his sister Un Rään married the Burmese governor of Martaban. The latter became alarmed at Makado’s growing wealth and popularity and plotted to kill him, but Un Rään sent him a warning, and when the attack was about to begin Makado’s men killed the governor. With the aid of his supporters Makado then made himself ruler of Martaban.

Later on, Makado, who was about to build a palace for himself, sent a message to the King of Sukhodaya announcing that he had made himself ruler of Martaban and praying for recognition as the country’s king under the suzerainty of Sukhodaya. ‘Your Majesty’s slave named Makado places his head beneath Your Majesty’s feet,’ he wrote. ‘Your
Majesty’s slave has done wrong, and fears Your Majesty’s punishment for running off with Her Highness the Princess. If Your Majesty will shield us both and exert authority over us we shall be safe from danger. Your Majesty’s slave has conquered the land of Martaban but has neither regalia nor title, and he begs that Your Majesty will be pleased to bestow them upon him.” Makado appointed an ambassador to take the letter to Sukhodaya, with more than a hundred attendants to carry offerings to Rama Ganphêń. When the mission arrived and the letter was presented, Rama Ganphêń was delighted. He called his counsellors and said: ‘Makado, who used to be in our service, fears us because he did wrong by running off with our daughter to the Môn country. Now that he is ruler of Martaban he asks to submit to us and receive a title. Sirs, what is your opinion?’ After reviewing the question, the counsellors concluded that Makado must possess a great store of accumulated merits, and said it would be fitting for the King to comply with his request. Rama Ganphêń said, ‘If my counsellors think so, I agree.’ He praised Makado’s accumulated merits, saying it was as if the sky (rúa, 猪) were leaking (rúa, (285,643),(338,670)) on him. He had the title ‘Jao Fârua’ inscribed on a golden sheet, and commanded his officers to take it to Makado together with regalia consisting of a white parasol, a crown, a sword, a fan and a pair of golden slippers. The officers then went to Martaban with the members of Makado’s mission. When Makado received the title and the regalia, he turned toward the east, prostrating himself with raised hands in homage to the King of Sukhodaya. On an auspicious day calculated by the astrologers Makado started to build his palace. A hole was dug for the main post of the building, a pregnant woman was pushed into the hole, and the post thrust in on top of her.44

44) Râjâdhirâja (Siamese translation), 5-17; cf. Phayre, History of Burma, 65; Harvey, History of Burma, 110 f.; Coedès, Etats hindouisés, 374. There are substantial discrepancies in these accounts in regard to the regnal dates of the kings of Râmaññadesa (see Table II). Phayre’s account is based on a Burmese translation of a history of Pegu written by the Môn monk Hsayadau Athwa; Harvey’s is based on the Burmese Yazadarit Ayedawbon (for the latter work, cf. D.G.E. Hall, ed., Historians of South-East Asia, London, 1961, pp. 57-8.) ‘Yazadarit’ is the Burmese pronunciation of ‘Râjâdhirâja’. 
In 1287, when the palace was finished, Makado assembled the astrologers, Brahmins and officers, and had them perform the ceremony of investiture, giving him the name *jao Fa-rua* which the King of Sukhodaya had bestowed on him. By this time he had conquered Hamsāvatī and was ruler of the whole of Rāmaṇadesa. In 1293 the King of Sukhodaya sent him a white elephant which became the palladium of Martaban; it was escorted on its journey by five hundred men and accompanied by four Brahmins chanting mantras.

Makado was later assassinated (for the date, see Table II). His brother Mukaṭṭa who succeeded him sent an ambassador to Sukhodaya with presents and a request for a title. The King of Sukhodaya had the name 'Rāmapratiśtha' inscribed on a gold sheet and sent it back with the ambassador. When Martaban was attacked by an army from Lān Nā, Rāmapratiśtha seemed to do nothing to defend the country. This alarmed his sister Un Rūān, who had by now married a second husband, Smin Mah Lā!ū. They took counsel together, had Rāmapratiśtha assassinated, and put their own son *jao Āo* on the throne in his place.

Jao Āo sent the same request to Sukhodaya as his predecessor had done, and received in return a gold sheet inscribed with the title 'Sēn Miāng Miṅg'. He seized the provinces of Tavoy and Tenasserim, which some historians have taken as an act of disloyalty toward his suzerain, on the theory that these provinces were tributary to Sukhodaya at the time. But were they? Even if we assume they had been tributary to Rāma Gaṅghē, which seems probable though we have no specific evidence to that effect, is there any reason to believe they were still tributary to Lōduīya?

According to Phayre, Sēn Miāng Miṅg was married to a daughter of the King of Sukhodaya, but there seems to be some confusion here.

---

47) R/S, 45-48; Phayre, 66.
48) R/S, 47 f.; Phayre, 66.
49) Prince Damrong, *Miscellaneous Articles*, 80; Phayre, 66.
50) 'The young king [Sēn Miāng Miṅg] was married to a daughter of the King of Siam'; Phayre, 66. By 'Siam' in this passage, Phayre evidently means Sukhodaya.
The only Sukhodayan princess mentioned in R/S is the lady who eloped with Makado. After Makado's death, according to R/S, she married Sén Mûang Ming's father, Sinh Mânh Lāp, whereas Sén Mûang Ming himself married his cousin Lady Tāpî.

Some time before 1321 the principality of Tàk, which had so long been a possession of Sukhodaya, was seized by a prince of Chiang Mài, one of Mâhrâya's grandsons who were fighting among themselves for the succession.51 The loss of Tàk would not necessarily cut off Lôdâiyâ's access to the route to Râmaññadesa, which led from Chiang Tông (on the Ping, between Tàk and Gampêng Pet), via Chôt to Myawadi and Kawkareik in Burma, and then down the river Gyaing to Martaban. But it would shake Lôdâiyâ's hold on Chiang Tông and the cities farther down the Ping, which we have reason to believe broke away before the end of his reign.52 We have no dates; but it is quite possible they were detached from Sukhodaya not long after Tàk, which would make it impossible for Lôdâiyâ to hold Chôt, much less to exercise any control over Râmaññadesa by sending a fighting force there even if he had one to send.

Sén Mûang Ming's successor on the throne of Râmaññadesa was his brother Jao Chîp, who took the title Râmaññâiya.53 Apparently he did so on his own initiative; at least there is no mention of his having received it from Sukhodaya. Perhaps official missions could no longer travel over the route between Martaban and Sukhodaya; or perhaps the new king of Râmaññadesa saw no advantage in being tributary to a

51) The evidence is the statement in Jinakñamâli that Mâhrâya's grandson Najjoththara (Nam Tuam) used Takkapura (226) as a base for his attack on Hari-puînâya in 1321; see Coedès in BEFEO XXV/1, p. 92; Jayawickrama, p. 114. Tàk presumably remained subject to Lân Nà after the disputes were settled. It was not recovered by Sukhodaya until around 1373; see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya, p. 41.

52) It appears that Sukhodaya did not recover these cities until shortly before 1357; see Griswold, op. cit., pp. 33, 34.

53) R/S, 49; Phayre, 66. For the date, see Table II. 'We learn from the Burmese annals,' says Prince Damrong, 'that after the death of Sén Mûang Ming, Pegu revolted and that King Lôdâiyâ endeavored unsuccessfully to quell the rebellion' (Miscellaneous Articles, 81). We can find no authority for his statement, unless it is Phayre (p. 67), who in reality says something rather different.
suzerain who could offer him no protection. In Rāmamaṭaiya’s reign, according to Phayre, Tavoy and Tenasserim ‘were retaken by the King of Siam’.54 This ‘King of Siam’ can hardly have been Lōdaiya; it was more probably the ruler of Subarṇapuri.55

The account of Rāmamaṭaiya’s reign given in R/S may be summarized as follows. He had two queens. One of them was a daughter of Rāmapratiṣṭhā named Lady Āppāḥ, who afterwards received the title Lady Candamāgala. The other was Lady Tapī, the widow of his brother and predecessor Sēn Mūang Ming. Lady Tapī had had a son by Sēn Mūang Ming named Āy Gaṅ Gōṅ, whom Rāmamaṭaiya adopted; but he proved to be mean and deceitful, so Rāmamaṭaiya threw him into prison and confiscated his possessions. One day five hundred Tai deserted from Bejrapuri, came to Martaban, and asked Rāmamaṭaiya to let them join his army because they heard it said everywhere that he had much love for his servants and soldiers. Their words gave him pleasure, so he rewarded them, accepted their offer, and appointed one of them, a man named Chī Pōn, as their commander. Rāmamaṭaiya attacked and conquered Tenasserim, while one of his generals attacked Tavoy. Later on, Rāmamaṭaiya himself attacked and conquered Tavoy.

What are we to make of the story of the five hundred Tai? As Bejrapuri, where they claimed to come from, is on the route from Subarṇapuri to Tenasserim, it is possible they were not really deserters at all, but a fifth column sent by the ruler of Subarṇapuri to interfere with Rāmamaṭaiya’s plans for Tenasserim, and eventually to seize Martaban itself for Subarṇapuri.

Some time after Rāmamaṭaiya returned to Martaban, Chī Pōn, who had just built a new house, begged him to honor him with a visit. When Rāmamaṭaiya entered the house the five hundred Tai fell upon him and killed him. Chī Pōn then mounted the throne.56

---

54) Phayre, p. 66.
55) Cf. Prince Damrong, Miscellaneous Articles, p. 81. Prince Damrong’s statement that these events took place after the founding of Ayudhya is apparently a slip; the latest possible date would be around 1330.
56) R/S, 49-52; for the date, see Table II. Phayre (p. 66) gives a much shorter account of Rāmamaṭaiya’s reign, and says he moved the capital from Martaban to Haṃsāvatī (not mentioned in R/S).
A week later Chi Pôn was killed by a certain nobleman to whom Lady Candamaṅgala had offered a large reward. She then released Āi Gam Gong from prison, set him on the throne, and married him. But as he showed neither gratitude nor affection toward her she poisoned him a few months later.\(^{57}\)

Lady Candamaṅgala then offered the throne to Āi Lão, the Lord of Thaton and Haṃśāvati, who was a son of Rāmapratiṣṭhā.\(^{58}\) Āi Lão went to Martaban, mounted the throne and made Lady Candamaṅgala his chief queen. From that time on, says R/S, the ties of friendship between Martaban and Sukhodaya were severed.\(^{59}\)

This statement can hardly mean that Āi Lão declared his independence from Sukhodaya: why should he renounce an act of vassalage which he had never assumed? It seems to be merely the statement of a fact which had been true since the accession of Rāmamāṭaiya who, unlike the first three kings of the dynasty, did not receive his title from Sukhodaya.

'The king of Siam,' says Phayre, 'angered at the death of Egāṅkān [Āi Gam Gong], who was his daughter's son, sent an army to punish his murderer. The Siamese force was defeated, and from this time the subordination of the dynasty of Wareru [Jaṅ Fā-rū] to Siam, ceased.'\(^{60}\)

Very likely the 'king of Siam' who Phayre says sent an army against Āi Lão was really the ruler of Subanāpurī, who, as we have suggested, sent the 500 Tai adventurers to Martaban to act as a fifth column for him. We see no reason why the ruler of Subanāpurī should be angered at the murder of Āi Gam Gong, but he would have every reason to be chagrined at the murder of Chi Pôn, whom he was no doubt counting on to make Martaban tributary to him. Even if the army he sent against Rāmāṇādasa failed to dislodge Martaban from Āi Lão, it may well have succeeded in seizing Tavoy and Tenasserim.

\(^{57}\) R/S, 51 f.; Phayre, 66.
\(^{58}\) Phayre, 66; R/S, 53. Āi Lão was apparently a half-brother of Lady Candamaṅgala (cf. R/S, 49).
\(^{59}\) R/S, 52.
\(^{60}\) Phayre, 66-7.
Unlike the political history of Rājendrā's reign, for which we have had to fall back largely on hypotheses, we have a good deal of information about its religious history.

Ever since the decline of Buddhism in India the island of Ceylon had been regarded as the fountainhead of the Theravāda, not only as the great storehouse of Buddhist learning, but also as the guardian of the most genuine monastic succession. To religious-minded people this last was as vital a matter as the apostolic succession in the Catholic Church. In order to become a monk a man has to fulfill certain conditions, and to be ordained in accordance with certain specified rites, in a duly consecrated place, by a chapter of monks who have been duly qualified to perform them. If there is any flaw in the qualifications of the ordaining monks, or in the performance of the ceremony, even though the flaw may pass unnoticed, the candidate's ordination will not be really valid; and any ordination which he himself may later perform will in turn be defective. There was always the danger that some flaw which might have occurred centuries ago would invalidate an entire succession without anyone being aware of it; and the only way for a monk to be certain of avoiding it was to be re-ordained, with the most orthodox rites, by a chapter of monks whose own succession was of unassailable validity. The Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura in Ceylon was generally admitted to preserve just such a succession.

The Mahāvihāra had a branch at Udumbaragiri, on a rocky mountain in the wilderness overlooking the Mahāvāluka River several miles south of Polonnāruva. This was an establishment of Araṇāvāsi or forest-dwelling monks, who were famous for their learning and their austerity. 'Forest-dwelling' is one of the thirteen dhutaṅgas or special ascetic practices which a monk may undertake as a means of purification and an aid to deep meditation. The Visuddhimagga (II, 53) specifies three

1) The Kālyāṇi inscription is an eloquent document concerning this danger; see Taw Sein Ko, The Kālyāṇi Inscriptions Erected by King Dhammacat at Pegg in 1476 A.D., Rangoon, 1892.
2) In the 11th century a long war had disrupted the Saṅgha in Ceylon and broken the succession, but it was restored with the aid of properly ordained monks from Burma; see Cuḷavamsa, Chapter LX.
grades of this dhutagga: in the strict grade, the monk lives permanently in a forest; in the medium, he spends only the cold and hot seasons there, retiring to a town or village monastery in the rainy season; in the mild, he spends only the hot season in a forest. Some Forest-Dwellers, refusing artificial shelter, lived as hermits in sylvan retreats, and took no nourishment except wild fruits and the roots of plants; others lived in 'forest monasteries', such as the Udumbaragiri. According to the rule, a 'forest monastery' had to be a certain minimum distance from the nearest town or village: in the case of an unwalled village, at least twice the distance a woman standing in the doorway of the outermost house would throw water when emptying a basin; in the case of a walled town, at least the distance a vigorous young man could throw a stone from the gate-post, or, according to another formula, 500 bow-lengths (about a kilometre) from the gate-post.

Ordinarily the Forest-Dwellers did not constitute a separate sect; every sect was likely to have its main establishment in the capital city of the kingdom, with some branches in other towns, some in villages, and some in the forest. The Forest-Dwellers were simply monks who adopted special duties and a special mode of life more or less permanently. But as some sects might have very few of them, and others very few Town-Dwellers, it sometimes happened that the two modes of life corresponded to two different sects.

At Pagan in Upper Burma the predominant Theravadin sect was the Ariyarahanta, which had been imported from the Mon city of Thaton in the 11th century. Some monks had doubts about the validity of the monastic succession in this brotherhood, and thought it safer to go to be re-ordained in Ceylon. In the reign of Narapati Sitthu (1174-1211) a community of Sihalabhikkhus ('Ceylon monks') was established at Pagan by five Mahatheras who had been ordained in Ceylon and spent many years of study there. The senior member of the group was a Mon named Chapata; one of the others was from Tamralipti in Bengal, one was a son of the King of Kamboja (Jayavarman VII), one was from Kañci in South

3) Buddhaghosa, *The Path of Purification* (Vissudhimagga), translated by Bhikkhu Nayanālī, Colombo, 1936, 73.  
4) Ibid., 72.
India, and one was from Ceylon. Chapāṭa, it is said, believed that the Mahāvihāra alone had kept the legitimate succession unbroken from teacher to teacher, and that valid ordination could be conferred only from this source. Probably all five monks belonged to the Mahāvihāra fraternity, but there is no evidence that they had any connection with the Udumbaragiri or that they practiced the dhutanaga of forest-dwelling permanently, though they doubtless undertook it from time to time. The new sect gained the King's favor, and their following grew in numbers. But the Mahāthera from Ceylon defected in order to marry; Chapāṭa died; and the other three had disputes on points of discipline, which caused the Ceylon order at Pagan to split into three separate sects.

At Martaban at the beginning of the 14th century there were, in addition to the Ariyārahanta, three sects of Sīhalabhikkhus which derived from the three at Pagan.

Two chronicles, Mūlasāsanā and Jinakālamāli, contain accounts of a new community of Sīhalabhikkhus which was established at Martaban in 1331, and of an offshoot from it established in Sukhodaya ten years later. We shall here summarize the information to be derived from these accounts, supplying estimated dates where we have no exact ones. After that we shall give translations of the two accounts, and the justification for our proposed chronology.

In 1331 twelve Mān monks from Martaban, who had gone to Ceylon to be re-ordained and to study the Dhamma at the Udumbaragiri Monastery, returned home. They were accompanied by a Mahāthera named Anumati—apparently a Sinhalese—who was a disciple of the

5) Taw Sein Ko, p. 51 f. According to the Kalyāṇī Inscription, Chapāṭa before returning to Pagan had spent ten years studying the Tipiṭaka and the Commentaries in Ceylon; and as he had completed his tenth year in the Order he received the designation of Thera ('Elder'). The designation Thera ('Elder') is conferred on monks who have spent ten years in the Order, the honorific Mahā ('great') on those who have passed a certain course of study.


7) Taw Sein Ko, 57-58.

8) The Kalyāṇī Inscription lists six sects at Martaban at an unspecified date, apparently between 1245 and 1458 (see Taw Sein Ko, pp. 56-58). The first is the Ariyārahanta under a different name; the next three are the Sīhalabhikkhus deriving from the three Ceylon sects at Pagan; and the last two were established by monks who had visited Ceylon and been re-ordained there. In all likelihood the three sects deriving from Pagan were established at Martaban soon after the fall of Pagan in 1287, while the last two were probably established later.
Mahāthera Kassapa, Abbot of the Udumbaragiri Forest Monastery. Anumati and the twelve Môn monks established a community of Forest-Dwelling Sihalabikkhus near Martaban, which was apparently the first one there to have ties with the Udumbaragiri, and very likely the first to practice forest-dwelling permanently. The King (Baññ Ái Lāo?—cf. Table II) and all the people were so delighted with Anumati’s virtues that they decided to confer the honorific title Udumbarapupphā Mahā-sāmi on him. His fame attracted disciples to Martaban from afar. Two of these were Siamese Mahātheras from Sukhodaya, Anomadassi and Sumana, who had studied for a time at Ayodhya. To be ordained in the Mahāsāmi’s order they had first to retire from the monkhood and become laymen, which would of course deprive them of their seniority; then Udumbarapupphā re-ordained them as bhikkhus. They studied with him for five years, and then went back to Sukhodaya, where they stayed five years more. Then they returned to Martaban again, probably in 1341 or 1342 and, having spent the required ten years in the Ceylon order, received the grade of Mahāthera (cf. above, p. 50 note 5.)

Shortly before this, Udumbara had received a message from King Lōdaiya requesting him to send a monk to Sukhodaya who was qualified to perform all the acts of the Saṅgha in accordance with the Sinhalese rites. This means that there were not yet any qualified Sihalabikkhus at Sukhodaya, though some other sect of Forest-Dwellers had been there ever since Rāma Gaṇhēn’s time. Udumbarapupphā complied by sending Sumana and Anomadassi to him. Lōdaiya installed Sumana in the Mango-Grove Monastery (sādhana), a kilometre west of Sukhodaya. In like manner Lōdaiya—who, as we have seen (p. 25), was uparaja at Sajjanaḷaya from 1340 to 1347—installed Anomadassi in the Red Forest Monastery (sādhana), at the foot of Mount Siripabba south of Sajjanaḷaya.

9) Several monks of this name had been head of the Udumbaragiri Monastery at different times. We have not been able to discover anything about this particular one from Ceylon sources.

10) It is not clear whether or not he already had the title of Mahāsāmi. If he received it in Ceylon, it might imply that he was not Sinhalese, for ‘sāmi’ was a title regularly conferred by the King of Ceylon on foreign monks who came there to be re-ordained (see Taw Sān Ko, pp. 27, 80-81). But he may equally well have received it in Ramānadesa, where it may have been granted to distinguished members of the Ceylon order regardless of their origin.
Not long afterward a remarkable adventure befell Sumana. He was on his way from Sukhodaya to Sajjanālāya to visit Anomaḍassī, traveling on foot, and stopped for a few days at Bāng Jā (Pān Cā) on a tributary of the Yom called the Fā Gradān (ḏānmaṇ). He was told there had been an old cetiya there, built by King Aśoka of India to enshrine a relic of the Buddha, but the monument had fallen down long ago and the relic was lost. The villagers reported, however, that other relics came and performed miracles there [sc. the relics, shining with light, flew in from elsewhere as if to communicate with the lost relic]. That night the guardian sprites of the cetiya appeared to Sumana in a dream, urging him to rescue the lost relic and help the villagers restore the monument. The next morning when he told the people to dig they discovered a casket with the relic inside it. Sumana lustrated the relic in a golden bowl, and saw it perform numerous miracles.

He then went on to Sajjanālāya, taking the relic with him. As the good news had preceded him, Līdaiya had made everything ready to receive him and the relic with suitable honor. After a few days he received a message from King Lōdaiya saying that he too would like to see the relic, so Sumana took it to Sukhodaya, where further honors were showered on him. These events probably occurred in 1342 or 1343.

The remainder of Sumana’s career is beyond the scope of this paper, but we shall recount it briefly, as a preliminary to our discussion of the authorship of Mūlasāsana. King Kilanā (Gu Na) of Lān Nā (r. 1355-85) invited Sumana to settle in Lān Nā and establish an order of Forest-Dwelling Sīhakadakkhus there. After some hesitation Sumana accepted, and in 1369 set out for the northern kingdom. Kilanā installed him at Wat Prā Yūn, a large monastery he had built for him about a kilometre east of Haripunjaya. Sumana did not stay there very long. In 1371 he moved to Chien T'ai, where Kilanā built the Flower-Garden Monastery (Wat Suan Dōk-mai) for him to the west of the city. Sumana became its first Abbot, and remained there until his death around 1389.

As everyone knows, the evidence of inscriptions is to be preferred to that of chronicles. Yet when chronicles deal coherently and plausibly with matters on which epigraphy is silent we believe they should be taken into consideration. We shall therefore give the chronicular evidence and suggest the conclusions to be drawn from it; afterward (p. 71 f.) we shall try to see whether there is anything in the inscriptions to invalidate them.
Miūlasāsanā, a history of Buddhism written in the Tai Yüan language, was composed at Chiang Mai in the 15th century. This work, which we shall call M for short, has been printed twice. The first edition was printed at Bangkok in 1939, the second at Chiang Mai in 19701. The first was based on a very defective manuscript (there may be no better ones extant) and added several mistakes of its own; the second is a reprint of the first. Most of the mistakes are obvious enough, and can be corrected by means of cross-checking. Where passages have dropped out, which is frequently the case, they can often be supplied, in approximate form, from the context. Despite its defects, M is a work of outstanding value to us because it gives such a lot of information about the religion at Sukhodaya in Lōdaiya’s reign.

The main author of M, who wrote in the 1420’s and almost certainly composed the portion that concerns us, was a monk called Buddhānā. From internal evidence we conclude that he was the fourth Abbot of the Flower-Garden Monastery at Chiang Mai, who held office c. 1418-29.  

1) अभिलोचन, Bangkok, B.E. 2482; Chiang Mai, B.E. 2513. As the pagination is the same in both editions, our references to pages in M are applicable to either. The footnotes in both editions contain numerous mistakes, especially in the interpretation of dates.  
2) The colophon to M (p. 337) gives the names of the two authors as Brah Buddhābukāma and Brah Buddhānā, without any further identification. As one section of M (pp. 243-261) is in effect the chronicle of the Flower-Garden Monastery, we may assume that both authors resided there. It appears that they were not collaborators, but that one of them was the main author who curried the narrative up to his own time, and the other continued it from there.  

Buddhānā, was almost certainly the fourth Abbot of the Flower-Garden Monastery, who presided over it from 1418 until 1429, when he was removed by the King and sent to the Jetubana Monastery at Haripunjaya. At p. 252 it is stated that 61 years had elapsed from the got set year in which the Flower-Garden Monastery was founded up to the got set year when this passage was written (’61 years’ means 60 years plus any fraction of a year). The dates of these two got set years are wrongly given in M; but Jinañcalami-li, whose dates are generally reliable, says the Flower-Garden Monastery was built in CS 733, which presumably means it was dedicated in that year, i.e. 1371 A.D. The nearest got set year was CS 732, and when the author of M says the monastery was built in a got set year, he must mean that it was begun in CS 732=1370 A.D. The got set year ’61 years later’, in which the passage was written, would therefore be CS 792 or 1430 A.D. We conclude that Buddhānā composed his portion of M in the 1420’s while he was Abbot of the Flower-Garden Monastery and added the passage under discussion soon after his removal.  

The second author, Buddhābukāma (the name is obviously misspelt) should probably be identified with the twelfth Abbot, who is called Mahā Kukāmāna-māra at the top of p. 260 and Mahā Nāgasārada in the next paragraph, and who held office from 1489 to 1499 (we have corrected the dates at p. 260, which have gone wrong by a few years). Evidently Buddhānā was the main author.
Although he does not always express himself very clearly, we have good reason to believe that he knew most of the facts correctly. He took office, presumably at an advanced age, about 30 years after Sumana's death, so it is quite possible that he had known him personally, perhaps even been one of his disciples. In any case it is obvious that he looked back on Sumana with deep veneration, committed the chief events of his career to memory, and had access to any historical records concerning him that were still extant.

If we tabulate the information given in M at pp. 245 and pp. 250-253, we have the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Held office from:</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Number of years in office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sumana</td>
<td>733 ruang gai</td>
<td>755 got sai</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kumārakassapa</td>
<td>755 got sai</td>
<td>gā me t</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nandapaññā</td>
<td>gā me t</td>
<td>770 pīk set</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Buddhapanna</td>
<td>770 pīk set</td>
<td>(not given)</td>
<td>(not given)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Buddhagambhira</td>
<td>(not given)</td>
<td>814 gā klai</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This information is obviously full of mistakes. 'Buddhapani'ā' is a mistake for Buddhapani, correctly given on p. 255 and p. 260 (probably miscopied here under the influence of the preceding name, Nandapaññā). In several cases the year numbers do not correspond to the cyclical names of the years, nor to the years in office. If we take as our base the year CS 733, the date given by both J and M for Sumana's assumption of office, and make what appears to us to be the most reasonable corrections, we shall have the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Held office from:</th>
<th>To:</th>
<th>Number of years in office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sumana</td>
<td>CS 733 ruang gai</td>
<td>CS 751 got sai</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AD 1371)</td>
<td>(AD 1389)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kumārakassapa</td>
<td>CS 751 got sai</td>
<td>CS 765 gā me t</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AD 1389)</td>
<td>(AD 1403)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Nandapaññā</td>
<td>CS 765 gā me t</td>
<td>CS 780 pīk set</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AD 1403)</td>
<td>(AD 1418)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Buddhapanna</td>
<td>CS 780 pīk set</td>
<td>CS 791 got rao</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AD 1418)</td>
<td>(AD 1429)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Buddhagambhira</td>
<td>CS 791 got rao</td>
<td>CS 805 gā klai</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(AD 1429)</td>
<td>(AD 1443)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Translation of Miilasana, pp. 225-235

In the ruang met year, sakurajja 693\(^3\), twelve monks returned (to Bân)\(^4\) from Ceylon.

They had requested the consent of King Suttasoma\(^5\) (of Rāmañña-desa) and gone to Ceylon to be re-ordained in the community of the Mahāthera (Kassapa). (While they were there) the King (of Rāmañña-desa) heard of the virtues of the Mahāthera Kassapa from afar. Being much delighted, and desiring to have him nearby, he fitted out a junk and sent men (to Ceylon) to invite him to come. The Mahāthera did not come, but sent instead one of his disciples, a monk named Anumati who resided at Udumbara\(^6\), together with a sāmānera who was his nephew and all the twelve monks who were natives of Bân. After preparing everything for the journey, they made a respectful salutation in farewell to their teacher, embarked on the junk and crossed the sea to Bân in accordance with the King’s wish.

(Anumati) practiced the religion there, beginning by establishing a consecrated place with simā boundary-stones for the acts of uposatha, then performing the acts of uposatha and pavāraṇā in concert with the twelve native monks, and after that he ordained a great number of disciples\(^7\). Of course they all followed the rules of conduct strictly, and the religion of the Omniscient Lord flourished exceedingly at Bân.

---

3) At p. 225 the first printed edition (as well as the corresponding passage in the two manuscripts we have consulted) gives the date as CS 793 ruang met, while the second printed edition gives it as CS 293 ruang met; but neither 793 nor 293 was a ruang met year. At p. 252, however, M gives the date as CS 693, which is certainly right, for CS 693 is the only ruang met year which could possibly correspond to the facts (CS 633, corresponding to 1271 A.D., would be much too early; CS 753 or 1391 A.D. would be much too late). We have therefore corrected the date to CS 693 (1331 A.D.).

4) In this translation we have put parentheses around the words we have supplied to clarify the meaning. In many cases it is likely that the author actually included expressions corresponding to those we have supplied, but that they later dropped out of the text through careless copying.

5) The name seems to be a fanciful one, taken from the Jātaka tales. Probably Baññi Ai Lão is meant.

6) The Udumbaragiri Forest Monastery in Ceylon.

7) In other words he established a consecrated place surrounded by eight boundary-stones (simā) as required for monastic ceremonies such as the acts of uposatha and pavāraṇā (the recitation of the Patimokkha or precepts of the monastic discipline twice each lunar month and at the conclusion of Vassa), and the ordination of monks. See Taw Sein Ko, pp. i-vi.
The people and the King were so delighted with Anumati's virtues that they decided to bestow a higher title on him. They conferred together, asking one another, 'What special name shall we give him?' Then the wise men saluted the King and addressed him as follows: 'Your Majesty, a fig-flower is rare in this world, and of course a quantity of fig-flowers is rarer still. A man who has as many virtues as Mahā Anumati is as rare as (a quantity of) fig-flowers. For that reason we ought to give him the special name of Udumbarapuppha Mahāśvāmi.' The King and the people agreed; so all together they bestowed that name on him. From that time on, the Buddha's religion flourished exceedingly in the Môn kingdom.

At that time there were two Mahātheras, natives of Sukhodaya, one named Anomadassi and the other Sumana, both of whom were disciples of Mahā Parbata, the Saṅgharāja of Sukhodaya. They had gone south to study the Three Piṭakas at Ayodhiyā, and then returned to the community of the Saṅgharāja Mahā Parbata as before. Having heard of the virtues of Udumbarapuppha Mahāśvāmi from a lot of merchants who had seen him at Bān and spoke about him when they returned, the two Mahātheras went to Bān to become his disciples. When they arrived they retired from the monkhood and asked to be ordained in the community of Udumbarapuppha Mahāśvāmi. The Mahāśvāmi ordained them, together with his own nephew the śāmaqera who had come with him from...

8) To a botanist this is not true at all. A fig itself is largely composed of minute flowers enclosed in a receptacle. 'The fig,' says Holttum, 'is not a fruit in the strict sense of being a developed ovary; it is a whole inflorescence, and the edible part consists of the hollow axis of the inflorescence . . . The individual flowers inside a fig are very small. They can only be examined under a powerful lens after very careful dissection' (R.E. Holttum, Plant Life in Malaya, London, 1954, p. 87.) Naturally the 'wise men' did not know this; they were thinking of flowers in the ordinary sense.

9) Udumbara is the Pali name of a wild fig, the ficus glomerata. The Pali noun puppha, 'flower', is neuter; but the wise men were evidently construing it as masculine, as the context shows puppha is intended to be the plural. Of course there is also a paranomastic reference to the Udumbaragiri ('Fig Hill') in Ceylon. It is not clear whether they were going to give him the title Mahāśvāmi or whether he already had it (cf. Section 3, note 10). It will be noticed that M frequently uses Sanskrit forms rather than Pali ones, even when speaking of monastic matters (e.g. svāmi, instead of sāmi). These may be due to later editing.
Ceylon. The two of them studied the Three Piṭakas and the interpretation for five years, and then took leave of the Mahāsvāmī to return to Sukhodaya. The Mahāsvāmī gave them the title of Nissayamutta, saying: ‘From now on you have no need of supports. When you have returned to Sukhodaya and remained there for five years, come back to see me again, and I will make you Nissayamuttas with the title of Maha­thera.’ Having listened to the Mahāsvāmī’s injunction, the two monks undertook to observe the thirteen dhutaṅgas. Then they went back to stay at Sukhodaya as before.

They stayed there five years; and when they returned to the community of Udumbarapupphā Mahāsvāmī they took eight monks with them, namely the Reverends Ānanda, Buddhaśāgara, Sujāta, Khema, Piyadassi, Suvaṃśagiri, Vessabhū and Saddhatissa, who when they arrived at the community, asked to be re-ordained. The Mahāsvāmī had the

10) "...literally ‘the elder and younger brother.’ They may or may not have been brothers, for the expression could equally well mean cousins or merely friends.

11) Nissayamutta, ‘freed from supports,’ i.e. able to preach without guidance from elder monks, was a title given monks who had been members of the community for five years, and therefore equivalent to Majjhimabhāmi in the modern Siamese saṅgha (see Wells, Thai Buddhism, Its Rites and Activities, first edition, p. 146; second ed., p. 181). The word nissayamutta is used in the same sense in Rāma Gaṇḍhi’s inscription at Nā/27; see JSS LIX/2, p. 211 f., note 77.

12) The text says ‘1 year’; but as it is clear from what follows that the right meaning is 5 years, we have made the correction.

13) Conjectural translation. The syntax is obscure and the text may be corrupt.

14) Optional ascetic practices recommended by the Buddha as an aid to cultivating contentedness, renunciation, energy, etc. A monk may take the vow to observe one or more of them for whatever length of time he sees fit. They are as follows: (1) wearing only patched-up robes; (2) wearing only three robes; (3) going for alms; (4) not omitting any house while going for alms; (5) eating at one sitting; (6) eating only from the almsbowl; (7) refusing all further food; (8) living in the forest; (9) living under a tree; (10) living in the open air; (11) living in a cemetery; (12) being satisfied with any dwelling whatever; (13) sleeping in a sitting position and never lying down. See Nyanatiloka, Buddhist Dictionary, Colombo. 1950, s.v. dhutaṅga. Of course it would be impossible for anyone to observe all thirteen dhutaṅgas at the same time. That is what our text said they undertook to do, but it probably means only that they undertook to observe the dhutaṅga of forest-dwelling and perhaps a few others.

15) The text says 7, but then proceeds to enumerate 8.
Rev. Anomadassi act as upajjhāya for three monks, namely the Revs. Khema, Suvannagiri and Piyadassi; and he had the Rev. Sumana, who acted as upatthamba for them, act as upajjhāya for the other five, namely the Revs. Ananda, Buddhāgāra, Sujata, Vessabhā and Saddhatissa. Thus all these monks were re-ordained in the monkhood.

They stayed in the community of Udumbarapuppha Mahāsvāmi for about three months. Then the Mahāsvāmi addressed all (ten) monks as follows: ‘Take heed, Sirs! The religion which I brought with me from Ceylon is not firmly established in this land of the Mons, is it? It will be firmly established in your country to last up to 5000 years. Therefore, Sirs, make haste and take the religion back to your own country and establish it there!’ Upon hearing his words, the monks prepared for their journey, saluted him, and asked leave to depart.

At that point, as the Rev. Anomadassi was the senior member of the group, Udumbarapuppha Mahāsvāmi intended to take Anomadassi’s almsbowl and see him off. When he took the Rev. Sumana’s almsbowl and came with it slung over his shoulder to see the Rev. Anomadassi off, accompanying him part of the way before returning to his own abode, his disciples asked him: ‘Is Your Lordship carrying the Rev. Sumana’s almsbowl on your shoulder in order to see him off?’ Udumbarapuppha Mahāsvāmi replied: ‘No, Sirs, I did not take up the Rev. Sumana’s

16) In this passage, upatthamba (‘support’) apparently means the ācāriya (‘teacher’) who assists the candidate when he is being ordained by the upajjhāya. A candidate for ordination must first present himself to an abbot or an upajjhāya (a monk with power to ordain, which he cannot have until he has become a therī). He must also seek one or two monks to act as ācāriya, instructing him in the Pali responses required, assisting the upajjhāya at the time of ordination, and afterwards giving further instruction to the newly-ordained monk. Not more than three candidates are received by an upajjhāya at any one ordination ceremony. (See Wells, Thai Buddhism, 1st ed., pp. 119, 123, 146, 147; 2nd ed., pp. 135-151, 181, 182.)

17) Pāli, ‘is not firmly established’; but the text may be corrupt. In the first place the author has already told us twice that the religion was in a very flourishing condition at Lān. In the second place the negative usually used in this text is not ल त but ल.

18) A reference to the old prophecy that the religion will disappear in the year 5000 of the Buddhist Era.
almsbowl in order to see him off, I am carrying on my shoulder the Buddha's almsbowl which I brought from Ceylon, and I am sending it to the Tai country to be firmly established and remain illustrious there up to 5000 years. The two Mahātheras brought the eight monks with them to Sukhodaya.

The Rev. Anomadassi went to reside (at the Red Forest Monastery) at Sājanālaya. The people of the city were so delighted with him that they gave him the special title of Svāmi. As for the Rev. Sumana, he went to reside at the Mango Grove at Sukhodaya. They both practiced the religion, planting simā boundary-stones and ordaining people into the monkhood, of course in cooperation with each other. Sometimes the Rev. Sumana brought candidates to be ordained at Sājanālaya in cooperation with the Rev. Anomadassi; sometimes the Rev. Anomadassi brought them to be ordained at Sukhodaya in cooperation with the Rev. Sumana.

As for the eight (other) monks, Rev. Piyadassi carried the religion to establish it in Ayodhyā, where the people gave him the title of Mahāsvāmi; Rev. Suvannagiri carried the religion to establish it in Jávā, where the people gave him the title of Mahāsvāmi; Rev. Vessabhū carried the religion to Nān, where the people gave him the title of Mahāsvāmi; Rev. Ānanda practiced the religion at the Mango Grove at Sukhodaya, where he replaced Rev. Sumana when the latter carried the religion to Chiang Mai. The other monks—Revs. Buddhāsagara, Sujāta, Khema and Saddhātissa—went to practice the religion in the middle city, namely Sōn Gvē.

19) The significance of the almsbowl incident is obscure and our translation is conjectural. The text may be corrupt.
20) The text is corrupt. The words lāmbhāra, 'at the Red Forest Monastery', have dropped out, and one of them, i.e., has found its way by mistake to a place two lines below, after baddha, 'Mango Grove'. For the Red Forest Monastery, see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, Map 3, No. 19; for the Mango-Grove Monastery, ibid., Map 2, No. 26.
21) Luang Pra Bang.
22) This Ānanda was one of the eight Siamese monks mentioned above, whom Sumana and Anomadassi took with them to Bān for ordination. He should therefore not be confused with the Ānanda mentioned by M at p. 235, who was a native of Bān.
23) Sōn Gvē (sōn an) was at or near Bāsuloka. Why it should be called 'the middle city' is not clear.
Now we shall tell how the Mahāthera Sumana carried the religion to establish it in Chiang Mai.\(^{24}\)

Once when he was on his way to Sajjanālaya, traveling on foot in order to preach tranquility and kindliness to the people, he stopped to preach at a place called Bāŋg Jā, 2 yojanas from Sukhodaya which lay to the southwest, and 1 yojana from Sajjanālaya which lay to the northwest.\(^{26}\) Soon after his arrival (the people told him that)\(^{27}\) a relic of the Lord Buddha, sent by King Aśoka,\(^ {28}\) had been enshrined in a cetiya there a very long time ago; but the cetiya had fallen down, no one could find (any trace of) it to worship, and that relic ought to go to a place where people could worship it. Because the Mahāthera had come to practice the religion and make it flourish,\(^ {30}\) many relics of the Buddha were coming and performing miracles both by day and by night,\(^ {31}\) and all the people who saw them told Sumana about them.

24) Before actually telling how Sumana carried the religion to Lān Nā, which he did in 1369, the author continues the recital of the events of the 1340's, telling at length the story of Sumana’s discovery of the relic which was to become so influential in Lān Nā in the 1370's.

25) The text (p. 229) has ехмшпрп (etc.) which makes no sense. We take it that the right order is ехмшпрп (etc.).

26) Sumana was evidently walking along the Pra Riang Highway (shown as a dotted line in Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, Map 4). The Fā Gradān cuts across the route a little over 30 km. north-northwest of Sukhodaya and a little over 20 km. south-southwest of Sajjanālaya (the river is shown somewhat too far north on the map, loc. cit.). Bāŋg Jā (Pān Cā) must have been located at the ferry. In Pali literature the value of the yojana is about 11 km. (in Siam its present value is 16 km., but it was less in the past). A few pages further on, the distance from Sajjanālaya to Bāŋg Jā is given as 2 yojanas, which would be about right if we take the value of the yojana as 11 km. The wrong distances and faulty azimuths here are apparently due to mistakes in copying. If we read ‘3 yojanas from Sukhodaya’ instead of ‘2’, and ‘2 yojanas from Sajjanālaya’ instead of ‘1’, we shall get the distances right; and if we read нази (instead of нази) in both places the azimuths will be improved.

27) This whole passage is corrupt. A lot of words seem to have dropped out, and we have conjecturally restored them.

28) King Aśoka of India (third century B.C.), who dug up the Buddha’s relics and divided them into 84,000 particles, which he sent to different parts of his realm and elsewhere to be enshrined in cetiyas.

29) для, for ду, equivalent to ду.

30) sc. in the kingdom of Sukhodaya.

31) These seem to be relics which flew in from other places to celebrate Sumana’s arrival at Bāng Jā and draw attention to the lost relic.
At that time several sprites who were guarding the Buddha's relic disguised themselves as Brahmins and appeared to the Mahāthera in a dream, saying: 'O Mahāthera! this relic of the Buddha will be extremely hard to find, because it came here such a very long time ago to wait for Your Lordship to discover it. You should gather the people together to dig for it.' (Then they told him where to dig)\(^{32}\).

(The next morning when the people gathered) he said: 'May the Lord Buddha's relic be found for me!' As soon as he had spoken, all the people purified their hearts. They dug down at that place, and soon they came to soil mixed with brick and many pieces of stone, so they were all delighted. Then they found an earthenware jar, which they brought to the Mahāthera. When the Mahāthera opened it and looked inside he found a silver casket. When he opened this he found a golden casket inside, and when he opened it he found a coral casket inside. At first he was not sure whether it was coral or a relic of the Buddha, but on closer examination he found it to be coral. He wanted to open it to look inside but could find no opening. He thought it was a reliquary, but why was there no relic of the Buddha inside it? He then worshiped it with various offerings, and made this wish: 'If it is really a reliquary, let there be an opening!'\(^{33}\) At once he saw the opening, so he opened the reliquary, took out the relic and placed it in a golden bowl to lustrate it. The relic manifested itself to let all living creatures see it. Then it performed a miracle, dividing itself in a moment into 2, 3, and up to 80 relics, floating on the surface of the water in the golden bowl, while the Mahāthera looked on with joyful heart. Then he sent word about it to the Ruler (of Sajjanālaya)\(^{34}\).

---

32) The text is again defective. Some expressions of the sort we have supplied here and in the next line must have dropped out of it.

33) This wish was a saccakāriya, an 'act of truth', which always consists of two parts, a premise and a wish. Provided the speaker has earned sufficient merit (e.g. in past lives), and provided the premise is true, he can be certain that the wish will come true too. See Geiger's translation of Mahāvamsa, Colombo, 1950, p. 125 note 1.

34) i.e. Lūdaiya, who was viceroy at Sajjanālaya from 1340 to 1347. The date of his appointment is given in the colophon to the Traibhūmiṇikāṭhā (see Coedès in BEFEO XVII/2, pp. 9, 45). He remained viceroy until his accession to the throne of Sukhodaya in 1347 (ibid., 13, 45).
When the Ruler heard the wonderful news he built a pavilion in the middle of the city of Sajjanālaya. Then he sent a message inviting the Lord Buddha's relic and the Mahāthera to come to the city. The Ruler caused the road from Sajjanālaya to Bāŋgāla to be cleared and made smooth everywhere; on each side of the road he set a row of banana trees, sugar-cane, fragrant substances, parched rice and flowers, together with lamps and music of every sort; and he had people wait to salute (the relic as it passed); the distance from Sajjanālaya to Bāŋgāla is about 2 yojanas\(^3\). The Ruler then caused drums to be beaten in proclamation in all the roads and lanes in Sajjanālaya to tell everyone to go to welcome the Lord Buddha's relic. When the people of Sajjanālaya heard the drums of Bāṅgāla they all raised their hands in salutation over their heads, facing toward Bāṅgāla with joy and delight, in such excitement that they got goose-flesh, and they all went together to welcome the relic.

On his journey to welcome the relic and his return trip to the city, the Ruler of Sajjanālaya was followed by a body of elephantry and cavalry, and accompanied by a retinue of illustrious persons from the city and the countryside wearing the dress of the various communities, carrying parched rice and all sorts of flowers, and speaking politely in a manner befitting the dignity of the Ruler's retinue, while the people followed in pairs or in groups in an endless procession. The Ruler and the townspeople went together to the Lord Buddha's relic, scattering an abundance of flowers and parched rice all the while. The Mahāthera took out the relic to show it to the Ruler, who caused music to be played in homage to it. The relic performed an astonishing miracle, and the Ruler was so thrilled that he got goose-flesh. After watching for a suitable length of time, he invited the relic and the Mahāthera to his city. He did homage to the relic, raised it up, and placed it in a golden shrine on the back of his own elephant. The procession then returned to the city.

\(^3\) Taking the value of the yojana as 11 km., the distance is here stated correctly. Cf. above, note 26.

\(^6\) The text in either this sentence or the preceding one must be corrupt. Were the drums beaten at Bāṅgāla, or in Sajjanālaya, or all along the road?
When it arrived there the Ruler, taking the golden shrine containing the relic into his arms, placed it in the pavilion with his own hands, and caused music to be played and drums beaten ceaselessly. When the relic entered the pavilion it would fill the people with joy and faith by performing very suitable and astonishing miracles. After extending an invitation to the Mahāthera to reside near the foot of Mount Siripabbata together with the relic, the Ruler, desiring to see the miraculous relic (again), presented it with many offerings in homage and, saluting the Mahāthera respectfully, said: 'Your Lordship, I beg to see the relic perform a miracle for the salvation of all creatures.' When he heard the Ruler say he would like to see the relic, the Mahāthera opened the caskets one after another, smeared his hands with sweet-smelling substances, and took the relic out to show the people, beginning with the Ruler. When the Ruler and the assembled multitude saw the relic they were all overjoyed, and paid homage to it with innumerable offerings. The Mahāthera and the Ruler lustrated the relic with perfumed water in a golden bowl. Then the relic sprang up above the surface of the water in the golden bowl like a dancing hamsa bird, and performed an astonishing miracle by shooting forth rays of 6 colors in order to dispel any doubt among the people that it was a genuine relic of the Buddha. Then it divided itself into 2 relics, and all the people saw this special miracle which they had never seen before. The Mahāthera, together with the people beginning with the Ruler, uttered exclamations of applause, and the people, relieved of their doubts, scattered cloths and scarves in homage a hundred times. The relic, after relieving everyone of doubt, joined itself together again into a single piece. All the people saw this stupendous miracle, which quickly made them rejoice even more than before, and they did homage with a great quantity of rich offerings. When the relic had completely satisfied their hearts by letting them see the miracle, the Mahāthera, taking various fragrant substances, received the relic and replaced it in its caskets as before.

---

37) We assume that අශෝ is a mistake for අශෝු අශෝු; cf. below, note 42.
38) The text has 'Siripāda', which is obviously a mistake; so we have made the correction. The Ruler was inviting the Mahāthera to take up his residence at the Red Forest Monastery. See above, note 20.
39) The text may be defective. We should expect the relic to divide itself into '2, 3 and up to 80 relics' as it did at Bāng Jā.
Now King (Dharmarāja) of Sukhodaya, having heard about the relic, sent officers of the Crown with a message to the Mahāthera, saying: 'We beg Your Lordship, who is full of compassion, to bring the Buddha's relic to Our city to relieve Us of suffering.' Thereupon the Mahāthera, full of compassion, having heard the royal message which the officers of the Crown had brought him, took the relic to Sukhodaya to relieve the King of suffering.

His Majesty King Dharmarāja, knowing in his wisdom that the relic was coming, caused the highway to be decorated with all sorts of things, such as bouquets and banners; he had a pavilion built, roofed with pure white cloth; and he prepared various offerings for the lustration of the relic. King Dharmarāja, the sovereign of the realm, having caused offerings such as flowers to be prepared, came out with all his troops to welcome the Buddha's relic and the Mahāthera when they arrived at his city. When the relic reached the city of Sukhodaya he took the excellent Mahāthera to stay at a monastery befitting an ascetic. That same day His Majesty, full of faith, saluted the relic; then he saluted Mahā Sumana and spoke as follows in order to lustrate the relic: 'We beg Your Lordship, who possesses such beautiful virtues, to let us see the relic perform a miracle for us all.' When the compassionate Mahāthera heard the King make this request, he opened the coral reliquary with his own hands so as to relieve the King of suffering and

40) Lūdaiya.

41) dukkha. The expression is purely conventional: dukkha (Pali dukkha) means the general ills which all creatures are subject to. The presence of the miraculous relic might alleviate these by reinforcing people's faith and their desire to make merit. The King may or may not have been ill at the time, and he was certainly in deep trouble from his territorial losses; but the expression here is not intended to refer to anything so specific. A similar expression occurs at p. 235, where it obviously has no topical significance.

42) Presumably the Mango-Grove Monastery, which qualified as an abode of Forest-Dwellers.

43) The phrase 'with his own hands', may be mistakenly interpolated here. It reappears, in almost the same form (phalasā inā), five lines further on, where it seems to be more appropriate. It is much more reasonable to say that the King took the relic up in his own hands than to say that the Mahāthera opened the reliquary with his own hands (we have already heard how the Mahāthera opened the reliquary on two previous occasions, without any special remark about whose hands were used).
bring the joy of heaven to him. King Dharmarāja gazed upon the relic, which was so excellent an object of contemplation for his heart. When he saw it revealed to his eyes, he and all his officers were filled with delight; and he invited it to enter the cloth-covered pavilion to be illustrated. Filled with faith, he took the relic up with his own hands, went to the golden bowl, mixed water with various fragrant substances, and spoke as follows: 'If Our Lord's Relic takes compassion on the company assembled there, then may we be allowed to see a miracle so as to cause the hearts of the townspeople to open like flowers, and make us radiant one and all! May we be allowed to worship it!'

But that time it did not perform a single miracle. It became inert because that city was not the place where the Lord Buddha's relic was to remain.

44) Conjectural translation of a clause that seems to be corrupt. We assume from the context ဗေဒါ is a mistake for ကြွေ နွေး, the expression previously used for 'golden bowl'. Some words seem to have dropped out between လို, 'went to', and 'နောက်' 'he went into the pavilion and put the relic in the golden bowl'.

45) We assume that the word နွေး is mistakenly omitted after ဗေဒါ.

46) ကျင်းပြားႏွင့်, literally 'attained remaining according to its regular condition.'

47) Doubtless foreshadowing the translation of the relic to Lān Na.
Jinakālamālī, or J as we shall call it for short, is a history of Buddhism composed in Pali by the Monk Ratanapāṇīna at the Red Forest Monastery (Rattavanavihāra) near Chieng Mai in 1516/7, with an addendum by the same author continuing the narrative up to 1527. This Red Forest Monastery (which is of course not to be confused with the monastery of the same name near Sajjanālāya) was a stronghold of the ‘New Ceylon Sect’, founded by a group of Chieng Mai monks who had been re-ordained in Ceylon in 1424. The founders of the New Ceylon Sect were bitterly hostile to the Ceylon sect established earlier by Sumana, which they regarded as deficient in Pali and lax in discipline; but a modus vivendi was eventually reached. Ratanapāṇīna himself writes of Sumana respectfully enough, though without much warmth.

Ratanapāṇīna was a careful historian whose accuracy, at least for the period from the 14th century on, has repeatedly been confirmed by the evidence of inscriptions. The portion of J dealing with Southeast Asia was published by Coedes in 1925, with the Pali text, a French translation, and a valuable introduction and footnotes. More recently Professor N.A. Jayawickrama has given us an English translation of the complete Pali text.

1) See Coedes in BEFEO XXV/1, pp. 4-6.
2) See Coedes, BEFEO XXV/1, 11, 12.
3) Coedes, Documents sur l’histoire politique et religieuse du Laos occidental, BEFEO XXV/1. We shall refer to this work as J/C, with page numbers referring to those in BEFEO XXV/1. For the full Pali text of J, see Ratanapāṇīna, Jinakālamālī, edited for the Pali Text Society by A.P. Buddhaddatta Malāthera, London, 1962 (reviewed by Prince Dhāni Nīvat at JSS L/1, 54 ff.).
A Thera named Sumana, a resident of Sukhodaya, had gone to Ayodhapura to study the Dhamma with the teachers there, and then returned to Sukhodaya. At that time a Mahāsāmi named Udumbara had just come to Rammanadesa from the island of Ceylon. Upon learning this, Sumana and a friend of his went to Rammanadesa to be re-ordained by Udumbara Mahāsāmi and to study the Dhamma with him. Dhammarāja, wishing to have with him a monk who was competent to perform all the acts of the Saṅgha, sent an envoy to the Mahāsāmi asking for a qualified monk. The Mahāsāmi, whose only aim was to advance the religion, sent the Thera Sumana to Dhammarāja so that he might perform all the acts of the Saṅgha at Sukhodaya. The Thera Sumana, accompanied by his friend, took leave of the Mahāsāmi and went to Sukhodaya. Dhammarāja, filled with delight, installed him in the Ambavanārāma, which he had just built, and supported him with the four requisites, One day Sumana, who was on his way to Sajjanālaya, came to the river named Pat and made a halt there. A relic appeared by night in


6) Ayodhyā.

7) The name Rammanadesa is a doublet of Rāmaṇādesa.

8) cf. above, section 3 and note 10.

9) ‘Dhammarāja’ in this passage is of course Lōdaiya, since J gives his son’s name a few lines further on as ‘Līdeyyarāja, ruler of Sajjanālaya’, i.e. Lōdaiya when he was Uparāja at Sajjanālaya, 1340-47 (see section 4, note 34). In another passage of J, preceding the portion we have translated, ‘Dhammarāja’ means Mahādharmarāja I (Lōdaiya); but this need cause no confusion, as the time referred to is in the reign of Kilanā of Lān Nā (1355-85), whereas the portion we have translated is retrospective.

10) The rites of uposatha, pavaṇaṇa and ordination; see above, section 4, note 7. It must be understood that Lōdaiya was asking for a monk who would be qualified to perform these acts in accordance with the orthodox Sinhalese rites; there were already plenty of monks at Sukhodaya who could perform them in accordance with their own tradition.


12) i.e. clothing, almsfood, a dwelling-place and medicine.

13) Pānānāma nadiṁ (J/C, p. 44); we follow the translation at J/C, 95, which has ‘la rivière nommée Pā’ rather than that at J/J, 117, ‘the river called Pānām.’ The river is the Pa Grilāva (Sinhalese); see section 4, note 26. As Pali possesses no equivalent of the letter d, P is used instead; and nāmā is omitted.

14) Apparently intending to stay there a few days to preach to the people.
an old monastery, performing a miracle, and the people who saw it reported it to him. That night a tree-sprite, having assumed the likeness of a Brahmin, told him where the relic was deposited. The Thera went there, caused the ground to be dug, and found the relic in a casket. He then went on to Sañjanālaya, taking the relic with him.

At that time Dhammarāja's son Lideyyarāja was ruler of Sañjanālaya. Upon learning that the Thera was approaching, Lideyyarāja went out to receive him, took him to Sañjanālaya, and installed him in the Mahārattavanārāma at the foot of Mount Siripabbata. As Lideyyarāja wished to see the relic, the Thera showed it to him. Lideyyarāja, filled with delight on seeing the wonderful relic, paid homage to it.

King Dhammarāja too heard the news of the relic, and wishing to see it sent an envoy to the Thera. The Thera Sumana went to Sukhodaya and took up his residence at the Ambavanārāma. Desiring to see the relic, King Dhammarāja set out accompanied by bearers carrying a large quantity of offerings, saluted the Thera, and said: 'Sir, I should like to see the relic.' When the Thera showed it to him, he paid homage to it, worshiped it and illustrated it in a beautiful and perfectly clean golden vessel filled with scented water.

[In verse:] The relic, in order to show that it did not wish to remain at Sukhodaya, performed a miracle for the King.

---


16) In the Original Pali, this stanza (J/C, p. 45) reads:

\[
patiheram nidassesi sa Ṛṣa tassa rājino
aṭṭhitukāmubhaavan sukhodayapure tahan ti
\]

While the normal interpretation of this passage is certainly that of J/C and J/1, which we have followed, there is nevertheless much to be said in favor of Mahā Śāh Manavidūra's contrary interpretation in his Siamese translation, which, by understanding that the relic did not perform a miracle, avoids a contradiction with M. In this connection Professor Kamaleswar Bhattacharya of the Centre National de Recherche Scientifique at Paris kindly writes us as follows: 'It might be possible to suppose an aorist nirassesi, "threw off", "despised", "neglected", corrupted into nidassesi, like nidassati for nirassati in the Suttanipata (cf. Pali Text Society's Dictionary, s.v. nidassati), provided we suppose an indicative present nirassesi, which as far as I know, is not attested (the normal indicative present and aorist being, respectively, nirasseti and nirass), but which, on the analogy of other forms, is not impossible (cf. Geiger, Pali Grammar, English translation, § 139.2). This should be regarded as a very bold conjecture.'
While J's account of Sumana is generally consistent with M's, the reader will have observed one striking discrepancy. In J the relic performs a miracle for Lodaiya to signify that it does not wish to remain at Sukhodaya, whereas in M it conveys the same message by declining to perform a miracle when he requests it to do so. On this point M seems more likely to be right than J.

If so, the relic's behavior must have been a frightful shock to Lodaiya. It had performed brilliantly for his son at Sajjanalaya, where it surely would have been even less willing to remain than at Sukhodaya, so the King was entitled to expect it to do the same for him. He made his request to the relic in the form of an 'act of truth' (saccakiriya), a magical device consisting of two parts, a declaration and a wish. If the person making it has earned sufficient merit in his past and present lives, and if the declaration is true, then the wish inevitably comes true too. When it failed to work for Lodaiya the only possible explanation was that his store of accumulated merit was exhausted. Coming on top of his territorial losses, it would confirm what the unlucky monarch must already have suspected, and it might well be calculated to hasten his death.

Fortunately two relics from Ceylon, which arrived at Sukhodaya probably a year or two later, performed a series of miracles in his presence. Before coming to this part of the story, however, we must glance backward and try to establish an approximate chronology.

Both M and J imply that Sumana and Anomadassi were re-ordained by Udumbara Mahāsāmi soon after his arrival at Martaban. As Udumbara arrived there in 1331, we may assume that Sumana and Anomadassi were re-ordained in 1331 or 1332. They were already Theras in the community of Mahā Pabbata (Skt. Parvata), the Saṅgharāja of Sukhodaya, which means they had been monks for at least ten years. Anomadassi was 'senior' to Sumana, i.e. he had been a monk for a longer time and become a Thera sooner, though perhaps not very much.

1) cf. the preceding note.
2) cf. section 4, note 33.
Since we have to work by minimum lengths of time, we shall disregard Anomadassi for the moment, and consider only Sumana's case. Supposing that Sumana became a Thera in Mahā Pabbata's community in 1330 at the latest (which would allow a decent interval of time before he retired from that community), he must have been a monk at least since 1320, and it was doubtless in the 1320's that he studied at Ayodhya. Before 1320 he had probably been a sāmaṇera, and moved on into the monkhood as soon as he was old enough, that is, at the age of 20, so we can guess he was born around 1300. He would therefore be 31 or 32 when he and Anomadassi retired from Mahā Pabbata's community, losing the grade of Thera, in order to be re-ordained as Sīhalabhikkhus by Udumbara. Five years later, say in 1336 or 1337, they returned to Sukhodaya; but not yet being Theras they were not qualified to perform the acts of the Saṅgha. It was probably around 1340 that Lōdaiya (perhaps prompted by Sumana?) sent Udumbara the message asking for a monk who was qualified to perform these acts, by which he meant qualified to perform them in accordance with the Sinhalese rites. In order to comply with the request, Udumbara waited until he was able to confer the grade of Thera on Sumana and Anomadassi.

It was probably in 1341 or 1342 that they returned to Marītban for three months and received the grade of Thera. Being now fully qualified, they went back to Sukhodaya and were installed in 'forest monasteries'—one near the capital, the other near Sajañalāya; and they at once proceeded to perform the acts of the Saṅgha.

Sumana discovered the relic soon after that, say in 1342 or 1343. At that time, as J tells us, Lidèyarrāja was ruler of Sajañalāya, i.e. Lōdaiya was Upāraja there. This fits in well with the information we have from other sources that Lōdaiya was Upāraja at Sajañalāya from 1340 to 1347. Furthermore the Traibhiṁikalā, composed by Lōdaiya in 1345, lists Anomadassi among the teachers to whom he acknowledges his indebtedness. This proves that Anomadassi was at Sajañalāya in 1345, so he may well have arrived there in 1341 or 1342.

3) In the preface he is listed as 'Brah Anomaddasi', and in the concluding statement as 'Brah Mahāthera Anomaddasi'. If the omission of the term Mahāthera in the preface is not simply due to scribal negligence, it may be explained on the ground that the preface was written before Anomaddasi became a Mahāthera in the Ceylon order, while the concluding statement was written after he became one.
It may be objected, on the other hand, that Inscription No. 9 says the Red Forest Monastery was founded by Mahādharmarāja I in 1359, while Nos. 4 and 5 seem to say that the Mango Grove Monastery was founded by him in 1361, so that our epigraphic evidence, so far as it goes, suggests that these two monasteries were not in existence in 1341/2. A possible explanation is that they were really founded around 1341, but on a very modest scale, perhaps as mere sylvan hermitages for a few monks, and that improvements were made later by Mahādharmarāja I on a large enough scale to be regarded as new foundations. This would be the more likely if the new structures were not exactly on the old sites but near them.

Inscription 9, however, throws some further doubt on our proposed chronology. This text was composed in 1406 by the Saṅgharāja Tīlokatalaka Tiratanaśilagandha, who had been ordained as a Gāmavāsi or 'village-dwelling' monk in 1343, and as an Araṇāvāsi or 'forest-dwelling' monk in 1357. After stating that he became Abbot of the Red Forest Monastery in 1361 upon the death of Mahākalyāṇatthera for whom the monastery had been founded two years earlier, the author goes on to say that Mahādharmarāja I sent for Mahāsamaṭṭhānera to come to the Mango Grove vide et al. in the same year, 1361—after which Mahāsamaṭṭhānera came to the Red Forest Monastery to salute the author of the inscription and to show him something the name of which is illegible.

In a later passage the author says that Mahāsamaṭṭhānera went to the north in 1369, a statement which identifies him as Mahāsūmanathāra, i.e. the Mahāthera Sumana. The implication might be that both Sumana and Anomadassi had returned from Martaban in the suite of the 'Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja' whose arrival at Sukhodaya in 1361 is recorded in Inscriptions 4 and 5, or perhaps that Sumana arrived in his suite, whereas Anomadassi had come back earlier. But the statements are too fragmentary to be conclusive: perhaps Sumana had first been installed at the Mango Grove around 1341, but went somewhere else later, and was

4) Alternatively these names may be used anachronistically in referring to events in the 1340's. There may have been other monasteries on these sites at that time, with different names. It is natural enough for the compiler of a chronicle to designate places (and persons too, for that matter) by the most recent names they had received.
finally recalled to the Mango Grove by Mahādharmarāja I in 1361. If the author of Inscription 9 became Abbot of the Red Forest Monastery in 1361, there is no reason why Sumana should not make a special trip to salute him and show him the relic he had discovered nearly twenty years earlier.

While epigraphic evidence is certainly preferable to chronicular, is the conjectural interpretation of an inscription preferable to the straightforward testimony of two chronicles whose accounts are plausible in themselves and internally consistent enough?

* * *

Inscription 2, which dates from Lodaiya’s reign, contains the biography of a monk from Sukhodaya, the Mahāthera Śrīśraddhārajācūlāmuni, or Śrīśraddhā as we shall call him for short. At the age of 26, when he was still a layman, he fought an elephant duel which was witnessed by King Lodaiya. When he was 31 years old he was ordained in the Sukhodayan monkhood. Some time after that, as we know from Inscriptions 2 and 11, he went via Martaban to India, and then to Ceylon where he spent ten years. Inscription 2, without actually saying so, implies that while he was in Ceylon he was re-ordained in the Mahavihāra succession, for it tells us that he restored the Mahāthupa and the Mahavihāra which were falling into ruin; and the title Mahasāmi, by which he is designated, was one the King of Ceylon conferred on monks who were re-ordained in the island. We assume that the reason he stayed in Ceylon for ten years was to become a Mahāthera in the Sinhalese order before leaving. Then, as we know from Inscription 11, he returned to Sukhodaya via Tenasserim, Bejrapuri, Raipur and Ayodhya.

While Śrīśraddhā was in Ceylon he obtained two ‘precious great relics’ of the Buddha, the Kesadhatu (Hair Relic) and the Givadhātu (Neck-bone Relic). About this time, it appears, he learned that one side of the platform of the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya had collapsed; at least Inscription 2 implies that he knew of the collapse before he left Ceylon5.

5) In the passage at 11/40 f., the ‘laymen’ whom Śrīśraddhā brings from Ceylon are evidently to help in the reconstruction of the Mahādhātu, which seems to prove he was still in Ceylon when he learned that the platform of the Mahādhātu had collapsed.
As the Mahādhātu was not only a monument of extraordinary sanctity but also the magical center of the kingdom, the damage it sustained would be regarded as yet another bad omen for Lōdaiya. After Śrīśraddhā returned to Sukhodaya the monument was rebuilt and the two precious relics were deposited in it, perhaps in the belief that their beneficent influences would dispel the King's ill fortune. Inscription 2, which commemorates the reconstruction of the monument, contains no legible dates; but the work must have taken a year or more, and Lōdaiya was still on the throne when it was finished. As Lōdaiya died in 1346 or 1347 (p. 1), we conclude that the latest likely date for Śrīśraddhā's return to Sukhodaya would be around 1344.

Taking this date as a base, we can work backward and estimate the latest probable dates for the main events of his life which are recorded: allowing a reasonable time for his journey from Ceylon to Sukhodaya, he must have left Ceylon c. 1343; as he spent ten years in Ceylon, he first arrived there c. 1333; allowing time for this itinerary through India, he passed through Martaban c. 1332; supposing that he had been ordained some two years before setting out for Martaban, his ordination took place c. 1330; and as he was thirty-one years old when he was ordained, the date of his birth would be c. 1299.

If this is the latest likely date for his birth, what is the earliest possible one? He was twenty-six years old when he fought the elephant duel which was witnessed by King Lōdaiya, so if we are right in placing Lōdaiya's accession in 1298, Śrīśraddhā cannot have been born before 1272. This leaves a range of 27 years between the earliest possible date and the latest likely one for his birth, and a similar uncertainty for the other events of his career, not to mention the date of the reconstruction of the Mahādhātu.

We shall see in Section 9 that there is some reason, based on epigraphic evidence, to believe that he was still alive in 1376. If that is right, which is not perfectly certain, he would have been between 77 and 104 years old at the time, an observation which might make us favor a date closer to 1299 than to 1272 for his birth, and to guess that the latest likely dates for the events of his career are not far from the actual ones. This is about as close as we can get if we rely on epigraphic evidence alone.

If on the other hand we take the evidence of the chronicles into account we can refine our estimates considerably. The chronicles, though they have nothing to say about Śrīśraddhā, provide indirect evidence regarding the date of his return to Sukhodaya. On the basis of
information drawn from J and M, we have concluded (p. 70) that Udumbara sent Sumana and Anomadassi to Sukhodaya and Sajjanālaya respectively in 1341 or 1342, in response to a request made the previous year by LSDaiya for a qualified Sihalabhikkhu. The request must have been made before Śriśradhdā’s return to Sukhodaya, for if he were already there it would have been unnecessary. We can conclude, too, that Śriśradhdā did not return until some time after Sumana discovered the Asokan relic, for the Kesadhātu and the Givadhātu counted as ‘great precious relics’, one of them plucked by the Buddha from his own head during his lifetime, and the other gathered from the pyre after his cremation; whereas the relic Sumana discovered was only one of the 84,000 tiny particles into which Asoka divided the miscellaneous relics collected from the pyre; so if Sumana had not discovered it before Śriśradhdā’s return it would have excited very little notice. From this reasoning we may conclude that the earliest date for Śriśradhdā’s return would be immediately after Sumana’s discovery, which according to our estimate was in 1342 or 1343. On the basis of epigraphic evidence, as we have seen, the latest likely date for his return would be around 1344; and the chronicular evidence suggests that this was approximately when he really did return. The corollary is that the ‘latest likely dates’ which we have proposed for the events of his career are quite close to the real ones.

If we take this evidence into account, we arrive at the chronology proposed in Table III. It places Śriśradhdā’s passage through Martaban in 1331 or 1332, soon after Udumbara’s arrival. Udumbara’s fame, which attracted Anomadassi and Sumana to Martaban at about the same time, may have also inspired Śriśradhdā to go to Ceylon; and Śriśradhdā would certainly wish to consult him about his contemplated journey. Anomadassi and Sumana had to be content with re-ordination and study under Udumbara; Śriśradhdā was able to go to the fountainhead for re-ordination and study.

This chronology seems to reflect the compelling attraction exercised by Ceylon through Udumbara, who was apparently the first forest-dwelling Sihalabhikkhu with whom the Sukhodayan monkhood had any direct acquaintance. In the absence of direct epigraphic proof to the contrary, it seems to make more sense than a chronology which would place Śriśradhdā’s departure for Ceylon prior to Udumbara’s arrival at Martaban: we may well ask whether Śriśradhdā would have thought of going to Ceylon at all if it were not for Udumbara.
The only surviving inscription of Lōdaiya's reign, to the best of our knowledge, is No. 2. The date is lost, but as the formal purpose of the text is to commemorate the reconstruction of the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya it was presumably erected at the time of the dedication ceremony, which we have guessed was around 1345.

The reconstruction of the monument was undertaken by the author of the inscription, who was either Lōdaiya or Śrīrāddhā. The latter's full designation is given at I/41 f. as 'Saṃteṣc Brahmī Mahāthērā Śrīrāddhārājācūḷāmūṇi Śrīrattanālaṅkādiḍipā Mahāsāmi pen Cau.' Elsewhere in the inscription he is called by variants or abbreviations of the same designation, with small variations in the spelling. We have already discussed the significance of the terms Mahāthērā and Mahāsāmi; 'Saṃteṣc' and 'Cau' are designations of rank; Śrīrāddhārājācūḷāmūṇi and Śrīrattanālaṅkādiḍipā are an oddly spelled mixture of Sanskrit and Pali, which in our discussion we regularize as Śrīrāddhārājācūḷāmūṇi and Śrīrattanālaṅkādiḍipā. 'Śrīrāddhārājācūḷāmūṇi' may be a syncretic form of his personal and monastic names. 'Śrīrattanālaṅkādiḍipā' was probably an honorific conferred on him by Lōdaiya when he came back to Sukhodaya.

The author of the inscription gives a succinct account of the rebuilding operations (II/45-48): 'The platform (pallāṅka) of the Mahādhātu had fallen down for a distance of thirteen fathoms along the east side. Filled with zeal, I exerted myself to [rebuild the monument].

1) We have previously designated the Sukhodayan inscriptions by Roman numerals, but from now on we shall designate them by Arabic numerals printed in 'bold-face' type. We shall continue to designate the different faces of an inscription by Roman numerals, and the lines by Arabic (e.g. II/3 means Face II, line 3).

2) He is called by a variant of this name, Cau (Prince) Śrīrāddhārājācūḷāmūṇi, at I/70, etc., before he enters the monkhood. This looks like Skt. sīr, an honorific, and śrāddhā, 'faith', plus Pali rājācūḷāmūṇi, 'the royal ascetic Cūḷā'; but why should he have been called an ascetic before he became a monk? 'Cūḷāmūṇi' reminds us of Cūḷāmuni, 'Hair-crest Jewel', which would be a very nice name for a prince. Perhaps it was later changed to Cūḷāmuni as his monastic name.

3) This mixture of Skt. and Pali is probably intended to mean 'glory of Ceylon, the island of jewels' (taking sīr as a noun, 'glory', with the Pali compound ratana-Laṅkā-dipa modifying it as in Siamese syntax).
with well-laid brick and to cover it all over with stucco.... I also stuccoed the feet, hands and bodies of the images of the Buddha. At several points I built, in quick succession, towers with extremely beautiful stone Buddha images. Exerting myself to accumulate an abundance of merit, I performed twenty-eight works in a single day.'

If the statement seems obscure at first glance, its meaning emerges when we examine the monument. Originally, as the Department of Fine Arts discovered several years ago when making some repairs, it consisted of a quincunx of laterite towers of Khmerizing style standing on a laterite platform, with a laterite buttress or gallery connecting each of the four axial towers to the central tower. After repairing the collapsed platform, the author encased the central tower in a tall pyramidal basement, on top of which he built the 'lotus-bud' reliquary tower we see today. Just as the inscription says, his work was done in brick and stucco (in accordance with the Ceylon tradition, in contrast to the Khmerizing tradition of laterite and stucco which prevailed at Sukhodaya before that time). He allowed the axial towers to remain, but gave them a rich and lively new ornamentation in stucco. He built four new towers entirely of brick and stucco, one at each corner of the platform. The corner towers, being free-standing, each have four niches for Buddha images; but the axial towers, the back of which is blocked by the buttresses connecting them with the central tower, each have three niches only. The reference to 'twenty-eight works' performed in a single day means that the author of the inscription installed images in all twenty-eight of these niches in one day, or at least held all the dedication ceremonies in one day. The passage is not a model of lucidity, and we have been able to extract its meaning only by consulting the monument. As the inscription of course stood beside it, the author doubtless intended his readers to look at the monument if they needed a gloss to his text.

4) The original monument may have been built by Śrī Indrāditya; but that is no more than a guess. See Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 3, 17.
5) See Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, 17 ff. In that work (p. 17 note 46) Griswold identifies the author of the inscription with Lōdaiya, but he now hesitates between Lōdaiya and Śrīśraddhā.
Inscription 2 was no longer in situ in 1877, when it was discovered by a government official sent by King Rama V to search for old inscriptions at Sukhodaya. When he found it, it was lying on the floor of a dark tunnel-like stairway corridor, built in the thickness of the walls of the brick maṇḍapā at Vat Śrī Jum, nearly 2 km. northwest of the Mahādhātu. The maṇḍapā was built at an uncertain date, probably in the last quarter of the 14th century or later, to shelter the colossal stucco image of the seated Buddha which occupies most of the interior. If, as is generally believed, the image goes back at least to the reign of Rama Gāmphēn, the brick maṇḍapā doubtless replaces an earlier wooden shrine. The ceiling of the corridor in which the inscription was found is made of stone slabs engraved with elegant drawings of Jātaka tales, a very incomplete set comprising less than a quarter of the original number. Representations of Jātakas, more than any other category of Buddhist art, are intended for the edification of the general public, so it is certain that these were not made to be installed in a dark stairway where they could be seen only with the aid of a candle. They are of Sukhodayan workmanship, probably dating from the middle years of the 14th century. They are not the stone carvings of Jātakas mentioned in our inscription at II/39 f., though they may have been inspired by them. They were very likely engraved for the Mahādhātu and installed there at the time of the reconstruction. Later on, after the majority of them were lost or damaged, the remainder must have been removed to Vat Śrī Jum and built into the corridor ceiling for safety at the time the maṇḍapā was constructed; and either then or later the inscription was taken to the same place.

Upon being shipped to Bangkok, the inscription was lodged in the Wang Nā Museum (now part of the National Museum). It remained there until 1909, when it was removed to the National Library. It is now in the National Library's Manuscript and Inscription Division.

The slab of schist on which it is engraved is 2.75 m. high, 67 cm. wide and 8 cm. thick (Figs. 1, 2), with a rounded top. Face I has 107

6) Coedès, Reconn. pp. 6, 177.
8) See Griswold, Toward a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 27, 49.
lines of writing, Face II has 97; but the text, instead of running continuously from the beginning of Face I to the end of Face II, has to be read as follows: I/1-90, II/1-87, I/91-107, II/88-95.

Very likely the engraver originally expected to be able to write the entire text in 180 lines or less, and decided to put about half on each face. Perhaps after completing Face I and a good deal of Face II according to plan he found he would need about 25 lines more than he had calculated, and so, when he reached the end of I/87, jumped back to Face I to add 17 lines, and finally returned to Face II to add the rest.

This strange arrangement may not be the fault of the engraver at all, but the fault of the author. It seems probable, in fact, that the portion running from I/1 to I/90 and from II/1 to the middle of II/82 is really the whole of the primary text, i.e. the text the engraver received in the first instance from the author; while the last 32 1/2 lines (II/82-87, I/91-107, II/88-95) are a postscript, given the engraver when he had almost finished engraving the primary text, or even after the inscription had been completed and set up. For convenience, without meaning to reach a definite decision, we shall speak of the two portions as the ‘primary text’ and the ‘postscript’ respectively.

The primary text begins with a long preface full of historical and biographical information, which all leads up to the formal purpose of the inscription. Then comes the account of the reconstruction of the Mahādhatu (II/45-48), and finally the recital of events that occurred immediately afterward and as a direct consequence of it (II/48-82).

The subject matter of the postscript has no apparent connection with the reconstruction. While the primary text can be regarded as complete in itself, the postscript begins with events that occurred at a different temple, apparently at a later date, and continues with miscellaneous acts of merit performed by Śrīśraddhā. This observation may serve to confirm our hypothesis.

9) Such prefaces are normal enough in inscriptions. For example the preface to No. 1 runs through Faces I and II, and the first 9 1/2 lines of Face III, before arriving at the formal purpose of the text, which is to commemorate the erection of the stone throne.
A photograph of rubbings of the inscription appeared in 1908 in Fournereau's *Le Siam Ancien*, Vol. II, together with a faulty and very incomplete translation of Face II by Père Schmitt. The first person to get the sense of the text was the late Professor George Coedès, who made use of it in an article that appeared in 1920. In 1924 he published the full text in Romanization, together with a French translation, introduction and notes. The Siamese section of the same work gives the text in modern Siamese characters with a Siamese translation of Coedès's introduction and notes, prepared by Luang Boribal Buribandh (then Nay Pyan Induvañsa) under the direction of Prince Damrong Rajanubhab.

This inscription is unusually difficult to understand because of the author's incoherent and sometimes cryptic style of composition, which is further complicated by the numerous lacunae. Probably that is why Père Schmitt was able to grasp so little of its meaning, and why no Siamese did any serious work on it until Coedès edited and translated it. Coedès, realizing its importance, addressed himself to its problems with his usual good sense and discernment. He produced a remarkably good translation, to which scholarship is lastingly indebted, and without which our task would have been immeasurably more difficult; but he was not able to disentangle its confused topography completely. In the half-century that has passed since he undertook the work, a wider range of Sukhodayan inscriptions has become available for comparison; a certain number of more satisfactory readings have been proposed; the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya has been cleared of debris and studied; and the meaning of a good many obscure passages in the text has become clearer.

In 1935 the late Brahyya Nagara Brah Rama raised several pertinent questions regarding the contents of the text; and though he was not able to answer them all correctly, he called attention to the parallels between Inscription 2 and Face II of Inscription 11, which are sufficient to prove

13) Prajum, I, B.E. 2467, pp. 61 ff. This seems to be the first time the text was ever printed in Siamese. It was reprinted, together with a version in modernized Siamese and notes by Mahā Chām Đōngānvarna (but without the introduction) in *Prajum*, I, B.E. 2500, pp. 13-37.
that the person whose acts of merit are recorded in the latter, but whose name is missing, was Śrāradhā himself (JSS XXVIII/2, p. 218 f.). This observation has enabled us to use the two texts to supplement each other.

Of our new interpretations, the most important deal with the location of the different places where Śrāradhā built or restored cetiyas and monastery buildings. Of the new readings, the only one which need concern us for the moment is the name of the future King Śrī Indrāditya of Sukhodaya, read by Coedès as Pān Klāh Dāv (interim), but now read with virtual certainty as Pān Klāh Hāv (interim, ‘district in the middle of an open space’ or ‘in the middle of the sky’).

In the light of the information now available, we may summarize the contents of the inscription as follows:

**Primary text:**

1. Introducing Śrāradhā. (I/1-8.)
2. History of his grandfather, Braṇā Śrīnāv Nām Thāṃ. (I/8-20.)
3. Introducing Braṇā Śrīnāv Nām Thāṃ’s son, Braṇā Pān Moaṅ. (I/20-21.)
4. History of the campaign conducted by Ba Khun Pān Moaṅ (Braṇā Pān Moaṅ) and Ba Kun Pān Klāh Hāv; their victories; their liberation of Sukhodaya from the Khmer; Pān Moaṅ invests Pān Klāh Hāv as King of Sukhodaya, giving him his own title, Śrī Indrāpatindrāditya. (I/21-32.)
5. Digression explaining that Pān Moaṅ had received this title, together with the sacred sword Jayāśrī, from the King of Cambodia. (I/32-35.)
6. Pān Moaṅ and Śrī Indrāpatindrāditya part on very friendly terms, each withdrawing his troops to his own country. (I/35-36.)
7. Eulogy of Śrī Indrāditya’s son Ba Khun Rāmarāja (Rāma Gaṃhēṅ). (I/36-37.) (Note that from here on, Pān Klāh Hāv is called by his new title in abbreviated form, Ba Khun Śrī Indrāditya.)
8. Eulogy of Śrī Indrāditya’s grandson Dharmāraja (i.e. Rāma Gaṃhēṅ’s son Lōdāiyu). (I/36-37.)
9. Retrospective eulogy of Phâ Mœañ.

10. Eulogy of Phâ Mœañ's nephew, Śrîśraddhâ. (I/41-61.)

11. Account of Śrîśraddhâ's youth and manhood before his final entry into the monkhood; account of his elephant duel with Khun Cân; digression regarding his childhood resolve to become an avatâra of the god Viśnu; his various elephant duels; his accomplishments; his restless life. (I/61-83.)

12. His grief at the death of his son; his resolve to renounce his princely caste and become a forest-dwelling monk. (I/84-89.)

13. His preparations to do so, imitating the example of Prince Vessantara in generosity; his departure from the lay life. (I/89-90; II/1-8; cf. No. 11, II/5 ff.)

   a. At one place he builds a cetiya for a precious great relic, plants a Śrîmahâbodhi tree, builds a vihâra and an āvâsa, etc. Cf. Inscr. No. 11, II/9 f.
   b. At one place he builds a large bridge, plants flowering trees and a Śrîmahâbodhi tree, etc., assigning several families to take care of the premises and to wash the monks' feet on the four holy days of each lunar month. This place is evidently Śrîvalâ; cf. No. 11, II/11 f.
   c. At one place he builds a ṭamnâk, a sâlâ, and a mahâcetiya, plants a Śrîmahâbodhi tree, and founds a large statue of the Buddha. Perhaps at Sukhodaya or Śrî Sajjânalaya; cf. No. 11, II/13 f.
   d. At one place he goes through the market buying up all the living creatures and setting them free, etc. Probably at Phân (Pâng near Uttaratiththa), Brê (Prê), Lâmbûn (Lâmphûn), Tâk or Jiâni Dôn (Chiang Tông); cf. No. 11, II/14.
   e. At one place, in a forest on Nâh Tay Hill, he goes by elephant to workship an image of the Buddha, and sets the elephant free. Note: he is on his way to Martaban, India and Ceylon, though the text does not say so but begins the next passage with him already in Ceylon. Cf. No. 11, II/14-16, which gives his itinerary.
At one place, he restores the Mahādhatu Hīvañī, ‘the gathering-point of all the Lord’s relics,’ i.e. the Mahāthūpa at Anurādhapura in Ceylon, which is falling into ruin and overgrown with forest and brush. He discovers a miraculous shell in the forest, and converts it into an enormous quantity of lime, which he uses to make stucco to coat the monument and repair the statues. Miracles performed by the relics which had been enshrined in the monument. Restoration of the Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura and of the broken statues. Digression comparing the beauty of the restored temple to that of a temple (the Mahābodhi?) at Pataliputta (Patna) in Majjhima Desa (North India). Statement that Śrīsraddhā is an avatāra of Kṛṣṇa, Rāma and Nārāyaṇa (Viṣṇu). Account of some stone carvings around the Mahāthūpa which have been ruined by treasure-hunters. Cf. No. 2, II/17, where the restoration of the Mahāthūpa is briefly alluded to.

15. Upon leaving Ceylon, Śrīsraddhā takes a group of Sinhalese craftsmen with him, as well as two precious great relics [the Kesadhatu and the Givadhātu]. Digression concerning the Mahiyāganacetiya in Ceylon, the relics enshrined in it, and the miracles performed by them (apparently to hint where Śrīsraddhā obtained his two relics). (II/40-45.)

16. Reconstruction of the Mahādhatu at Sukhodaya (II/45-48). Evidently the Kesadhatu and the Givadhātu are deposited in the monument at this time.

17. Miracles performed by relics at or near the the Mahādhatu. An unspecified group of relics send forth brilliant rays all over the universe (II/49-52). The Kesadhatu, shooting out rays, moves rapidly about in the sky; the Givadhātu, springing out of the cetiya, darts upward; together they look like two suns, surpassing the Sun itself in brilliance, and they perform miracles for most of the morning. The Sinhalese living at Sukhodaya invite the relics to return to their cetiya, but without success. (These Sinhalese, who reappear twice later, are doubtless the laymen Śrīsraddhā brought with him from Ceylon.) Then the author of the inscription invites the relics to return, and they re-enter their cetiya. (II/52-65.)
18. Continuation of the miracles. A relic whirls down from the sky and settles on Śrīraddhā's forehead. A Kesadhatu (apparently not the one that has just re-entered the cetiya, but a miraculous duplicate which it produced before returning) whirls down from above and circles around over his head. The Sinhalese, taking the action of these relics as a sign that Śrīraddhā is a future Buddha, do homage to him. (II/65-75.)

19. Continuation of the miracles. The next series begins at dawn the following day, when the two great relics (Kesadhatu and Gīvadhātu), shining like stars, rise slowly into the sky, then re-enter their cetiya for one night. At dawn they come out for a moment for everyone to applaud them, then return to their cetiya. The miracles continue for 31 days. The purpose is for the relics to show themselves to all the people and cause them to help uplift the Ceylon form of Buddhism. (II/75-82.)

Postscript:

20. Śrīraddhā presides over the enshrinement of the Dantadhātu (Tooth Relic) at a Forest Monastery outside a city the name of which cannot be read with certainty. The Dantadhātu performs stupendous miracles, in which various other relics participate, for three months. (II/82-87; I/91-96.)

21. Further acts of merit performed by Śrīraddhā; mostly illegible. (I/97-107; II/88-95.)

* * *

The script devised by Rāma Gaṇhēn in 1283, and used by him in 1292 in Inscription No. 1, has changed considerably in No. 2. True, the form of the consonants for the most part remains much the same, though they are narrower and less boldly written; but several of Rāma Gaṇhēn's innovations have been abandoned or modified. No longer are all the vowels written in the same line with the consonants; such vowels as ī and i, u and ū, have resumed their places above and below the consonants in conformity with the practice in Khmer and the other Indian-based scripts of Southeast Asia. The vowel ɨ for ī and ɨ for ī has dropped out of
use (except in one doubtful instance), so ' and ' have to serve not only for i and i but also for i and i; and indeed the distinction between ' and ' is not at all consistently observed, the same word sometimes being spelt with the one and sometimes with the other. The mai-hän-äkaša (') is now attested for the first time, but only sporadically, and only in Face I; for the most part its place is taken, as in Rāma Gamdhēn's inscription, by a reduplication of the final consonant of the syllable. The diacritical marks ' and ' corresponding to the modern mai-ek ('') and mai-do ("'), which nearly always occur in Rāma Gamdhēn's inscription where we should expect them, are used in this one in a very haphazard manner, frequently being omitted where we should think them necessary, sometimes being added where they are not needed; and the same word is often written indifferently with or without them. Occasionally something that looks just like the mai-ek is used as a separation marker from the preceding syllable (I/85, ādēnūm). Certain words that Rāma Gamdhēn regularly began with III or III are still sometimes written with those letters, but sometimes with s or s instead.

In contrast to Rāma Gamdhēn, whose style of composition was sobre, disciplined and orderly, with a well-defined succession of events and a clear topography, the author of Inscription 2 is gushing and hyperbolic, at times long-winded and repetitive, at times hurried and elliptical to the point of obscurity. He jumps about from one subject to another in a very confusing way, so that painstaking study is sometimes required to decide whether we are in Siam or in Ceylon or in India. He makes too much use of intensifiers like anā (adā), 'topmost' or 'to a superlative degree' 14, mūna (mūna), 'exceedingly', or even mū♠♠♠♠, 'to an exceedingly superlative degree' (which we have felt obliged to tone down in our translation). In Face I (apart from I/1-20, which is too fragmentary to judge) he is reasonably straightforward, though the eulogy of Śrīraddhā, which is drawn out to tedious length, is rather disorganized. From II/8 to II/17 the topography becomes vague; at II/18 we suddenly find ourselves at Amrāthapura without warning, and we remain there up to II/35; then after jumping to India for a simile, we are in Ceylon.

14) That this is the meaning can be gathered from II/46, ṣeśamādānāh, 'from the spire at the topmost, all the way to the ground', i.e. from the tip of the spire down to the ground.
again, with Śrīśuddhā preparing to return to Sukhodaya (II/40 f.); but before he starts we are given a retrospective digression to the Mahāyāna-ganacetiya. From II/45 to the end of the primary text (II/82) we are at Sukhodaya, at or near the Mahādhātu. The account of the reconstruction of the Mahādhātu (the formal purpose of the inscription!) is so laconic that it cannot be understood without some knowledge of the monument; but after the miracles begin (II/49) the style becomes pietistic, diffuse and disorderly. The postscript opens factually, but when a new series of miracles begins the style wanders off again.

Despite the oddities of composition, Inscription 2 contains passages of considerable beauty; besides, when we take the trouble to disentangle the succession of events and to straighten out the topography it is one of the most informative we possess.

It is the only known document that gives an account of the liberation of Sukhodaya from Khmer suzerainty and the establishment of the independent kingdom under a Tai dynasty. Coedes's analysis of this account is admirable, and requires very little modification today 15.

The revolt was organized by two Tai lords. The higher ranking of the two was Braññā Phā Möān (Phā Mauang), the ruler of Möān Rāt, which is generally believed to have been in the valley of the Sāk; but a study of the account in Inscr. 2 has convinced us that it was more likely near Uttaratittha 16. Phā Möān's father, Braññā Śrīnāv Nam Tham (Śīnāo Nam


16) The valley of the Sāk would be too far away for the manoeuvres described at I/23 f. If, as seems probable, the azimuths given in the fragmentary passage at I/13 f. have Rāt as the point of origin, Rāt must have been somewhere northeast of Chōt; and at I/25 f. Phā Möān's army, which is marching from Rāt to Sukhodaya, passes Sajjanālaya. The location that would best satisfy these conditions would be somewhere near Uttaratittha. The ruins of several old towns have been discovered near Uttaratittha; see Poragavatattusākā, 235 ff. It appears that in the reign of Rāma I (1782-1806) there was a town called Möān Rāt in the district of Tā Phā (village) on the Nān River 50 km. upstream from Uttaratittha; at least a manuscript in the possession of the Abbot of Wat Braññā Phā at Nān, giving a fragmentary history of the monastery, says that an army on its way from Bangkok to Nān in Rāma I's reign 'stopped at Prā Jinn in Tā Phā District, which is equivalent to Möān Rāt.'
Tom), had ruled—presumably under Khmer suzerainty—a huge territory which included Sukhodaya and Sajjanalaya, and extended southwest all the way to Chöt (Me Sôt) on the Burma frontier.\(^\text{17}\)

Phã Móaⁿ himself had received the title of Kamrate An Śri Indrapatiṇḍrādiṭya from the King of Cambodia, together with the sacred sword Jayasri (which reappears in Inscriptions 3 and 4 as part of Mahādharmarāja I's regalia), and had married a Khmer princess named Śikharamahādevī. In Khmer epigraphy, 'kamrate an' is a very high title, applied to the sovereign and to major vassal rulers; in the Sukhodayan inscriptions it is equivalent to 'brahṇa'. The signal honors Phã Móaⁿ received from his overlord suggest that he ruled a very large territory, perhaps approximately the same as his father had ruled.

Phã Móaⁿ's ally, who seems to have been younger and more active, was Pān Klān Hāv (Bāng Glāng Ilāo). He was perhaps the lord of Móaⁿ Pān Yān (Bāng Yāng), but the reading is doubtful, and the location of the place is not known. Pān Klān Hāv, who was apparently a sub-vassal of Phã Móaⁿ, did most of the fighting; he engaged the commander of the Khmer garrison in an elephant duel and defeated his forces utterly. Phã Móaⁿ then gave Pān Klān Hāv the investiture as King of Sukhodaya and Sajjanalaya, at the same time transferring his own title to him.

\(^{17}\) The mutilated passage at I/13 gives the limits of Nāṃ Thām's kingdom. Though the azimuth from the capital to Chöt has helped us to locate the capital (see preceding note), it is hard to make anything out of the distances. The passage seems to mean that Chöt was between 20,000 and 30,000 fathoms (byāma) southwest of the capital, which we have assumed to be Rāt, and that the kingdom stretched between 200,000 and 300,000 fathoms to the south of the capital. If we give the fathom the same value as it has in Rāma Gāmpāhī's inscription, namely 1.86 m. (see Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, p. 8), Chöt would be between 37 km. and 56 km. southwest of the capital, so the capital would have to be somewhere around Old Tāk, which is clearly impossible. The southern limit of the kingdom would be between 370 and 560 km. south of the capital, and if we take these distances from the latitude of Uttarārittha, we arrive at the Gulf of Siam, which is not unreasonable. (Would Nāṃ Thām's kingdom then be Chén-li-fu? cf. above, p. 30.) On the other hand if we were to assign a value to the byāma which would give the right distance between Chöt and Uttarārittha, the southern limit of the kingdom would be impossibly far away. We are inclined to think that the byāma in this passage really is the fathom, but that the distance between Chöt and the capital is either wrongly given or has been wrongly read.
This transfer, which was evidently designed to legitimize Phan Klân Hâv's succession from an original grant made by the King of Cambodia, may give us a clue to the date of the revolt, which is nowhere stated in the legible portions of the inscription. Phâ Moân had of course sworn an oath of allegiance to the Cambodian King; but while such an oath would bind him to the monarch to whom he had sworn it, it could hardly, in the nature of things, bind him to that monarch's successors. We do not know whether Phâ Moân had sworn allegiance to Jayavarman VII of Cambodia, who died around 1220, or to his son and successor Indravarman II, who died in 1243. Writing in 1924, Coedès placed the revolt of Sukhodaya around the mid-13th century, doubtless with the death of Indravarman II in mind; but in a later article he conjectured that it may have been soon after Jayavarman VII's death. On the whole, though there is no proof, we are inclined to prefer Coedès's first hypothesis.

Sri Indraditya, to use the abbreviated title by which Phan Klân Hâv henceforth became known, appears to have received a very small kingdom, perhaps not much more than the provinces in which Sukhodaya and Sajjanalaya were located, though we gather from Inscr. 1 (I/4 f.) that it included the valley of the Ping from Tâk to Traîtrihâ (see above, pp. 30-40).

As Coedès observes, Inscription 2 gives us a picture of the manners and customs at Sukhodaya, and an abundance of details on Buddhism, which are a welcome addition to those given in No. 1. Among the manners and customs, not the least interesting is the information about elephant duels; or again that on the cult of Viśṇu and his avataras, a cult which acted as a support of royalty in matters of which Buddhism took no cognizance, but at the same time added its lustre to the Buddhist religion. As to Sukhodayan Buddhism in the reign of Lôdaiya, it confirms and supplements the general impressions we have already got from M and J.

One of the most unexpected results of disentangling the confused topography is the certainty that Śrîśrâddhâ restored the Mahāthūpa at Anurâdhapura. If we have estimated the dates of his sojourn in Ceylon

correctly, he did this work between 1333 and 1343. At that time, as the former Commissioner of Archaeology for Ceylon, Dr S. Paramavithana, informs us, Anuradhapura had been abandoned by Sinhalese royalty, and the description of the Mahāthūpa as given in the inscription—"falling into ruin and covered with forest and brush"—would be accurate. Dr Paramavithana adds that he has been unable to discover in Sinhalese literature or tradition any reference to a restoration of the Mahāthūpa by a Siamese monk.

Who was the author of Inscription 2?

The majority of Siamese scholars take it for granted that it was Śrīśraddhā, since the whole text is basically an account of his acts of merit. If we take this view, the reconstruction of the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya would be not only the occasion of the inscription but also the last big work of merit Śrīśraddhā had undertaken at the time of writing; and the text would be his own certification of the stage he had then reached in his progress toward Buddhahood, just as Face II of Inscr. 11 is a certification of a later stage.

If Śrīśraddhā was the author, a western reader might conclude that he was insufferably vain and boastful, recounting his own virtues and accomplishments at tedious length, and causing a record of them to be engraved on a stone tablet which was to be set up in a public place. But such a judgment would be beside the point. In the Indianizing world it was not in bad taste, but quite right and proper, for a royal personage or a future Buddha to praise himself; inscriptions were called praśasti, 'glorification'; and many of them consisted of little more than a eulogy of the author and a reference to his performance of the particular work they are intended to commemorate.

Coedes, after observing that Inscription 2 consists mainly of an eulogy of Śrīśraddhā, remarks: "But he himself is not the author of the text; the author is someone else who speaks in the first person." If this view is right, the author would have to be Lōḍaiya, since he and Śrīśraddhā are the only two living persons eulogized in the text. The eulogy of Lōḍaiya (I/37-38) is brief and conventional; it does not specify a single act of merit performed by him, perhaps because the reconstruction of the Mahādhātu, recounted later on, overshadowed anything else

19) Recueil, p. 50; our translation.
be may have done. Lōdaiya also appears at I/72-74, but only in the role of a witness to Śrīśraddhā’s bravery in an elephant duel.

Two arguments may be advanced in favor of the view that Lōdaiya is the author. In the first place it is hard to believe that anyone except the King would be allowed to remodel the monument that was the magical center of the kingdom. In the second place, the wording at II/45-65 is difficult to reconcile with the view that Śrīśraddhā was the author. In this passage the author, speaking in the first person singular (I), rebuilds the Mahādhātu; the relics begin their miracles, which last several hours; then the Sinhalese come across the river to see what is going on, uttering shouts of applause; they invite the relics to return to their cetiya, but the relics pay no attention. When the author invites them to return, they come down, fly around the cetiya, and leap up again. ‘I had boundless faith,’ says the author; ‘I threw myself on the ground and offered my life as an irrevocable gift, vowing to uphold the religion of Lālkādiṣa, and to obey the Buddha’s words in all things. Then the relics came whirling down (etc.) and entered the cetiya like bees hurrying into their hive. Then I rose and performed anjali.’ In all this passage the author is the only individual mentioned; the Sinhalese are referred to collectively. As soon as he finishes the account of the honor thus bestowed on him by the relics, the author relates the honor bestowed on Śrīśraddhā by some other relics, apparently miraculous duplicates of those that have just re-entered the cetiya. At II/66 the author, who calls himself I in the preceding sentence (II/64), refers to Śrīśraddhā as mū (i.e. mū), ‘His Lordship’, and at II/67 by the title Brahma Śrīśraddhāraṣeṣṭhāmuni Śrīratanalaṃkādaḍīpa.

As both the King and Śrīśraddhā must have been present at all these events, Śrīśraddhā must have seen the miracles honoring the author, and the author must have seen those honoring Śrīśraddhā. If one of them is called I, and one is called mū, it is hard to see how both could be Śrīśraddhā.

Yet it might be possible after all. The author, as we have several times had occasion to remark, is not always very coherent. He may be using the first person as if the passage were a sort of direct quotation; and it would be less surprising for him than for a more rational man to refer to himself as ‘I’ and a moment later as ‘His Lordship’. The statement at II/60 ff., about offering his life as an irrevocable gift, vowing to
uphold the religion of Ceylon, etc., may sound more appropriate to a future Buddha than to a monarch; and if we ask why Śṛiśraddhā, who must have made this same vow long before, should repeat it now, the reply is easy: the author never hesitates to repeat himself when he wishes.

On the other hand it can equally well be argued that the vow is more appropriate for a king who has never made it before, especially so fervent a Buddhist as Lōdaiya, at the conclusion of the most conspicuous act of merit of his reign.

What of the author's hyperbolic style of writing, his repetitions and ellipses, his jumping about from one subject to another, his dream-like chronology and topography, and his general absent-mindedness? Are these things the normal characteristics of a high-ranking monk, of great energy and determination, who is confident of achieving Buddhahood and wants everyone to know it? Or are they to be ascribed to a monarch who has reigned (as we think) for more than 45 years, during which he has lost nine-tenths of his inheritance, whose kingdom is on the verge of collapse, and whose mind may have been affected by his reverses? Yet one of the most telling arguments in favor of the first hypothesis is that Inscr. 11, Face II, which was almost certainly composed by Śṛiśraddhā, displays very much the same sort of incoherency.

As neither set of arguments is conclusive, we shall leave the question open. Indeed it may be less important than it appears, for obviously even if Lōdaiya is the nominal author who remolds the Mahādhātu, he must have had a lot of help from Śṛiśraddhā in remodeling it and in composing the inscription; and a large part of the text, such as the passage dealing with Ceylon, could hardly have been composed by anyone except Śṛiśraddhā.20

20) Looked at in this way, Inscription 2 might be compared with No. 62, which was set up at Wat Pho Yén at Haripūrājaya in 1370 by King Kīlanā of Lōn Nē (see Prajum, III, p. 136 ff.; there is a French translation by Coedēs at BEFEO XXV/1, p. 197). No. 62 opens with a statement naming the King as the author, which may or may not have been true of No. 2 because of the lacunae; No. 62 gives credit for several acts of merit to the King by name, which is not true of No. 2; but a large part of No. 62 is a eulogy of the Mahāthera Sumana, just as most of No. 2 is a eulogy of Śṛiśraddhā; and though the King is the nominal author of No. 62 it seems obvious that most of it was actually composed by Sumana.
INSCRIPTION 2

Text

(๑) ชินปภู ศรี
(๒) ชินปภู
(๓) สิ่งเกจพระ.... คบปน....
(๔) เมีย สิ่งเกจพระ.... สรี....
(๕) บาดา... สรัสรัฐราชชวลมณีสรัศาสตกับมหาสมณ

(๖) (เจ้า).... วาริชีองסורใจอาจ.. คัมภีร์ล้ำองใจ... ยิ่ง

(๗) ผีเฝศประจำ (ก) หัตถะอุทุมซิมสีสัน... ถนน
(๘) ภริยากระจำลองสอนพระพุทธสันนาหัก.... ถนนพิภ
(๙) สรางในนครสอนจนอินธีนครศรีอยุธยาอินธีนคร

(๑๐) ขันไวย... พระ.... ถนน...
(๑๑) ถนน... ผีกินอินธี...(ก)....
(๑๒) เมียชีร่อง.... ถนน.. หู...
(๑๓) ค่า ๐... ปันในพระที่เกลี้ยงสอนเห็น
(๑๔) สิ่งยา (ม) ... ๐ เป็นหวัณสอนแสงพวกเขา (ม)

.... ว่า ๐ เบี้ย
(๑๕) ทินชนะกี ... ก ... ๐ แอ ... ก ... พล.ne ๐ แช ๑ เมืองสกุล
(๑๖) ไชย ... พ ... พ ... ยน ... รู้วิชำมาถอดฐาน
(๑๗) ........ เขา ... น ... น ... รวดวงกว่ายี่แข็งคุณ
(๑๘) ....... พล.ne ยี่ ... อ่านคุณเสิร์ซในยุปมานทามาทเว
(๑๙) *sizeof() ... ๐ พล.ne ... ก ... กใหญ่ ... ณ.แทน
(๒๐) ......... พล.ne ยี่ ... ก ... กใหญ่ ... ณ.แทน
(๒๑) .......... พล.ne ... ก ... กใหญ่ ... ณ.แทน
(๒๒) .......... พล.ne ... ก ... กใหญ่ ... ณ.แทน
(๒๓) .......... พล.ne ... ก ... กใหญ่ ... ณ.แทน
(๒๔) .......... พล.ne ... ก ... กใหญ่ ... ณ.แทน
(๒๕) .......... พล.ne ... ก ... กใหญ่ ... ณ.แทน
(๒๖) .......... พล.ne ... ก ... กใหญ่ ... ณ.แทน
(๒๗) ทรงจ visual ผ่านพ้น......มีให้จดอยู่หนังหนึ่ง
พระช้าง ๑ ปีดั้งแต่
(๒๘) ซุปบางบางหลวงและสมเด็จไชยลังทวาระบัน ๐ พระชูบางกลาง
ตราไว้บงกับแก้วณานมาเมืองพุท
(๒๙) ผ่านเมือง......(ข่ม) สมเด็จไชยลังทวาระบัน ๐ พระชู
เมืองจังจุเมืองสุกใส
(๓๐) ทำเข้าได้ ๐ เวลาเมืองแก้วณานาบางกลางหลวง ๐ พระชูกลางหลวงสิ้น
เข้าเพื่อการแก้พระราชทานพุท
(๓๑) เมืองจังอาะพลอยกุญชูกลางหลวงจึงเขามีเมือง ๐ พระชูเมืองจังยัน
แก้พระราชบางกลางหลวงชวยเมือง
(๓๒) สร้างใช้ให้จดจับแก้วณานาพระราชสาธายแก้สิ้นยันกรีกีนทรรศภย
๑ นาม
(๓๓) ถอนประเทาจึงยันสิ้นโลกระดับใหญ่ในปกครองเมืองมหาการบ่วน
โดยสร้างแปลงกายแก้วณานานเมือง
(๓๔) ทรงยันบางกลางหลวงแก้สิ้นยันกรีกีนทรรศภยเพื่อแก้วณานานเมือง
ยันกรีกีนพระราชสาธาย ๑
(๓๕) เมืองดูโอใช้เป็นเมือง ๐ พระชูยันกรีกีนทรรศภยแก้วณานาน
เมืองอาะพลอยกุญชูหลวง...
(๓๖) ก. ๑. แก้เมืองพระพวงกลางหลวงแก้//=ทรงพระคณะเมืองได้บ้าน
เมืองอาะพลอยกุญชู
(๓๗) พระทศภยผืน ซึ่งผืนนานราชสำนักบัญรูปราชภูdrationบังจก พระ
ธนบุรี ผืน ให้เสียชีวิตในตลอดพระ
(๓๘) อินทรูภยผืนซึ่งชีวิตราชภูdration Rooms พระทศภยผืนแก้แก้วณานาน
เสีย ๐ พระชูเมืองเจ้าเมือง
(๓๔) วันนี้ในต่างประเทศมีคนแยกแยกรวมทรัพย์เป็นอาหารพร้อมย้ายกลับประเทศ
ก่อความหวังหลัง.
(๓๕) ... โดยสวัสดิ์ดี ... ทุกคนเริ่มต้นใหม่ ... สาขาด้วยเหตุผลดัง
ที่กล่าวถึงอยู่ในที่ ... สร้าง.
(๓๖) lec in ยุทโธพน ... สรุปเก็บก่อนแรก ๐ มีซ้อนที่ซึ่งผ่านเมื่อถึง
นั้นซึ่งเดินร่างหน้ากางสีขาว.
(๓๗) ราชรัฐนี้จะสิ้นสุดภัยพิบัติสมบัติเป็นเจ้า พระมหาภูทมิตรีรา
ราชราชานั้นผ่านมาที่ (ชื่อ) ผ่าน.
(๓๘) งดมิฉะเชิญก่อกำกับหน่วยกำลังมักโยทามทุกเมื่อบั้น الزمن
จากโยทาม ...
(๓๙) สอบถามหนังเก็บควรจะถูกบั้นบุกโดยทำบั้นมิตรภาพกันที่นั้น
โดย ... คบเหล.
(๔๐) ถูกมิใช่ความจริงนี้ ... ถูกกำหนดเป็นภูมิทัศน์กลางวัน
ต่างคนในที่ ...
(๔๑) ผู้ชมมากมายไม่มีวัสดุปิดกรุงยังเมื่อสิ้นสุดตอนแรกก่อนที่จะส่ง
และดำวิจารย์ ซึ่ง ... หอ.
(๔๒) เทศ รู้ภูมิในพักกำลังทหารพยานกลาง (ค่ำ) โดยมีกลุ่มขับ
อยู่บนกรรมนำภัยสิ้นที่ ...
(๔๓) ... จ. ปลุกพระะวิมห์พวกที่ทำศูนย์บริการทั้งหมดทุกฝ่ายผลัก
สำนักพระเจ้า ...
(๔๔) ... ยืนตรีรับผิดชอบสงครามและผู้นั้นเป็น ... พระมหาภูทมิตรีรา
ราชราชานั้นผ่านเชิญ ...
(๔๕) ... กิจมิตรคือความสัมพันธ์ไม่ตรุจริตระหนก ... สุดท้ายทุกหลา
โปรดทายปัจจุบันโมที่ (o) ...
(๕๖) ค่ำยนนั้นรู้จะรู้วันที่มีพระยาลัฏฐาทิศหนึ่งสิ้นสุด
ทั้งหมดให้ดูอย่างระลึกว่าบัด
(๕๗) วัฒนียกษัตริย์ผู้เก่ง เพื่อที่บุราชาที่มีพระยาทิศทั้งหลาย พระยาทิศ
(๕๘) คำมงคลกิจ ๑ แผ่นที่ไม่ปรากฏคำกิจแผ่นที่กิจพระยาทิศหนึ่ง
(๕๙) ... นั้นได้กิจกิจกิจที่กิจพระยาทิศหนึ่ง...
(๖๐) ๔ ... ในเมืองลิงที่ใดหนึ่งที่กิจพระยาทิศหนึ่ง...
(๖๑) นั้น...(ผู้) เที่ยงคืนจึงถิ่นถิ่น
(๖๒) ... พระพุทธเจ้าตรึงใจให้ถังไม่เป็นไปอย่างสงบ Bên ตนก็ไม่
(๖๓) (๙) ........... เที่ยงคืนอย่างมั่นคงและนั้น ยิ่งเป็นไปใน
(๖๔) นั้น.... เที่ยงคืนพระพุทธเจ้าตรึงใจให้ถังไม่
(๖๕) ............... ที่ถึงเมืองทิศ... นั้นได้ถึงกิจกิจของ... ค.
(๖๖) นั้นในเมืองทิศคนไม่
(๖๗) ... งมายะย oluşan... อย่างยิ่ง... อย่างยิ่งศยิ่ง
(๖๘) นั้น... อย่างกลายที่วิถีและนี้ยิ่ง... นั้น... ไม่
(๖๙) ............... กินข้าวที่ทวีหลังมีหลังเรียงไม่ยิ่ง... สิ้นทิศ
(๗๐) ............... เป็นครั้งที่... เมื่อในหนึ่ง ๐ เร่... กิจที่...
(๖๒) (๓) ถนนกฤษณ์กลางคู่ท่าวาสตร์ประชุมจัง ๐ ชุมพลนันไม้
 แขงสามารถสร้างใหม่ให้
(๖๓) (แก่น) กินนิยมหนึ่งกินนิยมชาวรัง... กินนิยม (๓) ตกแต่งซ่ายาวเว้นกันทั้งชุม
 วง (๓) ร. ซ. ทาพุทธกำเนิด.
(๖๔) ...... คน (พะฤกษ์) ค้ำห่างพระธรรมหมู่. นอกกล่าวทั้งหมดแพร่
 (๔) น. น. ด.
(๖๕) ...... พ. คงยอนเจ้าสรีสรรสรา (ชูลุม) ณ หอแนบใหม่ทรงที่
 ท่านกฤษณ์.
(๖๖) สมัย ทรงเอาต้นทิ่งนางสาวช่วยน ... ช่าง ชี ท. ท. น.
 ชื่นชมแพะ ... น. น.
(๖๗) แถวซ้ายและสร้างประจำมณฑำหมาย ... นางสาวระบุอาการงดเห็น
 ลำนำกลาง...
(๖๘) อันอยู่ถูกทวาระสรีสรรสราติมุณี ... น. นำไปกฤษณ์. ก่อนบ
 วจุธนารามนน
(๖๙) ช่างสร้างเรือนเตียนเบียนพิงกันกลางคน้ในถิ่นภูของแรงสร้าง
 นอสจิก
(๗๐) พลังกลมถามพวกที่ไม่รู้สรีรสารติมุณีจึงเชื่อแบบช่าง ไปตามที่
 บ่อยคำว่า. หาท่าน
(๗๑) .... วางแผนในหูเหล่านี้แปะยึดกับสำคัญกับตัวข้าง
 ทะ. ท.
(๗๒) แนววิ่งเหนือและสร้างเรือนตามบ่อยกริ่งใจทางสร้างเรือนในใหม่และเติมจ
 ธรรมราน.
(๗๓) เมื่อถึงไทยแล้ว นั่งท่าน วางเครื่องเส้นครบก่อนแล้วจึงกล่าว

(๗๔) ทานแก้มาตรฐาน... วางเครื่องเส้นครบก่อนแล้วจึงกล่าว

(๗๕) เมื่อถึงมาเจ้าพระยาธาราข่มชุบแล้วทรงเปลี่ยนพระเครื่อง

(๗๖) แก้มาตรฐานเจ้าพระยาธาราข่มชุบแล้วเสียก่อนให้หมื่นตรอยปี

(๗๗) นั่งพระเกี้ยวปั้นเจ้าสมบักบ้ามีเจ้าพระยาปั้นขึ้นพื้นที่ท่าน

(๗๘) (๑) ขอนั่งพื้นที่พระยาข่มชุบเสียก่อนให้พลเอกช่างหน้า

(๗๙) เกี่ยนอยู่... บรรทัดที่เสียก่อนก่อนท่อนแรกแล้วเจ้าพระยา

(๘๐) คุณภักดีพร้อม... ท่านส่องพระเกี้ยวขึ้นพื้นผักนั่ง

(๘๑) (ผู้ช่วย) ขอนั่งพร้อมกัน... ขอนั่งพร้อมกัน... คณะผู้ช่วย

(๘๒) เจ้าพระยาธาราข่มชุบผ่านนั่งขับเข้าเฝ้าบังคับบัญช่วย

(๘๓) (ผู้ช่วย) บังคับให้กุชชายนับ... บังคับไปมาเจ้าไม่ทรงสามารถ

(๘๔) หลักขานเก็บ...
(๘ต) มหาภูภูมิเสียบกับพระมหาภูภูมิพระพุทธเจ้า ๘ ร. ค. ท่าน. ศ.

(๘ต) ฝนตกหนาหนาในทุ่งนา ป่าต้นไม้ย่นตัวมีที่ ชื่อที่นิ

(๘ต) จึงมาเก็บสระเสียบถึงสระทุ่งนา รักใคร่ผมระยะน้อย

(๘ต) โอท้านภูชนีเจิ้งหน้ินแห่งกิจของอยู่ทรงหลายอนแบบตาม

(๘ต) สะหน้า! ลุ่มพ้นหุ้งหุ่งในน้ำป่า…… อยู่เห็น

(๘ต) นุ่น! กิจงานพ้นและอย่าเรื่องพลังเรื่องมาผ่านผ่าน

(๘ต) เหลือ…… ตามวัฏจักรกิจไตรภูมิทานเฉลิม…… พยา. อยู่……

หุ้งหุ่ง

คำนาท ๑๘

(๑) …………… มีครั้งนับๆ ว่าทีใหม่ ท่านพะทุตตั้ง…

(๒) …………… น. แต่แจ้งปลูกสวนสองกิจของต่างๆ แยกแยะแยะระหว่างย……

(๓) …………… ฝนตก (น้า) โอท้านไม่เกล้าเกล้านมาซ้ํใครมหทารร

(๔) …………… قانونภูภูมิระบุคณิภูเกล้าโอท้านไม่เกล้าเกล้าฝั่ง

เลยอีก……
(๙) พระราชินี (เป็น) พระพุทธะ... จึงพิจารณ์อยู่จาก

รัตนภูมิเสพยาม (ตร)

(๑๐) ทรงเห็น... ทรงเห็นทั่วพระสรรพสมภพตระการ

โปรดพิจารณ์อยู่

(๑๑) พระสรรพสมภพตระการ... ทรงเห็นทั่ว

โปรดพิจารณ์

(๑๒) ทรงเห็น... ทรงเห็น

โปรดพิจารณ์

(๑๓) ทรงเห็น... ทรงเห็น

โปรดพิจารณ์

(๑๔) ทรงเห็น... ทรงเห็น

ทรงเห็น

(๑๕) ทรงเห็น... ทรงเห็น

ทรงเห็น
(๑๖) ฉันเป็นคน (วา) คนยิ้งแหลมหูน๊ะเปลือกในท้องนา
คนหักขา เนื่อง ผู้เสกควงทรงปลาย
(๑๗) ... หาวได้ธนิรุดเมืองและมวลถล่มท่อนเจ้าเมืองเมืองภูทษา
รู้ใจค่อนไม่ยอมมาก...
(๑๘) ทั้งนี้ใน...ในเวลานี้พวกเขาเข้าไปข้าราชการเจ้าไปประสพผู้
ลงเหล่าที่รู้ในพระยา
(๑๙) คุณเจริญนน...ทรงหลักซอมบอยเป็นเจ้าเมืองพระยา
บงสสวัสดิราชชูพิณี เป (น)
(๒๐) เข้า... เขามาคลุกใน ทำพระยาขาดคอหุ่นสงค์ในพระยาภาคภูมิ
สูงเก้าดีบดวายไม่
(๒๑) ... เหมาะพระยาหุ่นคงเสียงเอกเสียเอก (ศ) รัช (ยาย) ราษฎร
เมื่อเป็นเจ้าภาพทยาใหม่...
(๒๒) ...(น) สาจิตร... ชินเจ้าภาพทยาเป็นเป็นราชาหุ่นคง
ก้ามฝ่ายก้ามอย่างใครยิ่ง รู้
(๒๓) ฉันได้ยินพระยาชั่วชีวี ๑ สมเด็จช่างกลางทรงพระสวัสดิ์ ๑
เมื่อทรงเสวยอยู่ในกลางล่า
(๒๔) ... ฉันเห็นผู้อภิชักหน้าที่ผู้เป็นโดยพระยาสร้างช่วงจะมีเป็นเจ้า
จริงหรือสอบว่าต่าง
(๒๕) ... (ก) แต่สุ่งจากโตคงสนใจพระยาเป็นพระพุทธ
จรรยาใจซื่อ ให้พบปัก...
(๒๖) ... (ข) สถานบันตรป่าแห่งหน้าดอยหลวงปู่ปุ่มปั่นอันสูงตากห้วย
ที่กิ่งหน้านอนผา
กษัตริย์อีก 1 พระยา คุกที่บ้าน (ย) ที่บ้านท่าน
อดีตร้อยหนึ่งคนแรก ๆ พระยา
(1) ยกไทยลงด้วยหัวเก้า 1 (ร) ลงมาที่หัวเก้า อีกสองบัน
บารมีแล้วจึงไป
(1) ถ้า... หลายพระพุทธธระนั้น אמנותได้พจาน้อยใหญ่
เกิดช่วงต้องสวมที่
เอกภาพกิจการไว
(1) มะหาที่มาอ้างแห่งใดอดีตได้แต่ละแห่งใหญ่
เอกภาพกิจการ
(2) แต่ละคนหัวอภิปริจิต 1 แสงแห่งได้เครื่องด้วย
มุ่งพระค่อออกใหญ่
(1) ข้าพบอยู่ด้วยหัวเจ้าฯ มะหาที่เอาถึงกิจการ
ปริญญาพระค่อ
(1) มะหาที่มีอีกหนึ่งพระพุทธธระกิจซึ่งเป็นคนพระพุทธธระ
ออกใหญ่ ออกขาว ออก
(1) ... มะหาที่หนึ่งกว่าค่อมในมะหาที่มีทรงคุณสมบัติ
หนามหานแหก
(1) ... มะหาที่มี เบื้องหน้าบุคคลออกใหญ่ในพมานีพระศรี
แสนบุคคลในเจ้าชีวิตภูมิ
(1) ถ้า 1 พระวิศิษฏะ (เจ้า) ห้าประดียา 1 พระวิศิษฏะคือคน
พระมาสตรำชวารคสุนนี่เจ้าชีวิตภูมิ
(1) ภาษีเป็นเจ้าคืนพระนามพระมหาเทญพุทธภูมิที่อยู่ในสมรภูมิ
ออกใหญ่แยกไปในเลือก 1 เเละใหญ่
(๓๓) โอ... ใดโมจารียานนี้ถึงจะดีนักหนา... แล้วเห็นคุณใหม่จะรับแทน

(๓๓) คุณต์... แบ่งอิสระถ้าจึงไปเท่าพระเก้าทานคุณบริปร่อมดวย

(๓๓) ทรงอธิการขอ

(๓๗) ราชูทก (แพทย์) ราชูทกสุกฤทธิ์สมานพระเก้าทานในโดยมี

(๓๓) ... ถ้าโมจารียานนี้ถึงจะดีนักหนา

(๓๓) ราชูทกสุกฤทธิ์สมานพระเก้าทานในโดยมี

(๓๓) ... ขอคุณบริปร่อมด้วย

(๓๗) ราชูทกสุกฤทธิ์สมานพระเก้าทานในโดยมี

(๓๗) การณ์ติ... แบ่งอิสระถ้าจึงไปเท่าพระเก้าทานคุณบริปร่อมด้วย

(๓๗) ทรงอธิการขอ

(๓๗) ราชูทกสุกฤทธิ์สมานพระเก้าทานในโดยมี

(๓๗) ... ขอคุณบริปร่อมด้วย
(๖๓) (หนา) ด ทรงกลดก์แกวและพระคุณวิชักษ์ประจำเสกซึ่งใน
โกศลพงษ์พระยาจุล
(๖๔) ริมขามรุ้งพระเจดีทองเงินผา เขมรัศู(ร) จักรินเหนือ ๐
ถังสุกหน้าหลวง
(๖๕) ฉิมมา..น. ปะสรวิศวะคนHanอุทุมผู้ ๐ ถังนิมเปรียร
ร่มกังหกอ่อนสมทม
(๖๖) อุทุมมาก ... เหล็กแก้วกิ่ง словамกิ่งครอบตำแหน่ง
เสกชีดอยู่เห็น
(๖๗) ขณะพระเจดีอยู่ซึ่งต้อยงามบุกบวมแก่พระสรวิศวะราชจุล
มิตรสรวิศวะคนทม
(๖๘) ปิริยาสกิจวิปฏิบัติเอาโทษพระเจดีครุเสนพระเจดีเมืองบางเทว
แฮบเพลย
(๖๙)นี่หวั่พระสรวิศวรราชจุลปนปนกนผ้า เสกซิ่งกิ่งทมกิก
บษกกลางเกลี้ยงอย่าง
(๗๐) รัฐบาลปิว์ที่เกี่ยว ๐ สร้างสุทธางาเมยเอสรถยงครอน
เซาจิ้งคนกิก
(๗๑) ใครสนามบัดเบี่ยงจุดชนใดพองต้นพระสรวิศวรราชจุลปน
กิ่งหลังหายใจว.
(๗๒) เมนแบะกันล้อมม้ากระจงหองอยู่ใจมหาดกาเดงทิ่งต้าน
หนัง ๐ เซาริ.
(๗๓) ขึ้นบงกตางคน้วิจารณ์กุมารหมายที่มีหน้าผายทางกริ่งและ
เซาจิ้งยินดี (ที่นิ
(๗๔) พระเจดีมีดุยผ่ำผายกันขุนยศกทมหามิตรสรวิศวรราชจุลปน
บัลถิทุกต้นทม.
(๕) นุ้ตเจศฎีกิจกิจเหตุคนไม่แข็งแรงไปใหญ่ช่าง ๐ คุณคนพระพุทธคุณ
สองชั่วครู่ (ก)
(๖) มองภาพถ่ายแลกไปกลางหุบกับพระสิทธิธรรมราชอดุลย์ จึงช่วย
นักกีฬาไป... (ข)
(๗) วัคิภูนั้นพระเจ้าเศษเจ้าในโกส. แสงสว่างอรุณช่ำลงอยู่บนภูเขา
แห่งใหญ่ (ระหว่าง)
(๘) จงทลายทิศทางศุภศาสตร์แห่งเมืองเรือนแห่งการพิจารณาก็ไปกลาง
عارสู...
(๙) เตรียมที่ทำการสมบูรณ์เสร็จก่อนพระเรือนงามชูพระอาทิตย์
เมืองพุฒิ (น)
(๑๐) พระเบวิจกิจเหตุคนปราบดิศกิจเสื่อมดับเย็น ๐ หมู่พระปางเจ้า
ปราบดิศ (หลวง)
(๑๑) มงหนึ่งจิตใจล้มลุกแห่งแคนห้างหลายให้ปังช่ำ ญัชธรรมกิจ
กิ้ว (บ)
(๑๒) แบ่งแยกกู้สอนใหม่ไทยให้ปรากฏแก่ทุกชาติ ๐ ทางแห่งเปิดเปื่ึก
วางแผน (กิ่ง)
(๑๓) องค์เจ้าอิสระที่ต้องปรับสมรรถภาพกับรัฐบาลคนหน้าชั่ว (พระ)
มายา...
(๑๔) ชาติพุทธนำพานแม่นยำหลายอย่างเปิดกองหา... นคร...
(๑๕) เสรีภาพตรงจังเจรจาณประฤทธิ์สิ่ง พระมหาสงวน... ที่...
(๑๖) องค์จอมราชาเส้นอูมาเสกอันเลิศเมฆอินทร์หน้า... สท...
(๑๗) ทองเยาพระพุทธเจ้ามีพระ ก. หนักหนาไช... สามี...
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ตามที่ ๑ (ต่อ)

(๑๑) สรัสรบราชสิทธิสิ่งผู้ด้อยต่อมทับทิมพุทธศักราช

(๑๒) เป็นเจ้าสำหรับโยธาตรีที่ทั้งหมดไว้พ้น ๔ ที่พัก

(๑๓) ซึ่ง... สอบบัญชีทั้งหมดพระบรมราชานุสรณ์ให้ตามคำนัดหมาย

(๑๔) ลงหลักสูตรใน... เข้าทั้งหมด

(๑๕) (ที่) ถูกเจ้าครู... พระมหาภูเวส

(๑๖) กลางทบาทวิทPremiumname ภราญาสวรรค์... มาที่ รูป...

(๑๗) จุดหมายไว้ที่บุคคลแต่ละ... หน้าบุญนำพระเจ้า... บุญ...

(๑๘) อธิบดี... ลงที่... กลางทบาท ที่...

(๑๙) กษัตริย์... พระเจ้า (ก) ๑ (น)... อธิบดี (บ) ๑ (นเรศ) แห่ง...

(๒๐๐) ปช... มี...

(๒๐๑) กษานิ... บพระเจ้า (ราช) จุลยสิ่ง

(๒๐๒) ปช... ที่...

(๒๐๓) ที่...

(๒๐๔) (ช่าร์ช)

(๒๐๕) (ช่าร์ช)

(๒๐๖) พระ...

(๒๐๗) ยุ...
ก้อง</p>
Translation

[I/1 and I/2: illegible.]

[I/3-8] .................. Saṃteca Brah S...... pen [Cau] ....................

...... when Saṃteca Brah ... Śrī ..................... a Mahāthera named
Śrīsraḍḍhājūcālāmūṇi Śrīrattanalāṅkādīpa Mahāsāmi pen [Cau]......
Māvalikagaṅga in Laṅkā21 ...... Mōnh Lāmbah,22 up to ... Saṃteca
......... there he built the Brah Dantadhātustūgandhacetī23 which has three ...... at that [place] ...... in the towns of Sralvañ and
Sōn Čivē.24

[I/8-20] His grandfather who was named Brah Śrīnāv Nām
Thāp .... was the father of ............ built in two cities, one named

21) This passage apparently contained a short list of Śrīsraḍḍhā's acts of merit, some of which are more fully described later on. The one referred to here is his restoration of the Mahāyāna-cetiya on the bank of the Mahāvālukagaṅga; see II/42 ff., and note 149. The Mahāvālukagaṅga was the chief river of Ceylon (modern Māhāveliganga); see Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, s.v. Mahāvālukagaṅga. In the 13th century, ordination ceremonies were held on more than one occasion on a raft moored in its waters, as ordinations performed in an 'udakukkhepasimē' were considered less liable to hidden flaws than if performed on land (see Coedes in BEFEO XXV, p. 105 note 2; Čaláková, 87/72, 89/70 f., 94/17, as well as Geiger's footnotes to these passages in his translation of Čaláková, Colombo, 1953, p. 82 note 4, p. 199 note 3).

22) Perhaps near Sukhodaya, since the Khmer garrison-commander at Sukhodaya is called Khloń Lańban (!/25, I/27, I/28). But the reading of the name in all these passages is uncertain.

23) This 'fragrant cetiya of the Tooth Relic' is probably the monument at the Monastery of Forest-Dwellers where Śrīsraḍḍhā enshrined a Tooth Relic (II/82-87, 1/91 ff.). Unfortunately we do not know where the place was. Could it have something to do with the Temple of the Tooth at Mōṅ Phāṅ (Śiṅg), about 13 km. east of Uttaratīthī, which was very famous in the 17th century and perhaps earlier? 'Pour ce qui est de Meilung-Fang,' says La Loubère, '...... parce qu'on y garde une Dent, qu'on prétend être une Relique de Sommona Coloun, à la memoire du quel les Siamois batissent tous leurs Temples; il y en a qui appelent cette Ville non pas Meilung-fong mais Meliang-fan, c'est à dire, Ville de la Dent. La superstition de ces Peuples y attire toujours un grand nombre de Pélétrins, non seulement Siamois, mais du Pegu, et de Lào. (La Loubère, Du royanne de Sina, Paris, 1691, p. 12). For the antiquities at Mōṅ Phāṅ (Śvāga-pūría), cf. Poruṅavatthusthūna, p. 239.

24) For Sralvañ, see above, p. 3; Śrā Gvē was the old name of Bispuloka.
Nagara Sukkhodai, one named Nagara Śrī Sejanālaī. Braha S
........... there ........................................ noblemen26 in very great
number .......................... Mañah Jalyaṅ 27 ............ Ba Khunronym Tham 28 ....
........... .......................... to the southwest as far as Chūt, twenty
thousand and ................... four fathoms .......................... To the south, two
hundred thousand fathoms ....... .......................... To the north, as far as ............
.................. when .................. Ba Khun Nām Tham 29 at Mañah Sukkhodai
............. knew how to capture wild elephants, was daring and brave,
.......................... Ba Khun Nām Tham .......................... made him enter ........ for him. ..........................
two ........................................

[1/20-21.] A son of Ba Khun Śrī nav Nām Tham named Braha
Pha Moañ, the ruler of Mañh Rāt, .......................... (possessed?) a hundred
thousand elephants, his country was girt about with areca palms, and
countless cities paid him homage32. ..........................
[1/21-32.] Long ago Ba Khun Pǎn Klǎn Hǎv, the lord of Mōāh Pǎn Yǎn,33 caused .... The army of Ba Khun Phā Mōāh, the lord of Mōāh Rāt, ... [and] Ba Khun Phā Mōāh divided [the troops] between them34. ○ Ba Khun Pǎn Klǎn Hǎv captured Mōāh Sri Sējanālǎi .... Ba Khun Phā Mōāh, the lord of Mōāh Rāt, brought up his army ........ Pǎh Klǎn .... presented Pǎh Klǎn to Ba Khun Phā Mōāh35. Then Ba Khun Phā Mōāh took his army to Mōāh Rāt, Mōāh Sǎkōtǎi36 ....., Sri Sējanālǎi, and Sukkhodai. The valiant Khūm, Khloǎng Lǎm bāṇ, gave battle37 ....... ○ Then Ba Khun Pǎn Klǎn Hǎv went .......... the army of Ba Khun Phā Mōāh, ruler of Mōāh Rāt, came .........., they combined their forces. ○ Ba Khun Pǎn Klǎn Hǎv and Ba Khun Phā

33) The reading nhm11~ cH (l/22) is doubtful, so our translation 'the lord of' is equally so. The location of Pǎn Yǎn (umla) is not known. It may have been somewhere between Mōāh Rāt and Sējanālǎya, or else perhaps at or near the modern Pǎn Yǎn (jumma), about 7 km. south of New Sukhodai (Rājādhānī; see Royal Institute Gazetteer, III, map facing p. 1460); but these are no more than guesses.

34) mmà (l/22), Khmer phat (aum, 'to divide', 'to part'; cf. Prajom Si lacárīk I, Bangkok, B.E. 2500, p. 36, note 1. The reading of this passage (l/21-23) is uncertain and our translation very doubtful, but the general sense seems clear enough. Probably Pǎh Klǎn Hǎv persuaded Phā Mōāh to join with him in the campaign which is about to be described; then, as one of the two armies was stronger in one type of military force, say elephantry, while the other was stronger in another, say foot-soldiers, they divided their forces in what they thought would be the most effective manner.

35) Pǎh Klǎn (l/24) has not been identified; the context suggests that it may have been somewhere between Sējanālǎya and Sukkhodai. We might reconstruct the lacuna preceding and following the place-name in either of two ways, giving the sentence two quite different meanings: (1) Phā Mōāh brought up his army to Pǎh Klǎn, and the ruler of Pǎh Klǎn surrendered to him; or else (2) Phā Mōāh brought up his army to some other place, whereas Pǎh Klǎn Hǎv captured Pǎh Klǎn and presented it to Phā Mōāh.

36) Sǎkōtǎi (l/24-25), also unidentified, was evidently between Mōāh Rāt and Sējanālǎya, perhaps nearer to Mōāh Rāt.

37) The valiant Khūm (Khmer) Khloǎng Lǎm bāṇ was evidently the commander of the Khmer garrison at Sukkhodai. The word 'khōn', attested in Khmer epigraphy, denoted an official of a particular rank, generally military. See Coedès, JSS XIV/1, p. 6. Note that the reading 'Lǎm bāṇ' is uncertain.
Mōān mounted their elephants. ........................ met each other. 38 [Ba Khun Phā Mōaṁ] asked him to get up on his elephant's head with him. 0 When the plan was completed 39, Ba Khun Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv and the valiant Khōm Khōn Lāmśāṁ fought each other. 0 Ba Khun Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv sent word to Ba Khun Phā Mōaṁ. Ba Khun Phā Mōaṁ ........................ The valiant Khōm Khōn Lāmśāṁ ... was defeated utterly. 0 Then Ba Khun Phā Mōaṁ was able to enter the city of Sukkhodai. 0 He presented the city to Ba Khun Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv. 0 Ba Khun Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv, out of deference to his ally, did not enter it. Ba Khun Phā Mōaṁ withdrew his army, and Ba Khun Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv entered the city. 0 Ba Khun Phā Mōaṁ conferred the abhiśeka on Ba Khun Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv, as ruler of Mōaṁ Sukkhodai, giving his ally his own name Sri Indrapatindra-diśya, 0 which was the former title of Kamraṭen Aṉ Phā Mōaṁ 40. 0

[1/32-35.] Formerly the god 41 who was ruler of Sri Sodharapura 42 had given Ba Khun Phā Mōaṁ his daughter named Lady Sikharamahadevi, together with the sword Jayasri and a title of honor. The reason why Ba Khun Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv got the name Sri Indrapatindra-diśya was because Ba Khun Phā Mōaṁ took his own name and gave it to his ally [together with] Mōaṁ Sukkhodai, that is why. 0

38) This passage (I/27) has usually been read as සොහොනි, which Coedes translates as 'les Brahā se rencontrèrent'. But we are very doubtful about the reading 'brahā' (meye), a title which is nowhere else applied to Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv in this inscription. In any case, however, the sense of the passage seems to be that Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv and Phā Mōaṁ met each other.

39) dhāraṇi, cf. dīna, 'to calculate completely'. Apparently the two leaders, while seated together on the elephant's head, made a plan for concerted action.

40) Phā Mōaṁ, who had received the rank of Kamraṭen Aṉ (Khmer, 'king', 'viceroy', etc., more or less equivalent to Siamese brahā) and the title Śrī Indrapatindra-diśya from the Khmer king, now gave his title to Pāñ Khāṁ Hāv, together with Sukkhodai, Sājanīya and two or three other provinces, but probably retained the rank of Kamraṭen Aṉ and most of his territories. (It is possible that the Khmer king gave the title Śrī Indrapatindra-diśya to whichever of his vassals ruled Sukkhodai; if so, we might guess that Phā Mōaṁ, before succeeding his father as viceroy of the huge territories of Mōaṁ Rāt and receiving the title Kamraṭen Aṉ, had been ruler of Sukkhodai.)

41) වේණි (I/33), the Tai equivalent of Skt. devaraja.

42) The king of Cambodia. 'Sodharpura' is Yaśodharpura, i.e. Angkor Thom.
[I/35-36.] Ba Khun Sri Indrapatindrāditya and Ba Khun Phā Moān gave back each other’s troops, formerly, strolled around saying good-bye, and each one’s people went back to their own country as before.

[I/36-37.] A son of Ba Khun Sri Indraditya named Ba Khun Rāmārāja, wise and well versed in the Dharma, built a [monument named] Brahm Śrī Rattanadhatu in Sri Sajanaḷai.

[I/37-38.] A grandson of Ba Khun Sri Indraditya named Dharmarāja., well versed in merit and the Dharma, possesses most excellent and unutterable wisdom.

[I/38-41.] Ba Khun Phā Moān, ruler of Moān Rāt, caused cetiyas to be built, he earned the gratitude of many kings, he was the teacher and protector of a whole throng of monarchs, at Sri Sejanalai, all places to be for all the in the future. He allowed to choose and select, he bestowed alms on venerable persons in enormous quantity.

43) The word no longer means ‘to give back’ in Siamese, but has retained that meaning in Khmer.

44) We have translated this passage (I/35 f.) a little differently from Coedes. As well as we can make out, the two leaders, who had divided their troops between them for the campaign (see note 34), separated them again after the victory. The soldiers then said goodbye to their new friends and went home to be demobilized.

45) From here on, Pūh Klān Hav is called by his new title in abbreviated form, Śrī Indrā, Rāma Gamhē, and the ‘monument of the Precious Relic’ (srirattanadhatu) is almost certainly the stupa now called Vatū Jāh Lom (Chung Lom), which stands in the center of the walled town of Sajanaḷai.

46) Lūdaiya. The absence of a eulogy of anyone between Rāmārāja and Dharmarāja seems to prove that Lūdaiya was Rāma Gamhē’s immediate successor on the throne of Sukhodaya (cf. JSS LVII/1, p. 82 and note 20); the absence of any eulogy of a king of Sukhodaya following Dharmarāja proves that the inscription dates from Lūdaiya’s reign.

47) The expression we translate as ‘kings’ is dāv brahā (māyā); the word we translate as ‘monarchs’ is kṣatruḍhiraja, i.e. Skt. kṣatruḍhiraja. It is not clear whether the two terms are supposed to mean the same thing. Perhaps the second is intended to indicate rulers of a higher rank than the first.

48) Perhaps, if we reconstruct as we should understand: ‘to be worthy of worship’.

49) is a jingle meaning ‘in the future’.

50) sc. ‘he allowed people to choose whatever they wanted’?
There is a nephew\(^{51}\) of Ba Khun Phā Moān named Sāmīcch Brah Mahāthera Srīsadhārajācūlamūni Srīrattanalaṅkādipa Mahāsāmi pen Cau. Brah Mahāthera Srīsadhārajācūlamūni, Ba Khun Phā Moān’s nephew, who is full of faith, loves to perform works of merit and to act in conformity with the Dharma. He bestowed alms\(^{52}\) constantly, he never tired\(^{53}\) of giving . . . . clean and exceedingly beautiful, he gave food to the monks, and he gave alms\(^{54}\) without missing a single day, giving . . . . times [each day] . . . . [Since becoming a monk] he usually takes food only once . . . . each day. He likes to observe the precepts and meditate in the depths of woods and forests, absorbed in thought, forgetting to eat. [His usual food is only?] fruits and the roots of plants. His daily routine is like [that of] Sinhala\(^{57}\) in every way. He likes to wander about the country in search of wisdom . . . . [He knows all] countries, he knows all languages. He likes to

\(^{51}\) \textit{na} (I/41), which could mean either nephew or grandson. We are inclined to agree with Mr Kachorn Sukhbanij, who takes Śrīsadhā’s father Brahma Gāmēh Brahma Rāma (mentioned at I/63 f.), to be a son of Nām Thām (see JSS XLIV/2, 139 f.), and so a brother or half-brother of Phā Moān; and we certainly agree that Brahma Gāmēh Brahma Rāma is not be confused with Rāma Gāmēh; Brahma Gāmēh Brahma Rāma may have ruled Rāt as a vassal of Sukhodaya. But we cannot wholly exclude the alternative, that Śrīsadhā was a grandson of Phā Moān, which would make him a great-grandson of Nām Thām; and in that case \(\frac{1}{8}\) at I/8 would mean ‘great-grandfather’ (in Sukhodayan inscriptions \(\frac{1}{8}\) can mean a paternal or maternal grandfather or a great-grandfather).

\(^{52}\) We use the past tense in this passage, as it seems to refer to Śrīsadhā’s activities before becoming a monk.

\(^{53}\) \textit{na}, ‘never reckoned it difficult to’.

\(^{54}\) \textit{nu} (I/44, twice) is apparently a mistake for \textit{nu}, ‘alms’.

\(^{55}\) We follow Coedès’s reading ‘sāk vam’ (\textit{srnnum}) at I/44 (see \\textit{Revue}, I, p. 54), in preference to the reading \textit{srnum} given in \\textit{Prajum} I (B.E. 2500). If we were to adopt the latter, the translation would run: ‘without omitting a single thing.’

\(^{56}\) \textit{srnum} (\textit{sr}), ‘to take food’, is used only for monks; that is why we add (in brackets, at the beginning of the sentence), ‘since becoming a monk’.

\(^{57}\) Ceylon.

\(^{58}\) According to Mahā Chām Dāngāmyarna, \textit{srnum} is for thmūradasa (Khmer \textit{thmūr}, from \textit{tor}, to walk). Coedès, however, reads \textit{n} in place of \textit{sr}, and translates: ‘Les gens du Kameradesa [le pays khmer] viennent chercher la science [à Sukhodaya].’
practice asceticism. He is not not idle by day or by night, because he earnestly desires to accumulate the requisites of Buddhahood. He plants sacred Srimahabodhi trees and makes images of the Buddha everywhere. He uplifts the religion of the Lord, which is disappearing, to prevent it from falling into ruin or being destroyed anywhere whatever. The Mahāthera Śrīsradharājacūlamūṇi, who is full of faith, if someone injures him he does not get angry in return, but acts with forbearance and benevolence. He shows compassion to human beings and all creatures, he sets them free so that they will not die in that way. He recognizes people's merits and virtues, he is modest and gentle-mannered. He teaches himself and everyone else to be ashamed and afraid of doing evil, to be afraid of doing wrong to old people, parents, teachers, spiritual preceptors, companions or friends. The Mahāthera Śrīsradharājacūlamūṇi speaks in the highest degree. When the Sāptecā Brah Mahāthera pen Cau brings a kādi tree or a branch of a Srimahabodhi tree, or a ...... , or a ...... [gathered] in the land of Sīhala, and plants it in the ground, he utters the wish: 'If I am truly destined to become a Buddha, then may it live, rise up, and put out at least one shoot,' and as soon as he utters that wish, a dry leaf ......... turns green and exceedingly beautiful, and the tree comes to life so as to grow large, tall and exceedingly beautiful. [He has founded] many [statues], namely an image of the Lord [made] of carved ......, placed in the Sī Rāma ...

59) Such is evidently the meaning of the jingle nān (śu) naśu navāśe, literally 'in the middle of the day he does not stand still, in the middle of the night he does not remain [quiet].' 60) bodhisambhāra.

61) A reference to the old prophecy that the Buddhist religion is destined to suffer a sharp decline at the end of each thousand years after the Parinibbāna, and disappear altogether at the end of five thousand years. See Coedes, Le 2500e anniversaire du Bouddha, Diogène, Paris, 1956. But prophecies are not totally inexorable, and the making of sufficient merit can postpone their fulfillment.

62) kharānti (I/50), for krāśānti.

63) Calophyllum inophyllum.

64) tī for nī, 'to be raised up'. We assume he is a mistake for lā.

65) mū, for nī.

66) The wish of śannītha, I/55) was part of a saccakiriya, an 'act of truth'. See section 4, note 33.
bihāra ... 67 of Sukhodai, one placed at the foot of the Mahās68, ..., one placed in the spired building69 near ..., one in Śrī Sajanalai ... ... in front of the Braḥ Mahā ... 70. When he is propagating [trees] ... ... he utters the wish: 'If it is true that there is a city in Lankā- dvipa71 ..., then may there be ... ... Samtec Braṭ Mahāthera ........... a throng ........... laymen ... at that time. O

[I/61-74.] Cau Śrīsraddhājacūlamūṇi74, like a king of lions possessing enormous strength, fought an elephant duel with Khun Caṅṇ73. Khun Caṅṇ was riding a huge male war elephant,75 which was in rut, with the oil ... dripping down.77 Riding up at great speed, Khun Caṅṇ ... taunted Braṇa Gāṇḍheṇ [Braṇa Rāma]76, [telling] Braṇa Gāṇḍheṇ Braṇa Rāma ... to exchange a silk cushion in place of ... ... like that. Cau Śrīsraddhājacūlamūṇi resented it extremely on his father's account, like a Nāgarāja whose tail is hit with a hammer. [Riding a female] elephant named D ..........., he drove her ... ... the female elephant. The male war elephant was dripping oil [so abundantly] that it soaked his feet ... ... The war elephant, groping with his trunk

67) [l/57], indicating that the missing word was 'north', 'east', 'south' or 'west'. The Rāmamahāvihāra (if that is how the name at l/57 should be reconstructed) cannot be identified.
68) Conjectural translation. Mahās ... (l/58) was perhaps the name of a mountain. But cf. vānā ('great bridge') in inscription 11, II/12.
69) Assuming that ākāra (l/58) is put for ākāra, Pāli kuṭāgāra.
70) Perhaps Braṇ Mahāratanaddātu; cf. above, note 45.
71) Ceylon. The passage is another 'act of truth'; see note 66.
72) The lacuna at II/59-60 may have contained some expression like 'which was visited by the Lord Buddha'.
73) India.
74) Śrīsraddhā when he was still a layman.
75) [l/62], for ṛ (Jang).
76) [l/62]. We take ṛs to be the Mān word srāṛj (sarū), 'a warrior', etc.; see Halliday, Māru-English Dictionary, Bangkok, 1922, p. 448.
77) When a male elephant is in rut (called 'must' by Indian elephant-drivers) a thick oil drips from two pores in his forehead. Elephants in this condition are regarded as extremely dangerous.
78) As the next sentence shows, Braṇa Gāṇḍheṇ Braṇa Rāma was Śrīsraddhā's father.
to find his way underneath, which was hanging down, touched Cau Srisradharājucūlamūṇi's head got pierced by the hairpin. The war elephant walked with extreme pain. [Cau Srisradharājucūlamūṇi's] foot-soldiers went to help him. They stabbed the war elephant, who then retreated, limping, plunged into a thicket, and took flight. Cau Srisradharājucūlamūṇi then drove the female elephant in pursuit, striking relentlessly, and boldly urging her forward. [The male elephant], grooping with his trunk, took flight, fell into a thicket of tall grass, hesitated two or three times, entered, and ran away altogether. The [female] elephant pursued relentlessly, caught the war elephant, and brought him back. Samtec Dharmarāja, [the ruler of] Sukhopai, said: 'How is it that a female elephant fights a male elephant which is dripping oil and the male elephant runs away from the female elephant? How is it that the male elephant which is dripping oil runs away like that from the female elephant?'

[1/75-79.] When Samtec Cau Srisradharājucūlamūṇi formed the resolution to become the god Hariṣṇa, at that time.... when Cau  

79) oun (I/67). Equivalent to ṅā, a term used in elephant fighting when an elephant pushes under its adversary in order to lift it up and overturn it.  
80) Perhaps the male elephant, after failing to overturn the female, jerked his trunk upward, then started to lower it, and got it pierced by Srisraddha's hairpin on the way down.  
81) The meaning of 'oun (I/68) in this context is uncertain.  
82) We take oun (I/69) to be a mistake for 'un, 'to stab'.  
83) 'un, 'to withdraw' (Pallegoix).  
84) 'un, for 'oun, glossed as 'oun ('limping') in Prajum I, B.E. 2467, p. 79.  
85) 'un (I/70), 'relentlessly'; see Remeli, p. 66 note 6.  
86) Reconstructing -mu (I/71) as 'mu, 'to grope'.  
87) 'un (I/71), i.e. 'un, 'to stop' (Pallegoix).  
88) Lōdaiya.  
89) śārivaśāhānu:..... 'oun (I/73). We take 'oun as representing Pali āsī, 'yearning', 'resolution'; 'oun, 'to go and be', i.e. 'to become'. Hariṣṇa... (read as Hariṣṇa... in Prajum I, B.E. 2467, p. 68) looks like Hariṣṇaksa, i.e. Hariṣṇaksa, an epithet of Rāma (frequently used in the Siamese Rāmakirtī) and of Nārāyaṇa (Royal Institute's Siamese Dictionary). Cf. II/37 fr., where Śrīsradha is identified with Rāma and Nārāyaṇa (Vigui). Our interpretation of the passage at I/73 is different from the usually accepted one, which separates the words differently (sā-āsī) and makes 'oun equivalent to 'oun, 'to dress' or 'oun, 'to put on princely attire' (Prajum I, B.E. 2467, p. 79).
Srisradhārājaucilāmūṇi was a small child a little over two years old, still being nursed by his mother, when he reached the age of seventeen or eighteen years he had a fight with a lord called Dāv... a fight with another person, called Dāv Ī Cān. When he reached the age of twenty-six, he had the great battle in which he fought the elephant duel with Khun Cān..... a little...... we shall not relate it in detail, as it took place as related above.

[I/79-83.] Cau Srisradhārājaucilāmūṇi qualities, he liked to study the qualities of...... Furthermore he knew the qualities of elephants, he knew the qualities of horses, he knew the qualities of......, he knew the qualities of......, he knew the qualities of lions, he knew the chief and accessory sciences......, he knew the qualities of...... Cau Srisradhārājaucilāmūṇi now did good, now evil, now laughed, now wept, now won, now lost, now felt happiness, now sorrow, turning about and returning, going and coming with unquiet heart, in this round of rebirths, over and over again.

[I/84-89.] When he was between twenty-nine and thirty years old, he had a son [who died, causing] him [to grieve] exceedingly. He saw that this world of rebirths is impermanent, impersonal, without stability; then he thought...... When he was thirty-one years old, he had very great faith; if anyone wished to take his life...... he offered it to him at once. Then...... he destroyed all his

90) A good mother was supposed to continue nursing her child for as long a period as possible.
91) ūsya (I/76), for ūṣā. Perhaps he had a vision informing him that he was an avatāra of Rūma and Viśṇu.
92) kumarabatra, perhaps for kumarabhadra, 'a beloved son', or kumaravatsa, 'a young son'.
93) cf. the tilakkhāna ('three characteristics' of existence) of orthodox Buddhist teaching: anicca (impermanence), dukkha (suffering), and anatta (impersonality). See Nyanatiloka, Buddhist Dictionary, Colombo, 1950, s.v. tilakkhana.
94) We reconstruct śānti (I/85) as śānti (śānti), 'to think', since śi is normally followed by a verb.
95) Literally 'head'.
96) The meaning of āvād is uncertain.
97) mLān (śāna), cf. Khmer, lān, 'to wash', 'to destroy', and rāplān, 'to make disappear', 'to destroy'.

98) mlān (śāna), cf. Khmer, lān, 'to wash', 'to destroy', and rāplān, 'to make disappear', 'to destroy'.
weapons, such as ....... He longed to live\(^99\) in the the forest ......... Then he [decided to] renounce his [princely] caste\(^100\) and leave his home.

[I/89-90; II/1-8.] He erected a tent of red cloth, yellow cloth, black cloth, green cloth, white cloth and iridescent\(^101\) [cloth] ......... \(^102\) Then he presented the three kinds of almsfood [to the monks] ......... jewels .......... pilgrimages .......... he adorned his two daughters splendidly, putting gold [bracelets] on their wrists, and rings .......... in profusion, and offered them as a gift to whoever came and asked for them, because of his great [faith?] .......... [his wife?], dressing her splendidly, making her lovely for the eye to look at, and offered her as a gift to whoever came and asked for her\(^103\). Then he departed ....... In his eagerness to become a Buddha .... he left\(^104\) the world of riches\(^105\) to become an ascetic, carrying an almsbowl slung over the shoulder .......... all .......... to wander about in search of precious great relics, resolved to perform acts of merit .......... [and finally attain] omniscience\(^106\) while seated under a Srimahābodhi tree. Then he set off in search of [seedlings] to plant ......... at Nagara Sukhodai, Pañ Chlanī\(^107\) and Sri Sajānālaya, wishing in his heart to make them into holy cities.

\(^99\) i.e. to become a Forest-Dwelling monk. ฐาน (I/88) is for ฐาน 'to keep dreaming of', i.e. 'to long for'. The expression we have translated as 'to live' is ใหนา, literally 'to cook food' (used only for monks).

\(^100\) รัศ (I/89) is equivalent to Tat Yon รัก, 'to discard' and to modern Siamese รัก or รัก, 'to renounce', 'to relinquish', 'to abandon'. รัศ is for รัก, Skt. varga, 'caste'.

\(^101\) Reconstructing รัก (I/90) as รัก, modern รัก, 'shining', which we take to be equivalent to รัก at II/37.

\(^102\) In this and the following lacunae there are several legible fragments of words; but the lack of context makes it impossible to get the sense.

\(^103\) He is underaking the 'perfection of generosity' in imitation of Prince Vessantara, the penultimate incarnation of the Buddha. Following Vessantara's example he is first giving away his two children and then his wife.

\(^104\) ใหนา, ภิไนคร (II/5), i.e. abhiniskram, 'to leave one's home in order to become an ascetic'. He is imitating Gotama's 'Great Departure' (Skt. mahā-abhinisskramanā). ใหนา is for ใหนา, Pali mahi-abhinikkhāmaṇa.

\(^105\) ratanabhūmi (II/5), 'the world of jewels', i.e. life in the palace.

\(^106\) sarvabhaññatā (II/7), for sarvajñatā, sabbaññatā.

\(^107\) มีนา (aši), Bhaq Chalang, presumably between Sukhodaya and Sajjanālaya.
[II/8-11.] At one place he built a cetiya for a precious great relic, he established the nine jewels, he planted a Srimahābodhi tree, he built a vihāra and an āvāsa, he founded a statue of the Buddha there which was beautiful, fine, and in conformity with tradition, he built kutis, and forest hermitages.

[II/11-14.] At one place he built a large bridge, planted big trees with flowers of many colors, and a Srimahābodhi tree, assigning several families to take care of the premises, together with areca groves and betel groves; he donated rice-fields and many of every color; and he assigned servants to wash the feet of the

---

108) The expression at one place (saṁaya) at II/8, which reappears frequently in the ensuing passage, could mean either 'at one place' or 'at some places'. In each case it serves to introduce an account of some meritorious act, or series of interconnected meritorious acts, performed by Śrīśraddāh, so we translate 'at one place'. If we remember that this is its purpose, our translation 'at one place', which admittedly sounds a little awkward, will be understood to mean something like 'in one instance' or 'as one item in his program'.

109) The word uñā (II/9), which we translate as 'established', also means 'to plant' and 'to build'. Nauvārattana ('nine jewels') could be a foundation deposit in the form of a square flat stone, with sockets for jewels in the center and at each of the cardinal and sub-cardinal points, to be placed in the relic-chamber of a cetiya. On the other hand the term recalls the 'nine sacred objects' (śrīmālā) mentioned at II/41, which we think are the nine towers of the Mahādhatu at Sukhodaya (see below, note 146). We might therefore be tempted to take the passage at II/8-11, or at least part of it, as referring to operations at the Mahādhatu (with uñā meaning to build, or to rebuild); but if building the 'forest hermitages' mentioned at the end of this passage belongs to the same set of operations, the reference cannot be to the Mahādhatu, which is in the middle of the city of Sukhodaya.

110) āvāsa, a dwelling place, may here mean a residence for senior monks.

111) While Skt. vičitra means 'many-colored', 'diverse', 'elaborate', 'charming', etc., Siamese ātāvi usually means 'fine', suggesting excellence of detail, e.g., as a result of painstaking and delicate execution (in contrast to the general word for 'beautiful').

112) Sthāvaramaññapāda. The first word is Skt. aśramapada, 'hermitage'; we have omitted the second word (ātāvi) from our translation, as it does not make sense and may be a false reading; the third, attabi, stands for Pali aṭavi, 'forest'.

113) upaśaka (?).
Mahātheras, the Anūtheras and all the monks on the days of the new moon, the full moon, the uposatha and the pavaraṇā.

[II/14-15.] At one place he built a large tāmamakk, a sālā and a large...; he also built a mahācetiya, planted a Srimahābodhi tree, and founded a large statue of the Buddha.

[II/15-17.] At one place he went through the market buying up all the living creatures and setting them free...., such as human beings, goats, pigs, dogs, ducks, chickens, geese, birds, fish, deer, and all sorts of creatures... of goodly body and handsome form. He carved a beautiful seat-covering, and he carved a statue of the Buddha from [the wood of] an indra-tree.

[II/17-18.] At one place in the forest in... on Nān Tāy Hill, he went by elephant to worship [the statue of] the Lord, and set [the elephant] free at that place.

[II/18-40.] At one place, the gathering-point of all the Lord’s relics which... was falling into ruin and overgrown with forest

114) Siamese tāmüñak and Khmer tāmuak both usually mean a pavilion or an individual house for a prince or princess in the precinct of a palace. In the present passage, which is concerned with buildings in a monastery, we should probably prefer one of the alternative meanings of Khmer tāmuak such as a rest-house for pilgrims.

115) The word sālī may or may not be in apposition to tāmamakk; if not, it means an open-sided pavilion in a monastery.

116) Pāli santhata; the usual meaning is a rug for a monk to sit on, but as it was ‘carved’ it must have been something more permanent, probably for a statue.

117) According to McFarland (p. 998), tāsū is a species of tree of the red sandalwood group, but with larger fruit.

118) He is on his way to Martaban; cf. Inscription 11, II/14-16, which gives his itinerary; see also section 8, notes 20-22, especially note 21 which gives the probable location of the forest where he set his elephant free.

119) The Mahāthūpa at Anurādhapura, Ceylon; according to the old prophecy, 5000 years after the Buddha’s parinibbāna all his bodily relics will spring out of their monuments wherever they may be and fly to Ceylon, where they will gather at the Mahāthūpa, then fly to the Bodhi tree at Bodhagāya and be consumed in a great holocaust; see Inscription 3, I/48 f., which refers to the Mahāthūpa as Ratana mulikumahāstūpa; cf. M, p. 262 f.; and Coedes, *Le 2500e anniversaire du Bouddha*, Diogène, No. 15, juillet 1936.

120) For antaradhiṇāna, ‘disappearance’...
and brush, Saṅtice Brah Mahāthera Śrīsradharājaculāmāniṇi pen Cau......

121. The cetiya was ninety-five fathoms in height123, not [counting?] on top of it, two or three fathoms in circumference124. Śrīsradharājaculāmāniṇi pen Cau strove to cause...... then built it...... seven fathoms higher. He stuccoed125 and completed it. The cetiya, [including] the new construction as well as the old, reached a height of a hundred and

121) Śrī (II/20) probably refers to the Buddha. As the context is lost, we cannot guess what the passage meant.

122) The word we translate as 'saved' is सर (II/20) which we take to be the same as modern शर, 'to uphold', 'to raise up', in the abstract sense; cf. श (on), which implies doing something to strengthen the Buddhist religion and 'save' it from decline. Coedès, however, evidently takes सर to be equivalent to modern शर, 'to choose', 'to elect', and translates: 'Il décidé de restaurer la Grande Relique'. 'Dhātu' or 'Mahādhātu' can mean either the cetiya or the relics enshrined in it; here it is evidently the cetiya. The expression 'Braṇ Mahādhātu Hīvaṇ' or a variant of it ('Braṇ Mahādhātu', 'Brah DhiHu Hīvaṇ') recurs several times in the ensuing passage with the same meaning; and in order to avoid wearisome repetition we translate it as 'the cetiya' or 'it'.

123) The original height of the Mahāthūpa is said to have been 120 cubits, i.e. 120 Sinhalese 'architect's cubits' one of which was probably equal to 31 English inches, which would make the height about 93 m. This figure may or may not have included the harmikā, but it almost certainly did not include the chaṭṭa. If the word द, which we have translated as 'fathom', means the Sukhodayan fathom of about 1.86 m., the height given in the inscription would be around 1.78 m., which is of course impossible. But the author may have used the word in this passage to mean the Sinhalese 'architect's cubit'; and an original height of 120 architect's cubits may well have been reduced to 95 during the period the monument was neglected. See Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 61.

124) An आ is the circumference that a man can encircle with both arms, i.e. a circumference of one fathom, say 1.86 m. so the circumference mentioned would be between 3.72 m. and 5.58 m. The object which was so measured would be round, with a diameter between 1.18 m. and 1.77 m. It may have been the remains of a chaṭṭa, which the author of the inscription is apparently not counting in the height he gives for the cetiya.

125) चित्र (II/22), 'to stucco', still used in Tai Yunn; see Coedès, Recueil, p. 69 note 2.
two fathoms. The Khom call it ‘Brah Dham’ (127) It is built in the middle of Lord Kris’s city (128). When [the men] were ready to stucco it, as [shells] to make lime were extremely hard to find in the midst of the forest, they could not make lime. Then Brah Śrīrāddārājācīlāmūṇi pen Cau pronounced this wish: (129) ‘If it is true that I shall attain omniscience and become a Buddha, then may I find lime ......’ Having made the wish, at the very moment when he turned around he found a very extraordinary shelf for lime. They used it to stucco the cetiya, the new construction as well as the old; then they used it to repair the stone statues of the Buddha which were broken and fallen down; and when the work was finished there was still some lime left over. (128) The Brah Mahādhāthu Hlvāti performed a great many miracles and prodigies, surrounded by innumerable large relics (131). (130) The men paved the floor of the great Mahābhūra (132) with brick; when it was finished and

127) As Coedès points out (Reneil, p. 69 note 4), ‘Brah Dham’ (I/23) is Khmer for ‘the large Buddha’. The term would be suitable for any large object of veneration associated with the Buddha, and particularly for a cetiya such as the Mahāthūpa. In fact ‘Brah Dham’ would be an acceptable translation of ‘Mahāthūpa.’
128) i.e. the city of Lord Krṣṇa; for a possible reason why this epithet should have been applied to Anurādhapura, see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 61. It would be the more suitable in the present context as Śrīrāddā thought he was a reincarnation of Krṣṇa; see below, II/37.
129) adhissthiṇa (1/24), i.e. Pali adhitthāna, ‘a resolution’; he was making another ‘act of truth’ (saccañca). Rectiligne.
130) นิ้ว (1/26), modern นิ้ว, ‘hard’, ‘strong’, ‘extraordinary’.
131) ‘Brah Mahādhāthu Hlvāti’ here refers to the relics enshrined in the monument; the miracles they performed doubtless consisted of springing out of it, shining brightly, and flying around in the sky, while other large relics, flying in from elsewhere, surrounded them and accompanied them in their journey.
132) The Mahāvihāra, the principal temple in the monastery of the same name at Anurādhapura. (The Mahāthūpa was situated in the precinct of the Mahāvihāra.) Coedès (Reneil, p. 70) takes the word (s)āna (II/29) in its usual sense, ‘to hold a dedication ceremony’; but we think this difficult to reconcile with the words นิ้ว (nīn) following the object, which imply that the men were using brick to do something to the Mahāvihāra. The word นิ้ว can also mean ‘support’ (cf. the term for ‘shoes’ in the Royal language, นิ้ว, literally ‘supports for the feet’; the exact equivalent of นิ้ว, ‘supports for the feet’, in ordinary Siamese). By analogy we translate the expression as ‘paved the floor.’
perfected they went ... to search for old broken stone statues of the Buddha to worship, bringing them from as far away as two or three days' travel, to set them up in the Mahābhārata. At some places they found a neck or a body, at some places they found the hair or an arm or the breast, at some places they found a head which had fallen far away [from the body], and which it took four men to carry. At some places they found a shin or a leg, at some places they found a hand or a foot. Naturally they hauled the big stone statues to the Mahābhārata by cart or by barrow. They brought them there to piece together and repair with mortar, to make them as beautiful and fine in form and appearance as if they had been created by Indra; they brought them there to mend and restore into large, fresh-looking, exceedingly beautiful statues of the Buddha. They filled the Mahābhārata with them, placing them in many rows and niches. It was exceedingly beautiful ... [like?] the reliquary temple called Śrīdhanakatāka in Majhimadesa, in Pātaliputramagāra near the bank of the river Anomānādi.

133) Coedes translates: 'on alla à la recherche des anciennes statues en pierre du Buddha, on leur rendit hommage pendant deux ou trois nuits,' etc. (Recueil, p. 70). In order to take account of the expression विलिन we have ventured to consider the period of time as indicating distance, and to associate it with the verb विलिन rather than with विविलिन, 'night,' can also mean a period of 24 hours; and as we assume that the men would travel by day, we have translated accordingly.

134) दूस लिखत (1/34), literally 'young,' 'adolescent'. An examination of the stone does not justify the conjectural reading दूस, 'durable,' as there is no room for the दूस.

135) We assume that दूस at 1/35 means 'niches,' but it could also mean 'at intervals.' If associated with दूस, apparently दूस means 'rows'; if not, it could mean 'groups.' Coedes translates: 'on les installa en groupes ou on les rangea dans les galeries.'

136) If we are right in supposing that 'the temple called Śrīdhanakatāka' is introduced simply for comparison, it must be because it was even more famous than the structure whose restoration has just been described. From the point of view of Ceylon Buddhism, there was only one structure in the world which could fulfill that condition: the Mahābodhi temple at Bodhgaya in Patna District in Bengal. The Mahābodhi temple, which stood on the holiest spot in the Buddhist world, would unquestionably be the object of a pilgrimage by any Buddhist who visited northern India (cf. Griswold, The Holy Land Transported, Paranavitana Felicitation Volume, Colombo, 1968), so Śrīśraddhā is sure to have visited it (see below, p. 140, n. 23).
It was founded by the Lord Kris. The Lord Kris is the person of Brah Mahasami Srirasradharajacalamini Srirattanulaikadipa pen Cau, that is, the person of Rama and the god Naraya who descended from heaven to be reborn and travel through the round of transmigrations, wandering back and forth from birth to birth. Moreover, intimately associated with the Mahathipa at Anuradhapura by the prophecy that the Buddha's relics will assemble at the Mahathipa 5000 years after his death, and then fly to Bodhgaya where they will be destroyed by fire. We feel pretty certain, therefore, that the monument introduced for comparison is the Mahabodhi temple, which would fit very well with two of the references at II/36 f.: Majhimadesa means northern India; and Pataliputtanagara is Patna. The other two names do not fit, but the reading is very doubtful. The old name of the Mahabodhi temple was not Siridhanakatakā but Sir(mahā)vajrāsana ('Adamantine Throne'), while that of the river Phalgu which flows past it was not Anomanadi but Mahanadi or Mohana. See Griswold in Paranavitana Felicitation Volume, p. 174; Barua, Gayā and Buddha-Gayā, Calcutta, 1934, pp. 5, 7, 9. (For 'Anomanadi', see Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, s.v.; for 'Srīdhānakatakā', see Barcau, Le site de la Dānyakotakā de Hsiian-tsang, Arts asiatiques, XII p. 21 ff.; Barcau, Le stūpa de Dānyakotakā selon la tradition sélèvane, ibid., XVI, p. 81 ff., and Recherches complémentaires sur le site probable de la Dānyakotakā de Hsiian-tsang, ibid., p. 89 ff.).

The god Kris; cf. above, note 89. The statement may mean that the god Kris founded the Mahathipa; we know of no legend to that effect, but if Anuradhapura was considered to be Kris's city it would be natural enough to think he founded the Mahathipa. On the other hand we could translate vihāna (pratishṭa) at II/37 as 'restored' rather than 'founded'; and in that case the statement would serve to introduce the following passage, in which Srīsraddha is identified with Kris, etc.

Rama and Kris are both incarnations (avatāra) of the Hindu god Viṣṇu, one of whose names is Narayana. It was not unusual for Southeast Asian princes, whether Hindu or Buddhist by faith, to claim to be incarnations of this god (e.g. the Buddhist King Kyanzittha of Pagan). It is not in the least surprising that a similar claim should be made on behalf of Srīsraddha.

Ma (Skt. ayutā, Pali cuti) means to descend from heaven in order to be reborn.

This (II/38), literally 'to swing'; but as the word is used in the Traibhīmikathā in the sense of 'to wander', we have so translated it. 'Dola', however, is also the name of the festival in honor of the god Kris, in which persons or figures representing him are swung back and forth in a large swing; and as Kris (Kris) has just been mentioned, the association may be intentional.
this stanza is in the Mahānīdāna.141 Surrounding the large and lofty cetiya142 were stone carvings of the five hundred . . . .143 jātakas, marvelously beautiful and finely executed,144 which were pried loose by foolish men to get gold, and ruined145.  

[II/40-45.] The Śāntec Brahma Mahāśāṃi, leaving Sihala, brought with him a group of laymen . . . . to carry up bricks from below to restore and perfect the nine sacred objects with zeal; and he also brought two

141) Coedès comments in a footnote (Recueil, p. 71, note 1) that he has searched in vain in the Nidānakathā for a stanza with this beginning, so presumably some other text was intended; in any case, he adds, it is hard to see how such a stanza would be connected with the subject under discussion. We conjecture that Śrīśrāddhā intends to go on repeating this stanza to himself in all his future incarnations in order to keep his mind on his quest for Buddha-hood, which, as has already been revealed at II/25, he will eventually attain. In the present kappa (aeon), there will be a total of five Buddhas; four of them have already appeared, the fourth of whom was Gotama; Metteyya is still to come. The earliest possible chance for Śrīśrāddhā to attain Buddha-hood will be in the next kappa; and until that time comes, he will continue to pass through the round of rebirths.

142) The 'large and lofty cetiya' must be the Mahāthūpa.

143) The word we have omitted from our translation appears to be tiradessā, the meaning of which is obscure. Query: 'parables'? from Pali tiro, 'across' or 'oblique', and desanā, 'preaching'?

144) Perhaps bas-reliefs placed in rows around the base of a stupa for the edification of the public. At least it was the practice in Burma to display Jātaka scenes in that manner (see Luce, The 500 Jātakas in Old Burma, Artibus Asiae XIX); and it may have been the same in Ceylon. Coedès has suggested that the Jātaka scenes referred to here are the engraved stones at Vīṭ Śri Jum, Sukhodaya, and that they were originally placed at Sukhodaya's Mahādhatu (Arts asiatiques, III/4, p. 254; cf. above, p 77.). It now seems certain that they were located at the Mahāthūpa at Anurādhapura; but it is possible that Śrīśrāddhā had small copies of them made, which would later serve as models for the Sukhodayan Jātaka engravings.

145) The passage is obscure and the translation conjectural. We guess that mā is Khmer truk or trak, both of which mean 'stupid'. For mā, cf. Tai Yuan mā, 'to pry'; and Siamese mā, 'to scatter'. We reconstruct m̄ as mū. The connection between this passage and the preceding one is far from clear. Perhaps the author, having discussed Śrīśrāddhā's previous incarnations, is reminded of Gotama's, which in turn remind him of the Jātaka carvings at the Mahāthūpa.
precious great relics from Sihala to enshrine at that place\(^{146}\). We cannot recount in detail [everything he did]. \(\odot\) At one place, half[way] ...... near the bank of the river Māvalikaganga, where the Lord Buddha stretched out a piece of hide\(^{147}\), he restored [the monument of] the precious great relics which is called Mahiyānīgamanmahāceti, [in which] the Kesadhātu, the [Gīvādhātu and the Pārībhogadhātu] are enshrined, and at that place\(^{148}\) the [relics of the] Lord Buddha performed very marvelous miracles\(^{149}\).

\(^{146}\) The statement at II/40-42 must mean that Śrīraddbī, upon leaving Ceylon, took the two relics and a group of Sinhalese craftsmen to Sukhodaya with him, the craftsmen to help in the reconstruction of the Mahādhātu, and the two relics to be enshrined in its central tower (see Griswold, *Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art*, pp. 17-23). The 'nine sacred objects' (Mahavamsa, sc. mahānāman, with mūn used as a classifier equivalent to modern mahā) at II/41 must be the nine towers of the Mahādhātu, five of which were already in existence but were to be remodeled, while the other four were to be added; the two relics are the Gīvādhātu and the Kesadhātu which perform the miracles recounted at II/52 ff.; and the craftsmen are the 'nation[s] of Sihala' (Mahavamsa) who are present at the events recounted at II/58 ff., II/72 ff., and II/83 ff.

One possible objection to this interpretation is the expression mūn 'at that place' (II/42). If it refers to the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya, we should expect the author to say 'at this place', as the inscription was certainly erected beside the monument. But the same anomaly reappears at II/72 and II/80, where mūnutu and mūn certainly refer to the Mahādhātu. We guess that the author composed the text at his own residence, and forget where the inscription was going to be erected.

There is also another possible objection, which we shall discuss below (note 149).

\(^{147}\) For cammahān, an animal's skin used as a rug; see note 149. The Māvalikaganga (Māhāvalukagang) has already been mentioned at I/6, doubtless in reference to Śrīraddbī's meritorious works at the Mahiyānāgacetiya which are about to be described (II/42 ff.).

\(^{148}\) Mahiyānāgana, on the bank of the Māhāvalukagang, was the place where the Buddha, on his first visit to Ceylon, hovered in the air in order to frighten the Yakshas, and then spread out a piece of hide (cammakha) on the ground to sit on (Mahāvamsa, I, 21-32). The Mahiyānāgacetiya was later built on this spot by Sumana, the god of Mount Sumanakūṭa (Adam's Peak), to enshrine the Kesadhātu or Hair Relic, which he had received from the Buddha who plucked it from his own head during his first visit to Ceylon (Mahāvamsa, I, 33-36). The Thera Sarabhī enlarged the monument and deposited in it the Gīvādhātu or Neck-bone Relic which he had obtained from the Buddha's funeral pyre (Mahāvamsa, I, 37-39); cf. Geiger, *Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times*, Wiesbaden, 1960, p. 213, note 1). The Kesadhātu and the Gīvādhātu were two of the five most venerated relics in Ceylon in
the 12th century; the other three were the Akkha kadāhātu or Collar-bone Relic, the Dāthadhātu or Tooth Relic, and the Patḍadhātu or Almsbowl Relic (see Geiger, Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times, pp. 211-214). The Almsbowl was a Pārībhoga dāhātu or ‘relic of personal use’ which the Buddha had used during his lifetime; the other four were Śaṅkakadāhātu or ‘bodily relics’.) In addition there were large quantities of unspecified relics (see Geiger, Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times, p. 213).

Since the first of the three relics referred to in Inscription 2 at II/43-44 in connection with the Mahiyāṅgana cetiya is the Kesādāhātu, it seems certain that the second, the name of which is mutilated (II/44), was the Gīvadhātu (elsewhere in this inscription written ‘Gīvādhatu’) so we have restored it accordingly in our translation, just as Coedès does in his transcription (Recueil, 1, p. 58). We have been unable to learn anything about a Pārībhogadhātu ever having been deposited in the Mahiyāṅgana cetiya.

We have translated the passage at II/42-45 rather freely. It begins with the expression means ‘at one place’, which as we have observed is always in this inscription a signal that some act of merit performed by Śrīśāradhā is about to be related: and four of the six instances we have already seen involved building operations. As Śrīśāradhā did not build the Mahiyāṅgana cetiya, we are safe in assuming that he restored it. Just as the word ‘dhātu’ (in Kesādhatu, Gīvadhātu, Pārībhoga dāhātu and Śrīradhamahādāhātu at II/43-44) can mean either the relics or the reliquary monument, so dhātu (pratistha) can mean either ‘to enshrine’ a relic or else ‘to build’ or ‘to restore’ a monument. At II/27 this means ‘to build’ or ‘to restore’; at II/42 it means ‘to enshrine’ the relics, but it also implies rebuilding the monument; here it certainly means ‘to restore’. We assume that Śrīradhamahādāhātu is used as the generic name for monuments such as the Mahiyāṅgana cetiya which contain ‘precious great relics’ (as distinguished from ordinary miscellaneous ones); but it might be in opposition to Kesādhatu, Gīvadhātu and Pārībhoga dāhātu. It seems too indefinite a word to refer to one more relic in addition to the three that are so specifically designated.

There is no doubt that in this passage the Kesādhatu and the Gīvadhātu are the two chief relics at the Mahiyāṅgana cetiya. Yet later on (II/52-82) we find two relics of the same name at Sukhodaya performing spectacular miracles. How did they get there? We do not wish to suggest that Śrīśāradhā stole them from the Mahiyāṅgana cetiya; we prefer to think that the Kesādhatu and the Gīvadhātu, while performing miracles at the Mahiyāṅgana cetiya, miraculously reduplicated themselves, that duplicates flew down and landed on Śrīśāradhā’s head (just as they do at Sukhodaya later; see II/65 ff.), and that their action signified they wished him to take them to Sukhodaya.

In note 146 above, we said there might be a further objection to our view that ‘that place’ at II/42 means the Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya, and that the ‘nine sacred objects’ at II/41 are the nine towers of that monument. Here it is. If the author has jumped from Ceylon to Sukhodaya, why does he jump back again to Ceylon before returning to Sukhodaya to take up the account of the reconstruction of the Mahādhātu (II/45 ff.)? One answer
to the objection is that order and continuity are not his strong points; and he seems to be reverting to the miracles at the Mahiyanga Acetiya to suggest where he got the relics to bring to Sukhodaya. We believe this to be true; but the train of thought may be more complex.

In a recent letter, Dr. S. Paranavitana, the former Commissioner of Archaeology in Ceylon, has kindly given us the following information about the two rival kingdoms into which Ceylon was divided. Around 1330 the Jivaka dynasty of the kingdom of Yāpīpatuna (modern Jaffna) was supplanted by the Aryacakravarti dynasty, founded by a scion of a Rājput family from Gujerat. A brother of the last Jivaka king of Yāpīpatuna, after trying unsuccessfully to recover the kingdom from the first Aryacakravarti ruler, retreated southward to Kurunegala, where he was able to oust Purakramabāhu IV, the last king of the Puṇḍya branch of the Sinhalese royal family. He made himself king at Kurunegala, assuming the regnal name Vijayabāhu V. The Aryacakravarti ruler pushed the frontiers of his kingdom southward, so as to include Anurādhapura and Yāpavu within his territories; and Vijayabāhu was forced to retreat to the hills in 1341. In the same year he was succeeded by his son Bhuvanekabāhu IV, who made his capital at Gampola, 12 miles south of Kandy. Vijayabāhu V and his successors at Gampola claimed the overlordship of the whole island, and their claim seems to have been acknowledged by the Aryacakravarti of Yāpīpatuna, though he was at this time more powerful than they. Mahiyanga was within the territories of the Kurunegala and Gampola kings. As their kingdom and Yāpīpatuṇa both claimed to be the legitimate successor of the kingdom of Anurādhapura and Polonnārauva, both might claim the epithet of 'Sihala', in the reign of Vijayabāhu V (1335-41) Anurādhapura was under the rule of the king of Yāpīpatuṇa, so Śrīśraddhā must have received the patronage and assistance of that potentate to carry out works of repair to the Mahādhatu.

As most of Śrīśraddhā's sojourn in Ceylon was apparently spent at Anurādhapura, it seems possible to us that for him 'Sihala' meant the kingdom of Yāpīpatuṇa, and more particularly the region of Anurādhapura itself. If we take 'Sihala' at II/40 in this sense, then the 'nine sacred objects' could be monuments outside of Anurādhapura. There were altogether sixteen places of the greatest sanctity (solasamahāhānāi) in Ceylon; see J/J, p. 49 and note 1, also p. 130. Seven of them were in Anurādhapura and nine elsewhere, the foremost of these nine being the Mahiyanga Acetiya; see Geiger, The Culture of Ceylon in Medieval Times, p. 207.

Most likely the passage in Inscription 2 at II/40-42 is a kind of religious double-talk, in which the 'nine sacred objects' are not only the nine towers of the Mahādhatu at Sukhodaya, but also at the same time nine cetiyas in Ceylon, as if each of the former were magically identified with one of the latter. The central tower of the Mahādhatu, in which miraculous duplicates of the Kesadhātu and the Givadhātu were to be deposited, would then correspond to the Mahiyangana Acetiya, which contained the famous originals.
The platform of the Mahādhātu had fallen down for a distance of thirteen fathoms along the east side. Filled with zeal, I exerted myself to [rebuild the monument] with well-laid brick and to cover it all over with stucco. When it was coated with stucco from the tip of the spire down to the ground, it was as large and lofty, as white and beautiful, as Mount Kailāsa. I also stuccoed the feet, hands and bodies of the images of the Buddha. At several points I built, in quick succession, towers with extremely beautiful stone Buddha images. Exerting myself to accumulate an abundance of merit, I performed twenty-eight works in a single day.

Then the great relics performed tremendous miracles, sending forth rays like ocean waves or great showers of rain. Some rays were like the rain that splashes the mangoes, or a torrent of flowers of brilliant colors; some rays shone like stars at night, or like liquid gold flowing brilliantly everywhere; some rays were white like jewels, or like double and single gardenia flowers appearing all over.
the universe. The Kesadhātu performed a miracle like flashes of lightning and streams of water\(^{157}\), moving rapidly about in the sky in a marvelous manner. Moreover, they saw the Sun come out, blue like the flame [used for] firing earthen pots and jars [in a kiln]. The Givadhātu, coming out of the Golden Cetiya\(^{158}\), darted up to the... ... [The two relics] appeared like two suns, exceedingly brilliant and beautiful, surpassing the Sun [itself]. The Givadhātu appeared like a large silver drum surrounded by a broad band of brilliant rays. It is fitting to say that there were rays of six colors\(^{159}\), yellow, red, black, green, white, and iridescent\(^{160}\), brightly lighting every part of the universe. The miracles lasted from the hour of faint sunshine up to two degrees of shadow before noon. The natives of Sihala [who were living in] the five villages\(^{161}\) came across the river Bāy\(^{162}\)

\(^{157}\) Recalling the Yāmakapāṭhāriya, in which the Buddha produced flames and streams of water alternately from different parts of his Person; see Malalasekera, Dictionary of Pali Proper Names, II, 683.

\(^{158}\) The Golden Cetiya (ceti dūṇa, viṇāva or Suvaṇṇacetiya) is the central tower of the Mahādātu at Sukhodaya; the large bulb on top of it, representing a reliquary urn in the form of a lotus-bud, was originally gilded. See Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 19-20; it now seems more certain than ever that these miracles occurred at Sukhodaya, not Sajjanālāya.

\(^{159}\) chāppabphaññānā (II/57), i.e. chabban̄parahī, the rays of six colors, which, according to tradition, emanate from the Buddha's head. On evidence from the Pathamasambodhi, the Royal Institute's Dictionary lists them as: blue, yellow, red, white, orange-red like a cock's comb, and shining like crystal.

\(^{160}\) As 'blue' and 'green' were more or less interchangeable, these six colors correspond to those in the list in the preceding note except for one puzzling discrepancy: 'black', rather than 'orange-red like a cock's comb'. The same discrepancy is found in the six colors of the cloths listed at I/89-90. As we at II/57 corresponds to varṇa(ā) at I/90, we have translated it as 'iridescent'.

\(^{161}\) The 'laymen' (gahapati) mentioned at II/41, whom Śrīśradhā brought from Ceylon. They had evidently settled down in five villages close to Sukhodaya.

\(^{162}\) Conjectural translation, on the supposition that vīṇa (II/58-59) means 'the river Bāy': Cf. the river Sambhāy, on whose bank Rāma Gambhēn placed an inscription (see Inscription I, III/24). This river is said to be west of Vat Brahma Bāy Ḥivatā (Wat Phra Phath Luang), north of the old city of Sukhodaya. Coedès takes vīṇa to mean 'paddle'; but we think that in that case it would have to be followed by ānī.
uttering shouts of applause, and there was tremendous excitement. They invited the relics to return, but the relics did not come down. They asked me to invite the relics; the relics came down, made the pradakṣīpa of the Golden Cetiya, and then leaped up again. I had boundless faith, I threw myself on the ground and offered my life as an irrevocable gift, vowing to uphold the religion of Lankaḍīpa, and to obey the Buddha's words in all things. Then the relics came whirling down and made the circuit of the Golden Cetiya, shooting out rays which were marvelously beautiful to behold like crystal cart-wheels. Then the Givadhātū entered the Golden Urn, and the throng of other relics entered the cetiya like bees hurrying into their hive. Then I rose and performed anjali to the precious great relics of our Lord.

[II/65-75.] One relic, beautiful in color like gold, with a halo the size of a fruit, came whirling down from the sky and made the circuit of His Lordship's person, then rose up and settled on his head. The precious relic then came and landed in the middle of his forehead. Brahmā Srīsraddhārājaūcilāmūni Śrīrattanakāḍīpa raised his two hands to

163) wē (II/59); the Kesadhātū and the Givadhātū.
164) nā (II/61) is equivalent to no. The expression nirodhānuṇḍā means 'the religion of Ceylon' rather than 'the religion in Ceylon'; he was simply vowing to uphold the Ceylon form of Buddhism. The statement that he was vowing to make a pilgrimage to Ceylon (Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 20) must therefore be retracted. In Sukhodayan inscriptions there are several instances where no means 'of' (as it does in Khmer); further on in Inscription 2, at II/81, we have a clear case (see note 184).
165) Sūvannaceti (II/62), for svuṇpacetiya, the Pali equivalent of ceti dōn (वृंधे), 'Golden Cetiya'.
166) ṣuṇ (II/62), i.e. nirodhānuṇḍā, 'to look at' (loan-word from Khmer).
167) nā (kosa dōn, II/63), perhaps an epithet for the gilded bulb in the form of a lotus-bud on top of the central tower of the Mahādātā.
168) Conjectural translation, on the supposition that ṣuṇ should be restored as ni, now used chiefly as an adverb, 'hither and thither', 'in disorder'.
169) ṣuṇ (II/66) can mean any sort of fruit; the particular kind was probably specified in the lacuna.
170) mū (II/66), i.e. mū, the honorific pronoun of the second or third person. As appears from the next sentence, it here means Srīsraddhā.
receive it and do obeisance. A Kesadhātu, shining and beautiful, came whirling down from above and circled around over his head. Brah Śrisradhārajacāllumaṇi was full of faith, his tears flowed in great abundance and he did obeisance with his breast, his knees and his palms, in a manner which is beyond description. All the natives of Sihala, seeing the miracle, threw themselves down in a dense cluster doing obeisance with the five members, prostrate on the ground, embracing the legs and feet of Brah Śrisradhārajacāllumaṇi. All the people doing obeisance covered the ground like rows of scythed sugar-cane scattered in quantity all over that place. Then they rose to their feet, doing homage. Some of them said, ‘This Cau Rājakumāra Mahāsāmi is really a future Buddha, isn’t he?’ They brought water to wash the Mahāsāmi’s feet, and collected the water to drink. Wherever the Mahāsāmi Śrisradhārajacāllumaṇi stepped, they dug up the earth at that place as soon as he raised his foot: they dug it up as being worthy to take home and worship.

II/75-82] At dawn the next day the two great relics, shining like stars, first rose slowly into the sky. Then Brah Śrisradhārajacāllumaṇi went across the river... the relics entered the Golden Urn...
night... At dawn they came out for a moment so that all the people could see, applaud and worship them. Then they returned, shining as brightly as a cakra which rolls through the sky, and re-entered the Golden Cetiya where they were before. Their rays struck it and scattered, surpassing the rising Sun in brilliance and beauty. The relics performed miracles at that place for thirty-one days. The reason they performed such miracles was to show themselves to all the people, to cause them to help uplift the Dharma of Laṅkādīpa as a great source of merit, and to make the Buddhist religion manifest.

[II/82-87.] At one place he went to a monastery of Forest-Dwellers outside the city of Kāmbalai. The natives of Śīhala had arrayed it with flags, banners, lamps, incense and sweet-smelling garlands. They then... the Mahā... dhātu with a very numerous escort of honor following the mahā[theras], the theras and the [anu]theras. There was a troop of theras who observed the dhutāṅgasīlas, the Brahma Mahāsāmi...; next came the counsellors and royal ministers, upāsakas and upāsikās, in countless numbers... pavilion... gold, taking the Mahādantadhatu with very great... to put in... [The Mahā]-sāmi [Brah]... then raised both hands together in homage, so that the people might behold truly, clearly and easily. [Brah Śriṣradhārājacūlamūni Mahāsāmi] pen Cau, filled with faith, offered himself as a gift... at that place... made

182) u-ñua. 'For a quick moment' (I/77). In Lāo and T'ai Dēng, the world u means 'quick'.
183) The discus-weapon of the caṅkavartī (universal monarch).
184) gañnañcañca (II/81); q is for ev; sañnañcañca here clearly means the religion of Ceylon; it cannot possibly mean 'in', as it would be absurd to expect 'all the people' to go to Ceylon.
185) The postscript begins here. As usual, the expression 'at one place' introduces the recital of yet another meritorious act on the part of Śriṣradhā. The reading dhīna (II/83) is very doubtful, and the place (if that is what it represents) cannot be identified.
186) Doubtless the Mahādantadhatu; see below, II/67.
187) Optional ascetic practices.
188) Male and female lay devotees.
189) A Tooth Relic; cf. the Dantadhūtusugandhacetiya mentioned at I/7 (see note 23).
190) Reconstructing... as dhīma.
191) We omit the second pause 'at that place' (I/92), as the repetition appears to be a mistake.
a spire there. The relic performed stupendous miracles for three months all of them, the entire went into that place the precious relics, the Givādhātu, the Dāṇḍadhātu, the relics in the sky. The natives of Srihala, seeing them with their own eyes, were filled with faith...

[1/96-107.] [Srisradharaja]cūlamunī, on top of Mount S... perform meritorious acts. The people of Brah... worship one, carved out of... of Denuraja, founded... a Footprint, went to restore the cetiya in... [The relics?] came back, rays of six colors went up...

Brahasi [sradharaja]cūlamunī... [II/-88-95] Brah Mahāsāmi Srirattanalankā[dipa]

At the level of the pinnacle... Ārya Maitri... meditation, firm and straight under the tree... Sriratana... the great city of [Anu]rādhapura where... the Srirattanaladhātu... images of the Buddha... a hundred and fifty thousand... beyond counting...

---

193) ვან (1/93), modern ტაბ; probably the finial of a cetiya or a vihāra.
194) This passage may have begun with amēs, as it seems to introduce still another meritorious act performed by Sīrādhanā, perhaps the founding of a Buddhāpāda (Footprint of the Buddha) on a mountain (but the text is too fragmentary to be certain).
195) Perhaps Sumanakāla (cf. Inscription 8).
196) This name (1/98) is probably intended for Dhenuraja, ‘lord of the cows’, an epithet of Kṣaṇa; cf. above, notes 89 and 138.
197) Ārya Metteyya, who will be the last Buddha of the present kappa; cf. above, note 141.
Inscription 11 was discovered in 1921 by Prince Damrong Rajanubhab on top of Frog Hill (หน้า) at Pák-nāṃ Bo, Nagara Svarga. It was shipped to Bangkok the following year and placed in the Vajirañaṇa Library. It is now in the Manuscript and Inscription Division of the National Library.

The fragmentary slab of schist on which the text is engraved is 30 cm. high, 50 cm. wide and 6 cm. thick. Face I has 19 lines of writing; Face II has 29; and there are a few illegible letters on the narrow edge of the slab. Both the top and bottom of the slab are broken off, carrying away the beginning of the text on both faces, as well as the end of the text on Face II. There is no date in the surviving portions of either face.

The inscription was first published by the late George Coedes in 1924. As he observed, the two faces are unrelated to each other. He ascribed Face I to the reign of Mahādharmarāja III (1419-38), and believed that Face II was later; but he afterwards changed his mind about Face II and accepted Brahma Nagara Brahma Rāma's view that the person whose acts of merit it recounts, though the name is lost, is Śrīśraddhā.

Recent studies have convinced us that Face I was composed by Mahādharmarāja I. Its purpose is to commemorate several acts of merit, including the founding of a monastery by him in the town at the foot of the hill.

We can hardly doubt that Face II was composed by Śrīśraddhā. The nominal purpose of this text is to commemorate the erection of a cetiya by him at Ratanakīṭanagara, which the Tai call Kamphañ Grōñ Ó. Ratanakīṭa, 'Jewel Peak', was probably the old name of Frog Hill, and Ratanakīṭanagara that of the town at the foot of the hill, on the present site of Pák-nāṃ Bo; the name Kamphañ Grōñ Ó shows it was on low land (kampāñ is either the Khmer word for a landing-place or the Malay word for a settlement; grōñ is kam, a canal or waterway; and Ó is

2) Recueil, I, 145.
This text seems to certify a later stage in Śrīśraddhā's progress toward Buddhahood than Inscription 2. We shall probably not be far wrong if we ascribe it to the 1350's.

Both faces of Inscription 11 would therefore date from the reign of Mahādharmarāja I, but it is not clear which of the two is earlier. In favor of an earlier date for Face I is the absence of the mai-hān-ākāśa, which occurs four times in Face II. On the other hand the use of the same stone for two unrelated texts could be more easily explained on the hypothesis that Face I is later; if Mahādharmarāja I built his monastery around a cetiya erected some years earlier by Śrīśraddhā, he might very logically put his own inscription on the reverse of the same slab of stone that Śrīśraddhā had placed beside the cetiya5. The stone would then be left in situ to inform visitors to the monastery of the identity of the donors. Why it was later moved to the top of the hill is not clear.

In the present study we are concerned only with Face II6. The orthography is much the same as in Inscription 2. The vowels are similarly used, and the mai-hān-ākāśa occurs sporadically (four times in this short text, which is relatively more than in the much longer text of No. 2). The mai-ek does not appear, though something that looks just like it is used several times as a separation marker (much more often than in No. 2; cf. above, p. 59). The style of composition is much like the more concise and elliptical passages in No. 2, with even worse incoherencies which make parts of it very hard to understand.

5) At the foot of Frog Hill there is a vihāra dating from the Sukhodayu period, with a cetiya of 'Sinhalese' type behind it, which may belong to more or less the same period; see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, Fig. 40; and สมศิลปะศิลป์, Bangkok (Department of Fine Arts), B.E. 2505, Fig. 67. We are tempted to identify this cetiya with the one built by Śrīśraddhā, and to take the vihāra as part of the monastery built by Mahādharmarāja I.

6) We hope to study Face I in a later paper which will be devoted to the epigraphy of Mahādharmarāja I.
KING ŁODAŁA OF SUKHODAŁA AND HIS CONTEMPORARIES

INSCRIPTION 11, FACE II

Text

[Lines 1-3, illegible except for a few letters.]

(κ) ........................................... υρωνωρ
(ν) ........................................... σαραγκύν
(γ) ........................................... έπεναγεν (γ)
(ω) ........................................... τάσσαρα (ονα)
(φ) ........................................... άκαθ (παρμι)
(ε) ........................................... τάχερ...
(τ) ........................................... σρρπαράσσαρα(μαιον
(η) ........................................... ούανεκοςεαρσομενμποτερεκομα ηρεμη...
(θ) ........................................... έχ έπισμηρνεκερκεφικανοςκεμπουργρ (κ)
(ι) ........................................... σκαταριγκαλσαρεσουχειτεσκατάρασσαρη...
(ί) ........................................... όρπαμαρασκαλβαγομαπεστάρποναροχρ (ς)...
(μ) ........................................... σαραγκύνθηνεπισχαρακραφενεγκραφικπ (κρ)
(α) ........................................... βρασκεφεισμενοικαπεστάρασσαρη (π)...
(ο) ........................................... καρβαμεπραμαδακανεδεκασεγκατρισα...
(π) ........................................... δασαμερακαπελεκεσαμεραψεμασεστορακερή (ς)...
(ρ) ........................................... ωεσεκεκερακεκανεκαλεκεκατρισμεκακερή...
(σ) ........................................... ιστετειεβεσεκακεκακαλεκεκακατρισμεκακερή...
(τ) ........................................... σειστετειεβεσεκακαλεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισμεκακατρισм...
(๒๒) เกษหาน้ำก้านต้น แต่เก้าพระเจ้าพุทธศรี (๒) ค้นหาครูโคท ฯลฯ

(๒๓) (๐) หาสืบเชขานุกุลพันครูวังหุ่นพระองค์พระเจ้า……

(๒๔) (๑) สืบทูกพระสมภูมิไทยโคสามารถอานกลางถนนบุกคลา (๓๕).

(๒๕) ดังกล่าวนานานพิชพุทธายที่ลูกกบการเมือง……

(๒๖) ปลูกพระโพธิกาณกขับขยันไม่ทางทางเลิศกิจ (๓)……

(๒๗) สามารถปลีฟอสังหารบนบันบาลเผยแผ่ทางน้ำ (ต้น)

(๒๘) หนึ่งอีกโคคนกันนอกเครื่องกันหลักภาษากิจเจ (๗)

(๒๙) ..สืบแต่เกี่ยวนานานต่อถวายหนึ่งขอหน่วยงานประทับ..
Translation

[II/1-3.: illegible except for a few letters.]
[II/4-14.] .................................................. caste?, everywhere ..........
.................................................. two daughters ................................ like that8, adorning them splendidly9 ................................ in his faith and eagerness to10 ................................ the ten perfections11 ........................................

7) cf. No. 2, I/89, 'renounce his [princely] caste'.
8) Restoring - satyā (II/6) as satīya.
9) cf. No. 2, II/2, 'adorned his two daughters splendidly'.
10) cf. No. 2, II/5, 'in his eagerness to become a Buddha.'
11) dasāpārami (II/8), i.e. the perfect exercise of the ten principal virtues leading to Buddhahood, namely : generosity (dāna), morality (saśa), renunciation (nekkhamma), wisdom (pañca), forbearance (khanti), truthfulness (sacca), resolution (adīṭṭhi), all-embracing kindness (mettā) and equanimity (upekkhā). Cf. the Dasajati, the tales of the Buddha's last ten previous incarnations.
12) We restore - a (II/10) as an, 'only', 'counting only,' 'as for.' The word an occurs repeatedly in this text before an enumeration of a particular group of meritorious deeds performed by Śrīraddha, or the name of the place where he performed them.
13) The lacuna doubtless contained the enumeration.
14) cf. No. 2, II/9, 'he planted a Śrīmahābodhi tree, he built a vihāra and an āvāsa.'
15) Literally 'there is' (c, II/11), which seems to carry through to the end of the clause. We have substituted a transitive construction for clarity.
16) cf. No. 2, II/15, 'he also built a mahācetiya, planted a Śrīmahābodhi tree, and founded a large statue of the Buddha.'
17) cf. No. 2, II/11 ff., 'he built a large bridge, planted big trees (etc.) and a Śrīmahābodhi tree, assigning several families to take care of [the premises] (etc.) and he assigned servants to wash the feet of the Mahātheras, the Anūtheras and all the monks on the days of the new moon, the full moon, the uposatha and the pūrāṇa.'
18) sambhāra pārami (II/13); sambhāra means accumulation or storing up; for pārami, see above, note 11.
19) Either relics or a reliquary tower.
He went to Fhan, Ble, Rabun, Tak, Jyañ [Don] [Chot]²⁰, and all the way to the forest where he set his elephant free²¹. [then on to] Nagar a Bann²², the kingdom of Kaliṅga, Pātaliputta,...... puranagar a, the Three Cola Kingdoms, the Malala Kingdom, and all the way to Lankādīpa²³.

²⁰ Fhan is Mitun Pīng, in Bijaya District (~. Phān), Uttarātithī Province, about 40 km. south of the town of Uttarātithī; Ble is Pā (now Phā), on the right bank of the Pīng about 25 km. north of the present town of Tak; Jyañ Dōn is Chięng Tōng (~. Phān), which was a riverine port on the Pīng (perhaps near the present town of Tak) used by travelers wishing to continue their journey overland, via Pol Shī, to Martaban; the context enables us to restore the lacuna at Il/15 as Chot (~. Phān), i.e. Phān Shī. This passage may be compared with No. 2, Il/15-17, where Śrīsraddhā goes through the market (doubtless at Fhan or one of the other cities enumerated), buying up all the living creatures and setting them free; carves a seat-covering (for the pedestal of an image); and carves a sandalwood statue.

²¹ The forest where he set his elephant free must have been on the west side of the watershed in Burma, near Kawkareik on the north branch of the River Gyaing, where he could take a boat or raft downstream to Martaban. As he had no further use for the elephant, he turned it loose as an act of merit. Cf. No. 2, Il/15: 'in the forest in ... on Nān Tāy Hill, he went by elephant to worship [the statue of] the Lord, and set [the elephant] free at that place.'

²² Nagar a Bann (Il/15), the city of Bān, i.e. Martaban. The use of the word nagara confirms our view that Bān means the capital of Rāmaṇādesa, not some small place nearby. The route taken by Śrīsraddhā from Jyañ Dōn to Bān is the same as that followed in the opposite direction by the Mahāthera from Bān whom Mahādharmarāja I invited to Sukhodaya in 1361; see Inscr. 4, Il/11, ff. For an account of this route in the early 20th century, see Lunet de Lajonquière, Le Siam et les Siames, Paris, 1908, pp. 156-239.

²³ Śrīsraddhā evidently took ship at Martaban, sailed across the Bay of Bengal, and landed in Kaliṅga (modern Orissa), a kingdom which had successfully resisted Muslim encroachments and was still ruled by a Hindu dynasty. The harbor at False Point in Orissa is one of the best in India. Śrīsraddhā may have stopped there, then continued up the coast to the mouths of the Ganges, and sailed up the river to Pātaliputta (modern Patna); or else perhaps he went to Kālak (Cutack) on the Mahānādi in Kaliṅga, and continued overland from there to Pātaliputta, a distance of some 600 km. In either case his real objective was certainly Bodhgāya, the scene of the Buddha's Enlightenment, which is in Patna District 100 km. south of the town of Patna. All this region had been under Muslim suzerainty since the end of the 12th century, but the local rāja at Bodhgāya was doubtless a Hindu, who would feel no inclination to interfere with Buddhist pilgrims or the profitable business connected with receiving them. If Śrīsraddhā was traveling overland from Kaliṅga, there would be no reason for him to go to the town of Pātaliputta at all, for he would reach Bodhgāya first.

Śrīsraddhā's itinerary from there to Lankādīpa (Ceylon) is not perfectly clear. Coedes transcribes the intervening place-names as '..... pura nagara tri colamandalf malarāja'; in his translation he omits the unidentifiable
....purã', and takes the other names to be Nagarã Tri, Colamanãdala, and the kingdom of the Mallas (Remoûl, pp. 146, 149); but he evidently had doubts about 'Nagarã Tri' as a place-name, because he puts a question-mark after it. In the last name on the list, kãnava, he is certainly right in interpreting it as vrãõ, 'kingdom'; but we could represent either 'malla' or 'malala', and we are inclined to prefer the latter: the Malala Kingdom was approximately equivalent to Kerala on the Malabar coast. As we guess that 'colamanãdãla' is intended to be a plural, we propose to understand the names as .... paranagara, tricoãmanãdãla, malalanãdã, i.e. .... paranagara, the Three Coã Kingdoms [and] the Malala Kingdom.

The Coã Empire, which once ruled a large part of South India, disappeared in the 13th century, but the name Coãmanãdãla survived, and still survives today in the form 'Coromandel' which designates the east coast of South India. On the ruins of the Coã and Calukya Empires four kingdoms arose. The Muslims conquered a great deal of South India by the 1320's, but most of it broke away in the early 1330's, and a number of Hindu chieftains started restoring the old way of life (see Nilakantha Sastri, History of South India, Madras, 1955, pp. 202-228). The 'Three Coã Kingdoms', though we have been unable to discover any reference to this term in Indian history, must mean three states, either independent or tributary, on the Coromandel Coast. In the unsettled conditions that then prevailed in South India, Śrîśrãddhã would surely have found overland travel difficult, so we believe his South Indian itinerary represents a sea-trip with calls at ports along the east coast on the way.

Upon leaving Bodhgaya, Śrîśrãddhã probably returned to Kaliõga. We are tempted to restore '.... puranagara' as Dantapuranaga, a city in Kaliõga known to Buddhists as the place where the Tooth-Relic had been deposited before it was translated to Ceylon. Dantapura is generally identified with Puri, where there is a huge 12th-century temple dedicated to Jagannãtha, a form of Kãnaõ, as well as many temples dedicated to Viõõu, Rãma, Ñiva and other Hindu gods (see Walker, The Hindu World, London, 1968, p. 490 f.; Coomaraswamy, History of Indian and Indonesia Art, New York, 1927, p.115). This complex would certainly attract Śrîśrãddhã, who considered himself to be an avatarå of Kãnaõ, Rãma, etc.

If we accept Dantapuranaga as a partial restoration of the lacuna, we still have space left for about four letters, which probably gave the name of the port where Śrîśrãddhã embarked for Dantapura; perhaps it was Katak.

After leaving Kaliõga, he stopped, as we have guessed, at three ports on the Coromandel coast; possibly making short trips inland to worship at Viõõu temples or some of the surviving Buddhist centers. One of these was probably Nãgapattinam, where there was still a flourishing community of Buddhists (see Ramachandran, The Nãgapattinam and other Buddhist Bronzes in the Madras Museum, Madras, 1954, pp. 1-19). Śrîśrãddhã's last stop before reaching Ceylon was probably at some port in the eastern part of the Malala Kingdom, not far from the southern tip of India.
he found some precious great relics which, after beginning to whirl around, [continued] moving for ....... As for restoring the Mahādhātu to exalt the religion in the great city of Sinhala, as well, [it took him] a total of ten years. Then he came across [the sea] to Tana vsrī, [stopping there] to select a throng of good men.

24) mahāratanadha t u (II/17), doubtless the Kesadha tu and the Givadhātu which he saw performing miracles at the Mahiyaganacetiya in Ceylon (cf. p. 126). The miracles proved that the relics were genuine. The implication is that he had been unable to find any in Siam, Burma or India that proved their authenticity in this manner.

25) beginning with whirling' (the word also occurs in No. 2 at II/66); 'performed a movement' (Pali cariyi, which ordinarily means 'behavior', must be here used in a sense closer to its derivation from carati, 'to move').

26) 'five' or 'six', and the second either 'days', or 'months'.

27) Anurādhapura; cf. section 7, note 149.

28) 'added together'. The period of 'ten years' must mean the length of time he spent in Ceylon, long enough to become a Thera in the Ceylon Sangha.

29) Tenasserim, including Mergui and the town of Tenasserim. Mergui had a splendid natural harbor, in which ships were safe in the roughest weather, and by sailing upstream from there on a flood tide they could reach the town of Tenasserim. We have a detailed description of the Trans-Peninsular route in the 17th century (de Bourges, Relation du Voyage de Mounseigneur l'Enqué de Bercy, seconde édition, Paris, 1668), an account of a trip made over this route in the opposite direction in 1932 (Kerr, Notes on a Trip from Prachap (Kaw Lati) to Mergui, JSS XXVI, 203 ff., with a map), and some valuable comments by Mr Maurice Collis (Siamese White, London, 1936, 19 ff., 30 ff., with map facing p. 30). In the 17th century, and perhaps long before, travelers could transfer at Tenasserim to river-boats which were propelled by crews with sweeps or poles, and dragged over the rapids with ropes; the boats would ascend the Little Tenasserim and its tributary the Theinkun as far as a place called Jalina, where the travelers would disembark and continue the journey by sedan-chair or on foot. It was about 15 miles from there to the Đen Nai Pass (Burmese: Maw Taung), which is only about 1000 feet above sea-level. From the pass the route led down the slope to the Gulf of Siam, about 12 miles away. Under favorable conditions the trip from Mergui to the Gulf took less than a fortnight. This was certainly the route that Śrīsodhāha took. On reaching the Gulf, he continued, probably by boat, to Bejrapuri, Rajapuri and Ayodhya.

30) 'because' in the Sukhodayan inscriptions, is found in No. 2 at II/6 with a sense closer to its modern meaning, 'in order to', which is evidently what it means here.
...... Sihaladipa until [the coming of] the Buddha Sri Ār Maitrī31. [He went to] Bejapur!, Rajapuri, N...... s., 32 and Ayodhyā. Sri Ramade­banagara33, the place of the pond [?] of the Birūṇāsa at the Pātāla, the [Saṃ] tec’s palace [?] which His Majesty built there34.

31) The future Buddha, Ārya Metteyya (Skt. Ārya Maitreya). Though the lacuna at II/19-20 is rather short, the only meaning we can think of is that the throng of good men were to build something which would exalt the religion of Ceylon until the coming of the Buddha Ārya Metteyya. As the sentence stands, it must mean that Śrīśraddhā selected these men at Tenasserim, either to send them back to Ceylon in exchange for the craftsmen he had obtained there to take to Sukhodaya, or else to take them to Sukhodaya together with the Śiṅhalese craftsmen to help rebuild the Mahādhātu. But a line or two may have been omitted by mistake and added later, perhaps with a punctuation mark equivalent to a caret (no longer visible) to show where they should be read. We suspect that, after reading line 18, we are supposed to read line 20 to the end of line, then line 19, then the rest of line 20, and go on normally from there. If so, the meaning might be something like this: ‘As for restoring the Mahādhātu [i.e. the Mahādhū] to exalt the religion in the great city of Śiṅhala [and performing other works to exalt it in the whole of] Sihaladipa until [the coming of] the Buddha Ariya Metteyya as well, [it took him] a total of ten years.’ This certainly gives a more satisfactory sense.

32) Judging from its position on the itinerary, we suspect this name may have been wellvis, i.e. Nagarā Jayasri.

33) ‘Ayodhī’ is Ayodhyā. Rāmadebanagara, ‘city of the god Rāma’, is used as an epithet of Ayodhya, in allusion to Rāma’s legendary city of Ayodhyā in India, and at the same time in paranomastic reference to Ayodhyā in Śiṁ, whose ruler doubtless had ‘Rāma’ as part of his titulature; at the same time it recalls Śījaya Jiān Sēn’s former capital, Debanagara. If, as we suggest in Table III, Śrīśraddhā visited Ayodhyā around 1344, it must have been near the end of Śījaya Jiān Sēn’s reign or the beginning of Rāmādhīpati’s.

34) Conjectural translation. The reading nā at II/21 is fairly clear; nā is doubtless for nā, ‘place’; and nā can be identified by a comparison with the Asokārāma Inscription of 1399 A.D., where a name which the Śiṁese face gives as nā is written Saṁkhassara (‘conch-voiced’) on the Pali face (see JSS 57/1, p. 39 line 16, p. 42 line 50, p. 45 and note 21, p. 53 and note 75): nā is therefore a doublet of Pali sara, and the context shows it is used here not in the sense of ‘voice’ but in the sense of a lake or pond, perhaps in allusion to the Sano Pond (wūla) on the island of Ayodhyā. Birūṇāsa is probably put for Birūṇāsana (which would be pronounced the same way in Śiṁese), an alternative spelling of Virūṇāsana, ‘the throne of Viruṇa.’ In the Rāmakirti, Viruṇa is the Nāga King of Pātāla in whose subterranean palace Queen Śītā takes refuge when her husband Rāma accuses her of infidelity (see महापति, Bangkok, B.E. 2510, 238-9). We guess that we...... at the end of II/21 should be restored as mānī, ‘palace’, and we feel fairly certain that -i at the beginning of the next line should be restored as mā, Samtec, i.e. either Śījaya Jiān Sēn or Rāmādhīpati. The next word, mā, doubtless stands for mah, ‘His Majesty’. If we accept these conjectures, we should probably understand that Śījaya Jiān Sēn or Rāmādhīpati had built, or was building, a palace near the Sano Pond in imitation of the legendary palace of the fabulously wealthy Nāga King (after a hypothetical description in some version of the story of Rāma and Śītā from which the Rāmakirti of the Bangkok period derives).
As for the cetiyas he built for precious relics, the total reached a thousand... hundred and fifty-seven. At Rattanakāśāna, which the Tei call Kambu Grōn O, he built a cetiya... As for the Śrīmahābodhi trees he planted, the total reached three hundred, some [taken from] the top of the tree, some [from] a branch, and some [from] seeds, always planting them with a wish based on his perfections, then... As for the Bo trees he planted, the total reached a thousand. As for the flowering trees of various kinds he planted in homage, the total reached two thousand and eighty. [As for the offerings he made] in addition to those already mentioned, they cannot be counted at all. As for holding a lamp on his head, he did so a thousand nights throughout the night, observing himself many times, then taking... for a thousand nights, with the oil pouring down all over his head. The great lamp...

[The rest of the text is missing.]

35) We have supplied the pronoun as the subject of the sentence, which obviously refers to Śrīśraddhā.
36) As the illegible word near the end of II/22 seems to have had three letters, the total might be 1257, 1357, 1757 or 1957.
37) The text makes a clear distinction between Śrīmahābodhi trees (meyeśvaradana, II/24) and Bo trees (vratana, II/26). The Śrīmahābodhi tree is the fana religiosa, preferably grown from a cutting, layering, shoot or seed of the famous Śrīmahābodhi tree at Anurādhapura, which in turn had been grown from a layering of a large branch of the tree at Bodhagāya, which marked the site of the Enlightenment.
38) se. from a cutting or layering taken from the top of the Śrīmahābodhi tree at Anurādhapura.
39) [II/25], modern ṇī or ṇi, "a large fork of a tree."
40) For the perfections (pārami), see above, note 11. The wish was an "act of truth", the terms of which are not stated here. By comparison with No. 2, II/53 f., we can guess that it ran somewhat as follows: "If I am truly destined to become a Buddha, then may this tree live and flourish," etc.
41) se. "the tree came to life", or something of the sort; cf. No. 2, II/65 f.
42) Probably thekepa parulha (broad), which grows wild along watercourses, and which doubtless gave its name to the River Bo (vratana), as the lower section of the Ping was formerly called. Hence the name Pēk-n̄em Bo for the junction of the Ping and the Nān at Nagara Svarga (see F.G. Giles at JSS XXVIII/2, 213 f.).
43) If the missing word at the end of II/26 was wu, "thousand," the total was 2380; but as the lacuna probably contained four letters it seems more likely to have been wu, "ten thousand," which would make the total 20,380.
44) nu (II/28), modern ṇa.
45) Or perhaps four thousand nights; we cannot tell if the following the lacuna at the beginning of II/29 means ṇ, "four," or was the end of some other word.
46) It is hard to guess what this sentence means. As Śrīśraddhā's action was obviously supposed to be meritorious, it may have been some sort of ascetic practice to aid meditation by forcing him to stay awake all night.
We append here a piece of information which may be pertinent.

In a letter written to His late Royal Highness Prince Narisaraṇavattivānśa on August 25, 1941, the late Brahma Anumāna Rājadhana, who was at that time Director General of the Department of Fine Arts, said that an inscription on gold leaf had recently been discovered in a cetiya at Sukhodaya, and he enclosed a transcript of the text. The transcript, dated July 31, 1941, was made by the late Mahā Chām Dōngāmvarga, who states that the first three lines of the inscription and part of the fourth, which are in Siamese, are written in the characters of the south (i.e. Sukhodaya or Ayudhya), both for the words and for the numbers; while the Pali stanza at the end is written in the characters of the north (i.e. Haripūṇājaya or Chiang Mai). Brahma Anumāna’s letter and Mahā Chām’s transcript are published in Šilpakara, XII/i, pp. 28-32.

The exact provenance of the inscription is unknown, as well as its present whereabouts. No copy of it has been found among Mahā Chām’s papers, and so far as we have been able to discover there is no photograph or rubbing of it in existence. Because of Mahā Chām’s scrupulous scholarship, however, we have no hesitation in accepting the accuracy of the transcript.

The text states, first, that Saṃtec Brahma Mahāthera Cullāmuni built a vihāra on Friday the first day of the waning moon of the sixth month in C.S. 738, a year of the dragon; then that he enshrined a holy relic (or relics) and a lot of images of the Buddha (presumably votive tablets) on Wednesday the fourth day of the waning moon of the tenth month at the Kṛttikārka; and finally that he erected an 18-cubit statue on top.

We are indebted to Mr Roger Billard of the Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient for calculating the dates for us in terms of the Julian calendar. In a letter of July 23, 1971, he tells us that the date given for the building of the vihāra corresponds to Friday April 4, 1376 A.D. (Julian), while that for the enshrinement of the relic and images corresponds to Wednesday September 3 of the same year, at a moment when
the true moon was in the Kṛttikāṛṣṇa or constellation of Pleiades, i.e. after the local midday; and he adds that the mention of the Kṛttikāṛṣṇa makes it possible to confirm the accuracy of the corresponding date.

We think it highly likely that the Saṃteca Brahma Mahāthera Ċulāmuni of the gold-leaf inscription is the same person as Saṃteca Śrīśrāddhāraja-čulāmuni Śrīraṭṭunālahākādīpa Mahāśāmi Pen Cau to whose acts of merit so much of Inscription 2 is devoted. To enshrine the relic (or relics) and the images he evidently built a cetiya beside the vihāra he had just completed; he doubtless placed the gold-leaf inscription in the relic-chamber of the cetiya; and this cetiya would be the one at Sukhodaya, which we unfortunately cannot identify, in whose ruins the inscription was discovered.

By this time Śrīśrāddhā must have been nearly eighty years old, perhaps more. If we are right in our identification, the gold-leaf inscription records what must have been one of the last large acts of merit performed by him.
Text

(1) พระบาทสมเด็จพระเจ้าอยู่หัว

(2) พระบาทสมเด็จพระเจ้าอยู่หัว

(3) พระบาทสมเด็จพระเจ้าอยู่หัว

Romanized Transcription of the Pali Stanza in Line 4

iminā puññakammena
samsārā mocanatthāya
buddho homi anagate
sabbe satte asesato
[In Siamese: 1] In sakarāja 738, a year of the dragon, in the sixth month, on the first day of the waning moon, a Friday, Saṃtec Brah Mahāthera Cu(lā)muni built this vihāra, [2] which was finished after a month and fifteen days. After that, in the tenth month, on the fourth day of the waning moon, a Wednesday, (when the moon was in the) constellation of Kṛttika\(^2\), he enshrined [3] the holy relic\(^3\), and many images of the Buddha which he had made of silver, gold, tin\(^4\) and ivory. Then he made [4] an eighteen-cubit image\(^5\) on top\(^6\). [In Pali:] By means of my meritorious action may I become a Buddha in the future for the purpose of releasing all creatures from transmigration completely!

1) It is not clear whether the date given is that of the commencement or the completion of the vihāra, i.e. whether the ‘month and fifteen days’ began or ended at this date.
2) kṛttikārkhā. for kṛttikārkṣa.
3) or relics.
4) won, i.e. วิน, still used in Tai Yuen to mean ‘tin’.
5) athārāsa, for Pali aṭṭārāsa, ‘eighteen’, i.e. a Buddha image having a height of 18 cubits (a little less than 9 m.), traditionally believed to have been the actual height of the Buddha Gotama.
6) วิ้าส; the printed edition has วิ้าส which Mahā Chām glosses as วิ้าส, ‘on top of it’. As it seems unlikely that the letter ว had yet come into existence in the 14th century, we venture to substitute วิ้าส, either for วิ้าส (วิ้าส) or for วิ้าส (วิ้าส), which both have the same meaning.
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Addendum

In this paper, as well as our previous Epigraphic and Historical Studies, we have referred to the Manuscript and Inscription Division of the National Library. This is in the old National Library building, between Vāt Mahādātu and the Sanām Luang, and is now called Vajiraṇaṇa Hall. The former Vajiraṇaṇa Library is part of the National Museum.
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