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In an earlier part of this paper (JSS 61/1, pp. 119-176) we had a good deal to say about the 'Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja' from Bann (Martaban) who took up his residence at the Mango Grove Monastery west of Sukhodaya in 1361 at the invitation of Mahādhamarājā I. We shall now see if we can identify him a little more precisely.

The inscriptions call him only by his titles, without giving his name (with the doubtful exception of 'Traipiṭaka', which is more likely part of an honorific epithet than a name; see JSS 61/1, p. 144 note 64). The residence chosen for him shows that he was a Forest-Dweller. It is clear that he was a Sīhālabhikkhu, for Inscription 4 tells us he had 'studied the Three Piṭakas in their entirety' and 'had resided in Laṅkādvipa [Ceylon] where there are teachers of the precepts like the saints of old' (JSS 61/1, 133, 139); a mutilated passage in Inscr. 5 evidently said the same thing (ibid., 150, 156, 157); and the concluding passage of Inscr. 4 calls him 'the Mahāthera who came from Laṅkādvipa' (ibid., 135, 144). But they do not explicitly say he was a Sinhalese; he might have been a Môn, born in Martaban, who had gone to Ceylon for re-ordination and study. It is hard to say whether he is the same person as the Mahāsāmi Udumbara (Udumbarapupphā).

* For Part I, see JSS 61/1.
Udumbara is discussed at some length in the chronicles Milasasana (M) and Jinakālamāli (J), but is not mentioned by name in the inscriptions. According to M, he founded the brotherhood of forest-dwelling Sīhāabhikkhus at Bann in 1331. M, which implies he was a Sinhalese without actually saying so, tells us he had resided at the Udumbaragiri Monastery in Ceylon, which we know from Sinhalese history was the forest-dwelling branch of the great citadel of orthodoxy, the Mahāvihāra at Anurādhapura. (See JSS 60/1, p. 48-68.)

Some light is shed on these matters by a communication for which we are indebted to the late Professor S. Paranavitana, the distinguished Sinhalese historian and philologist who was for many years Archaeological Commissioner of Ceylon. He writes us as follows:

Nupegoda, Ceylon

It appears from the Colophon to the Pali work Lokappadīpasāra, that the Sinhalese Saṅgharāja who was invited to Sukhodaya by King Lidyā or Śrī Sūryavamsa Rāma Mahādharmarājādhirāja as recorded in a Khmer inscription found at Sukhodaya, was none other than Medharpkara-sailgha-raja, the author of that work, and that this hierarch resided at Muttima-nagara [Marta ban], honoured by royalty there, before he went to Sukhodaya. The Colophon of the Lokappadīpasāra, given below, has been settled by a collation of the text as appearing in (A) the printed book, edited by Hambarugala Piyaratana-thera and printed at Alutgama in 1928, (B) the Catalogue of Palm-leaf Manuscripts in the Colombo Museum by A.W. de Silva, Colombo, 1938, and (C) Pali Sahitya (Pali Literature), Part II, by Polwatte Buddhadatta-thera:—

1) The words in square brackets have been added by us. The notes signed ‘S.P.’ are Dr Paranavitana’s; those without signature are our own.
2) Coedès, Recueil des inscriptions du Siam; première partie, Inscriptions de Sukhodaya, p. 91 ff. (S.P.). The inscription referred to is No. 4; see JSS 61/1, p. 119-144.
3) The Collation has been kindly done by Dr. C.E. Godakumbure. (S.P.)
[Text]

Siri-Ratanapurābhidiḥāne Muttima⁴-nagare Setakuṇjarādhipati-
hūtassa mahārajanā mātubhūtiya Susaddhāya mahādeviya kārite
tipupātalacchādita⁵ Soṇamayamahāvihāre vasantena Silācārādi-
sampannenca Tipiṭakapariyattidharena saddhābuddhiviṃyapaṭi-
maṇḍitena⁶ Sīhaladīpe arabhavāvasanāṃ pasatṭha⁷-mahātherānāṃ
vaṃśalaṅkārabhūtena Medhaṅkaramahātheraṇabhyaṃpatitena Saṃ-
gharaṇīnakato' yaṃ Lokappādīpāsāro ti
Anena puṇṇena susambhatena
Sayambhutam yāva ca pāpuṇe varam
Nirantarāṃ lokahitassa kārako
Bhave bhaveyyam sarāṇehi pūrito
Anantarāyaṃ vināsāro yathā niṭṭham upāgato
Tathādise susampappam sattānaṃ dhammanissitam

Lokappādīpakasārappakaranaṃ mahāsāṅgharājena Lidayarājassa⁸ gurunā⁹ racitaṃ samattām.

[Translation]

This Lokappādīpāsāra has been composed by the Sāṅgharāja
known by the name of Medhaṅka-rā-mahāthera, who is residing in the
great golden monastery, covered with tiles of lead, which was caused to
be built by Susaddhamahādevi, mother of the great king who is the Lord
of the White Elephant of Muttimanagara, also called Siri-Ratanapura,
(the Sāṅgharāja) who is endowed with character, conduct and (other
good qualities), who is versed in the scriptures of the Three Piṭakas,
who is adorned with faith, intellect and courage, and who is the ornament
of the lineage of the eminent great Elders who are forest-dwellers in
Sīhaladīpam [Ceylon].

4) A, B: Jttama. (S.P.)
5) B: kāritehi puna. (S.P.)
6) B: Saddhābuddhiya; A: Saddhāviriya. (S.P.)
7) B: pasatṭha. (S.P.)
8) A: Dayarājassa. (S.P.)
9) A: garunā. (S.P.)
By this merit that has been well stored, may I, until the attainment of the excellent Buddhahood in the process of becoming, be always one who causes the welfare of the world and full of refuge (to others)!

Just as this work has come to its end without any obstruction and devoid of non-essential matters, may the well-intentioned and righteous efforts of beings be accomplished in the same manner!

Completed is the *Lokappadipasūrapakarana* composed by the great Saṅgharāja, the preceptor of King Lidaya.

**[Comment by Dr Parana Y itana]**

This Colophon, as it was originally written when the book was completed in Muttimanagara, obviously ended with the second benedictory verse. The prose passage which follows must have been added when the book was copied after the Saṅgharāja had gone to Sukhodaya and become the spiritual guide of King Lidaya.

The following reference to the author of the *Lokappadipasūra* is found in the *Sāsanavamsa*:

**[Text]**

Tato paccha ca Muttimanagarem Setibhindassaräño mātuyā ācariyo Medhāṅkaro nāma therō Sihaladipam gantvā Sihaladipe araññavāsānaṁ mahāthHerānaṁ santike puna sikkhaṁ gahetvā pariyāpunītvā suvaṃśaratamaye tipusisachanne Setibhindassa raño mātuyā kārāpi vihāre nisiddvā sāsanaṁ anuggahesi Lokappadipakāsārān ca nāma gandhamakāsi.10

**[Translation]**

After that also,11 the Elder named Medhāṅkara, the preceptor of the mother of King Setibhinda of Muttrimanagara [Martaban], went to Sihaladipa [Ceylon], took vows again with the great elders who were the forest-dwellers in Sihaladipa, studied the scriptures, resided in the monastery of gold and silver, covered with lead tiles, which was caused to be built by the mother of King Setibhinda, and served the religion. He also composed a book named *Lokappadipakasūra*.


11) That is after the establishment of the Sāsanā for the fifth time in Rāmañña-desa. (S.P.)
There is also another brief reference in the *Sasanavamsa* to the Lokappadipasāra (*Lokadēpakavāra*) and its author Medhankarathera, who is referred to as a resident of Muttimanagara.\(^{12}\)

The *Sasanavamsa* refers to Medhankarathera as a monk of Burma who came to Ceylon and was admitted to the Order of Forest-dwelling monks there and returned to his own country. But the description *Sihaladipe araṇīnavāśimna ṭhresatpha-Mahātherūnam vanśālamkārarahūtena* occurring in the Colophon of the *Lokappadipasāra* referring to Medhanākara Saṅgharāja does not suit a monk from Burma who was re-admitted to the Vanavāśi [Araṇīnavāśi] Order of the Mahavihāra in Ceylon. The Colophon of the *Lokappadipasāra* was most probably written by the Saṅgharāja himself. At any rate, it was written in his time and is more authoritative than the *Sasanavamsa*, written about four centuries later. The tradition could have been modified during this interval of time.

In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, the chief centre of the Araṇīnavāśi fraternity in Ceylon was Udumbaragiri, to the east of Polonnaruva. As the Saṅgharāja Medhankara is described as the ornament of the lineage of Forest-dwelling theras, it appears that he is the same as Udumbara-mahāśāmi who, according to the *Jinakālamālī*, came to Rammaṇadesa [Rāmaṇadesa] from Ceylon, and whose disciple Sumanathera was instrumental in establishing the Araṇīnavāśi fraternity in Syāmadesa.\(^{13}\)

---


Dr Paranavitana is certainly right in identifying the Mahāthera Medhāṅkara, the author of the Lokappadipasaśā, with the Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja who came to Sukhodāya at the invitation of Mahādharmarāja I (Lādaiya) in 1361. Insrs. 4 and 5 both show that the Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja was residing at Nagara Bān (Martaban) when he received the invitation from Mahādharmarāja; and both imply that he became Mahādharmarāja’s preceptor. The identification seems virtually certain.

Nor can we doubt that Dr Paranavitana is right in assuming that he belonged to the Udumbaragiri Forest Monastery in Ceylon before settling at Martaban. As M tells us that Udumbara had studied at the Udumbaragiri, it is tempting to identify him with Medhāṅkara, as Dr Paranavitana proposes to do; but there are certain difficulties (see below, p. 98 f.); and there may have been more than one Mahāsāmi from the Udumbaragiri living at Martaban in the 14th century.

The Order of Sīhalabhikkhus had been introduced at Pagan in Upper Burma in the early 13th century by five monks, who as far as we know were not committed to forest-dwelling as a permanent way of life. After one of them left the monkhood and another one died, the remaining three split apart, founding three separate sects (see Taw Sein Ko, ed., The Kalyāṇi Inscriptions erected by King Dhammaceti at Pegu in 1476 A.D., Rangoon, 1892, p. 55 f.; JSS 60/1, p. 49-50).

In a short account of Buddhism at Martaban, the Kalyāṇi Inscription, composed in 1476, gives a list of six different sects that were represented there at an unspecified date, evidently some time between 1245 and 1468 (see Taw Sein Ko, op. cit., p. 56-58; cf. JSS 60/1, p. 50 note 8). The first on the list is the Order that claimed spiritual succession from the monks Sōpa and Uttara, who had introduced Buddhism into Lower Burma in the reign of King Asoka of India. The second, third and fourth are Sīhalabhikkhus deriving from the three Ceylon sects at Pagan; presumably they were established at Martaban in the 13th century. The last two on the list, which were probably
established later, were founded by monks who had themselves visited Ceylon and been re-ordained there: one was a sect 'whose members were the spiritual successors of Buddhavamsa Mahathera, the Preceptor of the Queen, who went to Sihaladipa and received his upasampada ordination there, and who, on his return, performed his ecclesiastical ceremonies separately in Muttimanagara'; the other was a sect 'whose members were the spiritual successors of Mahasami Mahathera, otherwise called Mahâ-Nâga-Mahathera, who visited Sihaladipa and received his upasampada ordination there, and who, on his return to Muttimanagara, performed his ecclesiastical ceremonies separately' (Taw Sein Ko, op. cit., p. 58).

Supposing the Kalyâni Inscription's list is complete, a process of elimination shows that we should try to fit Udumbara and Medhankara, whether they were two men or only one, into one or the other of the last two sects on the list. This is by no means easy.

As M implies that Udumbara was a Sinhalese, and Dr Paranavitana thinks Medhankara was too, we might hesitate to identify either of them with Buddhavamsa Mahathera or the Mahasami Mahâ-Nâga-Mahathera, both of whom, according to the Kalyâni Inscription, went to Ceylon to receive the ordination and later 'returned' to Martaban.

On the other hand, as Sasanavarsa tells us that Medhankara was preceptor to the mother of the King of Martaban, and as the Colophon of the Lokappadipasara shows that she supported him handsomely, it would be natural to identify him with Buddhavamsa Mahathera, who according to the Kalyâni Inscription was Preceptor to the Queen of Martaban; though if the identification is right we might expect the inscription to give Buddhavamsa the title of Saṅgharāja which the Colophon gives Medhañkara.

Udumbara in M and J, the 'Mahasami Saṅgharāja' in Inscrs. 4 and 5, and Mahâ-Nâga-Mahathera in the Kalyâni Inscription, all bear the title Mahasami. This does not help us very much, as a great many monks must have borne it.
The chief obstacle to identifying Medhāṅkara with Udumbara is that Udumbara was apparently still residing at Martaban after 1361, when 'Mahāsāmi Saṅgharājā', whose identification with Medhāṅkara seems certain, left Martaban and settled at Sukhodaya.

According to J, King Kilanā (Gū Nā) of Chieng Mai (r. 1355-85) wanted to have a monk at Chieng Mai who was qualified to perform all the 'acts of the Saṅgha', in other words one who was qualified to perform monastic rites in accordance with the rules of the Sīhalabhikkhus, including the consecration of an uposatha hall, the planting of sīma boundary stones, and the ordination of monks. He therefore sent a messenger to Udumbara Mahāsāmi in Rammaṇadesa. Udumbara suggested his disciple Ānanda, so the messenger took Ānanda back to Chieng Mai with him. Kilanā was delighted with Ānanda's preaching, but for some reason Udumbara had not authorized Ānanda to perform the acts of the Saṅgha. This was a vital matter: if no new Sīhalabhikkhus could be ordained in Kilanā's kingdom the Order there could not expand. Ānanda therefore suggested that Kilanā invite Sumana, who was fully authorized to perform them, to come from Sukhodaya. Kilanā accordingly sent the invitation to Sumana, but Sumana declined, and sent another monk, Saddhatissā, instead. But as Saddhatissā had not been authorized to perform the acts of the Saṅgha either, Kilanā sent a lot of presents to the King of Sukhodaya (sc. Liḍaiya), asking him to persuade Sumana to accept. This he did, and Sumana thereupon set out for the northern kingdom.

M tells very much the same story; the details are different, but they need not concern us. The important thing is that the negotiations began with sending a message to Udumbara at Bann (Martaban), and ended with Sumana's acceptance.

The inscription of Wat Pra Yūn at Haripuṇjaya (Lampūn) says he arrived there in a year of the cock, in the first month. Wat Pra Yūn is the monastery Kilanā built for him; on the site there was a colossal statue of the standing Buddha facing east, which was already old; and soon after Sumana's arrival Kilanā began restoring the statue. According to the inscription, he started restoring it on the third day of the waxing
moon of the second month, a day called ‘kāp sēt’ in Tai and sikrabura (Friday) in Môn, in the year of the cock, 731 of the Era. As this date corresponds to Friday, January 11, 1370 (Julian), it appears that Sumana had arrived at Haripuṇājaya around December, 1369.¹⁴

We do not know the date when Kilanā had begun the negotiations by sending his message to Udumbara at Martaban, but it is hard for us to believe it was as far back as 1361. The sequence of events in J and M therefore implies that Udumbara was still residing at Martaban after 1361 when the Mahāsāmi Saṅgharāja (= Medhaṅkara) settled at Sukhodaya. If that is right, we should probably understand that Medhaṅkara and Udumbara belonged to different sects. Supposing that each had founded his own sect at Martaban, we should perhaps identify Medhaṅkara with the Buddhavāṃsa of the Kalyāṇī Inscription, and Udumbara with the Mahāsāmi Mahā-Nāga-Mahāthera.

But the reasoning is not entirely conclusive. In referring to the Mahāsāmi Udumbara(puppha) at Martaban in passages that evidently describe events occurring after 1361, both J and M may really mean his successor as head of the sect he founded.

¹⁴) M adds that soon after Sumana took up his residence at Wat Pra Yün (presumably in 1370), Kilanā requested him and Ananda to perform the Ceylon rites, including the planting of sima boundary-stones, and they willingly complied. When the ceremonies were finished, Ananda took his leave in order to return to the monastery of his teacher Udumbara(puppha) at Bann (Martaban). But upon reaching the town of Jīm [on the route between Haripuṇājaya and Mar­­taban] he was taken ill and died; and the people sent his almsbowl and robe to Udumbara. If this story is true, we must conclude that Udumbara was still living at Martaban around 1370.
Inscription 8 is engraved on a slab of schist 90 cm. high, 31 cm. wide and 15 cm. thick (Figs. 1-4). The obverse and reverse (Faces I and III) are in poor condition, but the writing on the narrow sides (Faces II and IV) is pretty well preserved. Face I has 31 lines, Face II has 29 (there may have originally been more), Face III has 26, and Face IV has 21. The language is Siamese; the style is typical of Mahādharmanāga I (Ljüdaiya).

The slab, which is now in the Vajirañāna Hall of the old National Library building in Bangkok, was discovered in 1908 by Prince Vajiravudh (afterwards King Rāma VI), during the course of his tour through "the land of Pratirangan." There seems to be no record of the exact place he discovered it, but a strong local tradition holds that it was on top of Khau Brah Pāda Hnāi about 3 km. southwest of Sukhodaya. This would therefore be the Mount Sumanākāta where, as is clear from the opening passage, the inscription originally stood. The hill was so named, the same passage adds, because there was a Footprint on top of it, copied from the Footprint stamped by the Lord Buddha on top of Mount Sumanakāta in Ceylon.

A stone Footprint discovered on Khau Brah Pāda Hnāi is preserved at Vat Irabah Dik (Vat Irabah Doi) in the old city of Sukhodaya near the Rāma Gāmphēn National Museum. Engraved on the stone is the diagram of a footsole, on which the remains of the 108 supernatural signs can be described, while nearer the edge of the stone are figures of a monk and a king or deva worshiping the Footprint (Figs. 5-7). There is no reason to doubt that this is the Footprint which Inscr. 8 commemorates.

1) No. 38 on Map 3, JSS 57/1, p. 33.
2) In the inscription, Sumanakātaparvata is written sūmanakātaparvata. For the Footprint on Mount Sumanakātaparvata (Adam's Peak) in Ceylon, see JSS 61/1, p. 111 and note 153. At Sukhodaya, any hill with a Footprint on its summit seems to have been given the name Sumanakātaparvata. We have regularized the spelling of most proper names of Sanskrit or Pali origin, for example Sukhodaya (written sukhoodai), Śrī Sajjanālāya (śrī sajjanālai), Śrīsaṇyavasyā (śrīsaṇyavasyā), Dharmarājādhīrāja (dharmanārājādhīrāja).
3) No. 8 on Map 3, JSS 57/1, p. 33.
The inscription was first published in 1924, by the late Professor George Coedès. The king called Śrīsuryavamśa Dharmarājādhīrāja who, according to the text (I/25-31), installed the Footprint on the hill in M.S. 1281 (1359 A.D.), was identified by Coedès as Lidaiya, which is unquestionably right. He believed, however, that the author of the inscription, who is called Brahma Śrīsuryavamśa Mahādharmarājādhīrāja at III/9-10, was Lidaiya's son. His reason for thinking so, he tells us, was because at the end of the inscription the author says 'he came up to worship the Footprint which his father had placed on top of the hill.'

Coedès's view was based on the mutilated expression mua.n at IV/16-17, which he read as mu.n and conjecturally restored as mu.un, 'his father'. On examining the stone in 1966, Prasert Na Nagara observed that the expression could equally well be read as mu.n, and would give better sense if restored as mu.n, 'he himself'. Prasert then wrote Coedès, who immediately accepted the new reading as more satisfactory. With this correction it becomes clear that the founder of the Footprint and the author of the inscription are one and the same person, Mahādharmarāja I.

At IV/19-21, after saying he climbed the hill to worship the Footprint which he himself had formerly placed there, Mahādharmarāja says: 'Then he engraved this additional inscription.' The statement must

4) Recueil des inscriptions du Siam, I, Bangkok, p. 123 ff. (p. 129 ff. of the Siamese section). The Siamese text was reprinted in Prajam silācārik bhāga di 1, Bangkok, B.E. 2500. Note that in the photograph of Face I in Recueil des inscriptions du Siam (facing p. 130 of the Siamese section), a fragment of the stone has been placed in the wrong position, with the result that the letters printed at the beginning of lines 13 to 18 are out of place (p. 131 of the Siamese section, and in the Romanized transcription at p. 125 of the French section). In any case these letters give no connected sense, and the reading is for the most part doubtful; so we have omitted them from the text we print here (p. 112 f.).

5) Recueil, p. 123. Coedès designates Lidaiya as Dharmarāja I and his son as Dharmarāja II; but as Lidaiya's father Lidaiya also bore the title Dharmarāja we prefer to call Lidaiya and his successors Mahādharmarāja I (or Mahādharmarājādhīrāja I), II, III and IV respectively. Coedès later accepted the late Brayā Nagara Brah Rāma's proposal to identify the founder of the Footprint with Lidaiya (Les États hindoules d'Indochine et d'Indonésie, Paris, 1964, p. 398 note 4). Though several of the proposals made by Brayā Nagara Brah Rāma (JSS XXVIII/2, pp. 214-220) are entirely valid, this particular one (ibid., p. 218) is no longer tenable.

6) See Social Science Review, Bangkok, Special Number, June 1966, p. 52 f.
mean that No. 8 consists of a primary text and a postscript. Judging from the context, the postscript begins at the middle of III/8; and the relative frequency of the mai-hān-ākāśa after that point confirms our impression.

The writing is much the same as in Mahādharmarāja's other inscriptions. The mai-hān-ākāśa occurs 6 times in Face III, and twice in Face IV (忐, III/7, 11, IV/1-2, 6; あの, III/10, 11, 12; ぬる, III/16). Elsewhere words that are now spelt with the mai-hān-ākāśa have the reduplicated final consonant instead, e.g. サ, 1/6, 9, 18, 24, and III/2. The accent 求 occurs 5 times in Face III, and once in Face IV: サ, III/22; サ, III/16; え, III/21; 腐, III/23; サ, III/22; サ, IV/12-13). The mai-ek occurs 5 times: サ, I/21, 25, IV/3; サ (=仏), I/20; サ (=やや), IV/2. Some of the words that have these accents are written without them in other parts of the inscription. Neither 求 nor 求 occurs, their places being taken by サ and 求, e.g. サ, 1/21, II/26; サ, I/2. The letters サ and サ occur just about where we should expect them. There are two orthographical oddities, doubtless inadvertent: サ at I/4-5, and サ at I/9 (though the same word is written サ at III/2).

The frequent occurrence of the mai-hān-ākāśa and the accent 求 in the postscript, in contrast to their rarity in the primary text, is probably to be explained by the changing fashion of the 1360's.

In Face I Mahādharmarāja says that the Footprint was placed on the hilltop so that everyone could see it with its 108 signs in bright color (I/5-8); he exhorts all divinities and men to worship it; and he reviews the advantages that will accrue to them for doing so (I/8-25). At I/25-31 he says that in さkakara 1281, in the eleventh month [i.e. around October, 1359], he did something, which is for the most part obliterated though we can still read the words サ, 'did,' サ, 'stone,' サ, 'sacred,' and サ, 'hill.' He then goes on to describe the festival which marked that occasion (II/1-23). The next passage (II/24-29), dated in the same year as the preceding one, refers to some calculations the King made, the nature of which is not clear, after the Footprint had been installed. At III/5-8, in a year whose designation is mutilated, the King and Queen caused the Footprint to be engraved.
We assume this means that the carving of the Footprint was still unfinished when it was brought up to the hilltop around October 1359, and the festival was held in celebration of its installation: hauling a heavy stone up a steep hill offered enough difficulties without adding to them the danger of damaging a lot of delicate carving. As the carving was almost certainly finished very soon after the stone was installed, we assume that the mutilated date when the King and Queen 'caused the Footprint to be engraved' was M.S. 1282, most of which would correspond to 1360 A.D. That would then also be the date of the primary text of Inscr. 8.7

The postscript was probably added in 1368, 1369, or 1370. Our reasons for thinking so are as follows.

The postscript opens with an illegible date, followed by the statement that Mahadharmarājā 'advanced with his army to Nān . . . . and pacified the whole territory, as well as that of . . . . to the east, and the whole (valley of the) Bṛāh Sākk, completely' (III/8-12). Then he went to reside at Sōn Čāvē (Bisānuloca) (III/12 f.). After staying there for seven years, we are told in a later passage (IV/4 f.), he returned with his army to Sukhodaya.

The last legible date in the primary text is M.S. 1281 (1359 A.D.). The events recounted in the postscript, which of course occurred afterward, seem to succeed one another without any long break, beginning with the King's military campaign, continuing with his seven-year sojourn at Sōn Čāvē, and concluding with his return to Sukhodaya and his journey to the top of Mount Sumanakūṭa to worship the Footprint. We know he was ordained as a sāmaṇera at Sukhodaya on Wednesday September 22, 1361 (Julian), and as a bhikkhu immediately afterward, probably the next day (JSS 61/1, p. 122). If he stayed in the monkhood at least three months, as seems likely, he cannot have resumed his throne before December 20; and if we allow time for preparations the campaign cannot have begun before January 1362. If the campaign lasted only a

7) The apparent sequence of events is a little puzzling, because the statement at I/5-8 sounds as if the Footprint were already installed, completed and in worship before the stone was installed on the hill. The probable explanation is that the passage at I/5-15 refers to the state of affairs at the time the primary text was composed, whereas the rest of the primary text is retrospective.
few months, he may have gone to reside at Sõn Gvè in the same year, 1362; if it lasted longer, he probably went there in 1363. To obtain the date of his return to Sukhodaya, we must add 6 in order to account, by the traditional arithmetic, for the 'seven years' he spent at Sõn Gvè, which would mean he stayed there at least until 1368, or perhaps until 1369. By using the tightest possible schedule, we arrive at a date of 1368 for his return to Sukhodaya; if we allow a little more leeway it would be 1369. Whichever of these years we choose for his return to Sukhodaya would then presumably be the year he climbed Mount Sumanaküta to worship the Footprint and added the postscript; but if he did not do so until some months after his return, a date of 1370 would be possible.

In order to glimpse the significance of Mahádharmarāja's campaign to Nán, we may refer briefly to the history of Nán's relations with Sukhodaya, which we have discussed elsewhere in more detail. The principality of Nán and Blua (modern Pua) was the seat of the Kāv (Gāo) branch of the Tai people. In the late 13th century, when it was tributary to Sukhodaya, its capital was still located at Blua in the upper reaches of the Nán Valley, some 50 km. upstream from the present site of Nán. In Lödaiya's reign the principality was detached from Sukhodaya, perhaps unwillingly, and for a time maintained a precarious independence. In Mahádharmarāja's reign it re-entered the orbit of Sukhodaya, not as a tributary but as an ally. Judging from the Nán Chronicle (NC), Mahádharmarāja was on very friendly terms with Kár Môah, who was ruler of Nán and Blua from 1351 to 1361, and who claimed suzerainty over Brê (ùwi). We have some evidence that

8) Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 3, JSS 57/1, pp. 57-107. Several corrections are now necessary in that article. At p. 59, line 13, Riíma Gamh(ai's probable regnal dates are c. 1279–c. 1298. At p. 63, line 1, 'November 1361' should be changed to 'September 1361.'

9) NC (Nán Chronicle), พาณฑ์นาราธัณฑ์, ประสรษรัชกาลพระน , Bangkok, B.E. 2461, pp. 82-85; NC (tr.), The Nán Chronicle, translated by Prasert Churatana, ed. by D.K. Wyatt, Ithaca, 1966. 9-11; cf. JSS 57/1, p. 61 f. Note that in the dates in this section of the chronicle there is a discrepancy of 2 years between the numeral in Cullasakaraja and the designation in terms of the ten and twelve year cycles. Supposing that the cyclical names of the years correspond to the years of the same name elsewhere, the CS dates in the NC have to be reduced by 2 years in order to correspond to those in use elsewhere, and the same adjustment has to be made when transposing them into the Christian Era. In the English translation of NC, Professor Wyatt has transposed them accordingly, and in the present article we shall follow him. See JSS 57/1, p. 57 note 1; cf. ibid., p. 105 note 90.
Mahādharmarājā I's Chief Queen, who gave birth to the future Mahādharmarājā II in 1356, was a granddaughter of Kār Mōaṅ (she is very likely the same lady who is mentioned in Inscr. 8 at III/5-8). In 1357 Kār Mōaṅ moved his capital from Blua to Jē Heṅ, across the river from the present site of Nān. It may be guessed that one of the reasons for the move was to be nearer Sukhodaya, and within easier range of Mahādharmarājā's assistance. Not very long afterward there was some sort of trouble at Brē, perhaps a revolt against Kār Mōaṅ's authority. Kār Mōaṅ may have requested Mahādharmarājā's help to restore order in the vassal state: at least, as we gather from Inscr. 9 (l/15 f), Mahādharmarājā took an army to Brē in 1359 or 1360 and stayed there seven months.

The trouble at Brē, whatever it was, may have been stirred up or encouraged by Prince Paramarājā of Subarṇāpuri.

In 1361, probably while Mahādharmarājā was in the monkhood, an alarming event occurred. According to NC, a person 'from the south' named Khun Indā (ქჰინდა) arrived at Nān with a valuable piece of cloth to present to the ruler. Kār Mōaṅ, not knowing the cloth was poisoned, accepted it; and as soon as he touched it he fell dead. NC does not say who Khun Indā was, but the statement that he was from the south may mean he came from Subarṇāpuri.

Very likely the purpose of Mahādharmarājā's campaign to Nān around 1362 was to restore order there and set the murdered ruler's son on the throne. At any rate, according to NC, Kār Mōaṅ was succeeded by his son Phā Kōṅ. This might not have been possible without Mahādharmarājā's intervention.

Why did he go to reside at Sōt Gvē for 'seven years'? Perhaps we can find a clue to the answer in two of the Pali chronicles composed by monks at Chieng Mai.

10) See JSS 56/2, p. 218; JSS 57/1, p. 48 and note 42 pp. 48-51 and notes 42, 54, 55; ibid., pp. 64, 67.
11) See above, note 9.
12) NC, 84 f.; NC (tr.), 11; cf. JSS 57/1, 63.
13) NC, 85; NC (tr.), 11; JSS 57/1, 63.
The first is the Sihingabuddhanidana (S), which is thought to date from the early 15th century. It gives the history of a statue called Sihingabuddharupa or Buddha Sihinga, ‘the Ceylon Buddha’, which was evidently regarded as the palladium of Sukhodaya in the 14th century: according to popular belief, it appears, anyone who had it in his possession should be able to gain control of the kingdom. S tells how the statue was made long ago in Ceylon in miraculous circumstances, how it was brought to Sukhodaya by way of Nagara Śrī Dharmarāja many centuries later, how the successive kings of Sukhodaya worshiped it, and how ‘King Aṭṭhakalideyya surnamed Dharmarāja’ [i.e. Mahādhammarāja I] served it constantly, took pleasure in studying the Scriptures, and devoted himself entirely to protecting his kingdom and his people. The text continues as follows:

‘Then the King of Ayodaya [Ayodhya, – Ayudhya] named Rāmādhipati, seeing his zeal, went to Dvisākhanagara, seized the city and placed it under the rule of his own son Teja. Aṭṭhakalideyya begged him for mercy; and when he had sworn a solemn oath to him, Rāmādhipati gave him Dvisākha. Aṭṭhakalideyya, taking the Sihinga image with him, went to Dvisākha, where he continued to worship it constantly. Throughout his life this king reigned with justice; and when he died Dvisākhanagara fell into Rāmādhipati’s hands again.’

The name Dvisākha, ‘confluence’, is of course the Pali translation of Sōn Gvē; and as we have seen that Mahādhammarāja resided at Sōn Gvē in the 1360’s we have an approximate date for the incident, for what it may be worth. ‘Teja’ is Paramarāja, who was Rāmādhipati’s brother-in-law, not his son. The ‘solemn oath’ that Mahādhammarāja swore to Rāmādhipati has usually been interpreted as an act of vassa-lage; but as it cannot have been that, it may have something to do with

14) The Pali text of the pertinent passage, together with a French translation, is given by Coedes at BEFEO XVII/2, pp. 41-43. For the approximate date that S was composed, see Coedes at BEFEO XV/3, p. 6.
15) Coedes (BEFEO XVII/2, p. 43), following Prince Damrong, identifies Dvisākha with Sargapuri in Jayanāda province (cf. below, note 19); but it seems impossible that any part of that province could ever have belonged to Mahādhammarāja I; and there is no reason to doubt that the names Dvisākha and Sōn Gvē are doublets, both referring to Bīṣṇuloka.
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the pact of friendship we have assumed existed between Mahādharma-rāja and Rāmādhhipati.¹⁶

Jinakālamāli (J), composed in 1516, is the work of a much more careful historian than S. The accuracy of J’s account of events at Chiang Mai has been repeatedly confirmed by the evidence of inscriptions.¹⁷ J’s account of the ‘Sīhāla statue’ (i.e. the Buddha Sihīhiga) belongs to one of the ‘inserted narratives’, some of which have weaknesses the author had no means of checking, but it nevertheless contains useful information. After relating the earlier history of the statue, J tells us what happened to it in the reign of ‘King Lideyya who was called Dhammarāja because he studied the Tipiṭaka [i.e. Mahādharma-rāja I]. Here is what it tells us:

‘At that time, it is said, there was a famine at Jayanādapura. Rāmādhhipati, the King of Ayojhapūra, came from Kamboja and seized the city on the pretext of going there to sell rice. After appointing one of his high officials named Vattiteja, who was ruler of Suvaṃabhūmi, to rule Jayanādapura, he returned to Ayojhapūra. Dhammarāja, sending many presents to Rāmādhhipati, asked him for Jayanādapura; Rāmādhhipati gave it to him; and Vattiteja went back to Suvaṃabhūmi. Then Dhammarāja, after appointing his younger sister Mahādevi to rule Sukhodaya and his minister Tipannā to rule Vajirapākara, went to Jayanādapura with the Sīhāla statue and continued to worship it. Upon the death of King Rāmādhhipati, ruler of Kamboja and Ayojhapura, Vattiteja left Suvaṃabhūmi and seized the kingdom of Kamboja. Then after Dhammarāja of Jayanādapura died, Vattiteja left Ayojhapura, took Jayanādapura, and removed the Sīhāla statue to Ayojhapura, where he continued to worship it.”¹⁸

¹⁶) See JSS 61/1, p. 78.
¹⁷) Coedes, BEFEO XXV /1, p. 11 f.
¹⁸) For the Pali text and French translation, see Coedes, BEFEO XVII /2, pp. 37-41, and BEFEO XXV /1, pp. 46, 47, 98-101; for Professor Jayawickrama’s English translation, see The Sheaf of Garlands of the Epochs of the Conqueror, London, 1968, p. 120-126.
In this passage ‘Jayanāda’ is Sōn Gvè (Biṣṇuloka), just as it is in the 15th-century poem Yuan Pātī;¹⁹ Ayojjhā is Ayudhya; Kamboja is Labapuri²⁰; Suvānabhūmi is the old name of Subarṇapurī; Tipaṇṭa looks like a Pali metamorphosis of the Siamese title  anvī , and Vajirāpākāra is the Pali translation of the toponym Kāmbēṇ Bejra (Gampēng Pet).

In both S and J, Rāmādhampati seizes Sōn Gvè and turns it over to Paramarājā to rule. But it would be out of keeping with everything we know about Rāmādhampati’s policy toward Sukhodaya for him to lay hold of the city. It is much more likely that the chroniclers have mistakenly attributed the vassal’s action to the sovereign; and that Paramarājā, taking advantage of Rāmādhampati’s absence from the capital on a campaign elsewhere, and of Mahādhammarājā’s temporary renunciation of the throne to enter the monkhood, seized Sōn Gvè on his own initiative.

If, as we have suggested, the purpose of Mahādhammarājā’s campaign in the Nān Valley around 1362 was to undo the mischief Paramarājā had done at Nān, the continuation of the campaign to the Sāk Valley may have been intended not only to regain lost territory but also to outflank Paramarājā at Sōn Gvè and show him that his position was untenable. That, plus a reminder to Rāmādhampati that his agreement with Mahādhammarājā was being violated by his vassal’s greed, may be the reason for Paramarājā’s withdrawal, which enabled Mahādhammarājā to take up his residence at Sōn Gvè.

Both S and J, without precisely saying so, seem to imply that Mahādhammarājā died at Sōn Gvè. In fact it is much more likely that he did not: in Inscr. 8 (IV/4 f.) he has come back to Sukhodaya after seven years at Sōn Gvè, and there is no reason to believe he ever went to reside there again.

S’s statement that Rāmādhampati retook Sōn Gvè after Mahādhammarājā’s death is probably wrong too. J’s sequence of events, which is more plausible, is as follows:

¹⁹) See Griswold and Prasert nā Nagara, A Fifteenth-Century Siamese Historical Poem, to appear in the Felicitation Volume for Professor D.G.E. Hall’s eightieth birthday. As Prince Damrong did not realize ‘Jayanāda’ was one of the old names of Sōn Gvè, it was natural enough for him to connect it with the modern place-name Jayanāda (เจริญ), and to suppose that it referred to the former site of Jayanāda, which was at Sargapuri. This in turn led him to the false identification of Dvisīkha.

²⁰) cf. JSS 59/1, p. 207 note 49.
(1) Rāmādhhipati dies;
(2) Paramarājā conquers Labapuri;
(3) Mahādharmarājā dies;
(4) Paramarājā seizes Sōn Gvè.

We know from AA/LP (the ‘Luang Prasert’ Recension of the Annals of Ayudhya) that Rāmādhhipati died in 1369, leaving the throne to his son Rāmesvara, the ruler of Labapuri; in 1370 Paramarājā seized the throne of Ayudhya and sent Rāmesvara back to Labapuri to rule as his vassal; and in 1375, after making several attacks on Sukhodaya’s outlying cities, Paramarājā took Biṣṇuloka (Sōn Gvè). AA/LP does not mention Mahādharmarājā’s death at all; but the sequence of events given by J corresponds pretty well to the information in AA/LP so far as it goes.

To the extent that we may depend on a generally trustworthy chronicle, when there is no epigraphic evidence to contradict it, we are therefore inclined to agree that Mahādharmarājā died between 1370, when Paramarājā seized the throne of Ayudhya, and 1375, when Paramarājā took Sōn Gvè.²¹

We now return to our discussion of Inscr. 8. In the absence of a legible date, we have calculated that Mahādharmarājā went to Sōn Gvè around 1362, and remained there until 1368 or 1369. At III/12-19 he tells us in brief what he did while he was there. He repaired the Mahādhātu,²² planted a śrimahābodhi tree, and (built a wall?) of laterite around (the precinct). He built an irrigation canal from Sōn Gvè to Sukhodaya to feed (water to) upland and lowland farms, so that areca palms and other trees could be planted, fish could be caught for food, and the people made happy and contented everywhere. Though he does not say so, the earth removed to make the canal would naturally be built into an embankment alongside and a road placed on top, which would be

²¹ cf. JSS 59/1, p. 160 and note 4.
²² This Mahādhātu at Biṣṇuloka was certainly not the monument now known by that name, which is a typical Ayudhyan prāng built by Paramatralokanātha (r. 1448-88); according to the ‘Luang Prasert’ Recension of the Annals of Ayudhya (sub anno 844) he built it in 1482. The Mahādhātu referred to in our inscription could be an earlier monument that stood on the same site. Or else it might be the Cetiya Dīn (1971cms) at Biṣṇuloka (see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, Bangkok, 1968, p. 33 and Fig. 27).
useful not only for commerce but also for defence. The rest of the passage shows, once again, Mahādharmarāja’s constant concern for the material well-being of his people, and his wish (like Rāma Gaṃghēn’s) to encourage the planting of fruit trees to increase their income.23

At Ill/19-26 Mahādharmarāja gives the limits of his kingdom at the time he added the postscript (c. 1368-70). North of the River Nān it touches the land of Cau Brañña Pha Kon, the ruler of Nān and Blua. South of the River Nān it touches the territory of a Cau Brañña whom he describes as his ‘younger brother’, but whose name is illegible. To the east it reaches all the way to the Khōh, i.e. the Mē Khōh, and the land of Brañña Dāv Fā Nōm. The statement about the western limit is mutilated, and only a few words can be read: Ṡuñhā, ‘prince who is the son’ then, after a lacuna, Ṡuñhā, ‘up to Moān ...’

According to NC, Pha Kon was ruler of Nān and Blua from 1361 to 1386.24 Presumably the portion of the River Nān that formed the boundary was the stretch where, after flowing more or less southward from the town of Nān, it turns southwest toward Utaratittha.

Fā Nōm, or Fā Num as the name is usually written, was King of Lān Jāh (Laos) from 1353 to 1374. Probably Mahādharmarāja’s kingdom extended eastward to the right bank of the Mē Khōh opposite Viāñ Candra (Viñg Jān, Vientiane), and presumably included all or part of the present province of Hnūh Gāy.

The most tantalizing lacuna is in the statement regarding Mahādharmarāja’s neighbor to the south, ‘Cau Brañña ............ who is his younger brother’. As no mere princeling would bear the august title of Cau Brañña, which in those days was reserved for independent monarchs, this neighbor is necessarily a king of Ayudhya. Mahādharmarāja may well have regarded Rāmādhipati as his ‘younger brother’, i.e. a cousin belonging to a junior branch of his family, or even an unrelated ruler who acceded later than he himself. If he means Rāmādhipati, the latest possible date for the postscript to Inscr. 8 would be 1369, the year in which Rāmādhipati died. He could hardly mean Rāṃśvāra, who was

23) cf. Inscr. 1: II/2 ff., II/34, III/2 f. and III/5 f.; see JSS 59/2, pp. 198, 200, 298, 213, 214.
24) See JSS 57/1, pp. 63-65.
so much younger than himself that he would be more likely to refer to him as his ‘nephew’ than as his younger brother. It is possible that he means Paramarājā; and if ‘younger brother’ sounds like too friendly a term to be applied to so hostile a person, it could be justified as a formality based on Rāmādhipati’s marriage to Paramarājā’s sister. If Paramarājā is meant, the earliest possible date for the postscript is 1370.

Though we cannot suggest any plausible reconstruction of the lacuna regarding Mahādharmanājā’s neighbor to the west, we can identify him with virtual certainty as Baṇā U, who acceded to the throne of Rāmanānadesa some time between 1345 and 1353, and died between 1385 and 1387. Very likely the dividing line between Mahādharmanājā’s kingdom and Rāmanānadesa was somewhat vaguely defined, running north and south through the mountains that form the boundary between Siam and Burma today.

At IV/4-16 Mahādharmanājā tells us of his return from Sōn Gvē to Sukhodaya with his army, escorted by a retinue of persons from thirteen different places, which he then lists. These persons are presumably his vassals who furnished contingents for his army. Here is the list of places, spelt as in the inscription, together with our proposed identifications:

1. Sralvaṅ [between Sukhodaya and Sōn Gvē]
2. Sōn Gvē [Bīṣṇuloka]
3. Pāk Yaṅ [at or near the confluence of the Yam (Yom) with the Nān, in the present province of Bicitra]
4. Brah Pāṅ [Pra Bāṅ, i.e. Nagara Svarga]
5. Jākanray [on the left bank of the Ping, at or near Gampeng Pet]
6. Subarrabhāva [Chiang Tōng, on the left bank of the Ping, near the present town of Taṅk]
7. Nagara Brāh Jum [Nagara Jum, Nakhon Chum, on the right bank of the Ping diagonally across from Gampeng Pet; see Inscr. 3]
8. Mōaṅ .. āi [?]
9. Mōaṅ Bāṅ [Pāṅ Bāṅ, Bāṅ Pāṅ, on the Pra Ruang Highway about one-third of the way from Gampeng Pet to Sukhodaya; see JSS 61/1, p. 107 note 113]

25) See JSS 60/1, p. 23, Table II.
10. Moañ... [?]  
11. Moañ Rāi [in the present province of Uttaratittha; see JSS 60/1, p. 85 and note 16]  
12. Moañ Sagā [perhaps in the upper valley of the Śīk, north of Lāṃ Pā Cāy; see JSS 59/2, p. 219 and note 129]  
13. Lāṃ Pā Cāy [at or near Hām Kāu (Lom Gao, Ṣāk)ī), on the Śīk River north of Hām Śīk (Lom Šāk, Ṣākī) in Bējrapūrān Province; see JSS 59/2, p. 218, note 129].

The inscription contains political implications which we could interpret better if we knew the date of the postscript more precisely. We think it most likely to have been added in 1368 or 1369, but it could have been in 1370. We have guessed that Paramarājā seized Śōṅ Gvē in 1361, while Mahādharmarājā was in the monkhood; even if our guess is wrong, it requires no imagination to believe that Paramarājā was eager to pounce on Śōṅ Gvē whenever he might get the chance. We suppose that Mahādharmarājā’s purpose in going to Śōṅ Gvē around 1362 to reside was to thwart any such attempt. But if that was his purpose, why did he withdraw his army and return with it to Sukhodaya ‘seven years’ later?

Two very different explanations may be considered.

The first is that Paramarājā forced him to demilitarize Śōṅ Gvē in exchange for some kind of guarantee, either near the end of Rāmadhipati’s reign when Rāmadhipati was fully occupied elsewhere (say in 1368 or 1369), or soon after Paramarājā seized the throne of Ayudhya in 1370. If that is the right explanation, Mahādharmarājā must have known that Śōṅ Gvē was doomed; whatever guarantee he may have received in return was a bad bargain; but he may have had no alternative.

The other possibility is that Mahādharmarājā may have thought Śōṅ Gvē was now secure, at least for the time being. If the postscript was written soon after Paramarājā seized the throne of Ayudhya, Mahādharmarājā might well expect the usurper to be too much occupied for several years consolidating his own power in the kingdom of Ayudhya to think seriously of attacking. The entry in AA/LP for CS 733 (=1371) stating that Paramarājā went to the north country and conquered it entirely (or: went to the northern cities and conquered them all) would be mystifying if, as some people think, it meant he conquered the Sukhodayan country at this early date; a more plausible interpretation is that it refers to his consolidation of power in the kingdom of Ayudhya north of the capital.
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Text

(1) "ева нё́яйе сяа съяна вьапа рако....
(2) уаахь кхвагь нёяйе пяпв нёяя арьо.
(3) сивягвъ гуаахь нёяйе нёяя арьо.
(4) ошв нёяйе сяа вьапа рако(к) нёяя арьо.
(5) дивь пънвъ вьапа рако(к) нёяя нёяя нёяжь нёяя.
(6) дива влнънъ влгъ(д) нёяя арьо.
(7) тьвпъ(къ) врпвъ нёяжь нёяя.
(8) дивъ впвльвъ нёяя вгънъ влд.
(9) врпвъ врпвъ нёяя вгънъ влд.
(10) дивъ впвльвъ нёяя вгънъ влд.
(11) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(12) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(13) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(14) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(15) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(16) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(17) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(18) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(19) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(20) врпвъ врпвъ нёяйе нёяя вгънъ влд.
(๑) สั่งศึกนั้นเสนอynaเกยูกิน
(๒) มน праваสัมพันธ์(น)พระ(ุษุ_ANGLE)เจริญเดิมหนึ่ง
(๓) (อัจฉร)ชำนาญภูมิปรกติคนควายใจตนเอง(ช)
(๔) (ยา)หน่วยละสังกัดสัมพันธ์คน....
(๕) ... الجمعเล็กเล็ก fab ขยาย fab ๑๓๔
(๖) ... เที่ยว...(ก)เก้า...(พ)ศร(ขุนค...)...
(๗) ... เจ้าวิรริตบุกแถลงพรานาย
(๘) (ศพฐ)พระธรรมราชียาราชยาง
(๙) ..... ขนาด.
(๑๐) ...... เข้า น........
(๑๑) ...... ส...................(ต)

คำว่า ๒

(๑) ถวายทหารแก่
(๒) เมื่องสุโขทัยแก่
(๓) เก้าเจริญมาก
(๔) มหานาคน
(๕) กบดอยปกครอง
(๖) ทรงถวายปกครอง
(๗) กบดอยปกครอง
(๘) รัฐบาลคฤห
(๙) มีทายปริศบ
(๑๐) เนธบดอยคฤห
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(๑) บุทกทรงปีก
(๑๒) ทงบกททงกส
(๑๓) กลางทวายลเท
(๑๔) ธาบปายชวน
(๑๕) ท่ากขันพดปย
(๑๖) ช่ปิตบวเปน
(๑๗) เหลนทุกมน
(๑๘) โศกชมอน
(๑๙) สายกรรภสรธ
(๒๐) (ก) ขุนจำปาทก
(๒๑) (ม) กงกลอภย
(๒๒) (ค) งสิหคงกิน
(๒๓) (จ) กกลอเหมะ
(๒๔) (สก) ราชการ ๑๒๖๑ ปี
(๒๕) (น) มีพระสิรบาน
(๒๖) (พล) กษณชินปร
(๒๗) (ศ) ถวิโนเขรสุ
(๒๘) (มน) ภูริบรพ
(๒๙) ...........

ด้านที่ ๓

(๑) ค่เลยน ไว... เลย.... แคม(นาม)
(๒) ก. ยอไกะหอน(เอน) ไทยวโลก(ก)
(๓) สมน.. .... ไคุ... น...
เมืองศรีสะเกษใหญ่ bí hai ...
ภูมิพงษ์ จันทร์กิจไชย ๑๓...(เทว)
อุณาแดง...พลตรียงค์ศักดิ์(ชัย)
บาทภักษาสวัสดีประวัติภูมิ
ไม่ทราบนะบาง ๑........
พระปุวิตรีราชพงษา
(๒๐) กรมราชสำนักงานแพทย์ไปปรากฏอย่างนั้น
(๒๑) ...(บัน)ไคลินที่กรุงยงคุมเมือง(ก)ขาด...
(๒๒) ...อย่างพระสรรเสริญซึ่งไปอยู่(ใน)
(๒๓) (ไม่)องค์(ก)ราชบุรี(บ)ปุระ
(๒๔) ราชวิทยาเทคนิคชา.. นาง. ย. มา...
(๒๕) ก. ภูมิพงษ์เจริญสิทธิ์. ซบ.. ท. ย
(๒๖) ก. ภูมิพงษ์เจริญสิทธิ์(ก)มาท่านุชิไชย...
(๒๗) ใบไม้ปุระกามาปุระ........
(๒๘) ...ท่านที่กันเย็นนั้น(ค)....(ฤ)
(๒๙) ก. ภูมิพงษ์เจริญสิทธิ์(ก)เจняเจน(ก)เจน
(๓๐) ภูมิพงษ์เจริญสิทธิ์แม่บัว(ย)...
(๓๑) เจняเจนบ้านเกิดคนเจ็นเจริญสิทธิ์(บ)....
(๓๒) (หา)....ผู้เมือง ๐ เจ็นท่านเมือง...
(๓๓) ..เจ็นท่านพระสุขทวายฟ้าอม....
(๓๔) .........ช. เจ็นบ้านกิ่ง....
(๓๕) .....เจ็นเมือง....
(๓๖) .....ผา....
(๑) หนอนยายน้ำคอก
(๒) วัลลิภท่านุเบศ
(๓) ธรรมบุตสกุลสมพงษ์
(๔) อยู่ในสมองกล
(๕) วัยเจริญเรื่อง
(๖) สมคณทวารคส
(๗) เจ้าสมอแตก
(๘) ราชคุณภูมิ
(๙) ราชสวัสดิภูมิ
(๑๐) ครุฑชูเมือง
(๑๑) เมืองพานเมือง
(๑๒) เมืองราชเมือง(ส)
(๑๓) คำเมืองปลวกษา(ก)
(๑๔) เทปริปาร์จ(ศกิ)
(๑๕) ถนนขยายพระบาง(ก)
(๑๖) สะพานแคนหน้า(ก)
(๑๗) กวาริชเทวราช(ก)
(๑๘) ถนนหน้าจอม
(๑๙) (เช่า)ขนบุกแก่นนิมิตร
(๒๐) ราชวิทยาเทวราช
This hill is called Sumanakūṭaparvata. It is so named because (an emissary) went to make impressions of the Footprint of our Lord the Buddha which is stamped on top of Mount Sumanakūṭaparvata in distant Lankadvipa, and brought them to establish on top of this hill so that everyone might get a sight of this imprint of our Lord Buddha's Footsole with the full hundred and eight signs in bright color and that all divinities might salute it, honor it and do homage to it. May they [attain] the happy condition of Buddhahood!

How can a person attain the happy conditions? For one thing, if he is born as a human being, and in the natural course of events obtains the enjoyment of happiness as...
cakravartin king,\textsuperscript{31} becomes \ldots \ldots and does not get any misfortune\textsuperscript{32} 

(Secondly) if he is born \ldots \ldots that happy condition.\textsuperscript{33} (Thirdly) \ldots \ldots all \ldots and becomes a monk \ldots \ldots very [many?] rich men, monks\textsuperscript{34} \ldots \ldots go\textsuperscript{35} \ldots then he will attain \ldots in that happy condition without fail.\textsuperscript{36} If anyone climbs up to the top of this Mount Sumanakṣāparvatā and worships the imprint of our Lord Buddha's Footsole with firm faith that these three happy conditions \ldots \ldots (can be attained), he will attain them without fail.\textsuperscript{37}

[\textsuperscript{I/25-31.}] In śaka(rāja) 1281 \ldots in the eleventh month\textsuperscript{38}, at the rūṣa of Vaiśākha\textsuperscript{39}, \ldots \ldots Cau, who had received the rājabhiseka and

\textsuperscript{31) cakravartirāja (I/13), for cakravartirāja, a 'wheel-turning king', i.e. one whose power extends as far as his chariot-wheels can roll. A man who has accumulated enough merit and understanding in past lives has the choice of becoming a cakravartin king or a Buddha. If he chooses the first, it is a form of manussasampatti; if the second, it is nibbānasampatti. Few persons have qualified themselves in past lives sufficiently to be given such a splendid choice in this life; but of course everyone alive today has made enough merit in past lives to have been reborn in this one as a human being. Even the most wretched human being is considered to be far better off than the happiest of the sub-human creatures. Whether he is rich or poor, robust or sickly, and so on, depends on his accumulated merits.

\textsuperscript{32) i'll (I/14), for i'll, Khmer kheii, 'trouble', 'adversity', 'want', 'misfortune'. Cf. the expression mii'lli'll, 'suffering and misfortune'.

\textsuperscript{33) This sentence seems to refer to devasampatti.

\textsuperscript{34) Our translation of mii (I/19) as 'monks' is conjectural as the context is lost.

\textsuperscript{35) Conjectural translation of mii (I/20).

\textsuperscript{36) This sentence evidently refers to nibbānasampatti, but because of the lacunae it is impossible to know just what it said. To attain nibbānasampatti, one has to be a human male and become a monk. The 'rich men' (sreṭhi, I/19, Pali sēṭhi, Skt. sreṭhīn) may be lay supporters of the monkhood. As the word is a noun, it cannot be modified by the adverb vādi (I/19), mod. vādi, 'very'. We therefore conjecture that the lacuna preceding sreṭhi contained some expression meaning 'many' or the like. The expression that we translate as 'without fail' is vādi (I/21), for vādi; it reappears at I/25.

\textsuperscript{37) sc. the merit he obtains from worshipping the Footprint will earn him whichever of the three happy conditions he chooses; cf. Inschr. 3, I/12 ff. (JSS 61/1, pp. 87, 95-96).

\textsuperscript{38) Around October, 1359.

\textsuperscript{39) (b)aiśra(kharkṣa).

\textsuperscript{40) sc. Lidaiya, cf. 3 : I/3-7 (see JSS 61/1, pp. 87, 94).
been given the name Śrīsūryavatpīśa Dharmarājādhirāja, did... stone
sacred... hill

[II/1-23.] The road from the city of Sukhodaya to this hilltop was magnificently decorated. On both sides of the road, kalpavṛkṣas were set up, garlands of flowers were hung; torches, candles and lamps were lighted, incense was burned whose fragrance was wafted everywhere, flags and banners were erected; on both sides of the road trays of areca fruits and betel leaves were hung. (Everyone) did homage, rejoiced and danced, making merry in every way. They...

41) ឬី (I/28). The whole expression can be used as an intensifying auxiliary preceding a main verb, as is the case at III/6 and at 3: I/65. But either ឬី or ី can be used as an emphatic particle. Apart from that, ី can also be used as a main verb, meaning 'to do', 'to make', 'to adorn', etc.

42) ផានិ (I/31-II/1), Khmer laṃtap, 'prepared' (cf. 4: II/19, JSS 61/1, pp. 133, 139); ស្ត្រី (II/3-5), 'in an extremely beautiful manner'.

43) ដឹង (II/5), a word that is not at present used in Siamese in this sense; but cf. ដឹង, 'edge', 'margin'. ដឹង now means 'place' (McFarland).

44) For the kalpavṛkṣa (here written kallpavṛkṣa, II/7) see JSS 61/1, p. 139, n. 35 (Inscr. 4, II/19).

45) ដឹង (II/8), Khmer ranyval (cf. 4: II/25, JSS 61/1, pp. 133, 139).

46) Though ដឹង (II/13) now usually means a place or district, the only possible meaning in the context of this passage is 'sides'. The word is probably related to ដឹង, which now means a river-bank or the shore of a waterway.

47) This passage should be compared with 4: II/18-20: brah pāda kamratan aś pre laṃtap sā lāja dhūpa pūspa kāulpavṛkṣa sañ... thve pūjā trāpa mārgga, 'His Majesty caused areca fruits, grilled rice, candles, incense, flowers and kalpavṛkṣas to be prepared'; 4: II/25-26: mvat pānīlay pānīlay jāvanīkā ranyval vāñy, 'he took the trouble to set up screens and garlands of flowers'; and 5: II/29-30: កូនូម្ន្ល ក្ដើប្ដូម ក្ដើប្ដូម, 'flowers and fragrant torches... to do honor to him, on both sides (of the road).'

48) ប្ដូម (II/16) = Khmer birām, to rejoice.

49) សី (II/16); សី is the expanded form of ី, 'to dance'; សី means 'to caper.' We take the whole expression to be equivalent to ី, 'to dance' (McFarland, p. 373).

50) For the expression ម្ន្ល ិសារ (II/17), cf. ម្ន្ល, 'thus', 'in that way,' 'therefore'.
sounds of praise and worship, and also with orchestral music, gongs and drums, making a loud enough noise to start a landslide.

[II/24-29.] In the year of the boar, when the Footprint was brought up and installed on Mount Sumanakôparavarta, nine days so that everyone might do homage to this Footprint. [Braûa Liûdai, who is the ruler of] Šri Sajjanaśīla Sukhodaya, himself made the calculations and himself noted them down.

[III/5-8.] In the year 12xx, the Braûa and Lady caused the Footprint to be engraved, and invited everyone to rejoice also with them.

[III/8-19.] In the year 1xxx, Braûa Śrīsūryavamśa Mahādharmarakṣādhiṣṭa advanced with his army to Nān and pacified the whole territory, as well as that of to the east, and the whole (valley of the) Brah Śak, completely. So he went to reside at Mōaī.

51) tūrya, Skt. tūrya, 'a musical instrument'; for tūrya, see JSS 59/2, p. 210 note 70. For this whole passage, cf. Inscr. II, II/18-20; JSS 59/2, pp. 199 and 210-211: tūrya translates tūrya, tūrya, tūrya, 'a musical instrument'; modern tūrya means 'a high numeral', 'a calculation', etc. It is hard to say what these calculations were; they may have had something to do with the calendar or astrology; cf. Inscr. 3: 1/65: śa rī sūrya vamś a ma hādha r ma raja, who made the investigation, and the reckoning, who calculated, so as to know it so exactly and so thoroughly? (See JSS 61/1, pp. 90, 103.)

52) The year of the boar, M.S. 1281, is the same year mentioned at I/25. See note 38.

53) The river Śak; for the campaign, cf. above, p. 107.
Sônh Gvê, repaired the Mahâdhâtu, planted a Śrimahâbodhi tree ....... [and built a wall] of laterite around (the precinct). He built an irrigation canal from Sônh Gvê all the way to Sukhodaya to feed (water to) upland and lowland farms, (so that people) could plant areca palms and ......... catch fish to eat, and be made happy and [contented] everywhere.

[III/19-26.] North of the River Nân (his kingdom) touches the land of Cau Brañâ Pâh Köh, the ruler of Mônh Nân Mônh Blyva ... South of the River Nân (his kingdom) touches the land of Cau Brañâ ... who is his younger brother. To the east, it reaches all the way to the Köhn (and the land of) Brañâ Dâv Fû Nôm. [To the west] Cau who is the son to Mônh.

59) l1 (III/13); equivalent to the, 'to repair' (Pallegoix).
60) vïhû (III/15-16). Coedes, evidently taking vî as a doublet of vi, translates 'éleva une muraille', and adds a footnote: 'Il s'agit sans doute d'une simple levée de terre, faite dans un but d'irrigation ou de défense' (Recueil, p. 128). In Taï Yvan, however, the word vû still means an irrigation ditch. The earth removed when digging the ditch is naturally piled up into an embankment along the side (hence the expression vûvû).
61) We assume that (III/16-17) should be reconstructed as vû, modern vû, 'to feed.'
62) vêhûlô (III/17), 'plant areca palms and plant ...'; the lacuna must have contained the name of some other sort of fruit trees. The rest of III/17 and the beginning of III/18, which are now totally illegible, were read by Coedes as lôvihû, which he translated as '(débrousser) la jungle d'herbes et de rotins', '(clear) the jungle of weeds and rattans'. But in his reading there is room for only two or three letters between lô and lô, so it is hard to see how this space could have contained the name of the second sort of fruit trees plus a verb meaning 'to clear'.
63) In accordance with Coedes's suggestion (Recueil, p. 132 note 2) we reconstruct lôhihû (III/18) as lôhôhûlô, modern lôhôhûlô, lit. 'cool in body, cool in mind', hence comfortable, happy, contented. The same expression occurs in the Traibhûmikâthâ (p. 613).
64) lô (III/19), mod. lô (l), is here evidently used in the sense of Lô thôi or thôk, 'to touch'.
65) Bîu, mod. Pû (û or ù). For this and the place-names that follow, see above, p. 110 f.
66) The lacuna presumably contained this ruler's name. The reading pa....hûs... is very doubtful.
67) The Mê Khôd.
constant[ly leading everyon]e to perform merito­rious deeds without missing a single time.\(^{70}\)

[IV/4-21.] After staying at Sōn ṇ Gvē for seven years, he brought his army (back to Sukhodaya), with a retinue\(^{71}\) of persons from Sralvan, Sōn ṇ Gvē, Pāki Yav, Braḥ Pān, Jākanrav, Subarṇabhāva, Nāgara Braḥ Juṛ̣, Mōan..., Mōan Bān, Mōan..., Mōan Rāṭ, Mōan Sagā and Mōan Lam Pā Cāy. He then came up to worship the Footprint which he himself had formerly placed on top of this Mount Sumanakīṭa. Then he engraved\(^{72}\) this additional inscription.

69) The lacuna may be longer, as it is uncertain how much more of the stone is lost.

70) This conclusion to the statement regarding the limits of Mahādharmarājā’s kingdom recalls the conclusion to the analogous statement in the second postscript to Rāma Gaṭhā’s inscription. See JSS 59/2, p. 202, lines 26-27, and page 220.

71) Literally ‘having the inhabitants of (the places named) as a retinue’ (लिङ्गक्षेत्र, IV/14). For the places, see p. 110 f.

72) अत्र (IV/20), ‘to write with an iron stylus’.
Fifteen or twenty years ago an inscribed gold leaf, simulating a page of a palm-leaf manuscript, was submitted to Maha Châm Dongâm-varqa for decipherment. It belonged to Mrs Hlin Prijajati, a resident of Old Sukhodaya, and was said to have been discovered by treasure-hunters at Vât Sraî Śri. The writing was in Siamese in Sukhodaya letters. Maha Châm did not publish it, but he retained his transcription and notes.

In 1964, upon the occasion of the opening of the Râma Gîmphên National Museum at Sukhodaya, the owner presented the gold leaf to His Majesty the King. It was later shown to Mr. Prasâra Puîîpragôn of the National Library, who made a new transcript, compared it with Maha Châm's old one, from which it differed very little, and published it in Šilpâkara VII/5, together with a version in modernized spelling (p. 88), and a photograph (facing p. 75). These are reprinted, without the photograph, as No. 94 in Prajum Šilacărîk bhâga di 4 (Bangkok, B.E. 2513).

The inscription records the erection of a cetiya in 1385 for the relics of Mahâdharmarâja, i.e. Mahâdharmarâja I. The date of his death is not known. If we are right in our estimate of the earliest date when he could have added the postscript to Inser. 8, he was certainly still alive in 1368 (see p. 103 ff.). It is clear from the inscription of Vât Jáî Lôm that the died several years before that monastery was founded, which was apparently in 1377, though it was not dedicated until 1384 (see JSS 59/1, 189-195). If we can rely on the sequence of events given in Jina-kâlamâli, and the dates given in AA/LP for two of these events, he was still alive when Paramarâja seized the throne of Ayudhya in 1370, but died before Paramarâja took Bîșnuloka in 1375 (see above, p. 108). Furthermore an old reading of a part of the Vât Jáî Phôak inscription (the portion of stone bearing this passage is now lost) suggests that Mahâdharmarâja died before January 1375 (see JSS 59/1, p. 158-169). We shall probably be safe in placing his death between 1368 and 1374, most likely between 1370 and 1374.

1) No. 9 on Map 3, JSS 57/1, p. 33.
2) See Šilpâkara, VII/5, p. 76 f.
That would mean that in 1385 he had been dead for at least 11 years, and perhaps a good deal longer. It might seem odd for his relics to have been kept so long without being deposited in a cetiya. Perhaps the delay could be explained by the acute danger in which his son Mahādharmarāja II found himself when Paramarāja began a series of attacks on Sukhodayan territory in the early 1370's and captured Bīṣṇuloka in 1375. Mahādharmarāja II may have preferred to keep his father's relics hidden in some place where he could pick them up quickly and take them with him in case he was forced to flee. (Rāma I, the founder of the present dynasty, took the same precaution with his father's relics.) After Mahādharmarāja II's surrender to Paramarāja in 1378, the relics may have remained in hiding until 1385, when Sukhodaya began to regain some semblance of independence.

On the other hand we have no assurance that all Mahādharmarāja's relics were deposited in the cetiya in 1385. They may have been divided among a number of persons, the largest share going to the eldest son, the rest to other members of the family and close associates. Sooner or later a cetiya would be built for the major share at Vāṭ Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya, which, like Vāṭ Śrī Sarbejñā at Ayudhya, was the normal place for the relics of deceased members of the royal family to be enshrined. In Inscription 40, which bears no legible date but can hardly be earlier than 1390, the King of Sukhodaya promises to give his nephew, the King of Ayudhya, free access to the Mahādhātu whenever he may wish to go there to worship Mahādharmarāja's relics (see JSS 58/1, p. 108).

The cetiya referred to in the gold leaf inscription was evidently built for a different share of the relics, the share belonging to the founder of the monument, who is described as 'the Braḥ Mahāsaṅgharāja Cau, the virtuous man who had been Mahādarmarāja's teacher' (lines 1-2). This is certainly the same person as the Mahāsāṁi Saṅgharāja from Bann (Martaban in Lower Burma), whose installation at Sukhodaya in 1361 is recounted at length in Inscriptions 4 and 5 (see JSS 61/1, pp. 133 f., 139 f., 150 f., 156 f.), and whose identification with
Medhāṅkara, author of the Lokappadipasāra, we think practically certain (see above, p. 95). As he was still at Sukhodaya in 1385, he would probably be the person referred to as 'the Braḥ Mahātherasaṅgharaṇa' around 1379 in the Inscription of Vāṭ Trabāṇ Jāh Phoak (1/18 ff.; see JSS 59/1, pp. 165, 168).

The founder would naturally deposit the gold-leaf inscription in the relic chamber of the cetiya. If it was really discovered at Vāṭ Sraḥ Śrī we should know for certain that the stupa there was the monument built by the Saṅgharāja in 1385; but the stated provenance of any object discovered by treasure-hunters is always open to doubt. In this case, however, we have some confirmatory evidence. The dimensions of the cetiya, as given in the inscription, show that it was extremely large. Apart from the Mahādhātu itself, which had been built long before, there are only two monuments at Sukhodaya which are large enough to correspond to the dimensions given. One is Vāṭ Janahsaṅgrāma, the other is Vāṭ Sraḥ Śrī.3 Both are bell-shaped stupas of 'Sinhalese' type, with square bases. The base of the stupa of Vāṭ Janahsaṅgrāma is 18 m. square, and stands on a platform 37 m. square. The base of the stupa of Vāṭ Sraḥ Śrī is 17.50 m. square, and stands on a stepped platform which measures 22.50 m. square at the top step. The monument described in the gold-leaf inscription was 'a square cetiya' (sc. a cetiya with a square base), 'twelve fathoms and two cubits in width'. If we take the Sukhodayan fathom at its value in the late 13th century (which is the only time for which we have any definite evidence), and adjust the other measures accordingly, we get about 23 m., which corresponds very closely to that of the top step of the platform at Vāṭ Sraḥ Śrī, but is quite different from that of either the base or the platform at Vāṭ Janahsaṅgrāma. These measurements, plus the presumed provenance of the inscription, make the identification with Vāṭ Sraḥ Śrī a virtual certainty.

3) Respectively Nos. 6 and 9 on Map 3, JSS 57/1, p. 33.
Text

(1) ศาสตรา ได้ ๒๔๖ ปีจำนวนครั้งครั้งที่มีคำว่าเหล่าที่ใน
สถานพระยาสังข์ราชเจ้าดีที่มีบูรณะเป็นกุฎีมี

(2) ประมวลราชสมภพครบปีเก้ากรุงฯ โปรดให้สำนักแผนก
เลือก สั่งให้ประชุมในพื้นที่ต่างๆ ให้บรรลุ

(3) ภายใต้บันทึกกระบวนที่สำคัญต่างๆ ที่มีพระยาคุณหม่อมพระธรรม
ราชบุญกว้าง ให้ด้วยเรื่องแต่ละอย่างที่สำคัญๆ

(4) ด้วยเจ้าท่านประจำเมืองแต่ละแห่งพระยาคุณหม่อมพระ
ยาคุณหม่อมที่ผ่านมา ถ้าผู้ใด
ว่าด้วยสิ่งที่น่าทึ่งที่ๆ
Sakaraja 746, year of the rat, in the fourth month, on the sixth day of the waning moon, a Friday, in Tai a ‘kāp sann’ day, the Brahma Mahā-saṅgharāja Cau, the virtuous man who had been Mahādhammarāja’s teacher, knowing that our lives are conditioned by karma, desiring to achieve the conditions necessary to attain Buddhahood, and wishing to lift sentient beings out of the round of transmigrations, got a large crowd of people to go and fetch stone to make a square cetiya for the relics of Mahādhammarāja, twelve fathoms and two cubits in width, and in height seventeen fathoms plus an arm. When it was finished he held the dedication ceremony for this reliquary, using the words ‘Buddho bhavissami anagate bhave.’

4) This date corresponds to Friday, March 3, 1385 A.D. (Julian). We are indebted to Mr Roger Billard of the Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient for calculating it for us.

5) Literally ‘saw the fruit of karma’ (i.e. the result of our actions in past lives or the present life), ‘which is the heartwood’ (i.e. the most vital influence), ‘and desired bodhisamabhāra’ (i.e. to prepare himself by performing works of merit so that in some future life, when he has accumulated enough merit and wisdom, he may become a Buddha). The Saṅgharāja has taken the ‘great resolve’ to become a Buddha in some future life, and wishes to add to his store of merits for that purpose.

6) In this instance, he wishes to persuade people to earn merit by helping to build the cetiya, which will advance them in their progress toward nibbāna.

7) ပူစတဲ့ ပူန်း (1/2-3), ‘a whole company’ (ပူစတဲ့, for pariṣada).

8) ထိုး, the expression suggests colossal blocks of stone. At Sukhodaya the only sort of ‘stone’ which would be likely to be used in colossal blocks was laterite.

9) ညမ်း (1/4), မီး, ‘arm’, is either the same as a cubit or else a cubit and a span. The Sukhodayan fathom was about 1.86 m. (see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 8). The cubit is 1/4 of a fathom, and the span 1/2 of a cubit. The base of the cetiya, or rather (if we have guessed right) the top of the platform which supported the base proper, would therefore be about 23 m. square, and the height of the monument would be somewhat over 32 m.

10) Pali: ‘May I become a Buddha in a future existence!’