EPIGRAPHIC AND HISTORICAL STUDIES NO. 14, INSCRIPTION OF THE ŚIVA OF KĀMBĒṆ BEJRA

by

A.B. Griswold and Prasert ṇa Nagara

Introduction

The majestic bronze statue of Śiva in Fig. 1, which was cast in 1510, was the subject of a scandal in 1886. A German merchant named Rastmann had noticed it a year or two earlier in the ruins of the Brahmin temple in the old town of KāmbēṆ Bejra (Gampèng Pet), where it was held in great esteem by the inhabitants; and wishing to acquire it for the Berlin Ethnographic Museum, he cut off its head and hands; then, upon his return to Bangkok, he made an official request to the Siamese authorities for the rest of the statue. Instead of granting the request, the authorities confiscated the head and hands; but in order to avoid offending the German Government King Rāma V caused a bronze replica of the statue to be cast, which he sent as a present to the German Crown Prince.¹

The original statue, with its head and hands restored to it, was placed in the Vān Hnā Museum, which became part of the Bangkok National Museum in 1924. The statue remained there until a few years ago, when it was transferred to the newly opened museum at KāmbēṆ Bejra.

Engraved on the upper surface of the bronze base of the statue is an inscription of three lines, running counterclockwise around the god's feet. Each line, because it makes a 90-degree turn at each corner, is split into four sections. The arrangement is shown in the following diagram, in which the Arabic numeral represents the number of the line, while the lower-case Roman numeral after the slant represents the section: 1/i is the portion of line 1 in front of the god's toes; 1/ii is the portion alongside the god's left foot (i.e. at the spectators's right); 1/iii is the portion behind the god's heels; 1/iv is the portion alongside his right foot; and so on.

¹) Fournereau, Le Siam ancien, p. 180 ff.
Diagram
The inscription is dated in Sakarāja 1432, in the sixth month, i.e. around April 1510 A.D. The writing is just about what we should expect for the period. The engraving is very shallow, and obliterated in places, so the following remarks must be accepted with due reservations. The mai-hān-ākāsa, which occurs frequently, is placed over the final consonant of syllables rather than the initial: 驸 ( = 驸 ), 1/iii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/i (twice), 2/ii, 2/iii, 3/iii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/i; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iii, 2/iv; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iv; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 3/iv. The mai-hān-ākāsa, however, does not entirely supersede the older method of expressing the same sound by reduplicating the final consonant: 驸 ( = 驸 ), 3/i, ii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iv, 3/iii, 3/iv. The mai-ek accent occurs in 驸 , 2/iii; 驸 , 2/iii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 3/ii; and perhaps 驸 , 3/i. The mai-do ( " ) has superseded the accent , which was formerly used for the same purpose, and it is usually, but not always, placed over the last letter of the syllable; it occurs in the following words: 驸 ( = 驸 ), 1/i; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 1/ii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 1/ii, 1/iii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/1; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/ii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iii; 驸 , 2/iii, 3/iii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iv; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iv; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 2/iv, 3/iii, 3/iv; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 3/i, 3/ii; 驸 ( = 驸 ), 3/i, 3/ii; but elsewhere in the inscription some of these words are written without an accent. It is often difficult to distinguish the vowel “ ” from “ ”. The vowels “ ” and “ ” do not occur.

The inscription was published in 1885 in the Saigon periodical *Excursions et reconnaissances*, with an eye-copy and transcription by the missionary Père Schmitt, and a French translation by A. Lorgeou. Their work reappeared in 1895 in Fournereau’s *Le Siam ancien*. A new Romanized transcription and French translation were published by the late George Coedes in 1924. The Siamese text was published at the same time in *Prajum śilācarīk Syām*. A version in modernized spelling,
together with the photograph we reproduce in Fig. 2, is printed in *Prajum cat-hmay hetu samāya Ayudhya*.  

So far as we have been able to discover, no rubbing of the inscription has ever been published, and no complete photograph. The engraving of the letters in the bronze is so shallow that a clear rubbing is almost impossible. We have used a pencil rubbing kindly supplied by the Department of Fine Arts; and though most of it is legible enough in itself, it would yield nothing more than a blur if photographed for reproduction. Instead we publish a reproduction of Père Schmitt’s eye-copy (Fig. 3). This might normally be considered a very risky procedure, as most of Schmitt’s work, done at a time when the study of Siamese epigraphy was still in its infancy, falls far short of perfection, and his Romanized transcription of the present text is full of faults; but the eye-copy (Fig. 3) is surprisingly good, as we discovered when we compared it with the partial photograph in Fig. 2 and with our rubbing. In Coedès’s Romanized transcription and the Siamese text published in *Prajum silācārik Syām*, most of the indicators of accents and the mai-hān-ākāśa are given their normal modern position in relation to the ākāras, whereas the eye-copy in Fig. 3 shows them in the same relative position as in the bronze; and in several places the eye-copy permits a better reading than appears in any of the transcriptions published up to now. True, there are inaccuracies in the eye-copy, but as far as possible we have called attention to them in the Appendix (p. 236-237) and corrected them in our transcription (p. 232). Some small errors, chiefly involving the presence or absence of a mai-hān-ākāśa or an accent, may have escaped us in passages where our rubbing is indistinct; but these, we hope, will not cause any substantial misinterpretation of the text.

The eye-copy in Fig. 3 follows a different arrangement from our transcription: the portions of all three-lines in front of the god’s toes are shown in section I, those alongside his left foot in section II, and so on. In order to read them in the proper sequence one must read the four

---

6) *Prajum cat-hmāy heṭu samāya Ayudhya*, p. 29 (with photograph between pp. 28 and 29).
7) *Recueil*, p. 185.
8) *Recueil*, p. 158.
sections of the first line one after another, then those of the second line, and finally those of the third. In Fig. 4, with the aid of scissors and paste, we have transposed the four sections of the eye-copy to conform to the arrangement on the base of the statue.

The purpose of the inscription is to commemorate a number of works of merit performed by Cau Braňňa Dharmăšokarāja, the ruler of Kāmbēň Bejra, and in particular the founding of the statue at whose feet it is engraved: the date, equivalent to 1510 A.D., is that when the statue was erected and dedicated, evidently soon after its completion. The text refers to Braňňa Rvaň (विन्ध्य) as Dharmăšokarāja's ancestor; and as this name unquestionably means one of the kings of Sukhodaya during the period of its independence it is clear that Dharmăšokarāja was descended from Sukhodayan royalty. Kāmbēň Bejra and the rest of the Sukhodayan territories had been incorporated into the kingdom of Ayudhyā in 1438, so Dharmăšokarāja was ruling as a subject of the Ayudhyān king, Rāmădhipati II (r. 1491-1529). He dedicates the merit accruing from his works to 'the two kings': presumably Rāmădhipati II, who was reigning at Ayudhyā, and one of the latter's relatives who was reigning as uparāja at Bișquloka.

10) In Fig. 3 the first line of section I corresponds to our 1/i, and the first lines of sections II, III and IV correspond to our 1/ii, 1/iii, and 1/iv; the second line in each section corresponds to our 2/i, 2/ii, 2/iii, and 2/iv respectively, and the third to our 3/i, 3/ii, 3/iii and 3/iv (cf. our Diagram, p. 224).

11) Fournereau (pp. 183, 184, and 187 note 3), following Schmitt, suggests that Dharmăšokarāja's action in connection with the statue did not consist in founding it, but simply in 'erecting' it, i.e. that he discovered an old statue lying neglected in the forest, rescued it, and replaced it on its pedestal. They proposed to identify it with the statue of Maheśvara mentioned in Inscription 4 (II/52 f.; see JSS 61/1, pp. 132, 137). This proposal is pure fancy.

12) Coedès (Revue, p. 157) gives the probable identification of the two kings as 'Paramarājī, roi à Ayudhyā, et Rāmădhipati II, alors nommé Braňţ Jeţţha, Uparāja à Bişquloka.' There is some confusion here, as may be seen from the following summary account of the three kings of Ayudhyā who reigned between 1448 and 1529.

Paramatrailokānātha (r. 1448-88) was succeeded in turn by two of his sons, Paramaṛājī III (r. 1488-91) and Rāmădhipati II (r. 1491-1529). Rāmădhipati II was known as Prince Jeţţha before his accession. His mother is thought to have been a princess of the royal family of Sukhodaya, which would mean that Dharmăšokarāja was related to him.
Dbannasokaraja’s works of merit, as recorded in the inscription, deserve a few words of comment. They are not listed in chronological order: the most important, founding the statue of Śiva in 1510, comes first; the others were probably performed at various times before that. We shall discuss them in the order in which they are listed.

1) Founding the statue of Śiva. Though Dbannasokaraja was of course a Buddhist, it is not at all surprising that he should found a statue of a Hindu god. Siamese rulers, according to tradition, were protectors of all religions, not only their own. Furthermore, almost every ruler of an Indianizing state in Southeast Asia, whether Buddhist or Hindu by

In 1463 Paramatrailokanātha transferred the capital from Ayudhya to Bīṣṇuloka for the purpose of consolidating his hold on the Sukhodayan provinces, appointing his son Paramarājā as Regent at Ayudhya; and in 1485 he appointed Prince Jetṭha to the post of Mahā-uparājā at Bīṣṇuloka. Upon Paramatrailokanātha’s death in 1488, the throne went to his son Paramarājā, who transferred the capital back to Ayudhya, leaving Prince Jetṭha to rule at Bīṣṇuloka. Three years later, on the death of Paramarājā, Prince Jetṭha succeeded to the throne, taking the regnal name Rāmādhipati (II) and reigning at Ayudhya.

In 1510, when our inscription was composed, the King of Ayudhya was Rāmādhipati II and the viceroy at Bīṣṇuloka must have been one of his brothers or sons, though we do not know which one (his son Buddhāṅkura was not appointed to the position until 1526). We may consider three possible identifications of ‘the two kings’ to whom Dharmāsokaraja transfers the merit of his benefactions in 1510:

(a) Paramatrailokanātha and Paramarājā III, both of whom were deceased when the inscription was composed;
(b) Paramarājā III, who was deceased, and Rāmādhipati II who was reigning at Ayudhya;
(c) Rāmādhipati II, reigning at Ayudhya, and one of his brothers or sons reigning at Bīṣṇuloka. We are inclined to prefer this identification; but we cannot reject either of the first two conclusively.

13) An uninscribed bronze statue of the god Viṣṇu, found in the ruins of the same Brahmin temple (Fournereau, Pl. L), was very likely cast at the same time; and two statues of Hindu goddesses, fragments of which were also found there (Fournereau, p. 181), may have belonged to the same series. In casting images of Hindu gods, Dharmāsokaraja was following the example of his ancestors the Buddhist kings of Sukhodaya; see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, pp. 13, 27, 28, 32; also Prince Subhadradis Diskul, เทวุปัณณภูมิ ปุระทวี, Bangkok, 1966.
faith, would have a body of Brahmins attached to his Court, to advise on
statecraft, law and technical matters; to regulate the calendar and cast
horoscopes; to manage the Swinging Festival, the First Ploughing, and
rites for the control of wind and rain; to perform ceremonies; and to
discharge a host of other tasks. Theravāda Buddhism takes no cogni-
zance of such things; they are not in conflict with it, but simply irrelevant
to it, and no more anti-Buddhist than consulting a doctor or a lawyer
today; and they were essential to the proper governance of a state. The
god Śiva, according to the inscription, was to protect the four-footed and
two-footed creatures in the state of Kāmbēh Bejra, and to help exalt
the three religions (Buddhism, Hinduism, and the cult of ancestral and tutel-
ary divinities): the founder expresses the wish that all three will func-
tion harmoniously together.

(2) Restoration of the Buddhist temple of the Great Relic (Mahā-
dhātu) and other temples in and around the town (chiefly Buddhist
monasteries, but probably also a few shrines dedicated to Hindu gods or
tutelary divinities).

(3) Restoration of the boundary markers of landed property.
Perhaps chiefly to put an end to boundary disputes which might interfere
with the orderly course of agriculture, and to demarcate lands allotted
to officials and private persons.

(4) Restoration of the highway to Pāñ Bān, which had fallen into
ruin. This must have been a section of the 'Braḥ Rvaṅ Highway,' which
led from Kāmbēh Bejra to Sukhodaya, and continued northward to Saj-
janālaya. Tradition attributes the construction of the highway to Braḥ
Rvaṅ or Braṅa Rvaṅ (Pra Ruang, Prayā Ruang), i.e. Rāma Gāmphēṅ or
some other king of Sukhodaya. Although it had probably been in
existence for a long time before Rāma Gāmphēṅ, it seems likely that
Rāma Gāmphēṅ was the first to turn it into an all-season road, raising
it above the flood-level by means of an embankment with ditches
running along one side or both for drainage, irrigation, and naviga-
tion by small boats. Besides providing internal communications for
the kingdom of Sukhodaya, and serving for military transport, it
was part of the regular route for travelers proceeding to Sukhodaya
from Martaban in Lower Burma: they would go by boat up the River
Gyaing to some place near Kawkareik, then overland to Chôt (now Mè Sôt), then continue eastward to the riverine port of Jyain Dôn (Chieng Tông) on the Ping, from where they could go downstream by boat or raft to the southern terminus of the Brah Rvan Highway at or near Kāṃbēn Bejra; and finally they would follow the highway northeast, via Pān Bān to Sukhodaya.14 Pān Bān (Bâng Pān, บริเวณ), located on the Brah Rvan Highway about 14 km. northeast of Kāṃbēn Bejra,15 must have been an important stopping-place on the highway, achieving considerable prosperity during the Sukhodaya period by offering hospitality to merchants and other travelers; and it is mentioned in three of Mahādharmanājā I’s inscriptions.16 It was probably repaired and maintained by Mahādharmanājā I and other kings of Sukhodaya, but abandoned in the 15th century. As Dharmāsokarāja repaired the Brah Rvan Highway only as far as Pān Bān, we should probably assume that the border between his territory and that of the vassal ruler of Sukhodaya passed through this town.

5) Dredging the river Trai (at?) Pān Brā. Doubtless to aid navigation and the irrigation of fields.

(6) Putting a stop to the custom of selling cattle to the Lavā. The term Lavā is generally used loosely to include various ‘aboriginal’ peoples, whose ancestors controlled large parts of Siam before the Tai conquest. Very likely the Lavā mentioned in our inscription acted as butchers, violating the Buddhist precept against taking life. The implication is that Dharmāsokarāja, out of respect for this precept, and perhaps out of

14) For the Brah Rvan Highway, see Rāy-ān Sukhodaya, Bangkok, 2512, map between pp. 92 and 93; also Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, Map 4. For the route between Sukhodaya and Martaban, cf. JSS 60/1, pp. 140 and notes 20-22.

15) See the maps cited in the previous note.

16) Inscr. 3, II/57 (JSS 61/1, pp. 93, 111); Inscr. 4 II/22 (where the name is written Pān Bān, ibid., pp. 133, 139); Inscr. 8, IV/11 (under the name Mān Bān, JSS 61/1, pp. 111, 117, 123). Nāh Dôn Hill, on the summit of which Mahādharmanājā I placed a Buddhapāda, is 2 km. northwest of Pān Bān (it is shown on the map in Rāy-ān Sukhodaya, cited in note 13).
respect for the Hindu veneration of cows, prohibited the slaughter of cattle. This prohibition is part of the program to protect ‘four-footed creatures’; see above, Item 1.

(7) Setting a good example to farmers: whenever he plants a rice-field he always plants it with seed taken from the same field, rather than taking rice from a granary to broadcast or to make a seed-bed from which to transplant (i.e. he uses seed adapted to the conditions of the field in question, rather than resorting to a granary containing rice from miscellaneous fields).

(8) Restoration of the irrigation canal dug by his ancestor Braňā Rvaň to lead water to Pāň Bān. This canal, which had got filled up so completely that its course was no longer easy to discover, must have originally paralleled that part of the Braň Rvaň Highway that led from Kāmbęň Bejra to Pāň Bān. As the elevation of Kāmbęň Bejra is almost 70 m. higher than that of Sukhodaya, and the canal between these two cities ran a distance of less than 70 km.,¹⁷ the downward gradient must have been something like 1:1000 on average, which would make maintenance difficult. The portion from Kāmbęň Bejra to Pāň Bān had evidently been neglected for a considerable time, during which the farmers along the way lost their main means of irrigation and had to depend on rain for their crops. Restoring this canal for irrigation purposes would greatly increase production. Dharmāśokarāja presumably restored it concomitantly with the highway (see above, Item 4), using the earth dug from the canal to repair the embankment of the road.

Text

[1/i] || ศาลาราช ๑๔๗๒ มีมติเกี่ยวกับการยกย่องพระเกียรติภูมิเสียดีลำกัน

[1/ii] กรณีศาลฎีกา ศาลฎีกาจึงเห็นควรจะตีความถิ่นที่มีอยู่ในเมืองกับพระประภัสสร

[1/iii] เป็นเจ้าจี้ไว้ในกรุงศรีสะเกษคืนในเมืองกับพระพุทธเจ้า

[1/iv] สาสนานุภาพผู้คนอย่างศาลฎีกาแห่งพระกรรมมิ่งหนึ่งโทษ

[2/i] เบื้องหน้าผู้มีอยู่แสดงกันประมวลราชกุมมาภิปร้การในเมือง

[2/ii] ที่เกิดขึ้นในเรื่องของสภาพแวดล้อมปีเกิดบริหารในเมือง

[2/iii] เทคโนโลยีข้อมูลไว้ไปเกิดสัญญาณจากรัฐบาลในเมือง

[2/iv] ภาษาญี่ปุ่นเข้าร่วมในมณฑลบุคคลภายนอกธุรกิจในยุคใหม่

[3/i] อนันต์ที่อยู่ร่วมทำนายไปถึงทางพานั้นก็ดีแก่สิ้นแล้ว

[3/ii] ญิลิ ub หน้าทางพานั้นพบกับทำนายนายให้เป็น

[3/iii] ให้เป็นนายเหมือนนายมิได้เป็นทางด้าน

[3/iv] ราชูทุมถ้าเก็บพิทักษ์พระเจ้าอยู่หัวท้องถิ่นพระองค์
[Translation]

[1] In sakarāja 1432, a year of the horse, on Sunday the fourteenth day of the waxing moon of the sixth month, (when the moon had) attained the ṛkṣa of hasta, at two nālikā after dawn, Cau Brañā Śrī Dharmāsokarāja founded this (statue of the) Lord Īśvara to protect the four-footed and two-footed creatures in Mōañ Kāmbeñ Bejra, and to help exalt the religions—the Buddha's religion, the Brahmanical religion, and the Devakarma—so that they will not lose their lustre. May [2] they function harmoniously together!

He restored the Mahādhātu, and the lesser temples 'both inside and outside the city, as well as the boundaries of household properties, and the highway which had fallen into ruin all the way to Pān Bān, and he dredged the River Trai (at ?) Pān Brā. Moreover he put a stop to the custom of selling cattle to the Lavā.

Moreover when he plants a rice-field he always plants it with seed taken from that field itself; he does not take rice from a granary to broadcast or (to make a seedbed from which) to transplant, as most people do.

Moreover, as the irrigation canal made by his ancestor Brañā Rvañ to lead water to Pān Bān had got filled up and altogether lost, so that it was commonly believed the rice-fields were dependent on rain, he searched for that canal, and when he found it he restored it so as to lead water into the fields and irrigate them instead of depending on rain.

The merit (accruing from) all these things that he has done, he presents to Their Majesties the two Kings.
Footnotes to Translation

1) The nālīka or nādi was an Indian measure of time, equal to 24 minutes by modern reckoning.

2) The word देवसेना (written देवसेना at 1/iii, which we translate as 'founded,' is from the Skt. noun pratiṣṭhāna, 'a firm standing-place,' 'foundation,' 'pedestal,' etc. In Siamese, in connection with a statue, it is used as a verb meaning 'to found,' 'to erect,' or 'to dedicate.' Often, as in the present instance, it has all three meanings at once.

3) Ṣiva (written Ṣavara at 1/iii) is the god Śiva.

4) We have regularized the spelling; at 1/iii the name is written Kāmbhēn Bejra (कांभेन बेज्रा).

5) Ṣan (1/iii) - modern Ṣon.

6) As Coedès remarks in a footnote (Recueil, p. 159), saiyasaṣāna (1/iv) is put for seyyasaṣāna, literally 'the excellent religion,' a common designation of the Brahmanical religion.

7) देवकर्म (1/iv), debakarma, Skt. devakarma, 'religious act or rite,' 'worship of the gods;' here means the cult of ancestral and tutelary divinities; cf. ग्रहज्ञानेन, Inschr. 1, III/6 (JSS 59/1, pp. 200, 214); देवसीनप्रविधानम्, Inschr. II, 1/15 (JSS 61/1, pp. 116, 117), and the long lists of divinities in Inschr. 45, Face 1 (JSS 57/1, pp. 75 f., 80 f.).

8) अनिवार्य (1/iv), literally 'to keep them from getting dull or tarnished.' A very similar expression, अनिवार्य, occurs in Inschr. II, 1/6 (see JSS 61/1, pp. 116, 117).

9) वायुकर्तिक (1/iv-2/ii), literally 'May they be one and the same thing!' Coedès, taking the preceding negative न to carry through this expression, combines it with the preceding clause into a single sentence, which he translates: 'afin qu'elles ne soient pas obscures et ne soient pas confondues en une seule.' (Recueil, p. 159 and note 2.)

10) तात्य (II/1), modern तात्य, 'to restore to good condition after decay or injury,' etc. (McFarland)

11) The primary meaning of महादाता is 'great relic,' i.e. a major bodily relic of the Buddha (as distinguished from the 80,000 particles into which King Anoka divided the miscellaneous relics); the secondary meaning is 'great reliquary,' i.e. a temple or monument built to contain such a relic. Such a Temple of the Great Relic was normally the central feature of a capital city. The one at Kāmbhēn Bejra has left extensive remains.

12) The term तमाल (2/ii), 'highway,' is composed of two words of Khmer origin. The first, तम, (modern Siamese ที่, 'road'), which in modern Khmer means a dyke, an embankment, or a road raised on an embankment (Guesdon), is found in Old Khmer in the form तित, तिति, तिति ('road'); it is derived, by means of the prefix त-, from Old Khmer त- 'to reach,' 'to arrive.' The second, भाल, found in Old Khmer in the form तित, 'that which is stretched out,' is derived, by means of the prefix भ-, from Old Khmer भ-, 'to unroll,' 'to unfold.' We are indebted to Madame S. Lewitz, of the Centre National de Recherche Scientifique, for this information.
13) The name of the River Trai recalls the town of Traîrâsa, about 15 km. downstream from Kāmbël Bejra (see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, Map 4); but that may be no more than a coincidence. We cannot identify Pūn Brô (Bông Prô, บ่งพระ).


15) The name of the River Trai recalls the town of Traîrâsa, about 15 km. downstream from Kāmbël Bejra (see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, Map 4); but that may be no more than a coincidence. We cannot identify Pūn Brô (Bông Prô, บ่งพระ).

16) A more literal translation of the passage at 2/ii-2/iii would be: 'moreover it was formerly the custom to sell cattle to the Lava, and those which would have been sold as in the past he therefore forbade to be sold.' Cf. Introduction, p. 230-231, above.

17) In modern spelling this passage, occupying parts of 2/iii and 2/iv, would read: 'moreover when he cultivates a rice-field, he regularly takes seed-rice from that field to plant itself.' Note that the word ṭān in this passage is given in the eye-copy (Fig. 3) as ṭān, which is confirmed by our rubbing. As we cannot see how ṭān could make sense in the context, we assume that the intention was to write ṭān.

18) ṭān (2/iv), modern គណ.

19) ṭān (2/iv), modern គណ.

20) ញញ, to transplant seedling rice in a flooded field that has been ploughed. Madame S. Lewitz informs us that this word, tī, occurs in Old Khmer, meaning 'to plant' or 'to transplant'; cf. Old Môn ɲam, ɲan, 'a plant or tree'; and Malay tanam, 'to plant.'

21) ṭān (3/i), modern ṭān.

22) ១ (3/i), modern ប, which now means 'paternal grandfather.' The term is used more loosely in Sukhodayan inscriptions, and sometimes means no more than 'ancestor'; cf. Inscr. 45, I/3-12, JSS 57/1, pp. 75 and 80 ff.

23) ១ (3/i), modern ប.

24) ពរ (3/ii, 3/iii) is apparently a dialectical form for ក, 'sky,' here used in the sense of 'rain'; and we understand ម៌ (3/ii, written ម៉្ at 3/iii) in the sense of 'by means of,' hence 'depending on.' The Mahāyānstra, in the section entitled សែន, contains the expression បុស្មោះអាង (បុស្មោះស្មោះអាង), 'to farm rice-fields which depend on rain', in contrast to អាង, 'irrigated rice-fields' (ម៉្, 'rice-fields,' + ម៉្, 'marsh,' 'water-course,' 'irrigation ditch,' 'land that is subject to flooding'). Coedes, on the other hand, takes ម៉្ to mean 'roads,' and translates: 'le canal d'irrigation que son ajeul Braññ Ryan avait fait pour conduire l'eau à Pūn Būn, se trouvant comblé et ayant disparu au point que l'on prenait les rizières pour des chemins ... ' (Recueil, p. 159).

25) Literally 'he made the irrigation canal to lead water into the fields and feed them, causing them to be irrigated fields (វរោះ) and dyked fields (ខ៍្) instead of depending on rain.' Coedes translates: 'il l’a refait pour amener l’eau devant arroser les rizières, afin qu’elles deviennent des rizières inondées et qu’elles ne servent plus de piste.'
Appendix

A fairly generous sampling of variant readings is given below. The first column contains our choice; the second is based on Père Schmitt’s eye-copy (Fig. 3), the third on Prajum sīlācārik Syām, BE 2467, p. 158, the fourth on Coedès’s Romanized transcription in *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam*, 1924, p. 158, and the last on the pencil rubbing supplied us by the Department of Fine Arts.
| 1/i | ศกราช | ศกราช | ศกราช | çakarāja | ศกราช |
|     | นภัทร | นภัทร | นภัทร | nāksātra | ? |
|     | อาทิพยาทร | อาทิพยาทร | อาทิพยาทร | ādityabāra | อาทิพยาทร |
|     | หะศ | หะศ | หะศ | hāṣṭa | หะศ |
| 1/ii | ประกาศัน | ประกาศัน | ประกาศัน | pratisthān | ประกาศัน |
| 1/iii | สติว | สติว | สติว | sātya | สติว |
|     | กษัป | กษัป | กษัป | kāmpina | กษัป |
| 1/iv | พุทธสาขาณ | พุทธสาขาณ | พุทธสาขาณ | buddhahasagāna | พุทธสาขาณ |
|     | หมอง | หมอง | หมอง | hmōn | หมอง |
| 2/i | ถว | ถว | ถว | tyav | ถว |
|     | วภ | วภ | วภ | vāt | วภ |
| 2/iii | วภ | วภ | วภ | vvā | วภ |
|     | สวว | สวว | สวว | lāvā | สวว |
|     | ฐุ | ฐุ | ฐุ | tuc | ฐุ |
|     | กอนนน | กอนนน | กอนนน | kūn nān | กอนนน |
| 2/iv | เอาพิชฐ | เอาพิชฐ | เเอาพิชฐ | au bija | เเอาพิชฐ |
| 3/i | ป | ป | ป | pū | ? |
|     | ววง | ววง | ววง | rvāṇa | ? |
|     | ทน | ทน | ทน | thāṃ | ทน |
| 3/ii | ญ่อม | ญ่อม | ญ่อม | nām | ญ่อม |
|     | เลียง | เลียง | เลียง | liāṇ | เลียง |
| 3/iii | ฝาย | ฝาย | ฝาย | fāy | ฝาย |
|     | อัน | อัน | อัน | kān | อัน |
| 3/iv | อัญหวา | อัญหวา | อัญหวา | ayū hvvā | อัญหวา |
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Fig. 1. The śiva of Kāmbēn Bejra.
Fig. 3. Eye-copy of the inscription. (After Fournereau, *Le Siam ancien.*)
Fig. 4 The eye-copy in Fig. 3, with the sections transposed to correspond to the arrangement on the base of the statue.