The inscription was presumably engraved and erected in Culasakara-ja (CS) 943 (1581 A.D.), the date of the last events recorded in it. Judging from its contents, it was originally set up at Vat Jyan Hman, though we have no means of knowing whether it has been there ever since, or whether it was at one time removed to some other place and later returned to Vat Jyan Hman.

1. The name is written วัฒน์เจน (jyañ hmān) in the inscription; the modern spelling is วัฒน์เจน (jyañ hmañ).

2. The name is written วัฒน์เจน (jyañ hmañ) in the inscription; the modern spelling is วัฒน์เจน (jyañ hmañ). By 'the walled city' we mean the area, approximately 1,700 meters square, which is surrounded by a moat and the remains of a brick wall built by Cau Kavila in the late eighteenth century (superseding an earlier wall and moat that enclosed a much larger area).

3. When our sources give a date in Culasakara-ja without specifying the month, we transpose it into the Christian era by adding 638, which may in some cases give a result that is wrong by one year.
The main text is preceded by an historical retrospect in two parts.

The first part (I/1-6) tells how the city of Chieng Mai and the monastery of Jyañ Hmán were founded by Braññi Māñ Rāy (Mang Rāi, King of Lāñ Nā), accompanied by Braññi Nām Mōañ (Ngam Muang, King of Payao), and Braññi Rvañ (i.e. Rama Gāmheñ, King of Sukhodaya). They were residing, it seems, in a sleeping pavilion built for them on the jayabhūmi that had been chosen for the Royal Palace; jayabhūmi, literally 'place of victory', is a technical term meaning a site that has been adjudged favorable by geomancy or by omens. At the auspicious moment, on a day corresponding to Thursday, 12 April 1296 A.D. (Julian calendar), at about 4 a.m., they started building the moats and the triple walls that were to surround the city, and erecting a cetiya (in this context, an architectural monument dedicated to the Buddhist religion) on the exact site of the pavilion; and the land around it was afterwards made into a monastery which was henceforth known as Vāt Jyan Hmān.

It may be instructive to compare this information with the accounts of the founding of Chieng Mai, and of the events that preceded its founding, as given in Jinakālamālī and the Chieng Mai Chronicle.

According to Jinakālamālī, whose dates for events at Chieng Mai are usually considered trustworthy, Māñ Rāy contracted a firm treaty of alliance with Braññi Nām Mōañ and Braññi Rvañ in 1287. He was already ruler of the principality of Jyañ Rāy (Chieng Rāi) and a large part of Lāñ Nā; but before he could become suzerain over the whole of northern Siam he would have to overcome Haripunjaya [modern Lampun (Lampān), 25 kilometers south of Chieng Mai], for the little kingdom of which it was the capital was still independent under a Mōn dynasty. In 1288 he began his preparations to conquer Haripunjaya; in 1292 he took the city, putting its ruler to flight; and in 1296 he founded his new capital at Chieng Mai.

4. We are indebted to Mr. Roger Billard of the Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient for examining the dates in this paper and calculating their equivalents in the Julian calendar.

5. See Coedes's translation, BEFEO XXV/1, p. 87 ff. In our summary, for the reader's convenience, we have transposed several proper names (which Jinakālamālī gives in Paliized form) into the form used elsewhere in this paper.
The *Chieng Mai Chronicle* tells much the same story, but with a lot more detail and a different chronology. Its account may be summed up as follows. In 1274 Măn Răy, while still residing at Jyai Răy, began preparing to conquer Haripuñjaya. In 1276 he started to launch an attack on Payao, but changed his mind and made an alliance with its ruler, Naș Mœan. Brañă Rvañ (Ramă Gâmheñ) was a great friend of Naș Mœan until he had an illicit affair with one of Naș Mœan's wives, after which Naș Mœan caught him and put him in prison. Instead of executing Brañă Rvañ, however, Naș Mœan asked Măn Răy to arbitrate the case. Măn Răy persuaded Brañă Rvañ to apologize and pay Naș Mœan damages of 990,000 cowries. The three rulers then made a solemn treaty of alliance (no date is given, but the account of the alliance is inserted between the events of 1276 and 1281). In 1281 Măn Răy conquered Haripuñjaya, put its ruler to flight, and mounted the throne. In 1283, leaving Haripuñjaya in charge of an official, he went to found a new capital, Jyañ Li, diverting a river to pass through it to supply water; but the river caused serious floods in the rainy season. In 1286 he founded another new capital at Kum Kâm (now in the southern outskirts of Chieng Mai). In 1291 he started looking for an auspicious place to build a capital that would prove completely satisfactory. The following year, continuing his search, he saw a series of favorable omens that indicated the exact location of the jayabhûmi he was looking for. He set up a camp in the northeast portion of the jayabhûmi, and went to live there on a day corresponding to Thursday, 27 March 1292 (Julian), at about 4.30 a.m. Having decided to build a large city with the jayabhûmi in its center, he invited his friends Brañă Naș Mœan and Brañă Rvañ to come and discuss the project with him; and the three of them built a pavilion to serve as a meeting-place near the jayabhûmi. They discussed the size and plan of the city that was about to be founded; they reviewed the geomantic advantages of the site; and they observed further good

6. According to the inscription, Văt Jyai Hmân stands on the site of the jayabhûmi. Văt Jyai Hmân, however, is not in the center of the present city, whose walls were built in the late eighteenth century, but near the remains of its north wall. The city Măn Răy built probably extended farther north than the present walled city, but not so far south.
omens. They paced off the four sides of the area for the city, deciding where to locate the moats, walls and gates. They made ritual offerings to the tutelary divinities of the jayabhūmi and the five gates. A quantity of craftsmen and laborers were gathered to build Mān Rāy’s palace at the jayabhūmi, to dig the city moats, and to build the city walls. Finally on a day corresponding to Thursday, 19 April 1296 (Julian), just before dawn, all the works were undertaken at the same moment. It took four months to complete them.

7. CMC/N, 23-25, 29-45, 54-61; CMC/HC, III/2, 138 ff. and III/3, 75-77, 82-87. While the date given in our inscription for the founding of the city of Chiang Mai corresponds to 12 April 1296 (Julian), the date given in the Chiang Mai Chronicle (CMC/N, p. 60; CMC/HC, III/3, p. 86) and the Yonaka History (p. 166) is exactly one week later, corresponding to 19 April 1296. This was the full-moon day of Visākha, the day of the great Buddhist festival of Visākhā-pūjā. Perhaps the ceremonies connected with founding the city lasted a week; and tradition may later have confused the date of their beginning with that of their conclusion. With one exception (the Mañrāyavinicchaya; see JSS 65/1, p. 147), all the sources we have consulted give the same year, CS 658 (1296 A.D.), for the founding of the city, though Jinakālamāli omits the month and day. In recording the founding of the city, none of our sources except the inscription mentions the founding of Vat Jyañ Hmān: the omission is particularly surprising for Jinakālamāli, the author of which is usually so careful to note all important benefactions to religion at Chiang Mai.

For the most part Jinakālamāli’s chronology seems preferable to that of the Chiang Mai Chronicle. If we were to accept the latter’s dates, it would be hard to see why Mān Rāy, after conquering Haripūjījaya in 1281, should wait 15 years before founding Chiang Mai (cf. Coedès in BEFEO XXV/1, p. 89 note 6, continued from the preceding page). Jinakālamāli, which says nothing about Jyañ Lī or the discovery of the jayabhūmi, says he founded Kumāmanagara in 1303 and built a cetiya there containing 60 statues of the Buddha; Kumāmanagara is generally, and in our opinion rightly, identified with Kum Kām, and the monument with the Cetiya Si Hliam (which can still be seen at Kum Kām, though much altered by a restoration in the early twentieth century); but as there would certainly be no reason for Mān Rāy to build a capital there seven years after founding Chiang Mai, we may conclude that 1303 is the wrong date for the founding of Kum Kām, but very likely the right date for the building, or rebuilding, of the cetiya. The dates when Mān Rāy founded Jyañ Lī and Kum Kām, and when he discovered the jayabhūmi on the site of Jyañ Hmān village, remain uncertain.
We now return to our inscription. The second part of the historical retrospect, at I/6-8, is a brief statement that King Tilakarāja rebuilt the cetiya in [CS] 833 (1471 A.D.). This monarch, whose title is usually written Tilokarāja, ruled over Lān Nā from 1441 to 1487. The statement means that he ‘encased’ the old cetiya: the usual practice, when a particularly venerated monument needs major repairs and someone wants to make it larger and more splendid, is to allow it to remain standing (being too sacred to demolish), and to build a new monument encasing it. The new monument, though it hides the old one completely, and though its architecture may be different, is regarded as identical to it.

* * *

Before discussing the main text of the inscription, it will be useful to recall certain events that occurred in the sixteenth century A.D.

In 1533 the apparition of an unusually bright meteor in the sky foreshadowed trouble for Lān Nā. In 1538 a group of nobles deposed King Mōañ Kesā and gave the throne to his son. The latter governed the country so badly that a rebellion broke out in 1543, in which he was killed. Mōañ Kesā was restored, but his mind had given way. In 1545 an official called Sēn Grāv (in some accounts Sēn Tāv) procured his assassination. With him the male line of Māñ Rāy’s son Jayasaṅgrāma, which had ruled over Lān Nā since Māñ Rāy’s death in 1311, became extinct.

Sēn Grāv offered the throne to Prince Mē Ku (Mekuṭi) of the Shan state of Mōañ Nāy (Monē), who was descended from another of Māñ Rāy’s sons. Meanwhile a rival group of nobles met at Jyaṅ Sēn (Chieng Sēn) and sent word to ask the King of Lān Jān (Laos) to accept the throne of Lān Nā for his son, Prince Jayajeṭṭha (Braṅā Upayo), whose mother was a daughter of King Mōañ Kesā. When the King of Lān Jān agreed, the nobles came down from Jyaṅ Sēn, took the city of Chieng Mai, and executed Sēn Grāv and his chief adherents. Pending Jayajeṭṭha’s arrival they installed a Chieng Mai princess, Lady Ciraṇrabhā, as regent.
Soon after her coronation, many of the religious monuments in Chieng Mai were badly damaged by an earthquake, including the Mahācetiya Hlvañ which at that time was regarded as the magical center of the kingdom. Lān Nā was invaded by a Shan army from Mōañ Nay, presumably for the purpose of putting Mē Ku on the throne, but they were defeated and withdrew.

In 1546 Jayajetttha reached Chieng Mai. After doing homage to the ‘Emerald’ Buddha and the Mahācetiya Hlvañ, he was crowned King of Lān Nā. The next year, however, he hurried home to fight his younger brother, who had seized the throne of Lān Jāñ on the sudden death of their father. His departure was followed by fighting among rival groups of leaders in Lān Nā. In 1551 he sent word to Chieng Mai that as he had to remain in Lān Jāñ he was returning the throne of Lān Nā to Lady Ciraprabhā.

In the same year, at the invitation of the Chieng Mai nobles, Prince Mē Ku of Mōañ Nay mounted the throne of Lān Nā. Sporadic fighting, however, continued in the country between rival forces from the Shan States and from Lān Jāñ. One day in 1556 Mē Ku saw an evil omen: a huge cloud in the sky in the form of a dragon moving toward the west, and the planet Jupiter moving northward leaving a trail of fiery smoke.

At this time the Burmese king Bureng Nông (Bayinnaung, r. 1551-81), who had his capital at Haṃsāvatā (Pegu), was engaged in a campaign to subdue the Shan States. In 1557 he received the submission of Mē Ku’s brother, the ruler of Mōañ Nay. The following year he led an army to Chieng Mai and invited Mē Ku ‘to come and sit on the same seat as himself to make the people and the country happy’. He then besieged the city; and three days later, on Saturday, 2 April 1558 (Julian) he received its surrender. Instead of deposing Mē Ku, he crowned him as his vassal, referring to him as his younger brother who belonged to the dynasty of King Māṅ Rāy the Great.

Bureng Nông, who was much more powerful than any previous king of Burma for several centuries, twice conquered the city of Ayudhya, first in 1564 and again in 1569. In 1564, hearing that Mē Ku had been plotting to revolt, Bureng Nông removed him and took him
to Hamsāvati, leaving Lady Visuddhadevi (apparently the same person as Lady Ciraprabhā) to rule Lān Nā as his vassal. She died on Tuesday, 11 November 1578 (Julian). Bureng Nong then appointed one of his own sons, Tharawadi Min (Naradhā Cau) as viceroy of Lān Nā. Bureng Nong died in 1581. Tharawadi Min continued as viceroy until his death in 1607; for the last nine years of his reign he was a vassal of Ayudhya8.

* * *

The main text of our inscription begins at I/8, with the statement that in CS 920 (1558 A.D.), when Chiang Mai had become part of the realm of King Mahādharmamakarasājādhirāja (i.e. Bureng Nong), the suzerain sent a valuable present to an official at Chiang Mai, instructing him to rebuild Vat Jyan Hmān. No action was taken until 1571, when the cetiya was ‘encased’ for the second time9; and several other structures were erected, including a vihāra, an uposatha hall, and a library for the scriptures. The delay in complying with Bureng Nong’s wishes may have been caused in part by difficulties connected with Mè Ku’s removal and his replacement by Lady Visuddhadevi in 1564.

The final series of benefactions recorded in the inscription took place in 1581, three years after Tharawadi Min had assumed office as viceroy upon the death of Lady Visuddhadevi. A large quantity of gold and silver was donated to the monastery, as well as lands and

8. This account of events in Lān Nā in the sixteenth century is mainly taken from the Chiang Mai Chronicle (CMC/N, 153-173; CMC/HC, IV/1, pp. 86-96), the Yonaka History (pp. 283-309), and Wood, History of Siam (Bangkok, 1933; pp. 103-106, 116 [and note 1], 117, 120, 130, 134, 135, 151, 165). There are some discrepancies between these accounts, which need not concern us here. For an inscribed statue of the Buddha cast in 1565, the year after Mè Ku was replaced by Lady Visuddhadevi, see Griswold, Dated Buddha Images of Northern Siam (Ascona, 1959; pl. XLVI and pp. 59, 92, 93).

9. We do not know what architectural form the cetiya had originally. The encasements of 1471 and 1571 may have introduced radical alterations; and so may later reconstructions, notably when Chiang Mai was reoccupied by the Tai in the late eighteenth century, after having been deserted for over ten years. The cetiya has been repaired several times since then.
villages; a great many persons were dedicated to it as monastery slaves; and the merit of the donation was transferred to ‘His Highness Prince Varorasādhirāja’, the viceroy (I/14-21).10 The remainder of the inscription (I/21-34, II/1-36) gives a list of the persons presented to the monastery as slaves.

On 30 December 1886, according to the Mission Pavie, Auguste Pavie took rubbings of the inscription, which was located in Vāt Jyañ Hmān ‘in the precinct of the [royal] palace of Chieng Mai’11. It was published in the Mission Pavie in 1898, together with the rubbings, and a Romanized transcription and French translation by Père Schmitt12. Père Schmitt’s transcription and translation, it must be confessed, are not very good; and the historical conclusions he drew from the text must be completely disregarded. A better translation of the passage regarding the foundation of Chieng Mai and the monastery (I/3-6) was published in 1925 by the late Professor George Coedès (BEFEO XXV/1, p. 89, note 1). A transcription of the whole inscription into modern Siamese letters, with glosses and a parallel version in modernized spelling, by the late Mahā Chām Dongāmvarṇa, was also published (Prajam Silācārik, vol. III).

In preparing the following transcription we have collated the printed version of Mahā Chām’s transcription13 with the rubbings illustrated in Mission Pavie, and with rubbings made in 1973 by the Department of Fine Arts (figs. 1a, b, c, d). Apart from a few false readings, Mahā Chām’s work is excellent, but is marred by a large number of misprints (mostly affecting matters of spelling, of no great importance). The rubbings illustrated in Mission Pavie (figs. 2a, b, c, d, e, f, g) are on the whole well done; and though a few parts of them were misleadingly retouched with white ink before publication, they can

10. As Bureng Nong died in 1581, we might have expected the merit of the donation to be transferred to him, but he is not mentioned at all in this part of the inscription.
12. ibid., pp. 297-324.
supply useful clues — if used with care — to the reading in places where the stone has since deteriorated. Wherever possible, our reading is based on the rubbings supplied by the Department of Fine Arts.

In transcribing the text into modern Siamese letters, we have placed a dot under a letter whenever it is conjunct with the consonant that follows, e.g. GridLayout. In other respects we have followed the system used by Mahā Chām. The diacritical mark shaped like a rounded circumflex (ऺ) is transcribed as a small circle, for example (1) ṇ, ṇ, ṇ (modern ṇ, ṇ, ṇ); (2) ṇ, 'pavilion' (modern ṇ). Another mark (‘), when placed over the final consonant of a syllable containing no written vowel, shows that the inherent vowel of the initial consonant (or cluster) is pronounced as a short 'O', while the inherent vowel of the final consonant is suppressed; in these cases, in imitation of Mahā Chām's example, we transcribe the mark by means of an apostrophe (') on top of, or following, the final consonant, for example  GridLayout, 'people'. In the inscription this mark is also used in words like  GridLayout,  GridLayout,  GridLayout (modern ṇ, ṇ, ṇ). When the mai-ek and mai-do accents occur, they are usually, but not always, in their normal position over the initial consonant; while a mark closely resembling the mai-do, but in fact corresponding to the modern mai-hān-ākāśa, may be placed over the final consonant of a syllable: we follow Mahā Chām in transcribing these marks as ('), ("), ("), according to their usage. We should add that the diacritical marks in this inscription are often difficult to distinguish from one another; but though in some cases we may have guessed wrong, the sense is not likely to be affected. A mark, written in the inscription as a small superscript circle surmounted by a short vertical line, is usually transcribed by Mahā Chām as ; we think, however, it stands for either or , we are not sure which; and after some hesitation we have decided to transcribe it as , for example  GridLayout (modern ṇ).

The diagram preceding the text (figs. 1a, b; 2a) is the horoscope of Vāt Jyaṅ Hmān, showing the position of the heavenly bodies at the
moment when the monastery (as well as the city) was founded. According to Mahā Chām, the figures in the column to the left of the diagram represent, respectively, the śakarāja, the māsakendra, the avamāna, the tithi, and the nādi; while those to the right represent the haraguna, the kammacubala, the ucabala, the ākṣa, and the nadirkaśa.

14. We have assumed (p. 111) that the whole inscription was engraved in 1581. It may be objected that the diagram at the beginning shows the position of the heavenly bodies at the moment in 1296 when Vat Jyān Hmān was founded, rather than at the time of the benefactions it received in 1581; so at first glance it might be supposed the inscription was a kind of charter of the monastery, originally consisting of only the horoscope and the first 5½ lines, dealing with its foundation in 1296, with the rest of the stone left blank so that the record of later benefactions might be entered on it from time to time. But on paleographic grounds no portion of the inscription can possibly be assigned a date anywhere near 1296; and we assume the horoscope is copied from an earlier record. The script is reasonably uniform throughout; and while the spelling is rather haphazard, no pattern of variation can be detected that could not better be explained by the habits of different scribes. Though we think it probable that the whole text was engraved in 1581, we do not necessarily mean it was all engraved at a single operation. Three punctuation marks, not counting the one at the beginning, occur in the text (II/12, II/30, II/32). They serve to separate four lists of slaves, all of whom, apparently, were donated in 1581. It is uncertain whether or not all four groups were donated on the same day.
Figure 1a. The inscription of Vat Jyan Hmün, face I (photographed from a rubbing supplied by the Department of Fine Arts, Bangkok).
Figure 1c. Same inscription, upper part of face II (photographed from the rubbing).
Figure 1d. Same inscription, lower part of face II (photographed from the rubbing).
Figure 2a. Same inscription, top of face I, showing the horoscope (after Mission Pavie; note that all the plates in Mission Pavie illustrating this inscription should be used with caution, as the rubbings from which they were made were somewhat touched up with white ink before publication).
Figure 2b. Same inscription, face I, lines 1-5 (after Mission Pavie).
Figure 2c. Same inscription, face I, lines 16-30 (after Mission Pavie).
Figure 2d. Same inscription, face I, lines 31-34 (after Mission Pavie).
Figure 2e. Same inscription, face II, lines 1-14 (after Mission Pavie).
Figure 2f. Same inscription, face II, lines 15-29 (after Mission Pavie).
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Figure 2g. Same inscription, face II, lines 30-36 (after Mission Pavie).
TEXT

Face I

1. สารราช ๖๕ ปี ราชสมภพกรีิก วีรรัฐออก ๕ ค่ำวัน ๕ โทษมันปลายยม

2. แตร้งแลงใส้กองทัพไทยสมบัติณั้นแล้ก้นเสียบวัง_binding

3. นาราศีพรัญญารายเจ้าแพรกางเมืองพระข่วงทางสามคนถิ่น

4. ในที่ชื่อภูมิราษฎร์ชลสกุลกันทวีปลุกแข็งสินณั้นแลก็พระเจดีย์ทั้งที่

5. หนองบานชัยฤทธิ์ในข้อหมายหมายานหนึ่งนั้นบางส่วนเปลวตกที่ทานแก

6. แก้วทรงสามเชิญว่าทั่วชัยฤทธิ์นั้นบุกคั้นกันต่อตนสามถังล้มปั้นวั้นหน้า

7. ได้ ๑๒๕ ปีสักการะ ๘๓ พรรศิกราชาเจ้ากษัตริย์ค้ำยืนเป็นเจ้า

8. นั้นวัสนองได้ ๒๖ ปีในปีเปล็กข้ากราขาว่า ๒๐ เมืองชองใหญ่เป็นชน

9. ชื่อsessname kgพรหมทรัพย์กีราราชเจ้าแพรกิมพระทรัพย์กิราราชเจ้า

10. เจ้ามีราชชนาประสานเจ้าท่านอย่างอับเป็นลูกบุญเกิดพุฒิปนผู้ได้พระญา

11. ลงมล่นบุกราชท่านสั่งวิจิตรชัยฤทธิ์นั้นในปีถ้วยสักการะ ๘๓ พรรศ

12. ข้อข่าวที่เป็นพระญาแผนหลวงในปีกรังเลตกิราราช ๘๓ ได้กิจเจดีย์

13. กวมที่ยังเป็นบุกมีพระญาแผนหลวงมราชท่านเสื้อแปลงกั้นเจดีย์

14. วิหารอุโบสถปั้กพระResourceManagerแผนหลวงในอารามชูบัน

15. ปั่นวัสนองสักการะ ๒๖ ปีในปีเปล็กข้ากราขาว่า ๒๐ เมืองชองใหญ่เป็นเจ้า

เปนทักพิมพ
16. คัมภีร์ ๒๐๐๐ กาเนวิ้น ๒๓๒๒๓๓ บ้านสมุทรปราการ หน่วยที่ ๒ บ้านสมุทรปราการ หน่วยที่ ๒

17. บ้านสมุทรปราการ หน่วยที่ ๒ บ้านสมุทรปราการ หน่วยที่ ๒ บ้านสมุทรปราการ หน่วยที่ ๒

Face II

1. នាី ៣ ប្រាក់ ១ ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

2. នមិយ័យ អនុមាត្រ ២ ស្រុក កំប្លែ ព្រះអង្គ បែកស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

3. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

4. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

5. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

6. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

7. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

8. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

9. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

10. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត

11. ដី ២ ប្រាក់ លី ស្រុក ក្រោយព្រះ បម្រុស បាត់ស្រុក របស់ ឈើអូត
១២. នេ ១០២ ឆ្នា ធីចុះបែបល្វែងៗផ្នែករាជធានីបឹងកញ្រាម ២ ខែកញ្ចក់ចាប់ពី ១ ខែ មកដល់ ១ ខែ ស្តេច ។

១៣. រយៈសំយោះលើកទីតាំងក្លិបឆ្នេរនៅជីថីទឹកជ្រៅ ១ ខែ មកដល់ ១ ខែ ស្តេច

១៤. រយៈសំយោះលើកទីតាំងក្លិបឆ្នេរនៅជីថីទឹកជ្រៅ ១ ខែ មកដល់ ១ ខែ ស្តេច

១៥. រយៈសំយោះលើកទីតាំងក្លិបឆ្នេរនៅជីថីទឹកជ្រៅ ១ ខែ មកដល់ ១ ខែ ស្តេច

១៦. រយៈសំយោះលើកទីតាំងក្លិបឆ្នេរនៅជីថីទឹកជ្រៅ ១ ខែ មកដល់ ១ ខែ ស្តេច
ឃ. មី ១ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២៤ កនុ ៉ាយ ២ យុង ៩ លេកនុយ ១ ៉ាយ ៥ យុង ៨ ស្រុងពីរ

៣៤. សត់ងនៃបារមី ៤ រ៉ូន ៣០ កនុ ៉ាយ ៣ យុង ១ លេកនុយ ២ យុង ធី ្កញ

៣៥. បញ្ចាហេយ្យ១ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២៦ កនុ ៉ាយ ៣ យុង ៣ ជូរុរសុណិចបារមី

៣៦. ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២៥ កនុ ៉ាយ ៥ យុង ១ លេកនុយ ៣ ៉ាយ ៥ យុង ធី មុនឈឺ

៣៧. នីយប៉េរនៃបារមី ៦ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២៩ កនុ ៉ាយ ៥ យុង ៣ លេកនុយ ៥ ៉ាយ

៣៨. យុង ៣ ជូរុរសុណិចបារមី ៦ រ៉ូន ៩ ក្រុង ២២ កនុ ៉ាយ ៥ យុង

៣៩. ២ លេកនុយ ៦ ៉ាយ ៤ យុង ៤ ជូរុរសុណិចបារមី ២ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ៣ កនុ

កុេះ ២

៤០. យុង ៤ លេកនុយ ២ ៉ាយ ៤ យុង ២ ជូរុរសុណិចបារមី ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង

៤១. អាភាស់លេគឺ ៥ យុង ២ ជូរុរសុណិចបារមី ៣ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ក្រុង

៤២. ៣ យុង ១ ១ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ សុវត្ថិភាពនៃអាទិភ័យ

៤៣. ឈឺរុនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ

៤៤. កែលិេឃរុនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ

៤៥. កែលិឃរុនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ

៤៦. អាភាស់មុោះ ២ ក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ ៣ រ៉ូនណោងក្រុង ២ ៉ាយ
Translation

[I/1-6.] || In saṅkarāja 658, a ‘ṛvāy sān’ year, in the month of Viśākha on the eighth day of the waxing moon, Thursday, in Tai a ‘mōn plau’ (day), at two nādi plus two pāda after the dawn trumpet, when the lagna was in possession of a navamśa belonging to Jupiter in the sign of Pisces¹, Braṇā Māṇ Ray Cau and Braṇā Nām Mōaṅ (and) Braṇā Rvaṅ, all three of them, having built a sleeping pavilion² at the jayabhūmi³

1. Mr. Roger Billard, to whom we are indebted for analyzing the dates in this inscription (see above, p. 112, note 4) equates  הראשון with the ‘watch of the cock’, attested in Kerala in south India, for which he refers to H. Gundert, *A Malayalam and English Dictionary* (p. 791): ‘yāmakkōli, a cock crowing exactly 7½ nālikena before sunrise, i.e. three hours before sunrise, or 3 a.m.’ Two nādi plus two pāda of the watch of the cock would be one hour from the beginning of the last watch of the night: about 3+1=4 a.m. We omit from our translation the word श्रो (?) at I/2, as we do not understand it. As Mr. Billard observes, the lagna (‘ascendant’), being in possession of a navamśa (one ninth of a ‘sign’) belonging to Jupiter in the sign of Pisces (which already belongs to Jupiter), means that the lagna took place from 16°40’ to 20° of Pisces. The date and hour correspond to Thursday, 12 April 1296 A.D. (Julian) at about 4 a.m.

2. ကုလေး (I/3-4) = တောင်ကြီး. We assume the expression means they had built the (temporary) sleeping pavilion before the day and hour specified for the founding of the city. (Cf. CMC/HC, III/3, p. 84; CMC/N, p. 57.)

3. စိုးရိုက် (I/4), for စိုးရိုက်; see above, p. 112. According to the *Chiang Mai Chronicle*, the jayabhūmi was chosen partly for its geomantic advantages, which are listed, and partly because two white deer and five white rats had come to live there (CMC/N, pp. 57-59; CMC/HC, p. 84 ff.); albino animals were considered highly auspicious. For an omen of another kind, cf. Professor Luce’s remarks (*Old Burma; Locust Valley, N.Y.*, 1969; p. 233): ‘Sites for building were apt to be chosen, by Burmese kings at any rate, for magical reasons: the lakṣaya (auspicious marks) must show that the site was a “land of victory” (Old Burm. ဗုဒ္ဓ မောင်, Pāli jayabhūmi, later corrupted into တောင်ကြီး, “Zigōn”). The first Pagān “Zigōn”, modern Shwé-zigōn with the prefix “Golden”, built by Kyanzittha about 1086 A.D., is still Burma’s national pagoda. Cāṇī II, the first Burmese king to use Burmese in his inscriptions, “went out towards Twraṅ (Tuywindaung) in the cast. ‘That shining thing,’ he asked, ‘is it a fire?’ ‘Yes, it is a fire,’ his followers replied. But the king was aware that it was a ruby shining. He turned back his elephant. ‘Ah!’ he said, ‘this land is truly excellent’, and he trod the site for a royal temple.”
(for) the Royal Palace, (began) digging a moat\textsuperscript{4}, building a triple rampart\textsuperscript{5} on all four sides\textsuperscript{6}, and erecting a cetiya exactly on the site\textsuperscript{7} of the pavilion, in the village of Jyañ Hmān, at that moment; and that piece of land was afterwards\textsuperscript{8} made into a monastery as an offering to the Three Gems, and given the name Vāt Jyañ Hmān, (which it still has) up to the present time\textsuperscript{9}.

[I/6-8.] In the year ‘rvañ hmau’, sakarāja 833\textsuperscript{10}, 175 years after the founding, Bra Ṭilakarāja Caū rebuilt the cetiya in laterite\textsuperscript{11}.

[I/8-14.] Eighty-seven years later, in the year ‘plōk jā’, sakarāja 920\textsuperscript{12}, when Jyañ Hmai had already become part of His Majesty King Mahādhammikarājādhirāja’s realm\textsuperscript{13}, King Mahādhammikarājādhirāja,

---

4. ဓ (I/4) is the word used in Tai Yuan for ‘moat’: see Medha Ratnaprasiddhi’s dictionary, พจนานุกรม ไทโยว — ไท — อังกฤษ, Bangkok, 1965, p. 57.
5. ဓ (I/4), the same word as ဓ in Inscr. 1; see JSS 59/2, p. 209 and note 58.
6. Sc. on all four sides of the city that was being founded.
7. ဓ (I/4), for ဓ, equivalent to ဓ. We should probably understand the term ‘site’ as meaning the entire Jayabhūmi (cf. below, note 9).
8. ဓ (I/5) = ราม, ‘afterwards’. According to the CMC, the sleeping pavilion, moats and ramparts were all built at the same time. The CMC does not mention the cetiya, which may have been built afterwards.
9. The Jayabhūmi must have been a large enough piece of land to accommodate both the monastery and the Royal Palace. Evidently the monastery fulfilled the same function in relation to the palace as Vāt Mahādhātu at Sukhodaya, Vāt Śrī Sarbejīna at Ayudhya, and the Chapel Royal of the Emerald Buddha at Bangkok.
11. ဓ (I/7-8), literally ‘built the cetiya of laterite for the second time’ (in Tai Yuan, ဓ means ဓ; cf. Medha Ratnaprasiddhi’s dictionary, p. 128); i.e. the old cetiya was encased; see above, p. 115.
12. 1558 A.D.
13. The realm of Bureung Nong (Bayinnaung). After a siege lasting for three days, according to the Chiang Mai Chronicle (Notton, p. 164) and the Yonaka History (p. 303), the city of Chiang Mai surrendered to him on Saturday, 2 April 1558 (Julian), in the morning. This is almost certainly the right date, though Wood (History of Siam, p. 117) gives the date of Chiang Mai’s surrender as April 1556 (probably a misprint), while Harvey (History of Burma; London, 1925; p. 117) gives it as 1557.
being filled with zeal, conveyed a gift of a silver washbasin weighing 4,000 to Braña Hłvañ Sám Län, with instructions to rebuild Vät Jyañ Hmän: so it is said. In the ‘täp plau’ year sakaräja 927, a royal decree promoted him to (the rank of) Braña Sën Hłvañ. In the ‘rvän met’ year sakaräja 933, the cetiya was again encased: Braña Sën Hłvañ, (in accordance with) His Majesty’s instructions, built the cetiya, (as well as) a vihāra, an uposatha hall, and a library for the scriptures, made a preaching chair and couches for sleeping and sitting.

14. ปั่ง (I/10); in Tai Yuan, ｬ, which is the same word, means ‘to give’, ‘to transfer’, etc.; see Medha Ratnaprasiddhi’s dictionary, p. 94, s.v.
15. A little over four kilograms.
16. Title of a high official at Chieng Mai; as we learn from the next sentence, he was promoted to the rank of Braña Sën Hłvañ in 1565.
17. ภักิ难得 (I/11); ภักิ may be for Pāli kamma, ‘work’, ‘performance’, etc.; 难得 is of course Pāli rajadāna, ‘royal gift’, ‘royal bounty’ (a king’s instructions are regarded as bountiful gifts). Literally: ‘to act (in accordance with) the royal bounty’.
18. วัณณนี (I/11) = วัณณนี.
19. 1565 A.D.
20. พระราชาญญา (I/11-12), modern พระราชาญญา; ญญา is the Sanskrit word निधी, ‘a command’.
21. 1571 A.D.
22. At I/12 and I/13, the word ‘cetiya’ is written जेतिया, ‘cetiya’, although it is written जेतिय at I/4.
23. Literally ‘built the cetiya the third time (เปลี่ยนฐานที่) encasing (นม= Tai Yuan ภักิ, Siamese กรม) it once (more)’ (I/12-13); cf. above, note 11. The operation was the third construction of the cetiya on the same spot, but the second ‘encasement’.
24. ภักิ难得 (I/13); see above, note 17.
25. ปั่ง (I/14), for Pāli pīṭakaghara, ‘house for the (Three) Pīṭakas’.
(built) a wall with arched gates, (and completed) everything in the monastery.

[I/14-21.] In the ‘rvañ sai’ year sakarāja 94328, he29 collected money, villages, plantations and people to present to the monastery, all of them. As for the portion of gold, there was 27,011 (weight) of gold; and the portion of silver was 432,273 (weight)32. Svan Hmāk village, in front of the monastery, and Sēn Sōn village, situated in the direction of Svan Hmāk village, two villages which are in the district of Í Mō, were given (together with the people living there) as slaves to the monastery. The whole mass of merit (earned by the donation) was presented to His Highness Vara-orasādhīrajā35, who is the ruler of Mōañ Bin Jyañ Hmaï36, on the day (he) came37 to do homage to the Three Gems in the vihāra of Jyañ Hmañ in the presence of the monks gathered there under the leadership of38 the Venerable Samtec Mahāmahindādīcavageṃsa, Lord Abbot of Vāt Jyañ Hmañ, aged 73 years, who is witness to all the details (of the donation).

27. We conjecture that ขว่ง (I/14) is a variant of the Tai Yuan word แข่ง, 'arch', or 'archway' (see Medha Ratnaprasiddhi’s dictionary, p. 51). Mahā Chām (Prajum Śilācārik, III, p. 217), however, equates it with the Tai Yuan word ช่วง, 'precinct' (see Medha Ratnaprasiddhi’s dictionary, p. 33).
28. 1581 A.D.
29. Sc. Braññā Sēn Hlvañ (cf. above, note 16). This official is mentioned in the Yonaka History, which says that when Queen Visuddhirājadevi [Lady Visuddhadevi] died in 1578 he supervised the construction of the funeral pyre and organized the cremation ceremonies.
30. รำม (I/15) = รำม, ‘to collect’.
31. ต้า (I/15) is the Tai Yuan word ต้า, ‘portion’.
32. One thousand-weight was a little over one kilogram.
33. พันนา (I/17) = พันนา, literally ‘1,000 ricefields’, a term used in Tai Yuan for ‘district’.
34. 婆羅門族 (I/17-18), Pāli puññarāsi, ‘mass of merit’.
35. The Burmese viceroy, Tharawadi Min.
36. Bin is the name of the river on which Chieng Mai is located.
37. สะเดา (I/19); สะเดา = modern สะเดา (from Khmer stac).
38. แปนParseError (I/20-21).
[I/21.] We shall state and explain the arrangement\(^{39}\).

[I/22-34.] Monastery slaves\(^{40}\) in the section\(^{41}\) (under) Hmīn Vāt\(^{42}\).

Khrahnān\(^{43}\) Dona, with two children, one male, one female; and four slaves, two male, two female;

Bān Posathadhāmmapāla\(^{44}\), with one son; two grandchildren, one male, one female; and two slaves, one male, one female;

Lām Vāt Pun Vān, with one wife, one daughter, and one female slave;

Gām Bā, with one wife, and three children, two male, one female;

Sāgara, with one wife and two daughters;

Pua Trā, with two children, one male, one female;

Nā Maṅgan, with one wife and two children, one male, one female;

Bal Prahnā, with one wife;

Mè Hmū, with one daughter;

Jōy, the silk weaver;

Gām Māv, with one wife;

Ī Jān San;

Nāṅ Tyav;

Ī Dum;

Ī Pōk;

Nāṅ Hmīn Hnōy;

Nāṅ Bān Hrōk Nōy, with one daughter;

---

39. This is a conjectural translation of จับผีเกนในธ (I/21): จับ, ‘shall’; ผี (=ผิว), ‘disclose’, ‘state’, etc.; แกน, ‘to solve’ (as a riddle), here probably used in the sense of ‘explain’, which is one of its meanings in Lào (Reinhorn, p. 144); ในธ, Pāli naya, ‘method’, ‘plan’, ‘manner’, ‘sense’, etc.

40. ข่าวคริ (I/22) = ข่าวคำ.

41. ข่าวคริ (I/22), ‘section’, ‘division’, etc.

42. Apparently a former official, then a slave, who was put in charge of these slaves.

43. ขนำน (I/22), for khnān or hnān, an honorific prefix to the name of a layman who has spent some time in the monkhood.

44. The name is written Posathadhāmmapāla (I/23); for Pāli Uposathadhāmmapāla,
Hmū Sneha⁴⁵, with one elder sister named Sutṭā;
Āy Svay;
Āy Pôm, with one wife;
Ñī Kōṅ, with one wife, two daughters, and one grandson;
Ratmaṅgan, with one wife; two children, one male, one female;
and four grandchildren, two male, two female;
Găm Bô, with one wife; and two grandchildren, one male, one
female;
Côm Phāṅ, with one wife;
Ñôt, with one wife, one younger brother, and one younger sister;
HnP Găm, with one wife, one younger brother, and one younger
sister;
Bek Prahṇā, with one wife and one daughter;
Pāk Āv, with one wife; and three children, one male, two female;
Un, with one wife and two daughters;
Bô Blōṅ, with one wife;
Im, with one wife and two daughters;
Un, with one wife;
Tāṅ Grak, with one wife; and [II/1-12] three grandchildren, one
male, two female;
Lun, with one wife;
Kève, with one wife;
Pun Mī, with one wife;
Mève, with one wife; and two children, one male, one female;
Dôn, with one wife;
In, with one wife and one son;
Jyaṅ, with one wife;
Kvāṅ Kē Vāṅ, with one wife;
Un, with one wife; two children, one male, one female; and two
granddaughters;
Lun, with one wife;
Rōan Klāṅ, with one wife and one daughter;

⁴⁵ The name is written สเนาะ (I/28), indicating the same pronunciation as for
สเนาะ (Sneha).
The blacksmith Pun, with one wife; and two children, one male, one female;

The image-caster Māṅgalayasa, with one wife and two daughters;  Erdoğan, with one daughter;
The wife of Bōp, with three children, two male, one female;
Āy Naṅ Dyam;
Naṅ Sāṅkā;
Pun Kōa, mother and child;
Punjana, husband and wife;
Cāndrā, with two children, one male, one female;
Naṅ Sāṅkā, wife of the crossbowman;
Naṅ Bvak, the doctor who treats wounds, with one daughter;
Naṅ Hmāṅ Vāṅ Kau, with one child and four female slaves;
Yōt Gām, with two daughters;
Vāṅ Pū Kāṅ, with one wife;
Ī Gām, one;
Ī Pān, one;
Pa Hlek, one;
Ī Phāy, one;
Pa Khvān, with one wife;
Pa Lem, with one wife;
Pa Kām, one;
Ī Naṅ Bī, one;
Ta Naṅ Māṅ Kham Cūm, one;
Thau Mōāṅ Hnōy, one;
Thau Mōāṅ Kēv, one;
Nāy Hnāṅsi Galprahāṅā, one;
Bāṅ Nōy Haṅ Gām, one;
Bāṅ Nōy Haṅ, one;
Lām Bāṅ Un, one;
Nāy Jāṅ Gām Mun, one;
Nāy Jāṅ Dan, one;
Nāy Jāṅ Roṅ, one;
Nāy Jāṅ Rāt, one, who is foreman.

46. Ṣimāṅ (II/4), modern Ṣimāṅ.  Ṣimāṅ (II/4).

47. Ṣimāṅ (II/11); the foreman of this section of slaves.
[In this section] there are 40 families of slaves^{48}, (including) 102 males.\

[II/12-30.] Section^{49} (under) Hmĩn Hua Sōa.

Braṇā Hlvañ Cau^{50}, pouring water^{51}, presented (the following), not only the children, wives, and slaves, (but also) the nobles and farmers, and all the people of every category who live with them, to be slaves of Vāt Jyañ Hmān, every one of them, everywhere^{52}.

Hmĩn Hua Sōa;

---

48. ກາງ (II/11), equivalent to າລາກ.
49. Cf. above, note 41.
50. Probably Braṇā Sēn Hlvañ.
51. In accordance with the Indian custom, widely prevalent in southeast Asia, he poured a little water into the ground to signify he was making an irrevocable gift. The word ຕັກ (written ຝະກາ at II/12), usually a noun meaning ‘a drop’, is here used as a verb.
52. The emphatic statement at II/12-13 suggests that the persons assigned to Hmĩn Hua Sōa’s section are in a different category from those assigned to Hmĩn Vāt’s section. All the heads of families listed at II/14-36 are being irrevocably presented as monastery slaves together with all their dependants; it appears that many of these heads of families possessed considerable property; and it may be that their lands and equipment were made over to the monastery at the same time. Many of those assigned to Hmĩn Vāt’s section seem to have been humbler people, with little or no property; and while in most cases their dependants were presented with them, there is no statement that none was exempted.

If, as seems probable, Braṇā Hlvañ Cau (II/12) is the same man as Braṇā Sēn Hlvañ, who rebuilt Vāt Jyañ Hmān in 1571 (I/12 f.), and ‘collected money, villages, plantations, and people to present to the monastery’ in 1581 (I/15 f.), he was presumably acting on behalf of a large number of donors in presenting the persons in the first section to the monastery. The persons in the second section were apparently his own dependants, which would be the reason why he poured water only in connection with them. He transferred the merit of the entire donation to the viceroy, on behalf of the various donors in connection with the first section, and on his own behalf in the second.
Un Rōan, with two wives, one son, and 20 slaves, 9 male, 11 female;

Ga Kēv Hnōy Bō Sut, with one wife and one son;
Pū Ėua, with one wife, one son, and one grandson;
Mē Cha'n, with one son;
Bō Tuvo, with one wife and one son;
Group belonging to Lām Hmīn Kēv, with one house and six families: 22 persons, 8 male, 14 female; four little children, one male, three female;
Bǎn Khvā Dāv Nōy’s group, with three houses and four families: 22 persons, 8 male, 14 female; and three little girls;
Nā Vijiar Mē Sā’s group, with two houses and one family: 12 persons, 4 male, 8 female; and one little girl;
Kēv Hnōy Hnōn Jōm’s group, with three houses and one family: 12 persons, 4 male, 8 female;

(Group) belonging to Lāv Nā Hō Lyap, with four houses and three families: 21 persons, 6 male, 15 female; and six small children, three male, three female;
Group belonging to Cā Tek Jay, with six houses and two families: 38 persons, 11 male, 27 female; and eight small children, five male, three female;
Group belonging to Tān Cai Pān Pō, with seven houses and one family: 24 persons, 9 male, 15 female; and 12 small children, 5 male, 7 female;

53. Un Rōan (II/14), now usually a name for a woman, was evidently a man’s name in the sixteenth century.
54. This translation is conjectural. The expression ฐุนุน ฐุนุนฉว้ in II/15 seems to be defective. Supposing that ฐุนุน is intended to refer to a son, the engraver may have omitted ฐุนุนฉว้ after ฐุนุน by mistake. Or else perhaps he intended to write ฐุนุนฉว้ only, but first wrote the word ฐุนุน instead of ฐุนุน, then crossed out ฐุนุน with a faint mark that can no longer be descerned; in that case the entry would mean ‘Pū Ėua, with one wife and one grandson’.
55. ฐุนุน Kēv (II/16), ‘group (of which) Lām Hmīn Kēv is master’. It would appear from the opening statement of this list (II/12-13) that Lām Hmīn Kēv himself is included in the donation.
Group belonging to Bán Sên, with four houses: 20 persons, 9 male, 11 female; and two little girls;

Group belonging to Bvak Nā, with three houses and one family: 16 persons, 7 male, 9 female;

Group belonging to Gvān Hmyañ, with three houses and one family: 14 persons, 4 male, 10 female; and three small children, two male, one female;

Group belonging to Nī Pha Nhī, with six houses and one family: 19 persons, 8 male, 11 female; and five small children, one male, four female;

Group belonging to Hmīn Tāh Nāh Öy, with six houses and six families: 22 persons, 10 male, 12 female; and six small children, one male, five female;

Nān Kham My’s group, with two houses and one family: nine persons, two male, seven female; and two small children, one male, one female.56

Nān Hmīn Fon Jyan Tāv Kau, with a family of doctors57 [consisting of] a mother and children, and two female slaves;

Nān Hmīn Lām Brān Kau, with a family of one daughter, and three female slaves;

Slaves of the golden statue of the Buddha: Nān Hmīn Uan; Î Qām Bi, one; Î Giêm Nōn, one.11

56. The list of persons in Hmīn Hua Soa’s section seems to end with the punctuation mark at this point. The remaining entries may have been added later in the same year.

57. This is a conjectural translation of (II/30-31). The rubbing shows an indistinct mark over the conjunct letter 猬, which may be intended for a mai-do, and which Père Schmitt’s illustration shows as a distinct mai-do (see fig. 2g). The reading 佴, ‘pots’, would not be satisfactory unless we assumed the word to be an abbreviation for 𠣱𧀝, ‘potters’,
[II/32-35.] Un, with one house and one wife, and his son Ay Hlvan, with one wife and two daughters; Lün Rōan, with one wife; and Bò Qäm Rōan, with one wife and one daughter: these three families of slaves, who serve the Samtec Cau, are presented to the statue of the Buddha in the maṇḍapa.

[II/35-36.] Hmai Cân, with one wife and one daughter; and Ba Lun, with one wife; these two families are presented to [Vāt] Jyan Hmān to learn sheetmetal-working.

58. เบ็น (II/34) = ขัติ; see above, note 48.
59. คุณกรม (II/34): we follow Mahā Chām (Prajum Silicirik, III, p. 218, note 34), who glosses คุณ as ท่าน. The 'Samtec Cau' seems to be the Abbot of Vāt Jyan Hmān mentioned at I/20, and we assume he is dedicating the slaves to the statue.
60. ณ (II/35) is a variant of นทิ, Pali 'maṇḍapa', which in Siam usually means a square shrine intended to house a statue or some other object of veneration.
61. เจ้า (II/35), for เจ้า, a title given in Tai Yuan to a layman who was formerly a sāmarapera (novice monk).
A NOTE ON NAMES AND TITLES IN THE INSCRIPTION

1. **Rulers and officials**

In the first part of the historical retrospect, Brañā ( Brañā) means 'king'. Miūn Ray is called Brañā Miūn Ray Cau (I/3), in which Cau (Cau) means prince or ruler. His two guests are called Brañā Nām Mōān and Brañā Rvañ (I/3).

In the second part of the historical retrospect, King Tilokarāja is called Bra Tilokarāja Cau (I/7). This is rather surprising, as Bra (Bra), modern Brañ (Brañ), is only a very general honorific; whereas the Chieng Mai Chronicle calls him by several different appellations, including Cau Brañ Tilokarāja.

King Bureng Nōng of Burma is called Samtec Bra Mahādhāmmikarājādhirāja Cau (I/9); Samtec, here obviously 'His Majesty', is from Khmer Sāmteac, an epithet of kings and the highest princes.

Samtec is also an ecclesiastical title: the Lord Abbot of Vat Jyañ Hmān is called Mahamahīndādīcāvapta Mahāsamtec (I/20).

Bureng Nōng's son the viceroy of Lān Nā is called Bra Vara-orasādhirāja Cau (I/18; Pali: vara, 'eminent', + orasa, 'son', + adhirāja, 'super-king').

By this time the term Brañā is no longer reserved for a king. In the early fifteenth century, according to the Chieng Mai Chronicle (CMC/N, 94; CMC/HC, III/3, 106), a man from Chieng Mai named Bejrayasa organized four groups of young warriors who fought so bravely that the King called them Tek Jay (Tek Jay, 'manly boys'). The Yonaka History (p. 214) adds that the four groups were commanded by officers with the titles of Brañā Sen Hlvah (Sen Hlvah), Brañā Šām Lān (Šām Lān), Brañā Čā Pān (Čā Pān), and Brañā Tek Jay. The Yonaka History is not infallible; and as no source is given for the statement we cannot judge its accuracy. These titles may have originated somewhat later. We see no reason to doubt the Chieng Mai Chronicle when it tells us that Jayajēṭṭha promoted several officials in 1546 A.D., raising one of them.
from the rank of Sên to that of Brañã Sên Hlvan, and another from the rank of Hmîn Sâm Lân to that of Brañã Sâm Lân (CMC/N, 158; CMC/HC, IV/1, 89).

Evidently the practice continued, for the merit-making recorded in the main text of our inscription is organized by an official at Chieng Mai, who when he is first introduced to us (l/10-11) is called Brañã Hlvan Sâm Lân (hlyvan, ṭṭ, 'great' or 'royal'; sâm lân: '3 million'), and who is later (l/12) promoted to Brañã Sên Hlvan (sên: '100,000'). It is not surprising that he should bear, one after the other, almost exactly the same titles that Jayajeţha had given two of his officials a generation earlier, but it is a little odd that they should be the same titles the Yonaka History gives the commanders of two of the four groups of young heroes.

The numerals in these titles must refer to quite different kinds of things, otherwise the change from 3 million to 100,000 would not be a promotion. 'Three million' in this context may be a territorial designation: as bân-nā (wîn, literally '1,000 ricefields') means a district, '3 million' might mean 3,000 districts. The title Brañã Sên Hlvan might be understood as 'lord of 100,000 (officials who have) the rank of hluvan': such a figure would of course be more theoretical than real; but he might control a considerable number of such officials, each with a large number of followers. This might help to explain the size and quality of his donation (the second group of slaves). 'Hundred thousand' could also belong to the series Nay Sip, 'master of 10', Nay Roy, 'master of 100', (Khun) Bān, 'lord of 1,000', (Khun) Hmîn, 'lord of 10,000', and (Khun) Sên, 'lord of 100,000'. In Mûn Rây's time, according to the Mûrjayavinicchaya, these figures represented the number of men under the command of the person whose rank they designated. These ranks applied to the civil administration as well as the military, though with the progress of time the relation between the rank and the number of men administered became largely theoretical.

In the reign of Tilokarâja, as we gather from the Chieng Mai Chronicle and the poem Yvan Bây, the rulers of cities in Lân Nā, as well as most of the high-ranking officials in the central bureaucracy,
bore the title Hmin, though a few of the top-ranking bureaucrats bore that of Sen. During the next reigns there is a gradual increase in the number of provincial governors mentioned in the Chieng Mai Chronicle who have the rank of Sen; but there are none with the rank of Branya before 1546.

Our inscription shows that the importance of certain ranks had depreciated by 1581. An official with the rank of Hmin was put in charge of each of the two sections of monastery slaves (I/22, II/12 f.), certainly a function far inferior to the rulership of a town.

2. Men on the slave lists

Three men donated as monastery slaves have the rank of Bun (-win, I/23, II/17, 23-24), two have the rank of Bun Noy or ‘deputy Bun’ (both at II/10), and three have the rank of Hmin (-win, I/22, II/12, 28). Another is called Ca Tek Jay (II/21), probably a rank belonging to the same series as Branya Tek Jay, which the Yonaka History gives one of the commanders of the young warriors: Ca Tek Jay, however, would be a much lower grade than Branya Tek Jay.

Some titles signify function. The term Lam (win, originally ‘to tether’, ‘to bind’) means someone who performs liaison duties, a go-between, an introducer, an emissary, an interpreter, or perhaps now and then an administrator of property on someone else’s behalf. It is sometimes followed by a title giving the rank of the person to whom the Lam is attached, such as Bun (II/10) or Hmin (II/16), or a term specifying the holder’s sphere of activity, e.g. Lam Vat (I/24), presumably someone connected with the business affairs of a monastery.

The term Nay (win) prefixed to a man’s name was once a high title (in Inscription 9, which dates from 1406, it is borne by several royal councillors at Sukhodaya). In the present inscription it seems to be more a title of function than of rank. For example Nay Hnansì Galprahan (II/9-10), ‘master of the Galprajna books’, was probably the custodian of a certain kind of books whose exact nature is not now known. There are also two men called Nay Jay (www, II/10-1),
'master of the people of . . . ', followed by what seem to be personal names — Qam Mun, 'origin of gold'; and Rāt, probably for Ratna, 'jewel'. Perhaps before being donated as slaves themselves, they had been overseers in the service of the persons named. The term Nay Jāv (น้ําจั๊ว, II/10-11) may be no more than a graphic variant of Nay Jāv; if not, it could mean 'master of 20', denoting the rank of a man named Dan, 'enduring', and one named Rōā, 'shining'.

Several terms may be prefixed to names to serve as cognizances or mild honorifics. Ṣā (I/25, II/18) is doubtless the same word that is still used in Lào to mean 'honorable', prefixed to the names of officials (it is said to derive from Skt. ājñā; see Reinhorn, p. 819). Khrahmān (I/22, a variant of คำ) denotes a layman who has been a monk; Hmai (คำ, II/35 = modern ṣā) denotes one who had been a sāmaṇera. Ṣā (I/28) may be an abbreviation for Nay Ṣā (คำ), something like a squad leader or its civilian equivalent. Terms like Bvak (II/24) and Ṣā (คำ, II/14), representing groups of persons, may be abbreviations of the same sort. ḫān (II/2) means a 'magistrate' (Reinhorn, p. 199). Ṣān (I/34, II/22, II/28) means 'deputy' or 'substitute' (Reinhorn, p. 938). Thau (คำ, II/9, now usually written ṣā) is a person of age or distinction. Ṣā (คำ, II/15) means 'grandfather'. In lists of slaves the word Ṣā (คำ, I/33-34, II/15, II/34), sometimes written Ba (คำ, II/35), may be applied to any male.

The terms Ṣā (I/28-29, II/5, 33), Ṣā (I/29, II/26) and Ṣā (II/15) in a man's name denote respectively the first, second and fifth son of his father (only these three appear in our inscription, out of the full series of ten).

Several men listed have Sanskrit or Pāli names, for example: Posatdhampāḷa (I/23), for Uposathdhampappāḷa, 'guardian of the preaching of the holy day'; Sāgara (I/25), 'ocean'; Maṅgan (I/25), for Maṅgala, 'auspicious'; Bala Prabhā (I/26), for Balaprajñā, 'forceful wisdom'; Sneha (I/28), 'affection'; Ratmaṅgan (I/29), for Ratramaṅgala, 'jewelled prosperity'; Bek Prabhā (I/32), for Vajraprajñā, 'adamantine
wisdom'; Mahgalayasa (II/4), 'auspicious rank'; Cân (II/35), for Candra, 'moon', or perhaps Candana, 'sandalwood'. One man is called Pun (Pāli puñña, 'merit'), and the same word appears as a component in several other names: Pun Vān (I/24) for Pāli Puñnavamsa, 'meritorious lineage'; Pun Mi (II/1), 'having merit'; and Punjana (II/5), for Puñña Janaḥ, 'merit gains the victory'. At least one name, Blôn (I/34), 'fire', is borrowed from Khmer.

Most of the names are Tai, or made up of words effectively naturalized into Tai. A favorite element, used in various combinations, is Gām (= gām), 'gold'; for example Gām Bā (I/24), 'bringing gold'; Gām Māv (I/27), 'golden armlet'; Gām Bō (I/30), 'enough gold'; Hnō Gām (I/32) or Hnā Gām (II/10), 'golden sprout'; Yōt Gām (II/7), 'golden pinnacle'; Gām Rōan (II/34), 'gold of the house'. One man is named Nōt Graṇ (II/4), i.e. Yōt Gaṇ, 'firm pinnacle', and another is named Nōt (I/31), 'pinnacle', without qualification. Besides Mr. Gold, we have a Pa Hlek, 'Mr. Iron', a Pa Khvān (modern khvān), 'Mr. Vital Spirit', and a Pa Lem, 'Mr. Treasury' (all at II/8).

Joy (I/26) means 'youngest child'; Svay (I/28-29), 'tapering'; Pōm (I/29), 'dumpy'; Kōn (I/29), 'in a heap'; Im (I/34), 'satisfied'; Grak (I/34), 'a mortar for pounding food'; Mēv (II/1), 'a cat'; In (II/2) is named for the god Indra. Tān Cai, 'equal to the heart', is the name of a man who lives at Pān Pō (II/22), 'village with a well'.

Three men are called Kēv (II/1, II/16, II/19), 'jewel', and a fourth is named Mōān Kēv (II/9), 'jewel country'. One is named Pua Trā (I/25), 'lotus symbol'. Five are named Un, 'pleasantly warm' (I/33, I/34, II/2, II/10, II/32), plus one named Un Rōan (II/14). The word Rōan, 'house', reappears in the name Rōan Klaṇ (II/3), 'central house', and Lūn Rōan (II/33), 'youngest of the house'. Used without qualification, Lun (or Lūn) means a younger son (II/1, II/3, II/35). In some cases the word Nōy or Hnōy (the two forms seem to be interchangeable in our inscription) probably started as a child's name, 'little', and then continued as a personal name for the adult. Bān Khvā Dāv Nōy (II/17) means a man with the rank of Bān, belonging to the 'right' (khvā, one of the two
major classes, right and left, into which the population was divided); Dāv (ดาว) is a noble or princely title; and Dāv Nōy could be either the man himself or else his superior in the administration. Kēv Nōy Hmōn Jōm (II/19) is ‘Kēv Nōy of Lake Jōm’. Nī Phā Nōy (II/26-27) is the second son (นิ) of his father; and Phā means ‘rock’ or ‘cliff’.

Nā Vijiar Mē Śā (II/18) is ‘the Honorable Vijiar of Mē Śā’ (a place on the River Śā in Chieng Mai Province). Hmōn Tān Nān Ōy (II/28) is a man with the rank of Hmōn, whose name means ‘equal to sugar-syrup’. Gvān Hmâyān (II/25) is an elephant-driver (gvān), named after the wild tea plant (भूष, भूष) whose fermented leaves are chewed with salt and other tidbits (Reinhorn, p. 1925; McFarland, p. 657).

3. Women on the slave lists

Three different terms are prefixed to the names of women according to their rank. For ordinary women the term is Ḡ (originally ‘the second daughter’), something like ‘miss’, which can also be used for female animals. For women of middling status the term is Mē, ‘woman’, (the counterpart of masculine Bb). For women of rank it is Nān, ‘lady’. When Nān is followed by a title such as Bān or Hmōn, it denotes the wife or widow of an official of that rank.

Five ladies on the lists are the wives or widows of officials with the rank of Hmōn. Obviously Nān Hmōn Nōy (II/27) is the wife or widow of Hmōn Nōy, and Nān Hmōn Uan (II/32) that of Hmōn Uan, but we have no information about these two officials. Nān Hmōn Vāt Kau (II/7) is very likely the wife or widow of a former Hmōn Vāt, a predecessor of the Hmōn Vāt who was put in charge of the first section of monastery slaves (I/22). Nān Hmōn Fon Jān Tāv Kau (II/30) is the wife or widow of Hmōn Fon, the former governor of Jān Tāv (Chieng Đào, 60 kilometers north of Chieng Mai), and Nān Hmōn Lām Brān Kau (II/31) is the wife or widow of Hmōn Lām, the former governor of Brān (Mōān Bān, i.e.,
"Müang Pān in Jyān Rāy Province); we take the final term Kau, ‘former’, as indicating that the husband formerly held the post mentioned. By 1581 the governor of a province would probably have had the rank of Sēn or Braṇā rather than Hmīn. The corollary may be that these two ladies were much younger than their husbands, and long outlived them.

Nāh Bān Hrōk Nōy (I/28) is the wife or widow of an official with the rank of Bān, whose name Hrōk (modern Hōk) means ‘spear’. Nāh Bvak Hmō Yā Pāt (II/6) is probably ‘Lady Bvak, the doctor who treats wounds’.

Little can be said about the other women whose names are prefixed with Nāh. Two are named Nāh Saṇkā (II/5, 6), in which Saṇkā is the Pāli word for ‘doubt’. Another is called Nāh Kham Mā (I/29), ‘Lady Horse-tamer’. Nāh Tyav (I/27) means ‘Lady Single’; Nāh Dyam (II/5) is ‘Lady Garlic’ or else an abbreviation for Nāh Dyam Cai, ‘Lady Equal to the Heart’.

Mē Hmī (I/26) means ‘Mrs. Pig’. Mē Chāh (II/15) means ‘Mrs. Granary’.

I Jān San (I/27) is ‘Miss Needle-Threader’, I Dum is probably an abbreviation of I Padum, ‘Miss Lotus’, I Pōk (I/27) means ‘Miss Shorty’, I Giṃ (II/7) is ‘Miss Gold’, I Pān (II/7-8) is ‘Miss Birthmark’, I Phāy (II/8) is ‘Miss Cotton’; I Giṃ Bī and I Giṃ Nōn (II/32) are a pair of relatives or friends, ‘the Misses Gold, elder and younger’.

Three of the women listed have no prefix to their names. One is called Pun Kōa (II/5), ‘merit helps’. Another, the elder sister of Hmī Sneha (I/28), is named Sutta, presumably put for Pāli Sutā, ‘daughter’. The third is called Candrā (II/5), a Sanskrit feminine meaning ‘shining like the moon’.

One woman, ‘the wife of Bōp’, (II/4) is anonymous.
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