

THE NOEN SA BUA INSCRIPTION OF DONG SI MAHA BO, PRACHINBURY

New evidence on cultural relations between Sri Lanka and
Dvaravati kingdom

This writer, being invited by *Matichon newspaper* and *Silpavathanatham monthly*, Bangkok, conducted a research programme on cultural relations between Sri Lanka and Siam in ancient times in 1986. Accompanied by Michael Wright and Sujit Wongthes on a tour to Prachinburi, I had the opportunity to visit the ancient site of Wat Sa Morakot and Dong Si Maha Phot (Sri Maha Bodhi). For me there were three main attractions: The Buddha Pāda Lānchana, the imprint of Lord Buddha's Feet, recently discovered at *Wat Sa Morakot*; the Sri Maha Bodhi tree, which is believed to have grown from a sapling brought from Anuradhapura; and an inscription containing three delightful Pali stanzas in the Vasanta Tilaka metre.

With the first reading of these stanzas, the writer felt them very near and dear to him, so much so, that they were as if lying hidden in some corner of his memory awaiting to respond. This instinct kindled in him a determination to make an intensive study of the inscription, the results of which constitute this paper.

I

The **Noen Sa Bua Inscription**, as it is called, is inscribed on a stone slab today housed at the small museum at Wat Sa Morakot, Dong Si Maha Phot, Prachinburi Province. The inscription is in what is generally called Pallava Script, that is, post-Brahmi Script, almost identical with the Sinhala Script of the 7th and 8th centuries A.D., and consists of 27 lines. The space from lines 6-16 provides for the three stanzas. The rest at the opening and the close of the inscription are in the ancient Khmer language, and are not of concern in this article.

The latest edition of this inscription appears in the *Caruk nai Prachet Thai*, vol. 1. The plate and the final text as produced in *Caruk* and *Silpavathanatham Journal* are given below.¹

The final text

Yo sabbaloka mohito - karuṇādhivāso
Mokkham karosi amalam - vara puṇṇa cando

Neyyo damo navikulam sakalam vibuddho
Lokuttaro namatha tam - sirasā munendam
Sopāna māla mamalam - tiranālayassa
Saṃsāra sāgara samuttaranāya setum
Sambodha tīramapicuttara khemamaggam
Dhammam namassatha sadā muninā pasattham
Deyyam dadantyamapi yattha pasanna cittā
datva narā phalamulam ratanam saranti,
Tam sabbadā dasabalenapi suppasattham
Sangham namassatha sada mita punnakhettam

The italic words are the main concern of this writer and they will be examined in consultation with the plate, and the reading adopted by *Caruk. mokkham karosi amalam*

This does not appear to be grammatical in Pāli, *karosi*, being second person present tense singular verb, requires a corresponding subject like *tvam*, which is impossible in the context. *mokkhamkaro*² is clear on the plate, but the next three aksaras are not clear at all,³ though *niramalam* has been suggested, and corrected as *si ama*.⁴ If *si* is replaced with *ti* to make *karoti*, which is grammatically correct with *yo*, then *mokkham karoti amalam* does make sense, but in the relevant space on the plate, it is impossible to discern *a* and the aksara looks more like *vi*, and then it reads as *mokkham karoti vimalam* yet *ti, vi, ma* three aksaras are not free from doubt.

varapunna cando

This seems to be read and restored correctly, but *vara punna cando* without a qualifying adjective does not yield a complete sense and also does demonstrate poor poetry. Since the first three aksaras of line 6 on the plate are clearly visible as *lam, va, ra* and if *va* can be read as *ba*, then we can make *lambara* and read together with two preceding aksaras *vima*, it makes *vimalambara*, which yet is open to doubt. Anyway, let us tentatively restore the second line as *mokkhamkaro su vimalambarā punna cando*.

tiranālayassa, line, 1, verse, 2

tiranālayassa looks clumsy and meaningless, *tiranālaya* can be considered a compound with *ālaya* and *tirana* as the two components, but the first word *tirana* is uncommon in Pāli. Unfortunately on the plate too though *ti* and *layassa* are clear the two aksaras in between are very difficult to decipher. The space demands one short and one long syllable—to fit in to the *Vasanta tilaka* metre eg., *ti—layassa*. If the two syllables can be identified as *dasā*, then it makes *tidasālayassa*, arraying the whole line as *sopanalamalamalam tidasalayassa* meaning, *(the Dhamma,) a flight of steps to the abode of the heaven of Tidasa (Tāvātimsa)*.

sambodha tiramapicuttara khemamaggam, line 3 verse 2

The whole line except for the last word *khema maggam* looks like a riddle, and difficult to read from the plate. Some aksaras which are very clear on the plate have to be replaced or totally rejected, if the line is to be read as proposed. For example *yya* has to be replaced with *ma* which is of an entirely different shape and *jja* has to be totally rejected if *cajjatta* is to be rendered as *cuttara*.

This being so, the whole line deserves to be read and interpreted afresh. The line starts with the third aksara of the eleventh line on the plate. The third and fourth are clearly visible as *sabbā*. The next aksara, in no way can be recognized as *ra* or *dha*. The aksara is of the shape \cap which easily can be identified as *ga*, and the next *ti* is clear. Thus we can form the word *sabbagati*, *sabba* + *agati*. The aksara next to *ti* has been read as *ra*, but a sharply focussed eye on the plate, would catch it as λ which can then be identified as *bha*; the next is very clear and correctly read as *yya*, thus making *sabbāgatibhaya*, meaning "all fears resulting from evil". The next aksara to *yya* is identified as *pi*, but as it appears on the plate there is no opening at the neck and the upper part of the aksara is also not broad enough to be identified as *pi*; this being so, it can be easily recognised as *vi*. The next aksara though read as *ca*, also can be *va*, as well. The conjoint aksara next, has been recognized as *jja*, but with the faint mark over the upper *ja*, it may be read as *jji*, and with the next conjoint *tta* the word forms itself *vivajjitta*. The last two words *khema maggam* are clear and correctly rendered. Thus we get the line as *sabbagati bhaya vivajjitta khema maggam*, "The path of safety to avoid fears of all evils."

datva nara phalamulam ratanam saranti, line 2, vers 3.

Phalamulam is uncommon in textual Pali language. *Saranti* appears to be incompatible in the context, where a close examination of the plate will help recognize the first two aksaras as *labha* making the word *labhanti*;

Elongation of vowels and duplication of consonants a peculiar phenomenon

As evident on the plate there are some vowels elongated without reason, such as to keep pace with the metre, as for example: *yāttha*, in line 13; *dātva*, line 14. Also at some places consonants are duplicated unnecessarily; for example *bhaya* and *vivajjitta* in line 11, *rattanam* in line 14, and *mitta* in line 16.

How can we explain this phenomenon? Could it be due to the peculiar way of Pali pronunciation adopted by the ancient people of Dvaravati? If so, it can be surmised that the scribe executed his engraving while somebody was reciting the stanzas, and that he incised aksaras as he heard them.

II

After the preliminary survey outlined above, one fine evening, when the writer was reciting these stanzas aloud, while relaxing alone, it suddenly dawned on him that he had read some similar stanzas in the *Telakatahagatha* which he had committed to

memory when reading for his first Degree. Being excited with this thought I rushed to the library and was surprised to note that these stanzas form part of the opening verses of the *Telakatahagatha*, in which they run as follows:⁵

TELAKATĀHAGĀTHĀ

Ratanattayam

1. Lankissaro jayatu vāranarājagāmi
Bhogindabhogarucirāyatapīṇabāhu
Sādhūpacāranirato gunasannivāso
Dhamme ṭhito vigate kodhamadāvalepo
2. Yo sabbaloka mahito karuṇādhivāso
Mokkhākaro ravikulambara puṇṇacando
Ñeyyodadhiṃ suvipulam sakalaṃ vibuddho
Lokuttamaṃ namatha taṃ sirasā munindaṃ
3. Sopānamalam amalaṃ tidasālayassa
Saṃsārasāgarasamuttaraṇāya setuṃ
Sabbāgatibhayavivajjitakhemamaggam
Dhammaṃ namassatha sadā munīṇa panitaṃ
4. Deyyam tad appam api yattha pasanna citta
Datvā narā phalamuḷārataṃ labhante
Taṃ sabbadā dasabalenapi suppasatthaṃ
Sanghaṃ namassatha sadāmitapunnakhettaṃ
5. Tejobalena mahatā ratanattayassa
Lokattayaṃ samadhigacchati yena mokkhaṃ
Rakkhā na ca'tthi casamā ratanattayassa
Tasmā sadā bhajatha taṃ ratanattayaṃ bho.

It is clear that the three stanzas appearing in the Noen San Bua inscription are identical with opening stanza 2, 3 and 4 of the *Telakatahagatha*. Before introducing and examining the authenticity and content of the *Telakatahagatha*, let us attempt to restore the inscription, relying faithfully on the aksaras appearing on the plate, refining the reading given in *Caruk* and the rendering suggested above by the author, comparing them with the stanzas of the *Telakatahagatha*.

The reading proposed by Caruk nai Pradet Thai, line by line⁶

4. Sri yo sabbalōkamohito ka -
5. ruṇādhivaso mokhaṃ karo (nirama) -
6. laṃ varapuṇacando noyyo da (mo na) -
7. vikulaṃ sakalaṃ vibuddho lokuttaro
8. namatthi taṃ sirasā munendaṃ //
9. sopānamālamamalam tiranā -
10. layassa samsārasāgarassamuttaraṇāya
11. setuṃ sambbāratirāyyapi cājattakhemama (ggaṃ)

12. Dhammaṃ namassta sadā muningē pasttham //
13. deyyam dada pyamapiyāttapasanna -
14. citta dātvā narā phalamulaṃ ratta (naṃ)
15. saranti taṃ sabbadā dasabalenapi suppasattham
16. sanghaṃ namassata sadā mittapunnakhetam //

Let us examine whether the reading and the editing can be improved further with the help of the *Telakatahagatha*:

- Line 4 in *mohito*, *mo* aksara is correctly read and editing as *mahito* is justified.
- Line 5 in *mokhāmkaro* a dot like mark over the aksara *kh* is not seen on the plate, and the rest *mokhākaro* is correctly read and editing it as *mokkhākaro* is justified. The last three aksaras read as *nirama* and edited as *si ama* by the editor of *Caruk*, and *tivima* by us, demand further revision in the light of the *Telakaṭṭhagāthā*. As noted above these three aksaras are almost totally defaced, but with the scarcely visible sines in the relevant space *raviku* as given in the *Tela* can be easily accommodated in the context of the plate.
- Line 6 The first two syllables can be read as *lamba*, and read together with the last three aksaras of line 5 it makes *ravikulambara* as given in *Tela*. *puṇacando* reading is correct and editing it as *punnacando* is justified.
Ñoyyo reading is correct and should be edited as *neyyo*, the last two aksaras read as *mo na* need revision. If one were to decipher more carefully one would discover the aksara *dhim*, *su*, which then will tally with *ñeyyodadhim* in the *Tela* which means “the ocean of what should be understood.”
- Line 7 The second aksara is read as *ku*, and taken together with two aksaras on either side it makes *vikulam*, but in *Tela* we get the word *suvipulam* with *su* as has been suggested to be the last aksara of Line 6. On the plate the remnants of the second aksara resemble *ku* more than *pu*, but *suvikulam* or *navikulam* does not yield a sensible meaning. On the other hand such a word is uncommon in textual Pali. Under these circumstances while we can accept *suvikulam* to be the correct rendering of the plate, it can be edited as *suvipulam* to be meaningful. This rendering tallies with the *Tela*.
The last aksara is read as *ro*, but looked at more carefully, *ma* with a dot over it, comes out clearly making the word *lokuttamaṃ* exactly as it appears in the *Tela*.
- Line 8 *namatthi* is faithful to the plate and editing as *namatha* is desirable. *ne* in *munendaṃ* is correctly read but may be edited as *munindaṃ*, since

- muni* + *indam* should combine as *minindaṃ*, which is the word in the *Tela*.
- Line 9 The last two aksaras already suggested above as *dasā* tallies with the *Tela*.
- Line 11 The revised reading adopted above as *sabbagati bhayya vivajjittakhemaggam* is confirmed by the *Tela* and *bhāyya*, *vivajjita* may be edited as *bhaya*, *vivajjita*.
- Line 12 Both *na* in *munina* on the plate are cerebral, but editing it as dental is justified and is in accordance with the *Tela*. The last word appearing on the plate is *pasattham*, but the *Tela* has it as *panitām*, to mean 'narrated' which appears to be the most appropriate in the context, "muninā panitām dhammam," "the Dhamma narrated by the sage". On the other hand there is *suppasattham* in Line 15, used in the same sense as *pasattham* on the plate; and this amounts to the fault of using repetition, *punaruttadosa*, which in no way can be attributed to the author of the *Tela*, especially considering his erudition and mastery of versification, as fully demonstrated in his work. In the circumstances *panitām* appears to be the ideal in the context. But the word *pasattham* is quite clear on the plate and cannot be rejected. What could be surmised is that the author of the inscription may have made a slip in his memory in choosing the word *pasattham* instead of *panitām*. Yet to be more fair by the author of the inscription Buddhasiri, we may adopt *pasattham*, which is actually on the stone.
- Line 13 *dadapyamapi*, is almost accurate to what is on the plate, although it slightly differs from *tadappamapi*, of the *Tela*; *da* instead of *ta* and *pya* for *ppa* may be attributed to faulty hearing of the engraver. This being so, *tadappamapi*, *tam* + *appam* + *api*, *deyyam* "that even a little that should be offered" may be adopted instead of *dadanti* + *yam* + *api* as has been edited. Editing of *yāttha* as *yattha* is desirable.
- Line 14 *dātvā*, as read and *datvā* as edited are both acceptable. The last seven aksaras have been read and adapted as *phalamulam ratanam*: In the *Tela* this phrase appears as *phalamulāratarām*, *phalam* + *ulāratarām* "greater benefit", a meaning most appropriate in the context. When we look at the plate, there is a vague dot over *la* which cannot be taken seriously. On the other hand, a vertical stroke parallel to the right arm of *la* is seen, which cannot be ignored. When *la* is read with the parallel vertical stroke, it becomes *lā*, The next two aksaras have been correctly read as *ratta*, and the final aksara, though read as *nam*, can also be recognized as *ram*. Thus we get *phalamulārattaraṃ* which, when edited as *phalamulāratarāṃ* is what appears in the *Tela*. Now we

have *deyyam tadappamapi yatth pasanna cittā datvā narā phalaṃ ulāratarāṃ labhanti*, meaning “to whom, having offered even that little that should be offered, human beings obtain very great benefit.”

Line 15 The first four aksaras which have been read as *saranti* are corrected above as *labhanti*. In the light of the above examination we can now produce the final text as it should appear on the stone slab as follows:

4. sri, yo sabba loka mohito ka -
5. karuṇādhivāso/mokkhākaro (raviku) -
6. lambara puṇa caṇḍo/noyyoda (dhiṃ su) -
7. vi (ku) lam sakalam vibuddho/lokuttamaṃ
8. namatthi taṃ sirasā munendam//
9. sopānamālamamalaṃ ti (dasā)
10. layassa/samsara sāgara samuttaranāya
11. setuṃ/sabbāgaṭī bhayya vivajjita khema maggaṃ/
12. dhammaṃ namassatā sada muṇiṇa pasattham//
13. deyyam dadapyamapi yāttha pasanna
14. cittā/dātvā narā phalamulārattaraṃ
15. labh nti/taṃ sabbadā dasa balenapi suppasattham/
16. sanghaṃ namassata sadā mitta puñña khettaṃ/

final version

1. Yo sabbalokamahito karuṇādhivāso
Mokkhākaro ravikulambara puṇṇa cando
Ñeyyodadhiṃ suvipulaṃ sakalaṃ vibuddho
Lokuttamaṃ namatha taṃ sirasā munindaṃ
2. Sopānamālamamalaṃ tidasālayassa
Samsārasāgara samuttaranāya setuṃ
Sabbāgaṭī bhaya vivajjita khema maggaṃ
Dhammaṃ namassatha sadā muninā pasattham*
3. Deyyaṃ tadappamapi yattha pasanna cittā
Datvā narā phalamulārattaraṃ labhanti
Taṃ sabbadā dasabalenapi suppasattham
Sanghaṃ namassatha sadāmita puñṇakhettaṃ

Translation

1. Pay homage, with (bowed) head, to that great Sage, the highest of the world, revered by the entire world; (the sage)-who is an abode of kindness; a mine of emancipation; the full moon in the sky of the solar clan; who has understood the entire vast ocean of knowledge.
2. Pay homage, always to the Doctrine, preached by the Sage;- (the Doctrine)-

* *paṇītam* in the, Telakatahagāthā, PTS. 1884, pp. 54.

which is the stainless flight of steps to the abode of Tidasā heaven (Tāvātimsa) the bridge to cross the ocean of Samsara, and which is the path of safety to avoid fears of all evil.

3. Pay homage always, to the Community which is an unmeasurable field of merit, to which having offered even a little that should be offered with delighted mind, human beings obtain very great benefit and which has been well praised by the ten-powered one.

The rendering of the Noen Sa Bua inscription in the way suggested above and comparing it with the three stanzas in the *Tela* which are identical to the text on the plate, one is compelled to deduce that the text of the inscription has been borrowed from the opening of the *Telakataha gatha*.

III

We now propose to deal with the question of the authorship and authenticity of the *Telekatahagatha*. In doing so we shall firstly quote Professor G.P. Malalasekera, the renowned author of the *Pali Literature of Ceylon*.

To the tenth century or the earlier part of the eleventh also belongs the small but delightful Pali poem of ninety-eight stanzas, known as the *Tela-katahagatha* - the Stanzas of the Oil Cauldron. They purport to be the religious exhortations of a great Elder named Kalyani Thera, who was condemned to be cast into a cauldron of boiling oil on suspicion of his having been accessory to an intrigue with the Queen Consort of King Kalani-Tissa, who reigned at Kelaniya (306-207 B.C.). The story is related in brief in the 22nd chapter of the Maha-vamsa. The *Rasa-vahini*, written by Vedeha in the first half of the fourteenth century, gives us greater details of the story. There we are informed that the Kings' attendants placed a cauldron of oil on the hearth and, when the oil was boiling, hurled the Thera into it. The Thera at that instant attained Vipassana, and, becoming an Arahat, rose up in the boiling oil and remained unhurt, "like a royal hamsa in a emerald vase" and in that position reciting a hundred stanzas, looked into the past to ascertain of what sin this was the result. He found that once upon a time when he was a shepherd, he cast a fly into boiling milk, and this was the punishment for his former misdeed. He then expired, and the king had his body cast into the sea. A vihara seems to have been built later on the spot where the Thera was put to death, for the *Salaihinisandesa*, written in A.D. 1462, refers to it as still existing.

"The decorated hall, which in their zeal
The merit-seeking people built upon
The spot where stood the cauldron of hot oil
Into which King Kelani-Tissa threw
The guiltless sage, a mere suspect of crime"

Neither the author of our version nor his date is known. There is no doubt, however, that he was a member of the Order, well versed in the Pitakas and commen-

tarial literature.

The stanzas show great depth of religious and metaphysical learning. The verses embody in them the fundamental tenets of Buddhism and are an earnest exhortation to men to lead the good life. They open with a blessing upon the king, apt beginning for the utterances of a holy man before his murderer. Their setting is exquisite, and the style of the poem clearly shows that it was written by a man who also knows Sanskrit quite well. Only such a man could have constructed in the elaborate and beautiful metre of the poem so delicate a specimen of Sanskritized Pali. Yet the Pali is not overladen with Sanskritisms, which shows that the work is earlier than the twelfth century. It is a fine specimen of the literature of what might be called the Pali Renaissance period, before the language became contaminated by Sanskrit influences and lost its pristine purity of diction and simplicity.”⁸

The author and the date of the composition of the *Tela* are not mentioned in the work. Malalasekara assigns the poem to either the tenth or the early part of the eleventh century A.D., but it is only a conjecture not based on any concrete evidence. Now we see that stanzas 2, 3, 4 of the *Telakatahagatha* had been quoted in *Sa Bua inscription* of 761 A.D. This being so, the *Telakatahagatha* should have been available in Prachinburi before 761 A.D., which leads us to the inevitable conclusion that the *Tela* predates the inscription.

If we accept that the actual poem was recited by the Arahant himself, as given in the chronicles, then the date would be some where around 250 B.C.

If that is the case then this poem would have been brought down through oral tradition to be committed to writing in the Vaṭṭagāmini Abhaya period, (89-77 B.C.) like the *Tripitaka*, *Hela atuva*, the commentaries in original Sinhala and history of the Sasana. The written *Telakatahagatha* then would have been refined and perhaps recomposed in the 5th century A.D., in the same manner as the Sinhala commentaries mentioned above were refined and translated by the learned Acariyas like Buddhaghosha, and also as the *Mahavamsa* came to its final form in the hand of Mahanama Thera in 5th century. Thus the 5th century A.D. can be the latest date of the *Telakatahagatha*.

However the most important questions that arise from our study are, how, when and through whom this Sri Lankan text reached Prachinburi, possibly the Dvara, or gateway to the Dvaravati Kingdom. Could it be that the knowledge of *Telakataha* was brought by Bhikkhu Buddhasiri himself, who was the author of the inscription, according to the Khmer language introduction? If so was he a Sri Lankan monk or a Dvāravati monk who had been in Sri Lanka before 761 A.D.? Whatever it may be, in the light of this new evidence it can now be established that the Sri Lankan Theravada literature had found its way to Southeast Asia, even before 8th century A.D. through Dvaravati, and not in the eleventh century through Ramannadesa as has been generally believed.⁹

Since the *Noen Sa Bua inscription* stands out as a strong testimony to cultural

contacts between Sri Lanka and Dvaravati kingdom, the Bodhi tree in the vicinity of the inscription also could have some connection with Sri Lanka. It is noteworthy that the legend connected with Dong Si Maha Phot has it that it was brought from Anuradhapura. It is also possible that Buddhasiri, the author of the inscription, planted the Si Maha Bodhi, having brought it from Sri Lanka, as had been the general habit of pilgrims from this region to Lanka, bringing, on their return, sacred objects such as corporal relics of the Buddha, replicas of the foot prints on Sumanakuta and saplings of the Sri Maha Bodhi at Anuradhapura.¹⁰ If so, both the inscription and the Sri Maha Bodhi can have a common birth certificate, with the father as Bhikkhu Buddhasiri, place as Dong Sri Maha Phot, Prachinburi and the date as 761 A.D. On the other hand it is also not impossible that the Buddha pada lanchana discovered at the same site at Wat Sa Morakot, Dong Si Maha Phot would also have been connected with this episode. It should be noted that in line 26, of the *Noen Sa Bua inscription*, there is a phrase "Phra Pada Pratistha" which means "established the foot print." The question is who established it? Was it Buddhasiri, the author of the inscription himself, or someone else.

If so the date of the establishment of the Buddhapada too, would be the same as that of the inscription and the Sri Maha Bodhi. This would then point again to the influence of the foot print worship prevalent in Sri Lanka in the early centuries of the present era, as already remarked by Professor, H.S.H., Prince Subhadradis Diskul, in his article "A Pair of Lord Buddha's Foot Prints at Wat Sa Morakot, Dong Si Maha Phot, Prachinburi,"¹¹

Thus the three monuments; the *Noen Sa Bua inscription*, *Sri Maha Bodhi*, and the *Buddhapada* at Wat Sa Morakot can be considered as concrete evidence for close cultural contact between Sri Lanka and the Dvaravati Kingdom as early as the eighth century A.D.

Mendis Rohanadeera

REFERENCES:

1. *Caruk nai pradet Thai*, vol.1 2529, B.E., the plate, p. 180; text, p. 185;
Silpavathanatham, (Art & Culture), Vol.7, No.9, July, 1986, plate, p.102 text, p.105.
2. Read as *mokhankaro*, on p.182, *Carik*.
3. The last three aksaras of line 5 on the plate, *Carik*, p. 180.
4. op. cit. pp. 182, 183.
5. The complete poem edited by Mudliar, Edmond R. Goonaratne with an introduction, appears in the *Journal of The Pali Text Society*, 1884, pp. 49-68.
6. op. cit. p. 183.
7. *panitam*, in the *Telakatahagatha* in the *JPTS.*, p. 54. .
8. Malalasekara, G.P.; *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*, 1958, pp. 162-163.
9. ...Pagan contacts with Ceylon begin with Anuruddha (fl.c. 1044-1077); and it was only at, or after the end of his reign that complete copies of the Sinhalese Tipitaka began to reach Pagan...G.A. Luce & Tin Htway, *A fifteenth century inscription and library at Pagan, Burma, The Malalasekare Felicitation Volume*, ed. by O.H. de S. Wijesekare, 1976, Colombo, p. 204.
10. For example Mahasami Sri Sraddha Raja Culamuni, in the mid fourteenth century A.D. "...brought (a sapling) from the Sri Maha Bodhi of the city of Sinhalas...and planted it..." Inscription 2, *Prachum Silacaruk*. (line, 54)
11. Muang Boran Journal, Vol.12, No.3, 1986, p. 31.