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The present writer, being invited by the Silapavathanatham, Bangkok, conducted a research programme on cultural relations between Sri Lanks and Siam in ancient times. Accompanied by Michael Wright and Sujit Wongthes on a tour to Prachinburi, he had the opportunity to visit the ancient site of Wat Sa Morakot at Dong Si Maha Bod. To him there were three main attractions: the Buddha Pāda lāñchana, the imprints 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 the inscription found at the temple complex of Wat Sa Morokot containing three delightful Pali stanzas in the Vasantatilakā 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 him to make an intimate study of the inscription; the results of which constitute this paper.
The Noen Sā Buā inscription, as it is called, is engraved on a slab of green sandstone, 177 c.m. high, 40 c.m. wide and 28 c.m. thick. It was first published in Borankadi, Dong Si Mahaphot, 1967, by the Faculty of Archaeology, Silpakorn University. Next Prof. Cham Thongkhamwari of the Fine Art Department published in the Prachum Silavarik. Again previous reading was revised by Col. Ycm Prephithong and published in the Carik Nai Pradees Thai, Vol. 1, in 1986. All the three publications are in Thai language.

The inscription contains 27 lines in so-called Pallava Grantha script with an average height of 2 c.m. The script is not far different from the Sinhala script of 7th and 8th centuries A. D. The first three lines and the last ten lines are in old Khmer language, while lines 4 to 16 contain three Pali stanzas in the Vasantatilakā metre. The first three lines show that the inscription was installed by a person called Buddhāsiri, probably a Buddhist monk and the date is given as Saka 683, which corresponds to 761 A. D. The last lines speak of certain donations made to the place. However the main focus in this paper is on the three stanzas spread in lines 4 to 16.

Certain lines, phrases, words and some aksaras were not satisfactorily deciphered and interpreted, mainly due to their fragmentary nature. However the present writer after a thorough examination on both the stone and the plate, was successful in restoring the lines to almost what actually were on the stone.

The plate, the Thai version of the reading and the final text adopted in The Carik Nai Prades Thai, the official publication and their transcriptions are given below for easy comparison.
An eye copy of the relevant part of the inscription prepared by the author
สารบัญ ต่อที่เป็นภาษาบาลี พระราชบรมทัศน์ ๕-๖ รวมหิมาภิบินในเล่าต่อดังกล่าว

คำจารึก

๑. (๖๙๘ คุณม) ทุก นุกูล นว โรง เชฤษ
๒. นุกูล นุ (นามะ) นุกูลนั้น ปรมิต
๓. วัช ดมาLIKE เข้า ฯ
๔. ฯ ทุ่ม ๆ โอ สมุทรโพธิ์โยธ เก-
๕. ฐานนิวกริยา ไม่สก ตรง (นิรัน)-
๖. ต ความณุกูลโยธ โยธโยธ ท(ไม) น
๗. ทุ่ม ทุ่ม ทุ่ม ทุ่ม ท้าวกลุ่มโย
๘. นัก นัก นัก นัก นัก นัก
๙. โพนบานบานบาน ติรณา-
๑๐. นัยนิธ นัยนิธ สาระสระสมุภุรสูตร
๑๑. เตีย ตัวยาวที่ยาวไป จุราจุราจุราย (กุล)
๑๒. บานบานบานบาน บาน บาน บาน
๑๓. ท้าว ท้าว ท้าว ท้าว ท้าว ท้าว-
๑๔. จีตนา จีตนา จีตนา จีตนา จีตนา (นิ)
๑๕. ฐานนิวติ ฐานนิวติ ฐานนิวติ ฐานนิวติ
๑๖. ฐานนิวติ ฐานนิวติ ฐานนิวติ ฐานนิวติ
๑๗. วัช โยธ โยธ โยธ โยธ ชวัน ชวัน ชวัน ชวัน
๑๘. ฯ ทุ่ม ทุ่ม ทุ่ม ทุ่ม อุณาตุ ปรมิต
๑๙. ฯ อุณาตุ สิทธานุภูมิประจักษ์ ฯ
๒๐. ฯ อุณาตุ ปรมิต (บุญ) เถ่ บุญ ฯ
๒๑. ฯ อุณาตุ ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฯ
๒๒. ฯ อุณาตุ ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฯ
๒๓. ฯ อุณาตุ ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฯ
๒๔. ฯ อุณาตุ ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฮัส ฯ
วิเคราะห์คำสำคัญ

เฉพาะตอนที่เป็นภาษาบาลแก้วราวกับบรรทัดที่ ๙-๑๖

ไทย สาทปิยะมิตต์  กรูณาธิวาส

โมกุล ไกรศิล  อมิตร มุผุณญาณิก

เนกินโยทัยวิภูติ -  ศิลป์ วิพุทธิ

โลกุตถโร  นมภิ  สิงสา บุณณิชา  เอก

โปรดแสดงสมุด ติ ตรีณะยะสุส

ติสราภรณ์  สมบุคดราม  เศรี

สมุโทศรีมปุจฉาธรรมภูติก

บุฒิ คมสุฎฐา  สาท บุญมร  ปรมุช

เทพี  ท่านคุณภูมิรัตนสุธานจิตรภั

ทศวา นรา  แกลมุติ  เกลน  สารวภิ

ติ  สมพุทธา  ทศวณรภิ  สุปพิศวภั

สูรน  บุณณิชา  สาท วิลัยภูมิทสูร

คำแปล

พระพุทธเจ้าพระองค์ชิน ทรงแก่ผู้ที่พระราชกิจทั้งประเพณีอดทนแล้ว ทรงมีพระ
ครูเป็นพระองค์ประคำทรงทิพย์ ทรงทรงที่ความรดตกที่จะให้痣ไม่ผลึก ทรงเป็น
ดูจงพระเจ้าที่มีชัยชนะที่ประชาชน ทรงทรงเสริมสร้างความได้รับพันธ์กับ
ที่ทรงเป็นกษัตริย์ที่ทรงชัยชนะที่ไม่ผลึกได้ เขียน
ท่านทั้งหลาย ให้ทรงศิริบพาราฤทธิ์พระพุทธเจ้าพระองค์นั้นผู้เป็นพระเจ้าภูมิทสูร

เข้าท่านทั้งหลาย นั้นการพระธรรมที่พระมหากษัตริย์ไว้ว่า เป็น
ระเบียบปริบังศีล สำหรับทุกเหล้าอย่างไปทรงธรรมธรรมธรรมปิฏกบาลเกี่ยวกับธรรม
ไปตามว่า ท่านสิ่งนี้ คือสิ่งที่ท่านจะต้องมี ต้องใช้เป็นบรรลุเป็นธรรมปิฏกบาล
ให้เข้าท่านทั้งหลาย สำหรับมหากษัตริย์

คือท่านผู้มีจิตยึดมั่นให้กับความที่พระเจ้าทั้งพระเจ้าที่ทรงพระอัง
ภูมิไม่มี
ความมีชีวิตั สำหรับ พักสุทธิภูมิทิพย์ อย่างที่มีที่ทรงพระอัง
ภูมิทิพย์ทั้งหลาย ผู้เป็นกษัตริย์ หมวดพระพุทธเจ้าทรงทรงทิพย์ 充分体现
พระพุทธเจ้าพระองค์นั้น
The reading proposed by Carik Nai prades Thai, line by line

4. Sri yo sabōelokamohito ka -
5. ruṉādhivāso / mokhāṁ karo (nirama) -
6. laṁ varapuṇeacando / ṅoyyo da (mo na) -
7. vikulaṁ sakalam vibuddho / lokuttaro
data
8. namathī taṁ sīrasā munendam //
9. sopājamālamamalaṁ tiranā -
10. layassa / saṁsārasāgasamuttaranāya
ta
11. setum / saṁbbārat īrāyapi cajjattakhemama (ggam) /
12. Dhammaṁ namaśta sadā muninā pasattham //
13. deyyaṁ dadāpyamapiyāṭṭapasanna -
14. cittā / dāvā narā phalamaṁ raṭta(naṁ)
15. saranti / taṁ sabbādā dasabelaṇapi suppasattham /
16. sanghaṁ nemaśata sadā mittapuṇṇakhettaṁ //

The final text.

Yo sabbalokamahito - karunādhivāso
Mokkhaṁ karosi amalaṁ - vara puṇaṁ cando
Neyyo damo navikulaṁ - sakalaṁ vibuddho
Lokuttaro namatha taṁ - sīrasā munendam

Sopāna māla mamalaṁ - ti raṁā layassa
Sem sīrasāgara samuttaranāya setum
Sambodha tiramapi suttara khemamaggaṁ
Dhammaṁ namaśatha sadā muninā pasattham

Deyyaṁ dadantyamapi yattha pasanna cittā
datva narā phalamaṁ rataṁ saranti,
Taṁ sabbādā dasabelaṇapi suppasattham
Sангha namassatha sadāmita puṇṇakhettaṁ

The words in italics are the main concerns of this writer and they will be examined in consultation with the plate, and the reading adopted by the Carik²

mokkhaṁ karosi amalaṁ line 1, verse 1

This does not appear to be grammatical in Pāli, Karosi being second person present tense singular verb, requires a corresponding subject like ṭhathā, which is impossible in the context. mokkhaṁkaro³ is clear on the plate, but the next three aksaras are not clear at all,⁴ though niramaṁ has been suggested, and corrected as si ama.⁵ If si is replaced with ti to make karoti, which is grammatically correct with yo, then mokkhaṁ Karoti amalaṁ 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 mokkhaṁ karoti vimalaṁ, yet ti, ma, aksaras are not free from doubt.
varapunṣu cando, line 1, verse 1

This seems to be correctly read and restored but varapunṣa 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 seen 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. Any way let us tentatively restore the second line as mokkhaṃkarasu vimalambara punya cando.

tirayālayassa, line 1, verse 2

tirayālayassa looks clumsy and meaningless, tirayālaya can be considered a compound with tirayā and ālaya as the two components, but the first word tirayā is uncommon in Pali. 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 — ā layassa. If the two syllables can be identified as dasā, then it makes tidasālayassa; when arranged the line as sopā tamarāmarāca tidasālayassa, it yields the meaning, (the Dhamma) a stainless flight of steps to the abode of the heaven of Tidasā (tāvatīṃsa)

sambodhi tiranepicuttara khemamaggam, line 3, verse 2

The whole line except for the last word khemamaggam looks like a riddle, and too far remote 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 caijatta is to be rendered as cuttara.

As such 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 sabtā. The next aksara, in no way can be recognized as ra or dha. The aksara is of the shape which easily can be identified as ga, and the next ti is clear. Thus we can form the word sabbāga. ī. sabba + akg. ī. The aksara next to ī has been read as ra, but a sharply focussed eye on the plate, would catch it as which can then be identified as bha; the next is very clear and correctly read es yya, thus making sabbāga ī she yya, 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. As such it can be easily recognized as vi. The aksara next though read es 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 *ṣṣi*, and with the next conjoint *utta* the word forms itself *vivajjita*. The last two words *Kheha maggam* are clear and correctly rendered. Thus we get the line as *sabbha.ṭ bhaya vivajjita kheha maggam*, “the path of safety devoid of fears of all evils.”

datvā narā phalamulaṃ ratanaṃ saranti, line 2, vers 3.

*Phalamulaṃ* 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 reasons such as to keep pace with the metre, as for example, *yaṭha*, in line 13; *dāivā*, in line 14. Also at some places consonants are duplicated unnecessarily; for example *bhaya* and *vivajjita* 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 Dvāravati? 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.
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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 *Telakajāhagāthā* which he had committed to memory when reading for his first Degree. Being kindled with this, he rushed to the library and was surprised to note that these stanzas form part of the opening verses of the *Telakajāhagāthā*, in which they run as follows: 6

**TELAKATĀHAGĀTHA**

Ratanattayaṃ

1. Lankissaro jayatu vāraṇarajagāmī
   Bhogindabhogarucirāyatapī tabāhu
   Sādhupacakārirato gunasannivāso
   Dhammeṭhito vigatakodhamadāvalepo.

2. Yo sabbalokamahito karuṇādhivāse
   Mokkākararo ravikulambara puṇṇacando
   Šeyodadiṁ suvipulam sakalam vibuddho
   Lokuttamaṁ nāmaṁ taṁ sirasā munindam
3. Sopāṇamālamamalā m tidasālayassa
   Saṁsārasāgarasamuttarāṇāya setum
   Sabbāgatābhavavijitakhemamagga m
   Dhamma m namassatha sadā muninā pañīta m.

4. Deyyam tadappamapi yatthā pasanna cittā
   Datvā narā phalamūratarām labhante
   Tam sabbadā dasabalenapi suppasatthe m
   Sangha m namassatha sadāmitapuñānakhetta m

5. Tejobalena mahatā ratanattayassa
   Lokattaya m samadhipacchatī yena mokkham
   Rakkhā na ca’tthi ca samā ratanattayassa
   Tasmā sadā bhajatha tam rutanattaya m bho!

In comparison, it is clear that the three stanzas appearing in the Noen Sā Buā inscription are identical with opening stanzas 2, 3 and 4 of the Telakaṭāhagāthā. Before discussing the contents and the authenticity of the Telakaṭāhagāthā, let us attempt to restore the inscription, relying faithfully on the akṣeras appearing on the plate, refining the reading given in the earik and the rendering suggested above by the author and, comparing them with the stanzas of the Telakaṭāhagāthā.

Let us examine whether the reading and the editing can be still improved with the help of the Telakaṭāhagāthā:

Line 4, in mohito, mo aksara is correctly read and editing as mahito is justified.

Line 5, in moklāmkaro a dot like mark over the akṣera kh is not seen on the plate, and the rest mokhākaro is correctly read and has to be edited as mokhkākaro. The last three aksaras read as nirama and edited as si ama by the editor of Carik and tivima by us, demand further revision in the light of the Telakaṭāhagāthā. As noted above these three aksaras are almost totally defaced, but with the scarcely visible sigs 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. puṣaṣaṇḍo reading is correct and editing it as puṣaṣaṇḍo is justified.

Noyyo reading is correct and should be edited as ḍeyyo, the last two aksaras read as mo na need revision. If one were to decipher more carefully one will discover the aksara dhim, su, which then will tally with ḍeyyodadhim 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 vikulaṃ, but in the 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 can easily make pu instead of ku, thus tallying with suvipulam in 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 lokuttamaṇī exactly as it appears in the Tela.

Line 8, namatthi is faithful to the plate and editing as namatha is desirable. ne in munindaṃ is correctly read, but may be edited as munindaṇī, since muni + indaṇī should combine as munindaṇī, 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 sabbāgati bhaya vivajjittahemamaggagīmaṇī is confirmed by the Tela and bhaya, 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 pa sitaṇī, to mean ‘narrated’ which appears to be the most appropriate in the context, “muniṇā paṇī saṇī dhammaṇī” “the Dhamma narrated by the sage.” On the other hand there is suppasatthanī in line 15, used in the same sense as pasattham on the plate; and this amounts to the fault of using repetition, punaruttadāsa, which in no way can be attributed to the author of the Tela, especially considering his erudition and mastery of versification, as amply demonstrated in his work. In the circumstances pa sitaṇī 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 using the word pasattham in place of pāruṇam. Yet to be more fair by the author of the inscription, Buddhhasiri, we may adopt pasatthanī, what is actually on the stone.

Line 13, dadāpyamapi, 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, as such tadappamapi, təṇ + appaṃ + api, deyyaṃ “that even a little that should be offered” may be adopted instead of dadanti + yaṇi + api as has been edited. Editing of yāttha as yatha is desirable.
Line 14, *dāivā*, as read and *datvā* as edited are both acceptable. The last seven āksaras have been read and adopted as *phalamulāratanma*. In the *Tela* this phrase appears as *phalamulāratanma, phalamulārataranma* “greater benefit”, a meaning well 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 āksaras have been correctly read as *ratta*, and the final āksara, though read as *naṁ*, can also be recognized as *raṁ*. Thus we get *phalamulārattaranma* which, when edited as *phalamulārattaranma*, is what appears in the *Tela*. Now we have *deyyam tadappamapi yattha pasamacitā, datvā narā phalamulārattaranma labhanti*, meaning “to whom, having offered even that little that should be offered, human beings obtain very great benefit,” exactly what is in the *Tela*.

Line 15, The first four āksaras 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 appears on the stone slab.

4. sri, yo sabba lokamohito ka -
5. karunādhivāso / mokkhākarī (raiviki) -
6. lambara puṇa ca d ṣo / ṃoyoda (dhiṁ su) -
7. vi (pu) laṁ sakalāṁ vibuddho / lokuttamaṁ
8. namatthi tīm sīrasā munidr̥m //
9. sopāṇamālamamālaṁ ti (daśā)
10. layassā / sāṃsāra sāgara samuttaranāya
11. setuṁ / sabbāgaṭṭī bhaya vivajjita khema maggam /
12. dhammaṁ namassata sadā munigaṁ pasattham //
13. deyyam dadeypamapi yāṭhapasanna
14. cītā / dātvā narā phalamulārattaranma
15. labhanti / taṁ sabbadā dasa balenapi suppasattham /
16. sanghaṁ namassata sadā mitta puṇā khoṭtaṁ /

final version

1. Yo sabbalokamahito karunādhivāso
   Mokkhākarī raivikulābā puṇa cando
   Neyyoadhīm suvīpulām sakalām vibuddho
   Lokuttamaṁ namatha tiṁ sīrasā munindaṁ

2. Sopāṇamālamamālaṁ tīdasālayassā
   Sāṃsārasāgara samuttaraṁ āya setuṁ
   Subbāgaṭṭī bhaya vivajjita khema maggam
   Dhammaṁ namassatha sadā muninā pasattham 6
3. Deyyaṃ tadappamapi yattha pasanna cittaṃ
dētā nārā phalamūlāraṃ rā labhanti
Tāṃ sabbā dasabalenapi suppasattheṃ
dangheṃ nampassatha sadāmita puññakhettaṃ

Translation

1. Pay homage, with (bowing) 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; and, who has understood the entire vast ocean of
knowledge.

2. Pay homage, always, to the Doctrine, preached by the Sage; (the
Doctrine) - which is the stainless flight of steps to the abode of Tidasa
heaven (tāvatiṃsa); the bridge to cross the ocean of Sāṃsāra, and
which is the path of safety devoid of fears of all evil.

3. Pay homage, always, to the Community - (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 Sā Buā 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 Telakaṭāhagāthā.

- III -

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

"The Telakaṭāhagāthā - the stanzas of oil cauldron, is a delightful Pali
poem of 100 stanzas which ...... report to be the religious exhortations of a
great Elder named Kāyaṇa 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 Kāḷāṇi Tissa, who reigned at Kāḷāṇiya
(306-207 B.C.). The story is related in brief in the 22nd chapter of the Mahāvamsa. The Rasa-vāhini, written by Vedeha in the first half of the thirteenth
century, gives us greater details of the story. There we are informed that the
King's 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 vipassanā,
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 in 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
Sālalūhi isandesā, written in 1451 A. D., 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 Kālaṅi-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 commentarial literature.

The stanzas show great depth of religious and metaphysical learning.
The verses embody in them the fundamental tenents 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.”

The author or the date of the composition of the Telė is not mentioned
in the work. Mālayasempa 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 Telakaṭāka-
gāthā have been quoted in the Sā Buā inscription of 761 A.D. As such the
Telakaṭākaṭāgāṭā should have been available in Frachthur before 761 A.D.,
which leads us to the inevitable conclusion that the Telakaṭākaṭāgāṭā 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 the poem would have been brought down through
oral tradition to be committed to writing in the vaṭṭagāmiṇī Athaya period
(89-77 B.C.) like the Tripiṭaka, Heṇa aruva, the commentaries in original
Sinhala and history of the Sāsara. The written Telakaṭākaṭāgāṭā then would
have been refined and perhaps recomposed in Pali in the 5th century A. D.
in the same manner as the Sinhala commentaries mentioned above were
refined and translated into Pali by the learned Acaṇīyas like Buddhaghosha,
and also in the same way as the Mahāvaṃsa came to its final form in the
hand of Mahānīma Thera in 5th century. Thus the 5th century A. D. can
be the latest date of the Telakaṭākaṭāgāṭā.
However the most important questions that arise from our study are how, when and through whom this Sri Lankan text reached Prachinburi, possibly the dvāra, the gateway to the Dvāravati kingdom. Could it be that the knowledge of Telakāṭhagāthā was brought by Buddhāsiri himself, who was the author of the inscription? 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 has found its way to south-east Asia, even before 8th century A. D. through Dvāravati, and not in the eleventh century through Ramaṇṇadesa as has been generally believed. 9

Since the Noen Sā Buā inscription stands out as a glaring testimony to cultural contact between Sri Lanka and Dvāravati kingdom, the Bodhi tree after which the area was known as Dong Si Maha Bod, also could have some connection with Sri Lanka. It is noteworthy that the legend connected with Si Maha Bod, has it, that it was brought from Anuradhapura. The use of the term Si Maha Bod - supports this belief, for the sacred Bodhi tree at Anuradhapura has usually been referred to in literature through out the period as Sri Mēha Bodhi, Sirī Mā Bo, or Mahā Bodi. It is also possible that Buddhāsiri, the author of the inscription, planted Sri Maha Bodhi having brought it from Sri Lanka, as had been the general habit of pilgrims from that region to Lanka, bringing on their return, sacred objects such as corporal relics of the Buddha, replicas of the Foot print on Sumenakūta and saplings of the Sri Maha Bodhi at Anuradhapura. 10 If so, both the inscription and the Si Maha Bodhi can have a common birth certificate, with the father as Bhikkhu Buddhāsiri, place as Dong Si Maha Bod, Prachinburi and the date as 761 A. D. On the other hand it is also not impossible that the Buddha pāda lāṇchana discovered in February, 1986 at the same site at wat Sa Morakot, Dong Si Maha Bod - too would have been connected with this episode. It should be noted that in line 26 of the Noen Sā Buā inscription, there is a phrase as “Phra Pāda Pratisiha” which means, “established the Foot print”. The question is who established it? Was it Buddhāsiri, the author of the inscription, himself, or some one else related to him?

If so the date of the establishment of the Buddhāpāda too would be the same as that of the inscription and the Si Maha Bod. This will then point again to the influence of the Foot print worship prevalent in Sri Lanka in the Anuradhapura period, as has been remarked by Professor H. S. H. Prince Subhadradas Diskul, in his article “A pair of Lord Buddha’s Foot prints at Sa Morakot, Dong Si Maha Pho, Prachinburi.” 11

Thus the three monuments; the Noen Sa Bua inscription, Si Maha Bo, and the Buddhāpāda at wat Sa Morakot can be considered as concrete evidence on close cultural contact between Sri Lanka and the Dvāravati Kingdom as early as the eighth century A. D.
Notes

1. *Carik Nai Pradesh Thai*, vol. 1,2529, B.E., the plate, p. 180; reading, p. 182, text, p. 185;

2. *Carik* p. 182

3. Read as *mokhāŋkaro*, on p. 182, *Carik*.

4. The last three aksaras of line 5 on the plate, *Carik*, p. 180.

5. op. cit. pp. 182, 183.


7. The author is indebted to Dr. L. P. N. Perera, Professor of Pali, the present Vice - Chancellor of Sri Jayavardhanapura University, Sri Lanka, for assistance in this translation.


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 Srdhda Raja Culumuri, in mid fourteenth century A. D. "......brought (a sapling) from the Sri Maha Bodhi of the city of Sinhalas...and planted it." Inscription 2, *Prachum Silacakir*. (line, 54)