

THE OLDEST KNOWN WRITING IN SIAMESE

THE INSCRIPTION OF

PHRA RAM KHAMHÆNG OF SUKHOTHAI

1293 A.D.

BY

CORNELIUS BEACH BRADLEY, A.M.

Professor of Rhetoric in the University of California.

BANGKOK

1909.

THE author gratefully acknowledges his special indebtedness to:—H. R. R. Prince Damrong Rajanubhab, Minister of the Interior, for permission to use the resources of the Vajirañāna Library and to have free access to the Sūkhothāi stone, and particularly for his invaluable personal assistance in the identification of places named in the text; to Oscar Frankfurter, Ph. D., Secretary of the National Library, for the generosity with which he has honored every draft made upon the stores of his learning and scholarship, and for his kindly interest, wise counsel, and unwearied helpfulness that have attended every stage of the work; to Phrā Māha Wicha Thām and Luang Chānthāramat, his learned assistants, for almost daily help rendered by them in all matters of Siamese philology and archeology; to Mr. R. W. Giblin, F.R.G.S. of the Royal Survey Department, for the reproductions of the text which accompany this paper; and in the North, to Chāu Suriyawong of Chiengmai, to Phrā Nāphi Siphīsankhūn of Wat Chieng Mān, and, not least, to Rev. Daniel McGilvary, D.D., for elucidation of many difficult points involving special knowledge of the Lao country, customs, and speech.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- BOWRING, SIR JOHN : The Kingdom and People of Siam. London 1827. Vol. I. pp. 278—279. (A very brief notice accompanied by a specimen of the writing—an indifferent pen-sketch of the first few lines.)
- BASTIAN, DR. A. : Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Vol. XXXIV. 1864. (The translation occupies pp. 7—12 of the reprint, which alone I have been able to see. It is really no translation, but a first sketch, in which the writer reports such impressions of the drift and import of the writing as he was able to get from Siamese sources.)
- SCHMITT, PÈRE : Excursions et Reconnaissances, Vol. VIII. Saigon 1884. pp. 169—187, with 9 plates of the text—its first publication. (The text is neither a facsimile nor a tracing, nor a rendering of it by any method of accurate reproduction. What the author supposed to be found on the stone, and what he supplied from conjecture, are both set down alike in coarse black letters apparently drawn with a brush. Words still plainly to be read on the stone reappear strangely, or even absurdly, transformed. The translation, naturally repeats the errors of this transcript, with, of course, others of its own.)
- SCHMITT, PÈRE : Deux Anciennes Inscriptions Siamois transcrits et traduites par M. Schmitt. Saigon 1885. (A little booklet apparently made up of reprints of the article just named, and of another from Vol. VII. of the same series).
- PAVIE AUGUSTE : Mission Pavie, Indo-Chine, 1879—1895. Études Diverses II. Paris 1898. pp. 176—201. (Introductory Note, transliteration, translation, and text by the

author of the two preceding studies. It is in fact another edition of them, revised and altered somewhat, and with the text now in photographic reproduction. But for the scholar, the value of this text is very seriously diminished by the fact that it has everywhere been retouched, and that too, it would seem, without reference to the original, but to some inaccurate transcript—apparently the one twice published before. Similar changes of the text appear, and nearly all the lacunæ are written in so as to appear as text. Transliteration and translation are, of course, no more authentic than the text on which they are based—if it be not rather sometimes the case that the interpretation has determined the text.)

————— วชิรญาณ (Vajirañana Magazine, Vol. VI. pp. 3574—3577. Bangkok 1898. A short article embodying in a freely modernized version nearly the whole of the fourth face of the inscription, including the dates, the story of the origination of Siamese writing, and the boundaries of the realm.)

————— เมืองเมืองสุโขทัย (Bangkok 1908. A pamphlet of 22 pages, prepared and printed for H. R. H. the Crown Prince, containing two inscriptions from Sūkhothāi and one from Khāmphæng Phēt. The first of these, the one with which we are here concerned, is the text in modern Siamese characters and spelling, with occasional substitution of modern words. Here also there is no indication of what portions are conjectural. But upon the whole, I find it the least inaccurate text so far produced.)

The Oldest Known Writing in Siamese.

MR. PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF THE SIAM SOCIETY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN :—

I feel very sensibly the honor you have done me in asking me to present first of all before you some of the results of my months of study here. Those studies lie, as you all know, in the very heart of the Dryasdust realm, and are not supposed to be interesting, or intelligible even, to any save dryasdust people. I felt sure that no other sort of people would come here this evening. I confess therefore to no little surprise at the large and distinguished gathering that I see before me—surprise not unmingled with fear at thought of what you may be ready to do to me before the evening is done. My own impression of people who work on inscriptions has not greatly improved on closer acquaintance with them. My subject has one point of general interest, however, which I may do well to mention at once. The earliest known inscription in Siamese is a unique document, not merely among the documents of Siam, but among the documents of the world. If I am not entirely wrong, there is no other document extant which records the achievement of letters for an untamed speech by one to whom that speech was native, and which at the same time fully illustrates that achievement. When we recall the part these very letters of this very inscription have played in the culture and the life of the Thai race both north and south, and when we reflect that the very form in which we read and write Siamese today is the lineal descendant of that,—not far removed and but little changed,—we may be interested to know something more about it.

There is another point also. As your President has just told us, the inscription itself has repeatedly been published, with transliterations, translations, and essays upon it. Yet few things in Bangkok seem so little known, or understood, or rightly valued. Few even of those who know something about it have ever seen the stone, or know where it stands, or have any clear idea of what it is all about. In spite of all

that these various editors have done,—I am not sure but I should have said, in consequence of what they have done,—the real nature and intent of this perfectly direct and simple-hearted utterance seem at many points wholly misapprehended. One editor finds in it—apparently for no other cause than that it is now the thing to do—a complete code of civil law. Another finds in it a complete ritual of religious observance and ceremony. Another varies the now somewhat hackneyed performance of discovering the lost tribes of Israel, by unearthing, forsooth from the ruins of a forest-monastery,—or rather from the word *aranyic* which means ‘forest-monastery’—his long-lost Aryan brothers!¹ Setting all such notions aside, it has been my earnest endeavor to know the thing as it really is, and to understand as a native would, just what it says—its natural drift and import. The quest, begun in the interest of philology pure and simple, has proved of absorbing interest, has taken me far afield, has opened up unexpected realms of thought and of life. If it be then your will to accompany me a little way on this quest, let us begin.

THE STONE.

The stone is a short stumpy obelisk almost without taper, terminating above in a sort of low four-square dome. The material is a fine-grained compact rock not yet precisely determined, neither too hard for easy working, nor too soft to hold the inscription well under proper care. It stands 34 inches high above its mason-work pedestal; its faces are rough-hewn below, but above are worked to a smooth surface, forming an area for the inscription of about 14 inches by 23 on each side. In company with another stone from Sūkhothāi, of later date, it now occupies the westernmost but one of the row of little open Salas on the north side of the main temple-building of Wät Phră Kæo within the Royal Palace.

Of the earlier history of the stone absolutely nothing is known save what is said in the inscription itself, ll. 80—97. While the language there leaves something to be desired in the way of explicit connection of

¹ See Notes, ll. 51—52.

the various statements, it seems impossible to mistake its general import; namely, that this stone was one of four prepared at the same time, and—though this is not said—presumably of similar or identical content. The four were dedicated with imposing ceremonies religious and civic. Three of them were set up in separate places which are named ¹. The date was 1214 (Māhasākārat), equivalent to 1293 A.D. But the dynasty of Khūn Ram Khāmhæng and the supremacy of Sūkhothāi were both shortlived. From that date not one word is heard of the stone for 540 years, that is until A.D.

1833, when it was discovered by Prince Chāu Fa
 Its disco- Māha Mōngkūt, who afterwards became King
 very. Sōmdēt Phrā Chom Klāu. The story of its reco-

very is thus told by H. R. H. Prince Vājirānan.—“In the year 1195 he [the Prince] made a progress through the northern provinces, doing reverence at various shrines, until at last he reached Sūkhothāi. Here as he wandered about, he came upon a certain large flat slab of stone set in masonry on the terrace beside the ruins of an old palace. The stone was an object of reverence and fear to all the people. If any one failed to bow before it, or presumptuously walked up to it, he would be stricken with fever or other disease. When the Prince saw it, he walked straight up and sat down to rest upon it; and, because of the power of his good fortune, he suffered no harm whatsoever. On his return to the capital he had the stone brought down and set in masonry as a platform at Wat Rachathiwat. After his accession to the throne, he had it brought to Wāt Phrā Sri Rātānā Satsādaram (Wāt Phrā Kao). He also secured a stone pillar inscribed in Khāmen letters, and one inscribed in ancient Siamese, both standing now in Wāt Phrā Sri Rātānā Satsādaram;—of wonderful import, as if presaging that he would be sovereign of Siam, a king of majesty, power, and goodness far-reaching, like the Phrā Bat Kāmāradeng At, . . . who was king in Sūkhothāi, as recorded in that inscribed stone.”²

1 The practice of setting of identical monuments in different places is illustrated also in the case of the other Sukhothai inscription, already referred to above as standing beside our stone in the Sala at Wat Phra Kao. A duplicate of it—but in Siamese—has recently been discovered, and there is no reason yet to despair of finding one or more of the duplicates of our stone.

2 Translated from หนังสือ พระราชประวัติ พระบาทสมเด็จพระเจ้าแผ่นดิน ๔ รัชกาล pp. 306—308. The reference in the last sentence is to the other stone. I am quite at a loss to understand how it is that the Siamese generally seem to value so highly Prince Kamaradeng At and his Khāmen inscription.

Since then the stone has not been moved. But it is greatly to be desired that a safer and more fitting resting place be found for this the most precious record and monument so far discovered within the realm of Siam. In its present position it is far too much exposed to the weather, to accidents, and to rough handling by unscrupulous persons. During the weeks of the writer's work upon it there was a constant stream of all sorts of people passing almost within arm's length of it, and without the slightest barrier interposed. Its security so far is almost wholly due to the entire ignorance of nearly everybody regarding its real character and value. Not only should it be placed where it may be safe, but where it can be examined and studied under suitable illumination. As it now stands, the inscription is exposed to such confusing and almost blinding crosslights, that direct study of it is extremely difficult, and attempts to photograph it are almost hopeless. Moreover good plaster copies of it should be made without delay, to serve for all ordinary purposes of study and reference, and to insure against entire loss of so unique a document.

The stone has suffered somewhat from exposure, and much more from outrageous mishandling—the latter incurred, so far as one can judge, chiefly during its transportation from the north. It has apparently been dragged along bodily over rock or grit, or pried about with crowbars, so that most parts of its surface are disfigured by long lines or sweeps of scratches. Besides this there are some channels and small areas that have been excavated by drip of water. The edge at points has suffered a smooth abrasion, no doubt caused by its use as a whetstone for sharpening knives¹. There is abundant evidence also of such things as recent dripping of oil and melted candle-wax upon the stone, and of the application of various inks and other pigments to the surface, presumably in attempts to secure reproductions of the inscription. By such means some lines of the inscription have become entirely filled up, and cannot be made to appear in any “squeeze” or “rub.” These

¹ The recently discovered duplicate of the other Sukhothai stone referred to above, p. 4, has had one of its faces so entirely worn down by the same misuse, that nothing can now be made out of the writing which was once on it. As for rough usage in transportation, any one who has watched the handling of recent “finds,” would simply stand aghast.

last, of course, are minor matters ; it is possible to clean the stone. Yet they serve to emphasize what has already been said about the need of stricter care. Still, in spite of all that it has suffered, the inscription is legible almost throughout. The letters were deeply incised at the start, and with patience and a good light, may often still be read, though the surface seems hopeless. The absolute losses are mostly of one or two letters out of a word, and these the context often enables one to supply beyond a peradventure. There are not more than twenty words completely lost from the whole inscription, and the restoration of a number of these is scarcely conjectural. In all this matter the recurrent or the aphoristic phrase, the metrical balance, the clue of rhyme—things dear to the elder Siamese speech—are often the surest guides out of the difficulty. (See further below pp. 18-20.)

THE WRITING.

“ Heretofore there were no strokes of Siamese writing. In 1205 of the era, Year of the Goat, Prince Khūn Ram Khămhang sought and desired in his heart, and put into use these strokes of Siamese writing. And so these strokes of Siamese writing are, because that Prince put them to use.” [Inscription, ll. 105-108.] Thus in phrase curt and rugged even to harshness, as if with suppressed emotion, is recorded what was by far the most important event of Prince Ram Khămhang’s reign, or indeed of the whole period of Thāi sovereignty. The Prince himself seems to have felt its importance, for he has reversed the historical order to give this achievement the place of honor at the end and climax of his story.

The general appearance of this earliest Siamese writing may be seen in the accompanying photographic reproduction of the text. A more detailed study of it can easily be made with the help of the Transliteration into modern Siamese characters. In mass it presents itself as a singularly bold, erect, open writing, four-square, with gently rounded corners, beautifully aligned, and closely too, but without any confusion resulting from superscript or subscript elements, or from letters which extend above or below the line ¹. Its look is therefore not unlike that

¹ Three letters only project at all above the line:— 𑄓, 𑄔, and 𑄕.

of a text of Greek uncials or of our own square capitals,—somewhat stiff, but singularly clear. The only drawback in this regard is the running together now and then of the contiguous strokes of different letters ¹. To the eye acquainted only with modern Siamese, this inscription seems at first quite as foreign as the Khāmen inscription which stands beside it in the court of Wāt Phrā Kæo. Closer scrutiny detects here and there a letter barely recognizable in its grotesque aldermanic breadth. And after the characters are all learned, their sequence is still a source of perplexity, being often quite different from that of modern Siamese ².

The particular writing from which these letters were adopted and adapted has not yet been identified. Its source. Their general character confirms the impression based on quite other grounds that it must have been South-Indian or Singhalese; that its immediate exemplars were doubtless the Pali religious texts; and that the efficient agents in the accomplishment of the Prince's scheme were Buddhist scholars like him who is mentioned in the inscription as one of the chief glories of the realm,—the Māhathen who “had studied the Pidōktrāi unto its end.”

The mere acquisition of the letters was, of course, the least part of the Prince's task. Much more difficult must have been the expansion of the meagre Indian vowel-list to meet the unusually large demands of Siamese speech ³.

¹ This occurs regularly in certain vowel combinations (where the result is really to make a new unit, as in the case of our diphthongs æ and œ); it occurs somewhat frequently in the case of an ວ or a ຍ directly following a vertical stroke; but rather rarely in other consonantal combinations. This practice has entirely disappeared in standard modern Siamese; but it continued in the north throughout the whole of the period of the so-called Fak Kham letters, until those gave way at last to the modern round Lao writing.

² This is due chiefly to the fact that the vowels which now are written above or below the consonants that lead them in pronunciation, in this writing all stand in the line, and precede their consonants.

³ The inscription distinguishes thirteen simple vowels and eleven diphthongs as follows:—a) ອາ, ອະ with ອົາ and ອຸນ (for ອັ), all symbols for short *a* in different combinations; ອ, ອັ, ອື, ອຸ, ອູ, ອ໊, ອ໋, ອ໌, ອ໑, ອ໒ (short *o*), ອອ, ອ໌ເອ (for ອ໌ເອ); and b) ອາ, ອາ, ອຍາ (for ອ໌ຍາ), ອ໌ເອ; ອ໌ and ອ໌, ອາຍ, ອຍາ, ອ໌ຍ, ອອຍ; ອຍຍ (for ອ໌ຍຍ), ອ໌ເອ and ອ໌ເອ (for ອ໌ເອ), in variant spellings of the same word. Modern Siamese writing distinguishes further the simple short vowels: ອັ, ອ໌, ອ໋, ອ໌, ອ໑; and the diphthongs: ອ໌ເອ, ອ໌ເອ, ອ໌ເອຍ, ອ໌ເອຍ.

Many of the devices adopted by the Prince to accomplish this end were not only illogical, but clumsy in the extreme ; and there are many duplications among them. But since his time \sim and a are the only characters that have actually been added to the vowel list. A few unnecessary \grave{a} 's have been dropped, but quite as many unnecessary ones have been added. The shift of a number of the vowel signs from the line to the space above or below (see next paragraph) has caused some change in the order of letters in the syllable, But in the main, for its peculiar system of representing vowels and diphthongs, the Siamese of to-day must thank the Prince.

But the most original as well as the most interesting feature of his scheme of vowel-notation was his bringing Position in of all the vowel-signs into the written line along the line. with the consonants, and so practically into the alphabet itself. Inclusion of the vowels in the alphabet was a master stroke of the Greek genius, when once for all it adapted oriental letters to the needs of a new world of life and thought. It is that alone, for example, which has made possible for all western tongues the immense advantage of a perfectly fixed order of words in vocabularies and lists. The lack of such an absolute word-order is a difficulty and hindrance to scholarship more or less distinctly felt throughout the Eastern world, and everywhere for the same reason :—the vowels have no place in the alphabetical order. Prince Ram Khămhaeng, so far as we can learn, is the only man in all this interval who has come at all near to duplicating that old Grecian thought. But he did not carry his thought through to its logical conclusion. He did not give the vowels their place in the sequence of elements in the syllable, as he had given them their place in the line. Siamese scholars, unlike the Greek, were continually conning oriental scriptures. They thus kept ever alive the old tradition, and obscured the new. Very few years passed before the vowels which had been brought into the line were back in their old stations in the field ¹. Thus it is that for Siamese of to-day, type that

¹ There is quite a series of the Sukhothai inscriptions, following this of Prince Ram Khamhaeng ; but in none of them, so far as I can ascertain, do the vowels retain their places in the line. I find it difficult to accept Père Schmitt's conclusion from this fact (*Mission Pavie*, II : 177) that the reduction of the vowels to the line was no part of the Prince's scheme, but rather a mere variation introduced by the stone cutter who " a voulu faciliter par là son travail, et donner de la netteté à ses caractères." Such presumption in dealing with his master's pet invention is hardly to be expected on the part of a workman who might be sure that his meddling would not escape his master's scrutiny.

can be conveniently cast and set, and dictionaries where words may be easily and certainly found, seem as unattainable as ever.

It seems that the adjustment of the consonant-scheme should have been much easier; but it was much more clumsily accomplished, if the scheme in present Siamese is to be taken as the Prince's. The consonant sounds in present Siamese are only twenty-one in number; and though some changes have probably taken place in the six centuries which have elapsed, the total number then can hardly have been very different from what it is now. The Indian consonant letters were thirty-three—giving, let us say, twelve supernumeraries to be stricken off the list, or else to be used only in rendering Indian words. But there were the

The
"tones." "tones" to be somehow indicated in writing. The easiest and most obvious plan would doubtless have been to indicate these directly by a series of accents. But those supernumerary letters seem to have led to the suggestion that they might somehow be used in indicating the "tones" of the vowels which follow them. To work out the suggestion completely by providing one letter of each sort for every tone, would require—if there were then as many tones as there are now in Siamese—no less than six times twenty-one, that is one hundred and twenty six letters. That being impossible, the compromise actually reached would seem to have been somewhat as follows:—1) One group of consonant-sounds, chiefly the non-aspirates and the aspirates, was actually provided with two letter symbols for each sound, the two letters indicating different tonal quality. The two parallel sets so formed were the so-called "high" and "low" letters. Each naturally gave its tone to the vowel which followed it. These two "inherent" tones were further susceptible of different modification by the use of two accent marks, the "ek" and the "tho," and also to some extent by final consonants; so that in the case of these letters all the required tones could be positively, though very clumsily, indicated. 2) A second group of sounds, mostly semi-vowels and nasals, was furnished with but one letter apiece, and that a "low" letter. To make good their deficiency, and to enable them to represent all of the required tones as well as their more favored companions could, it was arranged that whenever necessary one of the "high" letters should

stand beside them—silent of course—and so endue them with all the privileges and powers of the “high” class. 3) A third group, originally it would seem of no more than three or four, with all the functions of the “high” class except inherent tone, and not provided with any means of extending their powers, formed the so-called “middle” class.

The inheritors of this scheme, the Siamese and the Lao, both preserve to-day all of its essential features; but they differ considerably as to the constitution of two of the groups, namely the “high” and the “middle” letters. The difference concerns the five simple (unvoiced), non-aspirate stops which stand each at or near the head of its particular order of consonants: η , α , η , η , η . In Siamese these are all “middle” letters, while in Lao they are all “high.” The question as to which more nearly represents the original scheme, can never be positively answered, because we can never recover the Sūkhothāi pronunciation. But the probabilities seem all on the side of the Lao. In the first place, the Lao certainly seems the more primitive in type, preserving many archaic features which the Siamese has lost. In the second place, its central geographical position and its compact area would both defend it, in some degree at least, from the external contact and pressure which the Siamese has not been able to escape. And further, when we consider that any mind capable of thinking out such a scheme at all would not have made it purposely confused and irrational from the start; and when we recall how surely the mere progress of time operates to confound “the best laid schemes,”—as for example it has confounded our once quite rational English spelling;—we should be inclined, I think, to count that the best representative of the old, which most clearly shows evidence of order and intelligent plan. This the Lao does in surprising degree, as may be seen on comparison of any one of the consonant series of the Indian alphabet—the guttural for example—with the corresponding series in Lao. Thus:—

	surd			sonant	
simple		aspirate		simple	aspirate
Indian k		kh		g	gh
corresponds to					
Lao k		kh		k	gh
simple		aspirate		simple	aspirate
	“high”			“low”	

That is,—The Lao, having no voiced sounds corresponding to *g* and *gh*, utilizes these letters as tonal variants of the unvoiced pair *k* and *kh* taken without change from the Indian alphabet. The same thing is done with the corresponding pair in each of the five series. And the first pair—simple and aspirate—are uniformly “high” letters, while the second pair are uniformly “low.” Thus without help of any accents beyond the original mai ek (¹) and mai tho (²) of the inscription, a fuller scheme of tones than that of modern Siamese is provided for, without duplication of letters, without lack, and with fair balance of parts. Such symmetry and adaptation of means to ends surely is not the result of accident. If we make a similar comparison in the case of the Siamese, we find—

	surd			sonant	
simple		aspirate		simple	aspirate
Indian k		kh		g	gh
corresponds to					
Siamese k		kh		kh	kh
simple “middle”		aspirate “high”		aspirate “low”	aspirate “low”

Two things, apparently, have happened to the Siamese version of the scheme:—1) No. 1 of each group has lost its power of indicating “high” tone, and has gone to swell the list of imperfectly equipped “middle” letters: and 2) No. 3 of each group has taken on aspiration, and thus merely duplicates No. 4.

An outcome such as this is perfectly intelligible and natural if the original were something like the Lao. But the Lao scheme could hardly have been developed naturally from a scheme originally like that of present Siamese. And if our present twice, nay thrice, involved scheme of Siamese tonal notation—the dismay and confusion of all students,—together with the absurdly inflated consonantal alphabet which is part and parcel of it, were all really the work of Prince Ram Khāmhæng, it might well bear the palm among what Professor Whitney has called “devices of perverse ingenuity.”

As might have been expected, the working of the new
 Spelling. scheme was not always sure. In the inscription a number of uncertain or variant spellings are

to be found, to say nothing of certain downright mistakes ¹; but upon the whole the Prince seems to have been very well served by his scribes. Considering the difficulties encountered, this trial trip of the new writing was remarkably successful.

The Epilogue is almost certainly later than the rest of the inscription. It may even have been written after the death of the Prince, though it contains no reference to such an event. It evidently was inscribed by a different hand, and was cut by a different engraver. The strokes are finer, the letters are distinctly more slender, and some of them already approximate their present shape. But quite as convincing as any of these more obvious features is the evidence of dialectal variation in the speech itself. The vowel [^] has entirely disappeared from the writing. It is everywhere replaced by [^], precisely as is still the case in the provinces of Phrae and Lăkhawn, which directly adjoin the Sŭkthoăi region on the north. For a further difference in thought and style, see p. 21.

The direct successor of the Sŭkthoăi writing was, as has already been said, the Făk Khăm letters, so called because of the peculiar elliptical curve of the vertical strokes, recalling the curve of a tamarind-pod as it hangs on the tree. Early examples of of this type from the Sŭkthoăi region, no later than sixty or seventy years after our inscription, already exhibit its principal features:—superscript and subscript vowels, entire loss of the [^] vowel, more slender bodies of the letters, and a gradual approach to the modern type. For a time the Khămén character seems to have been a formidable competitor, especially in the religious field. But the Făk Khăm finally won its way, at least throughout all the north, as is attested by numberless inscriptions reaching down to quite modern times. It finally gave way in that region to the

1 The very first line reveals uncertainty as to how an initial vowel should be rendered:—[^]นทรา for [^]อินทรา. A very puzzling variation occurs ll. 51—53 and 63—66. in the spelling of a now famous word, อวิญญูญิก. These cases are all considered in the Notes. But the greatest uncertainty, or perhaps carelessness, is found in the use of the tonal accents, which are exchanged almost at random, or are omitted entirely. This last is equally true of the “tails” of the sibilants and of *f* and *p*: but this, of course, is a *lapsus manus* merely.

present round Lao writing, but at what date and from what source is still in question¹. Of its history in central and southern Siam I am not prepared to speak. But late northern Făk Khăm is already so nearly like southern Siamese of the 18th century, that there can be no doubt of their common relationship. From that time to this its course is a matter of common knowledge. The use of better surfaces and better instruments for writing, long practice, with resulting sureness and swiftness of stroke, have operated to lessen the stiffness, to reduce the more intricate turns, to diminish the aldermanic breadth of the original letters, and to give them the physiological slant. The modern Siamese written line—before type-writing and print had jostled it out of shape—was certainly more elegant, with its delightful clearness, its touch of feminine grace, its suggestion of accurate and fluent movement. But otherwise it differs not very greatly from that of Prince Ram Khămhæng.

THE LANGUAGE.

The total number of words used in this inscription is exactly 1500. The actual vocabulary, the total number of *different* words used, amounts to 404. This shows very fair scope and range for a document of this kind. A preliminary sorting of this vocabulary results as follows:—

1	Words recognized as of Indian origin	63
2	Words recognized as of Khămén origin	13
3	Proper names not Thăi and not included above	11
4	Thăi, native or effectively naturalized	317
	Total	404

This analysis concerns the question of purity of diction. But purity, it must be remembered, depends very little upon the ultimate derivation of words, and very much upon the sense which they awaken in the cultivated hearer of nearness to or remoteness from the common speech. Therefore it is that no attempt has been made to distinguish here between Thăi words and words

1. See a statement as to its origin, with a note thereon by the editor, in Phong-sawadan Yonok, p. 95.

effectively naturalized. To distinguish between them is moreover absolutely impossible in the absence of any early records of Thăi speech¹. But the groups in the scheme above are not mutually exclusive. Eleven words of group 1 and six words of group 2 seem thoroughly naturalized. After making the necessary changes the result appears as follows :—

Apparently native or fully naturalized	334
Foreign or uncertain	70

The Thăi element, that is, amounts to 83 per cent of the whole. Surprising as the figure is, it would have been higher yet, had the count been made as is usual in such cases; namely, a count, regardless of repetition, of all words as they actually occur in the text, instead of counting each word but once, as has been done here.

Almost equally surprising is the very small number of words in the Thăi group that have dropped out of current Siamese during the six centuries that have elapsed. As I count them, I find but twenty-one that seem really obsolete, that is, a trifle over 6 per cent.

Of the dialectal color of the Sŭkthohtăi speech it is impossible to speak in percentages. Of the twenty-one Thăi words accounted as not current now in Siamese speech, I have marked but six as known to me to exist in Lao. No doubt there are others as well, of whose use I am ignorant. To answer the question quantitatively, one would have to know also how many words out of this whole vocabulary are *not*—or rather *were not*—current in Lao. And even so, mere vocabulary does not by any means cover the whole ground of dialectal divergence, which consists quite

1. Since the matter is of some moment, it may be well to state the grounds on which words have been admitted to group 4. They are 1) Long domiciliation of the word and familiar use of it within the Thai area, especially if supported by evidence of the appearance of the word in the related dialects. 2) Use of the word in the metrical and linked phrases, or in the assonant or alliterative "jingles" peculiar to Thai speech, since these are almost invariably old or constructed out of native materials. 3) Appearance in the word of the peculiar Thai vowels or diphthongs. This last, of course, is conclusive only as *against* certain foreign origins. These same criteria have determined also the selection of certain words noted as native or naturalized from groups 1 and 2. The obvious criticism upon this method is that the question of purity is thereby judged by the nineteenth century instead of by the thirteenth. But the thirteenth century can no longer by any possibility be brought to sit in judgment on the case; and if it could, it is not likely that the result would be very different as concerns the overwhelming preponderance of the native element. Those who may care to review the case will find the complete lists at the end of the paper.

as much in special applications of the same words, and in tone, accent, and phrasing—matters as yet wholly beyond our reach. But there can be no doubt that to a cultivated Siamese the northern flavor of this speech is quite pronounced; while to a cultivated Lao who should hear it read aloud by one of his countrymen, it would probably seem very good Lao, only perhaps a trifle old-fashioned. That is, the standard Siamese speech of that day had not yet diverged very far from the ancestral type.

FORM AND STYLE.

As is wont to be the case with nearly all primitive attempts, the composition in its aim and intention is distinctly oral—is speech rather than writing. One striking outcome

The recurrent pattern. of this fact is the dominance everywhere of what may be termed the recurrent type or pattern of phrase. The type has been found to be effective; it is easier to remember and reproduce it, or to vary it if necessary, than it is to invent a new form specially adapted to the occasion¹. In its lowest form this dominance is seen in the wearisome repetition

Exact repetition. of identical details in various parts of the description of the city and its surroundings:—
 and lang,” “groves of areca and betel, groves of cocoanut
 beautiful; temples that are great, images that are great, images that are beautiful,” and so on to the end of the chapter. More distinctly rhetorical is the constant grouping of items in pairs,

Balanced and rhythmic phrasing. especially where the balance is regularly emphasized, and sonorous effect is secured, by repetition of the introductory word or words:—

“pa mak pa phlu” l. 36; “luk chau luk khūn” l. 25; baw mi ngön baw mi thawng” ll. 29—30. “mi wihan ãn yǎi, mi wihan ãn ram” l. 61. In all these cases the sequence is carefully attended to, so that each of the paired words stands last in its own phrase, and the phrase containing the more sonorous word shall stand last². From this it is

1 This tendency is strikingly exemplified in the recurrent forms of ballad literature everywhere.

2 Least sonorous of all is the word that ends with a stopped consonant *k*, *t*, or *p*. Of words otherwise equal the one with the long vowel, or the one whose vowel is followed by a sonorous nasal—*n*, *m*, or *ng*,—is given the final position.

but a step to the grouping of such pairs in extended rhetorical series, where pair balances pair, as item balances item, and with climactic effect:—"baw mi chang, baw mi ma, baw mi pua, baw mi nang, baw mi ngön, baw mi thawng," ll. 29—30; "chau mæ, chau chău; thui pua, thui nang; luk chău, luk khün; thăng sîn, thăng lai; thăng phu chai, phu ying," ll. 45—46. Such balance, either simple or complex, is found in almost every second line of the inscription. It is sometimes varied in rhythm, as the examples cited show; sometimes it is massed so as to fill a whole passage.

In primitive speech, the rhetorical effect of balance is scarcely more important than its mnemonic effect—the clue it affords the memory of speaker as well as of hearer. To a speaker a sonorous phrase, well-coined, is more valuable than a single word expressive of the same idea. The phrase has greater weight and momentum; it carries him, and his hearer too, more easily over gaps in his thought. If at all successful, it tends to become habitual—a stereotyped commonplace phrase. Its meaning, moreover, runs a course of its own, with little reference to the meaning of its constituent parts, as we may see in such locutions as: "păi năi ma" (*Go where come*), or in its English equivalent "How do you do?", or in "Good bye." It is not always necessary that all the words of such a phrase should have now, or ever should have had, either independent or pertinent meaning. It is quite permissible in many languages to invent them outright, if only the result prove sufficiently "taking." In such cases, however, it is generally desirable to invoke the aid of balance, alliteration, or assonance. Thus we come at length to the "söi khăm" as the Siamese call it, or the "jingle" as we may term it. Examples are: "kha sük kha süa" *enemies* l. 31; or "sănük sänan" *jolly*, and "năngsü năngha" *books*, of modern Siamese;—or our own *riff-raff*, *picnic*, *bric-a-brac*.

Balance, assonance, and alliteration have already brought us to the confines of verse. Metre and rhyme differ from these in degree rather than in kind. Primitive speech, if at all formal, turns naturally to metrical form. Our inscription is no exception to this rule. The balanced series cited above are metrical as well. But

there are other forms more elaborate and striking. 1) Most common, perhaps, is the short iambic verse of two feet only—a dipody, that is—of four words arranged in two balanced pairs. The pairs are coupled together at the point of junction by a caesural tie-rhyme, and the whole is expressive of a single generalized idea. Examples from the text are ;—“phrăi fa kha thăi,” *Siamese subjects* l. 23 ; “chĕp thawng khawng chăi,” *distressed in mind* ll. 33—34; “phi nawng thawng diu,” *own brothers and sisters* l. 2. Fourteen or fifteen of this species alone are to be found in the inscription. They abound everywhere in Siamese literature and speech. This seems indeed to be the fundamental pattern from which by variation are derived nearly all the other distinctly metrical forms which occur in Siamese prose.

2) One of these derived forms is simply an expansion of it by the insertion of identical words into the two members of the dipody, Thus in “khău phu lăk măk phu sawn,” *shares with stealer, consorts with hider* ll. 26—27, the four accented words, khău—lăk—măk—sawn, represent the original framework of the dipody, while the relative phu is the added element. In the much longer “hĕn khău thăn baw khrai phin, hĕn sin thăn baw khrai düat. ll. 27—28, the four accented words, khău—phin—sin—thăn, mark the simple pattern, with order and caesural tie-rhyme accurately kept ; while the added material has expanded the simple iambic dipody to three times its original dimensions. It makes now two anapæstic verses ; yet the tie-rhyme is not displaced. 3) A variation apparently simpler is produced by merely increasing the number of units, and building up thus a continuous stanza. A fine example occurs in ll.

18—19 :—

Năi năm mi pla,
 Năi na mi khău ;
 Chău müang baw ău,
 Chă kawp năi phrăi.

Here the first couplet answers exactly to an expansion of the pattern : năm—pla—na—khău, as described above, with pla and na for the tie-rhyme between the first two verses. But at this point come in the intricate rules of rhyme in stanzaic verse. Khău determines not only the tie-rhyme which is to link the two couplets together (in khău—chău), but the end-rhyme (ău) of verse 3 as well. There are thus

two rhymes and five rhyming words in this short stanza. Had this been a stanza of a continuous poem, there should have been two rhymes more to link it with the stanzas preceding and following.

It is scarcely necessary to remark how well these terse, balanced, and metrical forms serve the purposes of proverbial and aphoristic utterance, the pithy maxims of policy and of life. The reputed sayings of King Alfred and of Phră Ruăng are here alike in point. Their form not merely makes them more impressive, but makes it possible to remember and repeat them. There is little doubt that the three examples last cited were actually quoted by the Prince from a mass of current "saws" concerning the methods and results of just government ¹.

Contrary to what might be expected, these poetic forms are no unwarranted invasion of the realm of prose. Like any other poetic quotation or allusion, they serve rather to mark very naturally elevation of thought, the touch of lyric feeling, a glimpse of the ideal. This function is finely shown in a passage already cited, (ll. 18—19) which begins the sketch of a happy and prosperous realm under a kind and just government; and again in the Epilogue, where, as we pause to take our last look at the Prince, it seems as though he were already a memory in the hearts of his people. The stately, measured words in which are summed up the aims of his life read like an echo of the closing verses of the Book of Deuteronomy.

If we pass from form to content, the most striking feature of the diction is, no doubt, its concreteness, its objectivity. Everything touched upon is visualized—is realized in terms of space, action, and motion. This is true even of the lyric passages of which we have been speaking. But it is much more true when the Prince's thought is free to range at will. Then it is ever "this city of Sūkhothăi," "this grove of palm trees," "this stone slab," "the bell hung up there,"

¹ Since the above was written there has come unexpected confirmation of this statement. In looking casually over some fragments of inscriptions which arrived a few days ago at the Royal Library, I was surprised and pleased to light upon the precise duplicate of the second of the three referred to, the one found in ll. 27—28.

“the forest-monastery yonder.” The demonstratives, in fact, seem to be the most hard-worked word in his whole vocabulary. It is the same when he recalls the battle so narrowly retrieved, in which, as a mere stripling, he won his spurs and his name. He there sees the movements as “to left” and “to right.” He sees the soldiers “flee, beaten and cowering.” The elephants are “driven.” The lad “urges his way into the fight ahead of his father.” It is “a thrust of a weapon hurled” that disables the opposing elephant and turns the tide of battle. It is the same when he recounts the glories of his capital city. There are, of course, the noble temple grounds and buildings, the palace, the market place, the “groves of tamarind and mango, fair as if made to look at.” But his real interest is in the moving spectacles, in scenes of thronging human life and motion—the imposing ceremonies at the consecration of the inscribed stones, and at the taking of the oath of fealty; the illuminations and fireworks “when the Prince burns candles, when he plays with fire;” the great city gates when stormed by the tremendous rush of people surging through to see the spectacle. And in the midst of all, that inimitable touch revealing the very heart of an artist and poet,—that “gushing rock-spring of water as clear and as good to drink of as is the Khong in the dry season”¹.

THE MAN.

The most interesting thing in the whole writing is the man himself, Prince Khūn Ram Khāmhaeng. The inscription commemorates his reign. He himself is the speaker, at least throughout the body of the document. The perspective is that of a man of large and generous nature looking back with not unreasonable satisfaction over a long and strenuous career. In it he has risen from being the youngest son of a petty feudal chieftain—as we gather from the atmosphere and background of the opening scenes—to a point where he challenges the allegiance of the whole Thāi race (ll. 99—100). His territory, at first not stretching further than twenty miles from his

¹ The Me Khong is fed by melting snows on the slopes north of the Himalaya. When its spring flood is over, I am told that it runs clear and cold. But in such a matter I should be quite willing to take the word of a man with eyes and heart like those of the Prince. Only one who had seen and tasted and felt could have spoken so.

father's stronghold, includes at last an area quite comparable in extent to that held by Siam today, and not greatly different from that ¹. Had this been all, he would not command from us more attention than we give to many another bold adventurer who has done as much or more. But of his battles and campaigns—which no doubt were many—there is no parade whatever. If the Epilogue be the work of another hand, as indeed seems likely, there is no mention of them at all in the Prince's writing, save in that one opening scene wherein he slyly laughs at his own boyish presumption and lack of decorum. Whoever wrote the Epilogue, the ambition there ascribed to him "to become lord and ruler unto all the Thāi" was undoubtedly his. But it was coupled with the nobler ambition "to become preceptor and instructor to teach all the Thāi to know true righteousness," "to plant and rear the host of the sons of his city and realm to be in accord with righteousness, every one."

This capacity for a noble idealism is everywhere apparent throughout this all too brief writing. It is seen in the Prince's choice of the things he deems most memorable in all his reign :—the invention of writing ; the solemn reverence paid by him and by his people to the sacred relics—symbols of the best and the highest they knew in human life and character; and the consecration and setting up of the inscribed stones which were to record in Siamese words the achievement of a united Siam. It is seen in the love of justice and the passion for righteousness which everywhere flash forth from the writing. It is seen in his unaffected delight in the prosperity of his realm, the piety and the happiness of his people. It is

¹ Phitsanulok, distant about twenty miles from Sukhothai to the south-east, is named in the list of places added by the Prince to his realm. The fact that the name of Si Sachanalai, at about the same distance to the north, does not appear as part of the Prince's style and title until we find ourselves among the later events of his reign, leads us to count it also as a city that he had recently won. Tak, at a little greater distance to the west, seems to have been contested ground at the opening of the story.

In comparison with Siam of today, the Prince's territory in its northern portion was considerably larger, reaching as it did from beyond the Me Khong (ll. 115—116) to Pegu and the ocean (l. 120), and including the valley of the U, the great northern affluent of the Khong (l. 100). At the same time, it did not include the Chiangmai-Chiangrai area, which at this time was dominated by the picturesque and famous Meng Rai, who founded Chiangmai in 1296 A. D., only three years later than our date. In the Menam delta, the list includes nothing to the east and south-east of the Phitsanulok-Nakhawnsawan-Suphan-Thachin line,—nothing, that is, to the east of the western delta-stream. The omission of Lawo (Lophburi) is also significant. The forces which brought about the supremacy of Ayuthia, and with it the downfall of Sukhothai, were, no doubt already at work, though the city of Ayuthia was not founded until sixty years later ; that is, in 1350 A.D.

seen in the loving pride with which he regards his scholarly Māhathen, "who had studied the Tripitaka unto its end." It is this capacity for a noble idealism, together with the enthusiasms inseparable from it, which constitute the Prince's real claim to distinction—a claim which I feel sure no one who reads the record will disallow. We need not enquire how far the actual performance fell short of the inward vision. Fall short it must. But to have known and loved the Highest, and with all one's heart to have striven to establish that Highest in the world, is distinction high enough for any man.—Indeed there is no higher.

But I detain you too long among these preliminaries. Let us hear the Prince himself.

TRANSLATION.

NOTE :—Small figures indicate the number of the line in both Text and Transliteration. In romanized words all unmarked vowels are long—a departure from the regular philological practice necessitated by the exigencies of the press. Square brackets include words whose status is in considerable doubt, whether as regards text or syntax or rendering. Round brackets enclose words added in explanation of terms.

My father's name was Si Inthāratht. My mother's name was Lady Süäng. My elder brother's name His origin and family. was Ban Müäng (Warden of the Realm). ² We, elder and younger born from the same womb were five; brothers three, sisters two. My elder brother ³ who was first, died and left me while yet little. When I grew up reaching ⁴ nineteen rice-harvests, Khūn Sam Chōn (Prince of Three Peoples), lord of Müäng Chawt, came to Müäng Tak. His youthful exploit in battle. My father went to fight ⁵ Khūn Sam Chōn by the right. Khūn Sam Chōn pressed on to meet him by the left. Khūn Sam ⁶ Chōn charged in force. My father's people fled in haste, broken and scattered. ⁷ I fled not. I bestrode the elephant Nekā Phōn (Host of Warriors). I urged him into the mêlée in front of my father. I engaged ⁸ Khūn Sam Chōn in elephant-duel. I myself thrust Khūn Sam Chōn's elephant—the one called ⁹ Mat Müäng (Kingdom's Treasure) so that he was worsted. Khūn Sam Chōn was vanquished, fled. My father therefore raised my name ¹⁰ to the title Phrá Ram Khāmhaeng, because I thrust Khūn Sam Chōn's elephant.

During ¹¹ my father's time I was support and stay unto my father; I was support and stay unto my mother. His filial and brotherly devotion. If I got the body ¹² of a deer or the body of a fish, I brought it to my father. If I got any fruit, tart or sweet, ¹³ that I ate and relished, ate and found good, I brought it to my father. If I went ¹⁴ to hunt elephants, and got them, I brought them to my father. If I went to hamlets or ¹⁵ towns, and got elephants, got elephant's trunks, got slaves, got damsels, got silver, got gold, I brought ¹⁶ and left them with my father. My father died. I continued to be support and stay unto my brother ¹⁷ just as I had been unto

my father. My brother died. So I got the realm entire to myself.

¹⁸ During the time of Prince Khūn Ram Khāmhæng thi^s realm of Sūkhothāi has prospered. In the water ¹⁹ are fish, in the field is rice. The lord of the realm takes them not. He would invest them in his people. Along the highways people ²⁰ lead cattle to trade, ride horses to sell. Whoever wishes to deal in elephants, deals; whoever ²¹ wishes to deal in horses, deals; whoever wishes to deal in silver, in gold, deals. Among common folk of the realm, ²² among lords or nobles, if any one soever dies or disappears from house and home, the Prince trusts, ²³ supports, aids. They are always getting children and wives, are always growing rice, [these] folk of the realm, subjects of the Thai. Their groves of ²⁴ areca, their groves of betel, the Prince trusts wholly to them to keep for their own children. If people of the realm, ²⁵ if lords or nobles do wrong, fall out, are at enmity with each other, he makes inquisition, gets at the ²⁶ truth, and then decides the case for his subjects righteously, 'shares not with stealer, consorts not with ²⁷ hider,'; 'sees another's goods and covets not, sees another's wealth and rages not'. ²⁸ Whoever comes riding his elephant to visit the city, comes to the moat and waits beside it for ²⁹ me. Has he no elephants, no horses, no slaves, no damsels, no silver, ³⁰ no gold, I give to him. Has he wealth to found towns and cities ³¹ to be foes and enemies, to be strongholds for war and fighting, I kill not nor smite him. ³² In the entering in of the gate is a bell hung up there. If folk aggrieved ³³ within town or city have controversies or matters that distress them within and ³⁴ cramp their hearts, which they would declare unto their lord and prince,—there is no difficulty. Go ring the ³⁵ bell which he has hung up there. Prince Khūn Ram Khāmhæng, lord of the realm, can ³⁶ hear the call. When he has made investigation, he sifts the case for them according to right.

Thus it is that in ³⁷ this city of Sūkhothāi the people are everywhere establishing plantations of areca and betel throughout the city. ³⁸ Coccoanut groves and groves of lang are ³⁹ plenty in

this city. Mangoes and tamarinds are ⁴⁰ plenty in this city. Whoever plants them has them secure to himself. ⁴¹ [Within] this city of Sūkhothāi there is a gushing rock-spring of water as clear in color and as good to drink of ⁴² as is the water of the Khong in the dry season. Around this city of Sūkhothāi [the circuit] ⁴³ reaches to three thousand four hundred fathoms.

People in this city of Sūkhothāi ⁴⁴ are given to alms, are given to observing the precepts, are given to making offerings. Prince Khūn Ram Khāmhaeng, ⁴⁵ lord of this realm of Sūkhothāi, with the matrons and nobles of the city, their retinues of servants and maidens, ⁴⁶ the gentry one and all, both male and female, ⁴⁷ and the mass of common folk, have reverence for the teaching of Buddha. Every one of them keeps the precepts during ⁴⁸ Wasa (Buddhist Lent). When Wasa is over, there are the offerings of Khāthīn for a month before they ⁴⁹ are ended. In these presentations there are all sorts of money, all sorts of fruits, ⁵⁰ all sorts of flowers; there are cushions for sitting and cushions for reclining to accompany the yellow robes ⁵¹ offered year by year; and they take with them lan leaves to designate the recipients of the Khāthīn, going even unto the ⁵² forest-monastery yonder. When they would return into the city, they stretch in line from the forest-monastery ⁵³ yonder unto Huā Lan Dām, making the air resound with the sound of timbrels and lutes, ⁵⁴ the sound of carolling and singing. Whoever likes to sport, sports; whoever ⁵⁵ likes to laugh, laughs; whoever likes to sing, sings.

This city ⁵⁶ of Sūkhothāi has four gates exceeding great. The people throng and press each other fearfully there, when they ⁵⁷ come in to see him (the Prince) burn candles, to see him play with fire within this city of Sūkhothāi. ⁵⁸ In the midst of this city of Sūkhothāi there are temple-buildings, there are ⁵⁹ bronze images of Buddha;—there is one eighteen cubits high. There are images of Buddha ⁶⁰ that are great, there are images that are ⁶¹ beautiful. There are temples that are great, there are temples that are beautiful. There are reverend ⁶² teachers, there is . . . , there are venerable monks; there is a Māhathēn (Arch-priest). Toward sunset ⁶³ from this city of Sūkhothāi is a forest-monastery. Prince Khūn Ram Khāmhaeng made of it ⁶⁴ an

Religion.

Objects of interest.

offering unto Phră Măhathen, the Arch-priest, the scholar who studied the Trīpīṭākā unto its end, ⁶⁵ the head of his order, and above every other teacher in this realm. He came here from ⁶⁶ Sithāmmārat. In the midst of that forest-monastery is a temple-building that is ⁶⁷ large, lofty, and exceeding fair. It has an eighteen-cubit image standing erect. ⁶⁸ Toward sunrise from this city of Sūkhothāi there are temples with venerable teachers. ⁶⁹ There is a great lake; there are groves of areca and betel, there are plantations and fields, there is inhabited country ⁷⁰ with villages great and small, there are groves of mango and tamarind, as lovely as if made only to be looked at. ⁷¹ Towards bed's-foot (north) from this city of Sūkhothāi there is a [public] market place, ⁷² there is a Phră āchānā, there is a royal palace, there are groves of cocoanut and ⁷³ lang, there are plantations and fields, there is inhabited country with villages great and small. Toward ⁷⁴ bed's head (south) from this city of Sūkhothāi there are monk's cells, and a temple with venerable teachers ⁷⁵ dwelling there. There is Sridāphōngs there are groves of cocoanut and lang, of mango and tamarind; ⁷⁶ there are upland waters. In yonder mountain is a demon-spirit, Phră Khāphūng, that ⁷⁷ is greater than every other spirit in this realm. If any Prince ruling this realm ⁷⁸ of Sūkhothāi reverences him well with proper offerings, this realm stands firm, this realm ⁷⁹ prospers. If the spirit be not revered well, if the offerings be not right, the spirit in the mountain does not protect, does not ⁸⁰ regard;—this realm perishes.

In 1214 of the era, year of the Great Dragon, Prince Khūn Ram ⁸¹ Khāmhaeng, lord of this realm of Si Sāchānalāi-Sūkhothāi, [having] planted this grove of palm trees ⁸² fourteen rice-harvests [before], caused workmen to hew slabs of stone and to set them up in the open space ⁸³ in the center of this palm grove. From the day when the moon was quenched and reappeared, for eight days, ⁸⁴ and from the day when the moon filled out her orb, for eight days [more], a company of venerable teachers, reverend priests, with the Arch-priest, ⁸⁵ went up and sat above the slabs of stone, intoning the Law unto the laity and to the multitude ⁸⁶ of people who were observing the precepts. If it were not a day for reciting the Law, Prince Khūn Ram Khāmhaeng, ⁸⁷ lord of this realm of Si Sāchānalāi-Sūkhothāi, went up

The inscribed
stones.

and sat above the slabs ⁸⁸ of stone, and had the mass of lords, of nobles, and of soldiers pledge themselves together unto home ⁸⁹ and realm. On the days of new and of full moon, he had the white elephant named Ruchasi arrayed ⁹⁰ with trappings and housings all of gold and ivory right and ⁹¹ Prince Khūn Ram Khămhang mounted and rode forth to worship the Buddha [in the forest]-monastery, and ⁹² came [again]. One ^{Their location.} inscription is in Müäng Chăliäng, built into the (pagoda) ⁹³ Phră Sri Rătănăthat. One inscription is in a cave called the cave ⁹⁴ of [Phră R]am, situate on the bank of the stream Sămphai. One inscription is in the cave ⁹⁵ [Rătănă]than (Sparkling Brook). In the midst of this palm grove are two Salas: one called ⁹⁶ Sala Phră Mat (of the Golden Buddha), one called Phuttha B This stone slab, named ⁹⁷ Mănăng Sila Batră (Thought lodged in Stone), is set here that all may see [that] ⁹⁸ Prince Khūn Phră Ram Khămhang, son of Prince Khūn Sī Inthārathīt, is ⁹⁹ lord in this realm of Sī Săchănalăi-Sūkhothăi, alike over Ma, Kao, Lao, ¹⁰⁰ and Thăi of regions under the firmament of heaven, Thăi dwelling on the U, dwelling on the Khong.

When was ¹⁰¹ reached 1209 of the era, year of the Hog, he had the sacred relics exhumed that all ¹⁰² ^{The sacred relics.} might see. He made solemn sacrifice in reverence to the relics for a month and six days; and then ¹⁰³ interred them in the heart of the city Sī Săchănalăi, and built over them ¹⁰⁴ a pagoda, six rice-harvests until it was done. And he built a stone wall about the sacred ¹⁰⁵ relics, three rice harvests till it was done.

Heretofore these strokes of Siamese writing were not. ¹⁰⁶ In 1205 of the era, year of the Goat, Prince Khūn ^{The first Siamese writing.} Ram Khămhang sought and desired ¹⁰⁷ in his heart, and put into use these strokes of Siamese writing. And so there are these strokes of Siamese writing because ¹⁰⁸ that Prince [put them to use.]

That Khūn Phră Ram Khămhang sought ¹⁰⁹ to be ruler and lord unto all the Thăi;—sought to be ¹¹⁰ ^{Epilogue.} preceptor and instructor to teach all the Thăi to know ¹¹¹ true virtue and righteousness. Among men that live in the realm of the Thai, for ¹¹² knowledge and insight, for bravery and daring, for energy ¹¹³ and force, there cannot be found a man to equal him—able to subdue hosts of ¹¹⁴ enemies with

cities wide and elephants many. Eastward he conquered and secured to his realm ¹¹⁵ Să : Luang (Phichit), Sawng Khwæ (Phitsanulok), Lămbachăi, Săkha, up to the banks of the Khong ¹¹⁶ and on to Wiăng Chăn and Wiăng Khăm. Southward ¹¹⁷ he won the men of Phră Bang, (Nakhawnsăwăn) Phræk (Săngkhăburi), Suphănăphum, ¹¹⁸ Rachăburi, Phěchăburi, Sithămmărat, and the shore of the ¹¹⁹ ocean sea. Westward he won Müăng Chawt, ¹²⁰ Müăng Hôngsawădi (Pegu), with the ocean for ¹²¹ boundary. Northward he won Müăng Phlæ, Müăng Man, ¹²² Müăng, Müăng Phluă, and beyond the banks of the Khong, ¹²³ Müăng Chăwa (Luăng Phrăbang), securing them to his realm. He planted and nurtured a host of sons of his city ¹²⁴ and realm to be in accord with righteousness every one.

Ladies and gentlemen :—I think you will agree with me that we have here something far more valuable and important than a unique philological document, however important a document of that kind it may be. We have something more important than a unique historical document, which undoubtedly it is. We have here what some one has called a 'human document' of uncommon richness and power. We have a glimpse of the heart and the ideals of a man. The heart was one that could conceive, and the hand was one that for his brief day could bring to some realization that ideal toward which we all are still yearning— a Siam united, free, and good.

- ก ๑๒๐๘ ด้กั ปุกร ให้ ฐต (เอ)า พระธาตุด ออก ทงหลาย
 102 เหน กทำ ุบชา บัเรอ แก พ(ระ)ธาตุด ด้กั ด้เคอน หก วนนั ด้จ
 ด้ เออ ด้ง ด้ง ใน กตา(ง ด้เมอง) ด้ษรด้ชชนา ด้ไถ กั ด้พระเจ
 104 ด้ ด้ ด้เหนอ หก ด้เข้า ด้จ ด้แล้ว ด้คัง ด้วง ด้ผา ด้ถ้ม ด้พระม
 ด้หาธาตุด ด้ล้าม ด้เข้า ด้จ ด้แล้ว ด้มือ ด้กอน ด้ตาย ด้ด้ ด้ไท ด้นี้ ด้บ
 106 ด้มี ๑๒๐๕ ด้กั ป ด้มแม่ ด้พ ด้ชนรามคัแห่ง ด้หา ด้ไคว ด้ใจ
 ด้ใน ด้ใจ ด้แต่ ด้ไค้ ด้ตาย ด้ด้ ด้ไป(ท) ด้นี้ ด้ตาย ด้ด้ ด้ไท ด้นี้ ด้จ ด้มี ด้เพ
 108 ด้อ ด้ชน ด้ผู้ ด้นััน ด้() ด้ชนพระรามคัแห่ง ด้นััน ด้หา
 ด้เปน ด้ท้าว ด้เปน ด้พรญ(า ด้แ) ด้ก ด้ไท ด้ทั้ง ด้หลาย ด้หา ด้เปน
 110 ด้คร ด้อาจราย ด้ง ด้ง ด้สอน ด้ไท ด้ทั้ง ด้หลาย ด้ให้ ด้รู้
 ด้บุ ด้น ด้รู้ ด้ธรรม ด้แท ด้แต่ ด้คน ด้อน ด้มี ด้ใน ด้เมอง ด้ไท ด้ด้วย
 112 ด้รู้ ด้ด้ว ด้(ย) ด้ลาตวกก ด้ด้วย ด้แก้ด้ว ด้ด้วย ด้ห่าน ด้ด้วย ด้แะ
 ด้ด้วย ด้แรง ด้หา ด้คน ด้จก(ก) ด้เต็ม ด้มี ด้ได้ ด้อาจ ด้ปราบ ด้ผู้ ด้ช้ำ
 114 ด้ได้ ด้มี ด้เมอง ด้กว้าง ด้ช้ำ ด้หลาย ด้ปราบ ด้เมอง ด้ตวนน ด้อ
 ด้อก ด้รอด ด้สร ด้ตวง ด้ด้อง ด้แคว ด้ด้บ ด้บาย ด้ด้คา ด้เท้า ด้ด้ง ด้ขอ
 116 ด้ง ด้เถง ด้วง ด้จน ด้น ด้วง ด้คำ ด้เปน ด้ท ด้แล้ว ด้เบอง ด้หวด
 ด้นอน ด้รอด ด้คน ด้ท ด้พระบาง ด้แพร ด้ด้พรณ ด้ณ ด้ภู
 118 ด้ม ด้ราช ด้บุ ด้วี ด้เพช(ด้บุ) ด้ร ด้ศัร ด้ธรรม ด้ราช ด้ผู้ ด้ง ด้ท ด้เด
 ด้ด้ม ด้ทร ด้เปน ด้ท (ด้แล้ว) ด้เบอง ด้ตวนน ด้คก ด้รอด ด้เมอง
 120 ด้ง ด้ดอด ด้มี ด้(ง) ด้น ด้หง ด้คา ด้พ ด้ด้ ด้ด้ม ด้ทร ด้หา ด้เป
 ด้น ด้แดน ด้เบอง(ด้คน) ด้นอน ด้รอด ด้เมอง ด้แพด้ ด้เม
 122 ด้อง ด้ม่าน ด้เมอง(ด้) ด้เมอง ด้พล ด้ว ด้พัน ด้ผู้ ด้ง ด้ของ
 ด้เมอง ด้ชว ด้เป(ด้น ด้ท) ด้แล้ว ด้ปล ด้ก ด้ตย ด้ผู้ ด้ง ด้ต ด้บ้ำ
 124 ด้น ด้กั ด้เมอง (ด้อน) ด้น ด้ชอบ ด้ด้วย ด้ธรรม ด้ทุก ด้คน

NOTES.

N. B. References by numeral are to the numbered lines of the Text and of the Transliteration. With these also correspond the numbered lines of the Translation, so far as differences of idiom permit. References by letter are to publications named in the Bibliography, as follows:—

B. Bastian: Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1864.

S. Schmitt: Deux Anciennes Inscriptions Siamois, 1885.

P. Pavie: Mission Pavie; Études Diverses II, 1898.

RS. ฼็็็็็ ฼็็็็็ ฼็็็็็ (Rüäng Sūkhothāi,) Bangkok, 1908.

It has not been thought necessary to perplex the reader with unfamiliar spellings, save in cases where the text itself is in question. Ordinarily, therefore, words are cited in their modern form.

1. The first word ฼็ is of interest as showing that the names of the Siamese letters were pronounced then as they are now; that is, with the ฼็-vowel instead of with the ฼็-*vowel* of Indian usage. Simple ฼็-vowel *final* therefore is nowhere written in this text, it being inherent in the preceding consonant. But ฼็ medial always appears. Thus we have ฼็, ฼็, 7, and ฼็ 23; but ฼็, ฼็, 2, ฼็, 4. Other important points wherein the early usage of this letter is at variance with the present are illustrated in this same context, and will therefore be considered together here. *a*) The vowel ^{฼็} did not then require an ฼็ ‘supporter’ after it any more than did any other simple vowel. See ^{฼็} (฼็) 1, ^{฼็} (฼็) 26, ^{฼็} (฼็) 88. The ฼็ must now be written after every open (final) ^{฼็}-vowel, but the usage is wholly anomalous. *b*) An initial vowel sound regularly required the ฼็-‘supporter’ then, as it always does now. But the second word in the Prince’s title —^{฼็}฼็ for ฼็—appears without it both here and in 98, suggesting that the theory was not then fully grasped. *c*) Another token of imperfect-mastery of the system is seen in the use of the letter in diphthongs of the ฼็ type. In closed syllables with these diphthongs the ฼็ appears, properly enough,

as symbol of the vowel which forms the second element, or "vanish". But contrary to the analogy of *a*) above, and contrary also to present usage, whenever the syllable is open, an extra อ must appear as 'supporter.' Thus we have ^๑เสอ, ^๑เมอ in 1, but ^๑เชอ, ^๑เมอ in 3. *d*) The cases of ^๑เอน (เอน) 15, 29, of ^๑เสอ, 31, and ^๑เสก 114 (for คี), of ^๑เณ (เณ), 116, and of ^๑จอ (for) จอ 20, may indicate uncertainty as to the spelling, or may point to a different pronunciation of those vowels.

The last word but one in the line is given as ทน in S. P corrects it rightly to ทน (ทน).

There is no doubt that the vigorous native idiom of these opening lines seems shockingly rude to the ordinary Siamese, accustomed to expect in such a document nothing but the artificialities and servilities of courtly speech. I fear that a certain squeamishness of this same nature lingers even among people who ought to know better, and that it may be largely responsible for the general lack of interest and pride the Siamese have hitherto shown in this record and in this man. Especially offensive to such is the uncompromising 1st personal pronoun ๑ of a time when both prince and subject, without insolence and without slavishness, could use the same "I". This word, with its companion of the second person, ๑ is now entirely banished from courteous speech. The third of the group, ๑ when used of persons now carries a distinct note of contempt. But the Prince applies it to his distinguished visitors, l. 30, and more surprisingly still, to a temple building, l. 66. In this, as in many other points, the Lao is much nearer the ancient—and in this case the more virile—type. The story of the debasement of the pronouns is too long to be told here; but with regard to one of them see below, l. 26.

2. The first word is plainly ๑. S has it so in his text, but makes it 'phu' in his transliteration and translation. P boldly re-writes it to ๑ in his text. The word is a 1st personal pronoun now obsolete or provincial (Lao), and generally plural in sense, with a following appositive. (See Frankfurter: Siamese Grammar, p. 68.)

๑ is the numeral เอ, which form also occurs 95, 115. Similar uncertainty as to this medial vowel is found in other

words :—โอรส 42, ของ 100; โอรส 48, 83, ออกร 100, 115 ; โนน 50, นอน 71, 74, 117, 121.

2—3. *เมื่อ* which occurs twice in this sentence, is the well-known sentimental 1st personal pronoun of the romances. S copies it rightly, but is quite at a loss what to do with it. In face of the explicit language of the text that “my elder brother who was first died from me while yet little,” S renders : “Le frère qui suivit l'aîné (le cadet) mourut.” P's text is right, and his understanding of the general drift of the passage ; but troubled still by the memory of *เมื่อ*, he gratuitously adds : “le frère cadet m'est resté.” The second *เมื่อ* S gets rid of by transliterating it as *เมื่อ*, which gives an impossible syntax. In the second word beyond this S was puzzled by the unfamiliar *มฺวี่* (มฺวี่), and writes the word *แล* in his text, and *sē* in his transliteration,—with no intelligible meaning in either case. RS gives a modern gloss *ตั้ง* *แต่* for *ตยม* *แต่*, which no doubt gives the true meaning. But *ตยม* seems wholly obsolete.

The reader will notice that division of words at the end of a line caused the early scribe no difficulty whatever. The line simply ended with the last letter that could conveniently be included.

4. The word *ข้าว* (rice) is here used as a measure of time equivalent to ‘year’. It occurs again in the same sense in 82, 104, 105. The other word for year—*ปี*—is used also in this text, but only in connection with the name of the cyclic year of date :—80, 101, 106.

The words *ขุนสามชน* mean ‘lord (prince) of three peoples’; and I understand them to be the chieftain's feudal title as overlord of three clans, while *เจ้าเมืองตาก* names his civic authority and his stronghold. Both French versions, however, read “mandarin (*or* seigneur) de troisième rang”, plainly understanding *ชั้น* instead of *ชน* of their own text. They thus imply an imperial organization of government wholly unknown in feudal Siam. Tak is now a ruined town a short distance above the modern Rāhæng, and about forty miles

west of Sūkhothāi. Chawt has not been identified. ทั here and in 14 we must understand to have been pronounced ทั๑ as explained under 1 above. It is clearly the equivalent of ทั๑, and like it is an enclitic form, with specialized function, of the substantive ทั๑ 'place'.

5. The phrases ทั๑ทั๑ ทั๑ทั๑ are not now used in Siamese to designate direction, but are readily understood as meaning 'to the left', 'to the right'. The precise positions may not be very clear in this case, but there is nothing either in text or in context to support the 'rive gauche' and 'rive droit' of S. and P.

6. Uncertainty as to the sentence structure has made possible what I cannot but regard as an misunderstanding of the entire situation here described. Who was it that fled? All previous translators, looking only at the nearest phrase, ทั๑ ทั๑, have assumed that it was 'my father' who fled. But in the first place, the filial piety which the writer so earnestly claims just below, ll. 11—16, should have forbidden the parade of such cowardice on the part of his father, especially as there is not the slightest necessity for mentioning it here, even were it the fact. In the second place, the very next line seems plainly to imply that his father was not only there, but was actually pushing on to the encounter;—else how could the son "urge his elephant in ahead of his father"; that is, usurp his father's place in the impending duel? In the third place, the very number and variety of the words used to express the idea of fleeing, make it difficult to understand their application to a single subject like 'my father'. Far more naturally would such an inclusive and generalized predicate apply to the flight of a mass of men or of an army. Furthermore, the syntax does not by any means necessitate such a construction. ทั๑ ทั๑ might without violence be regarded as standing in genitive construction with the phrase just preceding which I have comprehensively rendered 'people' (of which see further below), and then the whole phrase 'my father's people' would become subject of the verb-phrase of fleeing. There is no difficulty involved in leaving ทั๑ thus at the end of the preceding predicate—ทั๑ทั๑ ทั๑ = 'charged home'.

There remains still a difficulty, but it involves the one construction quite as much as the other. It lies in the phrase ไพร่ ฉ้า หน้าใส, and more particularly in its second member, to which it seems almost impossible to assign any meaning within the natural range of its terms which shall seem at all compatible with the situation described. ไพร่ ฉ้า all agree in regarding as the antique form of the phrase now known as ไพร่ ฟ้า, meaning 'people of the realm'. หน้าใส 'faces bright' is also a phrase in current use as a poetic figure for 'glad' 'cheerful'. But there seems to be no way of justifying such untimely gladness in the face of imminent disaster, or of justifying its mention here at all, even if it were actually felt. The only way out, it seems to me, is to take the whole phrase as a stock expression in rhetorical or poetic style, equivalent perhaps to something like 'loyal subjects', taking the epithet as wholly conventional—in fact a poetic commonplace like Homer's 'blameless Ethiopians' and Virgil's 'pius Æneas'. This phrase, it should be noted, occurs again, l. 21, in a context where the epithet is almost as inexplicable as it is here. On this point see further Note, l. 23 below.

This last suggestion derives support from the marked tendency toward formal and conventional phrasing throughout this inscription. This earliest written speech in the language is as yet by no means free from the leading-strings of poetry. The theme itself is essentially a ballad theme. This very phrase is a striking example of the metrical form which continually recurs here, unmistakably marked as such by the curious internal rhyme, as well as by the formal balance of its members. The conventional character of these expressions, moreover is generally marked by some isolation or obscurity of meaning attaching to one or more of their members, due, as we may imagine both to exigencies of rhyme and to the use of antiquated diction. Another feature which connects them with the ballad-forms is their capacity for impromptu variation. Two examples in this text are plainly variations of this very phrase which we are considering; namely ไพร่ ฉ้า ข้าไท l. 23, and ไพร่ ฉ้า หน้าปลก l. 32—33. Indeed the modern Siamese phrase for people of the realm, ไพร่ ฟ้า ข้าแผ่นดิน, is but another variant of the same original, in which all inherited obscurity in the second member is at last cleared up by the explicit

meaning of its terms. Variation in the pattern itself, instead of variation in content, is illustrated in the last phrase of this line, *หนึ่ ญญ่าย พ่าย จมจ.* The rhythm is here triple in both members, augmented as they are by the introduction of a short alliterative syllable in each before the main stress. For a general view of this subject of metrical forms in prose, the reader is referred to pp. 19–21 above.

The word *^หน fled*, near the end of the line, illustrates one of the difficulties growing out of the fact that when the vowels were given their place in the line, they were not also given their place in the sequence of letters in the syllable. Since the vowel *^* must appear at the beginning of the syllable in which it is used, no matter where in the syllable it is actually pronounced, it comes about that 'ni' *fled*, is spelled exactly as is 'hin' *stone*, ll. 82, 85. The return of this group of vowels to the places above and below, which they occupied in the Indian scheme, has obviated the difficulty in their cases—indeed, this difficulty may have hastened their return. But a similar uncertainty as to pronunciation still besets the prepositive vowels. Only the context can determine whether *แห* spells 'hæng' or 'ngæ'; whether *เพล* spells 'phlau' or 'phela'.

As regards the text, S has transformed the second word of l. 6 beyond recognition, and beyond possible pronunciation, by writing an extra *ส* bodily in place of the *ล* before the consonant. P leaves off the 'mai ek' both in this word and in *ญ่าย* further on. But omissions and even alterations of accents by P are far too frequent to call for individual notice. *ผ้า* is made into *ฝ้า*, which is probably right as a correction; but it is not the reading of the stone. *ฝ้า* does appear once out of five occasions of the use of the word, in l. 21.

7. The vacant space at the beginning of this line was once occupied by some letter, for a trace of a part of its right hand stroke still remains. Whatever it was, it cannot be a part of the following word. S followed the obvious suggestion of making it a part of the previous word, and wrote in a *ร*—almost at random, it would seem, since it makes a word of no intelligible sense. P follows S both in text and transliter-

ation. The word at the end of the previous line may be the equivalent of the modern 侏, meaning 'dwarf' 'squat,' 'creeping'. In default of any better suggestion I have taken it so, and render it 'cowering'. RS inserts the sign of repetition, 丿, which may possibly have been the missing character. But it hardly seems likely that such a clever clerical device should have been in use when writing was so new; and a repetition of the last syllable of the balanced phrase spoils the rhythm, which the Siamese never forgets. I leave the gap therefore as I find it.

The 7th word of this line is read by all the editors as 𠵼. The plain reading of the stone is 𠵼. The vowel is positively ɿ, and not ʻ. The only doubt about the consonant is as to whether a certain small break in the stone has obliterated the loop of a 𠵼, or whether there never was any loop there, and the letter was 𠵼. In either case, to read 𠵼 requires an alteration of the text which the scholar should be loth to make, but which has found favor only because of the obvious sense it gives—'J'ai percé la foule'. But the text gives good sense as it stands. All the other elephants that figure in in this writing appear under their proper names. It would be strange indeed if the hero's elephant alone, in the hero's only recorded exploit, were left nameless. Neka Phon—shortened as Dr. Frankfurter suggests from Aneka Phon, (a host of troops)—would seem a very suitable name for a war elephant, and such I take it to be.

The sort of treatment this text has suffered throughout at the hands of editors is well shown in this single line. Of the 𠵼 inserted at the head of the line, which has no other raison d'être than that for a quarter of a century it has served to conceal an editor's inability to do anything else with it than to fill an empty space, I have already spoken. Through mere carelessness it would seem, since no conceivable end is gained, S writes 𠵼 (or is it 𠵼?) for 𠵼 (2nd word), and 𠵼 for 𠵼 (7th word), neither change according with his own transliteration; and he omits four of the seven still legible accents of the line. P on the other hand, with deliberation, but with equal clumsiness, attempts by mere pen-stroke to make over 𠵼 into ʻ (7th word), with a result which resembles nothing whatever in Prince Ram Khāmhæng's alphabet. In future I shall spare myself and

my readers further illustration of this point, and shall confine myself to such alterations of the text as directly concern the sense.

8. ฟุ่ง 'to thrust with a weapon hurled'. It hardly can be "je sautai sur l'éléphant" of S, nor even "je combattis son éléphant" of P.

9. The second word seems to me to be a part of the elephant's name, มาศ เมือง "the city's gold, or treasure," and I take the next word แพบ์ 'defeated' as expressing the result of the thrust. S and P, following only the cue of the word เมือง, take แพบ์ for แพล้, the well known Lao city. But among some hundreds of elephant's names encountered in reading, I cannot recall a single monosyllabic one; and that city's name occurs in this text spelled แพล้ l. 121.

10. เพ็อ, 'because.' In modern Siamese the word is almost exclusively prospective 'with a view to,' 'in order that,' 'for.'

In this text the use of the nikhahit (°) seems quite unsettled. It was, of course, the 'anusvara' used in Indian writing to indicate a nasalized final short *a*. In modern Siamese and Lao, in combination with ๗—as in อ้า—it is the regular spelling of the syllable *am*. Indeed the alternative spelling อัม almost never is seen save in the case of foreign words. In this text forms without ๗ are as numerous as forms with it. Thus we have : คัมแห *passim*, ๕๓ 37, ตัม 53, บัมรอ 11, 16, 17, บงคัม 53, สัมพาย 94; over against คำ 116, คัม 23, จัม 86, ถัม 93, 94, นัม 18, 41, 42, 94 พัม 16. In each case the usage is quite consistent. But the sign seems to indicate an entirely different sound in สัม=สั้ม *acid* 12, พัน perhaps พรรณ 49, 50, and ลูบยาจย--115.

12. All the European editors so far seem quite unaware of the fact that ทมก was, and in the North still is, the generic name for any edible fruit, including of course the fruit *par excellence*, the areca-nut, but not by any means limited to that. "Sour" and "sweet", the terms applied to the word in this line, cannot without violence be applied to the areca-nut; yet B, S, and P, all feel compelled to attempt that

violence. The generic meaning of 'fruit' obviates all difficulties both here and in 49. The specific sense is clearly intended in 24, 37, 69, as is indicated by its association with พลู่ (betel-leaf). The same word becomes a subordinate element with vanishing significance in compounds, as *หมาก ม่วง*, (mango), 39, *หมาก ขาม* (tamarind) 40, *หมาก พื้ง* (cocoanut) 72, *หมาก ลาง* 73. Since the Prince's day loss of stress first shortened *หมาก* to *มัก* (still heard in the North), and lastly to *มะ* or *ม*, which has now become an integral part of the names of many fruit-bearing trees—as indeed it has in the case of the very ones just cited. All such require the addition of a new word meaning fruit, if fruit is distinctly intended. Thus we have *ลูกมะม่วง* 'a mango', but *ต้นมะม่วง* 'a mango tree'. The last phrase exactly parallels our 'crab apple tree', as compared with the earlier and more idiomatic 'crab tree'. The history here sketched is no doubt that also of many other dissyllabic native Siamese words, whose compound nature is now entirely forgotten; as, for example, the large group of household and market utensils, and the still larger group of animal class-names beginning—according to euphonic conditions—with *กระ*, *กะ*, or *ตะ*.

The word 'lang' I have not succeeded in finding as the name of a fruit or a tree either south or north. A Lao friend recognizes it as a jingling pendant used with *หมาก พื้ง* 'cocoanut' but not known to him separately from that. Here it would seem to be a different tree at together.

14. The second word is certainly *ใด* 'any', and not *ดู* 'look', S, nor *ดู* 'T, P.

13—14. The phrase *ตี หน้ วั ซ้าง* has been the source of much perplexity to all students of this text, native as well as foreign. For what seems a very happy solution I am indebted to the kindness of Chau Suriyawong of Chieng Mai. The expression, he assured me, is a stereotyped phrase readily understood by the Lao, meaning 'to hunt wild elephants'. The apparent irrelevance of the terms used he explained as follows:—*ตี* is used in the same sense it still has in the phrase *ตีเกลียว* 'to lay up the strands of rope'. *หน้*, of course, refers to the strands of rawhide used in making the riata for noosing the

game, while ๙ ๙ should mean the place where the herd was assembled together. The metrical form with caesural tie-rhyme certainly marks the phrase as conventional. See p. 20.

15. For the balanced phrasing see pp. 18—19. The elephant's trunk is esteemed a great delicacy among the northern tribes,—so much so that no common person would think of keeping it for his own use. It is prepared by roasting it in a deep pit, where it is kept covered up in hot earth for days. P's rendering 'des défences des éléphants' both here and in the previous line is odd enough; but it suggests the straits to which he was reduced.

16. Of 'je pleurai mon père, et n'ayant plus à soigner ce dernier' (S), and of 'pleurant mon père' (P), there is not the slightest hint in the text. ๙๙๙ means 'constantly', 'steadily'; and so both S and P render it at the last, in spite of their manifest impression that it ought to mean something else.

The second word is plainly ๙๙๙=๙๙ 'as' and not ๙๙๙, nor 'rang' (S), nor ๙๙๙ (P), no one of which has any known meaning applicable here. The editors did not know the letter ๙.

18. The first word is involved in a break in the stone, but enough of it remains to make sure that its second letter is ๙, and that its first is a letter closed above like ๙ or ๙. The word cannot be ๙ 'four' as B's rendering gives it. S in his text writes ๙๙, which not only satisfies the requirements of the stone, but makes perfect sense in the phrase ๙๙๙๙, not yet obsolete, and equivalent to the modern ๙๙๙๙ 'altogether.' But S's transliteration reads 'phonla' and his translation follows suit with 'avec ses revenus'. P not only follows S in both, but has actually written the impossible ๙๙ into the text, where the penstroke with white ink betrays it.

The personal narrative ends here. The new section recounts in eloquent phrase and with dramatic circumstance the prosperity, freedom, generosity, and justice of the Prince's reign. Henceforth he is spoken of in the third person, either by his name, or by his office as Prince. Only once, l. 29, does the ๙ of the earlier narrative appear, betraying the fact that he is still the speaker. The characteristic metrical form of lyrical

passages is encountered at once at the close of the general introductory statement.

All the European editors seem obsessed by the idea that in this section must be found the "Code" which has become, it would almost seem, the one indispensable element in every such inscription. P writes in flowing phrase, p. 177, "Il donne ensuite la constitution de son royaume, tant administrative que religieuse. Il a fait graver sur cette pierre la loi qui régit son royaume, pour que le peuple en prit connaissance Cette inscription est restée la base fondamentale de leur vie civile et religieuse." Unfortunately this strong prepossession of all the editors displays itself, in the large amount of intrusive material they find it necessary to import into their translations, and in the surprising liberties they take both with the grammar and with the natural sense of the text. If other "codes" with which of late we have been made familiar are no better grounded in the facts of speech than is this, it is safe to say they never could have been administered. From beginning to end of the section there is not found a single one of all those verbal phrase-forms and modal particles—permissive, mandatory, or prohibitive—without which, in an uninflected language, no "code" could possibly be known to be such. The only natural and obvious inference, both from sentence form and from content, is that in his general survey of the conditions prevailing in his reign, the Prince, by a natural transition, and with natural and pardonable pride, passes from the visible prosperity, security, and happiness of his realm to speak of the kind and just government which has made these things possible. The features of that government he expounds concretely and dramatically, precisely as he has expounded the prosperity, by a series of illustrative examples or scenes—idealized of course. But with true human and true literary instinct he has refrained from marring their interest and weakening their force by attempting to make them prescriptive.

With this comprehensive statement, the value of which any one conversant with the language is invited to test for himself, I must dismiss this matter. I trust I may be excused from exhibiting in detail what I cannot but regard as mere foibles on the part of scholars whom I sincerely respect, however much I disapprove of some of their methods

—scholars my own obligations to whom I am ever ready to acknowledge.

21. The new topic is introduced by characteristic metrical phrases. The first dipody is identical with the one commented on in 6. Its second word is here written with ฝ instead of ฝ,—which is probably correct. Its last word is certainly, ไซ and not ไคร as S and P have it.

22. The opening of the line finds us in the midst of another metrical phrase, no doubt conventional as well. The first word is wholly uncertain. Its consonant may be either ฌ or ฌ, since small dependence can be placed upon the little horizontal stroke which alone distinguishes between them. The stroke is there, but the stone cutter has the habit of carving just such a stroke from the angle of the adjacent letter ฌ by way of a flourish. Not one of the known words which the letter might represent at all fits the sense. In such a case the native scholar is utterly at a loss to understand the European's remorseless pursuit of the individual word. It may have been, as he well knows, no word at all, but only an extemporized rhyme or a hazarded jingling pendant. For him all considered speech is Fine Art, quite as valuable for its sensuous effect and suggestion as for its logical and definable content. Fine Art it is too in that the whole is something far other and greater the mere sum of its parts. In such cases the native trusts himself absolutely to the total impression, and questions not the uncertain detail. And he is not wholly wrong. Who but pedants ever pursue the precise content of each illustration in one of Macaulay's dazzling flights, or question separately the logical definition of the words in Poe's haunting phrases? In the present case we have our cue in ไซ 'trusts' and ฌ 'props'. "Sympathizes and helps" is what the whole is felt to mean. It should be remembered also that because nearly all its words are monosyllables, the Siamese is fairly compelled to secure by some such means as these the needed rhetorical amplification of its otherwise highly condensed diction.

In the midst of this serious writing ไซ sounds surprisingly like a bit of modern half-slang in the sense of "are great hands to" "are forever——". But there seems no escape from it. Nor need we flinch, I imagine, from the obvious

suggestion of the set phrase which follows, that children and wives are sought in order to help in cultivating the fields. The suggestion is not universally abhorrent to human nature. The invariable precedence given to ลูก 'children' in the phrase ลูก เมีย, meaning 'family', is, I imagine, wholly a matter of euphony. The more sonorous เมีย is reserved for the final place and the heavy phrase-accent. See Note 2 p. 18. The introduction of the subject, พ่อเจ้าข้าไท 'people of the realm', after the statement is apparently complete, is quite foreign to present literary usage, but is a frequent device of racy talk, and follows well the lead given by ข้า above.

In the literal sense of 'father' the word พ่อ occurs thirteen times in the opening section of this inscription. As honorific prefix to the hero's name, it occurs later ten times, and in all of these I render it 'Prince'. Twice only, here and in l. 24, does it occur without any limiting word, and in both I render it 'the Prince', as suiting best both syntax and sense. B, S, and P, all choose the literal 'father', perhaps as lending itself better to the idea of a "code".

25. ฉะนั้น is an ancient conditional conjunction equivalent to ถ้า ฉะนั้น or ถ้า ฉะนั้น, 'if'—the ฉะนั้น curiously paralleling the 'an' or 'and' of the elder English 'an if'. Besides its ordinary function as the conjunction 'and', the word ฉะนั้น has some idiomatic uses in this writing which it may be well to notice here. 1) In 22 and 78, with circumflex accent, it is equivalent to '-soever' after the indefinite pronoun ใคร. 2) In 51 it seems the equivalent of the modern distributive particle ละ 'every', so that ฉะนั้น ปี should mean 'every year' or better 'year by year'. 3) The ฉะนั้น which immediately follows this last may be the idiomatic sentence-closer still frequently heard in such locutions as ฉะนั้น ฉะนั้น and ฉะนั้น บริบูรณ์ ฉะนั้น, though I have rendered it by 'and' in the translation.

26. All the European editors assume that ข้า must be the pronoun 'me'. But the writer nearly everywhere else uses ข้า in this sense, even in this immediate context, l. 29. There is no assignable reason why he should change the pro-

noun here. Moreover it is very doubtful, to say the least, whether at the time of this writing the abject noun ข้า 'slave' had advanced so far in that series of changes which at last have made of it the haughty, self-assertive 'T' of modern speech to inferiors. ข้า is still courteous in the North. There is no evidence yet to show that at this time ข้า was a pronoun at all. I take it therefore in the meaning it has everywhere else in this text ; namely, ' subject '.

28-31. This passage has proved a very perplexing one, and largely so because of the usual lack of explicit connection between its members. The difficulties mostly disappear if we regard it as illustrating the Prince's generosity in his treatment of visitors of rank, but at opposite ends of the scale of wealth and power. The customary gifts and courtesies are not neglected in the case of the one because he is poor and weak ; nor, because he is now in the Prince's power, is advantage taken of the other to crush in him a possible rival.

31. ข้า^๓เสือก I take to be variant spelling of ข้า^๓เส็ก, l. 113—114, which plainly must be our modern ข้าศึก 'enemy'. ข้าเสือก which follows it, is of course its alliterative pendant or echo, introducing no new idea. Cf. p. 19, and Note to l. 23 above.

The extremities to which editors have been driven under the tyranny of the code-idea may be seen in the following renderings of this passage :—" After the goods have been stapled up in the town and stored, there will be made an election of slaves and a rejection of slaves. Such as are clever in spearing, clever in fighting, shall not be killed, neither shall they be beaten." B. " Dans les condamnations à mort q'on fasse choix des chefs de bande, qui sont de vrais tigres, ne pas les tuer serait un mal." P.

32. หนึ่ is a demonstrative of place 'there' or 'yonder' still in use among the Lao. The device of a bell for securing the Prince's personal attention to an appeal for justice, crops up everywhere in the Orient. The classical version is no doubt the one in the *Thousand and One Nights*, where the hero is none other than Haroun Al Raschid himself. It appears in classical Siamese in the work entitled สิบสองมหัศจรรย์.

36. ชื่อ 'right' has been misread by B, S, and P, as ชื่อ 'name' both here and in 26 above.

41. In all my earlier attempts to read it, the first word of this line seemed hopelessly lost in the corrosion of the surface of the stone. The transliteration therefore left the space unfilled. A last exhaustive scrutiny of the writing, however, undertaken in the preparation of the plates, convinces me that S and P were right in reading กณ. Traces which to the eye were completely lost, were brought out in a careful 'rub'. A similar gap, with similar uncertainty as to what should fill it, is found at the beginning of the next line. S and P insert ไส repeated from the preceding context. But it seems hardly logical to say 'clear as it is to drink water of the Khong.' Since I have no alternative suggestion to make, I prefer to leave the space unfilled, as does RS.

43. The gap noted above seems to have been caused by a drip of water, which has excavated a deep narrow channel that extends continuously some six lines further, and then with interruptions quite to the lower edge of this face of the stone. While in this line it has not entirely effaced any one of the three letters involved, it has left the reconstruction of the text more perplexed than ever. The real trouble is to discover anything that will make intelligible sense in the same phrase with สฉิ at the end of 42. ๓ has definitely closed the adverbial phrase preceding สฉิ, leaving that word to begin the subject phrase. That word is the Indian numeral 'three', likely to be used only in some compound name or title. The general sense, which fortunately is unmistakable, calls for something equivalent to 'circuit', or 'distance' or perhaps 'wall'. The fragmentary traces at the beginning of the line suggest บุร with a faint line which might be part of an ไ, making ไต้ with the letter following. But no word fulfilling these conditions has yet been found. S and P read "tripura dai", and translate "les trois faubourgs compris". But the idea of faubourgs as constituent parts of a municipality seems wholly foreign to Siamese thought, nor would the Siamese apply to faubourgs separately the term 'pura' (buri) 'fenced city', which includes all its parts. RS reads ไป, which is within the possibilities of the stone, but which leaves สฉิ entirely unaccounted for.

46. ทั้ง ซึ้น must be meant for ทั้ง ซึ้น, 'all'. Letters of the ซ-ช-ช group are very uncertainly distinguished in this inscription.

49. พัน here and in the next line is a perplexing word. Like several others in this brief passage it is quite as much a stumbling block to native scholars as to foreign ones. Fortunately again the precise meaning of no one of them is essential to a comprehension of the vivid scenes here sketched. I follow, but with no assured conviction, the suggestion of a native friend that it stands for พรรณ 'sorts', 'kinds'. เขี้ย 'cowries' recalls the time when these shells were the chief currency in Siam. The term ดอก เขี้ย, 'cowrie-flower', is still the current word for 'interest'. P translates: "monceaux de gâteaux"

51. For แล ปี่ แล see Note l. 25. ลาน, a palm-leaf tablet containing the formula to be recited in making the offering. ลูต both here and in 85, 86, is for ลวด, to recite a formula. ลูตต is for ลูตี.

51-53. อโรญญก, which occurs twice here, and อโรญญก of ll. 63-66, are undoubtedly variant spellings of the same word, and both probably name the very same object. The word was originally a Pali adjective, araññaka, derived from arañ 'forest' and meaning 'of or in the forest'. In Siamese it became a noun, and means 'a forest-monastery'. The correct Siamese spelling now should be either อโรญญก, with modified vowel, or อโรญญกะ, which is the precise equivalent of the Pali form. The discrepant spelling admits of complete explanation. The Sūkhothāi scheme, it will be remembered, included no direct symbol for short *a*, but indicated that vowel by the device of doubling the consonant. The consonant here is already doubled; but the other vowel, *i*, must precede its consonant, or precede both of them if there are two. So it had to be moved up to the front, and stand just after the *r*, giving us the spelling อโรญญก of ll. 63, 66. On the other hand, the Pali nasal *ñ* has no equivalent sound in Siamese, and the letter is rendered variously *y* or *n*, or *ny* according to circumstances or according to convenience. If the speaker rendered

it as *y*, and pronounced *arayyik*, the scribe, unless he happened to recall the Pali, would inevitably write *araiyik*, and that is precisely what he did in ll. 51, 53. B understood the word, and translated it correctly, twenty years before S discovered in it the sure foundation of the now famous theory of the Aryan settlement of the peninsula of Indo-China. S and P both suppress the word entirely in their translations of this passage, where the manifest sense makes it impossible to render it 'les Aryens' or 'des Aryikas', reserving these for the more tractable passages further on. Cf. S pp. 7, 8; and P pp. 171, 175, 188, 189, and elsewhere. As for this immediate passage, it is difficult to see how any of the European editors could have imagined that what they wrote was in any sense a translation, so few and rare are the points of contact between it and the text.

53. หัว ลาน ดำ 'Black Lan Head' probably the name of some hamlet on the road between the forest-monastery and the city. On reaching the word สยง (เสียดยง) in this line, the stone-cutter was evidently in doubt whether it should not be spelled with the written vowel—in fact as it has come to be spelled in modern Siamese. To assure himself, with the point of his graver he very lightly scratched the word so spelled in the vacant space below the last word he had cut. The look of it, and very likely a glance at สยง and สยง just above, convinced him that the spelling was wrong, and he proceeded to cut the word correctly. In spite of all the vicissitudes of time, and in spite of the rough handling this stone has encountered, that lightest trace of a passing thought in the stone-cutter's mind six centuries ago may still be clearly read. His doubt was not illogical. Why should not a spoken vowel have its symbol in the written word? The pressure of that ever-recurring question has at last not merely legitimized the *i* which he was forced to leave out, but has created a symbol unknown to the Prince's scheme for the hitherto unwritten short *a*. It has not accomplished the same service in the entirely parallel cases of the unwritten *u* of สอน, and the short *o* of คน.

The assistance which the parallelism and balance of Siamese writing may sometimes render the student in dealing with words unknown or lost from the text, is well illustrated in ll. 53—54. Two balanced pairs of words name a quartette of festive sounds:—พาดย์-พิน-เล็อน-ซั๊บ. The third word is entire-

ly unknown in any sense applicable here. The second pair is clearly marked as vocal by the ขับ ‘singing’ which we do know, as well as by the implied antithesis. เลื่อน may therefore safely be inferred to signify some form of vocalization. This inference is presently confirmed by the appearance of the word, ll. 53—54, in a balanced triad of festive actions :—เล่น ‘sporting,’ หัว (เราะ), ‘laughing,’ and เลื่อน, ‘carolling’ (?).

56—58. ปาก ประตู here and in 32 distinguishes the gateway—the passage—from the leaves or doors used to close it. เพ็ชร ป้อม is an old-time phrase meaning ‘absolutely,’ ‘wholly,’ or as in this case, it is merely a sign of the superlative degree. It occurs again in 10. Public illuminations and displays of fireworks, of course, are what is spoken of in 57. มี ตี๋ จะ แตก of 58 has caused editors infinite trouble. B reads “a gong split in halves”. S, hopeless of the text draws wildly on his imagination :—“les routes se croisent”. P quite as wildly reads “La villa de Sukhodaya est immense, l’est à s’y perdre” Both S and P have changed แตก of the text to แฉก, ‘thatch,’ and as usual with no resultant advantage. Our Siamese scholars are quite as much at a loss. A solution seemed as hopeless as ever, when a Lao friend recognized in it a slangy colloquialism still current in the North, used in speaking of great numbers, amounts, and the like—comparable perhaps to such western slang as ‘fit to bust,’ ‘till you can’t rest,’ etc.

59. อฏฐาศ is simply the Indian numeral eighteen used as a substantive designation of an image of standard dimensions, much as the Englishman says “a sixty-four pounder” or “a six-footer”. B has rendered the word correctly. S reads “une bibliothèque”. P reads “des statues en relief”, and fortifies the rendering by the following foot-note :—“Attharça : par là les Thais désignent les statuettes et bas-reliefs : manque dans les dictionnaires”.

60. Caught in the tangle of superfluous verbiage just here, the engraver has lost his cue, and has repeated at the beginning of this line the four words he had just cut at the end of the last one.

62. I strongly suspect that the second word หนี is an error for หนี, which syntax and sense and the balanced phrasing alike

would lead one to look for here. An erosion at this point has obliterated all of the next word, or possibly of two short words, save a consonant at either end. B evidently understands *สังฆราช*, for he translates "high priest". S leaves the gap unfilled. P, for once does not write the word into his text, but transliterates "saingharâjas", as though there naturally should be more than one. It would be very convenient to read *สังฆราช* here. The context apparently calls for the name of some ecclesiastical functionary. A tracing from 64 where the word, though badly worn, is clearly identified, fits the space very well. But the final letter still remaining on the stone is the most serious obstacle in the way of this reading. True, the pronunciation would be the same in either case. But Pali words had then a long orthographic tradition behind them. The scribe would be far less likely to misspell one of them than one from his own hitherto untamed mother-tongue.

64. *ปิฎกไตร* the 'Three Baskets', name of the collected Buddhist Scriptures.

65. *ลูก แต่ เมือง มา*, a Lao idiom answering to the Siamese *มาแต่ เมือง* S displaces *ทุกคน* from its natural connection with the words before it, in order, as it would seem, that he may enlarge thereby the Aryan aristocracy which he has discovered in the word 'Arañnic'. His reading is:—"Tout les instituteurs de notre ville sont tous venus de la ville Çri Dharammarâya (*sic*) et demeurent avec les Aryens qui ont un temple" etc. P reads:—"Tous les immigrants venus de ville de Çri Dharmarâja vont, sans exception, s'installer dans le quartier des Aryyikas".

66. *มน* at the end is, of course for *มนน = มั่น*. The engraver had not room for the second *น* at the end of this line, and forget to put it in when he began the next one. A similar omission, though not with the same excuse, occurs in l. 84, where we have *ทั้ง* for *ทั้งนี้*.

67—68. *ลูก อ ย น* 'rises up and stands', 'stands erect'. The unexpected *อ* has sadly troubled the editors. B takes no notice whatever of the words. S discovers in them, of course, his protégés 'les Aryens', and reads "Les aînés de leur race". P simply says—"Partant de Sukhodaya."!

70. The phrase at the end of the line is recognized in the North as *งาม ดั่ง แก่ล้าง* 'beautiful as if purposely made so'. The last word *แก่ล้าง* is frequently used in Siamese of actions done with 'malice prepense', or with misleading intention, but not in this particular connection. The final *ง* needed is supposably in the break at the head of the next line, the opening line of the third face of the stone, and is not the *ง* which appears just at the edge of the break. As in a number of other cases, the problem of filling this insignificant gap at the beginning of a line has proved surprisingly difficult. The previous sentence is apparently closed, and the new sentence begins with the next complete word *after* the break.

71. *ดิน นอน* is certainly 'north' and *หัวนอน*, l. 74, 116, is certainly 'south', however strange such orientation may seem, and however difficult it may be to account for the fact. It is affirmed that early sepulture among the Thais was always with the feet to the north. P has exactly reversed the compass-points here, though he has them right in 117, 121.

72. Two letters have been lost from the beginning of this line. They should be medial between initial *ด* at the end of 71, and final *น*, the first letter legible here. S, P, and RS read *ประสาน* = *ประสาน*, 'united', 'joined'—which may be right, though the word is an odd one in this context. Of *อจน*, plainly writ, neither etymology nor meaning are known. The presumption, however, is that it is the name of some image, since the term *พระ* in this text is nowhere else applied to any inanimate objects save images and relics of Buddha. Cf. 59, 60, 91, 93, 96, 101, 102, 103, 104. The engraver omitted the letters *สา* from the middle of the word *ประสาน*, but by way of correction has supplied them in the interlinear space above.

75. *สระดง* still puzzles all editors. B renders it 'a lake'; S, 'des eremites'; S, 'des célèbres pénitents'. I would suggest that *สระ* = *สระ* is not an impossible variant of *สระ*, 'pool' or pond', from Pali *sāra*, 'water', and that *ดง* may be for *ตรพวง* l. 41, 'spring'—which also seems to have been in B's thought.

76—80. The spirit worship touched upon in these lines, is a most significant feature of the life of all the northern tribes of this peninsula down to the present time. In the south, though less obtrusive, it lies not far below the surface, and

crops up in unexpected quarters. It seems to be the survival of an aboriginal animism, long antedating both the Buddhist and the Brahmanical cults.

80. Having sketched his early life, his prosperous reign, the splendor of his capital and its surroundings, Prince Khūn Ram Khāmbhæng turns to note what he considers the three most important events of his reign :—1) The preparation, consecration, and installation of four inscribed monuments of stone, of which we understand that our own was one. 2) The exhuming of the sacred relics of Buddha, their lying in state for the adoration of the faithful, the solemn reinterment of them, and the building of a great pagoda and temple to be their final resting place and shrine. 3) The invention of the art of writing. Highly significant of the measure and stature of the man himself is the choice he makes from among the achievements of what must have a stirring reign. Interesting too is his reversal of the order of time—already referred to, p. 9—to give the art of writing the place of honour at the end and climax of his story.

The era here used is not named, but it is certainly neither the Buddhist Religious Era nor the Little, or Civil, Era, which has prevailed in all civil records of later times. What is known of Sūkthohāi history from other sources leaves no doubt that the Era is the Great Era, Māha Sākkārat, beginning in 79 A. D. For an account of the many eras which have had currency in this peninsula to the confusion of historical studies, see Phōngsawādan Yonōk, Introduction pp. 104—112. The date here given, (1293 A. D.) seems to be the real date of the inscription, though this is not distinctly said. The notes of time and sequence in the language—^{๒๓} and ^{๒๔}, l. 82, make it clear that this was not the date of the planting of the palm grove, as B understands. S reads the last figure of the date wrongly 2 instead of 4. P has it right in his transliteration, but his translation reads 1314. The plain statement that 'the Prince planted these palm trees, S disposes of as follows :—“le seigneur de la célèbre ville de -- Sukkthothai, la reconstruisit à nouveau.”

86. ^{๒๕} has already been noticed l. 25. ^{๒๖} is regularly a word of affirmation 'it is' or 'it was'. By a singular turn it has become a word of negation as well. In deliberate speech and writing, when the sense is negative, a negative particle

en pierre ", (l. 82). So he says here " la pierre qui ici sert de trône est appelée Mananga-Çila mâtra ". This stone with its pyramid-top would make a " trône " less comfortable even than some we hear of now-a-days.

Of the places mentioned in this connection none have been identified save *ซลั้ง*, which H.R.H. Prince Damrong tells me is the old name of เมือง ลอง, a town in the neighborhood of Nakhawnsăwān, situated at what was then the confluence of the two main branches of the Menam.

97. มนั้, 'thought' should rightly appear in the case-form มโน. But the Siamese, with no cases of its own, is not at all particular about the cases of Pali or Sanskrit words, regarding them as variant forms of the same word, among which it is at liberty to choose whichever it likes, without reference to the construction. ปาตริ 'that which receives'—the word which has become specialized to mean the bowl in which the priest receives alms of food.

98. The lack of explicit connection—which has been noted before as a perplexing feature of this writing,—leaves it uncertain whether the statement which begins at the head of this line, is an independent one, or is dependent upon เชน 'see' as its object. If this last were the case, the proper connective would be ภา 'that'. Indeed, that word may have been there, though now lost in the break at the end of 97. To me there seems little reason for mentioning again the Prince's parentage, and the scope of the allegiance he claimed, unless it were to state the purpose for which the inscription was set up. I have therefore supplied 'that' in the translation, and perhaps should have supplied its equivalent in the transliteration also.

99. กว (กว) and ลว are well known names of northern peoples. มา I have not been able to identify. The river U is the great affluent from the north which falls into the Khong above Luang Phrābang. P translates here: " Tant ceux qui habitent les rives des cours d'eau, que ceux qui habitent la brousse. "

100. มา ออก is a very unusual phrase in such connection. B connects it with the preceding words, and translates: " were called out ". S, assuming the same construc-

tion, but with different sense, says: "vinrent se réunir". P does not translate the words at all, evidently considering them as an introductory formula for the new date,—with which I heartily agree. Possibly we might save somewhat of the color of the expression if we were to say "When the year 1209 opened".

The nature of the Epilogue and the questions of its date and chirography have already been touched upon, pp. 15, 21, 23. The altered writing marks very visibly the opening of the new section in the middle of l. 108. The chief difficulties in the passage are those which concern the identification of places named. These have been for the most part satisfactorily solved, and the results so far attained have been embodied in the translation. There remain only *ลุ่มบาย*, *สะคา*, and *ผด*. *ผด* is doubtless for *ผด*, with the usual northern substitution of *l* for *r*. Phlua, which eluded earlier search, has been visited by Rev. Dr. McGilvary. It is now a little town on the upper reaches of the Nan river. *มาน* I am assured is found in old writings for *น่าน*—but that should not justify P's alteration of the word in the text.

The following verbal points should be noticed:—The third word of 112 is incomplete, and so far nothing has been made of it. Since, however, it is plainly coupled with *รู้* 'knowledge' in the carefully balanced triad of ll. 112—113, one cannot be far wrong in rendering it by some such word as 'insight'. Similarly *แคะ* at the end of 112 I have rendered 'ability' or 'force'. *รอด* 'saved,' rescued' ll. 115, 117, 121, seems used here in some sense rather more technical, but not precisely made out. One of my Lao friends tells me that in such connection it is the equivalent of *ถึง* 'unto'. Much the same is the case of the phrase *เป็น* *ที่* (or should it be *ที่*?) of ll. 116, 119, 123. In both cases I have had to content myself with a gloss. *แล้ว* l. 123, may be introductory to the following statement—as S and P understand it,—instead of concluding to the preceding one, as I have considered it. In that case some word other than *แล้ว* will have to be found for the gap in l. 119, where I have supplied *แล้ว* as probably being part of a stereotyped recurrent phrase, identical with the one in l. 123.

I cannot think that the ringing eulogium of l. 111 ff., with its distinct personal note—placed as it is at the climax of this whole writing, and following without break upon what is said explicitly of Prince Khūn Ram Khāmhang by name—could ever have been intentionally wasted upon a subject so vague and generalized as “Les habitants du pays des Thais”. The syntax, moreover, is wholly against any such reference. The phrase with which it begins, แต่ คน อื่น มี ใน เมือง ไท, cannot be the subject, since the introductory preposition แต่ marks it plainly as adverbial—“Of men that are in the Thai realm, . . . find a man to equal [him] you cannot”. Some pronoun, of course, our western idiom compels us to supply; but it should be supplied as all sound principles of interpretation direct, and as the native inevitably supplies it in his thought, from the subject last spoken of—that is, the Prince. No one who had not first determined to make “les Thais” and “les Aryens” synonymous terms, would ever have thought of thrusting the Prince out of the place of honor reserved for him in this peroration.

WORD-LIST.

NOTES.—In preparing the following list it has been thought best to avoid any confusion which might arise from unfamiliar spellings, by presenting words still current in their current Siamese forms; though where the difference is considerable or the identification is at all doubtful, the form in the text has been preserved, and the modern equivalent has been added in brackets. Words no longer current either in Siamese or in Lao are marked obsolete. Those found only in the northern dialect are marked Lao. No attempt has been made to isolate elements common to Shan and Thai, nor the inherited Chinese element. For revision of doubtful etymologies I am specially indebted to Dr. O. Frankfurter of the National Library.

I. Words recognized as of foreign origin.

A. From the Sanskrit or Pali:—

กฐิน กฐิ เจตีย์ ชด ไครบีฏิก ศรี เถร เทวดา ขรรณ ชาตุ
 ธาร ฆาต บุษา บริวาร ปราชญ์ ปราดาท พำ (for พรรณ?) พาทย์
 พิณ พิหาร (วิหาร) พุทธ เพชรบุรี พด พระ มโนดิศาบาตร มหา
 มาศ ยัต รัตน ราชบุรี ราม รุจาศรี สถาปก สัทธา สุ่มท สังฆราช
 สาดนา ศรี สรวิตพงศ ศรีขรรณราช ศรีสันหาโดย สัต สู่โขไทย
 ศก หงษาวดี อัญสุารศ เนก (for อเนก?) อัญญิก อาจารย์
 อินทราทิตย อุบาทก (51). Also the following which are account-
 ed effectively naturalized:—กต (in ทังกต) ครุ ฆ่า คาด ทาน
 บุญ รูป วาษา เวร สาดา สี color. (11)

B. From the Cambodian:—กระพัง กระพัต (for สะพัต)
 จาฏก ทรง นาง นำเรือ บงค (?) (7). Also the following
 effectively naturalized:—ทต ปราบ เสมอ สว่าง หาญ อาง (6).

C. Proper names not recognized as native, and not in-
 cluded under A. or B. above:—กาว a people กุญ ขพุง a demon
 โขง the river ชาว มา a people มแม มโรง ดุ่มบาจาย สคา
 อ the river (11).

แต่ expletive part. แต่ง แต่ง ดง ต้อม วัน ไว้ ไร่ ไร่ วา วาง
 หว่าง หวาน เวียง Lao วัว ตั้ง ได้ ตาม ดิน ดั้น ดิบ ดี เตียง
 เตียด (หนัง) เตื่อ เตื่อ เตื่อ and เตื่อ (คึก) ตวน ตุง ตูด (ตวด) เต็ก
 เต้ (ต้ม) ตอง and โตง ตอน ให้ หั้น Lao=นั้น หา ห้า หาย หิน
 หัว *head* หัว *laugh* Lao เหน แห่ง หก อัน เอา อ้าย ออก and
 โอก โอย (อวย). And the following proper names :— คำแหง
 นอด ขเตียง ตาก พระบาง แพรก พัดว์ แพล่ (แพร่) ม่าน (น่าน)
 เวียงคำ เวียงจัน ลำพวย เตื่อง ตองแคว ตระหวง 319

CORRIGENDA.

- P. 6, l. 23. *For* rock not yet precisely determined *read* slate-rock.
 P. 16, l. 25 ff. *For* the number 63 in the table *read* 62.
 " " " 317 " " " 319.
 " " " 404 " " " 405.
 P. 17, l. 8. *For* the number 334 in the table *read* 336.
 " " " 70 " " " 69.
 P. 22, l. 2. *For* Sangkhaburi *read* Sankhaburi (Müang San).
 P. 37, l. 6. *To* the words Royal Asiatic Society *add* of Bengal.

FIRST GENERAL MEETING.

A general meeting of the Siam Society was held at the Bangkok United Club on the evening of Tuesday, Feb. 2nd. Dr. O. Frankfurter, President in the chair, when Professor Bradley read his paper on the "Oldest Known Siamese Writing" before a large audience.

In introducing the writer of the paper, the President said:—To every one acquainted with our local history the name of "Bradley" is known. Dr. Bradley arrived in Bangkok in the reign of King Phra Nang Klao in the year 1835. He lived throughout that reign and the reign of King Mongkut and died in the present reign in 1873, after having recorded in his Calendar and other publications what was noteworthy in Siamese customs and history. Through his profession he was brought into contact with all sorts and conditions of men and what strides have been made in the knowledge of surgery in Siam we owe to him. He it was who first introduced vaccination, and through him and the American Missionaries was also introduced the art of printing, and Bradley's editions of the Kotmai, the Phongsavadan, etc., are known to all interested in literature. Thus in introducing his son, Professor Bradley, my task is an easy one. "*Stet magni nominis umbra.*" Professor Bradley was born in Bangkok in the reign of Phra Nang Klao in 1843, he lived in Bangkok nearly through the whole reign of Phra Chom Klao, he went to America and Europe and arrived in Bangkok again early in the present reign, and finally left for the United States in 1872. His interest in Siam, however, never flagged, as shown by his papers on Siamese grammar and phonology, and, to sound a more personal note, one might speak of the care he took of the Siamese students who were studying at California University.

Professor Bradley has kindly consented to read before us a paper on one of the famous Siamese inscriptions of Sukhothai which was brought to Bangkok in 1834 by King Mongkut whilst he was in the priesthood. It is a typical Buddhist inscription, recording, not so much deeds of war

and conquest, but the happiness which the people of the realm enjoyed in the reign of Phra Ramkapheng, what he did for the culture of the people, how he understood the Buddhist religion, what are the maxims of Government by which he was guided, how he was the first to use the written Thai characters for records. The inscription already shows all the characteristics of later Siamese, its fondness for poetry and couplets so that also in this respect it is a most valuable document. Of course attempts have been made to explain it. We have first a version given by Professor Bastian in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, vol. XXXIV. (1864). He simply recorded what the scholars in King Mongkut's reign told him; no attempt was made to elucidate doubtful points, and he did not publish the original version by which to control it. We have also in Bowring's Siam a short reference to this inscription. But the first scholar who seriously attempted an explanation was the late Père Schmitt. He gave two different versions, first in the Excursions et Reconnaissances vol. VII, and later in the Mission Pavie, Paris, 1898. There are small differences in the translation, and we must admire the diligence bestowed on it, but the Rev. Father can scarcely escape the reproach that in his explanations he was influenced by the Aryan Theory. Siamese versions and explanations have likewise been published but, unfortunately, as we all know, for the western scholar things written in Siamese, *Graeca sunt non legitur*. The real value of the inscription will be shown to us by Professor Bradley in his paper.

Professor Bradley then read his paper.

At the conclusion of the paper the President said:—In the very interesting paper to which we have just had the pleasure of listening, and for which in the name of this Society it is my duty to express to Professor Bradley our heartfelt thanks, Professor Bradley has shown in one concrete example, certainly the most prominent one of which we know at present, what treasure is still unexplored, what rich harvest may still be found in the deserted cities of Siam, to serve as documents for the history of progress and civilisation. He has shown us, I take it, also, the necessity which exists to collect these inscriptions and to incorporate them in the Corpus Inscriptur.

tionum Siamensium. That this hope of scholars both Eastern and Western will soon be fulfilled we have, however, good reasons to believe. Already excavations are made in old cities, the inscriptions found are collected and preserved from the inclemency of the weather. We have in Siam no written records of ancient Kings, or rather, we should say, they have not yet been traced. What therefore remains are the inscriptions in which the Kings and people recorded their pious deeds, and in collecting them, it will become true what the poet said, perhaps in another sense :—

“ Wenn Menschen schweigen, werden Steine reden.”

Mr. R. W. Giblin in seconding the motion said :—
 “ I have much pleasure in seconding the vote of thanks so happily proposed by our President.

Professor Bradley’s account of the inscribed stone and his translation of the inscription will always rank very highly in the records of this Society. They will be published in the Journal almost immediately and so reach those who have not been able to attend this meeting. I think that I shall be expressing the wish of all the members of the Society present to-night in stating that Professor Bradley’s able paper should be the first of such a series as will embrace all the inscriptions which have been found in Siam up to date, and those others, as they are brought to light, which our President has indicated yet remain to be discovered.

It may be said that those inscriptions which have already been copied have been deciphered and the translations published, and Dr. Frankfurter has referred to that Corpus Inscriptionum Siamensium (not yet in being) which should contain copies of the known inscriptions. But the point I wish to make is that it will be worth while to publish in the Journal of this Society even those translations which have been made, with illustrations or copies of the inscriptions themselves. Professor Bradley has shown in the case of the Sukotai stone that it has been possible to improve on former readings of it, and if that achievement is not to be accomplished in every case, the publication of inscriptions in the Journal, with their translations, will be of the greatest interest to those of us who have not the learning to decipher, while to those who can do so the means will be increased of indulging in the exercise of their science and skill.

I am able to state that a copy of a Lao inscription not, I believe, hitherto published, will presently be printed for the Journal of the Society, and Dr. Hansen, who is present here to-night, has been good enough to promise that his translation of it, first done into Siamese, will be done into English by him, so that it may be printed and appear with the illustrations."

Dr. Hansen remarked that there were a great number of inscriptions in the North, which he believed had never been published or translated.

The vote of thanks was cordially passed, and those present afterwards inspected the rubbings of the Sukhothai inscription which were on view, and the meeting terminated.

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

๑ ๒ ๓ ๔ ๕ ๖ ๗ ๘ ๙ ๑๐ ๑๑ ๑๒ ๑๓ ๑๔ ๑๕ ๑๖ ๑๗ ๑๘ ๑๙ ๒๐ ๒๑ ๒๒ ๒๓ ๒๔ ๒๕ ๒๖ ๒๗ ๒๘ ๒๙ ๓๐ ๓๑ ๓๒ ๓๓ ๓๔ ๓๕ ๓๖ ๓๗ ๓๘ ๓๙ ๔๐ ๔๑ ๔๒ ๔๓ ๔๔ ๔๕ ๔๖ ๔๗ ๔๘ ๔๙ ๕๐ ๕๑ ๕๒ ๕๓ ๕๔ ๕๕ ๕๖ ๕๗ ๕๘ ๕๙ ๖๐ ๖๑ ๖๒ ๖๓ ๖๔ ๖๕ ๖๖ ๖๗ ๖๘ ๖๙ ๗๐ ๗๑ ๗๒ ๗๓ ๗๔ ๗๕ ๗๖ ๗๗ ๗๘ ๗๙ ๘๐ ๘๑ ๘๒ ๘๓ ๘๔ ๘๕ ๘๖ ๘๗ ๘๘ ๘๙ ๙๐ ๙๑ ๙๒ ๙๓ ๙๔ ๙๕ ๙๖ ๙๗ ๙๘ ๙๙ ๑๐๐

(The right page contains very faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the leaf.)

75
80
85
90
95

Handwritten text in Khmer script, arranged in approximately 20 horizontal lines. The text is densely packed and appears to be a historical or religious document. The script is in an older form of Khmer, possibly from the Angkor period. The lines are numbered on the left margin from 75 to 95. The text is written in a dark ink on a light-colored paper or parchment. The overall appearance is that of an ancient manuscript.

100

105

110

115

120

124

100 101 102 103 104 105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120 121 122 123 124

(Faint, mostly illegible text on the right page)