THE WAT SRI CHUM JĀTAKA GLOSSES RECONSIDERED

CHRISTIAN BAUER

HUMBOLDT-UNIVERSITÄT ZU BERLIN

The engravings at Wat Sri Chum, Sukhothai, featuring scenes from the Jātakas accompanied by descriptive glosses in Thai, have recently attracted renewed interest, in particular concerning their date, now assumed to belong to the late 14th century.[1]

The engravings and their glosses were first published by Lucien Fournereau and edited posthumously by A. Barth, as the second volume of *Le Siam ancien* in 1908.[2] These were accompanied by transcriptions and translations by the Reverend Schmitt, identifications and summaries by Léon Feer, and reproductions of the engravings themselves.[3] In 1972 they were published in Thai as volume V of the series *Collection of Inscriptions*; the documentation consists of photographs of the engravings, rubbings, and line drawings, as well as summaries of the Jātakas and transliterations of the inscriptions.[4] Revised readings of the glosses were published in 1985 as part of the comprehensive collection *Inscriptions of the Sukhothai Period*.[5]

Even were it not for the controversy surrounding the dating of the engravings, the *Glosses* [Sd. 32] deserve attention: they have never been linguistically examined in any detail, and their vocabulary has not been included in *GISI*. In spite of the formulaic style — consisting of the title, followed by *bodhisattva pen* [ ][6] 'the Bodhisattva is [ ]', which is followed by a résumé — the Jātaka glosses at Wat Sri Chum provide a variety of vocabulary, some nowhere else attested in Sukhothai epigraphy.

It has been argued that the Wat Sri Chum glosses show the greatest orthographic and lexical variation in the Sukhothai corpus;[7] but is this kind of variation due to lack of standardization — however defined — or due to the fact that the engravings were the work of several craftsmen? Or can variation be ascribed to interference from another vernacular language?

The term 'standardization' warrants clarification.[8] The Jātaka glosses show marked standardization in the sense that, for instance, IA loans having retroflex consonants are consistently spelt in the Sri Chum glosses with their alveolar counterparts, except in the case of nasals where one finds

the following five Jātaka titles spelt with their etymologically correct retroflex consonants:[9] *puṇapāni* [3.1] (J. #53), *r(o)hiṇī* [5.1] (J. #45), *wāruṇidūsaka* [7.1] (J. #47), *lăkkhaṇa* [11.1] (J #11), *bārāṇasī* [13.3-4] (J. #13). By contrast, four Jātaka titles are spelt in their naturalized form; these are *kăndi* [12.1] < *kaṇḍina* (J. #13), *tăndūla* [26.1] < *taṇḍulanāli* (J. #5), *kālakanni* [46.1] < *kālakaṇṇi* (J. #83), and *'apanna* [58.1] < *'apaṇṇaka* (J. #1).[10] There are only two words in Sd. 32 which attest to variation, the subordinate marker *'ăn* ~ *'ann* and the quantifier *dăṅ* ~*daṅṅ*, and only in one instance do we find variation in the same gloss: 14.3 shows, in the same line, *'ăn* ~ *'ann;* in all other cases in which multiple *'ann /'ăn* are attested, their spelling is consistent either way: *'ann* in 5.2/5.4, 17.2/17.5, 33.4/33.5 and *'ăn* in 41.6/41.7. *daṅṅ* occurs in 5.1, *dăṅ hlăy* in 15.3.[11]

In fact, internal variation is found only in glosses 4, 15, and 24 with glosses 5-7, 9-12, 17, 18, 23, 26, 28, 29, 41, 51 showing consistency in spelling with respect to the use of superscript -*ă*-.

Before resuming any discussion about variation and standardization of orthographies, a clear notion about how sounds are encoded in a writing system is necessary. H.L. Shorto distinguishes between (i) allography, (ii) homography, (iii) hypergraphy, (iv) agraphy, and (v) discrepancies in (a) segmentation, (b) class and (c) the lexicon [including logograms, archaic spellings and etymological spellings of loans].[12] His demonstration, applied to OM, can easily be transferred to epigraphic Thai [ETh.]: (i) allography affects the writing of certain long vowels in ETh. (ii) homography is well attested throughout Sukhothai in the case of /ɯ/ and /i/, written *i*. Hypergraphy and cases of agraphy are not attested, although one might argue that the reduplication of final consonants to indicate short /a/ is a case of hypergraphy.[13] (v) discrepancies in class are not attested in OM, but in Old Khmer as well as ETh. from which it has borrowed most of its spelling conventions, such as the writing of the diphthong /uə/ as -*wa*- and /iə/ as -*ya*-.

In the following I will discuss variation affecting the lexicon, punctuation, tone marking, consonants, and vowels. Finally, parallels with Old Mon Jātaka glosses will be drawn.

1. Lexical variation

We find variation in the use of the honorific *braḥ* < OKhm. *vraḥ*. *braḥ* does not precede *bodhisattwa* in 3.2, 14.1, 15.1, 25.1, 34.1, 38.2, nor is any other honorific attached. In OM similar variation is attested; the honorific *trey* '[to be] noble' follows *bodhisattwa* in a number of cases while in others it does not occur. By contrast, epigraphic Middle Khmer [16th c.-18th c.] does not show variation, and *bodhisattwa* is always marked by *braḥ*.

2. Tone marking

Problematic in the Wat Sri Chum glosses is the marking of tone C;[14] elsewhere in the early ETh. corpus — except Sd. 5 of 1361 — this tone is either marked as +, or else unmarked.[15] By contrast, in Sd. 32 one finds in three cases the tone mark ' — which also encodes a minor syllable vowel — in contexts which should correspond to the etymological tone C, marked elsewhere by +. These cases are:

gā'	'to trade'	58.1
mā'	'horse'	17.2; 18.2

It is unclear how these are going to be interpreted: Are the B tone marks due to scribal error or do the assigned B tones differ from the expected C tones?

In other cases we witness variation between unmarked C tones and marked ones, such as:

cau+	'lord, master'	49.2; 56.2
cau		5.2
ṭan+	'trunk [tree]'	6.2; 41.4
ṭan		23.7
hay+	'to give'	23.5, 25.3, 42.5 43.2, 58.2
hay		3.3; 7.2

The following two cases occur only once each in the Sd. 32 corpus:

khēw+	'glass, crystal'	6.3
hlau+	'liquor, alcohol'	3.2

In still other cases the mark ' encoding elsewhere in the Sukhothai corpus either tone B or a minor syllable vowel may denote here still unknown prosodic parameters; consider the following:

pa'	'[negative marker]'	24.3
ba'	'father'	4.2, 4

In the first case ' denotes an anaptyctic vowel /ə/ and probably secondary stress in the context of Sd. 32.24.3 *pa' mi tai* 'and could not...'; in the second case ' marks the expected tone B. More problematic are the following instances:

gāmma'ni	'[title]'	31.1
jā'k	'[Jātaka]'	43.1
gojjā'niya	'[title]'	18.1
jā'tak	'[Jātaka]'	10.1, 18.1, 23.2
bārā'nasī	'[name]'	49.3
sātsatā'	'to instruct'	10.3
k'wāṅ	'deer'	11.2

With the exception of the first — in which ' encodes again the anaptyctic vowel —, what all cases have in common is that the mark ' only follows the long vowel *ā*. In 43.1 this may indicate an elision *jā'k* < *jātak*, but cases such as *jā'tak* in 10.1, 18.1 and 23.2 would argue against it. Given 18.1 *gojjā'niya* and 49.3 *bārā'nasī* one might speculate that the function of ' might be to shorten an orthographically long vowel *in lieu* of superscript *-ă-*; this view can be supported by the absence of *-ă-* in glosses 18 and 49, but not elsewhere in the Sd. 32 corpus where ' and *-ă-* co-occur.

Especially problematic is *k'wāṅ* 'deer' (11.2); the sign is not transcribed in *CI V*, nor in *ISP*, but clearly visible; a similar sign appears in the first line of the engraving, there being non-functional. The corresponding form in modern central Thai has level tone (unmarked); it cannot be conditioned by the cluster *kw-* since we have in 4.3 *kwayan* 'cart'.[16]

3. Consonant variation

3.1 Contractions

Compelling evidence for phonetic spellings are contractions of syllables, including weak forms. In the corpus two cases are attested in the same gloss,

13.4	*brāja*
13.3	*braña*

for *ba - rāja*, or possibly *braḥñā - rāja*, and *braḥñā* respectively. The last case may be doubtful since *braña* represents the etymologically correct form of this OM loan word. If it does denote the etymologically correct form this would then be an argument for a relatively earlier date.

3.2 Medials

3.2.1 Medial reduplication

Reduplication of medials occurs only in the word *desanā* [14] 'to preach' > *dessanā* in 15, 16, 18, 17. This may be to pre-empt naturalized forms such as **detsanā* /deːtsənaː/.

3.2.2 Medial metathesis

A phenomenon also attested in epigraphic Mon, occurring in Sd. 32 in #23 *pecñāwuddha*, is the metathesis of clusters; in OM and MM one encounters variant initial and medial clusters, such as *-ñk-* ~ *-kñ-* /-kɲ-/ and *-ṅg-* ~ *-gñ-* /-ŋg-/.[17] The following cases are attested in Mon:

laṅgat	~ *lagñat*	MM 'practice, to study'

languiw ~ *lagñuiw* ~ *lañ(ñ)uiw*   MM 'some, certain'
sangā   ~ *sagñā*   MM 'monk's robe'
ñkan   ~ *kñan*   OM/MM 'to be firm'

Sd. 32.23 follows this pattern *-cñ-* < *-ñc-*, < P. *pañcāwudha*.[18] It is likely that this kind of metathesis originates in an orthography where subscripts are distinguished, and therefore to have been borrowed from Mon.

Metathesis also occurs in IA loans, such as 41.3 *bānararāja* < *bārāṇa°*.

3.2.3 Loss of aspiration

In 24.4 Skt. *'adhiṣṭhāna* 'constancy' is spelt *'adisthān*. This is typical for OM (> *'adisthān* [OM 'to resolve'; OM Fr.Nag. 9.ii]), where aspirated stops have a low functional load, especially voiced ones — the latter being confined exclusively to IA loans. Also *vedabbha* > *wedapba* [8], *tipallatthamiga* > *tipallaṭamiga* [33.1].

3.2.4 Non-etymological aspiration

In two cases have unaspirated retroflexes been replaced by their aspirated alveolar counterparts, as in *vaṭṭaka* > *watthaka* [20], *kañcanakkhaṇḍa* > *kāñcanakhaṇndha* [24].

3.2.5 Naturalization of syllable-finals *-sth-* > *-t # sath-*, - *s-* > *-t # s-*

Skt. *śreṣṭhī* 'rich man' occurs in the *Glosses* four times, spelt in two different ways: (i) *sretsathī* [3.1; 5.2] and (ii) *sresthī* [7.2; 25.2]. The former case reflects assimilation of syllable finals, in this case *-s* > *-t /-t/*; the latter reflects the tendency towards etymological integrity, although it should be noted here too that retroflexes have been naturalized and therefore spelt with their alveolar counterparts.

In gloss #10.3 *sāsatā'* has an uncertain etymology: P. *sāsati*, Skt. *śāsati* 'to instruct, teach', or, Skt. *śāstra*, P. *sattha*. Reanalyzed as /saːt # sədaː/ from a hypothetical form *sās # sati*, or a hypercorrected form *sāssati*.

3.2.6 Medial contamination

The tendency to retain etymological integrity has — paradoxically — lead to erroneous reconstructions such as 43.1-2 *boddhi°* < *bodhi°* and *buddha*.

3.3 Finals

3.3.1 Final reduplication

Reduplication of final consonants occurs in 32.3 *cakk*, and there it is written as a subscript, unique in the *Glosses*. In 41.6 *khetta* and 28.7 *braṁdatta* reduplicated finals are etymological. In 4.4, 29.3 and 25.2, 33.5, 38.5, 41.5 /hua/and /tua/ respectively, final *wa* is not reduplicated but assumes a vocalizing role. The only cases of reduplication of finals in native words occur in pre-nasal contexts, such as *'ann* and *dañn* — and in both cases variants written with superscript *-ă-* are attested in Sd. 32 — and in 23.3 before *-y*, in *tawayy*, in variation with more numerous occurrences with simple final.

3.3.2 Loss of final syllables

This is problematic and affects the transliteration of loans tentatively offered here and elsewhere: is Skt. *śīla*, P. *sīla* to be interpreted in ETh. as *sīl* or *sīla* [3.3], to be reconstructed as */siːl/, */siːn/, or more likely */siːlaʔ/, in which case the transliteration of *sīla* should be retained.[19] Skt. *śiṣya* 'disciple' > ETh. *sis /sisa* [43.2]. Final IA *-ā* is dropped in 38 *khāradiyā* > *khāradiya/khāradiy*.

3.3.3 Pseudo-etymological finals

The following instances should be noted:[20]

8	°*bbha*	> °*pba*	» */-p/
30	°*dha*	> °*tda*	» */-t/
36	°*ga*	> °*kga*	» */-k/
24	°*kkhaṇḍa*	> °*khaṇndha*	» */-n/

The problem of how to interpret syllabic finals in IA loans is similar to OM; as Shorto points out in *DMI*, p.xx, the variant forms OM *'indra* ~ *'in* 'Indra' and OM *swarga* ~ *swar* 'heaven' are to be reconstructed as */ʔin/ and */swɔr/ [late OM] respectively. He proceeded in a similar fashion even in those cases where no corresponding naturalized spellings occurred. The Jātaka title of 24, *kañcanakkhaṇḍa*, is spelt here *kāñcanakhaṇndha*, implying a phonological form */kaːncanakhan/;[21] therefore °*dha* must be regarded as a pseudo-etymological final.[22] This argument is further strengthened by the devoicing of final stops in the vernacular forms. The existence of pseudo-etymological finals also suggests that the engravers were familiar with an orthographic tradition in which subscripts were used. This correlates well, by the way, with the attested subscripts in 32.3, quoted above.

3.3.4 Final glottal stop

In gloss #24.2 *sīsaḥ* /siːsaʔ/ 'head', P. *sīsa*, Skt. *śīrṣa*. The marking of the glottal stop /-ʔ/ as *-ḥ* points to a late date of Sd. 32.

3.4 Initials

Gloss 9.1 spells *bheriwādaka* as *beri°*. Again, as in the case of medial aspirated stops (cf. 24.4 *'adisthān*), this may be because aspirated stops have a low functional load in OM, and would imply at least acquaintance with OM orthographic spelling practices. The functional load of aspiration is significantly higher even in ETh. — prior to devoicing — than in OM.

4. Vowel variation

4.1 Vowel length

In the *Glosses* variation in vowel length affects only the vowel *i*, and here conforms to Sukhothai practice. In 10, 11, 18, 38 and 42 *bodhi°* is spelt *bodhī°*.[23] In 11.2 *sīp* < *sip* 'ten', and 4.5 *si* < *sī* 'four'. 9.2 has *ti* for *tī* 'to strike, beat, hit'.

4.2 Vowel conditioning

Elsewhere I have discussed vowel conditioning in pre-palatal contexts in Mon and epigraphic Thai in such instances as ETh. *prejñābala* (Nn. 1.A.19), Skt. *prajñā* and ETh. *karteñatā* (Lb.38.A.16), Skt. *kṛtajña*, P. *kataññutā*.[24] In Sd. 32 we find another instance, not noted earlier, in gloss 23.1 *pecñāwuddha* for *pañcă˚*. The metathesis in this case has already been discussed above (4.2.2). In OM conditioned vowels in pre-palatal contexts are not confined to loans,[25] and words such as OM *kumlac ~ kaṁlec* 'thief', *srañ ~ sreñ* 'silver', *clac ~ clec* 'flame-like ornament' are attested in the epigraphic corpus.[26]

4.3 Superscript -ă- /a/

As has been mentioned at the outset, variation in the writing of short /a/ by either reduplicating the final consonant or by using a superscript *-ă-*, called in modern Thai "/má:y hăn ʔa:kà:t/", affects in Sd. 32 only three lexical items, as has been noted above, two of them grammatical markers, *'ann ~ 'ăn* and *dañ ~ dăñ*, the other a loan from Skt. *bodhisattva*, P. *bodhisatta*, which are not attested anywhere else in Sukhothai epigraphy except in the glosses at Wat Sri Chum.

In the latter case, three types of variation can be distinguished:[27]

Type 1	˚ăt	(3)
Type 2b	˚ătwa	(5)
Type 2a	˚atwa	(2)
Type 3a	˚attwa	(14)
Type 3b	˚ăttwa	(17)

Type 1 is a completely naturalized spelling; type 2 is a blend-type showing a naturalized final and type 3 represents an etymological spelling. Types 2a - 3a are unmarked assuming that inherent vowel in IA word is short /a/ automatically. Types 2b - 3b are marked to avoid Mon-type confusion: *-ă-* may actually have originated as a convention created by Mon for Thai, where the inherent vowel — except before /-ʔ/ — corresponds, or had already shifted by that time, to /ɔ/ corresponding to former /a/. SM /-at/ < pM */-a:t/, SM /-ɔt/ < pM */-at/, */-ut/.

Elsewhere in the Sukhothai corpus we find the word Skt. *sattwa*, P. *satta* 'being', showing the following variation:[28]

Ay.1.A.33	sattwa	1361	
Ay.1.B.10	satwa	1361	
Sd.2.A.50	sattwa	1370s	
Sd.2.B.15, 16	sattwa	1370s	
Sd.17.A.11	sătwa	1373 ?	-ă-
• #94.2	sattwa	1384	
Sd.26.A.40	sătwa	1399	-ă-
• Sd.10.B.21	satta	1404	
• Sd.25.35	sătwaḥ	1417	-ă-
Kb.2.13.1	sătwa	1472/1510	-ă-
Sd.12.C.2	sătwa	1525	-ă-
Sd.12.C.3	sătwa	1525	-ă-
• Sd.28.B.22	satwa	1528	
• Sd.28.B.27	satwa	1528	
Sd.11.B.6	săt	1536	-ă-

5. Naturalization of IA loans

IA retroflexes are written uniformly as their corresponding alveolars, with the exception of the cases already listed above, *puṇapāni* [3.1] (J. #53), *r(o)hiṇi* [5.1] (J. #45), *wāruṇidūsaka* [7.1] (J. #47), *lăkkhaṇa* [11.1] (J. #11), *bārāṇasi* [13.3-4] (J. #13), the latter having naturalized variants elsewhere in the Sd.32 corpus. IA voiceless palatal spirants, written *śa*, are spelt with their corresponding alveolars *sa*. No cases of hypercorrection in the spelling of IA loans are attested. In gloss 28.7 Thai (? Mon [?]) syllable boundaries have been retained in *braṁ datta* /brɔm (?) # dat/ for *brahmadatta*, for which compare OM *brum, brumha, bruhma; bram, braṁm, braṁha, brahma*, reconstructed by Shorto in *DMI* as */brɔm/.

6. Grammar

In spite of their restricted style, the glosses permit one to make the following observations on early Thai syntax:

6.1 Anaphoric *'ann ~ 'ăn*

All occurrences of *'ann ~ 'ăn* in Sd.32 are given in Figure 1. It will be noticed that in seven cases out of the total 28 *'ann, 'ăn* occur in clause or sentence-initial position marked in the gloss by a syntactic boundary, transliterated here as #; in gloss 26 it occurs at the beginning of the gloss itself (context A), and is to be interpreted there — preceding the deictic *ni* — as a noun. In only seven cases do *'ann ~ 'ăn* mark a subordinate [relative] clause (context C): These fall into two groups, one in which the subordinate clause has a different subject (#17, #41, context C.2) and one in which the subject is co-referential with the one of the main clause. In those contexts in which *'ann ~ 'ăn* do not mark relative clauses they rather function as anaphoric pronouns, such as in context B.1. Remarkable is the absence of the equative verb 'to be' *pen* in context B.2. Again, one might guess that this is a scribal error, but given the careful notation of other prosodic features this seems somehow unlikely. Another explanation is that *'ăn* in this context may have been regarded as predicative 'that which is'. This has a parallel in Mon which will be discussed below in section 8.2.

6.2 Honorifics

It has been pointed out in section 1. on lexical variation that the use of the honorific *braḥ* varies in Sd.32. In this context it should be noted that the classifier for *braḥñā*

&c. is *gan* 'person' [17, 18], the classifier for humans, implying that honorific contexts were not distinguished, otherwise *brahñā* would have been classified separately, and not by *gan*: [17.4-5] *kē dāw brahñā cet gan* and [18.2-3] *kē brahñā cet gan* # '[preaching the Dhamma] to the seven Brañā'. The absence of honorific classifiers has a striking parallel in Old Mon.

6.3 Instrumentals

Grammatically perhaps the most intriguing, yet unfortunately marred by being an uncertain reading, is the possible occurrence in 35.2 of the marker *ṇa* '[instrumental] with, by means of'.[29] If the reading is correct *ṇa* is undoubtedly a borrowing from Old Mon *na ~ na'* '[instrumental]'; how this would connect with later Thai *ṇa* marking the 'locative' remains to be determined.

7. Dating

Based on the orthography, most notably the occurrence of superscript *-ă-*, Vickery concluded that the Wat Sri Chum glosses were to be dated rather late, implying by that the late 14th century. Following Prasert's hypothesis, according to which superscript *-ă-* was used first only in /-aŋ/ *-aṅ-* rhymes, then in other nasal rhymes [except *-aṁ*], and only subsequently to those environments containing obstruents. Gosling disputed this in her critique of 1988 arguing that superscript *-ă-* occurred in rhymes containing obstruents by the mid-14th c., namely in the Wat Sri Chum glosses, and that spellings became more standardized towards the end of the 14th c.[30]

The argument for a relatively late date of the Wat Sri Chum glosses has now been substantiated by Prasert's recent contribution;[31] his argument favouring a date later than 1392 AD is two-fold:[32] the use of superscript *-ă-*, as discussed above, and the palaeographical examination of the akṣaras *ṇa, pa, fa, ra, wa, sa, 'a* as well well as anusvāra and visarga. If visarga *-ḥ* is to be taken as encoding a final glottal stop *-ʔ*, this would support a late date. There is only one occurrence of word-final *-ḥ* indicating a glottal stop — though not unique in the Sukhothai corpus — , e.g. *sīsaḥ* /si:saʔ/. The earlier convention is reminiscent of Mon where final /-ʔ/ is marked by a *-'a* (vowel support, marked by virāma), or alternatively by *-a, -i, -u* in the contexts /-aʔ, -iʔ, -uʔ/ respectively. The absence of reduplication of finals, except for *daññ* and *'ann*, both grammatical markers, would indicate a late date.[33]

8. Old Mon Parallels

8.1 Formulae

The Wat Sri Chum glosses should be seen within the general context of Southeast Asian Jātaka illustrations accompanied by glosses.[34] At Pagan, Central Burma [11th/12th c.], Jātaka glosses written in Old Mon [OM] are documented

on the Ananda plaques, and OM ink glosses occur in a number of temples. One can distinguish two basic types of glosses accompanying Jātaka illustrations: (i) interpretive-descriptive glosses, and (ii) titles. Within the first group one could distinguish further types; also relative length of gloss correlating with narrative complexity in the illustration should be considered. The second group (ii) reveals similarities between the Pagan glosses and Sd. 32 at Wat Sri Chum, in particular the ink glosses at (i) West Hpetleik, (ii) the temple west of Taungbi tank and (iii) the west wall of the Lokahteikpan. These consist of the identification of the Jātaka by title followed by the identification of the Bodhisatta. Sd. 32 follows this pattern, and is thus not exceptional when seen within a regional context.[35] Striking parallels between some of the Pagan glosses and Sd. 32 can be observed, as for instance in the following (Old Mon glosses from W. Taungbi, nos. 11 and 13 and Sd. 32.11 and Sd. 32.12):

> OM 11   # [ ] *lakkhana jāt bodhisat das drāy <u>tos dharmma ku drāy gumluiṅ</u>* #
>
> Sd. 32.11   *lăkkhana jātak # braḥ bodhisāttwa pen kwāṅ gāṁ rap sip 'et lē*

where the second clause (underlined) *tos dharmma ku drāy gumluiṅ* 'preaching the Dhamma to the deers' has no counterpart in Sd. 32,

or

> OM 13   # <u>*wo' gaṇḍika jāt bodhi(sat das de) watāw chu' pihār k[u] rumba' c-eṅ drāy*</u> #
>
> Sd. 32.12   *kăndi jātak # braḥ bodhisāttwa pen debatā nay pā gāṁ rap sip sām*

where the clause *pihār k[u] rumba' c-eṅ drāy* (underlined) 'speaking to the other deer-hunters' and the initial deictic verb *wo'* do not occur in Sd. 32.

Structurally parallel are also the use of Wat Sri Chum (#) *meia* ... 'when, at the time when; as [temporal]' in glosses (26.2), 46.1, 47.1, 49.1, 52.1, 54.2, 56.1, and 58.1 with the Ananda's # *kāl* ... 'At the time, when'.[36] Apart from the Ananda plaques, structurally closest to the Wat Sri Chum glosses are those at the Myinpyagu, the Nagayon and the Pahtothamya, as shown in this typology of gloss-incipits:

Myinpyagu	*kāl* [NAME] *jāt goḥ* ...
Nagayon[37]	*wo' kāl* ...
Pahtothamya	*wo' kāl* ...
W. Taungbi	*wo'* [NAME] *jāt* ...
W. Hpetleik	*bodhisat das* ...

'At the time of the [ ] Jātaka ...'
'This is when ...'
'This is when ...'
'This is the [ ] Jātaka ...'
'The Bodhisatta is ...'

Also striking, as I have pointed out elsewhere, are grammatical parallelisms, including subordinate clauses, in Old Mon and early forms of Thai, such as they occur in the glosses in the West Hpetleik or again the Ananda.[38]

8.2 Anaphoric/deictic predicates

In section 6.1 reference was made to ETh. *'ann ~ 'ăn*, and it was suggested that some particular usages in the Thai corpus had correspondences in Mon.[39] Gloss 26 is unusual in that it begins with the clause *'ăn nī*

26.1	*'ăn nī [-]ī tăndūla jātak lē* (#)
26.2	*(meia) [b]odhisāttwa pen [ ]*
26.3	*[ ]tt [ ] (bra*
26.4	*ḥ) ñā brahmadhatta [ ]*

'This is the Tandūlanāli Jātaka'
'When the Bodhisattwa was [ ]'
'[Brahmadha]tta [who ...]'
'Brañā Brahmadhatta'

'ăn nī ... corresponds in OM to *wo'* ['this is'] type glosses at Pagan.[40] In Figure 1 *'ann ~ 'ăn* in context B. 1 can be regarded as a deictic noun, although occurrences in context B. 2 suggest that it can also be interpreted as a verb. In OM we find similar constructions:

I.A.27	# *ma tirley pa kir 'īm wo' ci* # *mu het yo* #

III.B.26-7	*mu het (man) tirla' gruṅ*
VIII.B.22	[# *ma man kyāk buddha byades*]
I.A.16	# *ma strak tlūṅ (mno)r*

'why did you smile thus, Lord?'
'why was it that you laughed, Lord?'
'that which the Lord Buddha foretold'
"that which was to come thereafter"
[Blagden]

It is obvious that the OM equivalent of ETh. *'ann ~ 'ăn* OM *ma ~ ma'* in I.A.27 functions as a cataphoric pronoun, *ma* being here co-referential with the following *mu het* 'why, which reason'.[41] A paraphrase occurs, in fact, in III.B.26-7 *mu het man* 'why is that...'.[42] In VIII the subordination of the clause to *ma* by *man* suggests that *ma* is to be regarded as a nominalized element, very much like ETh. *'ăn* in #26.1. A further example of such a constructions is attested in the Ananda plaques

Ananda
611/a   *gna kyek tubaḥ ma tur*

'the queen shows [him] the flames'

where there is no co-referential subject for *ma* which could be rendered as 'shows [him] that which is ...'.[43]

8.3 Prepositions

Other parallels occur on the Ananda plaques featuring the construction 'to preach [the Dharma] to' OM *tos (ku)*, ETh. *desanā kē ~ dessanā kē*[44] All occurrences of ETh. *kē* in Sd. 32 are given in context in Figure 2, where context A lists *kē* as a preposition proper and context B shows occurrences of *kē* as the translation equivalent of the genitive, with *kē* to be glossed as 'on behalf of, for'. In OM we witness variation with respect to the use of the preposition *ku* [in this context] 'to'.[45]

Ananda

574	*tos dharrma ku smiṅ*
791	*tos dhar ku smiṅ nāg*
789	*widhir tos dhar*
779	*tos rājawasati*
775	*kinkāl dhar ku smiṅ*

'preaches the Dharma to the king'
'preaches the Dharma to the Nāga king'
'Vidhura preaches the Dharma'
'preaches the Rājavasati'
'explains the Dharma to the king'

Sd.32 Wat Sri Chum[46]

15.2-3	*dessanā dharrma kē khau dān hlāy*
16.2-3	*dessanā dharrma kē dān brahñā*
18.4-5	*dessanā dharrma kē dāw (b)rahñā cet gan*
17.2-3	*dessanā dharrma tē brahñā cet gan*
14.2-3	*desanā dharrma kē brām* 'preaches the Dharma to them'

'preaches the Dharma to the Brañā'
'preaches the Dharma to the seven Brañā'
'preaches the Dharma to the seven Brañā'
'preaches the Dharma to the Brahmin'

8.4 Plurality

Significant in this context appears to be also the use of a pluralized personal pronoun, not attested elsewhere in Sukhothai epigraphy, as quoted above in the gloss 15.2-3 *khau dăn hlāy* 'they', which Schmitt translated freely as "[à] des villageois".[47] *khau dăn hlāy* is attested elsewhere only in a quantified noun-phrase in Sd.10.B.16-17 [ ] ... *khau dăn hlāy pet gan* 'all eight of them'. In OM personal pronouns [third person] are overtly marked for plural — as are nouns. OM *ḍeḥ* [sing.] - *ḍeḥ t'eḥ* [pl.], OM *'ja* [sing.] - *'ja t'eḥ* [pl.]; for the second person OM does have a singular/plural distinction in *kuṁ* [sing.], *beḥ* [sing.], and *bnaḥ* [pl.]; but *kuṁ* is also attested in a pluralized form *kuṁ t'eḥ*.[48] Examples occurring in the ink glosses on the Nagayon (1090), the Kubyaukgyi (1113) and the Hpetleik (West) are numerous:

Nagayon
15   *'ut ḍeḥ t'eḥ sak go' năṅ*

17 *'ja t'eḥ sak mic*
20 *ku twās ḍe(ḥḥ t'e)ḥ kuṁ kuṁ*
21 *twās ḍeḥ t'eḥ kuṁ kuṁ*
42 *... ma ḍeḥ t'eḥ pañ tiṅ(g)im*
   'they were unable to do it'
   'they did not want to'
   'and their disciples also'
   'their disciples, too'
   '...which they shot'

Kubyaukgyi
185 *buhic ḍeḥ t'eḥ*
   'frightens them'

West Hpetleik
1 *ḍeḥ t'eḥ tbāk jrey*
  'they cut down a fig tree'

In Gloss 3, however, plurality is unmarked.

One might argue, of course, that plural marking in epigraphic Thai originated as a calque of Pali/Sanskrit usage; however, this is unlikely since there is no statistical correlation between use of plural marking in epigraphic Thai and Pali in the Sukhothai corpus.[49]

9. Palaeographical notes

In addition to Prasert's observations, the following should be noted:

9.1 Vowel loci

Palaeographical variation occuring in the Wat Sri Chum glosses is of two kinds: (i) locus of attachment of vowel signs and (ii) morphology of akṣaras and vowel signs. Both may be relevant for dating.[50]

In the *Glosses* the medial vowels *i, ī* are shown to be attached to -*dha*- [in *bodhi°, bodhī°*] either to the left vertical as in glosses 10, 11, 18 and 28 or to the right vertical as in 38 and 48.

9.2 *pa* / *pa̱*

Problematic in the *Glosses* are also the akṣaras *pa* / *pa̱*. For the latter, together with *ta̱* a Thai innovation not found in Mon and Khmer scripts, at least two variants can be found in Sd.32, a looped variety and a variety with an extended right vertical, without loop. Figure 5c shows how *pa̱* is derived from *pa*, by first writing *pa* and then extending the vertical.[51] In glosses 12.2, 28.3, 5 and 30.2 *pen* 'to be [equative]' an extended vertical is not visible, and should therefore be read as *pen*; in other instances, such as 29.2, *pa̱* is written in the looped variety, or in 10.2 and 31.2 without the loop but with the extended right vertical. It is difficult to say whether these variants are *spelling* variants controlled by the engravers; in gloss 42 *pa̱* and *pa* are clearly distinguished, as in 42.4 *pa̱u* and 42.5 *pitā*.

9.3 Punctuation

Noteworthy is the variety of styles of punctuation marks as well as their positioning. The punctuation marks and their contexts for Sd.32 are given in Figure 3.[52] Palaeographically three *styles* and two *types* can be distinguished: The styles consist of (1) a wavy line, from left to right at the beginning, from right to left at the end of a gloss, (2) a circle with a small inner circle [28], (3) a mark reminiscent of Khmer [6], and (4) two parallel vertical strokes [5]. In 18.3 one finds a *pāda* — two parallel vertical strokes — instead of the circle. All types, with the exception of (3) are also attested in monumental inscriptions and votive tablets in Mon.

9.4 Text wrap

Complete text wrapping — that is, lines and segmentation of akṣaras, irrespective of their phonological boundaries, following the constraints of the pictorial space — occurs in glosses 33 and 34 (Jātakas 16, 17) whereas in glosses 18, 17 (Jātakas 22, 23) and 9, 41, 51 (Jātakas 57, 58, 59) the text appears as a non-wrapped block. Exceptional is gloss 1 which appears outside the pictorial frame.

9.5 Adjacency

Apparent variation can be further reduced when adjacency of plaques is taken into account; in other words, plaques which are positioned next to one another are less likely to show variation among themselves but only with other sets.

10. Conclusion

We still know too little about epigraphic Thai orthographic systems in order to discern any notion of 'standardization'.[53] The limited variation that is attested in Sd.32 can be ascribed to *lexical discrepancies* in Shorto's typology, affecting only two grammatical markers and the IA loan Skt. *bodhisattwa*, P. °*satta*, apart from Jātaka titles. Vocabulary of undoubted Tai or Mon-Khmer origin is not subject to variation in the glosses, except in the cases of *pay* / *pai̱, ba* / *ba', pa* / *pa'* and tone-marking.

In the case of inscriptions from Sukhothai in the 14th to the 15th centuries — and perhaps even later — the problems in the interpretation of early writing systems are compounded not only by the ongoing process of phonological, lexical and grammatical innovation but also — and perhaps more importantly — by interference from another language, in this case Mon.[54]

However, if second language interference must be assumed in some inscriptions, it may prove difficult in those cases to serve as "chronological benchmarks".

In the case of the Jātaka glosses from Wat Sri Chum, variation can also be accounted for by the fact that the glosses are the work of several engravers.

NOTES

Abbreviations:

BBHC   *Bulletin of the Burma Historical Commission,* Rangoon

BSOAS   *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies,* London

CI   *[Collection of inscriptions]* Bangkok, The Secretary of the Prime Minister's Office. Vol. v ([Wat Sri Chum Jātaka glosses] 1972). (in Thai)

GISI   *A glossarial index of the Sukhothai inscriptions,* compiled by Ishii Yoneo, Akagi Osamu and Noriko Endo, Kyoto University, Center for Southeast Asian Studies (Discussion Paper 53), 1972, reprinted by Shoukadou, Kyoto, in 1977; a new version, based on a substantially enlarged corpus, was published in 1989 by Ishii Yoneo, Nidhi Aewsrivongs, Akagi Osamu, Aroonrat Wichienkhiew, and Noriko Endo, Bangkok, Amarin, adding entries from another 17 inscriptions.

ISP   *[Inscriptions of the Sukhothai period].* Bangkok, Fine Arts Department, 1985 (in Thai).

JBRS   *Journal of the Burma Research Society,* Rangoon

JSS   *Journal of the Siam Society,* Bangkok

SSN   *Siam Society Newsletter,* Bangkok

Languages:

(E)MM   (Epigraphic) Middle Mon

EMKhm.   Epigraphic Middle Khmer

EOM   Early Old Mon

ETh.   Epigraphic / Early Thai

LM   modern literary Mon

LOM   Late Old Mon

OKhm.   Old Khmer

OM   Old Mon

SM   modern spoken Mon

Transliteration: The system used here is derived from Blagden-Shorto for Mon; in Thai the vowel support is transcribed as ' syllable-initially, as *å* medially when denoting /ɔ:/ — in analogy to Middle Mon rhymes *-åṅ, -åk. pa* and *ṭa* transcribe the akṣaras for the respective voiceless plosives /p-/ and /t-/, whereas their imploded counterparts are transcribed here as *pa* and *ta* (<Old Khmer *p-, *t-).

[1] This article was written before Prasert ṇa Nagara presented his revised dating of the glosses to the "Deuxième Symposium Franco-Thaï: Récentes recherches en archéologie", Bangkok, Silpakorn University, 9-11 December 1991. Prasert's contribution focuses on the palaeographical dating of the glosses, and not on orthographic, grammatical and stylistic issues and how these relate to language-contact. Adducing art-historical evidence Prasert also shows — *contra* Coedès and Gosling — that the Jātaka glosses were intended to be placed on the ceiling of the stairway of the maṇḍapa at Wat Sri Chum, and were not relocated from another monument. Prasert's paper and my linguistic re-assessment of the glosses here are complementary.

The Jātaka glosses are listed in Table 1; the numbering of the glosses used here in the index and the synopsis follows the order as given in *Inscriptions of the Sukhothai Period* which is taken as a base for Sukhothai epigraphy, even though the readings proposed there are frequently erroneous. These have been corrected here and elsewhere (*BSOAS,* LVI, 3, 1993 [in press]).
Tables 2a and 2b provide cross-references. The 59 Jātaka glosses, varying in length between two and ten lines, are collectively registered by the Fine Arts Department [FAD] as "Sd.32".

[2] Annales du Musée Guimet, XXXI, 2, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1908, pp. 43-127, plates XI-XXX. A selection of reproductions, originating from Fournereau, have been in reproduced in Jean Boisselier's *La peinture en Thaïlande,* Fribourg, Office du Livre, 1976, notably illustrations 18 [p. 44], 19 [p. 45], 37 [p. 68], 38 [p. 72], 40 [p. 74].

[3] Schmitt's is not a transliteration of the inscriptions but an approximation of the modern central Thai pronunciation.

[4] Bangkok, Office of the Secretary of the Prime Minister, Publications Committee for Historical Documents, 1972. The line drawings provided, probably based on the rubbings rather than the photographs, should be used with caution as they omit features clearly visible on the reproductions in either Fournereau or the FAD. The citations provided here are based on my own readings at Wat Sri Chum in October 1991 and in Bangkok [#18]; I wish to thank the offi-

cials of the Fine Arts Department in Sukhothai for granting me permission to check the earlier readings against the originals. Glosses 23 and 24 were not accessible, but the reproductions in Fournereau are good enough to provide unambiguous and certain readings. For a recent art historical study see Banlue Khoruamdet, *[A stylistic study of the Jātaka stone-slab engravings at Wat Sri Chum, Sukhothai],* Bangkok, Silpakorn University, 1990, MA thesis (in Thai), xxvi, 438 pp. Banlue does not refer to the Vickery-Gosling arguments, nor to Gosling's or Brereton's work. Although an art-historical analysis, Banlue provides transcriptions of the glosses, based on the 1985 FAD readings, referred to in note 5, checked by Thoem Mitem, of the National Library, Bangkok. Ten glosses, included in his thesis, remained hitherto unpublished. Some of the transcripts are marred by apparent typing errors, others by misreadings. It has to be admitted that the checking of these Jātaka glosses, except for those stored [23, 24] and displayed [18] at the National Museum, Bangkok, is exceedingly difficult, given their location.

[5] Bangkok, Fine Arts Department, Ministry of Education, 1985, pp. 393-440, accompanied by photographs.

[6] Because of the great variety of spellings in the glosses, this form is given here.

[7] E.M.B. Gosling states that these Jātaka glosses "[...] have the most inconsistent spellings of all Sukhothai inscriptions [p. 48]", in *Sukhothai: Its history, culture, and art,* Oxford University Press, 1991, based on her PhD thesis *The history of Sukhothai as a ceremonial center: a study of early Siamese architecture and society.* University of Michigan, 1983, xix, 498 pp., 265 ill., 2 vols. [chapter two published in an earlier version in *JSS* LXIX, 1-2, 1981, 13-42, and partly as 'Inscriptions and art history: The case of Inscription II', in: R.J. Bickner, T.J. Hudak, Patcharin Peyasantiwong, eds., *Papers from a conference on Thai studies in honor of William J. Gedney [30 May, 1980],* Ann Arbor, University of Michigan, Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies (Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, 25), 1986, 149-57]. The Jātaka engravings are discussed in her *Sukhothai* pp. 45-8. I have no access to Bonita Pacala Brereton *The Wat Si Chum engravings and their place within the art of Sukhothai,* University of Michigan, MA the-

sis, 1978.

[8] Gosling, 1988, op. cit., p. 7: "I find it hard to believe that these inconsistencies [sc. in the spelling of *bodhisattwa*] could have occurred at Sukhothai at the end of the fourteenth century, when efforts towards standardization are apparent."

[9] A fact that has helped Prasert to determine the relative date of the Sri Chum glosses.

[10] I am tempted to reconstruct for glosses 26 and 58 *tandu:l/*tandu:n and *ʔapan respectively. The reconstruction of *-l in gloss 26 is based on the possibility that some of the glosses may have been written by Mon. This is discussed below. One might counterargue that the phonological context to be taken into account is *tāndūlajātak* *tandu:laja:dɔk, whence -la instead of the expected -na; similarly for *'apannajātak* *ʔapanaja:dɔk.

[11] Notice that in gloss 15 one finds variation in the spelling of final nasals *dăṅ* and *'ann*.

[12] 'The interpretation of archaic writing systems', *Lingua* XIV, 1965, 88-97.

[13] Hypergraphy in OM is illustrated by *pum-* initials where no equivalent form *pm-* exists. The same may be applied to Old [Angkorian] Khmer clusters such as *thw-*, spellings which encode junctural aspiration, where no *tw-* initials exist. Agraphy includes cases such as OM *-i* in an orthographically 'open' syllable corresponding to the rhyme /-iʔ/. Through extant alternative forms such as *i'* as well as corresponding forms in modern dialects */-iʔ/ must therefore be reconstructed.

[14] Tone marking is the most problematic of the topics discussed here since the tone marks, especially + for the C tone, are in many cases hardly legible.

[15] In some instances the presence or absence of tone marks may be correlated to such factors as sentence stress.

[16] While some aspects of prosodic marking appear to be unique to Sd.32 — such as ' following *ā* — variation in tone marking is not confined to the Wat Sri Chum glosses; for example, other Sukhothai inscriptions in which no C tone mark is found include Br.1/ #107 (1339), Nw.2 /#11 (1361), #44 (1373), gold plate (1376), and Sd.15 /#45 (1392). The foregoing should be treated with caution:

the Sukhothai corpus has not been critically edited yet, and, as stated, above prosodic marks in Sd.32 are difficult to discern.

[17] Cf. *DMI*, p. xvi.

[18] This form is erroneously transliterated in all published sources, including *CI* V and *ISP*, as *pañcāwuddha* or *peñcā°*. This is the more surprising as Schmitt transcribed the form in Fournereau as *pechyā°*.

[19] *BSOAS* LVI, 3, 1993. Note, however, that 'head' is spelt *sīsaḥ* for */si:saʔ/, where *-ḥ* marks final glottal stop.

[20] The left-most column lists the etymological finals, the second column the actual form attested in Sd.32, and the right-most column the phonological reconstruction.

[21] The assumed final /-n/ is reduplicated, following short /a/, in accordance with early orthographic practice at Sukhothai, as an alternative for the comparatively later /-ăn. Apart from variation in vowel length, note also that the first mediocluster has been naturalized -ñc-/-ɲc-/>-nc-/-nc-/.

[22] *Pseudo*-etymological insofar as the correct final ought to be °*ḍa*.

[23] Again, line transcriptions in *CIV* cannot be relied upon, transcribing *i* in glosses 10 and 11 as *i*.

[24] *BSOAS* LVI, 3, 1993. Shorto proposes as an explanation for this orthographic device: "The writing of *e* before palatals presumably results from an attempt to note a terminal glide", reconstructing 12th c. OM ɔ for this vowel, cf. *DMI*, p. xviii.

[25] Tai languages lack final palatals; their occurrence thus marks words as loans.

[26] In addition to IA loans such as OM *trijas ~ trejas*, Skt. *tejas* 'glory of king' where the etymological vowel *e* is raised to *i*, *koṇḍañ ~ kuṇḍiñ*, P. *koṇḍañña* 'Fifth of the 28 Buddhas', *jeyabhūm*, *jeyyalekha* < Skt. *jaya°* 'victory'.

[27] The figure given in parenthesis shows the number of times the spelling is attested in Sd.32.

[28] Items preceded by • provide counterevidence against the hypothesis according to which ETh. spellings of Skt. °*sattwa*, P. °*satta* underwent standardization and were uniformly spelt with superscript -*ă*- by the late 14th c. Cf. E.M.B. Gosling 'On

Michael Vickery's "From Lamphun to Inscription 2"', *SSN* IV, 1, 1988, 5-7, and M. Vickery 'From Lamphun to Inscription No.2', *SSN* III, 1, 1987, 2-6 [lecture delivered 14 October 1986]. Vickery also proposed that the origin of the Thai superscript -*ă*- is to be sought in an earlier superscript -*ñ*-. The use of superscripts -*ñ*- and -*r*- is widely attested in epigraphic Mon in disyllabic words of the structure CVCCVC where C is written as a superscript. The latter's use is not systematic in OM, and both IA loans and OM words may be written either way; the OM infix [-r-] may be written either way. In MM superscript -*ñ*- is prevalent. Prasert's method of using superscript -*ă*- for the relative dating was published [in Thai] in the Bunrueang ṇa Nagara cremation volume of 1971, pp. 52-58 [on superscript -*ă*- p. 54]. It has since been independently confirmed by Ing-orn Supanvanit in *The development of the Thai script and orthography* [in Thai], Bangkok, Chulalongkorn University, 1984, quoted neither by Vickery nor by Gosling. In addition Gosling refers to Sd.18 [#106] as having superscript -*ă*- in obstruent rhymes; this occurs only in the Khmer loan *snap* 'to support', here Sd.18. B.20, and Sd.37.18 [#95], in [FAD reading] *sanăp jeiñ GISI*: "trousers?, sandals?"; not having examined the original — inscriptions at the National Museum, Bangkok, are currently in storage, except Sd.32.18 — one might speculate that the transcription of superscript -*ă*- is the result of a misreading of the looped variety of *pa*, transliterated here as *pa*, modern Thai /p/, and should be interpreted as *sanap* instead of *sanăp*. For the looped variety of *pa* see Ing-orn, op.cit., p. 446 and p. 721. It should be noted that Gosling's argument of superscript -*ă*- being uniformly spelt by the late 14th c. but occurring in obstruent rhymes earlier and with greater variation than the late 14th c. is based only on data extracted from an earlier edition of *GISI*. A synopsis listing cross-references for the earlier inventory numbers and the current registration numbers is published in *BSOAS* LVI, 3, 1993, [in press].

[29] *ṇa* is documented in the earlier FAD readings, without having sollicited any editorial comment.

[30] Gosling 1988, op, cit., "[...] in the last half of the fourteenth century, [...] there were increasing attempts at standardization" (p. 7), "[...] at the end of the fourteenth century, when efforts towards standardization are apparent" (ibid.), "To me, the Jataka [sic] inscriptions represent a transitional stage between that earlier, probably more chaotic orthographic period and the late fourteenth

century, when spelling was becoming more standardized" (ibid.).

[31] See the reference given in footnote 1; although Vickery, like Gosling, relied on the earlier erroneous FAD readings, the main thrust of his argument was based on the use of superscript -*ǎ*-, again taken up by Prasert in his most recent 1991 analysis.

[32] Prasert also adduces other historical arguments for his claim that Sd.32 glosses must have been engraved after 1392.

[33] Previous opinion, such as Gosling following Boisselier, favoured a date close to the mid-14th century; Boisselier stated in his *La peinture en Thaïlande*, Fribourg, Office du Livre, 1976: "La série, parfaitement homogène, peut être attribué, environ, au milieu du XIVe siècle" (p. 42) and "... [une] date qui s'accorderait d'ailleurs assez bien avec celle admise pour la construction de Wat Chedi Chet Thèo, la règne de Lü Thai (1347-1374 env.)" (p. 75).

[34] Cf. Charles Duroiselle *Epigraphia Birmanica*, Volume II, Rangoon, Superintendent, Government Printing, 1921, reprinted 1962, and G.H. Luce 'Pali and Old Mon ink glosses in Pagán temples', *JBRS*, LVIII, 2, 1975, 119-280, Ba Shin *The Lokahteikpan — Early Burmese culture in a Pagan temple*. Rangoon, Rangoon University Press (=Burma Historical Commission) [Mon ink glosses on north, east and west wall, reproduced here in modern Mon script, transliteration and English translation; glossary of OM words; appendices A and B by G.H. Luce], and G.H. Luce and Ba Shin 'Pagan Myinkaba Kubyaukgyi temple of *Rājākumār* (1113 AD) and the Old Mon writings on its walls', *BBHC* II, 1961 [1965], 277-416. Of the Myinpyagu glosses only the longer ones are transcribed in Luce 1975, pp. 237-9, so I do not know whether there are more parallels to Sd.32 in Pagan than referred to here.

[35] The earliest vernacular gloss in Mon identifying an illustration [6th. c.] was recovered from a site in Central Thailand; cf. *JSS*, LXXIXX, 1, 1991, 31-83. This is an amulet-type object, inscribed on the obverse in Old Mon, from Chansen, Nakhorn Sawan province. It is remarkable, however, that the Mon *sīmā* stones from Northeastern Thailand [8th / 9th c.], illustrating scenes from the Jātakas, are not accompanied by glosses, but bear inscriptions relating to the donor; cf. *JSS*, LXXIX, 1, op. cit., and Piriya

Krairiksh "Buddhist folktales depicted at Chula Pathon Chedi", Bangkok, Prachanda Printing Press [printed privately], 1974, and his "*Semas* with scenes from the *Mahānipāta-Jātakas* in the National Museum at Khon Kaen", in *Art and Archaeology in Thailand*, Bangkok, Fine Arts Department, 1974, 35-36+26 ill., Surasawadi Itharat *Illustrated Sīmā stones from Ban Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum* [in Thai], Bangkok, Silpakorn University, BA thesis, 1978.

[36] Attested on the Ananda in the following 14 glosses: 542, 565, 567, 571, 586, 589, 623, 625, 629, 632, 637, 649, 664, 667. Titles only (20 times) occur on plaques 544, 545, 547, 552, 559, 561, 666, 668, 669, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 679, 680, 681, 683, 838, 851. All other glosses contain a verb-phrase.

[37] *wo' kāl* ... accounts for most, though not exclusive, occurrences; the same applies to the Pahtothamya.

[38] *BSOAS* LVI, 3,1993.

[39] Subordinate / relative clauses in epigraphic Thai and Mon are discussed in *BSOAS* LVI, 1993, 3, and *JRAS* III. 1, 1993.

[40] *ji* 'to name; be called, named', if the reading of *ji* is correct — the preferred reading is *gi* 'to be, namely', but either reading cannot really be proven — it would be stylistically unusual to have 'to be named' in a formula style gloss. Although OM *wo'* is a predicative deixis, or rather a deictic verb, it can function as a noun as well. For details on *wo'* see *JSS* LXXIX, 1, 1991 [1992].

[41] OM *mu* etc., relative question particle 'which, what', OM *het* 'reason, cause', P. hetu.

[42] OM *man* is another clause-subordinating particle, in many ways functionally and structurally identical with *ma, ma'*, but not identical; exceptionally, both may be combined, as in VIII, as quoted.

[43] OM *tubah* 'to show'.

[44] OM *tos* 'to preach' is the equivalent of *desanā, dessanā* in Sd.32; OM *kiṅkal* 'to explain'.

[45] Other verbs occurring in the Ananda glosses showing variation are *bihat* 'to try, test' 566, 692, 785; *bihat ku* 546, 550, 551, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 732. *gulāñ* 'to talk' 572, 613, 626, 643, 717, 729, 758, 770, 771, 819,

846, 867. *kil* 'to give' 649, 651, 652, 655, 690, 776, 794, 800, 801, 802, 815, 826, 827, 831, 833, 836, 852, 872, 880, 895, 918; *kil ku* 760 761; *kil nā* 808; *kil tun* 897; *kiṅkan, 'nkan* 'to instruct' 745, 599; *kiṅkan, 'nkan ku* 713, 728a, 757. No variation occurs with *kiṅkāl, 'al* 'to explain' 875, 775; *wiñ ku* 'to play' 577, 653; the following verbs occur only once: *jin ku* 'to make over, donate' 723; *mḍac ku* 'to be angry' 712; *pubar ku* 'to show' 727; *sthān ku* 586. In 774, 822, 909 OM *ku* is a connective 'and'.

[46] In Sd.32.17.2-3 *tē* may be a misreading or scribal error for *kē*.

[47] In Fournereau, op. cit., p. 71.

[48] For the etymology of *-eh, probably an AA deictic term, see *DMI, t'eh*.

[49] If this were the case, one should expect the incidence of plural marking in Thai to be higher in bi-lingual Thai-Pali inscriptions than in monolingual inscriptions; yet, this is not borne out by the data.

[50] The terminology used follows, or is based on, A.H.D. Dani, *Indian palaeography*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1963; Dani does not cover Southeast Asian scripts later than the 10th c.

[51] Notably in gloss 18.

[52] Context A: plaque-initial; B.1: *lē* final; B.2: plaque-final; C.1: *gāṁ* without *'ann, 'ăn*; C.2: before *'ăn* without *pen*; C.3: before *'ann, 'ăn pen*; D: end without number, or fragment; E.1: before *meia*; Context E.2: following the Jātaka title.

[53] We do not even possess, in contrast to Old Mon and Old Khmer, an epigraphic dictionary with lemmata shown in their original spelling; only then can spelling variation be properly assessed. Standardization can only be identified if phonetic and etymological spellings are identified and when more is known about internal sound changes and the dialectology of the language at the time.

[54] It may be a truism that early Thai (14th to the 15th c.) was in contact with Khmer in the region of what is now upper central Thailand but it remains to be determined to what extent Khmer influence went beyond lexical borrowing. Structural convergence that can be identified in the Thai inscriptions is Mon; cf. *BSOAS*, LVI, 3, 1993.

Context A: Gloss-initial

| 26.1. | | 'ăn | nĭ [-]ì tăndūla |

Context B.1

41.7	/ 'au pa mĭ tai	'ăn	pen / gāṁ rap cet
37.4	nay --- ra hi/	'ăn	pen gāṁ ra(p)
3.4	cām sĭla hā/	'ăn	pen gāṁ rap /
38.7	nĭ lē /	'ăn	pen gāṁ / (rap) 5
16.3	kē dān brahñā	'ann	/ pen gāṁ rap
24.6	'au mā reian tai	'ann	/ pen gāṁ rap hā
23.7	' hēṅ tan #	'ann	/ pen gāṁ rap sip
40.3	[ ] mitthĭlā nagara	'ann	pen / gām rap sāṅ
17.5	/rahñā cet gan	'ann	pen / gāṁ rap ñi
20.2	pen paro/[ ]	'a(n)n	pen gāṁ (rap) s- [ ]
15.4	dăn hlăy # /	'ann	pen gāṁ rap # 19 #
35.3	[----m--t]	'ann	pen gāṁ rap 20 ( )
7.3	pai [ ] [ ] #	'ann	pen gāṁ rap ce(t)
5.4	sāṅ nĭ lē	'ann	pen gāṁ rap hā lē #
6.4	thăn mai seip #	'ann	pen gāṁ rap hak #
18.3	cet gan #	'ann	pen gāṁ rap ñĭ sip

Context B.2

10.4	sātsatā' # /	'ăn	gāṁ rap sĭp #
27.2	jā/tak	'ăn	gāṁ ra/p hak #

Context C.1

38.4	kē / neia	'ăn.	pen luṅ / kē neia
33.4	kē fūṅ neia	'ann	pen luṅ - nĭ lē
5.2	/ pen sretsathĭ	'ann	pen cau kē / khā

Context C.2

14.3	/ kē brām	'ăn	pujā fai -- 'ann pen
41.6	gwā/m [-]āy	'ăn	cakhe căk / 'au pa
17.2	...hi(sa)ttwa pen mā'	'a(n)/n	mā (maṅ)gal
35.2	fū(ṅ) liṅ	'ann	tai [----m--t

Context D: Fragment

| 2.3 | [ ] / --wwa-- | 'ann | ---- / --- åṅ # |

Figure 1: ETh. *'ann ~ 'ăn* in context [Sd.32]

116

Context A

14.3	desanā dharrma /	**kē**	brām 'ăn pūjā fai --
18.2	dessanā dharrma	**kē**	brahñā / cet gan
16.3	dessanā dharr/ma	**kē**	dān brahñā 'ann
17.4	d[e]ssanā dharrma	**kē**	dāw b/rahñā
15.3	dessanā dharrma	**kē**	khau dăn hlāy # /

Context B

35.1	pen brahñā	**kē**	fū/(n) lin 'ann
33.3	/ pen brahñā	**kē**	fū/n neia 'ann pen
38.3	/ pen brahñā	**kē**	/ neia 'ăn pen lun
17.3	pen mā (man)gal	**kē**	brahñā /
38.5	'ăn pen lun /	**kē**	neia taww tå/n
5.2	'ann pen cau	**kē**	/ khā mē lūk
34.2	bod/dhisătwa pen rsī	**kē**	p/risnā rāja

Figure 2: ETh. *kē* in context [Sd.32]

Context A

43.1	#	'ăssātamala jā'k (b)raḥ
6.1	#	'ārāmdūsaka jātak
17.1	#	(g)au(j)jāniya jātak braḥ
13.1	#	(w)ātamigga jātak /
41.1	#	bān [ ] / k
27.1	#	debadhaṁma jā/tak
31.1	#	gāmma' ni jātak braḥ
12.1	(#)	kăndi jātak braḥ
28.1	#	katththahari jāta/ka
16.1	#	kukkūra jātak braḥ
53.1	#	kutdhāla jāta(k) [ ]
11.1	#	lăkkhaṇa jātak # braḥ
4.1	#	măkkasa jātak braḥ
29.1	#	măkkhadeba jātak #
30.1	#	nigrotdha jātak braḥ
57.1	#	sāram- jātak -- [ ]
10.1	#	sukkhawīhāra jā'tak #
7.1	#	wāruṇīdūsaka jātak
34.1	#	[ ] (jātak) bod/dhi...

Context B.1: *lē* marked by sentence-boundary (plaque-final)

3.5	gāṁ rap / sām lē	#
11.2	gāṁ rap sīp' et lē	#
5.4	gāṁ rap hā lē	#

Context B.2: plaque-final

10.4	'ăn gāṁ rap sīp	#	
15.4	'ann pen gāṁ rap	#	19 #
2.4	----- / --- åṅ	#	
41.8	/ gāṁ rap cet	#	
12.3	gāṁ / rap sip sām	#	
13.5	gāṁ / rap sip sī		
27.3	gāṁ ra/p hak	#	
17.6	gāṁ rap ñi sip sām	#	
18.3	gāṁ rap ñĭ sip si	#	
16.4	gāṁ rap ñĭ sip såṅ	#	
15.4	pen gāṁ rap # 19		
6.4	pen gāṁ rap hak		
4.5	pen gāṁ rap sĭ		
21.4	[ ] / (ra)p hak		

Context C.1: Gloss-final

13.4	..../ṇāsī ba rāja	#	gāṁ / rap sip sī #
22.4	ba/ (k)i(n) (p)lā	#	gāṁ rap sā/m sip

Context C.2: Gloss-final

10.3	jī grū sātsatā'	#	/ 'ăn gāṁ rap sīp

Figure 3: Graphically marked sentence-boundaries # in Sd.32 in context

118

Context C.3: Gloss-final

23.7	/ hēṅ tan	#	'ann / pen gāṁ rap
7.3	pai [ ] / [ ]	#	'ann pen gāṁ rap ce(t)
18.3	/ cet gan	#	'ann pen gāṁ rap ñī sip
6.3	liṅ thân mai seip	#	/ 'ann pen gāṁ rap
15.3	kē khau dăṅ hlāy	#	/ 'ann pen gāṁ rap #

Context D: Gloss-closing

57.3	waww / ra [ ]	#
28.7	/ braṁdatta	#
30.3	jī nig/rotdha	#
31.3	grū dān braḥñā	#
43.3	cay / mē dān	#

Context E.1: Title-closing

| 46.1 | kālakanni jātak | # | meia bodhisattwa / [|
| 47.1 | / [ ] jātak | # | meia bodhisat[--] / [|

Context E.2: Title-closing

10.1	sukkhahawīthāra jā'tak	#	braḥ / bodhisătt...
11.1	# lăkkhaṇa jātak	#	braḥ bodhisăttwa /
19.1	(mauranăcca) jātak	#	braḥ bo/dhisattwa [
22.1	/ baka jātak	#	braḥ b(o)dhi/(sa)ttwa
25.1	/ culaka jātak	#	bodisăttwa pen /
29.1	măkkhadeba jātak	#	braḥ bodhisăt/wa
32.1	/ (tittha jātak)	#	braḥ bodhi/sattwa
39.1	dummedhajātak	#	braḥ / bodhisattwa
40.1	culajanaka jātak	#	braḥ / bodhisăt[-]...

Figure 3: Graphically marked sentence-boundaries # in Sd.32 in context

No. Index	Sd.32 Title [vernacular]	lines	ISP page	CI V page	Fournereau				Jātaka
					page	no.	plate	rubbing	
1	mahāsīlawa	4	393	83¤	95-7	37	XXV.4	63	51
2	[kapoṭa]	4	394	63¤	83-85	28	XXIII.1	54	42
3	punapāni	5	395	103	108-9	39	XXVI.2	65	53
4	mắkkasa	5	396	68	86-7	30	XXIII.3	56	44
5	rohiṇi	4	397	70	88-9	31	XXIV.1	57	45
6	'ārāmadūsaka	4	398	71	89-90	32	XXIV.2	58	46
7	wāruṇidūsaka	3	399	73	90-91	33	XXIV.3	59	47
8	[wedapba]	3	400	74	91-2	34	XXV.1	60	48
9	beriwātda	3	401	115¤	116-7	44	XXVIII.2	71	59
10	sukkhawīhāra	4	402	22	61-2	9	XV.1	27	10
11	lắkkhaṇa	2	403	26	63-4	11	XVI.1	29	11
12	kăndi	3	404	19	60-1	8	XIV.2	23	13
13	wātamigga	5	405	29	64-5	12	XVI.2	31	14
14	mắṭṭakabhatṭa	4	406	38	69-71	16	XVII.4	35	18
15	'āyācitabắt	4	407	41	71-2	17	XVII.5	36	19
16	kukkūra	4	408	46¤†	74-5	20	XIX.1	39	22
17	gaujjāniya	6	409	52	77-8	22	XX.1	41	24
18	gaujā'nīya	3	410	49¤†	76-7	21	XIX.2	40	23 Bkk
19	[nacca]	6	411	62¤	82-3	27	XXII.3	52	32
20	[maccha]	2	412	54¤	78-9	23	XXI.1	48	34
21	(sakunā)	4	413	56¤	79-80	24	XXI.2	49	36
22	baka	5	414	59¤	81-2	26	XXII.2	51	38
23	pecñāwud[dha]	8	415	107¤	110-12	41	XXVII.1	67	55 Bkk÷
24	kāncanakhaṇndha	7	416	111¤	112-3	42	XXVII.2	68	56 Bkk÷
25	culaka	4	417	3¤	50-51	2	XI.2	14	4
26	tăndula	5	418	5¤	52-3	3	XII.1	15	5
27	debadhaṁma	3	419	7	53-5	4	XII.2	16	6
28	katththahāri	7	420	9	55-6	5	XIII.1	17	7
29	mắkkhadeba	3	421	11	57-8	6	XIII.2	19	9
30	nigrotdha	3	422	13	58-9	7	XIV.1	22	12
31	gāmma'ni	3	423	21†‡	-	-			8
32	(tiṭtha)	4	424	24¤	62-3	10	XV.2	28	25
33	ṭipallaṭamiga	9	425	34	67-8	14	XVII.2	33	16
34	[māluka]	5	426	36	68-9	15	XVII.3	34	17
35	[naḷapana]	4	427	42	72-3	18	XVIII.1	37	20
36	kuruṅmikga	3	428	44¤	73-4	19	XVIII.2	38	21
37	[welukā]	5	429	66¤	85-6	29	XXIII.2	55	43
38	kharādiya	8	430	32	65-7	13	XVII.1	32	15
39	dummedha	10	431	80¤	94-5	36	XXV.3	62	50
40	culajanaka	4	432	90¤†	97-107	38	XXVI.1	64	52
41	[wānaripada]	8	433	112¤	114-5	43	XXVIII.1	69	57

No. Index	Sd.32 Title [vernacular]	lines	ISP page	CI V page	Fournereau page	no.	plate	rubbing	Jātaka
42	sǎṅkha	7	434	116	117-8	45	XXIX.1	77	60
43	'ǎssātamalajā'ka	3	435	117	118-9	46	XXIX.2	78	61
44	nanda	3	436	121◻	120-1	47	XXIX.4	80	39
45	[khadirǎṅgāra]	3	437	123◻	121-2	48	XXIX.5	81	40
46	kālakanni	3	438	126◻	123-4	49	XXX.2	82	83
47	['ǎtthǎssadwāra]	3	439	128◻	124-5	50	XXX.1	84	84
48	phala	2	440	105◻†	109-10	40	XXVI.3	66	54
49	(sīla)[wi]ma	4	-	130	-	-	XXXI.2	?	86
50	['abhiṇha]	3-4?	-	-	-	-	-	-	27
51	(tayaudhāṁma)	5?	-	-	-	-	-	-	58
52	[sā]keta	4?	-		-	-	-	-	68
53	kutdāla	4?	-	pl. LXXXI	-	-	-	-	70
54	[mahāsupina]	4?	-	-	-	-	-	-	77
55	['atthassadwāra]	4?	-	-	-	-	-	-	84
56	maṅgala	4?	-		-	-	-	-	87
57	sāram(bha)	3?	-		-	-	-	-	88
58	'apanna	3?	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
59	[wisawanta]	2?	-	pl. LXXX	-	-	-	-	69

TABLE 1: Synopsis of Jātaka glosses occurring in Sd.32

This synopsis lists the names of the Jātakas in vernacular spellings only; the running numbers to the left follow the sequence of the glosses as they are published in *ISP*. The symbols ◻, † and ‡ following the page-reference to *CI* V indicate respectively that the gloss is reproduced there as a photograph, line-drawing and rubbing; the absence of a symbol implies that all three are reproduced in *CI* V. ÷ currently not on display.

Jātaka	No. Index	ISP page	CI V page	Fournereau page	no.
1	58				
4	25	417	3	50-51	2
5	26	418	5	52-3	3
6	27	419	7	53-5	4
7	28	420	9	55-6	5
8	31	423	21	-	-
9	29	421	11	57-8	6
10	10	402	22	61-2	9
11	11	403	26	63-4	11
12	30	422	13	58-9	7
13	12	404	19	60-1	8
14	13	405	29	64-5	12
15	38	430	32	65-7	13
16	33	425	34	67-8	14
17	34	426	36	68-9	15
18	14	406	38	69-71	16
19	15	407	41	71-2	17
20	35	427	42	72-3	18
21	36	428	44	73-4	19
22	16	408	46	74-5	20
23	18	410	49	76-7	21
24	17	409	52	77-8	22
25	32	424	24	62-3	10
32	19	411	62	82-3	27
35	20	412	54	78-9	23
36	21	413	56	79-80	24
38	22	414	59	81-2	26
39	44	436	121	120-1	47
40	45	437	123	121-2	48
42	2	394	63	83-85	28
43	37	429	66	85-6	29
44	4	396	68	86-7	30
45	5	397	70	88-9	31
46	6	398	71	89-90	32
47	7	399	73	90-91	33
48	8	400	74	91-2	34
50	39	431	80	94-5	36
51	1	393	83	95-7	37
52	40	432	90	97-107	38
53	3	395	103	108-9	39
54	48	440	105	109-10	40
55	23	415	107	110-12	41
56	24	416	111	112-3	42
57	41	433	112	114-5	43
58	51				
59	9	401	115	116-7	44
60	42	434	116	117-8	45
61	43	435	117	118-9	46

Jātaka	No. Index	ISP page	CI V page	Fournereau page	no.
68	52				
69	59				
70	53				
77	54				
83	46	438	126	123-4	49
84	47	439	128	124-5	50
84	55				
86	49	-	130	[XXXI.2]	-
87	56				
88	57				

TABLE 2a: Synopsis — Jātaka reference numbers and *ISP*–based sequence

Fournereau page	no.	Jātaka	No. Index	ISP [page]	CI V [page]
50-51	2	4	25	417	3
52-3	3	5	26	418	5
53-5	4	6	27	419	7
55-6	5	7	28	420	9
57-8	6	9	29	421	11
58-9	7	12	30	422	13
60-1	8	13	12	404	19
61-2	9	10	10	402	22
62-3	10	25	32	424	24
63-4	11	11	11	403	26
64-5	12	14	13	405	29
65-7	13	15	38	430	32
67-8	14	16	33	425	34
68-9	15	17	34	426	36
69-71	16	18	14	406	38
71-2	17	19	15	407	41
72-3	18	20	35	427	42
73-4	19	21	36	428	44
74-5	20	22	16	408	46†
76-7	21	23	18	410	49†
77-8	22	24	17	409	52
78-9	23	35	20	412	54
79-80	24	36	21	413	56
81-2	26	38	22	414	59
82-3	27	32	19	411	62
83-85	28	42	2	394	63
85-6	29	43	37	429	66
86-7	30	44	4	396	68
88-9	31	45	5	397	70
89-90	32	46	6	398	71
90-91	33	47	7	399	73
91-1	34	48	8	400	74
94-5	36	50	39	431	80
95-7	37	51	1	393	83
97-107	38	52	40	432	90
108-9	39	53	3	395	103
109-10	40	54	48	440	105
110-12	41	55	23	415	107
112-3	42	56	24	416	111
114-5	43	57	41	433	112
116-7	44	59	9	401	115
117-8	45	60	42	434	116
118-9	46	61	43	435	117
120-1	47	39	44	436	121
121-2	48	40	45	437	123
123-4	49	83	46	438	126
124-5	50	84	47	439	128
[XXXI.2]	-	86	49		130

TABLE 2b: Synopsis — Fournereau page-reference and *ISP*-based sequence

INDEX