

NOTES AND QUERIES.

I

THE BLOW-PIPE IN NORTH-EASTERN SIAM.

When travelling recently in the province of Chaiyaphum, North-Eastern Siam, I found that the blow-pipe was in common use among the villagers. These blow-pipes are very simple affairs. They are made out of the bamboo called *ruak* (*Thyrsostachys siamensis*). A full-sized one is about three metres in length, but much smaller are sometimes used, particularly by boys. The nodes inside the bamboo culm are burnt out by means of a red-hot iron rod. There is no inner tube, mouth-piece or any kind of ornamentation. The darts are made from pointed bamboo splints, about 40 c. long, wrapped round with cotton-wool at the blunt end. As might be imagined with a pole three metres long, the pipe is rather unwieldy, and usually has to be rested on a branch in order to get a steady aim. It is used almost entirely for shooting birds.

A. KERR.

Bangkok, May 1931.

II

A KAREN DOGGEREL.

On a recent visit to Doi Angka I hired the local Karens to beat the jungle for me on several occasions. One day, after some hours of fruitless tramping under a scorching sun, we sat down to rest, and I observed the following ceremony performed by the head beater.

A dried leaf was picked from a bush, held close to the lips, and a charm whispered to it. Then he broke the leaf crosswise five or six times, the leaf cracking into smaller pieces as he did so, but none

was allowed to fall to the ground. Holding the fragments in his palm he removed them two by two and threw them away. The point of the proceeding was that if two bits of leaf remained in his hand at the end, the hunt would be successful; if only one, further search would be a waste of time. Three or four trials were made, with one fragment left over each time, so there was nothing to do but to return to camp.

With some difficulty I induced the man to dictate to me the words of the charm, which I wrote down in the Siamese character. He was unable to translate their meaning into Lao. The alleged words were as follows:

᳚ ᳚ ᳚
᳚ ᳚ ᳚ ᳚
᳚ ᳚ ᳚ ᳚
᳚ ᳚ ᳚ ᳚
᳚ ᳚ ᳚ ᳚

H. G. DEIGNAN.

Chiengmai, May 1931.

III

SOME LOAN WORDS IN SIAMESE.

The development of imported words into Siamese is in many cases well worth noticing. The following instance may be of interest.

Aya (ଆୟା).

This word is derived from the Sanskrit *ājñā*, "order, authority," made up of the prefix *ā* and the verbal root *jñā*. Early orthography of the word was (ଆୟା) which was an exact transcription into the Siamese of the original classical word. The compound ୟ (ୟ + ଯ) having become obsolete in modern Siamese, it was then written ଆୟା which doubtless is phonetically satisfactory. An attempt is made in the school-dictionary to indicate the etymology by restoring the ୟ and writing ଆଜ୍ଞା. No indication of the sound being given, many people adopted a new pronunciation of the word, that is *achāya*, which is of course unreal.

Let us now examine the development of its meaning which is even more eventful. For this particular purpose I have adopted my own translation of the titles of the Laws quoted, which may not be found in legal works. The following passages are intended to illustrate this development:—

ໂປຣານ ຮາຊກະອັນຕົກແຕ່ປາງກອນ ພຣະອັນຄອຮຽງພຣະກຣຽມາເພື່ອຈະນີ້ໃຫ້
ນຸກຂົມຄວ່າກະວ່າຫຼາຍແຕ່ຮາມໝູງຕ່າງເກີນ ພຣະ ຮາຊ ອາຊູາ ຈຶ່ງໃຫ້ຕາພະ
ຮາມບັນຫຼຸງທ..... (ດັກຂະນະ ອາຊາຫດວັງ, L. 24, 18a-c).
that is, in English:

"Ancient monarchs of yore, in their benevolence, lest their chief councillors and learned men as well as their people should misuse the Royal Authority, had the following law promulgated....."

Law on Royal Authority, Preamble.

Again :

ຈະກຳດາວຸນ ດົດດວກທອນບັນບັດ ກີດຄວາມແກ້ກັນ ດັວຍຕ່າງເກີນຂົມໜ່ວຍຜູນດ້ວຍ
ອຸປາຍ ຕ່າງໆ ທານ ອາຊູາ ແກ້ໄຂ ຕ່າງ ເອງ (ດັກຂະນະ ອາຊູາ ຮາມໝູງ, L.24,2,
124a-c).

"Now (we) shall treat of the fundamental category of litigation which covers cases in which one party infringes maliciously upon the rights of another on his own personal *authority*"

Law on Private Authority, Preamble.

It is evident from the above two passages that the word still retained its original meaning of 'authority'. The spelling of the passages quoted is that of the Recension of 1805 A. D.

The Thārmāsat (තෘම්සත), the date of which is, truly speaking, unknown, although the sixteenth century has been plausibly suggested as the date of its introduction, shows a difference in meaning in the following passage.

.....ອັນວາກິරຍາທອດຈົ່ງ ອາຊູາ ແລ້ວໃໝ່ໃໝ່ອັນໄດ.....ແກ
ບປຄດທງຫດາຍຝູ້ແພດດ.....ອັນວາດັກຂະນະນາຈາລະຍົກດ້າງ.....
ຂໍ້ວາດັກຂະນະທັນທີ (ພຣະກຣຽມສັຕິර, L. 1, 2, 83).

"The act of extending punishment and fines or fees to the defeated litigant is called *thāñth* (Skt. *danda*).

The juxtaposition of ‘fines or fees’ would seem to warrant taking the word օպա in the sense of punishment.

Finally:

บุคคลควรรับ օ պա ตามเมื่อมันได้กระทำการอันกฎหมาย
.....บัญชีที่ร่วงเป็นความผิดแต่กำหนดโทษไว้

“A person shall only be *punished*.....”, Official translation which served as original draft of the Penal Code of 1908.

A literal translation of this would be:

“A person shall receive *punishment* only when he has committed an act which the Law ordains as wrong and for which it lays down a penalty.”

Also from the same source:

แต օ պա ที่จะใช้ลงโทษผู้กระทำผิดนักไม่ควรใช้ օ պա ออย่างอื่น
นอกจากอาญาที่บัญชีไว้ในกฎหมาย

“No other *punishment* than that *defined* by law shall be inflicted.”

These two passages show clearly how the modern sense of the word has become specified.

From the above it is fairly clear that the exact meaning of օպա and գոյմանօպա are apt to be misunderstood, since it is more usual to speak in general of the Criminal Court and Criminal Law.

Turning again to words in general use outside the technique of Law, we find օպաສିଦ୍ଧି, *ayasiddhi* (Skt. *Ājñāsiddhi*), meaning ‘absolute power over life and death’ given to a commander in chief in a campaign, thus: พระราชนาんօպାସିଦ୍ଧିଗେମତିପ, “the King gave power over life and death to the commander in chief,” that is the commander was vested with the *siddhi* of *ājñā*, in other words with the *ājñā* (of the King). օպାଜକ୍ର (Skt. *ājñācakra*) is used quite vaguely and seems to have no connection with the original meaning in Sanskrit of the mystic circle of the Tantras, thus: ତାହାପରଜାତନଲ୍ବତ ୟୋହୀହେଚେତ୍ଵାସାପାଜକ୍ର, “if I commit a perjury, may I never escape the penalty of state” (a common vow).

The Pali form of the same word, ອານາ (ānā), is quite widely used in Siamese, mostly in a slightly different sense. By itself it is seldom met with. It occurs however in the formula of Invitation in the ceremony of Coronation:—

“ ຂອພຣະອັກຄົງທຽບແຜຄວາມປົກກຣອງ ແດຍໆພຣະຣາຊ ອານາ ໄທເປັນໄປແກປະເທີສົດຕ່ວທິກຫດາຍເຫດານ ”

The Pali original, also repeated in the ceremony, being:

Guttim tesam pasārento

Āññam vattetu rājakam

or in English,

“ extend his protection and exercise royal authority ” etc.

The compounds of ānā are numerous and still widely used, though it seems hard to detect their original sense. They show, by the method they are written, that they could not have been imported but were locally coined, for they are jumbles of Sanskrit and Pali words thus ānā (Pali) + cakra (Sansk.); ānā (Pali) + prajā (Sansk.) + rāstra (Sansk.) = ānāprajārāstra which is pronounced *anaprācharad* in Siamese. ອານາເຂົາ *anakhet* and ອານາຈັກ *anacāk* are loosely used to designate the extent of a political state, and may be seen translated in official papers as Kingdom, when applied to Siam, with the addition of ຮາජ (royal), thus:

ສະພາປະເທດເປັນຮາජ ອານາ ຈັກ ອັນໜຶ່ງອັນດີຍົວແບ່ງແຍກມີໄດ້. “ The Kingdom of Siam is one and indivisible ”. *The State Constitution, 2475*, (sect. 1).

Also, ສກາພນອກອາດານາເຂົາ is “ exterritoriality ”.

As regards ອານາປະຊາມຸງກູດ we find for instance in the preamble to the Constitution above mentioned the injunction that:

ຂອໃຫ້ພຣະບຣມງຄ່ານຸ່ງຄົງສົດຕະລຸ ແລະ ຂໍາຮາຊກາຣທິກທ່ານພດເຮືອນທວຍ ອານາ ປຣະຊ່າງ ອາංຊ ຈົມື່ຄວາມຄົມຄົງ ໂນລ່ຽມ ເອກຄັນທ ໃນອັນຈະກັບຊາ ປັງບຕ່ຽງຮັນນູ່ ແກ່ຮ່າຊອານາຈັກຮ່າຍນ. ”

Let members of My Royal Family, members of My Government services, military as well as civil, and the bulk of the *people* unite as a whole in maintaining this Constitution of the Kingdom of Siam,.....

The compound ອານາປະໂຍບນ though seemingly indicating something like *state revenue* is now used in the sense of *private income*, as for instance in the phrase: ເອົ້ປະປັນອານາປະໂຍບນແກ່ຕົນ, which may be translated, "Take away as one's income", *i.e.* appropriate. Parallel instances are not uncommon in Siamese, and one can quite frequently hear an elderly servant speaking of his master's service as ລາຄາທ ທີ່ strictly speaking should apply only to that of the King.

ໄຫຍ່, *thos.*

The word is obviously identical with the Sanskrit *dosa* and Pali *dosa*, "wrong." In Siamese its meaning ranges from 'wrong' to 'guilt' and 'punishment'. I have not been able to trace its successive development, but here are some examples of its uses:

(1) as *Wrong*: ຂອຂມາໄຫຍ່, ຂອອັບໄຫຍ່: to ask for forgiveness of *wrong* done. For comparison with the Sanskrit no classical example has occurred to me, but Apte, in his *English-Sanskrit Dictionary* (Bombay 1893), gives, under 'Apology': *Svadoṣa Svikārah*, which is suggestive.

ຂອໄຫຍ່ is an abbreviated form of the above.

In medical parlance, it is used as in the Sanskrit, *e.g.* for *Vāyudosa*, we have: ລມໃກ້ໄຫຍ່, ເສນໜໃກ້ໄຫຍ່, 'the wind-element causes a disorder, or phlegm causes a disorder'.

(2) as *Guilt*: which is also found in the original Sanskrit, there is ໄທໝານຸໄຫຍ່, *thosanīthos*, *e.g.* ລພວະຈາກອາງຸປາຕາມໄທໝານຸໄຫຍ່, to inflict the King's punishment (*aya*) according to the magnitude of his guilt (*lit.* to his [greater] guilt or lesser guilt), and consequently the punishment prescribed for his offence.

(3) as *Punishment*: the word however has developed into punishment, for which no equivalent exists, I believe, in the original Sanskrit, thus: ຄູລົງໄຫຍ່ຄືຝຍໍ, ຄູກຳໄຫຍ່ຄືຝຍໍ, "the teacher punishes his pupil". and ນີ້ໄຫຍ່ຜິດ seems to indicate a sense of being guilty of some wrong (offence).

Thus *thos* has usurped the meaning of *thăñth* (ທັນທໍ), which has almost dropped out of current speech except in proper names as ກ່ຽວກັບທັນທໍ 'the Prison Department of the Government', and in a few compounds such as: ໄທໝທັນທໍ, meaning 'punishment'.

It should also be noticed in this connection that another form looking almost alike, ໂທສ thosa, often ໂທໂສ thoso, meaning 'anger,' is known in Siamese. It is from the Pali *dosa* and the Sanskrit *dvesha*. The latter, (ඩ්වේස, *thāvēśa*) too is found in poetical use but with a different meaning, i. e. 'sorrow'.

However the word is seldom used with its correct meaning of 'anger' except in priestly or educated circles, being replaced as a rule by ໂມໂຫ, *moho*, (e. g. ໂມໄທກິດ, 'I am angry'), which in Pali designates 'infatuation.' The reason for this confusion may be that these two words, *doso* and *moho* (along with *lobho*) appear side by side in the enumeration of the 'three roots of evil,' known to all Siamese as they are the subject of countless sermons.

D.

IV A FURTHER NOTE ABOUT KHU MU'ANG.

A propos of Major Seidenfaden's notes on Khu Mu'ang (JSS, vol. XXVII, pt. I, pp. 105-110), the following additional information might be of interest:—

There exists a memorandum dated 1782 (1146 of the Little Era), bearing the statements of a former official in charge of the Sacred Footprint (Phrabad), who was questioned by a committee as to the past general administration of the shrine. The result of the enquiry is recorded in the form of a statement (ຄໍາໃຫ້ກາງ) which was a common way of recording an enquiry into any important subject. Now, since the fall of Ayudhya King Taksin was so busy with his wars of deliverance that he hardly had any time left for much else. As his wars were being successfully terminated he unfortunately lost his reason. Anarchy followed until King Rama I. started the reorganisation of administration in 1780. It is possible therefore that the process was just extending to Phrabad in 1782 by the appointment of a new curator who was president of the above-mentioned committee of investigation. The former official, known as Khun Khlon, is stated to have served under the monarchs of Ayudhya now known as King Boromakos or "The late King" (1732-1758) and the King of the Suriyamarind Mansion (1758-1767). This 'statement' was published in 1918 (B. E. 2461) in the 7th part of the Prachum Phongsawadar.

The gist of the statement as far as concerns Khu Mu'ang is as follows:—

Originally there used to be a township called Khidkhin (or Kitkin) which also had a Pali name "Parantapa". When, however, the Sacred Footprint was discovered 300 sen therefrom, the name Parantapa was transferred to the newly created township of Phrabad. The set of titles for the staff of its administrative council was also transferred along with the name of the district. The statement goes on to say that "whoever was not a native of the locality would not have been able to identify Parantapa at all, because the township had ceased to qualify as such long since, since the days, in fact, of King Kala. In that town there existed a double moat, four gates, namely : the Narrow Gate (Pratu Song), the Gate of Victory, the Water Gate, and the Gate of the Dead....." There was also a post for tying the white elephant on the mound of the palace, an ancient human skull which measured 8 *kam* (fist breadths). There were 15 monasteries, namely Wats : Dharmasena, Saraphi, Sak, Mahalok, Kok Ban Mo, Hua Tapan, Čæng Nang Phien Nang Phot, Ket, Sud, Khwid, Luang, Nakh, Phra Non, Phinoy; and Nonsi. There were 21 villages, namely : Ban Talatnoy, Ban Wat Taphan, Ban Khnon Sasong, Ban Yai, Ban Khamot, Ban Noy, Ban Kho Saraphi, Ban Rai, Ban Kramang, Ban Pla Khwan, Ban Bang Yani, Ban Bang Khamin, Ban Mabpho, Ban Khwang, Ban Makok, Ban Mo, Ban Nongcik, Ban Nongsrakæ, Ban Krau Krabtang. The distance from Khidkhin to the spring called Songkrib was 45 sen, thence to the Narai spring, 30 sen, and thence to the spring called *Thar thwai sor* (ທາດຫວ່າຍສົງ), 200 sen"

The greater part of the 'statement' is occupied with a description of the shrine of the Sacred Footprint and its locality as well as the details and usages of its administration, civil as well as ecclesiastical.

From the above description one can readily identify this old township with the Khu Mu'ang of Major Seidenfaden. Examining the statement of Khun Khlon side by side with that of Major Seidenfaden we find quite accurate corroborations. Both mentioned the double moat, the mound of the palace or Kok Prasat with its elephant post and the gigantic skull. Some differences exist with regards to the gates, for Seidenfaden records five and many different names. The 'Narrow Gate' of Khun Khlon is not found in Seidenfaden's account, although it is quite possible that there still exists a gap which might have answered to the name in those days but has been forgotten.

The name of the second gate is found in Seidenfaden's map, but he was told that this (south-western) gap was one "of quite recent origin". Of the Water Gate no mention is made by Seidenfaden, but the "Gate of the Dead" was identified by him. Walled towns or citadels of any size, I believe, invariably had a front gate (the Gate of Victory), and a back one by which the bodies of dead warriors were carried out for final disposal (the Gate of the Dead). In this case perhaps the south gate and not the south west should have been its front gate—the original Gate of Victory. It follows too that whoever built this place—which by the way might best be called a citadel for reasons which will be explained later—must have been anticipating enemies from the south and south-west. As to the 15 wats and 21 villages within the civil administrative district of Parantapa, no doubt if a thorough examination were carried out on the spot there would be no difficulty in identifying them. From a glance at Seidenfaden's map one would be in the position to identify the following: Wat Dharmasena, Wat Saraphi, Wat Sak, Wat Koh Ban Mo, and Wat Tapan; and also the following villages: Ban Talatnoy, Ban Mo, Ban Yai, Ban Khamot, and Ban Saraphi. These villages are situated along the present railway line from north to south. Our map does not extend very far to the west of the citadel, and thus many villages are still unidentified. Major Seidenfaden might still identify others but unfortunately he happened to be away while this was being written. As regards the places mentioned in connection with distances, their names are worthy of note in that they show their connection with the Siamese legend of Rama. Khidkhin is obviously the local form of the Sanskrit Kishkindha, the capital of Sugriva's kingdom. The other names of the same township, Senaraja Nakhon (i. e. Nagarā) and Parantapa, have not as far as I have been able to find out, been used either in the Indian epic or the Siamese legend of Rama to denote the capital of Sugriva. The name "Senaraja Nakhon" of the Phongsawadar Nu'a might of course by a stretch of imagination be interpreted as "the capital of the lord of the forces", referring to Sugriva's position as generalissimo of Rama's main army, although it is to be doubted whether "Senaraja" was ever used in that sense in good Sanskrit. The names of the springs on the road, Songkrib and Narai, are highly suggestive. In the Lao legend of Rama, Sugriva is called Sangkib. It is a well known fact that the Lao never retains an *r* when compounded

with another consonant, and the identification of Songkrib would therefore seem to be reasonable, especially when the general's name is so prominent in this neighbourhood. Narai is of course the local form of Nārāyaṇa, or Vishnu. The name of the stream, *Thar thwai sor*, means the stream where the bow was presented. This probably refers to the Episode in the Ramakien when Rāma Sūr (*i. e.* the Paraçu Rāma of the Indian legend) was vanquished by Rama and made him a present of a divine bow. As a matter of fact the surrounding country abounds in names connected with the legend of Rama.

The above provides a confirmation of the existence of a civil administrative district centred around this citadel of Khu Muang. Our information does not warrant the conclusion that the district consisted exclusively of the stretch of land comprised within this double moat, for in its enumeration of villages and monasteries it went a long way north-east, east and south of it. It is therefore a confirmation, in my opinion, of Seidenfaden's conjecture that the site could never have been a town. As to his suggestion however of its having been an island temple surrounded by a double moat which would easily lend itself to an employment as a fortress or a point d'appui, I should rather be inclined to imagine that it was indeed a citadel topped by a Hindu sanctuary intended for purposes of moral stimulation to its defence.

Our information unfortunately clears up nothing as regard its history. Its mention of Phya Kalaraj leaves us where we were. This King, since whose days Parantapa had been left to ruin, is hard to identify. Who was he, when and over what territory did he reign? The 'statement' passes over his name in a casual way. Khun Khlon might have taken for granted that everybody knew about this monarch or he might have been unable to furnish any further information himself. There are three possible alternatives in this respect. First, it might refer to a definite person, in which case we can offer no further conjecture for we have no information at all about any king of that name. Secondly, it might have been an abbreviated form of a longer name, and thirdly it might have been used in the sense of an epithet meaning 'the Black King', in the same way as King Naresuan used to be called the Black Prince. In these two alternatives there are certain possibilities. The Phongsawadār Nu'a says that Lavo was founded in c. s. 459 (B. E.

1002) by King Kalavarnatissa, the son of King Kakaphat, reigning in Takkasila (? Cambodia) and some 500 years later King Kraisor of Lavo, son of the man who founded Bisnulok, sent men to build Senaraja Nakhon about 500 sen from his capital. The first named King, Kalavarnatissa, could not have been the one who left the citadel to ruin for the obvious reason that the Phongsawadar Nua dates him considerably before the foundation of Senaraja Nakhon. With regard therefore to its origin and early history it would seem that our new information leaves Major Seidenfaden's theory still unchallenged.

D.

Bangkok, 8th October 1934.

V

THE EARLIEST TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPEL INTO SIAMESE.

Among the many interesting documents preserved in the Library of the "Missions Etrangères" at headquarters in Paris is a roughly bound volume entitled: "Premier livre de l'Evangile mis en Siam par Mgr de Metellopolis et achevé en 1685."

The book consists of pages of stout coarse paper (estimated size about 10" x 7") covered with Siamese script of the slanting type used in the seventeenth century, prefaced by two lines in Pali characters, and written by hand with good black ink. The writing runs from left to right along the breadth of the pages, so that the book must be held broad-wise to be read.

The first two lines of Pali appear to be an invocation such as is often found at the begining of Thai chronicles. It is followed by a free translation of the first chapter of St. Luke's gospel, beginning at verse five, and introduced by a few words relating to the period in the world's history at which the narrative took place.

The translation is clearly what is known as a free translation, adapted for the understanding of Siamese readers to whom such Hebrew words as Jehovah would be incomprehensible. The word Angel is explained as ມହାତ୍ମା and the epithet for the Almighty is rendered by the Siamese phrase "ທ່ານ ທ່ັນ". Modern translators have adhered more closely to the Greek text, with which both Vulgate and English Bible renderings here coincide; and it is open to question

whether the system of free translation adopted by the Bishop is not preferable to the modern practice.

The Bishop of Metellopolis, the translator, was Louis Laneau, the heroic victim of the misunderstanding between the Siamese and General Desfarges in 1688. He guaranteed the strict observance by the General of the terms of withdrawal of the French garrison from Siam after Phaulkon's fall, and the General's failure to observe these terms led to the imprisonment of the Bishop and his fellow-workers for about two years at Ayuthia.

By nature and inclination the Bishop appears to have been ill-adapted for the political duties which fell to his lot, but all the record agree in extolling his patience and dignity in adversity. According to his contemporary, Fr. Poquet, the Bishop's chief contribution to the Mission was literary, and his translation of the Gospel is proof of his erudition and of his enlightened ambition, which aimed at presenting the Gospel to the Siamese in a form less strange to them than it would have appeared in a textual translation from the original.

Bishop Laneau died at Ayuthia in 1696, after thirty two years continuous residence and labour in Siam.

The original Manuscript was photographed by me in Paris in August 1931. The transcription has been made with the assistance of a friend in Chiengmai, who desires to remain anonymous.

E. HUTCHINSON.

Chiengmai, 15th August 1933.

ສຖ້າພວກ ເອກຕາ ພຸທະກຸລັນກາວ ວິຍື່ຕຸພຸກຸດເຕ ຄູປາດີປຸນໍ ປັດສ໏າ
ນາຄີ ເອກຢູ່ຈານ ໂຄປຕຸຕາຍ ມາຫາກທຳ ອົາດອີຕີ ພຸທະເບີຕົມ ທີ່ ປູຖຸຈົດ
ແຕແຮກປັນພົກພອນປັບປຸງກີ່ສ່າງໃໝ່ພາແດແຜນດິນມີກ່າຽນໄດ້ 4000 ປັບ
ໃນກາດນໍຍັງມີພຣະນໍາທາງກ່ຽວຂ້ອງກົດຕົກຕົກ ແລ້ວ ດັນທີ່
ເຊົ່າຍຮາຊສົມບົດດີໃນເມື່ອງຮ່ອມາແດກຮອບກຣອງບົນກຣົງພົກພ ແດນທາກຮູ້ຕ່າງ
ອັງກຸດຕົກຕົກ ແລ້ວ ໄກສົງເກົ່າຫຼຸງຜູ້ໃຫຍ້ຜູ້ໃຫຍ້ ຂໍວ່າເຫຼົ່າເຫັນນັ້ນໃຫ້ເປັນພໍ່ງໆ
ໃນເມືອງບູເຊເດກ ① ໃນກາດນໍຍັງມີໜໍາຫຼຸງຮູ້ຜົນງານ ຂໍວ່າດີເຮັດວຽກ ແກ້ໄຂ

นั้นนามซึ่งกว้างແຍດສໍາແບດແຕທັກວິຍາແຕ່ດ້ານນັກມືຕ່ຽມໃນຂຮອງຊຸກາຮ
ໜີ້ອັດັກ ແລະ ລົງທ໶ນທີ່ພຣະມາເຖິງຄື່ພຣະອິດືນີພນ ແຕ່ນາງເອດສໍາແບດແຕ
ປົກມີໄວຈຸນເງິນຊ່າງກາດຫານຸ່ງຕຽມໃດ ແລ້ວຢ່າງໃນກາຕົວນັ້ນດີ່ກ່ຽຍເອກ່າຍານ
ເຮົາໄປໃນພຣະວ່າຫາຮອກ່າຍແກພຣະມາເຖິງຕາມບູນກ່າຈຳຮັກແຕກກອນ ๑ ຈຶ່ງພຣະ
ນາມຫາເຖິງເປົ້ານາງ⁽¹⁾ ໄຊຍັນຫາອັງຍຸດຄອພຣະມາເຖິງຕາມພັນນາມຊ່ອວາຄາບ
ແອນໃຫນຄຸນຕໍ່ລົມນາໃນພຣະວິຫາຮ ແລ້ວດີ່ເຮັດວຽກການທັນທັນກາຮະເໝນນາໂຫ້
ຢ່າຍອັນນັກມືຕ່ຽມທີ່ກົດຕົງທຸກໄຈກດັວຍນັກໜ້າແລ້ມຫາອັງຍຸດກັ້ນກາດ
ກັດວ່າ ດູກກ່ຽຍຍ້າໄດ້ຕໍ່ຄຸນຕໍ່ກ່ຽຍຍ້າໄດ້ຕໍ່ຄຸນຕໍ່ໄຈກດັວຍແຕກວານປົກງາແໜ່ງ
ສັກເຮົ່າຍື່ງໃດຍາຈ່າຍມີການຊ່າງແກພຣະມາເຖິງແຕກກອນແກພຣະມາເຖິງໃຫ້ອຸ່ນຍາດ
ຕໍ່ເວລັງບົນຫຼູງໃນກາດບັນດິນ ແລ້ວພຣະຍາຈັກຕໍ່ທຽງກ່ຽວກ່າວແຕຈປວັດບູນຫຼູງຫາຍອງໝໍ
ນັ້ນ ແຕ່ໃນກາຕົມເນື້ອບູນຫຼູງຈະອຸປ້ນນາການບັງເກດອອກມານັ້ນ ແລ້ວໜ້າດີກິນ
ທັງຫດາຍຕົ່ນບັງເກດກວ້າມໄສ່ນາກາຮັບສໍາມືນິດ ແດ້ທານຈົງເອນານຸຍາວໃຫ
ເປັ້ນນາມກຣແກ້ມາຮັນນັ້ນ ອັນໆກູມາຮັນຈົບເປັນດີ່ກໍລິກືພຸທ່າຍາກຕ້ອ
ຫນ້າພຣະມາເຖິງ ແຕ່ການຮັນແນນຍັງໄມ່ນອອກຈາກມາຕູ ໂຄງຮ່າແຮ່ມາດາ
ຕໍ່ຄົດຍອມຈົບບົນຫຼູງທັງພຣະພູທົກສົດແດຂາມຸງກາພແໜ່ງພຣະລົ່ມບົຣຖະລົ່ນທົ່ວ ອັນໆ
ກູມາຮັນນັ້ນບໍ່ຫອງຈ່ອງເລີ່ມຕົ້ນດັ່ງນັ້ນແຕ່ຈົບດົກດັ່ງຂຽມເຊັ້ນ
ຊາກຕົ້ນດາຕົມຫຼູມເຄວາໃຫທັງສັດຕິກຳດັ່ງນັ້ນຕະນະ

⁽¹⁾ ນາງ = beautiful woman ? ນາຄ = Protector, charitable.

TRANSLATION.

In the days, four thousand years after the first beginnings of the world, when the earth and sky had their origin, there was reigning in Rome a great Monarch named Augustus Cæsar, whose sway extended over half the earth. The chief Minister appointed by Augustus Cæsar as ruler in Judæa was named Herod.

At that time there lived a famous man named Zacharia; his wife's name was Elizabel; the heart of both husband and wife was just before the Law, and they were renowned for their Faith and Trust in the Great Dewa, "he who overflows and who surpasses".

Now Elizabel, from early youth to old age was barren.

Upon a certain day Zacharia took incense and went into the Sanctuary to worship the great Dewa in accordance with ancient practice. Thereupon, the Great Dewa, supreme and charitable, despatched a mighty "Angel"—that is, one of the higher Dewada named Gabrien, with orders to descend into the Sanctuary.

When Zacharia saw that Angel, his heart fell and he was sore afraid; but the Angel spake and said.—

"O Zacharia, fear not, nor be dismayed: thy desire, which in former days thou didst plead before the Great Dewa, will now be granted, and thy wish fulfilled. Thy wife shall conceive and bear a male child, and at his birth men of all nations shall rejoice.

"Thou shalt give the name of John to thy son. Furthermore, "he shall be a true Minister and perfect disciple of the Great Dewa, and even before he leaves his Mother's womb he shall "abound in virtues and in the grace of The Great Spiritu Santo. "Never will he drink intoxicating liquors, and he will endeavour "to turn the hearts of the people of Judæa towards a renewal of "the Faith....."

VI

A PROPOS DES LOIS SIAMOISES.

La première édition de Bradley.

Pour autant que je sache, la première édition du tome II des Lois procurée par D. B. Bradley manque à la Bibliothèque Nationale Vajirāvudh. L'édition la plus ancienne que renferme ce dépôt est la seconde, datée de 1229 c. s., c'est-à-dire 1867-1868 A. D. Les exemplaires de la première doivent être extrêmement rares. Pour ma part je n'en connais qu'un seul, venu entre mes mains il y a quelques années.

C'est un volume in-8, de pp. 513 + 2 p. n. c., qui mesure, après rognage, 240 × 143 mm., imprimé fort proprement sur un papier grisâtre, à raison de 21 à 23 lignes à la page, en règle générale. Il est daté de 1225 c. s., c'est-à-dire 1863-1864 A. D., et de la treizième année du règne de Mongkut.

Voici le libellé du titre :

หนังสือ | เรื่องกู้หมายเมืองไทย | ได้ท่านแต่งถูกต้องกันกับฉบับหลวง
ทุกเดือน | เมื่อจุดศักราช ๑๒๖๕ บกุญเปญจกศ. | กู้หมายทั้งหมดคด้าย
กัน | เป็นหนังสือต่อเนื่องกันและเด่น | ได้แบ่งทำเป็นหนังสือพมพ์ สองเดือน. |
ในเดือนที่หนึ่ง ๑๒ เรื่องตามที่นิมนต์ให้ออกไว้ | ในที่สุดหนังสือพมพ์นั้น. | ข้าพเจ้า
หมอบรรคเด, | ได้ตพมพ์ รวมบ้อมปากกาดังของบางหลวง. | ณะกรุงเทพ

A la fin du volume, première page non chiffrée, v° de la page 513 et dernière, on trouve une table des matières précédée des trois lignes que voici :

๑ หนังสือเรื่องกู้หมาย

๒ จุดศักราช ๑๒๖๕ บกุญเปญจกศ

ได้ตพมพ์ ในเดือน ๑๒ ศักราชวันกัน, เป็น ๑๒ เรื่องคด

Ces deux textes infirment une assertion de M. Lingat, *L'Esclavage privé . . .*, pp. 28-29, d'après lequel "la tentative (de Nai Môt) fut reprise, avec plus de bonheur; une vingtaine d'années plus tard, par le missionnaire américain D. B. Bradley."

C'est en réalité quatorze ou quinze ans seulement après la tentative de Nai Môt (1849) que Bradley a publié le second volume de sa première édition.

On peut même déterminer plus précisément la date de publication de ce second volume, depuis que le Journal de Bradley est devenu accessible.⁽¹⁾ Sous la date du samedi 30 janvier 1864, Bradley écrit en effet :

(1) *Abstract of the Journal of Rev. Dan Beach Bradley M.D. Medical Missionary In Siam 1835-1873*, Edited by Rev. George Haws Feltus, A.M.B.D., Troy, New York, U. S. A., 1930, 1 vol. in-4, dactylographié, xv-418 pp., (series 3, copy 1).

"Having finished printing the Siamese Laws *several weeks since*, we took up a few days ago the Siamese History of the Kings of Siam from the founding of the city of Ayuthia and hope to put it through the press in four or five months."

D'où l'on peut inférer que l'achèvement du travail d'impression se place dans les derniers jours de 1863 ou les premiers de 1864. Voilà pour le second volume.

Quant au premier volume, je ne l'ai jamais vu en première, et la plus ancienne édition qu'en possède la Vajiravudh est, à ma connaissance, la quatrième, datée de 1236 c.s. (1874 A.D.).

J'avais d'abord pensé que Bradley s'était contenté en 1863-1864 de compléter l'édition Môt dont le premier volume avait échappé à la destruction ordonnée par Phra Nang Kla. Mais il n'en est rien, et la première édition de Bradley était bien une nouvelle édition complète du premier volume. En effet, à la date du 1^{er} mars 1862, Bradley écrit :

"My son C. B. [Cornelius Beach Bradley] has relieved me much in the printing office, engaged in printing the "Laws of Siam",

Et à la date du 15 novembre 1862, Bradley écrit encore, avec toute la précision désirable :

"My time much occupied during all the week writing for my next calendar and proof reading. Printed the last form of the first volume of Siamese Laws being in all 62 forms. It has been in the press about 11 months".

Nous savons donc désormais :

(1) Que la première édition de Bradley comportait un premier volume, que ni moi, ni personne que je sache, n'avons jamais vu. Ce premier volume couvrait 62 feuillets ;

(2) Un exemplaire du deuxième volume de cette édition est connu ;

(3) L'impression du premier volume a commencé en décembre 1861 ou en janvier 1862, elle a duré environ 11 mois et elle s'est achevée entre le 8 et le 15 novembre 1862 ;

(4) L'impression du second volume était achevée plusieurs semaines avant le 30 janvier 1864. En gros, le travail d'impression des deux volumes avait duré deux ans.

C'est en 1861 que Bradley avait décidé d'imprimer les lois. Le samedi 10 août 1861 il écrit en effet dans son Journal :

I am much encouraged by the experiment we are making to obtain a part of our support by selling books on language, history, geography, the arts and sciences. It now seems to me that we should enlarge this branch of our business two or even threefold. We have many calls for the Siamese laws etc., which if we have (*sic*) them would sell to good profit.

J. B.

14 octobre, 1934.

VII

LES TROIS BANGKOK RECORDERS.

La *Bibliotheca Indosinica*, col. 782, consacre deux notices au *Bangkok Recorder*, la première, placée sous la rubrique *Bangkok Recorder*, vise l'édition siamoise, tandis que la seconde, placée sous la rubrique *The Bangkok Recorder*, a trait à l'édition anglaise. Ces deux notices, que H. Cordier a extraites d'un article du *Siam Repository* de janvier 1870 et de l'*Essay* de Sir Ernest Mason Satow, sont incomplètes et en partie inexactes. Comme le *Bangkok Recorder* est le premier périodique qui ait été publié au Siam, il nous a paru que ce serait faire œuvre utile que de compléter et de rectifier les notices de la *Bibliotheca Indosinica*, autant du moins que le permettent les documents dont nous disposons. On a même estimé qu'on devait profiter de l'occasion pour faire connaître aussi certains renseignements sur les débuts de la presse au Siam que contiennent ces vieilles publications, à peu près introuvables hors de Bangkok.

La Bibliothèque Nationale de Bangkok possède une collection complète du premier *Bangkok Recorder*.⁽¹⁾ Elle comprend seize numéros dont le premier est daté de juillet 1844⁽²⁾ et le dernier d'octobre 1845. Cette publication était éditée par les soins de la Mission protestante américaine A. B. C. F. M. (American Board of

⁽¹⁾ Cote ၂၁၅၁။ Provient de la bibliothèque de feu S. A. R. le prince Bhanurangsi.

⁽²⁾ Il a été mis en vente le 4. A cette date, Bradley note dans son Journal intime : "Issued first number of Bangkok Recorder this day. It is a very small thing, but it may perhaps be the beginning of a great work in this line." (*Abstract of the Journal of Rev. Dan Beach Bradley*, Edited by Rev. George Haws Feltus M. D. B. D., Troy New York, 1930, p. 129).

Commissioners for Foreign Missions), établie au Siam depuis 1831, et était imprimée sur les presses appartenant à la Mission.⁽¹⁾ En fait, le Rev. D. B. Bradley paraît en avoir assumé seul toute la charge.⁽²⁾ Le titre complet est ບໍານົດສະຈຸດທມະນາຍແຫຼວງ *Bangkok Recorder*. Il résulte d'une notice insérée à la fin des numéros 2 à 5 et 14 à 16 que ce périodique paraissait le premier jeudi de chaque mois. Le prix de l'abonnement annuel resta fixé, pendant la première année, à un tical, ou 60 cents (de Mexican dollar). Pour la seconde année, qui commence au numéro 13, ce prix fut abaissé à un salting ou 15 cents, et les éditeurs offrirent même de servir le journal gratuitement à tous les fonctionnaires et à tous les dignitaires du clergé bouddhique qui en feraient la demande. Chaque numéro comporte 4 pages rédigées entièrement en siamois, à l'exception de quelques courtes notices relatives au prix de l'abonnement et d'un avis de faire-part du décès de Mrs. Bradley, rédigés en anglais. Les titres de tous les articles sont donnés en anglais, quelquefois avec leur traduction en siamois.

La lecture de ce premier *Bangkok Recorder*, ancêtre de la presse siamoise⁽³⁾, est, il faut l'avouer, fort ingrate. On y trouve des articles de physique, de chimie, voire de philologie, des fables, de nombreux articles de physiologie et de médecine. On y trouve aussi des nouvelles d'Europe, d'Amérique, de Chine et de Singapoure. Mais le Siam en est presque entièrement absent. Un seul article de quelque étendue traite d'un sujet local. Il est intitulé "Statistics of Ardent Spirit in Siam"⁽⁴⁾ et fournit quelques données sur la quantité d'alcool distillé consommé annuellement à Bangkok et dans les provinces. Les seules nouvelles locales qui soient enregistrées sont les succès chirurgicaux du Rev. Bradley qui, comme on le sait, poursuivit, parallèlement à sa carrière d'éditeur, une carrière pour le moins aussi

(1) Les seules presses existant alors au Siam étaient la propriété de la Mission A.B.C.F.M. et de la Mission baptiste (George Bradley McFarland, M.D., *Historical Sketch of Protestant Missions in Siam*, Bangkok, 1928, p. 16).

(2) Daniel Beach Bradley, né à Marcellus (Etat de New York), le 18 juillet 1804, était arrivé à Bangkok le 18 juillet 1835. Il ne retourna en Amérique qu'une seule fois, de février 1847 à mai 1850 et mourut à Bangkok le 23 juin 1873.

(3) No. 6 (décembre 1844), p. 22.

(4) Il convient toutefois de signaler que Bradley avait commencé, dès le mois de janvier 1843, la publication d'un almanach annuel en siamois, dont nous n'avons pu découvrir aucun exemplaire.

brillante de médecin et de chirurgien. Il convient de noter aussi l'extrême rareté des articles concernant la religion et l'absence complète de tout esprit de prosélytisme. Aussi bien, les silences du *Bangkok Recorder* sont significatifs. La défiance générale à l'encontre de tout ce qui venait de l'étranger et la politique d'isolement que poursuivait alors le gouvernement siamois imposaient aux éditeurs une prudence et des réserves qui privaient leur entreprise de son principal intérêt et la condamnaient d'avance à l'insuccès.

Le seizième numéro du *Bangkok Recorder*, qui termine la collection conservée à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Bangkok, ne mentionne pas que la publication dût cesser avec ce numéro. On y trouve, au contraire, la notice habituelle sur le jour de la publication et le prix de l'abonnement annuel. Le Journal intime de Bradley, pourtant si plein d'informations précieuses sur son activité d'éditeur, ne contient de même aucun renseignement sur la fin du *Bangkok Recorder*. On va bientôt voir pourquoi il est cependant possible d'affirmer que le numéro 16 (octobre 1845) marque bien le terme de la carrière du premier périodique paru sous ce nom.

Le 16 janvier 1865, le *Bangkok Recorder*, selon l'expression employée par Bradley dans son Journal intime, "ressuscitait" sous une forme nouvelle.⁽¹⁾ L'éditorial du premier numéro contient les lignes

(1) Rev. George Haws Feltus, *op. laud.*, p. 333. Dans l'intervalle avaient paru deux périodiques, le *Rājakiccañupēksa* ou Gazette royale et le *Siam Times*. On se propose de revenir plus tard sur le premier dont l'existence, au début laborieuse, s'est prolongée jusqu'à nos jours. Pour le *Siam Times*, nous n'avons pu jusqu'à présent en découvrir aucun exemplaire. Aux renseignements recueillis dans la *Bibliotheca Indosinica*, on peut seulement ajouter que ce périodique a cessé de paraître à la fin de décembre 1865 ou au début de 1866. Il résulte, en effet, de l'éditorial du numéro 23 (16 décembre 1865) du second *Bangkok Recorder* que le *Siam Times* existait encore dans la première quinzaine de décembre 1865. D'autre part, le numéro suivant contient un avis annonçant pour le 11 janvier 1866 la vente aux enchères des effets de J. H. Chandler, y compris ses presses et son matériel d'imprimerie. J. H. Chandler, propriétaire et éditeur du *Siam Times*, appartenait à la Mission baptiste. Il quitta définitivement le Siam le 1^{er} avril 1868.—Une liste des périodiques parus au Siam publiée en 1929 par les soins de la Bibliothèque Nationale de Bangkok (រាយនាមអ៊ីលូមិមុខ ទាំងអស់ការពេន្យាយនៃប្រជាពលរដ្ឋសាស្ត្រកម្ពុជា) place en 1864 l'apparition d'un autre journal hebdomadaire, le *Bangkok Press*, qui aurait disparu dans le cours de la même année. Nous n'avons trouvé aucune trace de son existence ni dans le Journal intime de Bradley ni dans le *Bangkok Recorder*.

suivantes : " . . . About twenty years ago, there was a journal issued from this office, to which was given the name of Bangkok Recorder. It was wholly in the Siamese language, and we trust was the means of conveying to many of this people useful information.

"They were not however yet in a condition to appreciate such an enterprise, and partly on account of sickness in the family of one the parties concerned, and the increased duties of the other, it was discontinued, after a brief, but we trust useful existence of one year and three months. . . "

Ainsi, le premier *Bangkok Recorder*, d'après le témoignage de son propre éditeur, n'a pas été au delà du seizième numéro.

Le second *Bangkok Recorder* devait durer deux années complètes. La Bibliothèque Nationale de Bangkok n'en possède aucun exemplaire. Nous n'avons pu dépouiller que le premier volume, réunissant les numéros de la première année, dans un exemplaire provenant d'une bibliothèque privée. Cette première année va du 16 janvier au 30 décembre 1865, et comprend 24 numéros datés en général du 1^{er} et du 16 de chaque mois. Chaque numéro comporte dix pages, à l'exception des nos. 9 (16 mai) et 13 (15 juillet) qui en ont douze. L'ensemble forme un volume in-4° (310 à 330/250 mm. pour les quinze premiers numéros, 310/230 pour les suivants) de 244 pages précédées de deux feuillets non numérotés, l'un pour le titre, l'autre contenant une table des matières sous la forme d'un index alphabétique. Le titre imprimé en tête de chaque numéro est libellé comme suit : "Bangkok Recorder. A semi-monthly Journal, Res politicae, Literatura, Scientia, Commercium, Res loci, et in omnibus Veritas." La première page de chaque numéro porte en outre la notice suivante :

"A Semi-monthly journal will be issued from the printing office of the American Missionary Association, at the mouth of the Canal, "Klawng Bangkok Yai"⁽¹⁾ about the 1st and 15th of every month. It will contain such Political, Literary, Scientific, Commercial, and Local intelligence, as shall render it worthy of the general patronage.

"The Recorder will be open to Correspondents subject to usual restrictions.

"The proprietors will not be responsible for the sentiments of their correspondents.

⁽¹⁾ Les deux premiers numéros portent ici "Klawng Bang Luang." Le changement a été apporté à la suite d'une note du roi Mongkut mentionnée au n°3 (p. 28).

"No communications will be admitted unless accompanied by the name of the Correspondent.

"No rejected manuscript will be returned unless as a special favor.

Terms of Subscription.

Yearly in advance	\$ 8,00
Half yearly	\$ 4,50
Quarterly	\$ 2,25
Extra Copies to Subscribers	\$ 0,30
" " Non, do,	\$ 0,45

Terms of Advertising.

First, Insertion-Ten lines or half a square, and under, One Dollar.

Each additional line, Five cents.

Subsequent insertion, Seventy Five Cents, for ten lines.

and each additional line, Five cents

Advertisers must be particular to specify the number of insertions.

Standing advertisements as per Contracts.

Communications and remittances can be sent to either of the subscribers, or left at the store of Messrs. Virgin & Co.

{ N. A. Mc. Donald Editor
D. B. Bradley Publisher

A l'exception des trois premiers numéros qui contiennent chacun une ou deux pages de texte siamois, le nouveau *Bangkok Recorder* est rédigé entièrement en anglais. Cette fois, on a bien affaire à un journal d'information, où la vie locale tient la première place. Dans chaque numéro un éditorial commente les événements les plus saillants de la quinzaine écoulée. En dehors de la chronique locale, des articles parfois d'une grande étendue fournissent d'utiles renseignement sur le Siam de cette époque.⁽¹⁾ Un trait tout à fait remarquable est la liberté avec laquelle l'éditeur exprime ses opinions, n'épargnant pas davantage dans sa censure les plus hauts personnages du pays que les représentants diplomatiques étrangers. Naturellement, la polémique religieuse ne fait pas non plus défaut. Ce changement radical dans le contenu et le ton du nouveau *Bangkok Recorder* est un des témoignages les plus saisissants que nous connaissons de la transformation provoquée dans le pays par l'avènement

(1) On signalera notamment: A visit to Pra pra-t'oma-chedee, p. 24-25, 35; Chieng Mai Trip, p. 32-33, 42-43, 65-66, 73-74, 136; A tour to the Hot Springs, p. 97-98, 109-110, 119; Wat Visiting, p. 129-201.

du roi Mongkut. L'éditorial du premier numéro rend compte de cette transformation dans les termes suivants :

"Things have changed materially in Siam since the Recorder made its first appearance. The late king had decided upon an exclusive policy. Supposing himself to be the greatest monarch of the day, he was disposed to have but little to do with those whom he considered his inferiors. No one was permitted to see him, unless by accident. Not seeming to know the old proverb that, "A cat may look at a king," when he made his annual visits to the Wats, foreigners were forced by his officers into their houses, and the doors shut, and they were obliged to look through the bars like the inmates of some menagery.

"A Prince more friendly disposed to foreigners, has since ascended the throne, and those foolish restrictions have in a great measure been removed. Commercial treaties have been negotiated with the Western powers, so that even here "Japheth dwells in the tents of Shem in security."

"The western arts and sciences have also been introduced to some extent, so that when we hear the snort of the engine, or the shriek of the whistle, we almost forget the surroundings, and imagine ourselves for a time in the western world".

C'est évidement le spectacle de cette transformation qui a déterminé les éditeurs à faire paraître le *Bangkok Recorder* et à imprimer à la publication nouvelle un caractère qui contraste si fort avec le timide essai tenté vingt ans plus tôt.

Dans le dernier numéro du 1^{er} volume du *Bangkok Recorder* (n°. 24 du 30 décembre 1865, p. 241), Bradley annonce qu'il se propose pour l'année suivante de modifier le format du journal qui comportera désormais une seule feuille pliée en deux et de le convertir en un journal hebdomadaire paraissant le jeudi qui aura, davantage encore que dans l'année écoulée, le caractère d'un journal d'information. Il annonce également que le journal paraîtra désormais sous sa seule responsabilité, le Rev. N. A. McDonald, en raison de l'accroissement de ses charges de missionnaire, devant cesser de participer à l'édition. Enfin, la même notice donne le tarif de l'abonnement, qui est exactement le double de l'année précédente, à l'exception du prix du numéro qui reste fixé à 30 cents pour les abonnés et qui est réduit à 40 cents pour les non-abonnés.

On n'a pu mettre la main sur aucun numéro du *Bangkok Recorder* de la seconde année. Mais on sait par les extraits du journal intime de Bradley publiés par le Rev. George Haws Feltus, que le premier numéro de la nouvelle série a été mis en vente le 13 janvier 1866 et que la publication a été poursuivie jusqu'au 52^e numéro, paru le 17 janvier 1867.⁽¹⁾ Le second volume réunit donc, comme le premier, une année complète.

L'existence d'une édition siamoise du *Bangkok Recorder* permet heureusement de suppléer en partie aux lacunes de notre information concernant la seconde année de l'édition anglaise. Elle permet notamment de préciser les raisons pour lesquelles la publication n'a pas été continuée. Mais auparavant, il convient de retracer la carrière de ce troisième avatar du *Bangkok Recorder*.

On a vu que le second *Bangkok Recorder* avait été d'abord bilin-gue. A partir du quatrième numéro, la partie siamoise disparaît. Mais à ce moment fait son apparition un périodique indépendant, entièrement rédigé en siamois et intitulé: ໜັກສອງຈະທໍາມາຍເຫດ. The *Bangkok Recorder*. Cette édition siamoise du *Bangkok Recorder* devait exister parallèlement à l'édition anglaise pendant deux ans, du 1^{er} mars 1865 au 16 février 1867. La collection forme deux volumes in-4° (265/220 et 265/210 mm) de 244 et 305 pages dont il existe pour chacun un exemplaire à la Bibliothèque Nationale de Bangkok.⁽²⁾ Cette publication resta jusqu'à la fin bi-mensuelle. Le prix de l'abonnement était de 5 ticaux pour un an et de 3 ticaux pour six mois. Le prix du numéro était pour les abonnés de 1 salu'ng 1 fu'ang et pour les acheteurs au numéro de 2 salu'ng. Le numéro, après avoir été d'abord de 4, 5 et 8 pages, a comporté, à partir du huitième numéro douze pages et exceptionnellement quatorze. Une notice insérée dans certains numéros de la première année porte comme co-propriétaires du Journal, D. B. Bradley et N. A. Mc Donald. Mais le titre du volume I, imprimé vraisemblablement à la fin de la première année, ne mentionne que le nom de Bradley, ce qui paraît indiquer que ce dernier a en réalité assumé seul la charge de l'édition dès le début.

(1) Rev. George Haws Feltus, *op. laud.*, pp. 341 à 349.

(2) Cotes ພ/၁ et ພ/၂. Il manque 8 pages du premier volume et 21, dont tout le n°3, du second.

Comme l'édition anglaise, l'édition siamoise du *Bangkok Recorder* contient un certain nombre d'articles d'intérêt général, dont plusieurs sont de la plume du roi Mongkut : articles de toponymie, de polémique religieuse, d'ethnographie, etc.⁽¹⁾ Elle reproduit même quelques articles scientifiques du premier *Bangkok Recorder*. Mais, d'une manière générale, les actualités y tiennent une place plus grande que dans le premier volume de l'édition anglaise. Les événements, du reste, sont commentés avec la même indépendance et les critiques sont tout aussi hardies. L'éditeur se fait volontiers l'écho des doléances des particuliers contre les abus dont ils sont victimes. Mais cette source abondante de copie a été tarie, dès la fin de la première année, par un décret du roi rappelant à ses sujets que la procédure régulière en pareil cas est de lui adresser une pétition et leur défendant de saisir la presse de leurs griefs,—décret contre lequel Bradley n'a pas manqué de protester, mais sans résultat. Un bon nombre d'articles ont pour but de dénoncer au public l'activité politique du consul de France Aubaret, et sa prétendue ingérence dans les affaires intérieures du Siam. Cette campagne s'est terminée par une lettre d'excuse de Bradley reconnaissant qu'il avait été mal informé, lettre qui fut insérée, nous le savons par son Journal intime,⁽²⁾ dans le dernier numéro de l'édition anglaise du *Bangkok Recorder* et dont une traduction figure dans l'avant-dernier numéro de l'édition siamoise. Cette démarche n'a d'ailleurs pas arrêté les poursuites engagées par Aubaret devant le tribunal consulaire américain, et en février 1867 Bradley fut condamné pour diffamation à 100 dollars de dommages-intérêts au profit du consul de France.

Les soucis que lui causa cette malheureuse affaire ne manquèrent sans doute pas de contribuer à détourner Bradley du journalisme. Mais sa détermination était prise bien avant le jugement qui devait le confirmer dans son amertume. Dès le 1^{er} décembre 1866, c'est-à-dire avant même qu'Aubaret eût engagé les poursuites, Bradley écrit dans son Journal intime qu'il se sent de plus en plus convaincu qu'il est de son devoir de cesser la publication de l'édition anglaise du

(1) Quelques-uns de ces articles ont été recueillis dans ໂບກຣານຄົດສິມເລງ
ຖ່ານນຸ້ມພຣະບຣມມາທີບໍ່ຢ່າງໃນພຣະບຣມທີ່ຈະຈອມນັກລ້າ ແຈ້ວຍຸ້ຫ້, publié par le Bibliothèque Vajrirañāṇa en 2457 E. B. (1915).

(2) Rev. George Haws Feltus, *op. laud.*, p. 348.

Bangkok Recorder à la fin du second volume, parce que cette publication ne lui laisse pas assez de temps pour s'attacher comme il conviendrait aux œuvres essentielles de sa tâche de missionnaire⁽¹⁾. Dans le numéro du 5 janvier 1867 de l'édition siamoise, il annonce publiquement que l'édition anglaise prendra fin à l'achèvement du second volume, et il laisse entendre qu'il en sera de même pour l'édition siamoise. En effet le numéro du 16 février 1867 de l'édition siamoise contient une notice avertissant les lecteurs que le journal cessera de paraître après ce numéro. Dans cette notice, Bradley explique sans détour que la raison principale qui l'oblige à abandonner son entreprise est l'hostilité du gouvernement siamois. "Au début, dit-il en substance, le gouvernement était favorable à ce journal. Aussi tout le monde s'accordait à le trouver éminemment utile, et nombreux étaient ceux qui l'achetaient. Mais, dans la suite, le journal a cessé de plaire en haut lieu, et le nombre des lecteurs a diminué au point qu'il n'est plus possible d'en assurer la continuation qu'au prix de lourds sacrifices." En fait, le numéro du 15 avril 1865 de l'édition siamoise nous apprend que le journal était tiré à 300 exemplaires au plus. Le numéro du 31 janvier 1866 fournit les noms des abonnés à l'édition siamoise. Cette liste comporte 102 noms ; en tête figure celui du roi. Cinq noms sont d'apparence européenne. D'une notice insérée dans le numéro du 15 mai 1866, il résulte que le journal se vendait à cette date à 150 exemplaires. Enfin, la notice publiée dans le numéro du 5 janvier 1867 porte que le nombre des exemplaires vendus n'atteignait pas 140. On comprend que Bradley, qui se plaint par ailleurs d'être insuffisamment aidé dans sa besogne d'éditeur, se soit découragé en se voyant si mal payé de sa peine⁽²⁾

(1) Rev. George Haws Feltus, *op. laud.*, p. 346.

(2) Cette déception n'empêcha pourtant pas Bradley, trois mois après le dernier numéro du *Bangkok Recorder*, de s'intéresser au lancement et à la publication d'un nouveau périodique, *The Siam Weekly Monitor*. Bien que ce journal ait paru sous la seule responsabilité de E. D'Encourt, qui en était à la fois "Editor, Publisher and Proprietor," il résulte, en effet, des extraits du Journal intime de Bradley publiés par le Rev. George Haws Feltus que Bradley ne s'est pas borné à en assurer l'impression, mais qu'il en a surveillé la rédaction et y a collaboré plus ou moins ouvertement. Cette nouvelle entreprise ne lui rapporta guère que des déboires, et faillit même lui attirer des poursuites, cette fois de la part de son propre consul, J. M. Hood. La faillite de D'Encourt mit fin brusquement à la publication, au cours de la

En résumé, il convient de substituer aux notices consacrées au *Bangkok Recorder* dans la *Bibliotheca Indosinica* les notices suivantes.

| ◎ ບັນດາອາຈດທ່ານຍາທູ | Bangkok Recorder. |

Publication mensuelle de langue siamoise éditée à Bangkok par la mission protestante américaine A. B. C. F. M. Le premier numéro est daté de juillet 1844, le 16^e et dernier d'octobre 1845. Forme un vol. in-4° (240/280 mm.) de 48 + 16 p.

Bangkok Recorder. | A semi monthly Journal | Res politicae, Literatura, Scientia, Commercium, Res loci, et in omnibus veritas | (avec un peu de siamois dans les trois premiers numéros). Publication bi-mensuelle de langue anglaise éditée à Bangkok par N. A. Mc Donald et D. B. Bradley. Le premier numéro est daté du 16 janvier 1865, le 24^e et dernier du 30 décembre 1865.

Forme un vol. in-4° (310 à 330/250 mm. pour les quinze premiers numéros, 310/230 pour les suivants) de 2 f.n.n. + 244 p. Le premier f. n.n. contient le titre ainsi libellé: | The | Bangkok Recorder. | A Semi-monthly journal. | Edited By—Rev. N. A. Mc Donald A. M. | Printed at the Press of the American Missionary Association | Bangkok—1865. | Le second f.n.n. contient la table sous forme d'index.

Continué par D. B. Bradley seul, sous la forme d'un périodique hebdomadaire paraissant le jeudi. Le premier le numéro a paru le 13 janvier 1866, le 52^e et dernier, le 17 janvier 1867.

seconde année. La Bibliothèque Nationale de Bangkok possède une collection très incomplète du *Siam Weekly Monitor* (Elle va du numéro 41 du Vol. I. daté du 26 février 1868 au numéro 15 du Vol. II, daté du 29 Août 1868. Manquent les numéros 43 et 47 du Vol. I et les numéros 1, 2, 5 et 9 à 14 du Vol. II.—Cote Aa 1), mais suffisante néanmoins pour des indications bibliographiques. On en profite pour les donner ici, la notice de la *Bibliotheca Indosinica* ne contenant de renseignements précis et exacts que sur le nom du périodique et la date du premier numéro :

| The Siam Weekly Monitor. | And Bangkok Journal of Commerce. |

Au-dessus du titre sont figurés : un éléphant, un œil et un tigre.

Publication hebdomadaire ayant paru le mercredi pendant la première année et ensuite le jeudi. Editée à Bangkok par E. D'Encourt. Rédigée en siamois et en anglais, mais l'anglais domine.

Le premier numéro est daté du 22 mai 1867, le quinzième numéro de la seconde année et dernier, du 29 août 1868.

Chaque numéro comprend 4 p. n. n. in folio (365/305 mm. après rognage).

| © หนังสือจดหมายเหตุ | — | The Bangkok Recorder |

Publication bi-mensuelle de langue siamoise éditée à Bangkok par D. B. Bradley

Le premier numéro du vol. I est daté du 1^{er} mars 1865, le numéro 24 du vol. II est daté du 16 février 1867.

Forme 2 vol. in-4° (265/220 et 265/210 mm. après rognage) de 244 et 305 p.

Le vol. I est précédé de 1 f.n.n. pour le titre ainsi libellé :

| © หนังสือจดหมายเหตุ | The Bangkok Recorder | ເຕັມທ່ານງ | ຖັນແຕ່
ເຕືອນ ຂະ ຂັນ ຄໍາ ຈຸດສັກລາ ແກ້ວຂາ ປະດູ ຍັງເປັນອັກ | ຂັນ ດັງເຕືອນ ແ
ຂັນ ດັ່ງ ພ ຂະ ດັບປັດ ຕັບປັດ | ຂ້າພົຈ້າ ທນອ ບຣັດເດ ໄດ້ຕົກແຕ່ງ | ເປັນ ໜີ ຍາກ
ຕົກຍິກນ—ຄັງພິມພ ກອງງຫເພ ຈາເຕືອນດະ ໂ ຍາກ— Il comporte encore 4 p.
supplémentaires contenant un index alphabétique.

R. Lingat

VIII

NOTE EXPLAINING THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME OF THE TOWN PAKNAMPOTH IN THE PROVINCE OF NAKORN SAWAN.

I have often wondered why the name Paknampoh (ປ່ານນຳໂພ) was given to the place of that name, and I think many others must have had their curiosities aroused in the same manner. The word Paknampoh means the mouth of the river Poh or Poh mouth. I have asked many Siamese where the river Poh is, and have not yet received a satisfactory reply, in fact, they express ignorance. I pointed out that centuries ago the lower reaches of the river Ping might have been called the Poh, and that this name has been forgotten, only remaining as the name of the town, but this suggestion did not elicit any information. To-day while turning over the pages of the abridged version of the history of Ayudhia published in R. S. 117 (A. D. 1898), and again in R. S. 120 (A. D. 1909), (p. 1 of the R. S. 117 ed.), I came across a reference to this river. This history states that a King of Chiengrai, having been defeated by a King of Satong (the

Mon capital, Thaton or Saterng), retreated taking away with him the population. He came south, and eventually crossed the river Poh to the western bank opposite Kampengpet. He found the remains of an old city at this spot called Muang Pæb, and built a new one known as Krai Kring (ក្រោរីក្យ) on the old site. Now this river Poh is the lower portion of the river Ping (មេងកំពើ). It is but reasonable to assume that in olden days, the river Ping from its source to its junction with the Me Vang (មេវង), above Raheng (រោង), was known as the Ping river, but after the junction of these two streams the river was known as the Poh; hence Paknampoh (Poh mouth).

Some two days journey above Kampengpet, there is a Tambol called Pakyom (ភាកយំ), the mouth of the Yom. Can it be that the river Yom in ancient days found its outlet here, and that the present channel which joins the Menam Nan (មេនាំណាន) near Chum Seng (ចុំសែង) is of comparatively modern date. If the Yom joined the Ping at the place called Pakyom, then it may be that the name of the river Ping was changed to the river Poh after its junction with the River Yom. I think for historical reasons that a survey should be made to ascertain whether the ancient bed of the river Yom came south, and the mouth of the river was at the place called Pak Yom.

H. R. H. Prince Damrong Rajanuphab in his diary of a journey down the Ping river to Paknampoh (ភាកន័យពួ) published in B. E. 2461 (A. D. 1921) was not struck by the idea that if there was a Paknampoh, there must have been a Poh river, for he calls the whole waterway the Ping river.

The history I have referred to would seem to have been compiled from the works of Prince Paramanuchit (ក្រមអំណះប្រមាពិចិត) and the Chiengsen and Yonaka Chronicles.

F. H. GILES.

1/1/1935.

IX

WHO WAS DHARMARĀJĀ I OF SUKHOTHAI?

The King who has been known up to now as Dharmarājā *the first* of Sukhothai was the fifth monarch of the Phra Ruang dynasty, otherwise named Lithai or Lideyya. He it was who succeeded

Lœthai, his father, after encountering some opposition. He it was also who erected the *stūpa* of the Great Relic of Nakhon Jum, concerning which we have an important inscription (No. III in Coedes' *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam*, part I). He it was also who invited a learned monk from Ceylon, received him with much pomp and hospitality, and finally took holy orders himself for a time under his preceptorship (Inscr. IV, V, *ibid.*). Him it was that this learned monk wrote of as "Liberal as Vessantara, wise as , and strict in his observance of the Code of morals as King Silava, worthy of the commendation of the learned, proficient in Astronomy learned in the Holy Scriptures" (Inscr. VI, *ibid.*). He it was also who is known to have written perhaps the oldest surviving treatise in Siamese Literature—the Traibhūmikathā, now known as the "Traiphum Phra Ruang."

With every diffidence in contradicting the assignation of this ordinal number to King Lithai, I am afraid that certain facts have rendered it impossible for me to accept it, for the following reasons:—

(1) Of the first three kings of the Phra Ruang dynasty, there can be no reason whatever for calling them Dharmarājā, for no claim to the title has been known to have been advanced. Their relationship to one another too is unquestionable. The founder of the dynasty, Sri Indrāditya, was father to both the second and third kings—Bān Muang and Rāma Kamhaeng.

Now, Inscription II (face I, lines 37-8) says:

“ หตานพชุนต์ร้อนทรายคายผงซี๊ดรวมราชาพ.รับนร.รวมมีปั๊รชา ”

The passage was translated by Coedès (*Recueil*, I, p. 64) thus:

“ Un petit-fils de Ba Khun Sri Indrāditya nommé Dharnarāja, connaissant les mérites, connaissant la Loi, était doué d'une sagesse sans borne ”

Professor Coedès has also a foot note under "Dharmarājā" thus :—

Since Rāma Kamhæng was the son of Sri Indrāditya, it would follow that the grandson of the latter must have been Loethai, the fourth king of the dynasty, and not Lithai who was not a grandson but a great-grandson. It is true that the description of his wisdom and learning conforms rather to what has been known of Lithai than his father Loethai, but there is really nothing to disprove that the father too might have been "wise and learned" for in fact we have almost no statement so far about his personality.

Unless therefore the meaning of the word ໜ່າ (i. e. grandson) could be stretched to cover another generation, there would seem to be more reason to regard Loethai as the "Dharmarājā" referred to in Inscr. II as quoted above.

(2) In support of the above I would beg to quote another source, quite apart from the inscriptions. The Jinakālamālinī says :

"Sumana took the relic and went to Sajjanalai, where a son of Dharmarājā named Lideyyarāja (i. e. Lithai) was then reigning". (*Jinakālamālinī*, Siamese transl., R. S. 127, p. 170; also Coedès : *Documents sur le Laos occidental*, BEFEO, XXV, p. 96).

This evidence, admittedly not so reliable as the inscriptions, is nevertheless valuable in so far as it confirms their statement. The work was written in 1516 A. D. by a monk of Chiengmai named Ratnapañña. It is open to question as to whether he had any access to the inscription now before us. I am inclined to think he had not, for, if he had, he would not have recorded facts so contradictory to the inscription, such for example as saying that Rāmarājā (i. e. Rāma Kamhæng) succeeded his father and was succeeded in turn by Pālarājā (Ban Muang) his brother.

Professor Coedès, in his "*Documents sur la dynastie de Sukhodaya*" (BEFEO, XVII, 1917, p. 45), thus commented on the passage :

"D'après J. (*Jinakālamālinī*), Lideyya en 1355 A. D., gouvernait Sajjanālaya en qualité d'uparāja de son père Dhāmmarājā, roi de Sukhodaya. Mais, dira-t-on, cette même Jinakālamālinī ne dit-elle pas un peu plus loin que Dhāmmarājā est un surnom de Lideyya ; et ne s'agit-il pas d'un seul et même personnage ? *Pas nécessairement*. L'épigraphie nous montre que le titre de Dhāmmarājā, porté par Lidaiya (=Lithai or Lideyya) l'a été aussi par ses successeurs jusque dans le courant du XVe siècle. *Il peut fort bien l'avoir été par son prédecesseur*, et il n'y a pas forcément contradiction entre les deux passages de la *Jinakālamālinī*." The italics are mine.

(3) The inscription of Nakhon Jum (No. III in the *Recueil*, I), set up in 1357 by King Lithai, commences by saying that King Lithai was the son of Lu'athai (i. e. Loethai) and the grandson of Rāma (i. e. Rāma Kamhæng). After setting forth its main object—the commemoration of the installation at Nakhon Jum of a holy relic brought from Ceylon, with admonitions of a theological character involving lengthy calculations of time so dear to the heart of that monarch—it goes on to eulogise King Lithai and then to relate of

the welfare and prosperity of the kingdom under his grandfather Rāmarāja (face 2, line 12). Although unfortunately this part of the stone is very mutilated, yet we have the mention, immediately after Rāma Kamhæng's reign, of a successor "to the throne of his ancestors" (line 24) who ruled in righteousness (line 26), levying no duty on inheritance etc. (line 44, and was enabled by the merit of that righteousness to rule a long time (lines 46-7). It sums up (lines 29-30) by saying that ".... ... (under Dhar) mikarājā the kingdom was happy to live in."

The point here revolves round the personality of the King "Dharmikarājā" or Dharmarājā. It has been understood up to now that the epithet here referred to King Lithai (*Recueil*, I, p. 78). Professor Coedès summed up (*ibid.*) the passage from face I, line 64 to face II, line 47, as an 'eulogy of the King' etc. I do not however think that it referred to King Lithai alone. The passage begins, it is true, with an eulogy of that King, but on face II line 12 it goes back to the time of Rāmarāja—as I have already pointed out; and even to a successor (line 24), whom it styles Dharmika ('the righteous') (line 30).

Now, considering that the passage comes directly after detailing the prosperity and happiness of Rama Kamhæng's time, it seems but natural to expect that his successor—Loethai—must have been the next King to be mentioned, and that therefore the epithet "Dharmikarājā" applied to him. Besides, since King Lithai's eulogy has just been concluded above, it seems hardly likely that he could be again referred to here in this way.

I have come therefore to the conclusion that in this last part of the inscription, after eulogies of his own wisdom and erudition, King Lithai had eulogies of his two immediate predecessors added on and that therefore the "Dharmikarājā" here referred to King Loethai and not his son as has been generally thought.

(4) The Buddha's Footprint on Mount Sumanakūṭa at Sukhothai is again mentioned in a few other places and gives us further clues to the identification of King Loethai as the Dharmikarājā or Dharmarājā.

In Inscription VIII (*Recueil*, I) which commemorated the installation of the Footprint on this mount, we have the statement that the King came to pay his respects to the Footprint on Mount Sumanakūṭa 'which his own father set up' (face 4 lines 16-17).

The inscription is undated, but, since it names *King Ṭri Suriyabongs Mahādharmarājā*, it has been thought that the King was Lithai's son, to whom this name has been attributed by scholars. I believe however that it could have been none other than Lithai himself for I have evidences of his having been called this name. King Lithai unfortunately bore both the names of *Ṭri Suriyabongs Rāma Mahādharmarājā* (Insc. IV, face I, lines 12-13; V, face I, line 14 etc.) and also *Ṭri Suriyabongs Mahādūrmarājā*—without the *Rāma*—(Insc. III, face I, line 7; IV, face 3, line 58; VII, face II, lines 32-33 etc.). According therefore to my belief, the father who set up this Footprint was King Loethai, and the King who made the great pilgrimage was Lithai. In short I believe that we should move up one reign for both of these events.

To sum up then, I venture to submit that not only King Lithai and his successors, but also King Loethai, his immediate predecessor, was known as Dharmarājā or Dharmikarāja, both titles being identical, because :

- (1) Inscription II (face II, lines 37-38) says that the grandson of Ṭri Indrāditya (i. e. Loethai) was called Dharmarājā;
- (2) This is supported by the evidence of a similar statement from the Jinakālamālinī—an independent source;
- (3) Inscription III mentions the successor of Rāma Kamhæng as Dharmikarāja, and that Dharmarājā had a Footprint of the Buddha made and set up on Mount Sumanakūṭa at Sukhothai. The epithets are identical.
- (4) Inscriptions III and VIII record the pilgrimage of King Lithai in 1359 to Mount Sumanakūṭa at Sukhothai where a Footprint had been made and set up by his own father (i. e. Loethai).

I also venture to suggest that in the light of the above data, King Loethai is naturally the first Dharmarājā while his son Lithai becomes Dharmarājā II and his successors hitherto, known as the second, third, and fourth of the name would become third, fourth and fifth respectively. This change of order will be followed in my paper on Thai Ceramics.

* * *

Besides the above there are parallels between Inscription II and XI which are highly suggestive. Inscription II mentions a prince bearing the royal title of Phra Rāma. He was the son of a certain Phya Kamhæng, the son of Khun Pha Muang. He was also called in this Inscription by a name which he later acquired in holy orders, namely

"Somdec Cau Črisaradhadhārājacūlāmanī, the jewel of the Island of Lankā". This prince's pious actions resemble in a most striking manner the pious actions of some one in Inscription XI whose name cannot be found. The latter Inscription was set up by the benefactor who built the *chedi* of Rāma and the *vihara* of Rāma at the "monastery of Rāma on Mount Sumanakūṭa", which monastery scholars have identified with the one on Khao Kob at Nakhon Sawan.

Among the parallels worthy of notice are:—

Inscription II

Prince Rāma, in his devotion to Religion:—

- (a) decked two daughters with rings, and bangles and gave (them?) to those who sought them".

(ແຕ່ງແຍ່ຈຸກສ້າງສອງຄນິສົກອງ
ປະຕາຍແຂວງແຫວນຍ . . . ໂອຍ
ທານໃຫແກທານຜູມມາຂ . . .)

face 2 lines 2-3

- (b) (at the monasteries he built, arranged men to wash the feet of the high monks etc. (as they enter the buildings)

(...ແຕ່ງໃໝ . . . ດາງທຶນພວະ
ນຫາເກຣານູເດර)

face 2 line 13-14

- (c) went to Ceylon, where miracles happened in connection with the 'great precious relic' of the Buddha, (face 2 lines 49 to end) and the relic was brought back (face 2 line 42)

Inscription XI

Some one:—

- (a) two daughters
who were decked

(. . . . ສ້າງສອງຄນ
ຈອນແຕງແ)

face 2 lines 5-6

- (b) (In building holy places he arranged for good men to bring water to wash the feet of the holy brothers

(ໄກຄນູ່ງທີ່ທຳການນໍາດາງຕົ້ນູ່ງ
ຕັງ (ຂ))

face 2 line 12

- (c) went to India and Ceylon (face 2 lines 15-16), found the great relic (line 17), (? after) ten years crossed over to Tanaosri (Siamese port now in Lower Burma) (line 19), and sought the presence of the King at Ayudhya (line 21).

Now Inscription XI mentions that Phya Mahā Dhar (-mārājā?) came to clear the forest, level rocks and stones, set up the Footprint and built a monastery and many other things in order to "dedicate the merits accrued therefrom to his younger brother Phya Phra Rāma."

Moreover, as this was dedicated to Phya Phra Rāma, it is quite likely that his exploits would be recorded on the back of the Inscription. Unfortunately the top lines of the back have been obliterated and we are left to guess whom it is all about. From the similarity of the deeds recorded in the two inscriptions, one is naturally tempted to suspect whether the Prince Rāma of the second inscription might not after all be identical with the unknown person of the eleventh.

I am also inclined to suspect that the "Phya Mahā Dharmarājā" of Inser. XI who set up the Footprint might have been King Loethai himself; and that the "Phya Kamhæng" of the second inscription who was "father to Prince Rāma" might well have been King Rāma Kamhæng too. As for Pha Muang "the father of Phya Kamhæng" (Inser. II), perhaps he was a father-in-law. Colloquial Siamese even nowadays, makes no fine distinction between a father and a father-in-law, it is quite common to hear him being called *Wæ* simply.

And the result of this would be that the author of Inscription XI was none other than Loethai himself.

PHYA NAKHON PHRA RAM.