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Inscription XXXVIII, in which King Rāmarāja of Ayudhyā promulgates a law in the vassal kingdom of Sukhodaya in 1397, is a document of peculiar importance for the study of legal history.

It is the only known legislative text engraved on stone emanating from any of the Southeast Asian kingdoms. The Indian tradition held that the universe is governed by an immutable natural law, the Dharma, which was miraculously revealed to the sage Manu, and in turn revealed by him to other sages who made it known to mankind through abridged versions called Dharmaśāstra. Only a small part of the Dharmaśāstra deals with the administration of justice; the rest deals with Hindu rites and sacrifices, purification and penances; and its authority rests on sanctions deeply rooted in Brahmanical religion. It was not the duty of an Indian king to legislate, i.e. to impose laws of a general and permanent character, but to understand the Dharma by studying the Dharmaśāstra and to settle disputes in accordance with it. Cambodia and the other Southeast Asian kingdoms in which Brahminism predominated adopted the Dharmaśāstra with little or no change; disputes were settled, and the rites observed, by reference to it; as the King's decisions in specific cases were ad hoc commands which established no precedent, no code of civil law came into being.

As Professor Robert Lingat has shown, Ayudhyā was the only Southeast Asian kingdom to develop a code of civil law. This remarkable achievement, of which the Siamese might well be proud, was an outgrowth of an earlier development among the Buddhist Mōns. While we know nothing of the administration of justice in the kingdom of Dvāravatī, we know that the Mōns of Burma, as early as the 12th century if not before, started composing a series of works called Dhammasattha (the word is the Pali equivalent of Sanskrit
Dharmaśāstra). One of the most influential is attributed to the initiative of Wagaru or Wareru (Siamese: Cau Fā-Rua), who in the late 13th century made himself ruler of Rāmāññadesa, the Mōn country of Lower Burma. Based on the Hindu Dharmaśāstra, but with all the Brahmanical matter removed, and relying for its authority on a Buddhist adaptation of the legend of Manu, it was intended as a guide for Buddhist kings in the administration of justice. Rāmādhīpāti, when he founded the kingdom of Ayudhya in the mid-14th century, possessed a Dhammasattha of this type from Rāmāññadesa, which he used in deciding specific cases. The Rājasattha—a record of his decisions, reduced to general form and classified according to subject—took on the sanctity and all-embracing character of the Dhammasattha itself and became an integral part of it. He and his successors were thus real legislators instead of mere issuers of ad hoc commands.

It was therefore very fitting for Rāmādhīpāti’s grandson Rāmarāja to cause his law to be engraved on stone; other kings of Ayudhya may have done the same thing, though no examples have come to light; but rulers elsewhere in Southeast Asia, who were not legislators, would have no reason to use so permanent a material to make known their commands. In his inscription Rāmarāja constantly refers to the Dharmaśāstra, and couples the Rājasattra with it; though he calls them by their Sanskrit names, he obviously means the Dhammasattha on which Ayudhyan law was based and the Rājasattra which was the body of laws enacted by his predecessors (later Siamese rulers used the hybrid forms Dharmasātra and Rājasātra).

The Ayudhyan laws in general are known to us only from the Recension of 1805 A.D., which gives them not in their original form

but with an undetermined quantity of amendments made by successive monarchs. Rāmarāja's inscription, the only piece of Ayudhyan legislation we have in a form we can be certain has not been amended, provides a valuable clue to the original form of some of the laws. For example as certain things in it are evidently taken from the first three articles of the Law on Abduction, which the Recension of 1805 attributes to Rāmadhipati, we can be sure those portions of the Law on Abduction go back to the second half of the 14th century, and their attribution to Rāmadhipati—which Dr Quaritch Wales has questioned—is greatly strengthened. Further comparisons would certainly reveal a good deal about the nature of the amendments to which Rāmadhipati's laws were subjected by his successors.

Several references in Rāmarāja's inscription show that two of Ayudhya's most remarkable institutions—the system of sakti-nā and the division of the population into territorial groups headed by government officials called Mun Nāy—were already in force in 1397, although they were not perfected until later.

It was customary for Southeast Asian kings, who were of course the absolute proprietors of the land, to allot the usufruct of portions of it to their subjects. The kings of Ayudhya allotted a specified number of sakti-nā or 'dignity-marks' to each of their subjects according to his rank and the position he occupied, corresponding to the number of rai he was actually or theoretically entitled to; and when the system was fully developed the number of marks ranged from 5 to 25 for ordinary citizens, up to 10,000 for ministers in charge of important departments, and 20,000 for princes of the highest rank. The dignity-marks became a measure of each person's value; and the fines for certain offenses known as transgressions against rules established by the king—were calculated in proportion to the dignity-marks of the

2) Mr Lingat's edition of the Recension of 1805 (เวสเทิร์นมองจิมลิปติ ascertain, 3 vols. University of Moral and Political Science, Bangkok, 1938-39), made directly from the official manuscripts of the reign of King Rāma I, is the only printed version that reproduces their spelling faithfully. French translations of some of the laws will be found in his L'esclavage privé dans le vieux droit siamois, 293-377.

3) Ancient Siamese Government and Administration, p. 172.
culprit and the victim. A major wife was considered to have half the number of marks her husband had; a minor wife, one-quarter; and a slave wife who bore him children, one-eighth.

Rāmarāja speaks of this system as if it were already in effect at Sukhodaya, no less than at Ayudhā, but he may have been anticipating. Probably the Sukhodayan monarchs allotted the usufruct of land to their subjects not according to a set formula but taking into consideration various other factors besides the person’s rank, such as his ability as a cultivator, or the particular services he had rendered the Crown. It is doubtful if such allotments became the measure of people’s value for calculating fines. In establishing Ayudhyan law at Sukhodaya, Rāmarāja doubtless intended to systematize the practice and bring it into line with that at his capital.

In the kingdom of Ayudhā, at least in the portions that were ruled directly from the capital, the whole population was divided into territorial groups under government-appointed group-chiefs known as Mun Nāy, who were responsible to one or the other of two great departments at the capital. All male citizens, except officials above a certain rank, were subject to six months’ corvée out of each year, for which they received no pay or even rations. They were assigned to the military or to one of the public services engaged in digging canals, draining swamps, building roads, and various other tasks. In order to prevent anyone from shirking his duty, the population was registered in lists called hāng wao—‘kite-tails’, suggesting their inordinate length—giving each man’s name, territorial group, and assignment. The Mun Nāy was charged with the duty of supplying as many members of his group as might be required of him, so he had to know the whereabouts of everyone in his group at all times, keep an account of births and deaths, and make sure that no one deserted to another group. As

4) For नाय, see Lingat, L’esclavage privé, 355 note 1; the word is mentioned in the preamble to Rāmadhipati’s Law on Abduction (ibid., 362). For a discussion of the Ayudhyan śakti-nā system, see Quaritch Wales, Ancient Siamese Government and Administration, 25, 35-50, 60, 75-78. For its origin, see Lingat, Les origines du prêt à intérêt au Siam, Revue historique de droit français et étranger, 1950, 232-3.
some services were overburdened with heavy work while others had much lighter duties, there was always the risk that a group might become depleted by desertions; and some of the work was so hard that people tried to escape it by voluntarily selling themselves into slavery in order to join another group in which life was easier.\textsuperscript{5}

The details we have given are of uncertain date, and some of them may not be applicable for 1397; but Rāmarāja’s references to ‘Mun Nāy’ show that the system in its essentials was already in operation at Ayudhya. Whether it had more than a theoretical existence at Sukhodaya is open to question. We do not know how the corvée had operated during the period of Sukhodaya’s independence, or for how many months of each year; there is some reason to think it had been administered mainly by vassal lords rather than by government appointees, and that the kings made an effort to set humane limits on it.\textsuperscript{6}

In our first paper of the present series, \textit{A Declaration of Independence and its Consequences} (JSS LVI/2), we have discussed the historical information that can be extracted from Rāmarāja’s inscription, one of the purposes of which was to reassert Ayudhyan suzerainty over the kingdom of Sukhodaya—a suzerainty which had been to all intents allowed to lapse during his father’s reign. In our paper \textit{On Kingship and Society at Sukhodaya}, to appear in Volume II of \textit{Studies in Felicitation of Professor Lauriston Sharp} (Ithaca, 1969), we have commented on the inscription from several other points of view. Here we shall give as complete a translation as possible, together with notes on the textual problems involved in it.


\textsuperscript{6} It is true that the \textit{Trabhumikathā}, composed by Lū Tai in 1340, mentions \textit{Mun Nāy} (Edition of B.E. 2498, Bangkok, p. 604), but the context gives no clue to their functions. In Inscription III (II/39 f.), when he wants to set humane limits on the corvée, he addresses himself to the vassal lords (ศูน), not to the Mun Nāy.
The inscription, which was discovered by accident by the Highways Department in 1930 near the geographical center of the walled city of Sukhodaya, is now in the Manuscript and Inscription Division of the National Library at Bangkok. It is engraved on a slab of grey schist 1.08 m. high, 65 cm. wide, and 14 cm. thick (Figs. 9, 10.) The writing is in Siamese in Sukhodaya characters, 45 lines on Face I, 54 on Face II. The stone, though relatively little of it is actually broken away, is badly scratched and eroded in many places; and the numerous lacunae often make it difficult to grasp the sequence of ideas. A preliminary reading was published on the occasion of the Kathina Ceremonies at Vat Jana Jalsangrama, Bangkok, in 1935. Since that time Mahā Chām Dōngāṃvarṇa has succeeded in deciphering a good deal more of the text; his reading, together with glosses and a version in modern Siamese characters, appears in Prajum Śilācārīk, Vol. III, Bangkok, 1965, 25 ff. Quite recently we have been able to solve two of the most troublesome problems that were left unsettled in the printed edition, the date and the name of the king who promulgated the law.7

In the Siamese text which we give below, lacunae are indicated by rows of dots and conjectural readings by parentheses; even the readings not shown in parentheses are in several cases open to doubt. Apart from that, there are many difficulties such as elliptical constructions, confusing syntax, unusual word-order, and words used in unusual senses. To Professor Lingat, with his unrivaled knowledge of Ayudhyan law, we are much indebted for advice on problems of this sort which cannot be solved by comparison with other Sukhodayan inscriptions. Several passages are open to more than one interpretation. The honorific pronoun iñu may mean the legislator, a lord, an official, or the victim of an illegal act; when it means the legislator, we have generally followed Mr Lingat's suggestion to translate periphrastically ('a fine shall be imposed', 'it is provided that', etc.). For slaves and

7) See below, notes 8, 9. When the inscription was first discovered it was believed to date from 1344 (see Lingat, L'esclavage privé, p. 5 n. 1, p. 23 n. 1; Quaritch Wales, Ancient Siamese Government and Administration, p. 171). Mr Lingat was one of the first persons to suspect the true date (see his Conception du droit, BEFEO XLIV, p. 183, 182 n. 3).
other persons of low degree the pronoun is ฉัน (written either ฉัน or นิยม), while a householder is ผู้. In addition there is a sort of moral stratification of pronouns; criminals and their accomplices are ฉัน; and a householder who fails to do his duty is liable to be demoted from ผู้ to ฉัน as soon as he is found out.

The law, as can be discovered from a careful reading of the Siamese text, consists of a Preamble and eight Articles dealing with different matters. Neither the Preamble nor Article 1 has any heading; but the other seven each open with the expression ‘One Article’, though without any numbering. In our translation we have supplied the headings and the numbering for the convenience of the reader.

In the Preamble, Rāmarāja reasserts Ayudhyān suzerainty over the kingdom of Sukhodaya; presumably he imposed a new oath of allegiance on the vassal king, Mahādharma-rāja II. After describing his visit to Gampeng Pet on his way up from Ayudhyā, he tells how he promulgated the law ‘in the center of the city of Sukhodaya’.

That is where the Highways Department discovered the inscription 533 years later. Rāmarāja evidently did not choose the site at random, but in order to add solemnity to the proclamation and give it the widest possible publicity, for it was close to the shrine of the Hlāk Mōaň, the residence of the city’s tutelary sprite, and only a short distance from the Mahādhātu which was the magical and spiritual center of the Sukhodayan kingdom. The occasion, which must have been chosen with a similar purpose in mind, was the full-moon day of Vesākha, the date of the annual Buddhist festival of Visākhapūjā, when the streets would be crowded with worshipers from the city and its environs, as well as the outlying districts.
Face I

1. ......กักดูงกับการไฟฟ้าระบบแม่พระแสดงกิ่งใหม่เย็นมาก......

2. ......ลึกหน้าในภูมิมหานิยมแยกคุณสมบัติเก็บพื้น (มหาราชบัตร)......

3. ......ราชสำนักพิธีพิธีราชทานในเกิดจนเสร็จ......ภัสว

4. มายสองของพระรัชชินในยังก่อกับแผนพระรัชชินราชภิรมณ์คุณค่าพิษภักษา

5. พระองค์ท่านเสด็จในก้าแพงเพชรบุรีวิชวลานคุณปกครอง

6. พระพลเอกทรงคุณคุณธีรัฐสินพระญาพงศธรศาสตร์บัณฑิต

7. เสนาไทยบุรีพระญาพงศ์สุทธิภัณฑ์พิทยาทานพวงกฤชไทยแล

8. (ถึง)......พระราชาพินิตศิลป์พิธีพิธีพิธีจุลศกนันท์เขียน

9. ......เข้าเมืองทรงจุลศกนันท์ศิลป์ประจำราชวริย์ (มณฑลพาน)กรรม นั่งทรงงานภูญชี (พยา

10. ที่) เสด็จในกรมภูมิเสถียรภูญชีกระทัดธุรกิจและเห็นหมายทานเสด็จ

11. สมทบเทคโนโลยีเครื่องมือทางวิทยาศาสตร์ทางการผลิตชาวบ้านพิทยาศิลป์

12. ......ป่วยขอนพระองค์ท่านก็เสียใจในอิทธิพลจากโครงสร้าง

ราชภิรมณ์คุณค่า

ราชภิรมณ์คุณค่า
๑๙. (ยัง) พระยารามราชอนันต์ราชวงศ์พระกระษัตริย์วัดสุวรรณภูมิ
จัดทำเป็น (หลัก) กลาย......
๒๐. พระยาโรงธรรมมหาพรหมหนานั้นจัดทำหนังคบพระราชา
ประจุบดี
๒๑. ......ไฟลักขามณีควรบปริหารไฟฟ้าทั้งหลายถวายเมืองล่มเกลี้ย
๒๒. (อย่าง) ......ราชมีทางหนานี้เถิงกลางเมืองสุริยโยธินเป็น
ประธานยิ่งเกลี้ย
๒๓. (อย่าง) ......ทำเนียบช่วยกันแพร่athaช่วยป้องกันเอาไว้
๒๔. ......เมืองหลานทั้งนี้ไปสูโรยยะราเรื่องคนเมืองังนั้นถวาย
๒๕. ......ไปไว้ข้างทางพี่สองหนานี้ราชราชทางไปสูคนนั้นนั้นถวาย
แพร่ท่านซื่อช่วยทางถาว
๒๖. ย่อมเร้นเอาไปเวียนแจกข้าไถว่รังนี้จ้าช่วยบัณฑิตท่านหากวิ่งไปท้า
ให้แก่ข้าราชปรมณ์ได้
๒๗. ย่อมใส่แนะนังใจ......ใหญ่สูงเสียงช่วยข้างทางและไข่ข้าง
พนักงานทหาร......
๒๘. ......เสียทางท่าน......ตายในนำทีในราชศาสตร์ธรรมศาสตร์
และ
๒๙. สถานที่ก่อคืนใหญ่มัสกระกี่ไม่นั้นถักกันทำนานไปทันเอาออก
จากเมืองนั้นแล
๓๐. ......หน้าไปในกลางเมือง ๕ มาตราหนึ่งเสกสุทธิภูมิ
๓๑. ......เล่าผู้ใดยอมพ่ายบานนอก......เมืองเหลนกันยังใกล้จาก
๓๒. ......แก่เมืองใหญ่ทั้งหลายทำเนียบรอย
๒๗.  ..... แก้สนธานบ้านเนื้ออี้เสียหายบาง

๒๘.  ..... ช่วยสนธณาภิเษกรัฐมนตรีซึ่งจะขอข้อค้านในปรากฏการ

๒๙.  ..... ข้าราชการอธิบดีรัฐมนตรีพักผ่อนไปตามสั่งของหน่วย

สโมสรว่า

๓๐.  (อย่าง)  ที่กินอาชีพทีู่ในไปสูงขึ้นให้ไม่ใช้ว่าขาด

๓๑.  ..... ท่านเนื้อพิช.... แก้พิเศษแผนดินแกร่งปานทางเดิมเมื่อ....

จริงแน่นิ้วทำอย่างไรให้ไป......

๓๒.  ..... เมือง...... จับป้องคุมให้เข้าชั่นนั้น...... พยายามเล่าจ่า

๓๓.  ..... กล้านแต่เอามาให้พนสังข์ทางในชั้นทหารสารทำการ

ธรรมยากรทาง...... เข้าให้ได้

๓๔.  แกมนั้นแกล้กเอ้าช้าท่านเจ้าสิ่งในค์เส้นผ่านโคหาแม่สอส

แล้วช้าท่านพื้นสนามกัน

๓๕.  ถู... นิทานจาก ให้ใหม่แล้วนันสมมิพ์พน ไปจึงเกี่ยวกว่า พื

เป็นที่สิ้นท่านพน

๓๖.  ..... บ่นไปแผ่นพันประชาคิพ์เป็นแปลควบในทรงอ่อนผลอยู่ใจ

ช้าท่านพนในแปลควบ

๓๗.  สินใหม่ทำหมื่นทำพนแผนซึ่งพนวันนี้คึกคักท่านกระทำการสินใหม่

แผน

๓๘.  ผู้นี้โดยลักษณะกลกเกิดหน้าแล้วไปบ้านเก้าแลบจากการหนึ่งแล

เห็นแผนก้มผ่อนยอดมิ

๓๙.  ..... ทานจากใหม่คนคุณทานโดยกีทังข้าราชการธรรมยากรราช

ศาสตร์โคลง ๐ แม
การแปลงสะกดในบ้านผู้จักบ้านแห่งนี้แล้วเมืองเด็กผู้คนท่านไปจ่อยกันก็ไปถึงบ้านของคนกัน

ก็ไม่ยอมแกล้งกาวัจข้าพเจ้ามาส่งชัย......อนั่นไงไปจ่ายไปกลาย
กันก็ให้คนเจ้าบ้านเจ้า

เวียน... พิจารณาเห็นว่าจะจ้างเอาใจก็แล้วเอาใจน้อยอีก
ของ......

เจ้าให้ทำจ้างจริงข้าพเจ้าคนเจ้าของบั่นให้เกิดไปตาม
หายก่อนช่วง......

-----------------------------(ชั้นตุ๊ก)
-----------------------------(ชั้นตุ๊ก)

Face II

1. นั่งให้แก่เจ้าหน้าชื่ออันนี้คิดช่วยคิดยกเก็บไปแล้วให้ตัวคิดอยู่

2. สำนึกติดให้แก่ผู้ช่วยคิดยกคิดนั่นซึ่งคนนั้นคนนี้คิดอยู่คนนั้น

3. แสดงแนวณะจริงมะตูบโดยบรรยายบททำนั้นยั่งเจ้าช่วย......ครั้ง

4. คิดนั่งเพื่ออยู่เจ้าทุกข์นี้ให้ยืนเก็บขอน้อยต่างเจ้าของไปเลย

5. นั่งทำแต่งให้เข้าตรงเพื่อนคนนาคนนิ่งใส่ทำแต่งโดยอย่าน

นอกจากข้าพเจ้าอยู่
6. ต้องยึดกันแน่นและแน่นกันแข็งกันอย่างหนึ่งในที่เก็บที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูง

7. เลื่อนน้ำหนักของผูที่เก็บที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูงกว่า

8. มีผู้ผลิตที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูงกว่า

9. ยึดกันแน่นที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูงกว่า

10. เลื่อนน้ำหนักของผูที่เก็บที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูงกว่า

11. ให้ผลิตภัณฑ์ที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูงกว่า

12. ให้ผลิตภัณฑ์ที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูงกว่า

13. ผูผลิตที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูงกว่า

14. ผูผลิตที่สูงกว่าไม่ต่ำกว่าที่เก็บที่สูงกว่า
19. และถ้าฝ่ายหนึ่งปล่อยไปก็ให้จำนำบางประการไว้จนถึงวันราชาภูมิ
ayan เลยจุนเงินแล้วแล้ว
20. ว่าพ่อพันธ์ในขณะแล้วยอมละออกท่านท่านเสร็จเมื่อใดในบ้านใน
หายได้จะย้าย
21. ซ่อนถ้าพวกเขาวงค์ย้อมแล้วลักษณะท่านท่านเสร็จเมื่อใดในบ้านใน
หายได้จะย้าย
22. ให้ส่งผู้ท่านท่านเสร็จให้ใช้งานเสียดินที่
23. และถ้าใบเหยื่อมฉบับใด (ศกศิลปะ) แล้วถูกผู้ท่านท่านเสร็จ
หายได้จะย้าย
24. ท่านท่านเสร็จให้ดูแลicensed อย่างอย่างตามราชการอบรมธรรมราช
อนันท์แล้วได้กําลัง
25. จ้างคนท่านท่านเสร็จให้ตายเครื่องของผู้ผ่านท่านเสร็จอยู่ในวันใหญ่
ปี เจาะวันแสงใส
26. ให้ยื้อมันแล้วเหล่าก่อนชันสมบัติแห่งก่อนโมคลาภฉุยปรากฏ
ใหญ่เจาะทะนัส
27. ให้ปรับท่านท่านเสร็จให้จำนวนมากเหมือนเป็นหน้าบ้านก่อนโมคลาภฉุยปรากฏ
ใหญ่เจาะทะนัส
24. บ้านท่านถูกติดตามท่านผู้ใหญ่ลงคนไปถึงท่าฯท่านก็ถึงไปถูกค่วยคนแลก

25. แล้ววันนี้กลอจอมิ่งฝั่งท่านอ่อนนดานพื้นในประจำสัตว์มีเก็ญกัน

26. มีทูลเกจิโขงนอกแกลงปราสาทบกที่ข้ามซิ่ง (บ้านเก่า) ถ้า

27. ทำเจ้าบุรุษเตี้ยมป่าไปก่อเกดกับกีฬาลูกนี้ไร้เวลานั้นโค้งแล้ว

28. ไม่เห็นเจ้าโขงนอกแกลงปราสาทบกที่ข้ามซิ่ง (บ้านเก่า) ถ้า

29. ใส่กับผู้ใหญ่สื่อร้อย่ำผู้ใหญ่ท่านเจ้าแต่งให้ได้แกลงบั้นโค้งขนาด

30. ริสาท (ดั้ง) ทำเจ้าบุรุษตั้งผืนนี้ (เกาะธี) สุก (ชะระยา) ทำแกละ 0 ผ่าน

31. เอาเข้าระบบของทำเหมือนกลูกขุนท่านทำคนได้ก็ดีคนเจ้าของ

32. ผู้ใหญ่ทุกช่องหุ่นอยู่ดีอย่างนี้ให้แทนผู้ใหญ่ผู้นั้นเร็ววันถือถึง

33. มีคานทางล่าชัยอยู่ข้างเอาเจิงให้แทนผู้ใหญ่ผู้นั้นเร็ววันถือถึง

34. ให้มาให้เอำนนั้นจุใจได้แต่ให้ไปถึงแยกทำทำแยกบางใหม่ให้เป็น

35. นั้นให้ทำเป็นเร็วผู้ใหญ่ผู้ใหญ่ผู้นั้นใหญ่แล้วทำเจ้าก็ทำ 0

36. คนผู้ใหญ่ผู้ใหญ่ให้ปล่อยถ่ายออกเธออยู่กู้ผู้ใหญ่ผู้ใหญ่คนนั้นคนนี้ทำ

37. ใช้โค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้нโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบั้นโค้งบน
๓๙. แลเห็นยันเดือนยันเสียในผู้ชายสองคนเอาไว้ใส่ท่านถูกให้ใช้จงส้นถานยูกบก
๔๐. ข้า O มหาณิรังไชคผู้ใหญ่ซึ่งมีการอนุญาต (แลเห็นยันเตือน
ไม่ใช้ถานขณะข้าราชการ)
๔๑. ให้เอาวัตถุน้อยซึ่งกนิษฐาให้แก่เชื้อสายเดิม
๔๒. ไม่ได้ให้เยี่ยมยุรีย้อนเดือนแล้วเพื่อนของการ์คเข้าถูกก้าว
๔๓. ผู้ได้เบื้องสูงที่มีท่านผู้ใหญ่ให้ประทานติเตียน (โบยยู่) ท่าน
ปลายเปลว
๔๔. ผู้ใช้จะกลับท่านกันเปลวทรงท่าน ......... นั้นผู้ทั้งหลายเห็นนั้น
(พระปรมาภิไธย)
๔๕. ผู้เล่นว่าจะกลับมีสองเหล่าข้ามกันไปขณะว่าทังทั้งหลายเส่มซึ่งของ
มัน
๔๖. มากกว่าจะกลับกันแลว .. ท่านหลายเส่มซึ่งใดอยู่
๔๗. .........ฯลฯ ให้แก่ผู้นั้น
๔๘. ......... ไปบุญกันท่าน ........... นั้นผู้นั้น ......... ใจสั่งให้เจ้าไถ
๔๙. ......... ฯลฯ ให้ทางชีวิตทำแรมวัฒน์เส่มนั้น จงให้ไว้เส่มสิน
๕๐. ......... ว่าท่านผู้นั้นคือผู้มีพระคุณกลับคำข้อห์บ้านย่อมเกี่ย
แก่
๕๑. ......... ในที่นี้ นี้เสียท่านเจ้าใจหักมิให้ผู้คนเสียแน่ ..
๕๒. ......... บรรลุอย่างย่อม
๕๓. ......... แปลคืนผู้นั้น
๕๔. ......... ลูกอาภิเณท์ให้
TRANSLATION

Preamble

[I/1-4.] .................. śaka, year of the ox; full moon day of Baisākhaḥ, Thursday; in Tai, mīn +hmau; .................. lagnā in Phaguni; the time is afternoon. This capital is under the authority of Saṃteca Pabitra Mahārājaputra rāja Śrī Paramacakra- barrtiśa, who has succeeded to the throne in accordance with the royal wish. This sacred kingdom is like the Tābatiṇā.11

[I/5-10.] His Majesty proceeded to Kāṃbènbejrapūriśrivimalāsana12 with his retinue13, his generals, and his army with four

8) The printed edition has the digit 5 before śaka at I/1; but an examination of the stone shows that the figure is completely illegible and must be disregarded. It shows too that the Tai name of the day is mīn +hmau, hmānu (and not hmānu). The only year in which the calendrical data coincided was CS 759 (1397). We wish to thank Mr Roger Billard, of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient, for going to a great deal of trouble to confirm this for us, examining all the possibilities from the time of Rām Kamhong up to 1900 A.D. He writes as follows: 'if the reading is certain for all the elements of the combination “year of the ox, full moon day of Vaiśākha, Thursday, mīn +hmau”, and if no mistake was made by the astrologer or the engraver, the only possibility is CS 759 (MS 1319), or, to be more precise, Thursday April 12, 1397 A.D. (Julian); thanks to the mention of the lagnā, we can even add that the hour was around 3 p.m. local civil time.' In view of the hour worked out by Mr Billard from the lagnā, we we have translated twānā as 'the time is afternoon' rather than 'evening', which is the usual meaning.

9) As the date is 1397 A.D., this is necessarily Rāmarūja, 'the royal son' (mahārājaputra) who had succeeded his father Rāmeśvara as King of Ayudhya in 1395. The mutilated name may therefore be restored as Rāmarūjādhirāja.

10) Probably a wish expressed by Rāmeśvara before his death in 1395.

11) The Tāvatiṃsa Heaven. While 'succeeded to the throne' refers to the throne of Ayudhya, 'this sacred kingdom' (saṃtvaramahārajanī) apparently means Sukhodaya, whose kings had long borne the title Dharmarūjā (a title which was apparently not in use at that time by Ayudhyan royalty).

12) Gampeng Pēt (Kāmbēn Beja). The epithet vimalāsana means ‘seat of purity’.

13) śṛṅgāraparibāra, for śṛṅgāraparivāra (Skt. śṛṅgāra, ‘concubines’; parivāra, ‘suite’).
A LAW PROMULGATED BY THE KING OF AYUDHYA IN 1397 A.D.

branches\textsuperscript{14} [from?] the rivers of Braññā Baññī Kṣetra Sagāpūrī, Braññā Baññī Śrī Sejanālaiyapūrī, Braññā Baññī Dvaiyanadi Śrī Yamanā, and his elder brother Braññā Baññī Nagòrdaiyā.\textsuperscript{15} ............... The King’s maternal uncle, the Pabitramantri Anujita, who had reared him up ...... the Lord of Mōañ Trāyatriṅśa, together with the wise men and Rājakavi of high-ranking family, sat down to do homage to his

\textsuperscript{14} The four branches (caturāṅga) of an army in ancient India were the elephantry, the chariots, the cavalry, and the infantry. In Siam, where chariots were not used, the second branch consisted of artisans. See Quaritch Wales, \textit{Ancient Siamese Government and Administration}, p. 141.

\textsuperscript{15} This passage is quite baffling. As the four places mentioned were part of the vassal kingdom of Sukhodaya, their rulers presumably owed their allegiance primarily to the King of Sukhodaya and through him to the King of Ayudhyā. Sagāpurī (Sakāburī) was probably somewhere north of \textit{Lom Sak}; cf. Inscr. I, IV/18, where it is mentioned after \textit{Lom Sak} and before the shore of the \textit{Mē Kōng} and Vieng Jan; also Inscr. VIII, IV/12 f., where it comes after \textit{Mūang Rū} (probably near Uttaratittha) and before \textit{Lom Sak}. Sejanālaiyā is of course Sajjanālaya, which appears frequently in the inscriptions, but spelt with So- only in No. II (passim) and No. XI (II/13). The ‘two rivers’ (dvaiyanadi) of Śrī Yamanā must be the two main branches of the \textit{Yom}; cf. the Asokārama Inscription, II/23 (see supra, p. 51). Nagòrdaiyā (for Nagaradaiyā) is \textit{Nakōn Tai}, the old site of which, if not exactly the same as at present, was probably in the same general area, i.e. northeast of Bīṣṇuloka; cf. the Asokārama Inscription, II/17; we cannot say why its ruler is called the King of Ayudhyā's 'elder brother' (the term need not be taken literally, and here probably means a cousin belonging to an elder branch of his family). What is the significance of the titles of the four rulers? The context suggests that Braññā Baññī (i.e. bāññī, \textit{vī}) meant a vassal ruler, but we know of no instances of the expression being used in this sense. On the other hand the word may be related to \textit{trāṭbāñ} (\textit{mēvī}), a pond, as if the rulers were called 'lords of the ponds' of their respective territories. The ponds and rivers remind us, though remotely, of part of the abhiṣēka ceremony in which, as Mr Quaritch Wales tells us, 'the king of Siam is lustrated with water drawn from the five principal rivers of the kingdom, and from the four ponds of Subārapurī sanctified through constant usage in every State Ceremony where there is a purificatory bath, both in the Ayudhyā and Bangkok periods', etc. (\textit{Siamese State Ceremonies}, London, 1931, p. 74). But the connection, if there is one, is difficult to grasp.
sacred feet. His Majesty, having entered the Trimukha, enjoyed the merit and felicity due to his deeds [in past lives].

[I/10–13.] A little later His Majesty, turning, proceeded to the city of Sukhodaya, [to promulgate a law to?] the throng of evil-doers and the people in general, in order to make known to the people—all living creatures, both women and men, both monks and Brahmins—who are being troubled by the evil-doers. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . the plan by which His Majesty, having succeeded

16) Trāyātrīnā is Mōṇa Traipriṇa (మంత్రించ), a ruined town on the right bank of the Ping, in the Municipal District of Gampēṅg Pet, some 15 km. downstream from Gampēṅg Pet itself (see Map 2, supra, p. 31). The name of the place is a corruption of Skt. Trayastrīni (= Pali Tāvatiṃsa); according to Prince Paramanujita Jinarasandrā’s Sāmīrīpācakārākaṇḍa, the mother of Prince Ō Tōng (Rāmadhipati I of Ayudhya) was a princess of Mōṇa Traipriṇa. At the time our inscription was written, Traipriṇa was part of the vassal kingdom of Sukhodaya. The lacuna at I/9 makes it impossible to say whether the King’s maternal uncle was the lord of this place or whether two different persons are intended. Rājākavi means royal counsellor or poet (cf. the Kavirājapāṇḍita Śri Dharmatrāloka, who in 1399 drafted the Pali face of the Asokārā Inscription on behalf of his elder sister the Queen Mother, widow of Mahādharmanājī II (see supra, p. 38)

17) A ceremonial pavilion with three porches.

18) nau. This word, which now means ‘to change’ (transitive or intransitive), ‘to turn’ (from one thing into another), ‘to transform’, ‘to be transformed’, etc., occurs frequently in the inscription, but with a rather different meaning from its modern ones. Mr. Lingat suggests that when it is used as an auxiliary verb preceding the main verb it simply implies a change from the previous state of affairs. Here it evidently means that the King, having stayed as long as he wished at Gampēṅg Pet, continued his journey. At I/13 it means turning to take action. At I/18, 19, II/7, 12, 13, 14 (twice), 16 (twice), and 30, it implies that a person who was previously considered honest now succumbs to temptation, ‘changes’ into a wrong-doer, or ‘turns away’ from the path of virtue. In several instances we have omitted it from our translation in order to make for smoother reading.

19) The printed text has .... . The right reading is त्रायात्रीन, ‘into the city of Sukhodaya.’

20) युन्न here must have its Sanskrit meaning (nyāya, ‘plan’, ‘rule’, ‘model’, ‘an axiom which must be kept in mind in the explanation of special rules’, etc.), not its usual Siamese meaning of a mythical story.
A LAW PROMULGATED BY THE KING OF AYUDHYÄ IN 1397 A.D.

To supreme power, desires to cleanse this region in accordance with the Manusadharma like Brañña Rāmarāja, whose renown a throng of virtuous people have revealed clearly and happily to succeeding generations of children and grandchildren, and whose greatness is proverbial.

[I/13 -17.] Turning ................. [His Majesty issued] extremely mighty royal commands. Then he promulgated this law to all officials and group-chiefs as well as their retainers

21) i.e. either Manusadharma (human law) or else the Laws of Manu (cf. above, p. 109). In effect the King was imposing Ayudhyan law on Sukhodaya; see our article On Kingship and Society at Sukhodaya.

22) The legendary King Rāma of Ayodhya in India, the hero of the Rāmāyanā and the Rāmakirti, was the ideal king all monarchs are supposed to imitate. The model would be all the more cogent to the author of the inscription, who was his namesake and ruler of a kingdom bearing the same name (Ayudhya was still called Ayodhya at the time). According to the Dasara-thājakāta, the Indian hero governed his kingdom in absentia for three years by giving his slippers to his half-brother Bharata who ruled in his place; whenever a case was to be judged, the slippers were placed on the throne; if the decision was wrong, they beat against each other. (See Cowell, The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha's Former Births, Vol. IV, London, 1957, p. 81 ff.) As the King of Ayudhya would not visit Sukhodaya in person, he perhaps wished to imply that the vassal king and his deputies should bear the lesson in mind whenever a case had to be judged. In addition, the author of the inscription may well have intended a paronomastic reference to King Rāma Gajahēn of Sukhodaya, who was perhaps one of his ancestors, and who is known in Sukhodayan epigraphy (except Inscription I) as Brañña Rāmarāja.

23) Prajñāpti, the Sanskrit equivalent of Pali paññatti.

24) lūk khun mun tvān (ลูกขุนมณี). As tvān is apparently the Malay word tuan, master, equivalent to Siamese nāy, the phrase must be equivalent to the more usual lūk khun mun nāy, which appears at I/24, II/41 and II/42. In Ayudhyan law the Lūk Khun are the officials in general, while the Mun Nāy are the chiefs of the territorial groups into which the population was divided (see above, p. 111). This must be the meaning Rāmarāja had in mind, although, as we have suggested, it is doubtful if the system had more than a theoretical existence at Sukhodaya in 1397 (Rāmarāja's is the only inscription from Sukhodaya that mentions the term mun nāy, and even the title nāy is not attested until c. 1406, i.e. in Inscription IX, III/9 and III/11, where it has a different connotation). Probably much power still remained in the hands of the feudal lords; and in places where there was no government-appointed bureaucracy Rāmarāja may have intended the lords to perform the duties he is theoretically assigning to the lūk khun and the mun nāy (or mun tvān) in his law.
and all citizens, in all small towns as well as large ones......... throughout this whole region. [He promulgated it] in the center of the city of Sukhodaya which is the metropolis midway between cities ............. such as Jalyaň, Kāmbeňe Bejra, Duň +Yān, Pāk Yam, and Sōn Gwê.25

25) Jalyaň is Chalieng, 2 km. east of Sajjanālaya; Kāmbeňe Bejra is Gampēng Pet; Duň +Yān is Tung Yang, in the Municipal District of Uttaratittha; Pāk Yam is Pāk Yon, whose name shows that it was at the confluence of the Yom with the Nān; Sōn Gwê is Sōng Kwê, i.e. Biśuloka. Cf. the list in Rāmadhipati's Law on Abduction (Lingat, L'esclavage privé dans le vieux droit siamois, 360) : Chalieng, Sukhodaya, Tung Yang, Bāng Yom, Sōng Kwê, Sā Luang, Chāo-dong-rāo (i.e. Chā-gang-rāo), Gampēng Pet. Prince Damrong (Pramātra Lokānātha) observed that these names fall into pairs of cities which were linked geographically or by tradition: Chalieng and Sukhodaya; Tung Yang and Bāng Yom; Sōng Kwê and Sā Luang; Chāo-dong-rāo and Gampēng Pet. But it is a somewhat heterogeneous pairing. Chalieng, which had been the chief city of its province during the Khmer occupation, was later overshadowed by its neighbor Sajjanālaya. (Sajjanālaya, mentioned in our inscription at I/7 but not in the list at I/17 or in Rāmadhipati's list, was probably founded by Rām Kāmheṅ; as the second city of the independent kingdom of Sukhodaya, and long the seat of the Uparāja, it is constantly linked with the capital in the Sukhodayan inscriptions, though it was over 60 km. away.) Under Ayudhyan rule Chalieng regained its importance; in the 15th century, if not before, it gave its name to the provincial governor appointed by Ayudhyā, Prayā Chalieng, suggesting that it was his residence; and Paramatra Lokānātha built the great temple of Mahādātā there, probably on the ruins of a Khmer temple dating from the reign of Jayavarman VII (see Griswold, Towards a History of Sukhodaya Art, p. 57). Unless the Yom flowed into the Nān much further north than it now does, it is hard to see why Bāng Yom should be linked with Tung Yang, as Sōng Kwê would be between the two. Sā Luang (Sraḥ Hlvaň) must have been between Sukhodaya and Sōng Kwê, perhaps quite close to the latter. Gampēng Pet probably occupied its present location, and Chā-gang-rāo may have been very near it.
A LAW PROMULGATED BY THE KING OF AYUDHYA IN 1397 A.D.

Article [1].

[I/18-21.] ............... [When a slave in one of] those cities\(^{26}\) runs away to a person’s house, if that person ............... ...... withholds the slave for more than two days\(^{27}\); or else, having learned towards evening that the slave arrived at his house that day, and being unable to send him back at once [because of the hour], then if he does not hasten to give him up to the Officer of Slave Affairs early the next morning, and the Officer and the Chief Magistrate, happening to learn [what has occurred], go to fetch him to give him to his master, the law provides that:

[I/21-24.] If anyone, ............... [no matter how] powerful and highly placed, fails to return someone’s slave, or withholds someone’s slave or wife\(^{28}\) ............... \(^{29}\) he shall be ...... [judged?] according to the rules\(^{30}\) of the Rājaśāstra and the Dharmaśāstra. A fine\(^{31}\) shall be imposed on him exactly as [if he were] a

\(^{26}\) Article 1 deals with matters in large cities, such as those just enumerated, where there must have been a considerable bureaucracy; at least two officials are named, an Officer of Slave Affairs (sīva) and a Chief Magistrate (subhāpāti). Our reconstruction of the lacuna at the beginning of I/18 is of course conjectural, but the meaning is obvious from what follows.

\(^{27}\) In the traditional reckoning, any part of a day counts as a whole day.

\(^{28}\) พระอัครก (i.e. 苕ิ, the wife of a private person; นิชิ, the wife of a lord).

\(^{29}\) We have not attempted to translate ้ (I/22); the lacunae make it impossible to guess the meaning.

\(^{30}\) नम now usually means 'size'; but Pallegoix defines it as 'modus, exemplar, regula, aliquid determinatum, forma' (Dictionarium linguae thai sive siamensis, Paris, 1854, p. 276). In this inscription when it is followed by ้, etc., it is best rendered by 'rules'.

\(^{31}\) In translating ้ as a fine, we use the word loosely, to include not only fines paid to the Crown or the local lord, but also damages paid to the victim (in this case the slave-owner or husband). In Ayudhyan law ้ generally means the portion paid as damages to the victim, whereas a fine in the strict sense is ้ (vinaya). But in the present text the word seems to include both. Rāmādhipati’s Law on Abduction specifies in what proportions the fines for certain offenses are to be divided between the Crown and the victim. See Lingat, L’esclavage privé, 364, 369, etc.
thief who stole someone's people but, instead of taking them out of the city immediately, ran away and hid them inside the city.

32) Anyone who abducted a person's wife, child or slave was a thief and subject to punishment as such (see Lingat, *L'esclavage privé*, 126-8, 214-221). Abducted persons were in the same category as stolen goods; the 'injured party', to whom the damages would be paid, was not the abducted person, but the owner of the goods (i.e. the husband of the abducted wife, the father of the abducted child, or the owner of the slave). The penalty depended on the circumstances of the abduction (see below, note 49) and the value of the goods. Under the Law of Compensation, the value of a male slave began at 6 silver ticals for an infant, gradually rose to 56 ticals for the period of his greatest usefulness between the ages of 26 and 40, then gradually decreased again, dropping to 4 ticals at the age of 91; the value of a female slave began at 4 ticals, rose to 48 ticals between the ages of 21 and 30, then gradually decreased to 3 ticals at the age of 91. The value of the wife or child of a free citizen was calculated by multiplying the above figures by a specified coefficient depending on their dignity-marks. See Quaritch Wales, *Ancient Siamese Government and Administration*, 191-3; Lingat, *L'esclavage privé*, 61-63, 79-80.

33) Under Article 1 of Rāmadhipati's Law on Abduction (Recension of 1805) a man who abducted someone's wife, children or slaves and kept them hidden in his own house was fined an amount equal to their value, whereas if he took them out of the province the penalty would be higher (see Lingat, *L'esclavage privé*, 362; cf. below, note 49). But Article 3 of that law is more lenient than Rāmarāja's: a householder who withholds a runaway slave or other person who has taken refuge with him is given three days' grace instead of two; after that it provides a fine of 11,000 cowries per day until a month has elapsed, whereupon a fine equal to the value is inflicted. The money is equally divided between the Crown and the injured party (see Lingat, ibid., 363-4).
Article [2].

[I/24-33.] Officials and group-chiefs, anyone living in the countryside or in a small town, and all persons who live far away from the boundaries of large cities such as Jalyāi.

[If a slave runs away] to someone's dwelling-place, ..... whether [he is there] for a day or half a day; or if a slave [belonging to a person] who is under someone's jurisdiction, ..... or a preceptor's slave, or an upādhyāya's slave, runs away to someone's place or into his house; the man who took the slave there must return him. Whoever withholds someone's slave is guilty of an offense against the King and against the chief of the village and the lord of the district truly. If the master is not at home,
[someone] must go [and find him?] 42 ................. district .........  

The slaveowner shall be compelled 43 .................  

excused because he fears the law. 44  

[I/33–39.] ................. Whoever [steals] someone's people and brings them [to a place such as those mentioned] shall not escape punishment in accordance with the rules of Rājaśāstra and the Dharmaśāstra ....... Punishment shall be inflicted on the slave, 45 and on the man who brought him there, as follows [?]. If anyone commits the transgression 46 of withholding a slave for more than three days, he shall be fined eleven thousand [cowries] for each [additional] day up to five, making just fifty-five thousand for the [eight] 47 days; for example if the period elapsed is just eight days as stated, and he withholds the slave beyond the [three-day] limit but

42) The master (Lūh) may be the owner of the house or else the owner of the slave. If the latter, the meaning may be that the man who brought the slave there will not be excused from his obligation to return the slave on the pretext that he cannot find the slaveowner; or perhaps the slaveowner is to be called as a witness but is away from home; cf. Lingat in Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin, XVIII, 408.

43) Perhaps compelled to reimburse the man for his time and expense in returning the slave (cf. Lingat, L'esclavage privé, 368).

44) Conjectural translation, based on the assumption that . īva (I/32) stands for śrū. The passage seems to mean that if the man returns the slave within the specified time-limit he will be excused in accordance with Article 2 of the Law on Abduction (ibid., 363).

45) īvu (īvù). Under Article 1 of the Law on Abduction, a fugitive slave, if he was over 12 years old, was to receive 20 or 30 strokes of the rattan, depending on his age (ibid., 363).

46) īva, i.e. īva; cf. above, pp. 111-112. In modern times, as Mr Lingat tells us, the word is used as an equivalent to 'tort' in English law; but in Ayudhyan law it meant a transgression of a particular sort, namely the infraction of a rule established by the King, and it was punished by a fine depending on the rank (measured in sakti-nā) of the culprit and of the injured party. See Lingat, L'esclavage privé, p. 355 note 1.

47) The word is illegible, but the context shows that it must have been 'eight'.

not beyond eight days, he shall be fined fifty-five thousand; but if
one more day passes, he shall be fined in accordance with the rule in
regard to stealing someone's possessions, and taking them to his home
[shall be deemed the same] as taking them out of the province. His offense shall be considered a transgression and he shall be fined in proportion to dignity in accordance with the rules of the Dharmaśāstra and the Rājaśāstra.

48) The analogy of Article 3 of the Law on Abduction (ibid., 363) suggests that the person being fined is the owner of the house who has failed to return the slave promptly; but it might equally well be the man who brought the slave to the house; indeed in many cases the man who brought him there would be the house-owner himself. Article 2 of the Law on Abduction is more lenient than the present article; it grants five days' grace instead of three to the householder who lives in the country; after that, the fine of 11,000 cowries per day runs for a month instead of eight days; and only then does the higher penalty come into operation (ibid., 363-4).

49) Under Article 1 of the Law on Abduction, the penalty for abducting a slave and starting to take him out of the province would be one-and-a-half times the value of the slave; if he is taken into another province or offered for sale, the fine would be twice the value, provided the slave is returned; if not, the fine would be three times the value and the culprit would be flogged and marked with a brand or tattoo on the forehead (ibid., 362-3).

50) Such appears to be the sense of  in the present context (cf. Khmer , to divide, to break, to violate).

51) See note 46.

52) Śakti, i.e. śakti-nā; cf. above, p. 111.
Article [3].

[I/40-45, II/1-4.] When a thief who has stolen someone's people either stops at a person's place as stated below or passes by it, or when a thief who has stolen oxen, buffaloes, elephants, horses, or animals of any sort, either stops there or passes by, let the householder take thought. If he knows that the man really stole the goods, he should seize him and take him, together with the goods [to the lord of the district]. If the lord decides that the slaves are really and truly in a category which the owner has not given away, not a single one of them, since he is still looking for them. Let a [reward] be given to those who helped to recover the stolen goods. If a man who helped the thief steal and shared the loot with him demands a reward the lord shall not let him have it. [If the man], having taken note of the law, complains against the owner on these grounds, ought he get a reward or not?

53) i.e. immediately following.
54) Conjectural translation of ỉwir; we might have been inclined to translate: 'if the owner says', but the term for owner in the very same line is ỉt.".
55) A person who abducts slaves but returns them before their owner has learned their whereabouts is excused from punishment (Article 2 of the Law on Abduction; cf. below, note 62).
56) The last part of I/43 and the whole of I/44-45 are broken off.
57) i.e. if the owner of the place was an accomplice of the thief from the beginning or accepted a bribe from the thief to let him go, but later informs against the thief and demands a reward for doing so.
58) apparently the owner of the stolen goods, who would in the first instance have to pay the reward, though he would expect ultimately to get it back from the guilty parties. Alternatively might be the person who is judging the case.
59) i.e. the accomplice, who was also the owner of the place (cf. note 57).
60) thus.
This man was guilty of negligence, waiting until the owner went to him before producing the thief. The law provides that he shall be treated according to the rule for such cases, and judged as set forth in the section on negligence (dealing with those who) wait until the owner himself goes first (to look for the goods); and if he had an understanding with the thief he shall be further sentenced (as stated) below.

61) अनन्य, Skt. upeksa, 'indifference', 'negligence,' etc.
62) The Law on Abduction makes a sharp distinction between cases in which the slaves are returned before the owner has any information about their whereabouts, and those in which someone withholds them until he is questioned. See Lingat, L'esclavage privé 363, 364, 369, etc.
63) In other words the claimant is not only denied a reward but is also penalized for non-feasance in accordance with Article 5; and if he is proved to have been an accomplice of the thief he will be further penalized as stated in Article 6.
Article [4].

[II/6–8.] If a person catches a thief with stolen goods such as slaves, people or cattle,⁶⁴ and if that person turns and takes them into a city,⁶⁵ withholding the whole lot including relatives and wife for almost a day, in that case not a single thing out of the whole lot shall be given him [as a reward].

[II/8–10.] [In keeping with] ancient custom, he must be punished in conformity with whatever rules there are in the Rājaśāstra regarding thieves and concealers of stolen goods. He shall be sentenced accordingly.

---

⁶⁴) The rhyming phrase रुम्पुर्ण (रुम्पुर्ण), ‘oxen, bulls and ropes’, is apparently a ready-made expression meaning domesticated cattle. We have therefore omitted ‘ropes’ in our translation.

⁶⁵) We translate नगर as ‘city’ on the supposition that the theft occurred in the country, and the householder caught the thief in the country.
Article [5].

[II/10–22.] When a robber, having stolen someone’s people or cattle and run away, either goes past a person’s place as stated above\(^{66}\), or stops at his house \(...\)^{67}, if that person is guilty of negligence, not seizing [the thief] but letting him go; or else upon reflection he realizes that the man stole [the goods], but as the thief is his brother or cousin he deliberately lets him go; or else seeing that the thief is the servant of a powerful man, he lets him go because he fears that man’s power\(^{68}\); or else he seizes the thief but the thief bribes him, and so in exchange for the thief’s bribe\(^{69}\) he lets him go; or else if the owner of the goods or slaves, having chased the thief to the place, cries out for help to seize him, but the householder, though he is at home, does not provide a throng of helpers, and so lets the thief escape; in no matter which case, whether that cited as negligence in not seizing him, or letting him go because the man is his brother or cousin, or cited as letting him go because he is the servant of a powerful man, or cited as taking a bribe from the thief and letting him go, or cited as not helping to seize him and so letting him go; in all these wrongful acts, whenever they occur, at no matter whose place and at no matter what house, in the whole lot of cases like these [the householder] shall be punished exactly as [if he himself] stole someone’s wife or people or whatever goods have been stolen; he shall be made to pay the full value\(^{70}\) of the goods, equal to the fine that would be imposed on the thief; he shall be made

---

66) i.e. in Article 3.

67) The meaning of स्थः at II/11 is uncertain.

68) शक्ति, meaning not only his dignity but also the power and influence that go with his rank.

69) जिन

70) cf. notes 32 and 33. The usual meaning of वाणु ‘debts,’ is clearly not applicable; the meaning here is the same as at II/39.
to pay the reward\textsuperscript{71}; and he shall be fined in proportion to dignity and rank\textsuperscript{72}. Why must it be so?

\[\text{[II/22–27.] When ............. [a thief, having robbed]\textsuperscript{73} someone, flees to a person's house [or passes by with?] a lot [of people and goods] he has stolen, [the householder] shall not be punished if, in his desire for a reward of some kind, he resolves to return them, and takes them to give to their owner. To the extent that the Rājāśāstra and the Dharmaśāstra provide that he should get a reward\textsuperscript{74}, it shall be so; if they provide that he should get a reward in proportion\textsuperscript{75}, it shall be so; the reward for recovering the lot of goods shall be as provided. Knowing that a powerful lord will reward\textsuperscript{76} him exactly as the law provides in these circumstances, why should he be so negligent, having more regard for the thief than for the authority of the law? If he wrongs the victim of the theft, the punishment will prevent him from profiting by it.\textsuperscript{78}\]

\textsuperscript{71)} ฑีฆนิ; Though at II/24 f. the expression meant a bribe, it probably here means a sum given to the persons who helped catch the robber and recover the goods, to repay them for their time and expenses. Cf. Article 12 and 13 of the Law on Abduction (Lingat, op. cit., 364 f., 368 f.).

\textsuperscript{72)} ञัก्ति याशा; for ञाक्ति, see above, p. 111 and note 41; for याशा, titles of rank, see Quaritch Wales, Ancient Siamese Government and Administration, 35 et passim.

\textsuperscript{73) At II/22 there is a lacuna (not shown in the printed text) between रु and भु; it must have contained something like the meaning we have supplied in brackets.

\textsuperscript{74)} पञ्चनामं; see note 71.

\textsuperscript{75) In proportion to the owner's dignity? or in proportion to the value of the stolen goods?}

\textsuperscript{76) महर.}

\textsuperscript{77) न्याति प्रज्ञान्ति. For न्याति, 'authority', see Prince Dhaninivat, Some Loan Words in Siamese, JSS XXVIII/2, 188 f.

\textsuperscript{78) The reader will observe the similarities and differences between Articles 3 and 5. The hypothetical circumstances cited are much the same in both; but in Article 3 the householder fails to do his duty and is punished accordingly, whereas in Article 5 he returns the stolen goods and gets a reward.
Article [6].

[II/27—32.] When a certain man steals things from someone's place or steals someone's people,\(^79\) then any person whom he urged to go and steal, or to go with him to steal, or who knows that somebody has been pilfering articles for as long as ten years or stealing valuables within that period, without anyone [else] knowing or seeing a single one of all those thefts; then if that person, deliberately siding with the thief ...........\(^80\), does not inform the owner or come to tell any of the householders, he shall be fined [as if he himself were] the thief and punished in the same way.\(^81\)

[II/32—33.] He shall be fined [an amount equal to] the value of all that lot of goods, and sentenced according to the rules of the Rājaśāstra and the Dharmasastra as he would be if he had abducted someone's children or wife.

---

79) लोग उक्त at II/28 may be a mistake for लोग, people and slaves; it is clear from II/33 that the legislator has in mind the victim's family as well as his slaves.

80) The passage II/27-30 contains a number of uncertain readings, the meaning is obscure in several places, and our translation is conjectural. We have not attempted to translate नामिन; the sense may be that the thief gave him some of the loot as hush-money.

81) Or perhaps in proportion to dignity.
Article [7].

[II/33–37.] If a man starts to bully someone, or to take something from him by force, even though it is only some sour or sweet fruit the owner has not given him, and if [the owner] has no one to help him catch [the bully], then [anyone who is nearby] must seize him. Even if he is chasing [the owner] with a spear, a sword, or a great big iron weapon, he must be seized and brought to justice. A fine shall be imposed on him and given as a reward to whoever caught him. If at any time a man starts to make [trouble] there, let this be an example for everyone to act upon.

[II/37–40.] Whoever is guilty of negligence, not seizing the bully but letting him go, or not helping to chase and catch the bully, shall be fined an amount equal to the value of the goods lost to the bully who took them by force; whatever it may be, he shall be made to pay it in full. Let no one be guilty of negligence.

---

82) rābivirāma, which perhaps implies hectoring someone noisily and obstructing his passage; cf. Skt. rāvī, 'screaming', virāma, 'leaving off'.
83) รับ (รับใจ).
Article [8].

[II/40–50.] If any person, having some work to be done or some sort of ceremony to be performed, plans to kill a cow or a buffalo but does not point it out so that all may see it, then if the group-chief or if a commoner informs the group-chief that his friends know that person's intention [because he has invited them?] to feast together on portions which are not forbidden, though he has not only seen the law which specifies a flogging for anyone who alters or falsifies [the brands or other marks on an animal] or any ruffian who steals an animal to eat and falsifies [the marks] but also the rule [requiring him to] make his purpose known to everyone; whoever transgresses this law by killing [an animal] to eat without making it known to everyone [beforehand], even if [the animal] belongs to him or by stealing someone's [animal] to eat all these. Whoever takes heed a powerful lord concerned with the throng and goes to inform him, that man is honest towards his lord and serves his lord with honesty. Let a reward be given to that man; let [the guilty party] pay it, together with the value.

[II/50–54.] Men like this, namely those who are devoted to the King, will help safeguard the country for in a throng like this, [whereas those] whom the lord would be prone to consider guilty and to fine all actions even if people who not able to steal.

84) In order to feast the neighbors who will help with the work or attend the ceremony.
85) So as to prove that the animal was not stolen.
86) Mun Nay.
87) We have omitted the words that appear at II/42 in the printed edition, as the reading is doubtful.
88) i.e. the host says they will feast on meat which has been acquired legally, but some of the people who have been invited are skeptical.
89) Perhaps the most likely sense of this fragmentary passage is that if enough people show their loyalty by informing on thieves, the practice of theft will be stamped out.
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