Since the publication of H.L. Shorto's *Dictionary of the Mon Inscriptions* [DMI] in 1971, over thirty inscriptions in Old Mon have been discovered in Thailand and Burma (Figures B and C; Maps 1 and 2).

Although many of the inscriptions are fragmentary, the amount of new lexical material, including spelling variants not attested previously, is sufficient in quantity to warrant the publication of addenda to DMI.*

Equally important is the fact that this newly available corpus redresses not only a regional but also a chronological and dialectological bias in Mon epigraphy.¹

It also raises questions concerning early Khmer-Mon contacts and provides evidence for a chronologically unusually precise case-study of contact-induced language-change and language-shift in Northeastern Thailand and the Chao Phraya basin.²

In Figure A this shift can clearly be seen in the respective bar-graphs; the overlap in the Isan bar-graph may be accounted for by different rates of sub-regional propagation.

This article is divided into the following sections:

1. Seals and Impressed Designs (66/2522; Nw.i)
2. Spatial Deixis in Mon
3. *pragata*
4. Titles
   i. māñ
   ii. *tralā*
   iii. kuruñ
   iv. *kanimrateñ pdaí karom*
   v. ksmuni ~ ka smuni
   vi. ko'
   vii. kmun
5. An Inscribed *Dharmacakra* from Chainat (Jn.14; Jn.15)
6. Mon Inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand – A Reassessment
   i. Ban Kut Ngong (Muang, Chaiyaphum)
   ii. Ban Kaeng (Phu Khiaw, Chaiyaphum)
   iii. Ban Fai Hin (Chumphae, Khon Kaen)
   iv. Other Northeastern sites
   v. A votive tablet from Nadun (Mg.2) and Pagan parallels
7. 'at
8. Conclusion

*Glossary* (Addenda to DMI)

---

* See endnotes.
The information about former coastlines is taken from Phongari Vanasin and Thiwa Supajanya. Ancient cities on the former coastline of Central Thailand. Bangkok, Chulalongkorn University, 1981.
Map 2. Northeastern Thailand. Location of inscriptions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Burma</th>
<th>Lower Burma</th>
<th>Chao Phraya Basin</th>
<th>Northern Thailand</th>
<th>Isan</th>
<th>Eastern Thailand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>AEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>ACD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1350</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A - Slab, pillar
B - simá stone
C - votive tablet, Buddha image
D - glosses
E - stupa
F - seal, amulet
G - copperplate

Figure A: Mon, Khmer, Pali, and Sanskrit inscriptions in Burma and Thailand
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAD No.</th>
<th>Location site</th>
<th>Date at present</th>
<th>Date Type found</th>
<th>Lines Size</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kw.1</td>
<td>Chansen, Nakorn Sawan</td>
<td>private</td>
<td>6c E</td>
<td>[1979] 2 4.2 h</td>
<td>Lpb.87-88.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[D.w.38]</td>
<td>Mon Nang, Chonburi</td>
<td>Lpb M</td>
<td>8c C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh.K.16</td>
<td>Chumphae, Khor Kaen</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c B</td>
<td>1970 5 fr. 118 x 56/75 x</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kh.K.17</td>
<td>Chumphae, Khor Kaen</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c B</td>
<td>1970 8 fr. 143 x 70/85 x</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jy.9</td>
<td>Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c B</td>
<td>1978 2 130 x 43 x 36.5</td>
<td>Surasawadi 1978.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jy.10</td>
<td>Phu Khia, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c B</td>
<td>1978 5 fr. 49 x 64 x 26</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jy.i</td>
<td>Phu Khia, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c B</td>
<td>1978 5 fr. 77 x 61 x 34</td>
<td>Urai 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg.2</td>
<td>Nadun, Mahasarakham</td>
<td>KhK M</td>
<td>8c C</td>
<td>1979 4 13.8 x 11.2</td>
<td>Prasarn/Champa/Thoem 1981; IT.2.77-81; Bauer 1986; Urai 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg.3</td>
<td>Nadun, Mahasarakham</td>
<td>KhK M</td>
<td>8c C</td>
<td>1979 2 fr. 3.8 x 4.2</td>
<td>Prasarn/Champa/Thoem 1981; IT.2.82-84; Bauer 1986; Urai 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks.1</td>
<td>Muang Fa Daet, Kalasin</td>
<td>Bkk NL</td>
<td>8c C</td>
<td>1968 2 12 x 9 x 3.5</td>
<td>Prasarn/Cham 1968; IT.2.85-89; Bauer 1986; Urai 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks.2</td>
<td>Muang Fa Daet, Kalasin</td>
<td>Bkk NL</td>
<td>8c C</td>
<td>1968 2 12 x 9 x 3.5</td>
<td>Prasarn/Cham 1968; IT.2.90-94; Bauer 1986; Urai 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks.7</td>
<td>Muang Fa Daet, Kalasin</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c B</td>
<td>1984 1 73 x 53 x 6</td>
<td>IT.2.100-103; Bauer 1986; Urai 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks.i</td>
<td>Muang Fa Daet, Kalasin</td>
<td>Bkk NL/M?</td>
<td>8c C m</td>
<td>1968 1 21 x 13 x 4</td>
<td>Prasarn/Cham 1969.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks.ii</td>
<td>Muang Fa Daet, Kalasin</td>
<td>Bkk NL/M?</td>
<td>8c C m</td>
<td>1968 1 21.1/2 x 13 x 4</td>
<td>Prasarn/Cham 1968.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ks.iii</td>
<td>Muang Fa Daet, Kalasin</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Urai 1988.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jm.45</td>
<td>San Pa Tong, Chiangmai</td>
<td>Chiangmai U12c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1968 9</td>
<td>Griswold/Na Nakhorn 1971; IT.2.1.4-111.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[23/23]</td>
<td>Saraphi, Chiangmai</td>
<td>Lpb M</td>
<td>12c-13c C</td>
<td>1980 1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24/23]</td>
<td>Saraphi, Chiangmai</td>
<td>Lpb M</td>
<td>12c-13c C</td>
<td>1980 1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B: Mon inscriptions from Thailand and Laos not included in DMI.
1. Seals and Impressed Designs

The sigillography of early Central Thailand (5c-10c) has hitherto received little attention. This is in marked contrast to contemporaneous finds from other regions of continental Southeast Asia, such as the Mekhong Delta, as well as the discussion of numismatic finds of the same period from Central Thailand.3 It is the more regrettable as some of the impressed designs are inscribed in Old Mon; unlike the Mekhong Delta finds, we have here, for the first time, evidence of the vernacular being used for seals, stamps, and other impressed designs. Finds from the Mekhong Delta and Cambodia show Sanskrit inscriptions.

The existence of the two impressed designs featuring Mon inscriptions has been known since 1979, although they had been found earlier; neither object derives from controlled excavations but represent chance finds. Both have been published before; the readings below are corrections.

One is now in storage at the King Narai National Museum, Lopburi, registered as #66/2522; the other object is part of a private collection in Nakhorn Sawan. Both were found at Thambol Chansen, Ta Khli District, Nakhorn Sawan.

The first (#66/2522) is a fragment of baked clay, inscribed in relief at what must be regarded as the base, 2.8 cm in length. It bears an inscription in Old Mon and can be dated to c. 6c, unlike to be later than 7c.

The two lines read:
1. kmun ya
2. sowita(n)

While ya/sowita(n) must be interpreted as a proper name, kmun has been interpreted in other contexts as a verb 'to be king, to reign, rule', being also spelt elsewhere kmun; inflected and derived forms are also attested in DMI, skmun 'shall reign' (s-), kirmin 'royal power' (-r-), kumin 'to enthrone, make king' (vocalic infix), and the periphrastic form -pa kirmun 'to enthron(e). To these should be added now Ks.7 kanmun, the frequentative form (-N-). However, kmun in this syntactic position, also attested in Sp.11, has to be regarded as the grammatical subject, and must thus interpreted be as a noun, despite the morphological evidence cited above which necessitates it to be analyzed as a verb.

The second, referred to in glossary and index as Nw.i, is an object made of baked clay, 4.2 cm in height. The front shows a figure riding a horse. It is inscribed in relief at the base, again in Old Mon, contemporaneous with 66/2522. The two lines read:
1. (s)r[1] trala kyāk
2. [ ] ya [ ] dūn

The segment [ yāl ] must be interpreted as a proper name, being preceded by the title sri trala kyāk; hitherto not attested is the combination of sri and trala 'lord, master'. dūn is a verb, attested elsewhere in Old Mon, 'to attack, march against, charge'. The text relates directly to the motive of the impressed design and is meant to be a gloss, unlike 66/2522 which must be a votive object.

Another baked clay object, inscribed with a ye dhamma formula, found at Nakhorn Pathom, has been referred to by Malleret.4

These inscribed objects have not been registered as inscriptions, and have thus not been included in IT.

It is as yet uncertain how these and other finds from the Chao Phraya basin relate to the seals and stamps found at Oc-ēo. Some objects, inscribed in Sanskrit, also found at Chansen, are contemporaneous, such as jayi 'victorious [person]' (baked clay, 2.8 cm in diameter, Lpb M) and Malleret # 1254, jaya 'victory'. Malleret regards some of the Oc-ēo finds as personal seals and stamps, some as votive objects.

One difference to be noted is that signets and stamps found at Oc-ēo are carnelians or made of metal (bronze, gold, tin) whereas the impressed designs from Central Thailand bearing inscriptions are made of baked clay.

2. Spatial Deixis in Old Mon

In the following I shall discuss two sets of demonstratives in Mon, 'this' (proximal) and 'that' (distal).5 The early epigraphic evidence (6c-8c) may suggest, for the first set, two terms, one of which may be borrowed from Khmer, the other derived from an earlier existential verb ('to be present'). If this can be
shown successfully, intensive Khmer-Mon language contact must have occurred by the middle of the first millennium in the Chao Phraya basin and northeastern Thailand; the case is also relevant for a reconstruction of proto-Mon syntax.

Deictic expressions discussed here are limited to spatial deixis; the term 'expressions' is chosen deliberately because it is doubtful that we can speak of demonstrative pronouns. It is not clear to which word-class these elements should be assigned. Shorto classifies them in DMI as both nouns and demonstrative pronouns. Shorto's analysis is based on the development of its later reflexes: such cliticized forms are well attested in Old Mon. Finally, wo', 'awo' and their cliticized variants wo, 'awo, are attested in the earliest Mon inscriptions. Both 'awo' and wo' are contemporaneous, occurring in Nth. 9 and Sp. 1, that is, both dating from the 6c. In DMI Shorto assumes 'awo' to be a prefixed locative form, with wo' being its demonstrative base; wo' is classified in DMI as both 'noun-suffix' and as a noun. Again, Shorto's analysis is based on the development of its later reflexes:

"The interpretation assumes a combination of wo' 'this' with the prefix found in MM 'an(o) 'here' and IM 'ate' 'there', 'aluiw where'."

(DMI.12.)

Proceeding with the analysis in greater detail, the following forms will be discussed in turn:

(i) wo, wo'
(ii) wo', wau'
(iii) wo' / 'awo' (wo / 'awo)
(iv) ne', nai'
(v) nai' wo'

The word for 'this' in Old Mon has two variants, wo and wo'. Forms without a final glottal stop are not attested in the corpus on which DMI is based. In the comparatively homogeneous corpus of votive tablets from Pagan, as published in OBEF, we find seven occurrences of wo as opposed to 39 occurrences of wo' in prenominal position and nine in postnominal position. If we adduce instances from the remaining corpus not included in DMI we find wo (1) and 'awo (1) against wo' (14) and 'awo' (6). Forms lacking a final glottal stop, written -', are found invariably in prenominal position.

This syntactic correlation between phonological form and syntactic position makes the lack of final - unlikely to be due to scribal error, but rather represent a way to encode phonological liaison between two segments, that is, between, wo and the following noun.

Such cliticized forms are well attested in Old and Middle Mon; examples are listed in Figure 2. The last instance cited, min, mun, man, shows that clitics should be distinguished from weak forms. man is not a clitic since no phonological liaison exists, unlike in the other cases given.

If this interpretation is correct, are the two elements also closely linked syntactically? From the phonological
variation we can, for instance, deduce that there is no pause between the clitic and the following noun. If the two elements are thus closely linked syntactically, wo cannot be analyzed as a noun but clearly as a nominal proclitic.

(ii) o, au

The vowel in this deictic is spelt in two variant forms, either as o or as au. Until now it has been maintained by both linguists (Shorto for Mon, Jacob for Khmer) and palaeographers (Dani) that these variant vowel representations ought to be interpreted as a single unit, o, although graphic o may – and does indeed in Old Mon – represent a number of phonological units. These two variants are given in Figure 3, A-J; whatever the context, the final glottal stop is not given. Figure 3 (A-J) is arranged in chronological order and according to region (Chao Phraya basin, Isan, Pagan).

The problem is reminiscent of Pre-Angkorian Khmer: in closed syllables au alternates with the more common o (Jacob 1960.354-355).7

---

### Figure 2: Strong and weak forms of particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Form</th>
<th>Weak Form</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>post-nominal</td>
<td>definite plural</td>
<td>OM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ro</td>
<td>ro</td>
<td>sentence-final</td>
<td>relative question</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo, mu</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td>pre-nominal</td>
<td>relative question</td>
<td>OM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min, mun</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>clause-initial</td>
<td>subordination</td>
<td>OM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Figure 3: au and o

| A         | Sp.1, Saraburi, 6c |
| B         | Nth.9, Nakhon Pathom, 6c |
| CaCb      | Lp.1, Lopburi, 7c |
| D         | Ks.1, Muang Fa Daet, 8c |
| E         | Ks.2, Muang Fa Daet, 8c |
| F         | Jy. i, Chaiyaphum, 8c |
| G         | OBEP 27d, Pagan |
| H         | OBEP 27b, Pagan |
| I         | OBEP 25e, Pagan |
| J         | OBEP 36d, Pagan |
| K         | ko; KhK.16, Chumphae, Khon Kaen, 8c |
| LaLb      | ko; Khk.17, Chumphae, Khon Kaen, 8c |
| M         | moy; Lp.7, Lamphun, 13c |
| N         | moy; Lp.1, Lopburi, 7c |
| O         | go'; Lp.1, Lopburi, 7c |
| P         | toy; Sp.1, Saraburi, 6c |
| QaAb      | kom, ko'; Sp.1, Saraburi, 6c |
| RaRb      | to; Jn.15, Manorom, Chainat, 6c (Pali) |
| Rc        | ka; Jn.15, Manorom, Chainat, 6c (Pali) |
| S         | yo; Nth.3, Nakhorn Pathom, 6c (Pali) |
| T         | yo; Nth.10, Nakhorn Pathom, 6c (Pali) |
| U         | yo; Lp.16, Lopburi, 6c (Pali) |
| V         | goh; I.B. 17, Pagan, 1102+ |

---

**Legend to Figure 3**
It will be noticed that in Figure 3 the vowel graphs $au$ and $o$ alternate only in the early, that is, pre-12c period. Subsequently all medial $au$ correspond to $o$. Medial $o$ shows two variant forms, a common flat-topped variety with (H-J, P, Ra, Rb) or without notched $a$ (F, O) and a less common variant with a raised vertical (D, N). Contextual constraints seem unlikely to have played a role in the development of these two variants since alternate forms in identical contexts are attested (N / M and D / E respectively).

The rise of the notched $a$ in contexts like $wo'$ (G-J, V) can be easily explained: a notched $a$ removes ambiguity in such contexts as $go'h$ (which after 7c/8c may have been read as $keh$ because the middle verticals were no more extended below the base-line) or $wo'$ (which might have been read as $te'$). Another feature to note is that the right vertical of the notched $a$ is extended in some instances, as illustrated in Figure 3.V. It may be that this is an archaic retention from cases such as P-S (6c). Notched $a$ with and without extended verticals are contemporaneous.

A number of attested forms are ambiguous: they are neither perfectly flat-topped, that is $o$, nor notched, nor can they be with any degree of certainty regarded as $au$ because of the extended vertical of the $e$ (as in cases K, Lb, less marked so in F, La). Since these are similar to cases found in Pali inscriptions of the same period where it does correspond to $o$ (in S, T, U) it can be argued that they should be interpreted as $o$.

The problem is not simply one of palaeographical typology and chronology but one that may have phonological implications.

Whatever the state of affairs may have been, Shorto's reconstruction for forms such as $wo'$ / $wa'u$, $wo$ / $wau$, ‘$awo'$ / ‘$awau'$, ‘$awo$ / ‘$awau$, as OM /$wol$ is not tenable; his reconstruction is based on Epigraphic Middle Mon $wo'w$ where "...lw, which presumably notes lip-rounding, serves to distinguish it from /ul/" (DMI. xix). It is precisely *$/u$/ that needs to be reconstructed here: modern dialects with some obvious MM retentions in other contexts have forms such as /wu i a/

as a reflex of OM $wo'$ (being confined to Literary Mon), comparative evidence from Aslian suggests a more central vowel than *$/o$/, and the analogous history of the verb OM $go'$ would imply /u/ as does LM $hua'$ (which however, is not attested in OM). The problem is, though, that $go'$ is not as extensively attested before 12c, and where it is (Lp.1) only with a flat-topped $o$ (as in Figure 3.O).

(iii) $wo'$ / ‘$awo'$

The third problem to be addressed is whether ‘$a$' represents a prefix, and if so, whether this prefix is locative.

If IA loans in Old Mon and Burmese loans in Middle Mon are excluded, ‘$a$-initials in OM are restricted to environments with nasals and stops in post-initial position. Both have been interpreted as prenasalized stops.8 The only remaining forms are ‘$am(o)$' and ‘$awo'$.

If the possibility of preglottalized consonants in OM -- except for implosives proper -- can be discounted, and if ‘$a$' does not indicate a locative prefix, what other interpretations remain left? One possible answer concerns again the interaction between phonology and syntax: since ‘$a$'-forms are attested exclusively in initial position they may simply encode strong stress at the beginning of the segment.

$wo'$ / ‘$awo'$ show two distributional patterns: S-initial and postnominal; these are given in Figure 4. In addition, occurrences of $wo'$ on inscribed votive tablets and in ink glosses accompanying frescoes at Pagan temples are given in Figure 5 and 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$wo'$ + Nominal Group</th>
<th>Nominal Group + $wo'$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21bh 22b 26bcd ef 27 abcdf</td>
<td>20bc 21b 27ce 35e 39bg 73a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28abd 30b 36d 39c 50b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52e 59abc 60bde 61de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62acd 63b 72c 73bg 64b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$wo$ + Nominal Group</td>
<td>Nominal Group + $wo$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50b 52d 60bde 62a 64b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: The position of $wo'$ / $wo$ in OM inscribed votive tablets [figures refer to plates and catalogue entry in Luce, OBEP]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temple</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>$wo'$ + N</th>
<th>N + $wo'$</th>
<th>cl-final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Hpetleik</td>
<td>1070</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myinpyagau</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagayon</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pahtothamya</td>
<td>11c</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Taungbi tank</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubyaukgyi</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lokahteikpan</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>hapax</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopyi</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>\checkmark</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: $wo'$ constructions in OM ink glosses accompanying frescoes
While both possibilities are attested for wo' and its variants, 'awo' occurs exclusively in initial position. It is not attested after the 8c, that is, not outside the Chao Phraya Basin and Northeastern Thailand, in the area between the Chi and Mul rivers. Postnominal wo' is not attested before the 13c, that is, not attested in the Chao Phraya Basin and the Isan. A notable exception is Sp.1: here wo' must be analyzed as a noun, in the context dey wo' here' (Sp.1.3). In any case, it is not a postnominal clitic, and here the analysis agrees with Shorto’s in DMI where wo' is taken to be a noun. If 'a- were to mark the locative (as it does in the modern language) why would there then be two variants of it, a periphrastic construction, like Sp.1, and a prefixed form 'awo' (as in N thirsty,9) where, moreover, it is not locative?

When initial, wo' / 'awo' have clearly a predicative function.9 This would then rather suggest that in proto-Mon wo' / 'awo' were not a demonstrative noun-clitic 'this' commuting in a paradigm with goh 'that'. One would then, however, have to discount the possibility of ne' / nai' being a Khmer loan. If ne' can be traced to proto-Mon, its absence in Thaton and Pagan inscriptions -- in other words, in areas west of the Salween, until 1478+ -- suggests it to be a dialect feature.10 Yet, Nw. 7 ne’ is also predicative, and may ultimately be a Khmer calque, as discussed below.

The difficulty in interpreting initial wo' / 'awo' has been noted before by Blagden when translating XI.1-3 (13c, Kyaukse)11

#0# wo’ ey mahāthē(r) [loň kļā] ey tiuin dmoň (han) kloš sayon wo’

which he translates as "I, the mahāthera lōň, when I came out to reside at K.", adding in a footnote: "My rendering hardly gives the force of wo', which seems to go with 'ey, 'I', making something like 'I here'. It seems a curious construction, and possibly one could interpret it to be 'This (is) I, the Chief Monk'.12 The problem is -- not considered by Blagden -- that the illegible part preceding lōň may contain not only a proper name but also a verb, in which case we obtain a construction similar to the one attested on votive tablets and ink glosses accompanying frescoes. Examples of wo’ initial constructions in votive tablets are given in Figure 7. Contrastive examples are also listed, such as 23c where no wo’ occurs, and 73a and 39b where wo’ occurs in postnominal position.

Comparing 22b with 23c, wo’ can be interpreted as a demonstrative pronoun; 26bc and 73b follow the same pattern although it could be argued that initial wo’ may be a prenominal clitic, especially when 73a and 39b are examined.

Another problem complicating the analysis and interpretation of wo’ in these contexts is the attributive form that is part of the subject; attributive forms in Mon are non-predicative, that is, /-m/- inflected verbs, or those pre-
caded by an extracted infix /ma-/ requires a predicate to form a sentence.

A further complicating factor to be taken into account specifically in this context is that these votive tablets originated in a multilingual area (Mon, Pyu, Burmese): if it was not for 23c, one might argue -- based on consistent evidence -- that wo' must be predicative because it is followed by an attributive form ma + Verb. Cases such as 23c may be attributed to language contact.

It will also be noticed that wo' may occur twice in the same segment, attached to different hosts, as in 73a. This example shows that wo' by itself cannot have a topicalizing function, and that wo', although preferably attached to grammatical objects, may also mark the grammatical subject. 73a also shows ambiguity in scope: does it extend only over the segment beginning with tarley 'lord' (that is, the subject), hence nominalizing the attributive form ma-lát 'ma + to mould'?

Examples 39b, 27c and 27d show that co-subordination and the placement of other verbal adjuncts do not interact with wo'-marking; the clauses attached are:

39b. 'ey miic 'är nibbán
27c. 'or das kyek
27d. jin pin sarbba' satta ku' dewatā guluñ

where in 39b we have a topicalized object, marked by wo', in 27c a non-topicalized object marked by wo' (in addition to segment-initial wo'), and in 27d a non-topicalized object not marked by wo'.

Another noteworthy feature of wo', equally troublesome, and related to the question of scope in 73a, is shown in two ink glosses at the Kubyaungyi, 155 and 156 respectively:

155. twañ yawagræm siriwadda sethī ma täw ca wo'

This is the village Yawagrama where the rich man Sirivañcha lives.

156. dun diddhil ma smīn videharāja ma täw ca wo'

This is Mithila, where King Videha dwells. This shows that wo' may not only occur S-initially but also S-finally. However, as pointed out above, wo' in final position creates ambiguity in that the ma-clause may be interpreted as nominalized. Syntactically, the wo' could be shifted to initial position, the difference being one of emphasis.

So-called double-marking of wo' is also attested in Jm. 45.1-3.

Thus far it can be concluded that neither wo' by itself nor 'awo' (as well as their weakened variants wo and 'owo') are locative, and consequently that there is no evidence of a locative prefix 'a-', that wo' when postnominal, can occur in a segment, marking either subject or object, that wo' can be either final or initial in a sentence or clause, wo' can be pronominal. When sentence-initial, it is predicative, a vestige that can be traced to proto-Mon.

(iv) ne', nai'
The other deictic, 'this', is attested only twice in the Old Mon corpus, contemporaneous with the other inscriptions.
A show an extension of the top towards the right, ending in an upward moving vertical, in Ab even slightly turned back to the left. This leftward stroke in the latter may be explained as avoiding ambiguity with o as shown in C where not only the top vertical is extended but ends in a rightward stroke. Finally, in D the leftward stroke is greatly extended.

The latter graph has been interpreted, without any reference to e in contemporaneous inscriptions, as ai, and it has been stated that this vowel graph in Mon inscriptions is confined to Northeastern Thailand.20 The graph ai is attested in Northeastern Thailand only three times in Mon inscriptions: in nai’ in Mg.2 and Mg.3, and in pdai in Mg.2.21 However, in Pagan ink glosses at the Alopyi (1130) and the Pahtothamya (11c) we also find ai, transcribed by Luce and Shorto as eai, respectively.

The word nai’ in Mg.2, Mg.3 is the same as the one found in Nw.7, there spelt ne’. Syntactically, the distribution is identical (sentence-initial, in lieu of the expected wo’). The second question that arises is equally difficult to answer: is ne’ / nai’ a Khmer loan?

pdai in Mg.2 must be assumed to be a Khmer loan by its word-structure since words with known Mon-Khmer etyma have only closed syllables in Old Mon, the cited treai, treaty (elsewhere trey ‘holy being’) and deai (elsewhere dey ‘in, at’), respectively.

The question of whether ne’ / nai’ is a Khmer loan cannot be answered without taking into account the syntactic context in which this form occurs. The two texts are as follows:23

Mg.2: nai’ wo’ punya karinmatei pdai karon ‘or skurn das jdti smar

Nw.7: ne’ kyak puna tr[ ] wihr

Mg.2 is written on the reverse of a votive tablet, Nw.7 is inscribed at the lower rim of a terrotta stupa. Mg.3 is a votive tablet similar to Mg.2, but fragmented. In addition KhK.16 should be considered in this context although the crucial initial segment is chopped off:24

KhK.16: [ ] ‘awo wo’ pun mahn dar-nam #

In what follows it will be argued that we have here simply a case of reduplication, an argument strengthened by the fact that (i) ‘a- forms are only initial elsewhere, and that (ii) we have phonological liaison between the first and the second element — through elision of the final glottal stop.

Two things should be noted here: one is that ne’ in Nw.7 is used in lieu of wo’, in other words, assuming its function and position in the sentence, the other that in Mg.2 and Mg.3 one of the two elements is redundant unless one interprets nai’ as a locative — and predicative — element and wo’ as a prenominal clitic attached to punh conforming to Pre-Angkorian Khmer word-order.

I regard it as axiomatic that if two grammatical elements fulfill the same function, occupy the same position in a clause, verb- or noun-phrase, and may be combined, that one of the two terms is a borrowing.

This, for instance, is the case of Old Khmer man, borrowed from Old Mon.25

I will argue in the following that Mg.2 is a Khmer loan-translation, a calque.

where wo’ / ‘awo’ occurs. The forms in question are ne’ (Nw.7, Nakhorn Sawan 8c-9c) and nai’ (Mg.2 and an identical fragment Mg.3, Nadun, Mahasarakham).

We are faced here with two problems: (a) Do we deal here with a palaeographic or orthographic variation? In other words, do the two graphic variants represent one vowel symbol or two, and if so, do the two vowel symbols represent two different vowels phonologically? (b) Is this second word for ‘this’ a loan from Khmer, or can it be traced to proto-Mon?

In Figure 8 instances of e, o, and ai are given A, B, and C from Lp.1 (Lopburi, 7c), and D from Mg.2; these correspond to the words dek (Aa), dék (Ab) ‘serf, dependent’, kwel (B) ‘vehicle, cart’, may (C) ‘one, and nai’ (D) ‘this’ respectively.19 The e in B kwel is ambiguous in that the top-most right extension of the e merges with the serif of the ka, and it is not clear where the extension (if any) ends and the serif begins. By contrast, both instances in
When we examine sentence-constructions in Old Khmer with initial nave, that is, syntactically analogous cases to our Old Mon samples, we find predominantly sentences that contain a predicative element, in Old Khmer nave. This implies that nave 'this' by itself is a non-predicative element, unlike its lexical equivalent in Mon, wo', which is predicative. A typical example occurs in the Hin Khon inscription (Khorat, 7c-8c; K 388/Nm.28, here: B.9-10):

nave gu ru punya' upādhyāy srī rājabhikṣu tel (...)  

K 388.C.15:

'nave gi 'attōnoy (...)  

In the entire Old Khmer corpus we find ten cases of sentence-initial nave gi against only three cases where no gi occurs; in pre-Angkorian Khmer this should be expected given that the demonstrative clitic nave is attached in pre-nominal position.

Cases with reverse word-order should be noted, gi nave (24 occurrences), and gi noh (10 occurrences); this can be contracted to gnih (and gnoh respectively) attested only once (K 25).

The double marking nave 'wo' in Mg.2/Mg.3 may be interpreted as 'wo' having been reanalyzed in terms of Old Khmer gi as a predicative element, requiring then another demonstrative.

What preliminary conclusions can be drawn from the discussion above? The reconstruction of spatial deixis for proto-Mon is rather difficult; what is certain is that OM 'wo', and its variants, was originally a predicative form, if not an autonomous verb. te' remains problematic because it is not attested until 15c in Mon, yet we find a cognate form in various dialects of Nyah Kur, there subject to variation in vowel length and vowel-quality (front half-close and half-open). Lawa te' that may be a Mon loan. The origin of ne cannot be determined with certainty. Irregular vowel correspondences between the two epigraphic forms (Nw.7, Mg.2) on the one hand and the later reflexes on the other suggest Khmer contact.

3. pragata ~ pragat

This word occurs twice in the Mon corpus, in Ks.7 and in Jy.i.

Ks.7: punya pragata kammun kasmuk kyak  

Jy.i.C.1: wo' punya kurui praga(ta)

It has been argued that pragata is Khmer or Sanskrit.

In epigraphic Khmer this word is a hapax; it occurs only in K 505.3 (= Pc.1), a dated inscription (639) from Prachinburi (Aran), in the following context:

kriyā 'arhnoy sināth pragata 'āya ta vihār

which Jenner glosses as a" slaves given by the pious hermit to the vihāra", interpreting pragat as a stative verb "[to be] pious, devout", modifying the preceding noun sināth 'hermit'.

The rhotacized form Cr' is not attested in modern Khmer, only phgat', occurring only in compounds such as phgat' phgati' 'to make careful provision' and phgat' bhnaen 'to sit crosslegged (in meditation). Forms like sragat' 'to be composed, possessed, reserved' (Jenner), also in compounds such as sragat' srāgatī "modest, self-effacing" (Jacob) may have led Jenner to such an interpretation.

In LKM Jenner posits a root gat' /kut/, connecting it there with OKhm. pagat, (also a hapax, K 164B.71, of 844), girdle, sash, belt, regarded as a dou- blet of *-khut, whence pragat, borrowed into Thai as phgat is attested in only two Khmer inscriptions.

Neither root nor derivative are attested in Old or Epigraphic Middle Mon; modern Mon has gat' to bind, tie, knot', a cognate of the Khmer base given by Jenner in LKM.

Whilst Coedes's assumption of a Sanskrit borrowing can be discarded, it remains to be determined whether we have here a cognate or an inter-branch borrowing from Khmer into Mon.

Prima facie one could argue that rhotacized initials of the form CrVC(C)VC are unknown in OM, except for loans from Sanskrit; rhotacized initials emerge only in Middle Mon. This, however, is only partially correct: The ink-glosses at the Nagayon at Pagan show rhotacized forms where contemporaneous inscriptions in Pagan have CirCVC forms, including Sanskrit loans, such as

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OM</th>
<th>OM variant</th>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pí(r)kār</td>
<td>prakār</td>
<td>prakāra</td>
<td>kind, sort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pirdhān</td>
<td>pradhān</td>
<td>pradhāna</td>
<td>leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piryām</td>
<td>paryām</td>
<td>prayāma</td>
<td>extent (space/time)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-rhotacized initials in OM CirCVC correspond to rhotacized initials in MM CraCVC(C).

However, when examining Mon inscriptions from Lamphun (13c) we notice that non-rhotacized initials Cir- correspond there to rhotacized initials Cra-. This point is discussed elsewhere, accompanied by a list of examples. This would then imply that pragat is not necessarily a non-canonical form in OM, and consequently a loan.

The correct interpretation hinges on the morphological analysis of the word; can we segment it into pr-r-gat where p- is the causative and -r- the reciprocal (or, alternatively, -r- the reciprocal, derived from a base pg-)? If so, given the paucity of -r- reciprocal forms in OM, it may well be Khmer. In OM -r- is a nominalizer; reciprocal -r- is attested only once, kirlo 'to penetrate'.

The meaning of 'to bestow, make over' — OM jin, jun in other contexts — would fit the context in Ks.7 as well as associated forms in Khmer 'to outfit, supply'; syntactically, however, it is problematic.
4. Titles

Titles to be discussed below fall into several categories: (a) Mon titles used in Khmer inscriptions, (b) Khmer titles occurring in Mon inscriptions, (c) problematic cases, and (d) Mon titles restricted to Mon inscriptions.

Note that no discussion as to ranking is offered here; the aim is only to list the titles that are attested in newly found Mon inscriptions and to discuss their linguistic contexts.

The discussion is limited to the following titles:

(i) mān
(ii) tralā
(iii) kurun
(iv) khammāte nhāi kārom
(v) sa snun
(vi) ko’
(vii) kmun

(i) mān

The title mān occurs ten times in six Khmer inscriptions; their geographical distribution covers a wide area and does not show any particular pattern, except that mān, as the other Mon titles, does not occur east of the Mekhong.33 Except for K 292 all occurrences are confined to pre-Angkor inscriptions; one inscription, K 388 (Nm.28, at Hin Khon), is located in a linguistic transition zone.

It as generally been assumed by khmerisants that mān is a Mon title.34 mān is attested in Literary Mon and in Old Mon, but in Khmer it occurs only in the six inscriptions mentioned. In K 76 this title occurs alongside the ethnonym for Mon, rmaī. In Khmer epigraphy this graph is interpreted as a male title, with ‘in, being its female equivalent. Whether these two can be equated with the Khmer titles va, vi (male) and ki (female) remains to be determined. In the case of the Mon titles, as will be shown below, it is inappropriate to speak of slave-titles.35 Jacob argues for in to be also interpreted as a Mon title, and equates it with OM ‘in, ‘in; this is a tenuous assumption, based on three occurrences in OM as part of personal names:

‘in jan, ‘in ra’, ‘uin thuy (the vi vocalism being unusual).

In OM ‘imān (I.C.35-36) is a hapax, glossed by Shorto as ‘husband’. The earliest attested MM form is mān blāy ‘young man’. The term occurs four times on OM votive tablets from Pa­gan, in two different contexts:

(23cde) trāpr mān yas
(72d) mān

where in (23) yas is a proper name, and in (72) the title is followed by a proper name. Notice the variation in vowel length. Luce comments on (72): “The donor appears to have had an Old Burmese title” (OBEP.II.plate 72). A form ma(n) is also entered in DMI.

In the Mon inscriptions from the Northeast it occurs as mān in KhK.16 (four times), KhK.17, BTL, and in north­ern Thailand in Km.45. For chronological and geographical reasons Luce’s interpretation of it being Burmese can be discarded.

In KhK.16 the first occurrence is difficult to interpret because the lines in this inscription, a sīmā stone, run across its ‘spine’ which is blank but may, in fact, be defaced; the context reads:

mān dar nām

It is tempting to reconstitute the text as mān kandar nām, to be translated as ‘husband and wife (by name of)’, a compound also attested in L, as cited above. Otherwise, dar remains unintelligible, which could be a separate word, or be read together as darrām, also unattested, although conforming to OM word-structure. In lines 2 and 3 mān is always preceded by ko’ (which is discussed below).

In KhK.17 it occurs again as part of ko’ mān, followed by a defaced part.

Jm.45 suggests it to be part of a teknonym, implying that the rank is independent of age.

(ii) tralā

The occurrence of

# va tralā pju # (K 24.6, 6c-7c)

prompts Coedes to comment:

“Ce nom a une consonance nettement môn (tralā = chef”).36

tralā is attested three times in Khmer, exclusively in pre-Angkorian inscriptions (K 115, K 22, K 24). Significant here is that K 115 has also an occurrence of mān, strengthening Coedes’s speculation. The final long vowel, however, is problematic; in Mon — see the forms given in the glossary below — the final vowel is never lengthened; OM word-structure, except in the case of loans which are not naturalized, does not permit open syllables. The word for ‘lord, master’ in OM is spelt either with a final glottal stop (the vowel support and virāma) or la without virāma corresponding to inherent vowel followed by a glottal stop. Yet, this could be reconciled with the variation found in va, vi in Old Khmer.

Jenner does not discuss Coedes’s interpretation, commenting on K 22 as being ‘unintelligible’ the occurrence in K 24 as being part of a slave-name, and K 115 as being a derivate from the base /tlā:/ ‘to be clear, pure’, which, however, is in contradiction to his morphological analysis, postulating here a rhotacized tra- prefix whereas the modern reflex /tlā:/ would require an /-r/- infix. Besides, -r- reciprocal forms are derived from transitive verbs.

(iii) kurun

This title occurs in the entire Mon corpus only in Khk.17 and Jy.(1). By contrast, in Khmer we find 30 occurrences in 15 inscriptions, of which four inscriptions date from the pre-Angkorian period. While no chronological pattern emerges, the geographical spread and the contexts are more revealing: Chaiyaphum–Khon Kaen (Chumphae) as the northernmost extension, Nakhorn Sawan as the westernmost, Angkor Borei as its southernmost. In some cases the contexts are restricted in both languages, such as combinations with other titles.

In Khmer we find the following occurrences:
NOTES ON MON EPIGRAPHY

The exact grammatical contexts are given in Figure 9-A with translations by Coedès/Dupont given in Figure 9-B. Finot translates kurun in the verbal contexts as "régner" whereas Coedès/Dupont use periphrastic constructions in French in the belief that kurun is a noun. Jacob connects OKhm. kurun with mod.Khmer kruil 'to protect, cover over'.

In K 235 we find three instances of kurun being part of serial verb constructions

\[
V_1 \quad V_2 \quad V_3 \quad V_4
\]

C.78 stac wiñ mok kurun
D.31 dau kurun
D.36 wiñ mok kurun

Figure 9-A: Occurrences of kurun in K 235 (=Pc.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Number of occurrences</th>
<th>Inscriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mratán kurun</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>K 38, 181, 570, 693, 735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurun 'añ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K 357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vrañ kanmiñ kurun 'añ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K 423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>K 388A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kurun</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>K 124, 134, 235, 380, 451S, 966</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Mon kurun occurs preceded by ko' in KhK.17, and in Jy.(1) without any other title. In KhK.17 no proper name is attached. CVCVC words in Old Mon are either loans or forms derived from CCVC bases. Distribution and chronology as well as its absence elsewhere in Mon strongly suggest that this is a Khmer title.

Coedès was uncertain about its ranking: in some contexts he translated it as "chef" (K 124.7; IC.iii.172), in others as occurring in a list of "serviteurs" (K 134.13; IC.ii.94); in K 235 it was left untranslated. In K 235 (=Pc.4, the Sdok Kak. Thom inscription) kurun is used both verbally and nominally.

C.29 # kurun bhawapura 'oy prasāda bhumi 'āy wijaya 'indrapura #
C.16 # man wrañ pāda parameśwara mok 'anwi jawā pi kurun ni 'nau nagara 'indrapura #
C.65 . . . man wrañ pāda parameśwara kurun ni 'āy nagara hariharālaya #
C.78-79 ### man wrañ pāda parameśwara stac wiñ mok kurun ni 'āy nagara hariharālaya wrañ kamrateñ 'añ ta rāja nāṁ mok 'ukk #
D.31 . . . man wrañ dau 'anwi dau 'anwi nagara Śri yaśodharapura pi dau kurun ni 'āy chok gargyar nāṁ kamrateñ jagat ta rāja dau 'ukk #
D.36-37 # man wrañ pāda śivaloka wiñ mok kurun ni 'āy nagara Śri yaśodharapura nāṁ kamrateñ jagat ta rāja wiñ mok 'ukk #

Figure 9-B: Coedès/Dupont translation of kurun contexts in K 235 (=Pc.4)
In C.61 kuruñ has to be analyzed as a verb because of the preceding clause-head pi 'so as to, for (the purpose of)' as in D.31 preceding dau kuruñ. If in C.65 kuruñ were a noun, the clause introduced by man would lack a predicate. Only in C.59 can kuruñ be regarded as a noun (title). How is this variation to be interpreted?

We find a parallel development in OM kmuñ. On morphological grounds OM kmuñ must be interpreted as a verb meaning 'to reign, rule', and the nominal usage as attested in Sp.1 and 66/2522 must be regarded as being derivative. If we now draw a set of isoglosses, as presented in Map 3, delineating those areas where OM kmuñ is attested as a verb and a noun on the one hand, and those areas where OKhm. kuruñ is attested both as a noun and a verb, as opposed to areas where we find noun-only occurrences, one could regard OM kmuñ nominal usage as the result of contact with an area where nominom-verbal variation occurs, as in K 235, that is, to an area southeast of the Chao Phraya basin. The nominalization of OM kmuñ may thus be contact-induced (through Khmer), although that would still leave open the question how OKhm. kuruñ 'to reign, protect' would have developed into a noun (title). Morpho-syntactic constraints clearly show for Mon that a noun/verb distinction exists.

Where such variation does not occur in the adjacent area, as in the nominal kuruñ zone, kmuñ remains a verb, as attested in OM kammuñ (Ks.7) — an -N- infixed 'frequentative' form — north of the nominal kuruñ zone. This has obvious implications for early OM dialectology, however difficult it may be to sustain this argument on chronological grounds. Indeed, this example shows the limits of using absolute chronology to determine directionality of linguistic change: Nominal kmuñ are the first to be attested in Mon (6c), verbal forms are attested only later (8c, once; then 11c-12c); nominal kuruñ forms are attested first in Khmer (6c), verbal forms only subsequently (11c), and only in an isolated instance (K 235). In other words, how would one explain a 6c form (nominal kmuñ) being contact-induced by forms attested only in 11c? However, greater weight should be given to morpho-syntactic constraints; outside the Chao Phraya basin, kmuñ is attested in inflected verbal forms and in -r- derived nominal forms.

(iv) kammrateñ pdai¡ karom

This Khmer royal title occurs in Mon only once, attested in Mg.2 (as well as in a fragment of an identical votive tablet Mg.3, as mentioned above). In Khmer it is attested 22 times, in 15 inscriptions. It occurs only twice in the pre-Angkorian period (K 137, K 259). Except for K 85, it is spelt in the Angkorian period consistently kammrateñ pdai¡ karom (or karom) or once kammrateñ pdai¡ karom (K 523). No geographical pattern of spelling variants can be discerned; K 85 is a graphic archaism. Problematic is the Mon form pdai; is this an archaic retention, like K 85, or an indication that Mg.2 and Mg.3 were written by a Mon, in conformity with Mon spelling conventions, according to which complex initials consisting of two stops do not encode junctural aspiration, a phonetic feature, unlike Khmer, where in the Angkorian period phonetic juncture in this context is encoded.

Jacques points out that this is the only instance where the title is used in the singular; elsewhere in Khmer it is a generic expression.40

(v) ksmuñ, ka smuñ / kasmuñ

These two forms occur in Ks. (-) and Ks. 7 -- the former possibly to be identified with Ks.4 -- as ksmuñ and kasmuñ (or ka smuñ) respectively. The text of Ks.7 has already been given above; Ks. (-) reads:

'avo' punya ksmuñ

The form smuñ can be connected with OM smin, smini 'king, prince', the spelling variants being analogous to such forms as pin, pun and min, mun, in all cases denoting, in this phonological context, */s/. ksmuñ is regarded to be a contraction of kasmuñ, or rather ka smuñ. ka can be interpreted here as fulfilling a grammatical function, and it is tempting to connect it with OKhm. ka and to regard it as a Khmer-Mon contact word, given its peculiar chronological profile and syntactic distribution in Khmer.

ka is attested in Khmer both in pre-verbal and pre-nominal position. In its pre-verbal usage OKhm. -ka has as its modern reflex /ko:/.

A list of occurrences of ka in OKhm. is given in Figure 10-A and 10-B.

Figure 10-A: Old Khmer ka in pre-verbal contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Man</th>
<th>Ka slap</th>
<th>K 350.N.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gi nā</td>
<td>Ka sthāpana</td>
<td>K 450.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Ka 'ac ti paryyan</td>
<td>K 868.A.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka mān ley</td>
<td>K 70.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Ka gi nōḥ</td>
<td>K 349.S.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># nēh</td>
<td>Ka gi prasir</td>
<td>K 348.N.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10-B: Old Khmer ka in pre-nominal contexts

| Gi nōḥ vnok ka vraḥ | K 38.12 |
| Cmuḥka vraḥ | K 137.11, 15 |
| Cmndak ple ka vraḥ | K 357.7 |
| Mahānasa ka vraḥ | K 155.18-20 |
Map 3.
Distribution of kmun and kurun
Only two khmerants have ever offered comments on OKhm. ka; others may have regard it, at least implicitly, as a scribal error or a misreading for tu.

Jacques suggested that pre-verbal pre-gi contexts may read ta gi. 

But sentence-initial ta gi contexts are not attested in OKhm., and in any case pre-verbal ka is not a problematic form, unlike its pre-nominal counterpart. Coedes notes in the case of K 38: "Il est possible que ce caractètre [sc. ka] ait été effacé après gravure. Il y aurait, dans ce cas, de l’annuler" (IC)i.p.46, note 1.

In the case of K 137 he remarks: "Le mot ka qui revient plus loin (11.11 et 15) dans l’expression cmuh ka vrah a évidemment une valeur grammaticale qui reste à déterminer" (IC)i.p. 117, note 8. In no other case has Coedes commented on ka elsewhere.

Jenner distinguishes three syntactic elements, (i) 'conjunction marking a main, consequential or final clause of a series", (ii) an autonomous verb 'to come, bring, into being, create', (iii) an autonomous verb 'to keep, attend, prepare', and (iv) 'unidentified', "presumably title of slave donor". For the first three Jenner lists putative modern reflexes.

-ka is also segmented in slave-names tarka and kanika.

However, the complexity of ka does not seem to have been fully appreciated, for in K 155 we find the following construction: sre dana 'svaradaitta'kanaka vrah mraata bhava (K 155/III.17-18). Here Jenner connects (iii) 'to support, keep, tend', with nan being glossed as (i) 'side, neighborhood', (ii) 'near'. He also lists the possible Mon cognate rian 'to be near', as well as the OKhm. spelling variants rian and iian.

In all other contexts, OKhm. rian occurs in pre-nominal position except in K 1.25 rian gui sre and K 155 cited above.

ka in K 155 cannot be the autonomous verb 'to support, keep'. When we examine rian in Mon, we find that it is attested in OM only once as a stative verb modifying a noun. In MM it is attested in pre-nominal position but always linked to the following noun by the clitic ku (OM ku, ku', ko'), as in rian tau ku srih 'near the ghat' HL, Pegu, 15c (where tau is an aspectual post-verb modifying rian)

rian ku kalo jhad 'close to [my] family' XII.A.28

It is tempting to regard the construction in K 155 as linking rian to the following noun by ka. One should remain cautious, however, because in all other instances OKhm. rian is directly attached to the noun and because ka occurs in other pre-nominal contexts as well, most notably preceding vrah. In any event, though, Jenner's analysis does not hold.

The same applies to the contexts listed in Figure 10-B where Jenner translates ka with "serving". Here ka can be interpreted as a weak form of its Mon counterpart OM ku, ku' ko' which connects nouns to verbs to mark, among others, benefactives and instrumentalities. Problematic in this case, however, is that in OKhm. ka links nouns to nouns, and the function I envisage for ka in these contexts is already marked in OKhm. by nai, naiy, as for instance in ni gi vnom nai ge kloii K 904.B.10 'as regards the (slave) force of kloii...'

(tv) ko'

ko' is difficult to interpret. In Sp.1 it is clearly a clitic linking nouns, corresponding to the entries ku, ku' ko' in DMI. In the Isan inscriptions, however, the contexts are very restricted, and there ko' occurs only with known titles and proper names, and usually following a punctuation mark, that is, initiating a new segment. In KhK.16 we find ko' mahl, followed by a proper name (2), in KhK.17 ko' kurun without proper name, and ko' uppajhay, without proper name. In addition KhK.16 has ko' nah pus where nah and pus cannot be identified.

While such a segmentation is not attested elsewhere in Mon -- segment - initial, following a punctuation mark, linking to separated segments -- it cannot be excluded to be a co-ordinating clitic. Given the contexts in KhK.16 and KhK.17 they may be interpreted as titles.

(vii) kmun

kmun occurs only twice in the DMI addenda, in 66/2522, as discussed above, and in Sp.1; its derivative kammun is attested in Ka7. For further discussion see section (iii).

5. An Inscribed Dharmacakra from Chainat (Jn.14, Jn.15)

In October 1988 fragments of an inscribed dharmacakra were discovered at a site in Manorom district, Chainat province. The Fine Arts Department (FAD) visited the site the same month and moved the fragments for temporary safekeeping to the Chainat branch of the Bangkok Bank. The supporting pillar is still in situ (Plates 1-4).

This discovery calls for a number of comments, especially in view of the fact that the FAD report remains unpublished, and that the epigrapher who read the fragments of the inscription, registered as Jn.14 and Jn.15, does not discuss the palaeography of this find.

The fact that we are now able to date this dharmacakra with certainty to the 6th century AD may resolve a controversy between Boisselier and Quaritch Wales. Although written in Pali, the inscription is directly relevant for Mon epigraphy: The middle vertical of the aksara ka, extended below the base-line, is identical to the one we find in the middle of the first line in Sp.1 where it could have been misread as kla. Jn.15 now shows that Sp.1.1 should read ka (in ko').

The find consists of various parts of the rim which combined make up about 30% of the entire wheel, with some heads of spokes still attached, two spokes detached from the rim without head-attachment, two spokes without head, and a number of fragments of pillars of spokes, two parts of the shaft, three parts of the collar, at least two parts that belonged to either the head of the pillar or its base, and a number
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAD No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date found</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'An. 2  Wat in situ</td>
<td>Sawang Arom Utth.</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>37 x 76 x 14</td>
<td>Coedès 1929; Lpb.89-90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'An. 3  Wat in situ</td>
<td>Sawang Arom Utth.</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>37 x 76 x 14</td>
<td>Coedès 1929; Lpb.89-90.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chansen private</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>5.3 x 6</td>
<td>Champa 1979; IT.2.112-118.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns. 2  Muang, Nw.</td>
<td>Ns. Wat in situ</td>
<td>13c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84 x 18.5</td>
<td>Coedès 1929; IT.2.34-37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ns. 3  Muang, Nw.</td>
<td>Ns. Wat in situ</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>84 x 18.5</td>
<td>Coedès 1929; IT.2.34-37.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure D:** Uncertain items not included in DMI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAD No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nw.7</td>
<td>Thap Chumphol Lpb M 8c-9c</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>37 h</td>
<td>Mon, Pali</td>
<td>compl.</td>
<td>Lpb.34-37; IT.2.95-99.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281/2504</td>
<td>Chansen (?) Nw. Lpb M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>fragm. (50%)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286/2504</td>
<td>Chansen (?) Nw. Lpb M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>fragm. (75%)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278/2504</td>
<td>Nongkrot Nw. Bkk M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>fragm. (50%)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Nth. Bkk M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>fragm. (80%)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure E:** Inscribed Terracotta Stupas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAD No.</th>
<th>location/site</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>language</th>
<th>element incribed</th>
<th>measurements</th>
<th>condition quantity</th>
<th>date found</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lp.14</td>
<td>Lopburi (Muang)</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>spoke (1)</td>
<td>17 cm. 1. fr. 4 sides</td>
<td>1970 Lpb.7-10. IT.1.109-111.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kd.24</td>
<td>Pathom</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>spokes (15)</td>
<td>98 cm d. compl. 4 sides</td>
<td>? IT.1.59-64. Coedès 1956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lp.19</td>
<td>Lopburi (Muang)</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>rim</td>
<td>20.5 x 32 cm fr. 1 line</td>
<td>? IT.1.123-125. Lpb.5-6. Boisselier 1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sb.1</td>
<td>Kamphaeng Saen, N.P.</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>collar</td>
<td>37 x 36 x 32 cm top 4 lines</td>
<td>? IT.1.98-99.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lp.1</td>
<td>Lopburi (Muang)</td>
<td>7c-8c</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>9 x 145 cm 8 sides</td>
<td>? IT.2.57-66. Lpb.64-70 Halliday Coedès 1929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rp.3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>7c-8c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>(rim ?)</td>
<td>18 x 33.3 x 7 1 line</td>
<td>? IT.1.223-224.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saphampa</td>
<td>Lopburi M</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>spokes (2)</td>
<td>14 cm l.</td>
<td>1986.9 SCp.18.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn.14</td>
<td>Manorom (Chainat)</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>spokes rim pillar</td>
<td>20 x 100 cm ca. 180 cm d. fr.</td>
<td>1988.10 FAD report (unpublished)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn.15</td>
<td>Manorom (Chainat)</td>
<td>6c</td>
<td>Pali</td>
<td>pillar</td>
<td>20 x 60 fr. 8 sides</td>
<td>1988.10 FAD report (unpublished)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure F:** Inscribed Dharmacakras
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAD No.</th>
<th>Location site</th>
<th>at present</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Date found</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nth.8</td>
<td>Nakhorn Pathom</td>
<td>Bkk M</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1940s</td>
<td>IT.1.95-97; Coedès 1963; 1966.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Chainat</td>
<td>pvt.</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Dkh.#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Chainat</td>
<td>pvt.</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Dkh.#7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Chainat</td>
<td>pvt.</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Dkh.#8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Chainat</td>
<td>pvt.</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Dkh.#9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Chainat</td>
<td>pvt.</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Dkh.#10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Chainat</td>
<td>pvt.</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Dkh.#11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Uthaithani</td>
<td>pvt.</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Boelles 1867.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Uthaithani</td>
<td>pvt.</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Boisselier 1972.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wicks 1989, #47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Nakhorn Pathom</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wicks 1989, #49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Uthaithani</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6-7c</td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Wicks 1989, #50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure G:** Inscribed silver coins from Central Thailand

A  śrīdvaraśkritivarapuṇya
Aa śrīdvaraśkritivaradeviśrīpuraṇya
B  labhapura
C  labdhaśvara
D  śrīsucaritarikara
E  Wicks (1989.28 #50): "Traces of an inscription in outer perimeter of flan."
PLATE 1 Jn.14: Inscribed Dharmacakra from Manorom, Chainat (Pali, 6c; section of rim)

PLATE 2 Jn.14: Inscribed Dharmacakra from Manorom, Chainat (Pali, 6c; section of rim)
PLATE 3 Jn.14: Inscribed Dharmacakra from Manorom, Chainat (Pali, 6c; spokes, detached, without head)

PLATE 4 Jn.15: Inscribed Dharmacakra from Manorom, Chainat (Pali, 6c)
of unidentified objects which must have been part of the cakra or its base. A fragment of the octagonal pillar, probably its head, inscribed on all sides with five lines in Pali has also been recovered (Jn.15).

The cakra is carved in the round, inscribed on both sides, and shows similarities with the fragment described by Boisselier in 1961.44

Figure F lists all inscribed cakras found in Thailand. Note should be taken that Lp.1, an octagonal pillar from Lopburi, is likely to have been a supporting pillar for a cakra, like Jn.15. If so, it is the only cakra inscribed in Mon.

In the following I shall discuss what I think are the most important characteristics of the Chainat Wheel; some of the features examined, although prevalent in other epigraphic material found in Thailand, have never been discussed or even noted by palaeographers in this country. Yet, they may ultimately be relevant in establishing a chronological framework.

These features include (1) punctuation marks, (2) ka, (3) medial ä and (4) medial i.

Palaeographically, there are striking similarities between the Chainat Wheel and the two earliest Old Mon inscriptions found in Thailand, the Nakhorn Pathom fragment Nth.9 and the Narai cave inscription from Saraburi Sp.1; the Chainat fragment is to be dated earlier than the octagonal pillar from Lopburi, also in Old Mon, which was dated by Coedes at AD 771 (Lp.1).

(1) Punctuation marks: In early Mon epigraphs (that is, pre-Pagan) punctuation marks are not attested except in the Nakhon Pathom fragment (6c) and the Lopburi pillar (8c); this may be partly due to the nature of the inscriptions (votive tablets, cave inscriptions). In the Nakhorn Pathom inscription a punctuation mark is attested in B.2 (see Figure 11.Aa).

This is identical with the mark found on the rim of the Chaihat Wheel. Two punctuation marks also occur on the octagonal pillar of the Wheel (see plate 4, lines 2 and 4); here, however, either only the right-hand half occurs (Figure 11.Ab), as at the end of line 2, or a vertical stroke precedes the punctuation mark (Figure 11.Ac), as at the end of line 4. In later inscriptions, such as the Lopburi pillar Lp.1, punctuation marks are simply two parallel horizontal strokes (Figure 11.Ad), as they are still used in Mon today. In the Chainat pillar the punctuation mark looks like a double-curved ja. This may lead to a re-assessment of the reading of one of the votive tablets originating in the Northeast (Mg. i).

Punctuation marks are not discussed by Dani, nor are they referred to elsewhere in writings on Southeast Asian palaeography. Their syntactic role not only in Mon epigraphs but also in later Mon writings has not been examined yet.

(2) ka: This aksara is attested on the pillar only twice, in line 1 (fragmented, element below the base-line) and in line 3 in visattikā. The medial vertical extends below the base-line with its lower end curved. However, in this instance here the vertical ends "in a [...] leftward pointing hook" (Casparis 1975.16), or, paraphrasing Dani's terminology, in a leftward horizontal tick (Figure 11.Ba). Whether this
hook (or tick) has chronological implications, or is simply an ornament, remains to be seen. Again, attention has not been drawn to this particular element of the ka-vertical; in the Narai cave inscription, line 2 (Figure 11.Bb) it is missing. In the Nakhorn Pathom fragment ka occurs only together with subscript la (A.3) and subscript ya (A.4), both joined with the extended medial vertical. Final -k (A.4) appears at the edge of the fragment.

(3) medial ã: This vowel sign occurs on the pillar in line 3 and in lines 2 and 3 as part of the digraph o. Again, a feature not referred to elsewhere although attested in other inscriptions, such as Narai cave (Sp.1) or K 969, a Sanskrit inscription from Prachinburi (IT. 1.40-43), is the notched top variety of medial ã (see Figure 11.Ca). In the Nakhorn Pathom fragment no notched top is attested (Figure 11.Cdcd). Noteworthy is also the extension of the vertical (Figure 11.Cb), as attested in line 2 as part of the digraph o.

(4) medial ñ: This vowel sign occurs on the pillar in lines 3, 4 and 5. Noteworthy the variation attested in the same inscription: (i) oblong-shaped or (ii) with notched verticals. The notched variety has gone unnoticed in other epigraphs, such as the Pali inscription from Sap Champa, Lopburi (Lp.17), in IT.1.117-122, face B.4, 5, 6. So far one cannot say whether this is a regional variant or may have chronological relevance (Figure 11.Dab).

Finally, problematic is the digraph o, or rather its element e. In the earliest Mon inscriptions, such as Nakhorn Pathom and Saraburi (Narai cave), the bottom-most line of the e (as part of the o digraph) ends in a curl well above the base-line; such an e is attested in 6c Châlukya inscriptions or 7c Pallava (but there touching the base-line). On the Chainat pillar, however, in lines 2 and 4, the e has no curled end and touches the base-line, similar to late Pallava of the 8c. Does this cast doubt on the relatively early date of the Chainat Wheel/pillar of AD 500-600? I would still maintain that the Chainat fragment is contemporaneous with Nakhorn Pathom and Saraburi, possibly occupying a chronologically intermediate position, but certainly antedating the Lopburi pillar in which ka has no extended vertical at all.

6. Mon Inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand — A Reassessment

Pre-9c Buddhist Sanskrit inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand have been edited and published by Coedès in 1958 and 1964, although some of them were known as early as 1922 (Figure H). Until then no Mon inscriptions from the Isan had been reported, the earliest find dating back to 1968.45

Coedès noted on several occasions that these, largely contemporaneous, Sanskrit inscriptions (Chaiyaphum, Phu Khiaow: K 403, K 404, K 965, K 977; Kalasin, Kuchinarai: K 511; Udorn, Kumphawapi: K 981; Khon Kaen, Chumphae: K 985, K 986), apart from being Buddhist, shared palaeographical characteristics that linked them to Lp.1, the 7c octagonal pillar in Mon from Lopburi, and to Sp.3 (= K 964), the 7c-8c Sanskrit inscription from U Thong, a Mon site. In other words, Coedès felt in 1958 that they might originate from Mon sites, although no direct evidence was available at the time.46

Although the Fa Daet site at Kamalasai, Kalasin, was surveyed as early as 1954 and illustrated simâa stones, showing Mon influence, reported then and again in 1959, it was only in 1968 that the first four Mon inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand were discovered (Prasarn/Cham 1968). These are inscribed votive tablets from Fa Daet. What is remarkable about two of them, but surprisingly went unnoticed ever since, is that they are moulds from which votive tablets were cast or stamped; the moulds bear a single line inscription in Mon in reverse at the lower rim (these are referred to here as Ks.i, Ks.ii). By 1971 a number of Mon inscriptions from the Northeast were known but went unreported in DMI.47

The pre-9c inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand (Maps 2 and 4) discussed here, limited to the area north of the Mu, east of the Pasak, north-west of, and to the exclusion of, Yasothon/Ubol, fall into two categories, simâa stones and votive tablets; votive tablets are inscribed exclusively in Mon whereas simâa stones are inscribed in either Sanskrit or Mon, bilinguals are unknown.47

Most inscriptions of that period from the Northeast, referred to summarily by Coedès as 'pre-Angkorian', are merely fragments; some simâa stones show only faint traces of writing, in others only some aksaras are legible and no continuous passage can be reconstructed. These have been excluded from our corpus here (Figure B and H) since the language cannot be identified with any degree of certainty.46 However, what emerges now from a survey, begun in late 1983, is that about a third to half of the number of simâa stones from Chaiyaphum and Khon Kaen sites are, or were at some time in the past, inscribed, implying that this was not an exceptional, but rather a common practice. Simâa stones from Yasothon and Ubol have yet to be examined for traces of writing.48 Map 4 shows the location of pre-9c simâ stones and sites where Mon inscriptions have been found.

The Mon inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand need to be reassessed for the following reasons: (i) a complete inventory is lacking, (ii) inscriptions have not been critically edited, and (iii) documentation of sites is incomplete.

The last is particularly important because when we compare northeastern sites where Mon inscriptions are located, or have been reported (Figure B), with those where contemporaneous Sanskrit inscriptions are located (Figure H) we realize that in most cases Mon and Sanskrit inscriptions originate from the same site, as for instance in Ban Kut Ngong and Ban Kaeng, Chaiyaphum, Ban Nong Phai, Khon Kaen, or a site complex as in Kumphawapi, Udorn.

(i) Ban Kut Ngong (Chaiyaphum)

Twelve illustrated simâ stones, representing scenes from the Jâtakas, were iconographically identified and compared with illustrated simâ stones from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFO</th>
<th>FAD</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date at present</th>
<th>Date found</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>No. lines</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K 981</td>
<td>KhK.2</td>
<td>Kumphawapi, Udorn</td>
<td>KhK M</td>
<td>7c-8c</td>
<td>pre-1964</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 982</td>
<td>Kumphawapi, Udorn</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>pre-1964</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>IC.vii.160.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 983</td>
<td>Kumphawapi, Udorn</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>pre-1964</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>IC.vii.160.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 984</td>
<td>Muang, Khon Kaen</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>IC.vii.161.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>KhK.25</td>
<td>Chumphae, Khon Kaen</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>7c-8c</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Seidenfaden 1922.78; IC.vii.82.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 510</td>
<td>Kuchinarai, Kalasin</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>Seidenfaden 1922.78-79; IT.3.90-93.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 511</td>
<td>Kuchinarai, Kalasin</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>Seidenfaden 1922.78-79; IT.3.90-93.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Ts.3</td>
<td>Tha Khahto, Kalasin</td>
<td>7c-8c</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>IT.1.273-275.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Ts.5</td>
<td>Kalasin</td>
<td>KhK M</td>
<td>7c-8c</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 403</td>
<td>Muang, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>pre-11c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>Lajonquière 1907.314; IC.vii.71-72.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 404</td>
<td>Jy.1</td>
<td>Kaset Sombun, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Seidenfaden 1922.90; IC.vii.72-73; IT.357-59.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 512</td>
<td>Jy.2</td>
<td>Kaset Sombun, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>7c-8c</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Seidenfaden 1922.90; IC.vii.72, 74; IT.1.267-269.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K 977</td>
<td>Kaset Sombun, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>pre-1964</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>IC.vii.74-75.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Jy.8</td>
<td>Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Jy.11</td>
<td>Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Jy.11</td>
<td>Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Jy.10</td>
<td>Phu Khiai, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Jy.11</td>
<td>Phu Khiai, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Jy.12</td>
<td>Phu Khiai, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Jy.13</td>
<td>Phu Khiai, Chaiyaphum</td>
<td>in situ</td>
<td>8c</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure H: Buddhist Sanskrit inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand
Legend Map 4:

- Mon sima site

Aa Akat Amnuay, Sakol Nakhorn
AC Amnat Charoen, Ubol*  
Bph Ban Phue / Tha Bo, Udorn**
Cph Chaiyaphum, Muang
Cph Chumphae, Khon Kaen
Ctt Chaturat, Chaiyaphum
HT Hua Taphan, Ubol*
KKh Khon Kaen, Muang***a
Khn Khongchiam, Ubol*
Khw Kwao, Chaiyaphum***b
KKK Khamkhuen kao, Yasothon*
Kms Kamalasai, Kalasin
Kn Kuchinarai, Kalasin
Kpw Kumphawapi, Udorn
KSK Khao Suan Kwang, Khon Kaen***c
Ksw Khon Sawan, Chaiyaphum
Ktw Kantharawichay, Mahasarakham
MCC Mahachanachay, Yasothon*
Mk Manchakiri, Khon Kaen
MS Muang Samsip, Ubol*
Msk Mahasarakham, Muang
Nd Nadun, Mahasarakham
Nh Nong Han, Udorn
Nth Nonthai, Khorat***d
Pkh Phu Khlaw/Kaset Sombun,
Chaiyaphum
PT Pha Tiaw, Yasothon*
RE Nuang, Roi-et***e
Rss Rasisalai, Srisaket***f
Sdd Sawang Daen Din, Sakol Nakhorn
Slp Selaphum, Roi-et***g
Sn Sung Noen, Khorat*
Ss Suhaatsakhan, Kalasin
Swk Suwan Khuha, Udorn**
TPh That Phanom, Nakorn Phanom
WSp Wang Saphung / Na Klang, Udorn**

*Location appears in ทะเบียนโบราณสถาน, ภาพระดับภูมิศาสตร์ เมื่อ ๑, กพม., กรมศิลปากร, กรมโบราณสถาน, 2529.
**Location appears in ศุภต ศิริบุตร, รายงานผลการสำรวจโบราณสถานต่างๆตามโครงการ แหล่งที่มีคุณค่า, กพม., กรมศิลปากร, 2517.
***NETAP Surveys: 22/2528, 29/2528; b21/2528; 2525; 2525; 27/2526; 11/2526; 2524.
Other locations appear in น. ณ ปานไพร, ศิลปะโบราณสถาน, กพม., กรมโบราณสถาน, 2524.

Map 4
Sites with Mon inscriptions or Mon style sima stones
PLATE 5 Bhūrīdattā - Simā stone at Ban Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum; inscribed recto and verso

PLATE 6 Jy.8: Unidentified inscription, on reverse of Bhūrīdattā (Plate 5)

PLATE 7 Jy.9: Vidyurapāñḍīta - Simā stone at Ban Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum; Old Mon inscription (8c) on base

PLATE 8 Jy.9: Two line inscription in Old Mon (8c) at base of simā stone illustrating an episode from the Vidyurapāñḍīta (Plate 7)
PLATE 9 Mahānāradakassapa - Simā stone at Ban Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum; unidentified inscription at lower left

PLATE 10 Unidentified inscription on simā stone stone illustrating the Mahānāradakassapa (Plate 9)

PLATE 11 Temiya - Simā stone at Ban Kut Ngong, Chaiyaphum; reverse inscribed, unidentified

PLATE 12 Jy.11: Inscribed simā stone at Ban Kaeng, Phu Khiaw, Chaiyaphum; Old Mon (8c)
Muang Fa Daet, Kalasin, and with glazed tiles from the Ananda at Pagan by Surasawadi in 1978; two of the Kut Ngong slabs were reported in 1978 to be inscribed in Old Mon and registered with the FAD as Jy.8 and Jy.9; these remain unpublished until now. Another sixteen simā stones were recovered from the same site, but these are not of the illustrated type. All of them are slab-types, and are exhibited at Ban Kut Ngong, Muang district, Chaiyaphum, not far from the original site where they were found. The illustrated simā stones are kept in a permanent roofed shelter. Their base has been lowered into the ground by some 30 cm; this can be witnessed by comparing, for instance, the photograph of the kut Ngong slabs were reported from the same site, but these are not of the illustrated type. All of them are slab-types, and are exhibited at Ban Kut Ngong, Muang district, Chaiyaphum, not far from the original site where they were found. The illustrated simā stones are kept in a permanent roofed shelter. Their base has been lowered into the ground by some 30 cm; this can be witnessed by comparing, for instance, the photograph of the Mahānāradakassapa in Surasawadi 1978 (slab #2, photograph #18) and the one published here (Plate 9) where the lower end of the robe coincides with the ground level, and the base of the simā stone showing the feet is cemented into the ground. This accounts for the variation in size given here and in Surasawadi 1978.

Another three illustrated slabs bear traces of inscriptions; these are Temiya (Plate 11), Mahānāradakassapa (Plates 7 and 8) and an unidentified fragment (Surasawadi 1978, #1, photograph #15).

(1) Jy.8

This simā stone (Plates 5, 6) is inscribed recto (lower third, right; 4 lines) and verso (upper third, across the back; 4 lines). It is now impossible to establish a continuous text; Surasawadi claims Jy.8 to be in Old Mon (1978.35, photograph or rubbing) has appeared in print. Segment B (Plate 13, infra) shows clear traces of continuous text; virāma are distinct. The amended text reads:

1. \[\text{[...]} \text{āt̂a-ra jā}\]
2. \[\text{[...]} \text{tā loṁ tā kya}\]
3. \([k]\) \[\text{[...]}\]
4. \[\text{wo' puñya} \[\text{[...]}\]
5. \[\text{[...]}\]
6. \[\text{[...]}\]
7. \[\text{[...]}\]
8. \[\text{[...]}\]
9. \[\text{[...]}\]

(2) Jy.9

Segments of this inscription, found at the base of the slab (recto) illustrating the Vidhuraṇaṇḍita (Plates 7, 8), are legible; the inscription comprises two lines:

1. \[\text{āvav puñh [daśākṣya - - - -]} \text{wo'}
   \[\text{[...]}\]
2. \[\text{deva 'at wo' tāw kraw}
   \[\text{[...]}\]

"This is the work of merit [...]. This [...] all these deva dwell (behind/after) [...]"

Noteworthy here is the variant graph o / au in the word for 'this', wau' (line 1, twice) and wo' (line 2). The quantifier 'at all' is discussed below.

(3) Jy.ii

The slab showing a scene from the Mahānāradakassapa (Plates 9, 10) has an inscribed section recto (lower quarter, left). Seven to eight lines can be distinguished, lines 2 and 5 showing initial wra[ ] and w(ri)ah respectively.

(4) Jy.iii

At least five lines can be seen inscribed on the reverse of Temiya (Plate 11). The size of the aksaras varies from line to line. Although no continuous text can be established, it is of palaeographical value. Some legible segments suggest it to be Sanskrit.

(5) Jy.iv

This unregistered inscription is not reproduced here; a photograph appears in Surasawadi 1978 (slab #1, photograph #15). The slab is damaged and cannot be identified iconographically. An examination of the stone reveals distinct traces of writing. Most of what must have been a continuous text is defaced.

(ii) Ban Kaeng (Chaiyaphum)

Fifteen simā stones are exhibited on the grounds of Wat Phra That Nong Sam Muen, Ban Kaeng, Phu Khia district, Chaiyaphum. Of these at least five are inscribed. Four of these are registered with the FAD, Jy.10 to Jy.13 respectively. Two of them have been published (Jy.11 and Jy.1; Uraisi 1988); emendations are proposed below. Inscriptions appear only on one side of the slab, sometimes legible on one side of the spine; in some cases it is not quite clear whether the stone was in fact, inscribed only on one side of the spine. None of the Kaeng slabs are pictorial, a feature they share with simā stones found 30 km to the north, at Nong Phai, Chumphae district, Khon Kaen.

(1) Jy.11

The slab type simā stone is inscribed on the right hand side of the spine (Plates 12, 13); no traces are visible on the left side, nor on the reverse. The inscription may have comprised up to nine lines; the FAD record states ten lines. A reading of the first four lines of segment A (Plate 13) has been published, but no reproduction (either photograph or rubbing) has appeared in print. Segment B (Plate 13, infra) shows clear traces of continuous text; virāma are distinct. The amended text reads:

1. \[\text{[...]}\]
2. \[\text{[...]}\]
3. \([k]\) \[\text{[...]}\]
4. \[\text{wo' puñya} \[\text{[...]}\]
5. \[\text{[...]}\]
6. \[\text{[...]}\]
7. \[\text{[...]}\]
8. \[\text{[...]}\]
9. \[\text{[...]}\]

(2) Jy.i

This inscription, not registered with the FAD, has only been partially read (Uraisi 1988). It is reproduced here as Plate 14. The published reading, however, consists only of segment C in Plate 14, although the reproduced rubbing clearly shows another two lines in segment B. Until now it has gone unnoticed that a section left of the spine (marked A in Plate 14) is also inscribed; traces of three lines of text can be seen, but only the first line and the middle of the second line can be read. An amended and complete reading is proposed here:

1. \[\text{wra}]/\[\text{wo'}\] \[\text{puñya}\]
2. \[\text{[...]}\]
3. \([\text{[...]}\)
4. \[\text{[...]}\]
5. \[\text{wo'} \text{puñya}\]
6. \[\text{wra}]/\[\text{yān}\]
PLATE 13 Inscribed simá stone
Ban Kaeng, Phu Khiaw, Chaiyaphum; Old Mon (8c), segment B illegible
PLATE 14 Jy. i: Inscribed simâ stone at Ban Kaeng, Phu Khiaw, Chaiyaphum; Old Mon (8c)

PLATE 15 Jy.10: Fragment of inscribed simâ stone at Ban Kaeng, Phu Khiaw, Chaiyaphum; possibly Old Mon (8c)

PLATE 16 KhK.16: Inscribed simâ stone at Ban Nong Phai, Chumphae, Khon Kaen; Old Mon (8c)
PLATE 17 KhK.16: Section of inscription left of spine (inscription is to be read across the spine); see Plate 16

PLATE 18 KhK.16: Section of inscription right of spine; see Plate 16

PLATE 19 KhK.17: Inscribed sima stone at Ban Nong Phai, Chumphae, Khon Kaen; Old Mon (8c)

PLATE 20 KhK.17: Inscribed sima stone (Plate 19, section B); Old Mon (8c)
PLATE 21 KhK.: Fragment of an inscribed simā stone at Ban Nong Phai, Chumphae, Khon Kaen; Old Mon (8c)

PLATE 22 Inscribed simā stone at Ban Nong Phai, Chumphae, Khon Kaen; unidentified
(3) Jy.10
This inscribed slab is damaged (Plate 15). It has five inscribed lines of text on both sides of the spine and at least two lines right of the spine. The akṣaras that can be read suggest it to be Old Mon:

1. * * * [- - - ]
2. [- - - - - ]
3. [- - - - - ]
4. -- wo [ ] na
5. wra - [- - - ]

(3) Ban Fai Hin site (Khon Kaen)
Nine simā stones, all of them undecorated, are kept on the grounds of Wat Non Sila, Wang Hin Lat, Chumphai district, Khon Kaen, just some 30 km north of Phu Khiaw, Chaiyaphum. Four of them are inscribed. Of these, one is badly damaged (Plate 21), one is illegible (Plate 22), and only the remaining two have been registered with the FAD (KhK.16 = Plate 16, 17, 18; KhK.17 = Plate 19, 20). The inscriptions have been read and published before, but warrant emendation.

(1) KhK.16
This inscribed slab has five lines of text on both sides of the spine; the text has to be read across the spine (in the transliteration below this has not been marked). Problematic is the form garaluṅ ~ garluṅ in line 1 (of the left section, Plate 18) ra, serifed, the lower end of the vertical curved to the left, shows clearly a virāma above its serif. In line 4 (of the right section, Plate 17) the expected virāma on ra in garluṅ is missing, which must here be read as garaluṅ. The serif of ra cannot be interpreted as a virāma on a sans-serifed ra since it is clearly level with the serifs and the adjacent ga and la. Given that garluṅ occurs on another slab from the same site (KhK.14), with ra marked by virāma, the KhK.16.4 form garaluṅ should be interpreted as a scribal error for garluṅ, although it is transliterated below.

1. ‘awo wọ puñ mān, dar nām ko' naḥ pu
2. s rās # ko' mān dar aṣ # ko' mān su
3. bāhu # ko' mān mren # wọ puñ
4. 'at garaluṅ # 'dc kantāp ta kyāk
5. buddha 'arṛyamaitriyya -ā kyāk -

(2) KhK.17
An eight line inscription appears in the upper right hand section of the slab (Plate 19, marked B; enlarged Plate 20) which has been read and published before. It is not clear whether section A, left of the spine, was originally inscribed as well; if so, the inscription could not have been read across the spine.50

Problematic here is the word tma' occurring in line 1 -- and there hardly legible -- and again in line 6. In fact, the first occurrence is visible clearly only on the published rubbing (Uraisi 1988.497, Figure # 16) and not on sight (see Plate 20) where it might be regarded as a scribal error. Both IT and Uraisi translate tma' as 'stone' in both cases. "Voici la construction en pierre (Sema), acte méritoire de ..." (1988.494), and "Cette oeuvre en pierre (Sema) ..." (ibid.). Before attempting an alternative interpretation, an amended reading proposed:

1. wo' tma' puñ nāh mahā
2. yuta drān gana #
3. ko' kuruṇ # ko' ('u)pa
4. jāy warahma # -[-]
5. ko' mān -w #
6. wipāk tma' wo [- - (-) ]
7. n gulo [ ]
8. (k)

The form tma' 'stone' is attested only since MM; the earlier OM form is invariably tmo'. More problematic, however, is word-order, and also the formulaic style of simā inscriptions.

If wo' in line 1 is regarded as a non-predicative form, it must consequently be interpreted as a proclitic to tma' or tma' puñ; if this is accepted, OM syntax of KhK.17 conforms to PA Khmer word-order53 and not to OM syntax, a possibility that should not be dismissed given evidence of interference from Khmer elsewhere in OM epigraphy of the same period. However, this would then be incompatible with the construction in line 6 where wo(') closes a nominal group, unless we admit to syntactic variation of this type of construction at the time.

If wo' in line 1 is regarded as a predicative form 'this is', tma' puñ must be analyzed as a noun-compound; of all votive inscriptions attested over a period of six centuries (6c-12c), this would be the only case to my knowledge where predicative wo' is followed by a compound. Other votive inscriptions have the formula wo' puñ or wo' kyāk.52

However, an alternative interpretation can be envisaged, although the vocalism remains equally problematic: Mon has a plural clitic OM to', following nouns or nominal groups, attested since MM as ta'. The inflected form is attested for the first time in 1219 at Wat Don, Lamphun (B.16), as timmo', also in postnominal position. Its modern reflex LM tma', a universal quantifier 'all, every', occurs in pronominal position. Plural marking is attested in two contemporaneous inscriptions from the same site, in KhK.16.3-4 wo' puñ 'at garaluṅ and in KhK.i (there, however, following a lacuna; see infra). Thus the passage in KhK.17.6

# wipāk tma' wo'[ ]

can be translated as 'These acts'. This leaves open the question why an inflected form is used for plural marking, instead of the base 'ta' (attested only in OM as to', or as a weak form ta in restricted contexts). The Wat Don (Lamphun) inscription also has this type of construction. Perhaps the inflected form referred to universal quantification, in this case 'All these acts', whereas the base 'ta' - 'to' - 'ta' indicated simple definite plurality. Yet this interpretation does not solve the problem of tma' at the beginning of this text in line 1. Elsewhere in OM quantification and emphasis, such as cardinal numerals and post-nominal ci, may follow the demonstrative wo'. The beginning of KhK.17 could thus be translated as 'All these are meritorious acts'; alternatively, the inflected form tma' may precede nouns — as it does in modern Mon — and the passage would translate as 'These are all the meritorious acts'.

(3) KhK.i
This inscription (Plate 21) is not registered with the FAD; the slab is damaged and the four legible lines are fragmentary. The remaining continuous segments have been read; these warrant emendations:
1. j puñ jiw pāl
2. j māṭ bnah # kō‘ortex
3. j garlūn kantāp la kyā
4. (-) [- (-) riy #

bnah may be either a proper name or 'brahmin'; elsewhere in the OM and MM corpus, bnah is attested only as a morphologically complex form, OM burnah, bimnah, bamnah, &c MM bannah, but in modern Mon bnah is attested together with forms such as bannah and banah. Given that in KhK.173-4 we find a title ('uppajhāy wrahma' such an interpretation is not to be discounted.

Noteworthy is the naturalization of IA loans, such as (āryame)rity (for Skt. arjyamaitreya) and jīvo pāl (for P. Jivapāla); virāma on -ya and -wa are clearly visible.

(iv) Other northeastern sites
(1) KhK.19

Although this inscription has a Khon Kaen registration number in the FAD list, it originated from an Udorn site (Ban Don Kaew, Kumphawapi district). An amended reading is proposed here:

1. 'awo' puñ [dhaRmma]
2. [t]mot 'awo' jmah ba 'ey
3. [ ]
4. y kaḥ nom kfl' kyā - - -
5. Jh ba 'ey ymo' 'ey mfl -
6. ]Ryya ymo' 'ey tmot -

Given the fragmentary nature of this text, due to lacunae as well as a number of hitherto unattested words which do not have reflexes in modern Mon (such as tmot, jmah), any analysis should proceed with caution; however, noteworthy is the construction in line 4

kaḥ nom kfl'

which can be interpreted as 'to be without', kaḥ being the OM verbal negative auxiliary (which may be inflected for the 'hypothetical', s-) followed by the verb nom 'to be, exist, be present'. In this context kfl' is likely to be the prenominal clitic ku~ku~ko', indicating possession when linking the existential verb nom with a noun ('to have, possess'). This construction here is at variance with negation elsewhere in OM where the existential verb nom has, when negated, a suppletive form kāḥ sak 'not to have, to lack' (the modern suppletive form is a reflex of OM *sak may).

(2) Ks.1

This is a votive tablet recovered from Muang Fa Daet, Kamalasai, Kalasin; it has been read and published by three different epigraphers (1968: Prasarn & Cham; 1986: Thoem & Champ; 1988: Urais).

The following is an amended reading:

1. wo' kyā piñi 'u)pajhāy
2. 'ácáRyya guna vihkhyā #

Together with Ks.2 this is first time that P. puñha 'merit' is attested is OM as piñi, in analogy to Skt. punya, OM pun, pin, and evidence for s̩c allography -u- ~ -i- before palatalis which Shorto reconsruits as /ə/.

(3) Ks.2

This inscription is not identical with Ks.1, lacking a final glottal stop in the first word; this is unlikely to be a scribal error but the encoding of a particular phonetic feature (juncture), as discussed in the second section of this article.

1. wo kyā piñi 'u)pajhāy
2. 'ácáRyya guna vihkhyā(t)

In both Ks.1 and Ks.2 the serif of na (line 2) may be mistaken for virāma.

(4) Mg.i

This is a fragment of an inscribed votive tablet from Nadun, Mahasarakham, now at the National Museum at Khon Kaen; an amended reading follows:

1. puñ cakravatīta ja
2. - - taRla urah swa
3. yo'ga

Noteworthy here (as in Mg.vii, infra) is the superscript ra, transliterated as R, being attached the right-most vertical of the following aksara, that is to ta and la (in Mg.1), and to la in Mg.vii.54

(5) Mg.vii

1. taRla wa -

It is obviously tempting to reconstitute the text as taRla w(rah) but this not supported by the epigraph itself.

(6) Mg.viii

1. - Rya ga

The superscript ra is attached to the middle vertical stroke of the ya, in an upward stroke ending in a right curve. This is the common way of writing -ry- medio-clusters.

(v) A votive tablet from Nadun (Mg.2) and Pagan parallels

Mg.2, lines 3-4, reads

'or skun das jāti snar

to be translated as 'may I not be born to a mean existence'; a more detailed account is given in Bauer 1986.

Although inscriptions found on votive tablets may vary considerably, a certain formulaic style can be discerned. This is the case here with Mg.2, which finds a parallel in a votive tablet from Pagan inscribed in Old Burmese; OBEP 31c, lines 5-8 reads

# sansāra aphet (phlet a)syak but ma su(i') ma phlet (phlet a)syak but ma su(i')

which Luce translates as "So often as I am born in Samsara, may I never be born to a mean existence (?)", adding that this is "[...] one of the oldest specimens of written Burmese extant" (OBEP II.23).

While negative purposives are not attested in other votive tablets inscribed in Old Mon, the following constructions are noteworthy:

27c. 'or das kyek
'may I become a Buddha'
27e. 'or go' das kyek
'may I be born a Buddha'
70g. 'or go' das kyek
'may I be born a Buddha'
20b. 'or go' das 'a(rhan) twās tirla
'may I be born an Arahat and His disciple'

go' may be taken here as an auxiliary pre-verb to das 'to be' and thus be parallel to skun 'not (hypothetical -s-) in Mg.2. VT 31c lends further support to my interpretation given elsewhere (1986) where skun is regarded as a Khmer-Mon blend-form.
### Old Mon | Old Khmer
---|---
wrah | wrah
kuruň | kuruň
kamraten | kamraten
phaï karom | phai karom
mân | mân
ya | ya
tai, ne' | ne, neñ, neññ, this'
man, min, mun | man

ta | ta
ko, ku, ku' | ka
MM ra | ra
na, na' | nu
row | ru, rû, ruw
kum | kam
-N- | -N-

| Title | Deictic, 'this'
---|---
tai | pre-nominal clitic 'for, to'
man | relative clause marker, anaphoric pronoun
ko | pre-nominal clitic
MM | clause-, sentence final clitic (modal)
ka | pre-nominal clitic, instrumental
ra | 'as, to be like'
ru | pre-verbal negative
ruw | frequentative

---

**Conclusion**

The common strand of these epigraphic notes relates to early Khmer-Mon contacts as they can be linguistically traced in inscriptions. A list of Khmer-Mon contact words, as attested in 6c-13c Khmer and Mon inscriptions, is given in Figure 12. It will be noticed that this list consists exclusively of titles and grammatical function words; the latter are significant indicators of unilateral bilingualism. No attempt is made here to determine the direction of borrowing; in some instances we are not even certain whether we deal with borrowed/reanalyzed or cognate elements, as in the case of the nasal infix -N-marking the 'frequentative'.

The next step will be to examine the factors which affect the frequency and the distribution of inscriptions in order to determine whether these indicate speaker populations.
I would like to express my gratitude to the following individuals for letting me examine inscriptions held in public and private collections: The Director-General of the Fine Arts Department; Mr. Phuthorn Bhumadhon, former Director of the National Museums in Lopburi and Bangkok; Mrs. Manita Khuankhan, the present Director of the King Narai National Museum at Lopburi; Dr. Samnuan Palatwichai, of Chainat, and the Director of the Bangkok Bank branch at Chainat; Mr. Cha Lopburi and Bangkok; Mrs. Manita Lopburi; Dr. King Narai National Museum at Ayutthaya, and the abbots of Wat Kut Ngong, Wat Phra Si Rattana Satsadaram, and Wat Non Sila. I am also grateful to Professors Harry Shorto and Claude Jacques for discussing sections of the present article.

1. Mon inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand were not part of the corpus upon which DMI was based because the finds had not been published at the time DMI went to press; BTL, however, is mentioned in the introduction (p.xxxiii), although excluded from the DMI corpus. The chronological bias in DMI consists of the gap between 6c inscriptions from the Chao Phraya basin and 11c inscriptions from Thaton; Mon inscriptions from the Isan fill this gap now, with the earliest being contemporaneous with Lp.1, the octagonal pillar from Lopburi, dated by Coedes in 1925 as not earlier than the second half of the 8th century, but which Shorto dates to the seventh (although marked by a query; DMI.xxxiii). Coedes`s datings have proved to be problematic, although no alternatives can be offered yet. A major desideratum is the establishment of a relative chronology of Isan Mon and Sanskrit inscriptions; a first attempt has been made by Kanika (1988). The chronological bias distorts the history of OM vocalism, and this may also have implications for early Mon dialectology, as will be discussed in the last section, concerning the quantifier `at.

2. These ideas, based on fewer data than, have been first discussed in my `Mon inscriptions in the Isan and early Khmer-Mon contacts`, in: Proceedings of the Conference on Ancient Cities and Communities in the Northeast, Thailand, Khon Kaen, 26-29 August 1986, pp. 185-193, and will be further developed elsewhere.


4. Mallaret in his Notes ... (II, p. 105, #16), a ye dhammad formula in six lines.

5. Complication arises with the delimitation of the term 'deixis'; for instance, the clitic to `ta`, ta — marking definite plural — is part of the Mon deixis, but is excluded from discussion here.

6. Blagden translates: "these hundred and eighteen stupas" (EB.iv.l, p. 59), Shorto: "Those 118 statues aforesaid" (DMI, p. 162).

7. See J.M. Jacob, "The structure of the word in Old Khmer", BSOAS 1960. xiii.2.351-368, here pp. 354-355: "ai and au: These vowels do not operate with final consonants. The exceptions of this statement are in words for which an alternative spelling either without the final or with a different vowel is more usual. Thus d'ay and kantai are alternatives of dai and kantai and daar, jaun, and jawo are written in place of the more common don, jon and jadwo, ai and au are therefore held to represent the vowel a with final y and v respectively (ay and av)." Shorto (DMI) distinguishes in his transliteration between o, oau and au; oau corresponds to Coedes's au whereas Shorto's au is a graph attested only since MM, corresponding to OM āw spellings. āw rhymes are spelt in the Nagayon ink glosses as oau.

8. The environments that are attested in the corpus are `g, c, j, b, b; aN, iNc.``

9. One might argue that wo`, especially the cliticized form wo, is linked to the following, as it is in Pre-Angkorian Khmer where demonstratives precede nouns (see J.M. Jacob, Lecture notes on Old Khmer, and her "Notes on the numerals and numeral coefficients in Old, Middle and Modern Khmer", Lingua 1965.xv.143-162, here pp. 150-156. But the PA-Khmer constructions require a predicate.

10. But again we would have to ask, why is ne` / nai` confined to Khmer-Mon contact areas? We would also have to explain the anomalous shift /e/ > /o/.

11. EB.iii.l, p. 171.
12. For the reading of line 3, see Shorto's emendation in DMI.

13. In the case of lāti we have ma-V forms instead of -m- infixed forms because of morphophonemic constraints in Old Mon; evidence for this is not extensive, but seems likely: only three lm- initials are attested in OM, (i) lmoh 'then' for which Shorto posits a root *nōh, in analogy with (ii) lmom, the attributive infixed form of the base nom 'to be present, to have, possess', and (iii) (l)mo (unknown); for the last, Shorto proposes an emendation, lmoh. Morphophonemically, /nm-/ initials violate canonical forms whereas /mn-/ initials are attested. /lm-/ initials are attested from MM onwards but have different correspondences in Old Mon. When these morphophonemic restrictions apply, -m- is extracted so that the underlying form #1-m-at# is not realized as /lmat/ but as /m-lat/. In OM any segment that contains -m- or ma- is not part of the predicate, and thus requires a predicate, which in this case is given here in wo'.

14. In 73b we deal with two different syntactic segments; a boundary should be assumed between ma-kantam and phal.


16. The gloss for 5 is Shorto's who proposes an amended reading to Luce's (DMI.90).

17. In which, case, however, the entire segment is non-predicative. One should remember that these are glosses accompanying frescoes.

18. In Mon, the further to the left a nominalized segment, the more topicalized it is.

19. In Figure 8.D the final glottal stop in the original has been omitted here.


21. As part of the royal title kanimrateni pdai karom.

22. These would correspond phonologically to /e, e / > /o, a/.

23. In Mg.2, Mg.3 Uraisi 1988 misreads nai for nai'; for nai'; for translation see Bauer 1986.

24. Upon close inspection it seems unlikely that the part which is chipped off contained an aksara at all; if so, certainly not more than one. In KhK.16 only the first sentence is cited here.

25. This was discussed at length in my "Khmer and Mon relative clauses - An historical study", Australian Linguistic Society, 16th annual meeting, Alice Springs, 29.8-2.9.1984.

26. Spelling variants include, gi, gui, giē, giy.

27. Uraisi 1988, p.490; Coedes IC.v.24, note 4, the latter proposing the etymology Skt. pragata 'gone forward, started'. It should be pointed out, though, that there is no virāma on ta in Ks.7.

28. P.N. Jenner, A Chrestomathy of Pre-Angkorian Khmer, Honolulu, University of Hawaii, 1981, vol.ii: Lexicon of the dated inscriptions, p.203, in addition to the glosses "true, firm; to adjust; hold, fasten". What the exact source for Jenner's interpretation is, I do not know; the contexts in the modern forms, listed below, however, concur with such an analysis.

29. The second terms of the compound are respectively phgān 'to provide, support', and bhīmu 'cross-legged position', derived from baen 'to sit cross-legged'. R.K. Headley lists, in addition, an OKhm. form phgat-phgān; this is a ghost-word in Old Khmer (see A Cambodian-English Dictionary, Washington, DC, The Catholic University of America, Press 1977, voli, p.613).

30. P.N. Jenner and S. *ou, A Lexicon of Khmer morphology (= Mon-Khmer Studies ix-x), Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press, 1980-81; /kut/ is glossed as "1. to be true, precise, ...; to be even. 2. to be fit, ..., whole entire. 3. to be secure, proof."

31. It should be noted that in some OM inscriptions, such as Shwezigon, medial r is spelt as a superscript and as r with a subscript consonant attached, or as -r# followed by a new initial. See C.O. Blagden, JRAS1910, p.600.

32. K 46B, K 292, K 76, K 137, K 115, K 388C.


34. See the discussion in Jacob, op.cit., pp. 423, 426, and Claude Jacques, "Sources on economic activities in Khmer and Cham lands", in: D.G. Marr and A.C. Milner, eds., Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th centuries, Canberra, ANU; Singapore, ISEAS, 1986, pp. 327-334, here p. 329.

35. Coedès, IC.i.p. 16, note.

36. Claude Jacques reminded me of both verbal and nominal usage of kurui', which was first pointed out to me by Judith Jacob in her course on Old Khmer (1979/80). Jenner agrees on this point, and draws attention to the fact that in K 235 kurui' is followed by ni; see his "In search of Old Khmer ni", in East meets West: Homage to Edgar C. Knoulton Jr., edited by R.L. Hadlich and J.D. Ellsworth, Honolulu: University of Hawaii, College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, Department of European Languages and Literature, 1988, p.135-57.

37. Claude Jacques reminded me of both verbal and nominal usage of kurui', which was first pointed out to me by Judith Jacob in her course on Old Khmer (1979/80). Jenner agrees on this point, and draws attention to the fact that in K 235 kurui' is followed by ni; see his "In search of Old Khmer ni", in East meets West: Homage to Edgar C. Knoulton Jr., edited by R.L. Hadlich and J.D. Ellsworth, Honolulu: University of Hawaii, College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature, Department of European Languages and Literature, 1988, p.135-57.
42. The unidentified slave-donor is listed in Jenner, Chrestomathy, op.cit., *Lexicon of the dated inscriptions*, the occurrences of *ka* in other contexts are given in the *Lexicon of the undated inscriptions*. Clausal *ka* is listed in both lexica.

43. The four examples given here in Figure 9-B are glossed by Jenner, *Chrestomathy, Lexicon of the undated inscriptions*, as "the company of attendants upon the shining one", "recorders serving ..." (with *cmuh* scribe' being analysed as an -m- infixed derivative, from *cuh* 'to record; to lower, descend'), "camdak ple serving ...", and "preparers of (food) offerings serving ...".


45. As can be seen in Figure H, K 403 was first noted by Lajonquine, *Inventaire descriptif des monuments du Cambodge* (tome deuxième), Paris, E. Leroux, 1907, and K 404, K 510-512 were known by 1922, as described by E. Seidenfaden in "Complément à l'Inventaire descriptif des monuments du Cambodge pour les quatre provinces du Siam occidental*, BEEFO 1922, xxii.55-100 [with contributions by G. Coedès]. The first report on Fa Daet, written by Seidenfaden, was published as "Khanok Nakhon, an ancient Mon settlement in Northeast Siam (Thailand) and its treasures of Art", *BEFO* 1954.xlii.2.643-647, followed five years later by Subhadrads Diskul, "Mueng Fa Daet, an ancient town in Northeast Thailand", *Arribus Asiae* 1959, xiii.362-367. Neither publication refers to inscribed *semas*. Illustrated *semas* from Fa Daet were already known by 1934. K 965 was published by Coedès as the second inscription in his "Nouvelles données épigraphiques sur l'Indochine centrale", *JA* 1958.125-142, here: pp.131-132, the others from Khon Kaen, Chaiyaphum, Kalasin and Udorn in *Inscriptions du Cam-bridge, VII*, Paris, EFEEO, 1964, passim (see Figure H for page references). For a comprehensive pre-1974 bibliography on Mon *simá* stones see Piriya Kraitiriksh, "*Semas with scenes from the Mahâniputâ jâtakas in the National Museum at Khon Kaen*, in *Art and Archaeology in Thailand*, Bangkok, FAD, 1974, 35-65 [+26ill.], especially notes 5-12; an error should be corrected here: Piriya, quoting Solheim and Gorman [reference hereafter], states on pp.41-42 that the inscribed *sema* from Kumphawapi [K 981] is in Khmer; in fact, this inscription is in Sanskrit, and it would have been highly unusual to find a pre-9c Khmer inscription in that area. Piriya refers to W.G. Solheim and C.F. Gorman, "Archaeological salvage program, Northeastern Thailand - first season", *JSS* 1966.1xv.2.111-210, here: p.159; Solheim and Gorman have taken Coedès' [chronological] term 'pre-Angkoran' to mean Khmer. Another assumption by Solheim and Gorman — although not referred to by Piriya — is equally erroneous: "The third stone upright [K 981] was in all probability not originally intended for use as an upright [...]. This inscription is meant to be read when the stone is lying in a horizontal position" (op.cit., p.159). Writing on a *simá* stone parallel to the spine, instead across the spine [horizontally in upright position], is not exceptional: K 965, from Kaset Sombun, Chaiyaphum, is also inscribed along the spine; an illustration of K 965 can be found in No Na Paknam's *Buddhist boundary markers* [reference infra], p.126, ill.851. K 965 is not damaged, is not circular in cross-section, but rather positioned horizontally, which implies that the inscription, along the spine, must have been read vertically too. For post-1974 work on *semas* see the following: E. Seidenfaden, "Une inscription sanskrit de Phu Khiau Kau", *BEFO* 1975.i.2.89-116; id., *Surasawadi 1978* is given in the bibliography here [infra].

46. While analyzing Sb.3 (= K 964), a copperplate, inscribed in Sanskrit, from U Thong, Coedès draws attention to "[...] cette particularité, traînant peut-être une influence mônë, que l'extrémité inférieure de certains jambages verticaux (notamment ceux de Ia et de l') a tendance à se retrousser vers l'extérieur, c'est-à-dire vers la droite" (1958.129-130). A page further on, when discussing K 965, from Kaset Sombun, Chaiyaphum, also in Sanskrit, he notes, again, "[...] une écriture tout à fait étrange qui exagère le crochet à la base des jambages inférieurs de l'a et de l', comme dans l'inscription précédente [Sb. 3/K 964] et dans les inscriptions précitées extérieures au Cambodge, et qui développe à l'excès, comme dans l'écriture chame tardive, les fleurons supérieurs des caractères au détriment du corps même de ceux-ci. Il semble y avoir là une évolution autonome, en pays excentrique, qui oblige à supposer l'écoulement d'un certain temps depuis l'inscription sanskrit boudhique de Phu Khiau Kau, mais qui ne prouve pas forçément la date tardive de l'occupation khmère de la region" (1958.131-132). For K 404, Coedès quotes himself (supra, 1958, 129-130) in *IC.vii.73*, adding "Cette particularité se retrouve dans d'autres inscriptions du plateau de Korat." A propos K 981, in Sanskrit, from Kumphawapi, Udorn, "[...] présentant comme les autres inscriptions du plateau de Korat la particularité d'exagérer le crochet à la base du trait vertical des voyelles longues a et i" (IC.vii.159). Exactly the same comment accompanies the notes on K 984, in Sanskrit, from Muang, Khon Kaen.
NOTES ON MON EPIGRAPHY

(i) PUBLICATIONS


DKh. ภูธรภูมิธน. ปั้น gammērī มีลกกีแซงคม อ.ต. thượngพลๅว อ.ชัยนาท อ.ชัยนาท, 2530

57. K 388/Nm.28 and K 389/Nm.31 are written in Khmer but show traces of Mon; variation in vowel length in IA loans is suspect in K 369/Sn.2. K 400/Nm.24, also in Khmer, shows palaeographical characteristics similar to Mon and Sanskrit inscriptions found elsewhere in Northeastern Thailand.

ABBREVIATIONS


[Archaeology Division, FAD. Report of archaeological excavations at Hangnamsakhorn, Manorum, Chainat. Bangkok, 1988.]

SCp. ภูฏ ภูฏ ภูฏ. แยกลงขึ้นข้าว. ลดพื้น,พิพิธภัณฑ์สถานแห่งชาติศิลปแห่งประ-

การณ์, 2529.


(ii) NAMES

G/NNk. A.B.Griswold/Prasert na Nakhorn

HLS H.L.Shorto

(iii) LANGUAGES

Khm. Khmer

EOM Early Old Mon

EMKhm. Epigraphic Middle Khmer

EMM Early Middle Mon

LOM Late Old Mon

LM Literary Mon

MM Middle Mon

OKhm. Old Khmer

OM Old Mon

P' Pali

PA Pre-Angkorian Khmer

Skt. Sanskrit

SM modern spoken Mon
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[Champa Yueangcharoen, Thoem Mitem; Khongdet Praphat-thong. An analysis of the stone
NOTES ON MON EPIGRAPHY

inscriptions at the Hariphunchay National Museum (Lamphun). Bangkok, FAD, 1979. iii, 89pp. no plates; Mon inscriptions from Lamphun pp.8-34.

[Champa Yueangcharoen, Prasarn Bunprakhong, Thoem Mitem. An inscribed terracotta Buddha image from Nadun, Mahasarakham province. Silpakorn 1980.23.6.63-64.]

ประชา บุญประดง จำป่ายั่งแจ่ม ยี่ยง ปี 1106/22 ค.ศ. 2524 บุญประดง จำป่ายั่งแจ่ม ยี่ยง ปี 1106/22 ค.ศ. 2524

[Phuthorn Bhumadhon, Somchait Nakhorn Phanom, eds., The earliest inscriptions from Lopburi and surrounding areas. Bangkok, FAD; Lopburi, King Narai National Museum, 1981.]

[Thoem Mitem, Champa Yueangcharoen. An inscription at the entrance to Narai cave. Silpakorn 1984.28.3.53-57.]

Figure A: Chronology of inscriptions from Burma and Thailand

[Because the discussion concentrates on Khmer-Mon contacts in the Chao Phraya basin and northeastern Thailand, inscriptions from Burma in Sanskrit, Pali, Burmese and Tircul have been omitted. Thai inscriptions have also been omitted because they do not fall within the chronological frame of reference given here. A typology is given only for Mon.]

Figure B: Mon inscriptions from Thailand, not included in DMI

Figure C: Mon inscriptions from Burma, not included in DMI

Figure D: Inscriptions from Thailand excluded from Glossary

Figure E: Inscribed terracotta stupas from Thailand (7c-8c)

Figure F: Inscribed dharmacakras from Thailand (6c-8c)

Figure G: Inscribed silver coins from Thailand (6c-8c)

Figure H: Buddhist Sanskrit inscriptions from Northeastern Thailand (7c-8c)

Abbreviations used in Figures A-G:

Bkk       Bangkok
Lpb       Lopburi
NP        Nakhon Pathom
M         Museum
NL        National Library
c        century AD
m          die, mould
pvt       private collection
compl     complete
fr        fragment
l         length
d         diameter
(l)       line(s)
s(s)      side(s)
?         unknown

All measurements are given in cm. — refers to an inscription which is not registered with the FAD.

GLOSSARY

This glossary comprises 186 lemmata, 53 of which are not attested in DMI. In the case of words already attested elsewhere and entered in DMI, glosses have been kept concise; a cross-reference to DMI is given. Words attested in our corpus for the first time are discussed at length here, or will be in subsequent publications. The main entry is followed by the location (inventory number of inscription, see Figures B and C), the last digit indicating the line, an English gloss, followed by a cross-reference to DMI (if the word occurs in previously recorded corpus), alternative spellings (if attested elsewhere in OM and MM), inflected (infl.) and derived (der.) forms, if any. This is followed by an etymology in the case of loan-words.

The transliteration follows Shorto's, with w being used for vernacular forms and v for Indo-Aryan; Shorto's oau is transcribed here as au, his eai here as ai. The following symbols are used: (?) unknown, uncertain, reading or gloss; * reconstructed, unattested form; [ ] lacuna, ( ) emendation, uncertain reading.
'at
quantifier, 'all'.
DMI.19-20.
'ut, et, 'ut; Lph. 'at, as- (junctural form);
MM 'uit; derr. OM rin'ut, MM pa'uit

'addharaj
Jm.45.4
'princeling (?)'
P. addha 'half', rāja 'king'

'aniruddhadewa
VT.Mm.1-2; VT.Km.2
name

'anurādhapura
Sp.11
capital of Ceylon
DMI.6.
MM 'anurādhapu 'anurādhapu

'anuruttadew
Bass.5
name; P. anuruddha 'devoted to'

'abā (la)
BTI.13-14
(?)

'awo
cf. wo'

'awo'
cf. wo'

('a)ss(r)āy
Jm.45.1-2
Skt. āśāya, P. assaya
G/NNk "refuge"

'āç
KhK.16.4
'to ask for'
DMI.13-14.
'āç; MM āt; der. OM rīr'āç

'ācāryya
Ks.1; Ks.2; Jg.9.1
'teacher'
DMI.14.
Skt. ācārya, P. ācariya
'ācār, 'acār; MM 'ācāriya, 'acā, că

'āditya
Ks.i.; Ks.ii
'sun' [proper name]
DMI.5. 14.
Skt. āditya
'ādityawār 'sunday'; MM 'aduit

'ārīyamaiytriyya
KhK.16.5

(aryama)triyy
KhK.i.4
P. ariya 'good' right; Skt. maitreya
'benevolent'

'ita
Tv.2
[part of proper name] respect title
DMI.17, 306
'ita; MM yata, 'ita

'imō'
cf. ymo'

('upa)jāhāy
KhK.17.4
('upa)jāhāy
Ks.11; Ks.2.1
'preceptor'
DMI.21. HLS regards this as a blendform
Skt. upādhyāya, P. upajjāya

'ekarat
Tv.3
'king'
DMI.23
Skt. ekarāja
MM 'ekarat

'ey
Mg.iv.2; KhK.19.2, 3, 4, 5, 6; Ks.i; Ks.ii;
Jm.(i); Jm(ii); Pg.12; Bass.3
[first person singular (personal pronoun)]
I, me, my
DMI.24. 'ey, 'e'; MM 'ey

'or
Mg.2.3
'to command to', in subordinate clauses
'so that, in order to'
DMI.24-25. 'or; der. p'or; infl. s'or

kandāṁ
Bass.2
kandāṁ

kantāp
KhK.16.4: Khk.i. 3
'to be in time for, to finish [act]'
DMI.38. kintāp; MM gatāp

kandar
Sp.11
'wife, spouse'
DMI.39. kindar, kandar; MM kandaw

kanmun
cf. kmun

kanhāṁ
cf. kandāṁ

karumrateăn pdai karom
Mg.2.2-3; Mg.3.2
[royal title]
Khmer

kali gwa'
Tv.2
'to attain to'
DMI.49. MM kuli go'

kasmuñ
cf. ksmuñ

kāla
Jm.45.8
'time' [here: name (?)]
DMI.35. kāl, kāla
Skt./P. kāla

kintu phalaguin
Bass.1
12th lunar month [March]
DMI.38-39. kintu, kintu, kantu

\textit{gatu cay}

Tv.1

1st lunar month [April]
DMI.38-39. MM kitu, kitu, gatu

\textit{kuiw}

BMI.42-43. kil, kul, kel, keil, kuil;
der. krakel; infl.

\textit{ku}

cf. ko'

\textit{kum}

VT.Mm.4; VT.Km.4

\textit{kuruñ}

KhK.17.3; Jy.i.1

\textit{kusuiw}

Tv.1, 2

\textit{ku}

Pg.2, 16

DMI.43-45. ku, ku', ko'

\textit{kon}

Pg.2; Tv.1

'child (male, female)'

\textit{konn}

Km.45.5, 8

\textit{kwon}

Bass.2

DMI.50. Skt. kuśala, P. kusala

\textit{ka'\textsuperscript{'}

Sp.1.1; KhK.16.1, 2; KhK17.3 5; KhK.1.2;
Mg.iv.2; Jy.i. A.2

Title (?) and proclitic, marking object, &c.
cf. DMI; in Sp.1. providing noun-linkage
'and'.

\textit{ku}

Pg.2, 16

DMI.43-45. ku, ku', ko'

\textit{garluñ}

Bass.2

DMI.43-45. MM ku

\textit{kong}

Pg.2; Tv.1

'child (male, female)'

\textit{konn}

Km.45.5, 8

\textit{gamluñ}

Bass.2

DMI.53. MM kwon

\textit{kon}

cf. kon

\textit{gatun}

cf. kintu

\textit{gana}

KhK.17.2

[part of personal name (?), here: drañ gana]see W.M.B.4, cited in DMI.72 g(ana) d(ak)

\textit{garluñ}

KhK.16.4

'quantity, number'

DMI.77. girluñ, girloñ, garloñ, garleun,
garoñ (Lph.) : MM galuin; from base gluñ,
gluñ (DMI.88).

\textit{gamsun}

Tv.1, 3

[attributive form of base gluñ &c.]
DMI.74; cited DMI.88

\textit{gacap}

Tv.1

(?)

\textit{guna}

Ks.1; Ks.2

'favour, virtue, grace'

DMI.78-9. gun, guñ, guña; MM gun; Skt./P. guña

\textit{gulo}

KhK.17.7

'family (?)'

DMI.50. kulo; MM kulo, kalo; P. kulo

\textit{goh}

Pg.14

[noun clitic, deictic in origin]

DMI.82-83. goh, goh, goh; MM gah,
gah; derr. rgoñ
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gna</th>
<th>VT.Mm.2; VT.Km.2</th>
<th>jiw pāl</th>
<th>KhK.i.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[royal prefix to name or title]</td>
<td></td>
<td>name (?)</td>
<td>Skt./P. jīva 'soul', P. pāla 'keeper' (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.84. gna; MM gna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gwa'</th>
<th>Tv.2, 3</th>
<th>ju'</th>
<th>BT.1.9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[as postverb in kali gwa' (Tv.2), q.v.; second context (Tv.3) unclear, dali gwa']</td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) title (?), (ii) great-grandmother</td>
<td>DMI.124. Lph.1 for (i), Lph. for (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.80-81; nominalized OM form gwo'</td>
<td></td>
<td>conn. OM jtu, and its syllabified form taju</td>
<td>q.v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.89. base go'; MM go'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DMI. 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.49 kuli go' 'to acquire'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cak</th>
<th>Ks.7</th>
<th>jumnok</th>
<th>cf. jnok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.91. cakka (Lph.), in W.K.II.6 kyāk...wil cakka; Skt; cakra: P. cakka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>juin</td>
<td>cf. jin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jnok</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cakravarti</th>
<th>Mg.i.1</th>
<th>jumnok</th>
<th>cf. jnok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'universal monarch'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skt. cakravartin 'ruler'; cakravartīta 'sovereign'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bass.3</td>
<td>'to be large, big, great'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DMI.128. jnok; infll., der. jnok, jrinok</td>
<td>VT.Mm.2-3; VT.Km.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conn. OM jtu, and its syllabified form taju</td>
<td>q.v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>jnok</td>
<td>DMI.126. jinok</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cāďon</th>
<th>Tv.1</th>
<th>jmāp</th>
<th>Kh.K.19.2, 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>measure, length of foot; applied to time</td>
<td></td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.91. MM cāďon, cāďwon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>com</th>
<th>Pg.12, 13</th>
<th>jmah</th>
<th>Kh.K.16.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'entirely, solely'</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal name; possible alternative reading mren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com ma, com ma' 'only, alone', preverbal; here postverbal in context nom com.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.108. com</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chāy</td>
<td>Tv.2</td>
<td>jren</td>
<td>Kh.K.16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in compound rān chāy 'to flourish'</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal name; possible alternative reading mren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possibly connected with Skt. chāya, Om chāy 'to be beautiful', der. cirhāy 'beauty'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.116. 315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>chuiw</th>
<th>Tv.2</th>
<th>fī</th>
<th>Kh.K.16.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to find, meet, encounter'</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal name; possible alternative reading mren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>janjih</th>
<th>Sp.1.1</th>
<th>nāh</th>
<th>Kh.K.16.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to sing, singing'</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal name; possible alternative reading mren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequentative form, derived from base *jih</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or *jeh, -N- infix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.122. jinjeh jinjeh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jāti</th>
<th>Mg.2.4</th>
<th>nāh</th>
<th>Kh.K.16.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'lineage, descent group, existence'</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal name; possible alternative reading mren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.120. jāti; MM jāti; Skt./P. jāti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jin</th>
<th>BT.1.3</th>
<th>nāh</th>
<th>Kh.K.16.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'to bestow, make over, hand over'</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal name; possible alternative reading mren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.125-126. jin, jin, jen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>juin</th>
<th>Tv.2</th>
<th>nāḥḥ</th>
<th>Kh.K.16.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMI.125-126. MM juin</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal name; possible alternative reading mren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jinnalāyy</th>
<th>Jm.45.9</th>
<th>nāḥḥ</th>
<th>cf. nāḥḥ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>name (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>personal name; possible alternative reading mren</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. jīna 'victorious' (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| jīk | Pg.6 | ḍik | cf. ḍek |
The text contains a dictionary of Khmer words with their English translations and etymologies. The dictionary includes words such as:

- **dék** (BTI.8): 'serf, dependant; person assigned for service at temple, sanctuary'
- **ti** (Jm.45.8-9): name
- **tira** (Bass.3): 'lord, master'
- **tala** (Ks.i; Ks.ii; Tv.1): only as MM form tila, tila, tala, tla
- **tuy** (cf. toy): 'hand, arm'
- **tay** (VT.Mm.4; VT.Km.4): 'sun, day'
- **tma** (KhK.17.1, 6): (i) 'stone', DMI.170-171. tmo'; MM tmo', tma', tma'; (ii) attributive form of OM to', MM to', ta', 'ta', definite plural, here: quantifier 'all, every'
- **tmo** (KhK.19.2, 6): (i) male (person)
- **tjr** (TV.1): DMI.175. trus, trus
- **truh** (DMI.175. MM truh):
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>truh</th>
<th>cf. trus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ lta(nhā) paba</td>
<td>BTI.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ltherdhammāguna</td>
<td>Bass.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. thera, dhamma, guṇa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dākā</td>
<td>Tv.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'layperson, donor'</td>
<td>DMI.185. MM dākā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dayah</td>
<td>Tv.2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to be well-known'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dar</td>
<td>KhK.16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part of name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>darañ</td>
<td>cf. drañ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dali</td>
<td>Tv.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in context dali gwa'; cf. kali gwa'; alternatively cf. DMI.205. MM dli', infl. damli, 'constantly, abiding, immovable', assuming in Tv.3 a syllabified cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dalu</td>
<td>cf. dlu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>das</td>
<td>Mg.2.3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to be, become'</td>
<td>DMI.189-190. das; infl.; derr. dirdas, pa'das</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dah</td>
<td>Tv.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMI.189-190. MM dah, das, dāh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dān</td>
<td>Pg.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'gift, alms'</td>
<td>DMI.190 dān; MM dān; Skt./P. dāna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dewatau</td>
<td>Tv.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jy.9.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'god'</td>
<td>DMI.198-199. dewatāw; MM dewatāw, dewatau; Skt./P. devata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dewa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noradra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pathān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dlu</td>
<td>Bass.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to be dark, blind'</td>
<td>DMI.205. d-lu; infl.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
'four'
DML.224. pan; MM pan

(parapa)
Nw.7
(?)

pāl
cf. jiw

pāravati
Mg.iii
in context kyāk pāravati, part of name;
conn. P. pārvata 'mountain; cloud' (?)

pi
Nw.7
'three', or part of name/title (?)
DML.230-231. pi, pl'; der. pumpī

piñ
cf. puñ

puñ
Jy.9.1; Mg.1.1; Mg.ii.1; Mg.iii; Mg.iv.1;
KhK.16.1; KhK.17.1; KhK.19.1; KhK.1.1;
D.w.38

piñ
Ks.i; Ks.ii
(work of) merit'
P. puñha
DML.235

puñya
Mg.2.1; Mg.3.1-2; Ks.7; Ks.iii; Jy.i.1;
Jy.11.4; BT.1; Jy.i.A.1
'work of merit'
DML.235. puñya, pun, p(u)n, pin
Skt. punya

puña
Nw.7

puin
Tv.2
DML.235. MM puin

pus
KhK.16.1-2
name (?)
conn. Skt. pausā, puṣya '10th lunar month
[January]'; DML has MM puh (DML.239)

poy
Bass.3
first person plural pronoun 'we, us' our'
(exclusive)
DML.240-241. poy; MM puīy

puin
cf. puñya

pāday
cf. ḍey

pdai
cf. karūnrateṇ

pragata
Ks.7; Jy.i.C.1 as praga(ta)
'to procure; be devout'
Khmer; OKhm. pragat

pray
Tv.1
'to be excellent, noble'
DML.251. prey; infl.; MM prey, pray; OM
der. purey

preñ
BT.5
'buffalo'

phuiw
Tv.2
'fruit', result'
DML.254. phal; MM phuiw; Skt./P. phala

ba
KhK.19.2, 5
DML.257; onomastic ?

bapeñ
Tv.1
from base MM peñ 'to be full'
reflex of either (i) OM causative form
(p-) 'to fill' (ii) OM reciprocal form (-r-) 'to
fulfil', or (iii) OM nominalized form (-r-)
DML.231. piñ, infll.; derr. pupīñ, pirpīñ;
MM peñ

baṣā
Tv.1
measurement, viss (= 3.65 lb).
DML.262. MM baṣā, bāṣā; HLS: Tamil visai

bi(hā)r
BT.4-5
'monastery'
DML.267, 350. bihār, wirhār; MM bhā;
Skt./P. vīharā; cf. wirhār

bō kaḥ
Tv.1
name (?)

bnañ
Bass.4
unit of paddy-land
DML.272. HLS: from base bāñ 'terrace'

bnañ
KhK.i.2
in context māñ bnañ name (?)

brau
Tv.1
'woman, female'
DML.277. brow; MM brāw, brau

bhawa
Tv.3
'existence, incarnation'
DML.280. Skt./P. bhava

cf. mun

manik
Tv.1
here: name, 'gem'
DML.286. manik, mañika; MM manik,
manik; Skt. mañika

māñ
KhK.16.1, 2, 3; KhK.17.5; KhK.i.2; BT.8-9
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Jm.45.6
onomastic prefix for persons of either sex;
if conn. DMI.284. MM mãn, ma(ang),
modern usage applied to males only; more
likely to be connected with OM 'husband'
imán, (i)mãnh; MM mãn, as in DMI.18.

mun
VT.Km.1
attributive particle, relative clause marker.
DMI.297. mun, mín, man; MM mín
conn. Khmer; OKhm. man; cf. Bauer 1984,
1986

ma
VT.Mm.3; Pg.2; Tv.2
DMI.281-282. ma, mâ; MM ma
from attributive infix -m-

moy
DMI.229-300. moy; MM mwoy, mway,
moy; derr. OM mimoy, mirmoy

moyy
Jm.45.5

muirmok
Bass.1
'east; day of moon's waxing period'
DMI.295. mirmok, mramok; MM
bramak, bramok, bama'k, bama'k, mrama'k, mamma'k, mma'k
from base OM mok 'to appear'

mňah
Jm.45.1
'person, man, one (who)'
DMI.301
cf. ňah

mnih
Tv.3
'human being, man'
DMI.292. mãnus, mãnus(sa); MM mãnuih,
mânh Skt. mãnuśa, P. mãnus; DMI.286
manus, manis (hapax) MM mnh, manin
(hapax), manuih

mreń
alternative reading for jreń
cf. jreń

msunn
Jm.45.1
'five'
DMI.304. msün, msun, msun,
másun, masun, musun; MM masun; OM
der. mursun; contraction of *moy 'one' and
*sun 'five'
DMI.384-385 for base *sun, OM sün(na),
MM sun

mhásami
Tv.1
name
(?)

ya
Jm.45.3; BTI.12
female onomastic prefix
DMI.305. ya

yašo

yah

yano

ymo'

'imoh

himo'

yaso

P. yasa (?)
DMI.308 has yasodhara, a name of the
Buddha

Tv.1
base of lyah (q.v.) 'to shine. dawn'
DMI.309. yas; MM yah; DMI.310. yiryas;
MM lyah

Jy.i.2
part of name (?), in context vrah [ ] yañ

KhK.19.5, 6
'to be named, called; name'
DMI.307. yamo', yimo', yamo; MM yamu
HLS: conn. yo', particle of address (?)
Pg.2, 10
Jm.45.5-6
DMI.307. himo', simo'; MM himu

Sp.1.2
'to dance'
frequentative form of *rhéh, causative
raleh
DMI.319. rínle’h base DMI.338

Tv.2
in compound rán chý 'to flourish'
DMI.315. rán

Jy.11.1
'king', title, part of name
Skt./P. raja

KhK.16.2
(?, (i) 'manner, like as', DMI.323 row; MM
rau (ii) MM rau gau 'to revere'

Tv.2
here: name, 'brick'
DMI.327. (la'a)l; MM l'it, l'uit, duit

Tv.3
prohibitive particle, 'do not'; contraction
of 'lah, 'pa'; DMI.330. lapa, MM.
cf. pa

Tv.1
Guillon: 'to deposit' (?), conn. DMI.399.
siom) 'to cover'; DMI.344. lhomm, MM, 'to
encase'.

BTI.6, 7
'pair, yoke' (?), conn. OM lañgur (DMI.
329) Guillon's reading may be questionable;
possibly lutgur.

lát

VT.Mm.3; VT.Km.3
to mould
DMI.333. lät

langar
BT1.6, 7
alternative reading of lāngar (q.v.)

loṅ
Jy.11.2
(?)

lop
Sp.1.3
'to enter, go, come, in(to)'
DMI.339-340. lop; infl.; derr. plop, rinlop;
MM lwop, lop

lyah
Tv.2
'light, radiance'
DMI.342, 310. yiryās; MM lyah cf. yah

wa(nna)
BT1.2
in context: trala wa(nna), name;
P. vanṇa 'appearance'

wikhyat
Ks.1; Ks.2, as wikhyā(t)
'to be renowned'
Skt. vihār 'wealth'

wilān
66/22
part of name (?); cf. yaśo

wipāk
KhK.17.6
'product, work'
DMI.349. wipāk; Skt./P. vipāka 'result, fruits'

wihāra
Nw.7
'monastery'
DMI.350. wihār; MM wihār, wihā, wiha;
Skt./P. vihāra cf. bi(h)ār

wo
Sp.1.3; Jy.9.1, 2; Jy.i.A.1; KhK.16.1, 3;
KhK.17.1; Jy.11.4; Ks.1.1; Pg.6; Jm.45.1, 3;
BT1.1, 8;
VT.Mm.1; VT.Km.1
'this'; deictic clitic; can be predicative.
DMI.353. wo'; der. 'awo' 'here' (?)

wo [ ]

wo
Ks.1, Ks.2.1

'awo'
Jy.9.1; Mg.2.1; Mg.3.1; Ks.iii; KhK.19.1, 2
DMI.353. 'awo', locative form ? (HLS)

'awo'
KhK.16.1

wwa'
Tv.2
DMI.353., MM wo', woo', wwa', wa', wwa'

wrahma
KhK.17.4
part of name, title
via Khmer (?) : Skt. brahma 'priest'

wrah
Mg.i.2; Jy.i.2; Jy.i.A.1, C.2 Khmer vrah
honorific prefix

sakkārāt
Tv.1
calendrical year (AD 639).
DMI.335. sakarāj, sakarāja; MM sakkarāj,
sakkārāt Skt. sakarāja

sattru
Tv.3
'enemy'
DMI.360. satrum, satrā'; Skt. satra

sāṃbhuc
Pg.5
'food'
DMI.365. sāṃbhuc, surābhuc; MM sambut;
Skt. sambhojā

sayar
Nw.1
(?)

sāsanā
Tv.2
'doctrine, religion'
DMI.371-372. sās, sāsana; MM sāsanā,
sāsannā (hapax); P. sāsana

sināw
Sp.1.2
hermit, ascetic (?)
reading uncertain, possibly sinādh(a) conn. Khmer (?)

silā
Bass.6
'precept, conduct'
DMI.378. sil, sila, silica; Skt. sila, P. sila

sukk(māla)
Jm.45.3-4
name
G/NNK: sukha Skt./P. 'delight', sukha P.
'white' màla Skt./P. 'garland'

subāhu
KhK.16.2-3
name (?)

suriyakumma
Tv.2
name
Skt. suṛya 'sun', Skt./P. kumāra 'child, boy,
prince'

sem
Pg.10
'Shan'
DMI.385. MM sem, semi

suini
Tv.1, 2, 3
'together with', noun-particle
DMI.381-382. suim; MM suim, suim

skumi
Mg.2.3
(i) 'to possess', attested only in MM com­
ound cuim skum (DMI. 388)
(ii) Khmer kum, negative particle,
preverbal, s- prefix (OM), hypothetical;
see Bauer 1986.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>smar</strong></td>
<td>'low, below'</td>
<td>Mg.2.4; DMI.393-394. smar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>smai</strong></td>
<td>VT.Mm.2; VT.Km.2; TV.3; Bass.4, 5 'king, prince' DMI.394-395. smai smai; MM smai, smai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sri</strong></td>
<td>Nw.i; Jy.11.1 honorific prefix for persons, shrines, cities DMI.396, 353-354, sri, sri, sriy, srih, sri; MM sri, sri. Skt./P. sri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>swayāga</strong></td>
<td>name, in context tarla wraḥ swayaga</td>
<td>Mg.1.2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>hān</strong></td>
<td>'place, location' DMI.401-402. hān, w. f. han, hin; combined form han wo' 'here'</td>
<td>Sp.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>himo'</strong></td>
<td>cf. ymo'</td>
<td>Pg.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>bār</strong></td>
<td>'two' DMI.405. bār; MM der. OM birṭar; der, MM tarmā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>