

## Observations on Old Khmer *man*

Philip N. JENNER  
University of Hawaii

That no text can be understood unless all of its parts are understood first is a truism which few would deny. It is also a useful reminder. It follows from this self-evident principle that progress in our understanding of Old Khmer epigraphy goes hand in hand with the clarification of a number of lexical and grammatical forms that continue to elude us. At the moment I can think of no form more in need of clarification than *man*, an item which is at once pervasive in the inscriptions and still, after a century of study, largely unknown. In the following paragraphs I offer, first, a hypothesis integrating the conclusions resulting from a recent investigation of *man*; second, a discussion of the data on which those conclusions rest; and, thirdly, a brief testing of the hypothesis against data not used in formulating the conclusions.

A dictionary definition of *man* might be configured as follows:

1. pronoun, demonstrative:
  - a. general demonstrative: (archaic) that;
  - b. adverb, temporal: at that time, = then;
  - c. conjunction, temporal: at that time, = then;
  - d. conjunction, subordinating: that;
2. pronoun, relative:
  - a. general relative: that, = who, which;
  - b. conjunction, temporal: at the time that, = when

This is the hypothesis I propose. If its details prove open to debate, most of the distinctions it makes appear to be sound. It should be noted that the enquiry turned up no evidence that *man* has, or ever had, an interrogative function.

No reflex of *man* has been identified in modern Khmer, though a connection with the *māna* /maan/ of *ḥunmāna* /ponmaan/ 'how much?' and a few other fossilized items cannot be discounted without careful study. So far I have found no cognates of *man* in sister languages, though it will be surprising if one or more do not turn up eventually. Tempting as it is, finally, to interpret the common Thai pronoun *man* /man/ as a loan from Old Khmer *man*, this seems fraught with risk and premature without full investigation. In the absence of evidence from any of these three quarters we cannot even assign a phonological shape to the *man* in question here: it could be /mɔɔn/, /mɔn/, /maan/ or /man/, though we may infer from the fact that its orthography undergoes no change throughout the Angkorian period that it represented the last of these four possibilities.

The orthographic form *man* occurs 412 times in the Old Khmer corpus, but this total includes items other than the pronoun we are concerned with. In pre-Angkorian, for example, several of its 70 occurrences prove to be a variant of *mān* /maən/ 'to exist'. A few others represent *man* /mɔɔn/ 'mulberry' and *man* /mɔɔn/ 'Mon'. In at least four cases it is a personal name or part of a personal name which may or may not have had lexical meaning. The exact frequency of the pronoun, therefore, cannot be determined until all 412 *man* have been identified and assigned to specific lexical, grammatical and onomastic items. It is an inescapable fact that this cannot be accomplished until every text in which *man* occurs has been re-examined from start to finish. The probability that the items extraneous to the present enquiry are very few is in no sense a mitigating factor, since any intermingling of data requires that the entire list be gone through to isolate the one pronoun under study. It need hardly be added that the conclusions adduced here are necessarily provisional.

Under these rather adverse conditions the investigation had to be based on internal contextual comparison: the block of 412 mixed *man* was sifted in a search for patterns. With one exception, the patterns which were identified provided the basis for the conclusions which have already been stated.

1a. *Man*<sub>1</sub>: *pronoun, demonstrative*

The exception just mentioned is the function of *man* as a general demonstrative. I have labelled this function archaic because it is supported by the data only inferentially. The five functions of *man* which are directly supported by the data show that a general demonstrative function provides a parallel with the general relative function which apparently developed from it, and at the same time it unifies the three specialized functions which can be supposed to have developed from the general one.

1b. *Man*<sub>2</sub>: *adverb, temporal*

The function of *man* as a temporal adverb is attested by a pattern in which it stands at the head of a main clause and marks the events reported in that clause as having taken place after events previously reported. If the total number of examples forming this pattern cannot be given, it can at least be said that data are in good supply. The great Sdok Kak Thom inscription (K.235) alone contains 22 instances, and these are enough to establish a reliable pattern. It may be worth noting that all occurrences of this *man*<sub>2</sub> are from the Angkorian period. One example well represents all that have been found:<sup>1</sup>

- (1) *man* vraḥ pāda parameśvara cat nagara śrīyaśodharapura ...  
(K.235D: 12, A.D. 1052), 'Then H.M. Parameśvara founded the royal city of Śrī Yaśodharapura ...'

<sup>1</sup> Aymonier, 1901: 266, Finot 1915:89, and Cœdès et Dupont 1943-46:113. The other occurrences of *man*<sub>2</sub> in K.235 are as follows: C: 56, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69, 71, 78, D: 9, 10, 11 (occurring twice), 14, 31, 36, 40, 41, 45, 61, 64, 73, 81.

The following abbreviations are used:

C = Cœdès 1937-66

K. = Prefix (Kambujā) to accession numbers in the "Liste générale des inscriptions du Cambodge," in C VIII: 73:225.

To account for this adverbial function of *man*<sub>2</sub> one need only remember that the three other Old Khmer demonstratives often show locative meaning: *neh* /neh/ 'this' and *noh* /noh/ 'that' as well as the weak *gi* /gyy/ (cf. Latin *is*) frequently express 'in this place' and 'in that place'. It is the ease with which these pronouns can slip into another wordclass, coupled with the fact that the locative and temporal categories are barely distinguished in Khmer, that favors postulating an adverbial function for *man*<sub>2</sub>. So natural do these shifts from general demonstrative to locative adverb appear that it seems unnecessary to posit an underlying \**nā neh* '(in) this place' or \**nā noh* '(in) that place' to explain them. In the same way, it should not be necessary to posit an underlying \**kāla man* '(at) that time' to explain *man*<sub>2</sub>, though doing so would imply full acceptance of *man*<sub>1</sub>.

It remains to be mentioned that a further specialization of the meaning of *man*<sub>2</sub> is to be observed. Few examples of it that have been collected express the purely locative/temporal idea of 'at that time, then'. In most cases what is clearly intended is the idea of 'from that time, after that'.

*1c. Man*<sub>3</sub>: conjunction, temporal

A further shift from one wordclass to another is seen with *man*<sub>3</sub>, only one step away from the temporal adverb just described. This conjunctive function, attested by only a few examples, shows *man*<sub>3</sub> at the head of a main clause as the correlative of *man*<sub>6</sub>. A single example will suffice:

- (2) ta gi man ti stap vyavahāra **man** mratāñ kuruñ paṃvyatt neh 'amve ta rohñ nehñ (K.181B: 2-5, A.D. 962), 'When the case was heard, **then** the lord regent confirmed the acts aforesaid.'

This usage is so rare that one may well wonder whether it is useful to distinguish *man*<sub>3</sub> from *man*<sub>2</sub>.

*1d. Man*<sub>4</sub>: conjunction, subordinating

Not attested in pre-Angkorian Khmer, *man*<sub>4</sub> is to be inferred from a pattern comprising nearly 50 examples. In all cases it follows a verb capable of being complemented by an indirect statement or embedded sentence. The most common of these verbs is *kathā* /kəthaa/ 'to say', with 17 occurrences; the next most common is *nivedana* /niβeet/ 'to state', with 14 occurrences.

- (3) vāp dharmma kathā **man** neh sre neh ta praṃvyañ jeñ ti oy ta vrañ kamrateñ 'añ 'āy dvijendrapura vyat (K.262S: 7-8, A.D. 983), '... *pater* Dharma said **that** it (was) indeed this ricefield of seven *jeñ* that had been given to the *vrañ* Our High Lord at Dvijendrapura.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Cf. C IV: 115. For the record, the 16 other cases of *kathā man* are found at K.181B: 6-7, 14 (A.D.962); K.425: 9 (A.D. 968?); K.262S:31 (A.D. 983); K. 344:35, 39 (A.D. 985); K 257N:4 (A.D. 994); K.693B: 28 (A.D. 1003); K.235D:14 (A.D. 1052); K.175E: 2 (A.D.878-977); K.233B: 11 twice (A.D. 878-977); K 353S:16 (A.D. 878-977); K.566B:1 (A.D.978-1077); K.67D:2 (A.D. 978-1177).

- (4) *svāmi nivedana man sre dai mvāy jeñ cval kamluñ gol ukk* (K.262S: 25-6, A.D. 983), '... the owner stated that another ricefield of one *jeñ* also lay within the boundary markers.'<sup>3</sup>

Eight other verbs followed by *man*<sub>4</sub> have been found so far, and a few others may turn up in the course of further investigation.<sup>4</sup>

### 2a. *Mans*: pronoun, relative

The pattern eventually interpreted as pointing to *mans* originally consisted of 48 examples in which four nouns stand before *man* followed by a verb phrase. These nouns were *khñuṃ* /kɲum/ 'slave', in 14 examples; *sre* /sræ/ 'ricefield', also in 14 examples; *bhūmi* /βhuum/ '(piece of) land', in 10 examples; and *dravya* /drap/ 'object of value', also in 10 examples. This pattern occurs in pre-Angkorian as well as Angkorian. To anyone investigating *man* without preconceptions the chief interest of *mans* is that, while best represented in the data, it is the most ambiguous. Consider the following:

- (5) *khñuṃ man duk ta 'āśrama yogendrālaya ...* (K.33: 24, A.D. 1017), "Esclaves affectés à l'āçrama Yogendrālaya ..." (C III: 151)

In every case a noun phrase (NP) head, the four nouns just mentioned, is followed by a verb phrase (VP) linked to it by *man*. In all 48 examples only 7 verbs occur, and all of these are transitive: *duk* /duk/ 'to assign', *jāhv* /jaw/ 'to acquire by exchange', *duñ* /dɲp/ 'to buy', *oy* /qooj/ 'to give', *jvan* /juuən/ 'to offer up', *loh* /loh/ 'to free', and *kalpanā* /kalbənaa/ 'to secure to'. Going by Cœdès' rendering of the above passage, one is entitled to wonder whether the *man* is not a passive marker. Indeed, review of his treatment of the other examples shows that he favors the past passive participle construction:

- (6) *dravya man oy ukk khlās l jyañ pramvval vat l jyañ 3 tamrɣya l 'so* (K.420: 48, A.D. 878-977), "Biens donnés en plus: 1 *khlās* de 7 *jyañ*, 1 *vat* de 3 *jyañ*, 1 éléphant blanc" (C IV: 166).

Probing further, however, we come upon a variation of the pattern just described, in which an NP intervenes between *man* and the verb and functions as subject of the latter:

- (7) *jmaḥ ge kñuṃ man mratañ śakrasvāmi oy ta vrah ...* (K.904A: 21-2, A.D. 713), "Noms des esclaves que Mratañ Çakrasvāmi donne au dieu ..." (C IV: 62)

<sup>3</sup> Cf. C IV: 116. The 13 other occurrences of *nivedana man* are at K.266:19 (A.D.960) K.262S: 3 (A.D.983); K.425:10 (A.D. 968?); K.158B:15 (A.D. 1003); K.598B:6, 32, 43 (A.D.1006); K.933:3 (A.D. 1014); K.380E:66, W:30 (A.D.1038); K.968B:6 (A.D.1044); K.235D 13 (A.D.1052); K.299:8 (A.D.978-1077).

<sup>4</sup> These other verbs are *vol* ~ *bol* /βool/ 'to tell, reveal' (K.208: 53, A.D. 978-1077), K.144 4, A.D. 1178-1377); *yal* /jɔl/ 'to see' (K.233B: 7, A.D. 878-977; K.380E: 20, A.D. 1038); *chle* /cləj/ 'to answer' (K.262S: 23, A.D. 983); *tyañ* /dɣəj/ 'to know' (K.843C: 13, (A.D. 1025); *pamvvat* /βəmβiiə/ 'to confirm' (K.233A: 12, A.D. 878-977); *sandeha* /səndech/ 'to fear, suspect' (K.380E: 61, A.D. 1038); *dār* /daar/ 'to claim' (K.697B: 10, A.D. 878-977); and *mel* /məəl/ 'to regard' (K.829: 10, A.D. 978-1077).

Comparison of the group of data illustrated by examples (5) and (6) with the group of data illustrated by example (7) raises the question, Did Cœdès interpret the *man* in the first group as a passive marker and the *man* in the second group as a relative pronoun? I think not. There are several objections to taking *man* as a passive marker.

In the first place, to take it as a passive marker on the basis of Cœdès' rendering of examples (5) and (6) would be to attach too much importance to the surface appearance of his French versions. The question is not how he interpreted these examples but what the examples themselves are intended to mean.

In the second place, the passive voice is used sparingly in all stages of Khmer. In modern Khmer it is expressed periphrastically or through verbs which are stative rather than truly passive, or avoided altogether. In Old Khmer it is expressed by the passive marker *ti* /*ḍii*/ before the otherwise active verb, the optional agent taking its place between the marker and the verb, as in

- (8) *yal man neḥ tai kanhyañ ti vāp rau oy thlāy krapī...*(K.233B: 7, A.D. 878-977), 'Seeing **that** this *tai* Kanhyañ **had been** given by the *pater* Rau in exchange for a buffalo, ...'

The existence of this construction proves nothing by itself, inasmuch as the language could have alternative means of expressing the passive.

In the third place, the data represented by examples (5) and (6) are not structurally different from the data represented by example (7). In all cases what follows *man* can be formulated as (NP<sub>1</sub>) + VP + (NP<sub>2</sub>), where optional NP<sub>1</sub> is the subject of the transitive verb while optional NP<sub>2</sub> is the direct object. Examples (5) and (6) can be taken to show that NP<sub>1</sub> is zero when the subject is understood, a condition which obliges the translator to reach back into the context and find the antecedent for supplying a pronoun subject or to avail himself of other means. In (5) and (6) and a good many similar cases Cœdès elected to use the past passive participle (*affectes*, *donnés*) as stylistic shortcuts to getting across the meaning of these passages, thereby saving himself the trouble of inserting pronouns and saving the reader the agony of having to read translations already overloaded with other, more important insertions. Apart from this problem of style, our two examples can be just as easily expressed in the active voice:

- (5A) 'Slaves **whom** (I) assign to the *āśrama* of Yogendrālaya ...', referring back to the '*añ* /*qaṃ*/ 'I, me' in line 16.

- (6A) 'Valuables **which** (he) has given in addition: 1 ewer (weighing) 7 *jyañ*, 1 *vat* (weighing) 3 *jyañ*, 1 elephant, white', referring to the *vrah* *steñ yodhāpati* in line 46.

The fourth and last objection to taking *man* as a passive marker is that it would be difficult to accommodate our hypothesis to it, whereas taking it as a relative pronoun (in the ambiguous cases described so far) only amplifies the less ambiguous data represented by example (7).

Worth considering are the following two passages containing dependent passivized clauses:

- (9) 'amṇoy ... ta vraḥ kamratāñ 'añ śrīmadāmṛāta **ti** oy ta poñ candravindu ... (K.115: 5-7, A.D. 665), 'Gifts ... to the *vraḥ* Our High Lord Śrīmad Amṛāta, **which** are given over to the *poñ* Candravindu: ...'
- (10) ... jā sakṣī nā caṇyat bhūmi **man ti** oy prasāda nu **man ti** jvan ta vraḥ kamrateñ 'añ śrībhadreśvara ... (K.702B: 6, A.D. 1025), '... to be witnesses to the delimiting of the lands **which** had been given in gift and **which** had been offered up to the *vraḥ* Our High Lord Śrī Bhadreśvara ...'

There is no need to regard the *which* in my rendering of (9) as supplied by translator's license and the two *which* in (10) as somehow more legitimate. The structure of the first example exhibits the normal unmarked subordination of the relative clause to what precedes it. The only difference is that in the second example the relative clause is marked by *man*<sub>5</sub>. The unmarked passivized relative clause is the more usual type, but instances of the marked type are not wanting.<sup>5</sup>

A similar kind of marked/unmarked contrast is to be seen in the following pair of examples from the same pre-Angkorian text:

- (11) kñum **man** kloñ trasok oy ta vraḥ ... (K.561: 27-8, A.D. 681), "Esclaves **que** le Kloñ Trasok donne au dieu ..." (C II: 43)
- (12) kñum ta **man** kloñ 'amṇṛta oy ta vraḥ ... (K.561: 26), "Esclaves **que** le Kloñ Amṛta donne au dieu ..." (ibid.).

In this second example we see *man*<sub>5</sub> bound to its antecedent by the subordinating conjunction *ta*. This structure is used six times in this inscription but is found nowhere else. It appears to have been a short-lived experiment. Redundant as it is, it never passed into Angkorian Khmer.

It must be acknowledged that examples such as (9) and (10) as well as (11) and (12) cannot be used to refute the thesis that *man* is a passive marker. Indeed, passages in which *man* is unmistakably not a passive marker are relatively rare. Among the handful that have been found are the following:

- (13) sre ai ñeñ travañ tmañ **man ge** pādāmūla pañjāhv teṃ satra vraḥ ... (K.726A: 17-8, A.D. 678-777), 'The ricefield in the environs of the reservoir at Tmañ, **which** these worthies disposed of for a sacrifice to the *vraḥ* ...'<sup>6</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Cf. for example K.33: 16-20 (A.D. 1017); K.205:6-8 (A.D. 1036); and K.566B: 1-2 (A.D. 978-1077).

<sup>6</sup> *Jāhv*/jaw/ meaning 'to acquire by exchange', *pañjāhv* /ḥonjaw/ is 'to cause X to acquire Y by exchange'; when X is not stated, this must be recast as 'to dispose of Y by exchange' or some equivalent.

- (14) ... pi jvan ta vrah kamrateñ 'añ nārāyana **man** mratāñ khloñ sthāpanā ta sruk vraī karañ ... (K.598B: 4, A.D. 1006), '... to offer (it) up to the *vrah* Our High Lord Sri Nārāyaṇa, **whom** the lord *khloñ* had set up in *sruk* Vrai Karañ ...'<sup>7</sup>

In all but three of the examples given above *man*<sub>5</sub> is in the objective case. Examples (8) and (9) are not relevant, and in example (10) it is the subject of the clause it introduces. The other Old Khmer relative, *tel* /dʔeɛl/, is definitely a general relative not associated with any particular case. That *man* is likewise general is shown by the following:

- (15) sre **man** poñ kaṃvau saṃ vyavahāra doñ poñ 'akṣaragupp ... (K.790: 11-2, A.D. 578-677), 'The ricefield **over which** the *poñ* Kaṃvau had litigation with the *poñ* Akṣaragupta ...'<sup>8</sup>

In this case it is clear that *saṃ vyavahāra* 'to be a party to a legal dispute' cannot be passive.

But nowhere is the evidence that *man*<sub>5</sub> is a relative pronoun stronger than in four minor patterns. These are *nu man*, occurring 12 times in pre-Angkorian as well as Angkorian; *syāñ man*, found 6 times in Angkorian only; *roḥ man* found 5 times in Angkorian only; and *hetu man*, attested 4 times in Angkorian only.

*Nu man* appears to have two shades of meaning, the first of which supports our weak premise that *man*<sub>1</sub> is a general demonstrative. At the head of a non-initial sentence it means 'with that' in the sense of 'together with the foregoing' or 'also, moreover'. At the head of a coordinate clause it means 'with which' in the sense of 'in addition to which'. The following passage from pre-Angkorian happens to contain both types:

- (16) **nu man**<sub>1</sub> poñ chāñ ktiññ sre poñ tel poñ matiśakti ta pamre teṅ gui lañas ai kañjrap 'mac purandarapura soñ ktiñ ra gui ge 'nak vrah kanmeñ dār canlek yugala ta gui ukk yau 4 **nu man**<sub>5</sub> gui sañ kara ta ge (K.493: 21-3, A.D. 657), 'Also, the *poñ* Chāñ, who had owed (me) the ricefield of his which the *poñ* Matiśakti, his former servant, had leased to the prisoners of war assigned to Purandarapura, did indeed repay his debt. The devotees of the younger *vrah* asked of him 4 *yau* of double cloth besides, **in addition to which** he paid their fees.'

In 9 of its 12 occurrences *nu man* stands at the head of a non-initial sentence.

*Syāñ man* in all of its occurrences can be rendered literally 'to comprise that which' or 'to be what':<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> For other examples of *man* as an unambiguous relative see below and cf. K.49: 14-5 (A.D. 665) and K.125: 1-2 (A.D. 1001).

<sup>8</sup> But cf. C V: 72.

<sup>9</sup> On *syāñ/syənʔ* see Jenner 1991.

- (17) *gi noḥ sre noḥ syañ man oy ta vraḥ kaṃmarateñ 'añ śivaliṅga nu vraḥ kaṃmrateñ 'añ śivapāda* ◦ (K.353S: 26-7, A.D. 878-977), 'It (is) these ricefields **which constitute what** (I) have given to the *vraḥ* Our High Lord of the Śivaliṅga and the *vraḥ* Our High Lord Śivapāda.'

*Roḥ man*, like *nu man*, has two shades of meaning. The form *roḥ /roh/*, with 279 occurrences in both periods of the language, is a noun meaning 'way, manner'. In the following example, the only one of its kind that I have found, *roḥ man* pretty clearly, despite the lacuna, means 'the way that, = how':

- (18) *gi roḥh man ti sabhācāre ...* (K.233A: 4, A.D. 878-977), '**this is how** ... by the Council's agent.'

In the four other cases the sequence shades off into the adverbial idea of 'in the (same) way that, = as':

- (19) *vāp jinendrānanda pandval vraḥ śāsana ta vāp vrahma roḥh man ti kaṃsteñ pandval oy sre neḥ ta vāp vrahma siddhi ...* (K.566B: 1-2, A.D. 978-1077), 'The *pater* Jinendrānanda communicated the royal instruction to the *pater* Vrahma (and), **as** (he) had been charged by the *kaṃsteñ*, gave this ricefield to him in perpetuity ...'

*Hetu man* is based on *hetu /heet/* 'cause, reason', a loan from Sanskrit. In all four of its occurrences it clearly expresses the idea of 'for the cause (reason) that', in other words, 'because':

- (20) *ka gi noḥ bhūmi noḥ ta srac ti jau hoñ hetu man mān 'apavāda nu 'nak vraḥ thpall vyavahāra* (K.348: 2-3, A.D. 954), 'It came about that this piece of land was eventually acquired **because** there had been opposition (to its sale) by the people of the *vraḥ* Thpal, who had taken the matter to court.'

## 2b. *Man*<sub>6</sub>: *relative conjunction, temporal*.

It has already been mentioned that *man*<sub>3</sub>, attested by very few data, functions as the correlative of *man*<sub>6</sub>. If the former means 'at/from that time, = then', the latter is 'at/by the time that, = when'. Consider the following passage, which incidentally illustrates the problem of sorting out the different functions of *man*:

- (21) *man vraḥ pāda nirvāṇapada krīdā vala pi 'naka tok vraḥ 'āy bhadrapattana nu stuk ransi* ◦ *man vraḥ svey rāj[y]a chnām 2 guḥ 5 steñ 'añ śivācāryya sthāpanā vraḥ noḥ ta nai santāna viñ* (K.235D: 40-1), 'His Majesty Nirvāṇapada **then** raised an army against those who had overthrown the images (*vraḥ*) at Bhadrappattana and Stuk Ransi. **By the time** His Majesty had reigned for only two years, the *steñ 'añ Śivācāryya* had set the images belonging to (his) family back up again.'<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Aymonier, 1910:269; Finot 1915:91; Cœdès and Dupont, 1943-6:120-1. Excellent as Finot's version is in other respects, it fails to express the *man* heading the first sentence and paraphrases the *man* in the second. Wide of the mark as Cœdès and Dupont's version is, it captures the sense of the two *man* precisely. Dupont's unfortunate comment (1943-6:121, note 1) to the effect that Finot misunderstood the *pi* in the first sentence is quite groundless.



Outside the Sdok Kak Thom inscription examples of free-standing *man*<sub>6</sub> are rare. The only one I can cite at the moment is the following:

- (22) **man** ti stap vyavahāra ... ti jau muh=ni vyat (K.353S: 17, A.D. 878-977), ‘**When** the case was heard, ... were indeed acquired by exchange as before (said).’

More often we find what could be called an augmented *man*<sub>6</sub>, taking the form of *ta gi man*. The sequence *ta gi* consists of headless *ta*, denoting subordination to the sentence as a whole, followed by the demonstrative *gi* in its locative mode. The demonstrative force of the latter is so attenuated that the combination expresses an almost purely prepositional notion referring to time or place: *ta gi rājya* ... (K.33: 15), ‘During the reign of ...’; *ta gi mvaṅ roc mārggaśira* ... (K.105: 22), ‘On the first (day) of the fortnight of the waning moon of Mārggaśira ...’; *ta gi neḥ ihaloka* ... (K.868B: 9), ‘In this world here below ...’ We have already seen in example (2) that *ta gi man*<sub>6</sub> ‘when’ may be followed by a correlative *man*<sub>3</sub> ‘then’ heading the main clause. The data show that this usage is rare in that usually no *man*<sub>3</sub> is present:

- (23) **ta gi man** kaṃvau khmān ni ter cāp viṣaya phoṅ vraḥ neḥ ti tok ... (K.237N: 6-7, A.D. 1067), ‘**When** Kaṃvau rose up against (the sovereign) (and) went forth to seize various districts, these images were overthrown ...’

A word of caution is in order. The sequence *ta gi man* does not constitute a grammatical unit in all cases. In texts in which no punctuation (◦) is used interpretation may be difficult. One example from the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, where the punctuation corresponds now to our comma, now to our semicolon and now to our full stop, illustrates the pitfall:

- (24) santāna cat sruk jmaḥ bhadrayogi ◦ ’aṅvay=ta gi sthāpanā vraḥ śivaliṅga ta gi ◦ **man** vraḥ pāda parameśvara mok ’aṃvi javā pi kuruṅ =ni ’nau nagara indrapura ◦ (K.235C: 60-1), ‘The family founded a township named Bhadrayogi; (they) settled in it (and) set up a *vraḥ* Sivaliṅga in it. **Then** His Majesty Parameśvara came from Java to rule (and) hold sway in the royal city of Indrapura.’

As mentioned in my opening remarks, the final step in the investigation is to test the hypothesis against randomly selected occurrences of *man* not figuring in any of the patterns recognized in the foregoing discussion. For this purpose I have chosen ten such occurrences. In the interest of brevity let me say simply that the results of such limited testing were virtually predictable. In two cases (K.100: 1, A.D. 878-977); K.410: 23, A.D. 1025) the passages in which *man* occurs are invalidated by lacunae which made their interpretation problematic.<sup>11</sup> In one case (K.450: 12, A.D. 978-1077) the item in question proves to be *man*/mɔɔn/ ‘mulberry’ despite the difficulty of making sense of the passage.<sup>12</sup> In one case (K.523D: 11-4, A.D. 1118) *man*<sub>4</sub>, the subordinating conjunction, was revealed. In three cases (K. 348: 18, A.D. 954; K. 344: 22-4, A.D. 985; K.598B: 4, A.D. 1006) *man* is clearly the

<sup>11</sup> In the case of K.100, Cœdès’ restitution of *nu sruk* is almost certainly misconceived.

<sup>12</sup> Compare the text at C III: 110 with the translation at 112.

relative pronoun *man*<sub>5</sub>. In two other cases (K.348: 14, A.D. 954; K.350N: 4-5, A.D. 978-1077) it is *man*<sub>6</sub> 'when'. Fortunately, the results were not as humdrum as all this would suggest, for in two cases *man* functions as a reduction of *hetu man* 'because', a usage nowhere adumbrated in my patterned data. Both of these cases are from the 11th century. The earlier reads as follows:

- (25) t[ai kam̥bha] khñuṃ vāp nos pralāy **man** vāp nos jā vargga ta kam̥sten oy tai kam̥bha kam̥steñ jvan ta vraḥ (K.221N: 9-10, A.D. 1011), 'Tai Kam̥bha, a slave of the *pater* Nos of Pralāy: **because** the *pater* Nos, who is of the *kam̥steñ*'s chapter, gave her to the *kam̥steñ*, who offered (her) up to the *vraḥ*.'<sup>13</sup>

This passage is one of several on the same model in this text. The other occurrence of [hetu] *man* is found in a difficult passage in K.380E (A.D. 1038), lines 62-3.

For the moment, the presumption is that study of the remaining data will confirm most of the conclusions reached in this first effort and reveal one or two other functions of *man* that the patterned data have not shown.

## REFERENCES

- Aymonier, Etienne. 1910. *Le Cambodge, 2 : Les provinces Siamoises*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Cœdès, G. 1937-66. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. 8 vols. Hanoi [vols. 1, 2]; Paris [vols. 3-8]: Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient.
- Cœdès, G. and P. Dupont. 1943-6. Les stèles de Sdok Kak Thom, Phnom Sandak et Prah Vihar. *BEFEO* 43: 113-130.
- Finot, Louis, 1915. Notes d'épigraphie 16 - L'inscription de Sdok Kak Thom. *BEFEO* 15, 2:89-200.
- Jenner, Philip N. 1991. The form *syañ* in Angkorian Khmer. In: J.H.C.S. Davidson, ed., *Contributions to Austroasiatic Studies: Essays in honour of H.L. Shorto*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, p.227-40

Received: Thompson Festschrift

356 Delezenne Rd.  
Elma, WA 98541,  
USA

<sup>13</sup>Cf. C III: 59.