ANOTHER SOURCE FOR INFORMATION ON AYUTTHAYA THAI

Jeremy H.C.S. Davidson

The Hūa-Yī yiuyū 華夷譯語, Chinese-Foreign language (bilingual) vocabularies, are a valuable and interesting source of information for our knowledge of the earlier history of many Asian languages, the major period of extant record being the Míng (1368-1643) and Qīng (1644-1911) dynasties (Féng 1981). These topically arranged word-lists have been well known to sinologues, and to Western ones since the late eighteenth century (Davidson 1975:1, 296), the first of them being published, or 'edited', with translations in 1822 (loc. cit.). Of special relevance to South East Asia are the studies or annotated translations of the yiuyū relating to the Bā-Yī (Yūnnán Tais) and Bābā (Chiengmai Tais) (Müller 1892); to Malacca Malay (Edwards & Blagden 1931) and to Cham (Edwards and Blagden 1939), both of which are based on a manuscript, the Gèfùo yiuyū (c.1549), in the archives of the School of Oriental and African Studies of the University of London; Vietnamese (Gaspardone 1953; Ch'en Ching-ho 1966-68; Davidson 1975), and Thai (Shintani 1974).

When describing a particular language these yiuyū are, even so, not identical copies of one another, as can be seen from the detailed survey conducted by Féng Zhēng (1981), hence this is definitely 'indicative of discontinuous compilation and of different periods and compilers' (Davidson 1975:1, 299, n.17), a point of considerable importance when one is using one particular text as a source of definitive information in the study of a given language (cf. Shintani 1974). The yiuyū have, however, not been used extensively as a means for the analysis of the foreign languages through a phonological study of the Chinese transliterations characters used to represent those foreign languages, or, if it is present as well, an investigation of the foreign languages' script entries and a comparison of these with the Chinese transliterations as an additional tool for interpretation. Phonological analysis has, none the less, been done in a thesis for Thai of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries (Shintani 1974) and also for Vietnamese (Davidson 1975).

Since it is obvious, therefore, that these yiuyū for a certain language are not copies of one another, even though some of the entries may be identical, their use is of increased interpretational value because they provide a varied range of data for different periods in the historical development of the foreign languages with which they are concerned. Thus, the Lockhart Chinese and Arabic Dictionary, which I found in the
This text is incomplete, comprising only six topical sections\(^3\) (cf. Davidson 1975:I, 299, n.17), but has 505 entries (not all of which are in themselves complete, e.g. L.207). It is untitled, and has had additional entries noted as such in margins made to its basic text; it is written in very clear major entry and Chinese transliteration characters in Míngh style \(kǎishū\), above which is the Thai equivalent in an eccentric but informative Thai script, for the word the Chinese transliteration is attempting to reproduce. This all suggests that the manuscript is probably of late sixteenth to early seventeenth century (i.e. 1579-1630) date although the fact that it has no title may speculatively imply that it was compiled before 1579, the date when the Xiànlùoguān (Siamese translation bureau) was established\(^4\) (Mínghší J.324/19blf.; note 19a10; Wild 1945:625,637; cf. Sìyīguān j.12/1ha7-8; cf. op.cit. J.7/13a1 and 15blf.) and that name was included in the titles of the \( yi\)' it prepared. Nevertheless, internal evidence proves the Míngh Dynasty and Ayutthayā period date of the manuscript (see L.88,89; fig.) while external historical evidence supports this too.

The Thai script certainly differs from the standard form introduced from 1932, its eccentricity leading my Thai specialist colleagues to maintain that it cannot have been written by a native Thai. Noted variations in spelling may perhaps be indicative of changes in tones, and the entries also include a large Indic (Pāli?) element,\(^5\) hence script and spelling are definitely worth further study.

The vowels recorded in the transliterations and in the Thai script range very widely, which is suggestive of differing articulations, representing considerable change between the Ayutthayā and the Modern Standard (=Central) Thai (MST =Th. in examples) forms, such changes requiring detailed investigation. Of interest is the fact that the Chinese continue to use transliteration characters of the \( st/shí\) vocalics to describe MST /\(ə\)/ /\(u/\) (cf. also Davidson 1975:I, 311) even though this is not always the case. There is, none the less, a suggestion that a change from /\(ə\)/ to a preferred more centralized /\(u/\) was underway, since we find it represented by [\(a\)] [\(a\)] in many cases of transliteration (e.g. L.95 \(kə̂̄n̄\) 'waves', Th. \(khlaen\), Ch. \(kēlēng\) [\(kvλŋ\)]; also L.128,158,369, etc.), and we also find it more closed and longer (because of the absence of a final consonant) in certain instances (e.g. L.329 \(ná\)'to hold', Th. \(th̃\), Ch. \(tə̂\) [\(tʰv\)]; note L.95 above).

Consonantal changes taking place during and from the early Ayutthayā to the present MST period are, however, more
immediately obvious and of very great interest. Shintani Tadahiko (1974) has neatly established the devoicing of sonorant occlusives in common Thai, dating that to the fourteenth to fifteenth centuries; has shown that uvular occlusives also existed; that the passage from /r/ to /h/ was taking place in the sixteenth century (though in an unspecified dialect); and that /b/ and /d/, were pre-glottalized by this time. Few of these features are, on the other hand, apparent in the Lockhart yìyù. Where consonants are concerned, evidence preserved in the Chinese transliterations and in those words in Thai script that are identifiable is intriguing. The Lockhart yìyù tells us the following (and more) about Ayutthaya period Thai of c. 1579-1630 (or, one hopes, even earlier!)

Finals

Stops: -p, -t, -k

-p: There is confusion over the -p, -t, -k final stops (e.g. L.38) in many instances when they are unvoiced, unaspirated plosives, though this is not a regular occurrence, and it is interesting to note that in several entries, the final -p is actually transliterated by a separate character, bù 布 (GSR 102a; e.g. L.13 賞 báo 'hail!', Th. lâuk hêp, Ch. lüêkê布; see also L.12, 77, etc.), which suggests that on these occasions it was distinctly more audible, perhaps indicating voicing and/or aspiration away from which the language was developing at the time.

-t: In most cases the transliterations record this final accurately (e.g. L.34 日晒 rîshài 'to dry in the sun', Th. tâk deêt, Ch. dâliè 打裂; GSR 29la-t; L.194, 331, etc.) but, surprisingly, the entry for the Thai word 'preacher' nâk theêt (L.206, Ch. 'eunuch') finds both transliteration characters ending with -p. (GSR 695h, 618q). Could there be a reason for this? such as an attempt at euphony?.

-k: Normally the unaspirated velar final stop is recorded by such transliteration characters (e.g. L.8,17,21,49,etc.) but there is a suggestion that it may have been an aspirated plosive (like -p = bù?) in certain contexts (e.g. L.194 闔月 rûnyûè 'intercalary month', Th. aathiknâat, Ch. 阿附驚貌 àttîkâmò; cf. GSR 277).

Nasals:

-m: This seems to fall into three sets of either recipient awareness or of phonetic change - the latter interpretation being my favourite - two of which suggest a shift from a softly articulated dental nasal final /-n/ or velar nasal final /-ŋ/ in the
Thai of this period to a bilabial voiced nasal final /-m/ in MST
(=*-n/ e.g. L.16 陰 yīn 'dark', Th. ขัน, Ch. 闇 kàn) or
(*=-q/, e.g. L.7 風 fēng 'wind', Th. ลม, Ch. 風 fēng; see
also L.30,71, etc.). However, the velar nasal /-q/ is sensibly
perceived as such in transliteration throughout the manuscript
(e.g. L.10,18,54,68, etc.) wherever it occurs as such in the
Thai and so leaves our intrigue with the final /-m/. Awareness
of its presence, implying a growing establishment of it as a
bilabial final replacing /-n/ and /-q/ in various words is made
apparent by its repeated appearance in which it employs a
special Chinese transliteration character to represent it: 水
水, (e.g. L.43,73,76,92= 水 shuǐ 'water', Th. น้ำ, Ch. 水
水, found again in L.125-31,202,303, etc.) Changes in
articulation may well be developing here.

-n: This is recorded regularly by transliteration characters
of the same dental nasal class (e.g. L.5 雨 yǔ 'rain', Th. 風,
Ch. 風 fēng) while replacing /-m/ as well.

Initials

An initial excitement is the continuous Chinese transliteration
(e.g. L.10,34,182,93,228,319,354, etc.) of MST /d/- by an initial
/1-/, (e.g. L.3 星 xīng 'star', Th. ดาว, Ch. 星 xīng; L.182
月 yuè 'month (of time)', Th. ล่าง, Ch. 月 yuè), which
implies that in Ayutthaya Thai of this time the shift from /l-/
alone had not yet taken place. 7 None the less, /l/- exists
in its own right in the Lockhart manuscript as a simple initial
lateral consonant as can be seen in L.12,305, etc.

Still relevant is the quality of the initial /r/- in
some Thai words because we find it transliterated mainly by
characters beginning with /l-/, (e.g. L.249 我 wǒ 'I', Th. น้ำ,
Ch. น้ำ), but in a few other entries it is very definitely
an affricate or trill (roll) or tap probably alveolar in
articulation /r-/, (e.g. L.11 紅 hóng 'rainbow', Th. หน้า, Ch.
偽 หงส์), hence perhaps indicative of its increasing presence
to replace the lateral /l-/

Furthermore, the possibility of the existence of a
prelabialized nasal before the voiced initial /b/-, (perhaps
suggesting an implosive?), that is /m-b/-, is indeed implied by
the evidence supplied by examples such as L.109 ต้น 'village',
Th. ตระกูล 'group of villages', Ch. ตัน (and
L.47,363,384). Similarly in the late sixteenth to early
eighteenth century, Ayutthaya Thai seems still to have had a
voiced velar fricative /χ/ which later developed into an
unvoiced unaspirated velar plosive (/χ>/ k-/) (e.g. L.333
宽 kuān 'broad; to extend', Th. ว่าง, Ch. 宽 kuān/
χú: wāːŋ; also L.13), although in this text it appears to be well
on the wane. At the same time, unaspirated voicing remained dominant in words that are now voiced unaspirated velar initials, /k/- in MST (e.g. L.103 洲 [shōu] 'island', Th. ถิ, Ch. 長 ), while the MST unvoiced aspirated velar /kh/- is already thoroughly present in this ypiǔ (e.g. L.128 水長 [shuí] 'water increases; tide rises', Th. น้ำท่าน [nàm tān], Ch. 生米 kēn 南升之船).)

Yiǔ awareness of initial consonant clusters is naturally noticeable, as is shown by the regular use of two transliteration characters to represent their occurrence in the Thai (e.g. L.38 昏 [hùn] 'dusk', Th. ที่น่อ, Ch. 且 [jù] 蒸; see also L.59,181,199,268,368,408, etc.), with the practice where possible of vowel euphonics in the transliterations (e.g. L.59). The Lockhart yipiǔ, on the other hand, show us some things that are no longer present in Modern Standard Thai. The /kr/- initial consonant cluster is very obvious in the representations in both languages, but it has definitely been dropped in some 'modern' words (e.g. MST กระบัตร 'king' is found in L.198 皇帝 [huángdì] 'Emperor', where the Thai is transliterated เจ้า [krātsat?] while it has been reintroduced in others (e.g. L.251 晚 [shǎi] 'who', Th. ใคร, Ch. 誰 [shǎi] once again suggesting that changes are underway while the word-list preserves much valuable information on the pronunciation of its time.

/khl/- is frequently recorded (e.g. L.65,94,133,338, 417, etc.) but it is unfortunately not possible to argue for the existence of a /tl/- cluster which later develops into a /tr/- as there is not adequate supportive evidence. (And cf. /r/- above).

In addition to such examples of phonetic information preserved in this yipiǔ and that are of relevance to Thai of the Ayuttaya period, a few other notes of immediate interest are presented by the manuscript. Of course, there are loanwords of Indic (e.g. L.204 = Th. mantri; L.269 = Th. rajtri) and of Khmer origin (e.g. bureaucratic titles like อดศ, L.203,205,231) but a distinct Chinese presence is made clear. One example is 'The Southern Dipper (Constellation)' (L.27 老巢 [Nándōu] which is transliterated as Ch. 老巢 sōōpāo to represent the Thai ด้าว sanphāw 'The Chinese Junk'. Another direct and forceful example is L.227 岁 [kè] 'guest; visitor', Th. แข็ง [kè] 'visitor; Indian' for which the transliteration character is also kè!, while several others occur transliterated in the Thai as Sino-Thai pronunciations of the original Chinese entries although they have not been identified by Thai colleagues (e.g. L.234,235,255,291) but are indicative of a strong Chinese commercial presence during that time.

Of further interest is the antiquated but societally and historically useful information provided by such a
vocabulary as this. For instance, the Buddhist monk (L.287
僧 sēng) becomes a ลวน 'royal official' in the Thai (Ch.
transliteration ลวน, a fabulous bird associated with
bells) but the Buddhist nun (L.289, Ch. translit. ลวนกิ้ว
guī) has not been identified by any Thai colleagues via Thai
script, despite the fact that words like Th. คัง_slave
'toll gate', although no longer in use, are still recognizable.

Very revealing, however, are the two entries L.213
叔 ษฎ 'father's younger brother', Th. า, Ch. 阿, 阿, and
L.218 姑 นะ 'father's elder sister', Th. า (both MST words
meaning 'younger paternal aunt or uncle'), Ch. 阿 阿.

This transcription in the Lockhart ย่วยู่ supports the existence
of an early original variant in the Middle Ayutthaya period of
the pronunciation in the sixteenth century of a word now
pronounced า in Modern Standard Thai and whose spelling with
the cancelled /-w/ has been the subject of considerable
controversy, giving us a very early evidence that contradicts
the standard Thai opinion, and proving a change.

And so, from the preceding discussion of some of its
contents, we can see that this Lockhart ย่วยู่ is of immense
importance for the information that it provides for the study
of the Thai language (and associated data to be learnt from
the vocabulary) of the Ayutthaya period circa late sixteenth
to early seventeenth century (i.e. c.1579-1630). More detailed
research on the manuscript, and comparative study with other
Ming Dynasty Chinese-Thai ย่วยู่ will thus undoubtedly prove of
considerable value.

NOTES

1. qv. Feng, op.cit., 57; 59, pl.5 : Xinluo text with
script; again, p.60, pl.31; cf. also p.66.

2. A more detailed study of this ย่วยู่ will be published
shortly.

3. These deal with : I. The Heavens; II. The Earth;
III. Time; IV. People; V. Human Affairs; VI. The Human
Body; a selection that suggests considerable direct
interest and involvement in terms of social, administrative,
and bureaucratic contact. I have numbered all the entries
consecutively (L = Lockhart) from start to finish (1-505).

4. Interestingly, in 1511, during the Ming Zhengde 明正德
reign (1506-21), a Bābāi 百官 was established
(Styiguăn j. 13/16a6; also Feng 1981: 57).
5. Useful in this respect as an example is the transliteration of the Thai for L.228 神 sān 'spirit', Th. (=MST) /thēwēdāa/ 'benevolent spirit', but Ch. tiēpōlā 鏯拍 /tʰēpōpə/.

6. But what is the distinction between /s/ and /ʃ/? Most of the entries in the Lockhart manuscript record /s/ but there are instances of /ʃ/, as in L.310 动 dīnɡ 'to rouse', Th. sān 'shake, tremble', Ch. shān 珊. Is this again the devoicing that Shintani is discussing, from early /ʃ/ to modern /s/?

7. Müller (1892:2,11) represents the same transcriptions for the Bā-Yī word-list, with the Chinese l- becoming a Bā-Yī n-. Does this mean that the Ayutthaya dialect still preserved elements of northern dialect form at the time the yīyū was compiled? Of passing relevance, in reverse, is the fact that certain southern Thai dialect speakers turn /d/ [ʔd] into /l/ [ʔl] (Egerod 1962:66).

8. Note, too, that some southern Thai speakers turn /d/ into [ʔr]. (loc.cit.).

9. Amusingly, in tar² lʊ⁴ and the tar² lə⁶ dialects of the Sipsongpanna, the orders are reversed, with shu (FyBro) becoming /aːu/ and gǔ (father's younger sister) /a/. (Yǔ 1980:117b,118a).

10. Adding to this early Chinese evidence, my colleague Dr Manas Chitakasem found an interesting series of letters between Prince Naris and Phraya Anuman discussing the topic which was most notably a subject of confusion in the 1930s. Prince Naris (1963:3,84) inquired about the truth of the proposition that aw was a term for a male and aː for a female. Phraya Anuman investigated the question and replied (op.cit.,86) that in all Thai dialects with the exception of Thai Nung both forms were used and he concluded that aw is the younger brother of the father and aː is the younger sister of the father. Prince Naris recognizes this information in two letters (op.cit., :3,96;5,2ll) confirming that both terms are in use, although that the information is not usually accepted in Modern Standard Thai (in which the spelling is standardized to make the sound identical: aː) nowadays. The Chinese entry in the Lockhart yīyū is, therefore, probably the earliest record of these two distinct terms, adding further weight to the value of such manuscripts in the study of South East Asian and other languages.
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