THE FORM *SYAÑ* IN ANGKORIAN KHMER

Philip N. Jenner

In at least one respect the study of ancient languages known only from written monuments is like the study of contemporary languages which have never been reduced to writing: in both cases the investigator encounters as a matter of course lexical items which are not readily amenable to analysis. What is sometimes forgotten is that the linguist working on a living language normally has recourse to informants, whereas the linguist working on a dead language can have no such guidance. Hence, if most of the ancient lexicon is known or knowable, certain forms prove resistant to identification, and alternative means must be brought into play in attempting to account for them.

It is not my intention to claim that the difficulties confronting us in Old Khmer are as numerous or as perplexing as they seem to be, or to have been, in many another ancient language. Since the first inscriptions were published by Aymonier a century ago we have, thanks to the painstaking work of a few dedicated French scholars, seen the gradual elaboration of a tolerably good understanding of Old Khmer. By 1966, when the eighth and last volume of Cœdès's monumental *Inscriptions du Cambodge* [= C] made its appearance, most of the texts in the growing corpus of Khmer epigraphy had been analysed and explicated with an acceptable degree of reliability. By that year the bulk of the lexicon was fairly well understood, but a good many specialised terms had not been worked out to our satisfaction. This is still the case today, when a good many lexical and other problems continue to elude us. Among these is a small class of forms which appear to perform grammatical functions.[1] Typical of this class is *syañ*, which I propose to discuss here.

Not found in the pre-Angkorian inscriptions recovered so far,[2] this orthographic form is attested in Angkorian Khmer well over a hundred and fifty times. In addition, its life is extended through the Middle Khmer period, where it appears variously as *syañ* (A.D. 1560-77), *syiñ* (1560-1701), and *siñ* (1587-1706), with the apparent nonce-forms *siñ* (1620), *siñy* (1696) and *sĭñ* (1701). As to the meaning of the Angkorian form, Aymonier (1883: 494, n.1) took it as synonymous with Sanskrit *kevalam* 'solely, entirely' and as the source of modern Khmer '*siñ*' — by which he

---

1. There were no published studies of Old Khmer grammar until the valuable sketch by Saveros Pou (1979). The enquiry presented here goes hand in hand with my earlier *Asie du Sud-Est et Monde Insulindien* studies (1981, 1982).

2. The language of the pre-Angkorian period, conventionally ending with the founding of Angkor in A.D. 802, is manifested in the form of two dialects. The principal or A dialect, among other criteria, lacks the high falling diphthongs [iːə], [ɯːə], [uːə] and their short counterparts. The lesser or B dialect, conforming with the phonology of the Angkorian period, has these diphthongs. The orthographic form *syañ* is ambiguous but must have been realized with a high falling diphthong: [siːəŋ], [siəŋ], [sɯːəŋ], [suːəŋ]. It could, therefore, have occurred in pre-Angkorian as a dialect B form, but would take some other form in dialect A.

evidently meant *siña* /sȳŋ/ [svŋ] 'nearly all, almost'.[3] In 1913 Cœdès (Parmentier 1913: 14) understood it in the same sense as Aymonier and rendered it '*sans exception*'. In 1915, however, Finot (1915: 106) re-defined it as a pronoun, glossing *syañ ta* as '*qui*'. For most of the half-century down to 1966, Cœdès and his contemporaries treated the form in various ways which are impossible to reconcile. Thus in the largest number of cases, representing about 35% of the total, we find it expressed by appropriate forms of *tout*. Yet in roughly 29% of its occurrences it does not seem to be rendered at all, at least overtly,[4] even in those fairly numerous cases where the idea of *tout* would not appear out of place. Several times it is expressed by the related notion of *ensemble*. In other passages, representing a little over 15% of the total, we find it rendered by '*comme*', '*tel*', '*réellement*' and, in one instance, '*voilà*'. It must be said, however, that in none of these latter cases is it absolutely certain that *syañ* is being expressly rendered at all. Indeed, one has the impression that Cœdès and his contemporaries allowed themselves in some instances to be led into the translation they give under pressure from the supposed contexts. This uncertainty is greatest in passages in which figure appropriate forms of *être*: one simply does not know whether *syañ* is being so rendered or is being passed over in silence.

To this diversity of interpretations may be added the treatment of *syañ* and its variants in Middle Khmer texts. During the 1970s my learned teacher Saveros Pou redefined *syañ* as an anaphoric 'pronoun or particle' (*sic*), holding at the same time that the Middle Khmer form or forms were the source of modern Khmer *siña* /sȳŋ/ 'nearly'. As far as I am aware, however, it is nowhere rendered as an anaphoric pronoun in any of her superb translations. Of the fifty-seven Middle Khmer occurrences of *syañ* and its variants collected for the present study, twenty-seven (48%) are not overtly rendered at all. Twelve, or 21%, mostly in combination with what we are no doubt justified in now calling the equational copula *jā* /ɟaa → cīiə/, are conceivably assigned a copular function or, if this is not so, are also unrendered. In only three cases is *syañ* represented by '*comme*'. On the other hand, in eight cases (14.5%), French and my own English translations read as if *syañ* marked the apodosis of an 'if' or 'when' clause, or as an unexpressed 'then' introducing the consequence of a prior clause. We also have a small number of instances in which *syañ* is, as I might say, plainly none of the foregoing but seems to express a contrastive ('nevertheless') or instrumental ('thereby') idea. In only two cases, both suspicious, does it appear to be taken as a pronoun.[5] I may as well mention

---

3. As will be seen, he may have had in mind modern *siña* /sɔ̀ŋ/ [svŋ] 'to rest'.
4. In addition to the occurrences tallied here, in over 9% of its instances the passages in which *syañ* occurs are left untranslated for one reason or another. The Angkorian corpus also includes twelve passages with *syañ* which are too garbled to be used in the present discussion.
5. I might mention in this connection that I have considered the possibility of a loan relationship, in one direction or the other, between Middle Khmer *syañ* ~ *siñ* and Thai /sȳŋ/ (for the corresponding Lao form see Kerr 1972: 493b), usually treated as a relative pronoun 'used in reference to a person, an animal, or an inanimate object... in the nominative, objective, or possessive case' (Sethaputra 1965: I, 349ab, who adds that it is also 'used in a literary context to introduce a noun in the objective case after a transitive verb, where in ordinary language no preposition (*sic*) is required'; cf. Haas 1964: 157b; McFarland 1944: 309b). Since it seems to yield no useful results, my consideration of this possibility is not included in the present discussion.

here that none of the Old Khmer or Middle Khmer occurrences of *syañ* allows interpretations suggestive of modern *siña* /sȳŋ/ 'nearly'; as far as I am able to determine, this sense is unattested in the older language.

In view of such radically different interpretations of the meaning and function of *syañ*, we have no choice except to re-examine the data. It will be appreciated that the task of doing so has something of the character of a trial at law in which the evidence, abundant though it may be, is entirely circumstantial. This, taken with the diversity of views expressed by a number of eminent scholars, demands that all of the usable evidence be adduced and weighed. With this in mind I have screened all of the Old Khmer inscriptions available to me and collected every occurrence of *syañ* with a view to ensuring that no usage escaped notice. For Middle Khmer I have gone through all of the so-called 'modern' inscriptions of Angkor (Lewitz 1970-72);[6] some seventeen *cpā'pa* /cbap/ or ethical texts;[7] the *Lpœka 'angaravatta* /lbaaək qɑŋkɔɔrwoət/; the undated metrical *Supina* /sobȝn/; and nine other inscriptions, namely* K.39 (A.D. 1574), K.177 (1478-1577), K.285 and K.465 (both 1583), K.715 (1586), K.27 (1587), K.261/I (1611), K.261/III (1639), and K.261/II, IV and V (1578-1677). Data in this quantity create a problem of presentation. On the one hand, the reader is entitled to examine the full array of the available evidence; but to provide the latter would occupy from sixty to seventy-five pages of space which could no doubt be put to better use. On the other hand, any significance to be found in the present study lies in whatever conclusions one may draw from the evidence, and such conclusions can be given in a few short paragraphs. One of these extremes being as unsatisfactory as the other, I have attempted to strike middle ground, first, by confining my citations to those from the Angkorian inscriptions and, secondly, by reducing the number of my citations to the absolute minimum consistent with the reader's ability to grasp the problem and its solution. It should be explained at the same time that, if it is true that a strictly objective examination of the evidence would furnish only the Old Khmer passages in question, this would be tantamount to dismissing the work and judgements of my predecessors and to depriving the reader of the

---

6. For a full list of her 'Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor' [*IMA*], see references below, Lewitz (1970-75).

7. Six of the *cpā'pa* have been translated and analysed by Saveros Pou and Philip N. Jenner under the title ' Les cpāp' ou 'Codes de conduite' khmers', as follows: (I) *Cpāp' kerti kāl, Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient*, **62** (1975): 369-94; (II) *Cpāp' prusa, idem*, **63** (1976): 313-50; (III) *Cpāp' kūn cau, idem*. **64** (1977): 167-215; (IV) *Cpāp' Rājaneti, idem*. **65** (1978): 361-402; (V) *Cpāp' kram, idem*, **66**, (1979): 129-60; and *Cpāp' trīneti, idem*, **70** (1981): 135-93. The remaining eleven exist only in Cambodian editions. Eight of these eleven are given in *Cpā'pa phseña-phseña / Chbab divers* (Phnom-Penh: Editions de l'Institut Bouddhique, 1970), as follows: *Cpā'pa hai mahājana* (I), 31-43; *Cpā'pa kūna cau lpoeka*, 59-76; *Cpā'pa vidhūrapaṇḍita*, 129-37; *Cpā'pa paṇṭām pitā*, 45-57; *Cpā'pa dūnmāna khlwna*, 121-7; *Cpā'pa bākya cā'sa*, 139-42; *Cpā'pa srī*, 15-29; *Cpā'pa 'āriyasatthā*, 143-50. The other three are: *Cpā'pa hai mahājana* (II) (Phnom-Penh: Seña-Ñwna-Hwta, 1965); *Cpā'pa paṇṭām ū buka* (Phnom-Penh: Puta-Naña, 1959), also (Phnom-Penh: Seña-Ñwna-Hwta, 1965); and *Cpā'pa dūnmāna kūna* (Phnom-Penh: Puta-Naña, 1958).

* K = the inventory number in 'Liste générale des inscriptions du Cambodge', Cœdès (1966: **8**, 73-225 and Supplements). (Ed.)

opportunity of weighing their judgements and mine for himself. I therefore give the published translations of each passage cited; my own alternatives to those translations are given later.

The simplest structural contexts we are concerned with are those in which *syaṅ* follows a demonstrative pronoun (Dem.) and is itself followed by a noun (N) designating a metal—though there seems to be no good reason to take the metallic nature of the noun as in any way obligatory. In each case the Dem. + *syaṅ* + N sequence is preceded by a more or less lengthy list, which I abbreviate, of objects forming part of an endowment:

(1) *vaudi mvāy svok mvāy... 'arghya pādya mvāy tampar neḥ syaṅ prāk* (K.171: 7-8), 'Un *vaudi*, un plateau,... quatre vases pour le lavage des pieds (*ārghya pādya*). Tout[8] cela en argent' (*C* VI: 166).
(2) *... cancyān 1 ratna ta gī 1 naupura 2 khse chdvāl 1 neḥ syaṅ mās* (K.669C: 10), '... 1 bague avec 1 joyau, 2 anneaux de cheville, 2 (*sic*) chaînes; *tout* cela en or' (*C* I: 182).

Only slightly less simple are structures such as the following in which *syaṅ*, still following a demonstrative pronoun, is itself followed by a noun phrase (NP). The sequences Dem. + *syaṅ* + N and Dem. + *syaṅ* + NP may of course be considered equivalent.

(3) *... me 'yak me ṅam me des me sān me dvat neḥ syaṅ sruk 'amarālaya* (K.598B: 29), 'Les *me* Tak, Ṅam, Des, Sān, Dvat, *tous (sic)*[9] du sruk Amarālaya' (Finot 1928: 77).
(4) *... ta duk praśasṭa neḥ mratāñ śri satyayudha nu mratāñ śri ripumatha neḥ syaṅ kvan mratāñ śri prathivīnarendra...* (K.956: 58-9), '... Ceux qui conservent cet acte inscrit sont Mratāñ Çrī Satyāyudha et Mratāñ Çrī Ripumatha(na), enfants de Mratāñ Çrī Pṛthivīnarendra' (*C* VII: 135).
(5) *kamrateṅ 'añ yogī ta pvās ta neḥḥ phye phlu pūrvvottara tīrthodyānapuspārāma neḥ syaṅ dharmma kamrateṅ 'añ didai ra...* (K.139B: 7-10), 'Les seigneurs Yogin qui sont entrés en religion ici confient le chemin du nord-est, le bain, le parc, le jardin fleuri: ce *sont* les œuvres pies de chacun des seigneurs' (*C* III: 179).

In such passages as the following we see that the place occupied by Dem. in the preceding sequences may be filled by an NP:

(6) *... patigraha raupya 2 khlās 2 vodi prāk 2 bhājana dramvaṅ 1 bhājana khpac 1 syaṅ hanīra bhājana pralvaṅ 3 bhājana ta madhyama 6...* (K.669C: 15-6), '... 2 crachoirs d'argent, 2 agrafes, 2 *vodī* d'argent, 1 récipient *dramvaṅ*, 1 récipient décoré *tout* en *hanīra*, 3 grands récipients, 6 récipients moyens,...' (*C* I: 183).
(7) *... dep reḥ ta dai ti syaṅ dakṣiṇā* (K.263D: 44), '... ensuite on en choisit d'autres *comme* offrande (*dakṣiṇā*)' (*C* IV: 138).
(8) *kamsteṅ śāntilakṣmi paṅket chloñ haridātta chloñ somaśarmma syaṅ*

---

8. Here and hereafter, those forms which I take to be intended to express *syaṅ* are italicized.
9. One would expect *toutes*.

bhāgavata paṃre (K.989B: 16), 'Kaṃsteṅ Çāntilakṣmī donna naissance à Chloñ Haridatta et à Chloñ Somaçarman, *tous* (deux) *bhāgavata* serviteurs' (*C* VII: 183).

(9) ... *vaudi 3 katāha 5 svok 10 syaṅ tap prāṃ jañjyaṅ padigaḥ 4...* (K.263D: 14), '... 3 *vaudi*; 5 bassines, 10 plateaux, *soit* 15 *jañjyaṅ*; 4 crachoirs;...' (*C* IV: 137).

A further step toward structural complexity is seen in cases of the following type in which the NP following *syaṅ* is introduced by the subordinating conjunction *ta* without a grammatical head. As far as the data show, this type is not common.

(10) *kamrateṅ śivāśrama nu steṅ 'añ vnaṃ kansā yok kanmvāy 3 strījana syaṅ ta sahodara 'aṃvi sruk kuti...* (K.235D: 24-5), 'Le seigneur du Çivāçrama et le *steṅ añ* de Vnaṃ Kansā prirent trois femmes, leurs nièces, *toutes* de même mère, provenant du *sruk* de Kuti...' (Cœdès & Dupont 1943-46: 117).

(11) *neḥ syaṅ ta gi kalpanā dau ta vraḥ kamrateṅ 'añ śrī cāmpeśvara sap chñaṃ* (K.99S: 11-12), '...*voilà* ce qui doit être fourni à V.K.A. Çrī Cāmpeçvara tous les ans' (*C* VI: 112).

(12) *nau 'a[ṃ]pall punyaśrama kuṭi sruk sre bhūjyākara kñuṃ* (sic) *dravya phoṅ* xxxxx *dravya syaṅ ta vraḥ rājapunya* (K.19: 17-8), 'toutes les fondations, monastères, cellules, villages, rizières, revenus des terres, esclaves, biens de toute sorte... ces biens *sont* des fondations royales' (*C* VI: 146).

With the foregoing type the NP following *syaṅ ta* is realised as N, as Dem. + N, and as N + N. The next structural type, which is the most abundantly represented of all in the Angkorian data, consists of *syaṅ ta* followed by a Verb phrase (VP). This is the same as saying that *syaṅ* is followed by an NP consisting of *ta* + VP; viz., a 'headless *ta* phrase' in which the *ta* subordinates the VP not to the preceding *syaṅ* but to some such unmanifested headword as *'nak* 'person' (qv. Jenner 1981).

(13) *steṅ 'añ śivasoma nu steṅ 'añ vāmaśiva syaṅ ta cat śivāśrama sthāpanā vraḥ noḥ* (K.235D: 7-8), 'Le *steṅ añ* Çivasoma et le *steṅ añ* Vāmaçiva, *ensemble*, établirent le Çivāçrama, y fondèrent un sanctuaire' (Cœdès & Dupont 1943-46: 112).

(14) *grāmavṛddha syaṅ ta śapatha kathā ruva bhūmi 'anin ta nirmūla krau gol* (K.598B: 39), 'Les anciens des villages prêtèrent serment et dirent que cette terre d'Anin était sans maître et hors des bornes'.

(15) *'nak neḥ phoṅ syaṅ ta samayuga yok iss dravya noḥ phoṅ ta jā thlai bhūmi* (K.207: 27-8), 'Tous ces gens *ensemble* ont pris tous ces biens comme prix de la terre' (*C* III: 21).

(16) *neḥ syaṅ ta dau dār bhūmi nā thve vraḥ camnāṃ* (K.425: 8), '*Tels* ont été ceux qui sont allés demander le terrain pour instituer la prestation' (*C* II: 144).

(17) *teṅ bhava* x *teṅ kṛṣ teṅ rudrāṇī teṅ ke ni teṅ* x *te* (sic) *so teṅ sa[ra]svatī syaṅ ta dār vraḥ karuṇāprasā[da]...* (K.61B: 7-9), 'Teṅ Bhava, Teṅ Kṛṣ, Teṅ Rudrāṇī, Teṅ —, Teṅ —, Teṅ Sarasvatī obtinrent *toutes* de la faveur royale — ...' (*C* VII: 22).

(18) *... nau 'nak ta 'aṅgvay ta gi sruk neḥ nu dharmma sre noḥ syaṅ ta oy pūjā [ka]mrateṅ 'añ ta gi dvādaśī phon pratipaksa...* (K.100: 3-4), 'Les gens installés dans ce pays et dans les fondations et sur ces rizières, offrent la *pūjā* au K.A. le douzième jour de chaque quinzaine...' (*C* VI: 215).

(19) *... vol ekavākya man* xxxx *[teṅ hyan]ṅ vasanta nu loñ ney vraḥ chpār syaṅ 'yat santāna ley...* (K.208: 53-4), '(Ceux-ci) déclarèrent unanimement que Teṅ Hyaṅ Vasanta et Loñ Ney des saints jardins étaient *réellement* sans descendance...' (*C* VI: 292).

A related structural type is seen in a few cases in which *syaṅ*, preceded as usual by an NP, is followed by an NP manifested as the complementiser *man* + a VP. In all cases, the *man* serves as a relative pronoun in the objective case, its antecedent being either animate or inanimate.

(20) *khñum śata mvāy 10 sakarma pvān . phoṅ neḥ syaṅ man jvan ta vraḥ kamrateṅ 'añ śivaliṅga thvāy ta vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ 'añ śrī sūryyavarmmadeva .* (K.212A: 11-5), 'Cent dix esclaves et quatre employés (*sakarma*), tous ces gens *sont* offerts au V.K.A. Çivaliṅga et remis à S.M. le roi Çrī Sūryavarmadeva,...' (*C* III: 32).

(21) *gi noḥ sre noḥ syaṅ man oy ta vraḥ [kammrateṅ 'a]ñ śivaliṅga nu vraḥ kammrateṅ 'añ śivapāda* (K.353S: 26-7), 'Ces rizières ont été données à V.K.A. Çivaliṅga et à V.K.A. Çivapāda' (*C* V: 139).

This leaves us, finally, with a number of passages in which *syaṅ*, still preceded by an NP, is followed directly by a VP without an intervening *ta*. Note that in five of the following cases the verb following it is passivised by the marker *ti*.

(22) xx *khñum vraḥ neḥ phoṅ ta daiy ti leṅ* xx *vraḥ tapasvi bhagavat pāda vraḥ kammrateṅ 'añ ta guru jvan kāla sthāpaka syaṅ codita 'añ ta jmaḥ vraḥ tapasvi vidyāspada gi pi mān ta upakal[pa]ka jvān ta vraḥ śivaliṅga...* (K.523D: 18-24), '—tous ces esclaves du dieu et les autres, —Vraḥ Tapasvi Bhagavat Pāda V.K.A. ta Guru me les a offerts au moment où il fit la fondation, en m'incitant, moi qui ai nom Vraḥ Tapasvi Vidyāspada, à faire les préparatifs pour les offrir au saint Çivaliṅga...' (*C* III: 141).

(23) *lvoh ta 1035 śaka pi vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ 'añ śrī sūryyavarmmadeva ta jā vraḥ cau mātṛpaksa vraḥ pāda karateṅ 'añ śrī jayavarmmadeva nu vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ 'añ śrī dharaṇīndravarmmadeva svey vraḥ dharmmarājya 'añjeñ bhagavat pāda kamrateṅ 'añ ta guru śrī divākarapaṇḍita jā vraḥ guru gi ta thve rājābhiṣeka man vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ 'añ syaṅ thve vraḥ dīkṣā ryyan iss siddhānta phoṅ...* (K.194: 26-9), 'En 1035 çaka..., lorsque S.M. Çrī Sūryavarmadeva, petit-

neveu en ligne maternelle de S.M. Çrī Jayavarmadeva et de S.M. Çrī Dharaṇīndravarmadeva, accéda à la sainte royauté, il invita le vénérable seigneur Guru Çrī Divākarapaṇḍita à remplir les fonctions de Vrah Guru pour célébrer le sacre royal. Alors Sa Majesté accomplit la sainte initiation (*vrah dikṣa*), étudia toutes les sciences (*siddhanta*),...' (Cœdès & Dupont 1943-46: 146).

(24) *neh syaṅ ti thvāy jā vrah rājadharmma* (K.33: 30), '*Tous* ces (dons) sont offerts à titre de fondation royale (*rājadharma*)' (*C* III: 152).

(25) *srū ta kh'val neh phoṅ phle chpār ta nohh phoṅṅ syaṅ ti jvan ta vrah kaṃmrateṅ 'añ ekādaśamukha...* (K.168: 11-3), 'Tout ce paddy... et tous les fruits de ces jardins *sont* offerts à V.K.A. Ekādaçamukha...' (*C* VI: 169).

(26) *... nu 'aṅgāsa nu kañje chnāṅ kañje kalpita khjeṅ phoṅ nu duk pāy syaṅ ti yok dau uk nu sthāli ceh dlah* (K.353N: 33-4), '... *nu* à distribuer la nourriture, paniers en forme de marmite, paniers *kalpita*, *khjeṅ*, pour mettre la nourriture, *tout* cela est aussi emporté avec les *sthāli*, jarres et *dlah*' (*C* V: 142).

(27) *... ti paścima vāyavya 'aṃvi leṅ sthāpanā sre lvah travāṅ xx dau lvah jeṅ x viṅ uttara prasap vrah phlu noh phoṅ syaṅ ti jau ta cak svāy ...* (K.353S: 31-2), 'A l'ouest et au nord-ouest, depuis Leṅ Sthāpanā Sre jusqu'au bassin.... revenant jusqu'au bassin au pied de...; au nord, touchant ces chemins sacrés; *tout* cela a été acheté à Cak Svāy;...' (*C* V: 140).

(28) *neh syaṅ ti cāṃ caṃnāṃ ta kaṃmrateṅ jagat śrī vṛddheśvara* (K.33: 23-4), 'Ces (terres) sont affectées au service des fournitures pour le dieu Çrī Vṛddheçvara' (*C* III: 151).

These twenty-eight citations illustrate all of the environments in which *syaṅ* is found in my Angkorian data; there may be a few more buried in garbled texts. To recapitulate the information just given, we have seven groups of passages distinguished on the basis of the following patterns: Dem. + *syaṅ* + N (1-2); Dem. + *syaṅ* + NP (3-5); NP + *syaṅ* + NP (6-9); NP + *syaṅ* + NP (= *ta* + NP) (10-12); NP + *syaṅ* + NP (= *ta* + VP) (13-19); NP + *syaṅ* + NP (= *man* + VP) (20-21); and NP + *syaṅ* + VP (22-28). These seven groups can, of course, be subsumed under the two formulas NP + *syaṅ* + NP and NP + *syaṅ* + VP. It remains to be seen whether these structural distinctions are useful. Whether they are or not, the number of examples given should be enough to show that not all of the interpretations which have been applied to *syaṅ* could be accurate.

Even if it is found that one or more of the above interpretations is correct, any re-evaluation of *syaṅ* must begin by challenging all of the interpretations which have been applied to it. In the absence of living informants, our enquiry is essentially a search for common ground underlying every occurrence of *syaṅ*. It is reasonable to begin seeking such common ground by testing each of my predecessors' interpretations against every passage in which *syaṅ* is used. I shall spare the reader the

agony of being led through a critical review of the data, and simply assert here that few of the interpretations given above stand up under such a simple test.

For example, the idea of 'solely, entirely' or '*sans exception*' would not appear out of place in examples (1), (2), (5), (6), (7) and (11); it would not do in the remaining citations. All other imaginable adverbial ideas have been tried but none seems to fit.

On the other hand, the notion of *tout* has been particularly beguiling. It is seen in nine or more of the above citations and, as has been said, with these we may group the related idea of *ensemble* seen in (13) and (15). One thing that seems fairly clear is that in most of these examples the immediate constituents are interpreted as neḥ syaṅ | prāk (1), neḥ syaṅ | mās (2), and so on, in which *syaṅ* (whether construed as a noun, a pronoun, or a verb) is seen as attributive to *neḥ* by virtue of its position. However this may be, it is curious that *tout* would have been no less plausible in nine other of our citations, namely (4), (5), (8), (11), (13), (18), (21), (25), and (28). The fact that it is not used in these cases seems to reflect uncertainty as much as inconsistency. The main point to be considered, however, is that in examples (7), (9), (14), (22) and (23) the idea of *tout* is pretty clearly excluded. The fact that *syaṅ* has been taken in senses other than *tout*, or has been left unexpressed, cannot be ignored, and the more one weighs those cases in which it is understood as *tout* the more one believes that this idea is contextually derived and that such dubious cases as example (8) were influenced by the apparent preponderance elsewhere of the *tout* idea.

The same kind of review must be made in weighing the possibility that *syaṅ* is a relative pronoun, as Finot thought. In this case a cursory examination suffices. While one might be tempted to take it as a pronoun in as many as fifteen of the above citations, to do so does violence to each passage. We now know enough about the role of all the other elements in most of these examples to be on our guard against such interpretations, though our knowledge is still imperfect. I have recently demonstrated the possibility of 'double' demonstratives in Old Khmer (Jenner 1982) and this might suggest that *syaṅ man* could be something of the kind. But consider the following:

(29) neḥ bhūmi ta rohh nehh man vāp 'amarānanta duñ syaṅ man jvan ta vraḥ noḥ... (K.693B: 20-1).

A close rendering of this would be 'These lands, aforesaid, which *vāp* Amarānanda bought *syaṅ* what (he) offers to the sanctuary...'[10] No conclusions can be drawn from this or from our two other *syaṅ man* citations, (20) and (21), since all three passages might have a zero copula with *syaṅ*, conceivably, duplicating the office of *man*. But all the other evidence indicates that this is not so.

The claim that *syaṅ* fulfils an anaphoric function is as difficult to disprove as it is to prove. Re-examination of our citations yields mixed

10. Cf. *C* V: 208: '... telles sont les terres que Vāp Amarānanta a achetées et qui sont offertes à ce temple...'

results: in six cases the possibility seems very unlikely, while in the remaining cases the possibility is present. In citations (1) to (5) plus (13), (16), (20), (24) and (28) together with citation (21), in which we have respectively *neḥ syaṅ* and *noḥ syaṅ* conceivably standing to the left of a binary cut, one wonders why the *syaṅ* and not the *neḥ* or *noḥ* should be anaphoric, and also why the alleged anaphor should be attributive to the demonstrative, as it would be, when *syaṅ* alone or with a following *neḥ* or *noḥ* would be expected.[11] The claim for *syaṅ* as anaphoric pronoun (or particle) is too weak to be applied to all of our citations, let alone most of the data collected but not given here, and is hence unconvincing.

When we turn to consider the remaining examples given above, we find them nearly equally divided between those in which *syaṅ* is not expressly rendered at all and those in which it seems to be rendered by appropriate forms of *être*. The former comprise (4), (14), (18), (22), (23), and probably (21) and (28); the latter comprise (5), (12) (19), and probably (21), (25), and possibly (28). If none of my predecessors has advanced the claim that *syaṅ* is a copula or copula-like verb, it has not been made entirely clear earlier in this discussion that such a claim is almost implicit in a good many of their interpretations both of Old Khmer and of Middle Khmer texts. In a remarkable number of cases it is as if each context forced them into such a position without their being aware of it. Indeed, the moment we take a new look at our twenty-nine citations and consider them apart from their renderings, we are obliged to allow that many of them could equally well, considering the nature of our enquiry, be analysed as neḥ | syaṅ prāk (1), neḥ | syaṅ mās, and so on, in which *syaṅ* could be functioning as a copula identifying *neḥ* or another subject with a predicate. To test this hypothesis, I give here and now my own fairly close versions of our twenty-nine examples, my tentative equivalents of *syaṅ* being shown in italics:

(1) 'One *vaudi*, one *svok*, four... (to hold) water for washing the feet, these *consisting of* silver.'
(2) '... one ring, one jewel (belonging) thereto, 2 anklets, one *khse chdval*, these *being of* gold.'
(3) '... *me* 'Yak, *me* Naṃ, *me* Des, *me* Sān, *me* Dvat—these *being of* the land of Amarālaya.'
(4) '... Those having this edict in their safekeeping (are) the lord Śrī Satyāyudha and the lord Śrī Ripumatha, these *being* sons of the lord Śrī Pṛrthivīnarendra.'
(5) 'Our high lords the *yogin* who have been ordained here give over the northeast road, the garden on the *tīrtha* [bathing-place] (and) the flower garden, these *being* their several pious works...'
(6) '... 2 silver cuspidors, 2 clasps, 2 silver *vaudi*, 1 *dramvaṅ* vessel, 1 figured vessel *consisting of hanīra* [an unidentified alloy], 3 vessels with spouts, 6 vessels of medium size...'

---

11. The sequences *syaṅ neḥ* and *syaṅ noḥ* are not attested in Old Khmer. This is hardly the place to take up the question of anaphora and its ramifications. Those interested should consult Patricia A. Lee (1981), especially 6.5 on 'Reference, Anaphora, Deixis.'

(7) '... (they) then selected others (*to serve*) *as* a fee'.

(8) 'The *kaṃsteṅ* Śāntilakṣmi begat the *chloñ* Haridatta (and) the *chloñ* Somaśarman, (who) *were bhāgavata* in (divine) service.'

(9) '... 3 *vaudi*, 5 *kaṭāha* (with) 10 *svok totalling* fifteen, an upright panel, 4 cuspidors...'

(10) 'The high lord of the Śivāśrama and the *steṅ 'añ* of Vnaṃ Kaṃsā took three female nephews/nieces (who) *were* co-uterine (and) from the land of Kuti...'

(11) 'These (items) *constitute* the endowment gong to the *vraḥ*[12] Our High Lord Śrī Cāmpeśvara each year.'

(12) 'All (these) gifts of *āśramas*, cells, villages, ricelands, rents, slaves (and) objects... (all this) valuable property *comprises* the *vraḥ* the royal gift.'

(13) 'The *steṅ 'añ* Śivasoma and the *steṅ 'añ* Vāmaśiva *are* the ones who founded the Śivāśrama (and) set up the image therein.'

(14) 'The village elders *are* the ones who declared under oath that the land of 'Anin (was) uninhabited (and) outside (anyone's) bounds'.

(15) 'These individuals *are* ones who joined together to take all of these possessions as equal to the value of the land.'

(16) 'These *are* the ones who went and claimed the land (as) a place on which to establish the *vraḥ* the foundation.'

(17) 'The *teṅ* Bhava.., the *teṅ* Kṛṣ, the *teṅ* Rudrāṇī, the *teṅ* Ke Ni (?), the *teṅ* ...te So (?), (and) the *teṅ* Sarasvatī *are* the ones who claimed the *vraḥ* the royal favour...'

(18) '... the individuals who are settled on this land and on its gift of ricefields *are* ones who (shall) offer a sacrifice to Our High Lord on the twelfth days of each fortnight...'

(19) '... (they) declared in one voice that... the *teṅ hyaṅ* Vasanta and the *loñ* Ney of Vraḥ Chpār *were* ones who had no family whatever...'

(20) 'One hundred and 10 slaves (and) four helpers, —these *are* what (he) offered to the *vraḥ* Our High Lord of the Śivaliṅga (and) presented to His Majesty Our High Lord Śrī Sūryavarman.'

(21) 'Those same ricefields *are* what (they) gave to the *vraḥ* Our High Lord of the Śivaliṅga and to the *vraḥ* Our High Lord Śivapāda.'

(22) '... these slaves of the sanctuary and others,... the *vraḥ* the *tapasvin bhagavat pāda* (and) the *vraḥ* Our High Lord the *Guru* offered (them) on the occasion of (his) consecration of the image (and) *enjoined* me, named the *vraḥ* the *tapasvin* Vidyāspada, to make arrangements to offer (them) to the *vraḥ* the Śivaliṅga...'

(23) 'In the year 1035 of the Śaka era, when His Majesty Our High Lord Śrī Sūryavarmadeva—who was the *vraḥ* the maternal grandchild of His Majesty Our High Lord Śrī Jayavarmadeva and of His Majesty Our High Lord Śrī Dharaṇīndravarmadeva—(began to) exercise the just kingship, (he) invited the *bhagavat pāda* Our High Lord the *Guru* Śrī Divākarapaṇḍita to serve as the *vraḥ* the *guru*, he (being) the one

---

12. In these close translations, *vraḥ* is a noun usually but not always marking any divine or royal being or object, and functions as a headword with which the following NP is in apposition. (Note that the purpose of the closeness of the translations is to show the structure of the Khmer rather than the sense.)

to celebrate the king's consecration, (and) His Majesty Our High Lord *made* his preparations (and) learned all of the *siddhānta*...'

(24) 'These *were offered* (to serve) as a *vraḥ* a royal good work.'

(25) 'The paddy in these granaries (and) the yield of these fields *are offered* to the *vraḥ* Our High Lord Ekādaśamukha...'

(26) '... *aṅgāsa* vessels, vessels (in the form of) kettle baskets, *kalpita* baskets and *khjeṅ*, (and) vessels in which to keep (cooked) rice *are* also *taken away* together with *sthāli, ceḥ* (and) *dlaḥ*.'

(27) '... westward (and) northwestward from Leṅ Sthāpanā Sre to the reservoir.... (and) on to the outskirts of... (and) back northward to meet the *vraḥ* the roads (which) *were acquired by exchange* from Cak Svāy...'

(28) 'These (lands) *are assigned* to the endowment of Our High Lord of Creation Śrī Vṛddeśvara.'

(29) 'These lands, aforesaid, which *vāp* Amarānanda bought *are* what (he) offers to the sanctuary.

The first twelve of these new versions, together with my interpretation of the three examples with *man*—(20), (21) and (29)—seem plausible enough; but my restatement of examples (13) to (19), with *syaṅ ta* + VP, and of examples (22) to (28), with *syaṅ* + VP, seems less plausible at first glance. Having considered these two types for more years than I care to admit, however, I have come to believe that the difficulty lies not in the value I assign to *syaṅ* but in the circumstance that *syaṅ* forms part of two patterns of expression one of which seems to lie just beyond our comprehension. The seven examples with *syaṅ ta* + VP strike me as not especially exotic variations played upon the simple VP. Thus I suspect that example (13) does not mean precisely what it would mean in fluent English, but is a weak expansion of 'The *steṅ 'añ* Śivasoma and the *steṅ 'añ* Vāmaśiva founded the Śivāśrama (and) set up the image therein.' The seven examples with *syaṅ* + VP are sharply divided into two groups. The last five—*syaṅ ti thvāy* (24) 'were offered', *syaṅ ti jvan* (25) 'are offered', *syaṅ ti yok dau* (26) 'are taken away', *syaṅ ti jau* (27) 'were acquired by exchange', and *syaṅ ti cāṃ* (28) 'are assigned to'—seem quite admissible until it is remembered that my English equivalents would more naturally be expressed by *ti thvāy, ti jvan*, and so on, without *syaṅ*. These five cases, then, are as perplexing as the two examples of the remaining group, *syaṅ codita* (22) 'enjoined' and *syaṅ thve* (23) 'made'. For all that, serial verb constructions are so widely used during all periods of the language for which we have documentation that, for the moment at least, I am unwilling to reject the hypothesis on the grounds that I cannot fathom these seven cases. It seems more prudent to allow that we are concerned here with a periphrastic construction the effect of which cannot yet be determined. This situation, it will be remembered, was alluded to in my first two paragraphs above.

Rather than leaving the matter here, however, I should, because of its

importance to our understanding of Old Khmer, attempt to account for the form and function of *syañ*. If its function is indeed copular, as I claim, how does it happen that the form itself suddenly appears in A.D. 895 and enjoys a life of nearly seven centuries, only to vanish into thin air? If the function it serves is an innovation, we may suppose that the form itself either has a source in the earlier lexicon or is a loan from some other language. I have not found any cognates of *syañ* in Mon or other Mon-Khmer languages and have, as I believe, considered all the possibilities outside the latter family. In fact, the only light thrown on the question comes from the claims of Aymonier and Pou. As has been explained, Aymonier opined that Angkorian *syañ* is the source of a modern '*siñ*', without specifying whether he meant modern *siña* 'nearly' or modern *siña* 'to rest'. On the other hand, Pou has stated categorically that Middle Khmer *syañ* led to modern *siña* 'nearly'. Whether we consider *siña* or *siña*, these claims are ones of which I was justifiably sceptical when they first came to my attention, since their authors nowhere troubled to explain the radical line of semantic development involved. In either case, the leap was one that I could not imagine. Yet there is a way of linking modern *siña* 'nearly' with modern *siña* 'to rest', and of linking both with Angkorian *syañ*—provided that a copular or quasi-copular function is assigned to the latter.

It can be pointed out, first of all, that the semantic range of modern *siña* is exceedingly narrow: if dictionaries define it as more than 'nearly, almost', it is only to ring the changes on this same idea. This is enough to suggest that the modern meaning is a restriction of some broader one. What is more, forms having only adverbial senses in Khmer are rare. This circumstance permits us to suppose that the adverbial sense of *siña* represents a reduction from a more general verbal idea. In attempting to reconcile *siña* and *siña* therefore, we may posit an earlier transitive meaning for *siña* 'to be near to, just short of'.

As to modern *siña* 'to rest', this form is attested once in pre-Angkorian (K.44B: 10) with the sense of 'to dwell in'. In Angkorian it occurs thirty-three times, most often with the meaning 'to officiate' but also four times with the meaning 'to dwell in' (K.754:13; K.413/IV: 12; K.56C: 37; K.70: 16), and once with the meaning 'to depend on' (K.369: 6,7). It persisted through Middle Khmer and into the modern language, where its sense is restricted to '(*of monks*) to sleep' and '(*of magicians*) to perform (a rite)'. The Middle Khmer form is unquestionably the source of Thai /sĭŋ/ 'to stay, enter and inhabit, possess, (*of spirits*) haunt', which tells us much about the range of the Old and Middle Khmer forms. These attested meanings are all we need to show that the idea of 'nearly' represented by modern *siña* /sȳŋ/ [sɤŋ] is an entirely orthographic specialisation of the Old and Middle Khmer verbal idea dimly recognised in modern *siña* /sə̀ŋ/ [sɤŋ] as defined above. This recognition, in turn, forces upon us the insight that Angkorian copular *syañ* is probably a doublet of Angkorian *siñ* /siŋ/, as defined above, and that all of the forms in question here make

up a fairly compact semantic cluster which can be set up as:

1. (*intr.*) to stand, hold still, be at rest;
   (a) to rest, lie; to repose, sleep;
   (b) to rest, remain, continue;
   (c) to be inherent or present; to exist, be.

2. (*tr.*) to remain in or at, inhabit; to dwell in;
   (a) to lie or reside in, be in the presence of, be near to;
   (b) to consist of, comprise, constitute;
   (c) to be present at, preside over, officiate at; to perform or celebrate (*rite*).

The meaning of Angkorian *siñ* and of the single occurrence of pre-Angkorian *siñ* having been given above, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the *syañ* doublet (if such it is) of Angkorian *siñ* was restricted to the remaining semantic field. All of the data collected show no overlap between Angkorian *siñ* and *syañ* and suggest, rather, that the latter was narrowly limited to the intransitive sense of 'to remain, be' and to the transitive sense of 'to consist of, comprise'.

It is hardly necessary to add that we cannot at this late date know the genesis of the *syañ* doublet of Angkorian *siñ*. The correspondence between pre-Angkorian and Angkorian *siñ* and what we may now represent as modern *siñ ~ siñ* is normal, while that between pre-Angkorian *siñ*, Angkorian *syañ*, and modern *siñ ~ siñ* is seen in only a handful of cases—most notably in Angkorian *tyañ* /ɗiəŋ/ : modern *tiña* /dɣŋ/ 'to know' and Angkorian *'yat* /qiət/ : modern *it* /qɔ̀t/ 'to lack'. If the doublet relationship is tenable, Angkorian *syañ* is therefore short /siəŋ/ or, possibly, /sɯəŋ/. That the hypothesis of a doublet relationship explains so much overrides, as I believe, the apparent impossibility of our ever knowing how and why these doublets arose.

REFERENCES

Aymonier, E.   1878. *Textes Khmers*. Publiées avec une traduction sommaire. 1ère Sér. Saigon (Lithographed).

. . . . .   1883. Quelques notions sur les inscriptions en vieux khmer. *J. Asiat.* 1883 (1), 441-505; (2), 199-228.

Cœdès, G.   1937-66. (ed. and trans.) *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (Coll. Textes et Documents sur l'Indochine 3). Hanoi & Paris: Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient & Boccard, 8 vols. [= C]

Cœdès, G. & Dupont P.   1943-46. Les stèles de Sdŏk Kăk Thom, Phnom Sandak et Práh Vihār. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **43**, 56-154.

Finot, L.   1915. Notes d'épigraphie. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **15**, 1-211.

. . . . .   1928. Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **28**, 43-80.

Haas, Mary	1964. *Thai–English student's dictionary*. London: Oxford Univ. Press.
Jenner, P. N.	1981. The role of *ta* in pre-Angkorian Khmer. *Asie du Sud-Est et Monde Insulindien* **12** (1-2), 75-90.
. . . . .	1982. Pre-Angkorian *gniḥ* and *gnoḥ* and the syntax of *gi*. *Asie du Sud-Est et Monde Insulindien* **13** (1-4), 143-53.
Kerr, A. D.	1972. *Lao–English dictionary*. Washington: Consortium Press, 2 vols.
Lee, Patricia A.	1981. Topical bibliography in linguistic pragmatics. *Working papers in Linguistics* (Dept. Ling., Univ. Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu) **13**(1), 1-89.
Lewitz, Saveros	1969. Note sur la translittération du cambodgien. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **55**, 163-9.
. . . . .	1970 Textes en Khmer moyen. Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor 2 et 3. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **57**, 99-126.
. . . . .	1971. Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor [= IMA] 4, 5, 6 et 7. *Bull. Ec. fr Extr.-Orient* **58**, 105-23.
. . . . .	1972a. Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor 1, 8 et 9. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **59**, 101-21.
. . . . .	1972b. Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor 10,11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16a, 16b, et 16c. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **59**, 221-49.
. . . . .	1973. Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, et 25. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **60**, 163-203.
. . . . .	1974. Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 et 33. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **61**, 301-37.
. . . . .	1975. Inscriptions modernes d'Angkor 34 et 38. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **62**, 283-353.
McFarland, G. B.	1944 [< 1941]. *Thai–English dictionary*. Stanford: Stanford Univ. Press.
Parmentier, H.	1913. Complément à l'inventaire descriptif des monuments du Cambodge. *Bull. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient* **13**, 1-64.
Pou, Saveros	1977. *Etudes sur le Rāmakerti (XVe – XVIIIe siècles)* (Publ. Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient **111**). Paris: Ec. fr. Extr.-Orient.
. . . . .	1979. Une description de la phrase en vieux-khmer. *Mon-Khmer Stud.* **8**, 139-69.
Sethaputra, So	1965. *New model Thai–English dictionary*. (library ed.). Samrong, Samud Prakan: So Sethaputra's Press, 2 vols.
Supina	1965. *Riaña supina*. Phnom Penh: Seña-Ñwna-Hwta