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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 *phunmāna* /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 *sū* /maan/ 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 /mōn/, /man/, /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.

MON-KHMER STUDIES 20: 1-10
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 *män* /maan/ ‘to exist’. A few others represent *man* /mooon/ ‘mulberry’ and *man* /mooon/ ‘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. Man₁: *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. Man₂: *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 *man₂* are from the Angkorian period. One example well represents all that have been found:

(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 …’

---

1 Aymonier, 1901: 266, Finot 1915:89, and Cœdès et Dupont 1943-46:113. The other occurrences of *man₂* in K.235 are as follows: C: 56, 61, 62, 65, 66, 69, 71, 78, D: 9, 10, 12 (occurring twice), 14, 31, 36, 40, 41, 45, 61, 64, 73, 81.

The following abbreviations are used:
C = Cœdès 1937-66

MKS 20:1-10 (c)1992 See archives.sealang.net/mks/copyright.htm for terms of use.
To account for this adverbial function of $man_2$ 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 $man_2$. 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 $man_2$, though doing so would imply full acceptance of $man_1$.

It remains to be mentioned that a further specialization of the meaning of $man_2$ 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. $man_3$: conjunction, temporal

A further shift from one wordclass to another is seen with $man_3$, only one step away from the temporal adverb just described. This conjunctive function, attested by only a few examples, shows $man_3$ at the head of a main clause as the correlative of $man_6$. A single example will suffice:

(2) ta $gi$ $man$ ti stap vyavahāra $man$ mraṭān kuruṅ pāṃvyatt $neh$ 'aṃve ta roḥh neḥ (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 $man_3$ from $man_2$.

1d. $man_4$: conjunction, subordinating

Not attested in pre-Angkorian Khmer, $man_4$ 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 $kathā$ /kɔθaa/ ‘to say’, with 17 occurrences; the next most common is $nivedana$ /niβeept/ ‘to state’, with 14 occurrences.

(3) vāp dharma $kathā$ $man$ neḥ sre $neh$ ta pramvyal jeḥ ti oy ta vraḥ kamrateh 'aṅ ʾāy dvijendra-vuṣa $vyat$ (K.262S: 7-8, A.D. 983), ‘… pater Dharma said that it (was) indeed this ricefield of seven jeḥ that had been given to the vraḥ  Our High Lord at Dvijendra-vuṣa.’

---

2 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).
svāmi nivedana man sre dai mvāy jēn cval kamlūṅ gol ukk (K.262S: 25-6, A.D. 983), ‘... the owner stated that another ricefield of one jēn also lay within the boundary markers.’

Eight other verbs followed by man4 have been found so far, and a few others may turn up in the course of further investigation.4

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 khūnum /knum/ ‘slave’, in 14 examples; sre /sreel/ ‘ricefield’, also in 14 examples; bhūmi /bhoom/ ‘(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) khūnum man duk ta ṛāşrama 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 /jāhv/ ‘to acquire by exchange’, duñ /duñ/ ‘to buy’, oy /qooy/ ‘to give’, jvan /jvañ/ ‘to offer up’, loh /loher ‘to free’, and kalpana /kalbnaal/ ‘to secure to’. Going by Cœdes’ 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 pramyyal vat l jyañ 3 tammryya 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) jmāḥ ge kñum man mṛtañ śakrasvāmi oy ta vraḥ ... (K.904A: 21-2, A.D. 713), “Noms des esclaves que Mṛtañ Čakrasvāmi donne au dieu ...” (C IV: 62)

---

3 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).

4 These other verbs are vol ~ bol /bool/ ‘to tell, reveal’ (K.208: 53, A.D. 978-1077), K.144: 4, A.D. 1178-1377); yal /jal/ ‘to see’ (K.123B: 7, A.D. 878-977; K.380E: 20, A.D.1038); chley /clesl/ ‘to answer’ (K.262S: 23, A.D. 983); yvañ /dyyan/ ‘to know’ (K.843C: 13, A.D. 1025); pramyyat /pommiat/ ‘to confirm’ (K.233A: 12, A.D. 878-977); sandeha /sandęk/ ‘to fear, suspect’ (K.380E: 61, A.D. 1038); dār /daaar/ ‘to claim’ (K.697B: 10, A.D. 878-977); and mel /mool ‘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 /diil/ before the otherwise active verb, the optional agent taking its place between the marker and the verb, as in

(8) yal man neḥ tai kanhyan ti vāp rau oy thlāy krapī...(K.233B: 7, A.D. 878-977), ‘Seeing that this tai Kanhyan 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 (NP₁) + VP + (NP₂), where optional NP₁ is the subject of the transitive verb while optional NP₂ is the direct object. Examples (5) and (6) can be taken to show that NP₁ 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 (affectés, 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 ’aṅ /qañ/ ‘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 vraḥ steṅ 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) ‘āmnoy ... ta vraḥ kamrataṅ ’añ śṛimadāmrāta 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 caṅvat bhūmi man ti oy prasāda nu man ti jvan ta vraḥ kamrateṅ ’añ śṛibhadreśvara ... (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 mans. The unmarked passivized relative clause is the more usual type, but instances of the marked type are not wanting.5

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 kloṇ trasok oy ta vraḥ ... (K.561: 27-8, A.D. 681), “Esclaves que le Kloṇ Trasok donne au dieu ...” (C II: 43)

(12) kñum ta man kloṇ ’āmṛta oy ta vraḥ ... (K.561: 26), “Esclaves que le Kloṇ Amṛta donne au dieu ...” (ibid.).

In this second example we see mans 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 ſeň travaṅ tmaṅ man ge pādamāla paṇjāhv tem satra vraḥ ... (K.726A: 17-8, A.D. 678-777), ‘The ricefield in the environs of the reservoir at Tmaṅ, which these worthies disposed of for a sacrifice to the vraḥ ...’6


6 Jahv/jaw/ meaning ‘to acquire by exchange’, paṇjāhv /bonjaw/ 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 kamrate snel 'añ nārāyaṇa man mratān khloñ sthāpanā
ta sruk vrai 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 ...’

In all but three of the examples given above man_s 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 /dëél/, 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 sam vyavahāra doñ poñ 'aksaraguñp ...
(K.790: 11-2, A.D. 578-677), ‘The ricefield over which the poñ
Kaṃvau had litigation with the poñ Akṣarañupta ...

In this case it is clear that sam vyavahāra ‘to be a party to a legal dispute’ cannot
be passive.

But nowhere is the evidence that man_s is a relative pronoun stronger than in
four minor patterns. These are nu man, occurring 12 times in pre-Angkorian as
well as Angkorian; syañ man, found 6 times in Angkorian only; roh 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_1 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_1 poñ chāñ ktiññ sre poñ tel poñ matiṣakti ta pamre tem gui
lañas ai kañtrap 'mac purandarapura soñ ktiñ ra gui ge 'nak vrah
kanmeñ dār canleñ yugala ta gui ukk yau 4 nu man_s gui sañ kara ta
gi (K.493: 21-3, A.D. 657), ‘Also, the poñ Chāñ, who had owed (me)
the ricefield of his which the poñ Matiṣakti, 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.

Syañ man in all of its occurrences can be rendered literally ‘to comprise that
which’ or ‘to be what’.9

---

7 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).
(17) gi noh sre noh syan man oy ta vrah kammarateñ 'añ śivalinga nu vrah kammarateñ 'añ śivapāda. (K.353S: 26-7, A.D. 878-977), 'It (is) these ricefields which constitute what (I) have given to the vrah Our High Lord of the Śivalinga and the vrah Our High Lord Śivapāda.'

Roh man, like nu man, has two shades of meaning. The form roh /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, roh man pretty clearly, despite the lacuna, means 'the way that, = how':

(18) gi rohh 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) vaḍ jinendrānanda pandval vrah śāsana ta vaḍ vrahma rohh man ti kamsteñ pandval oy sre neñ ta vaḍ vrahma siddhi ... (K.566B: 1-2, A.D. 978-1077), 'The pater Jīnendrānanda communicated the royal instruction to the pater Vrahma (and), as (he) had been charged by the kamsteñ, 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 noh bhumi noh ta srac ti jau hoñ hetu man mān 'apavāda nu 'nak vrah 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 vrah Thpal, who had taken the matter to court.'

2b. Man₆: relative conjunction, temporal.

It has already been mentioned that man₃, attested by very few data, functions as the correlative of man₆. 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 vrah pāḍa nirvvānapada krīḍā vala pi 'naka tok vrah 'āy bhadraptanna nu stuk ransi. man vrah svey rā[j]ya chnām 2 guñ 5 steñ 'añ śivācārya sthāpanā vrah noñ ta nai sāntāna viñ (K.235D: 40-1), 'His Majesty Nirvānapada then raised an army against those who had overthrown the images (vrah) at Bhadraptana and Stuk Ransi. By the time His Majesty had reigned for only two years, the steñ 'añ Śivācārya had set the images belonging to (his) family back up again.'

10 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* 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).'</p>

More often we find what could be called an augmented *man*, 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 mvay roc mārgaśīra* ... (K.105: 22), 'On the first (day) of the fortnight of the waning moon of Mārgaśīra ...'; *ta gi neṛ ihaloka* ... (K.868B: 9), 'In this world here below ...' We have already seen in example (2) that *ta gi man* 'when' may be followed by a correlative *man* 'then' heading the main clause. The data show that this usage is rare in that usually no *man* is present:

(23) *ta gi man* kamvau khmān ni ter căp viṣaya pĥon vrah neṛ ti tok ... (K.237N: 6-7, A.D. 1067), 'When Kamvau 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 jmah bhadrayogi ◦ 'aṅgvay=ta gi sthāpanā vrah śivalinga ta gi ◦ *man* vrah pāda parameśvara mok 'āṃvī javā pī kuruṃ =ni 'nau nagara indrapura ◦ (K.235C: 60-1), 'The family founded a township named Bhadrayogi; (they) settled in it (and) set up a vrah Śivalinga 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. In one case (K.450: 12, A.D. 978-1077) the item in question proves to be *man* ['moun/ 'mulberry’ despite the difficulty of making sense of the passage. In one case (K.523D: 11-4, A.D. 1118) *man*, 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

---

11 In the case of K.100, Cœdès’ restitution of *nu sruk* is almost certainly misconceived.
12 Compare the text at C III: 110 with the translation at 112.
relative pronoun man₅. In two other cases (K.348: 14, A.D. 954; K.350N: 4-5, A.D. 978-1077) it is man₆ ‘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 kambha] khñum vāp nos pralāy man vāp nos jā vargga ta kamsten oy tais kambha kamsteň jvan ta vrah (K.221N: 9-10, A.D. 1011), ‘Tai Kambha, a slave of the pater Nos of Pralāy: because the pater Nos, who is of the kamsteň’s chapter, gave her to the kamsteň, who offered (her) up to the vrah.’

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.
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