

The 1731 Edict on Missionary Activities

Kennon Breazeale

Most of the first century of Christian missions in Thailand is characterized by temporary visits of priests of the regular orders. The first two missionaries arrived in Ayutthaya around 1567 and attempted to establish a church, but it disappeared in the Burmese capture and partial depopulation of the Thai capital in 1569. Many individual missionaries visited Ayutthaya from time to time during subsequent decades up to the time of King Narai. The names of about fifty Dominicans, Jesuits, and Franciscans are known during this period. They ministered to Portuguese, Japanese and other Christians who settled in the Thai capital, but few remained for long. By the 1640s and 1650s, however, mission churches were becoming firmly established and became a permanent feature of the city. The priests of the regular orders continued their role in ministering to the resident Christian community and were soon joined by those of a new missionary society—the Missions Étrangères de Paris (MEP) or “Foreign Missions of Paris”—who were quick to develop a new role for themselves.

The seminary

In 1662 three French MEP priests arrived in Ayutthaya, on their way to assignments in Vietnam and China. They did not expect to stay. But they soon understood the geographical and political value of the Thai capital. It was a safe base for a mission and particularly for religious instruction, where they would be free of the official resistance and persecution that missionaries encountered in places farther east.

Even before the first group reached Thai territory, another party had set out from France. Among the nine members of the second party was the young Louis Laneau, who had studied at the Sorbonne, reached Ayutthaya in January 1664 and was soon placed in charge of the nascent seminary. Well before Laneau was consecrated in 1674 as the first bishop assigned to Ayutthaya, foreign students were going there for training. The first to be ordained, in March 1668, were a student who had been sent from a mission in Vietnam and a resident Portuguese, who was subsequently assigned to the Thai port of Mergui and became the first MEP missionary to reside there.¹

Laneau and some other MEP missionaries in the late 17th century believed that they could convert Thai Buddhists. But they had little success. Thereafter and for the remainder of the Ayutthaya period, proselytizing ceased to be a primary concern. By the early

¹ In addition to Ayutthaya and Mergui, there was a French MEP church in Chanthaburi, where a Vietnamese priest ministered to the local Vietnamese Christian community.

1700s, the French seminary, which operated alongside the cathedral, became the main justification for the MEP establishment. The missionaries wanted to provide an advanced level of education, equal to their counterparts in France. Their fellow missionaries in Vietnam and China, unable to provide comparable training, sent their most promising students to Ayutthaya. The seminary thus rapidly became a cosmopolitan community. Seminarians were expected to return to their respective homes after completing their studies leading to ordination as priests.

Given the lack of success by the missionaries in converting Thai Buddhists, and the fact that the Christian settlements in Ayutthaya were populated mostly by foreigners, it is not surprising that Thai officials took little note of mission activities. But a series of incidents in 1730 reversed the Thai government's early tolerant attitude.²

Offending books

The first bishop was a scholarly man who believed that Thai Buddhists could be converted to the Christian religion. To sharpen his abilities in theological debate and persuasion, Laneau not only acquired fluency in Thai, but also studied Pali and put his refutations of Buddhist beliefs in writing in Thai, in manuscripts that were kept in the mission library. After his death in 1696 and the deaths of others of his generation, the early fervor for seeking converts seems to have died out. During the next several decades, various missionaries estimated that fewer than ten people were baptized each year on average.³ Some of those must have been foreigners (such as Vietnamese, Chinese, Filipinos and Portuguese), and the Buddhists who claimed to be "converts" may merely have been politely expressing admiration for Christian virtues rather than faith in the religion. In any case, proselytizing ceased to be an important occupation, and few if any of the MEP missionaries became proficient in the Thai language. Laneau's essays, written for the purpose of persuasion, lay neglected on the shelves of the library.

Then, in 1730, a prince of the old dynasty (the son of either King Narai's sister or his daughter) became involved. Known to the missionaries as the "monk-prince" because he had been a bhikkhu for a long time, he lived near the cathedral and often came to the seminary for friendly discussions with the missionaries. In the library, he discovered Laneau's long-forgotten manuscripts, borrowed some of them and appears to have become fascinated by their arguments. He had access to the king's brother, Prince Phòn, who was the most powerful member of the royal family after the king, not only because of his royal status but also because Phòn was his father-in-law. He showed some of Laneau's writings to Phòn, who became troubled by what he read. He later asked some scholars among the Thai Sangha to comment upon and refute Laneau's arguments.

² The following discussion is drawn almost entirely from the MEP documents published by Adrien Launay in 1920 and largely from volume 2, pages 108-241, which encompass the time of the last three bishops at Ayutthaya. Additional details from unpublished documents are cited from Forest (1998).

³ Forest 1998 i: 256.

He got no satisfaction, however, and the scholars seem to have found excuses for not being drawn into an unfamiliar type of debate.

One man who did enter the fray was a senior minister known as the Phra Khlang—an official of Chinese ancestry who was responsible for foreign diplomatic affairs and for maritime trade. The mission records do not reveal why he became so disturbed by Laneau's writings. It appears from the reports, however, that he became the principal adversary of the missionaries in this debate. The reports depict him as more defensive about Buddhist beliefs than the Thai themselves were, and he attempted to lead the debate among Phòn, the king and other ministers concerning mission activities.

In one council meeting, as reported by the monk-prince, the Phra Khlang condemned the missionaries for being troublesome to the people and despising Buddhism, and proposed that they be expelled. In response, another senior minister pointed out that the missionaries had always been given freedom to preach, that nothing bad was known about them and that they had provided medicines to cure many people, including bhikkhus and officials. Prince Phòn agreed. In the end, King Thai Sa asked why they were bothering about this matter at all and told them to leave the Christians in peace.

The stone inscription and the 1731 edict

The Phra Khlang had been thwarted but nonetheless persisted. He and his men had already pressed the bishop several times to agree to four restrictions on missionary activities. While refusing to make any agreement, the bishop acknowledged that the missionaries would be subject to any law that the king might make. The Phra Khlang finally managed to prevail in the case, and on 17 January 1731 an edict was issued in the king's name, but through Prince Phòn, who was apparently responsible for implementing it. The edict placed four restrictions on the missionaries.

A stone inscription was prepared with the text of the edict carved into it, but this stone was not brought to the cathedral immediately. Mission records do not explain the delay. The Phra Khlang is reported to have made repeated attempts, all without success, to get the bishop to install the stone himself, and must have continued to do so during this interval. Finally, in October 1731, Thai officials and masons brought the stone and built a pedestal on which it was set up in a prominent place in the vestibule, facing the door that led to the seminary. A duplicate inscription was placed in the church at Mergui.

No copy of the Thai text of the inscription is known to exist. Adrien Launay published mission reports that provided loose translations in French, together with commentaries to explain some of the text. He also published a version in Latin made by an unidentified translator, possibly one of the young seminary students (the most likely residents to have a firm grasp of the Thai language) with the assistance of his teachers.⁴

Latin was the language in daily use at the seminary. Most of the students spoke languages that the missionaries did not know (Vietnamese and various dialects of Chinese) and that were mutually incomprehensible among some of the students themselves. Few if any of the missionaries, moreover, had more than a rough command of

⁴ The Latin text was published in Launay (1920 ii: 126-7).

the Thai language. Ayutthaya thus had a small but scholarly Latin-speaking community. The Latin text, which is reproduced at the end of this article and follows in English translation,⁵ is the only version of the law that would have been well understood by everyone in the mission and its seminary.

Translation in English of the Latin version of the edict

A royal edict through the Prince⁶ (today the successfully reigning king) in which are enacted the following:

Since, for a long time there had been friendship between the kingdom of Siam and the kingdom of France, the king of France sent ambassadors to the kingdom of Siam,⁷ together with presents and letters, in which he requested that the missionaries, having constructed a seminary, be allowed to stay in Siam in order to maintain, strengthen and increase, more and more than formerly, the friendship between the two crowns. The king of Siam, showing as much consideration as possible to the king of France, not only assented to all the wishes of the king of France, but also granted gifts and craftsmen for the construction of the missionaries' seminary in the royal capital, in the settlement called Ban Pla Het, in a way that satisfied the request in the letter that the king of France sent to the king of Siam. The missionaries continued to stay for no short interval of time in that seminary, constructed through the benevolence of the king.

But then, as the years passed, namely in 1730,⁸ Laurentius Teng,⁹ son of the head Phra Khlang,¹⁰ took pains to reveal to the Prince (now reigning successfully as king), that

⁵ I am very grateful to Dr. Daniel E. Harris-McCoy, Assistant Professor of Classics at the University of Hawaii, for reviewing my draft translation and providing corrections and refinements to ensure the accuracy of the translation. Any remaining omissions and errors are my own.

⁶ The missionaries used the term "the Prince" when referring to the Prince of the Front Palace, who was the most powerful member of the royal family after the king and who, because of his position, was most likely to succeed to the throne. In 1730, this man was Prince Phòn, a younger brother of King Thai Sa. He made many of the decisions in the declining years of the king, who may have suffered from throat cancer. The king died in January 1733, and after a bloody succession struggle, Phòn succeeded. His formal titles include Song Tham and Baromma Thammika Rat, but he is most commonly known by the posthumous title Baromma Kot (r. 1733–1758). At this point in the Latin text, the translator added the parenthetical note *modo Regi feliciter regnanti* ("today the successfully reigning king"), which shows that the translation was made at some time after January 1733.

⁷ King Louis XIV sent two embassies to the court of King Narai. One visited in 1685 and the other in late 1687 and early 1688.

⁸ The original Thai text probably specified "this year of the dog, second in the decade" (the Thai year beginning 12 April 1730), which the translator has converted to 1730.

⁹ The case of Laurentius Teng is examined in sympathetic detail in Launay's documents. He was the son of an earlier Phra Khlang minister and a Vietnamese Christian consort. After the minister's death, the mother was forced to leave the minister's house, and she entrusted her little son to the bishop. Teng was brought up in the seminary but was later forced to return to his family, to renounce his Christian beliefs and to provide Prince Phòn with information about missionary activities. The edict attributes to him the four points at issue in the controversy, but mission records do not blame him. He was apparently regarded as an innocent victim of oppressive treatment and interrogation.

¹⁰ The term "head Phra Khlang" may be a miswording in the Latin for "head of the Phra Khlang,"

the missionaries who had spent time in the seminary in the settlement of Ban Pla Het, both those who preceded the Bishop of Rosalia and the Bishop of Rosalia himself, had committed offenses in many ways.¹¹ First, the Khmer and Siamese scripts were used to translate many books pertaining to the Christian religion. Second, when preaching, their sermons were translated from their European language to the Siamese language. Third, quite a few Siamese, Mon and Lao¹² were lured away from their own religion through deception, so that they would embrace the Christian religion. Fourth, several books were composed that cast scorn and mockery in various ways on the sacred religion of the Siamese.

The Prince had everything in the account of Laurentius Teng presented to the king. His Majesty, comprehending each of the points in depth, issued orders through the Prince to the Bishop of Rosalia and all missionaries of the seminary, to assemble in the place where affairs concerning foreigners are accepted by the Phra Khlang,¹³ to plead the case concerning the aforesaid points, in which the Bishop and missionaries had committed offenses. They gathered together in the appointed place and acknowledged that they had done what was contained in the points in question. Whereupon, they came to offer flowers, incense and candles, and other gifts, and to make entreaties about the faults that had been committed. When His Majesty was informed of these things, he proclaimed through the Prince that the offenses of the bishop and the missionaries should be kept secret for the present time, both because of the friendship that had persisted for a long time between the kingdom of France and the kingdom of Siam, and because the bishop and missionaries had recognized and begged to be forgiven for their offenses, and had brought the aforementioned gifts.

But henceforth, let both the Bishop of Rosalia and all the missionaries who enter the royal capital for the purpose of residing there understand that, in order to maintain, strengthen and increase, more and more than before, the friendship between the two crowns, they must avoid doing any of those things that are enumerated in the four aforementioned points and, if they observe them with care, then the missionaries shall be conducting themselves in a manner befitting missionaries who, living in Siam, set their hearts on sustaining the old friendship with the king of France. But if any of the missionaries of Siam should become so bold as to violate any of these four prohibited points, the missionary who dares to act in this way will doubtless be regarded as having caused a rupture in the bonds of friendship between the two crowns, because he will not have had the least concern for abiding by these four points. That is to say:

since it obviously refers to the minister.

¹¹ The Apostolic Vicar and Bishop of Rosalia (1727–1736) was Jean-Jacques de Quéralay-Tessier. All Apostolic Vicars were consecrated with titles of defunct dioceses, as they were priests “on mission” to Thailand and technically not titular bishops of the country. He did not speak Thai well, and his predecessor (the second bishop at Ayutthaya) spoke none at all.

¹² These three ethnic groups formed the great majority of the king’s Buddhist subjects. The term “Lao” at that time encompassed all the people around the periphery of the kingdom who spoke dialects of the greater Tai language family.

¹³ In other words, they assembled at the law court of the Phra Khlang, who was the minister in charge of foreign affairs.

First, the missionaries are prohibited from using the Cambodian and Siamese scripts in translating anything that pertains to the Christian religion.

Second, no missionary shall preach in the Siamese language.

Third, if any Siamese, Mon and Lao who were previously practicing their own religion and afterwards changed their intentions—whether desiring of their own accord to embrace the Christian religion, or whether, out of poverty, they are compelled to ask the missionaries to lend them money or other things, so that they are released from their debts and other miseries and, as a result, profess that they will adopt the Christian religion—let the missionaries not receive these or others.

Fourth, no missionaries shall compose books that openly show contempt towards the Siamese religion.

All missionaries who are residing in Siam are most strictly forbidden to contravene these four specific points in any way. Henceforth, if missionaries who are living in the kingdom venture upon the four aforesaid points, after becoming aware of all that has been expressly ordered in the stone inscription, and if they should in any way violate them, and after an inquisition and examination has been made and the truth has been ascertained, the bishop shall be condemned to death. Moreover, other missionaries, after making humble petitions and being punished severely by fines, shall be banished from the kingdom of Siam.

Furthermore, the Siamese, Mon and Lao who have embraced the Christian religion under the Bishop of Rosalia shall be punished severely and prosecuted up to the death penalty. In future, if Siamese, Mon and Lao abandon their religion and embrace the Christian religion, knowingly violating the orders prohibited in the inscribed stone, they shall be subject to harsh penalties without any doubt. They shall be condemned to death and publicly impaled in front of the seminary in the Ban Pla Het settlement. Their parents, children and all other kinsmen shall be considered parties in these grave offenses, and all the possessions of their families shall be taken into the treasury.

Given on Wednesday, the ninth [day] of the waxing phase of the second lunar month, in the era of this kingdom 1192, *pi čhò*, second in the decade, their Year of the Dog [Wednesday, 9 Pausha CS 1192 (17 January 1731)].¹⁴

Enforcement

The severe punishments prescribed in the edict (especially threats of execution and impalement in public places) were doubtless intended to ensure compliance through fear, and not to be carried out literally. Some Christians were indeed imprisoned by the

¹⁴ The published Latin text has *mense nono* (ninth month) which is obviously an error and should read “ninth day.”

troublesome Phra Khlang, although before the edict was issued. They were eventually released at much cost to the mission in payments to the minister. There is no record of more serious action by the authorities. The main reason is that most of the four articles were already irrelevant by the time of the edict. None of the French missionaries had enough knowledge, if any, of the Khmer script to write anything in it (article 1), and none had enough fluency in Thai to preach effectively in the language (article 2) or to write anything, disrespectful or not, about Buddhism (article 4). Some young seminary students were capable of preaching and writing in Thai, but there is no record of any case brought against them. Preaching became confined to the cathedral, and henceforth Portuguese replaced Thai in the sermons.

Unfortunately the documentation reveals the least about article 3, which prohibited the conversion of Buddhists or lending money to them. It is scarcely believable that any priest would turn away someone who wanted to embrace Christianity or would refuse to help someone who was desperately in need of a little money. Judging from earlier reports, the number of conversions (perhaps ten each year, and not necessarily Buddhists) and the amount of loans had been extremely small in the best of times. Thereafter, it seems likely that these practices continued but were carefully concealed, so that officials would not notice or bother to intervene.

One reason why the missionaries were not greatly troubled by the authorities was the short-lived victory of their main adversary, the Phra Khlang. King Thai Sa died in January 1733. In the violent struggle for the succession that ensued, Prince Phòn defeated his rivals and took the throne. (He is known by a posthumous title as King Baromma Kot.) The Phra Khlang, however, had supported the losing side and perished in the turmoil.

A new Phra Khlang, likewise of Chinese ancestry, was appointed. He, too, was regarded by the missionaries as an opponent of Christianity. But like his predecessor, he was the minister responsible for foreign affairs in general, including friendly relations with France. The text of the edict itself dwelt on the long-standing and good relations between the two kingdoms. The bishop, moreover, was regarded not only as the head of the resident French community but also in a general sense as a representative of the French crown. The concern of the king and his council about an official French reaction to the curbs on the missionaries helps to explain why the edict attributes any hypothetical *future* rupture of friendly relations to missionary misbehavior, as well as why the Thai authorities were cautious about enforcement.

Thai officials took note of possible non-compliance with the prohibitions and gave reminders to the missionaries from time to time. Compulsory participation in official Buddhist ceremonies occasionally caused friction. After one incident (the refusal of the bishop to allow Christians to participate in an important Buddhist ceremony sponsored by the king), the king assigned an official to keep watch, so that the edict would be respected. Since the inscriptions had become effaced, a new stone was placed at the cathedral in May 1749 and another new one was placed in the church at Mergui at the beginning of the following year.¹⁵

¹⁵ Forest 1998 i: 288.

Missionaries sometimes reported “persecutions” to the directors in Paris. But there were no serious cases like those experienced by missionaries in Vietnam. Some of these incidents may have been the result of clashes between individuals or the indisposition of certain Thai officials towards the Christians. This may be the case when the missionaries brought charges of harassment and oppression against the governor of Mergui, which led to his removal. As long as the Christian community acted according to the law and cultivated good relations with Thai officials, they were generally left in peace.

End of the stones and the mission

Throughout the period from the 1730s to the 1750s, the stone inscription was a constant preoccupation in reports from Ayutthaya. The missionaries looked upon it as an open wound in their relations with the Thai authorities. Fortunately, it remained a symbol of their resentment and did not become an instrument of persecution. The possibility of the bishop removing the stone was debated among the missionaries, but no initiative was taken. Jean-Jacques de Quéralay-Tessier (the bishop from 1727–1736) was a reclusive man and declined to take any action.¹⁶ After he died, there was a long interim from 1736 to 1742 until the next bishop, Jean de Lolière-Puycomtat, arrived. He died in 1755 and was succeeded by Pierre Brigot, the last bishop at Ayutthaya, who was in charge 1757–1767.

The issue of the stone was debated by the directors of the mission society in Paris, who were divided in their opinions. Eventually it was referred to authorities in the Vatican. But by the time instructions from Rome—not to remove the stone—reached Ayutthaya, it was too late.¹⁷

Philippe-Robert Cirou, a young priest who had arrived from France in 1754, had been serving as an instructor in the seminary and must have been obsessed by the restrictions imposed by the edict. Without consulting anyone, he resolved the matter himself. In early February 1760, only a few days before an invading Burmese army reached the outskirts of the capital, Cirou broke the stone into pieces and threw them into the river in front of the cathedral. There is no record of a Thai response to this act, or even any indication that the Thai authorities became aware of it. Their attention turned elsewhere. The Burmese siege lasted until April, when King Alaung-hpaya, himself in command, was injured in an artillery accident. He withdrew with the army and died en route back to Burma. The situation in Ayutthaya remained tense for several years, despite the temporary respite, and then the Burmese returned in force.

In January 1765, a Burmese army approached Mergui. Georges Alary, another young priest who had arrived from France the previous year, took advantage of the disorder to break the Mergui stone to pieces. A few days later, the Burmese took control of the port, and Alary was taken away as a prisoner. The mission there came to an end and was not restored. The Thai never regained control of this port on the Andaman Sea.

The Burmese forces continued overland and began ravaging the Thai countryside

¹⁶ Forest 1998 i: 277.

¹⁷ Forest 1998 i: 290.

west of Ayutthaya in March 1765. Near the end of June, shortly before the Burmese cut all routes out of the city, two of the missionaries led most of the students to safety, taking refuge first in Chanthaburi and eventually settling at a site along the coast near modern Hatien. The seminary operated there for some years, was subsequently moved to the French colony of Pondichéry and eventually to Penang. It never returned to its original home.

After more than two years of fighting and siege, the Burmese forces captured Ayutthaya in April 1767. The cathedral and seminary buildings were burned, Bishop Brigot was taken away as a prisoner (accompanied by a few remaining seminary students) and the French mission at Ayutthaya thus came to an end.¹⁸ During the period when the kingdom was restored and in the early Bangkok period, no copy of the edict could be found, and its prohibitions disappeared from memory. There is no mention of the 1731 edict or the stone inscription in the reports from French missionaries after 1767. Nor does the revised Thai law code compiled in 1805 mention it. In the absence of the Thai text, the Latin translation made from the stone inscription is the only record of this law that has survived.

References

- Breazeale, Kennon. 2008. 'Bishop Barthélemy Bruguière (1792–1835)'. *Journal of the Siam Society* 96: 51–72.
- Forest, Alain. 1998. *Les Missionnaires français au Tonkin et au Siam (XVIIème–XVIIIème siècles: Analyse comparée d'un relatif succès et d'un total échec*. [The French Missionaries in Tonkin and Siam, 17th–18th Centuries: Comparative Analysis of a Relative Success and a Total Failure.] Three volumes. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Launay, Adrien. 1920. *Histoire de la Mission de Siam, 1662–1811: Documents historiques* [History of the Siam Mission, 1662–1811: Historical Documents]. Two volumes. Paris: Anciennes maisons Charles Douniol et Retaux; P. Téqui, successeur. Published for the Société des Missions-étrangères.

Transcription of the Edict

Regio edicto per Principem (hodie regem feliciter regnantem) haec sequentia sancta sunt:

Cum jampridem regnum siamense inter et regnum Galliae amicitia intercessisset, tunc rex Galliae misit legatos in regnum siamense una cum muneribus ac litteris, quibus obsecrabat, ut missionariis, constructo seminario, concederetur Siami, commorari ad conservandam, corroborandam et augendam magis magisque quam antea utriusque Coronae amicitiam Rex Siami, ob regis Galliae amicitiam quam plurimi aestimat, non solum omnibus votis regis Galliae annuit, sed insuper concessit dona ac opifices qui seminarium missionariis construerent, in urbe regia in campo dicto Banplahet, juxta petitionem contentam in epistola regis Galliae ad regem Siami transmissa; in eoque seminario regis benignitate exstructo missionarii continuata scie,

¹⁸ See Breazeale 2008 for a brief account of the resumption of French missionary activity after 1767.

non parvo temporis intervallo commorati sunt.

At, succedentibus temporibus, scilicet, anno 1730, Laurentius Teng, filius barcalonis principis, curavit repraesentari Principi (modo Regi feliciter regnanti) missionarios in seminario sito in campo dicto Banplahet degentes, tam eos qui Domino episcopo Rosaliensi praecesserunt, quam ipsummet Dominum episcopum Rosaliensem multiformiter deliquisse: 1° quidem utendo characteribus Camboyensium ac Siamensium ad traducendos complures libros, ad religionem christianam spectantes; 2° praedicando traductos sermones ex idomate europaeo in idioma siamicum; 3° fraudulenter ac illecebrose alliciendo plures Siamenses, Peguenses et Laos a sua religione, ut christianam religionem amplectantur; 4° componendo plurimos libros, quibus diversimode contemptui ac ludibrio exponitur divina religio Siamensium. Princeps haec omnia secundum relationem Laurentii Teng, regi praesentavit; Sua Majestas, singulis articulis penitus perspectis, edicto per Principem sancivit, ut Dominus episcopus Rosaliensis ac omnes missionarii de seminario convenirent ad locum ubi de more excipiuntur extranei a barcalone, ad discutiendos supradictos articulos, quibus deliquerunt Dominus episcopus ac missionarii; qui ad locum sibi designatum congregati confessi sunt se fecisse quae in memoratis articulis continentur; quapropter oblatis floribus, thure, candelis, aliisque muneribus veniam postularunt de culpis a se perpetratis. Haec cum intellexisset Sua Majestas, per Principem statuit dissimulandas esse pro praesenti culpas Domini episcopi ac missionariorum, tum propter amicitiam quae jamdiu perseverabat regnum Galliae inter et regnum siamense, tum quia Dominus episcopus et missionarii culpam suam agnoscentes ab illa absolvi petiere, praedictaque munera obtulerunt.

Sed deinceps intelligant tam Dominus episcopus Rosaliensis, quam omnes missionarii qui in urbem regiam commorandi causa ingredientur, ad conservandam, corroborandam et augendam magis ac magis quam prius, utriusque Coronae amicitiam, sibi esse vetitum quidpiam eorum agere quae recensentur in quatuor praedictis articulis, quos, si accurate custodierint, tunc se gerent uti decet missionarios quibus cordi est, Siami commorando, antiquam amicitiam regni Galliae fovere. Quod si quisquam missionariorum Siami degentium eo audaciae devenerit, ut aliquem ex his quatuor articulis prohibitionis violaverit, procul dubio missionarius qui ita praesumpsit, censebitur vinculum amicitiae utriusque Coronae infregisse, eo quod minime veritus fuerit contrahere quatuor istis articulis, quorum: 1^{um} est quod missionariis prohibeatur ne characteribus Camboyensium aut Siamensium utantur in traducendo quae ad religionem christianam spectant; 2^{um} ne missionarii concionentur idiomate siamico; 3^{um} si Siamenses, Peguenses et Laocenses, qui prius suam religionem colebant, dein mutato proposito, sive suapte sponte postulent amplecti religionem christianam, sive aegestate compulsi a missionariis commodato postulent pecuniam aut alia bona ut a debitis ac miseriis eximantur, seque suscepturos christianam religionem profiteantur, istos et alios missionarii non excipient; 4^{um} ne missionarii componant libros quibus despectui pateat Siamensium religio. His singulis quatuor articulis ullomodo contravenire strictissime omnibus missionariis Siami degentibus prohibetur. Quod si deinceps missionarii qui Regiam commorandi causa, ingredientur quatuor praedictos articulos ad quos potissimum reducitur omne edictum lapidi insculptum, scienter quomodocumque transgressi fuerint, facta inquisitione ac examine reique veritate perspecta, praelatus poena capitis condemnabitur, caeteri vero missionarii, gravissimis suppliciis mulcati, de regno Siamensi pellentur: praeterea reducentur Siamenses, Peguenses, et Laocenses, qui sub Domino episcopo Rosaliensi religionem christianam amplecti sunt, ut saevissime et ferme ad mortem usque puniantur. In posterum vero si Siamenses, Peguenses, et Laocenses divinam suam religionem deserentes scienter edictum prohibitionis lapidi insculptum violaverint religionem Christianam amplectendo, sine dubio acerbissimis poenis affecti, capitali sententia condemnabuntur, ac palis deinde affixi in fronte seminarii campi Banplahet constituentur, eorumquoque parentes, filii aliique cognati gravissimae culpaeparticipes censebuntur, bona vero totius familiae fisco addiscentur.

Datum die Mercurii, mense nono, secundae lunae crescentis, aerae hujus regni 1192. Pi cho tho soc, seu anno Canis.