

**The Khmer Inscriptions of Roluos (Preah Ko and Lolei):
Documents from a Transitional Period in Cambodian History**

Published in *Seksa Khmer*, Nouvelle Série No. 1 (janvier 1999), Phnom Penh.

**Michael Vickery
Universiti Sains Malaysia
Penang, Malaysia**

The Khmer Inscriptions of Roluos (Preah Ko and Lolei): Documents from a Transitional Period in Cambodian History¹

Michael Vickery

The temples of Roluos, Preah Ko and Lolei, contain several long Khmer inscriptions from the end of the 9th century, which, because this was the site of the first capital of ‘Angkor’, should have attracted careful attention from historians. Nevertheless, except for Aymonier, those inscriptions have been largely ignored, as has Aymonier’s work on them, until Pou 1996, perhaps because they were considered to be only ‘slave lists’; and the only major Khmer inscriptions of Roluos to be published, probably because they were continuations of long Sanskrit texts by important persons, were K.713, “Stèle de Práḥ Kô”, by Indravarman and Yaśovarman, and K.809, “Une inscription de Çivasoma”.² Aymonier summarized the contents of the Roluos inscriptions, and noted the interesting names of gods, dignitaries, and places they contained, as well as the terminology designating working personnel. Although Coedès did not publish them either in transcription or translation, he included some of the proper names in his “Index des noms propres de l’épigraphie du Cambodge”, and Saveros Pou has selectively cited some names and vocabulary in her dictionary of Old Khmer.³

As I have insisted in earlier studies, the so-called ‘slave lists’, which rarely held the attention of historians, were much more than that. They sometimes provide tables of organization of their foundations and often cross-sections of society in those communities.⁴ I have remarked that, “the first scholars interested in Cambodia were Sanskritists. If, through a different historical accident, they had been Mon-Khmer linguists, Cambodia scholarship would certainly have developed differently”.⁵ Although Aymonier was not a linguist in the modern sense, he knew Khmer, and he understood that the history of Cambodian society must be based on Khmer records. His study of the Roluos inscriptions was an admirable first step, which subsequent work neglected, after the study of ancient Cambodia had come under the domination of Indologists and Sanskritists.

Now it is possible to go beyond the descriptions of Aymonier and situate the Roluos inscriptions in a developmental sequence between the pre-Angkor and Angkor records. The

¹ The research on which this paper is based was supported by a grant from the Social Science Research Council, New York.

² . Aymonier, pp. 439-71; G. Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* I, pp. 37-46, where he remarked that the Khmer part of K.809 “ne contient qu’une longue liste de serfs”. In Coedès 1964 there is hardly any use of Khmer inscriptions. The inscriptions to be studied here are numbers K.312-K.320, K.324 -K.332, and K.337, based on the published plates of their rubbings in Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres & École Française d’Extrême-Orient, 1926-1937, numbers CLI-CLXXIII, CLXXIV-CXCII, and CXCI. In addition some data reported by Aymonier from other inscriptions of the group which were too damaged for publication will be given attention. In what follows I assume that the K. number of inscriptions is sufficient to locate their bibliography in Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, Vol. 8, “Liste générale des inscriptions du Cambodge”.

³ . Coedès, 1966a; Pou 1992. Pou 1996, which I had not seen before the present article was typeset, provides transcriptions, very summarized translations, and some commentary. Pou did not, however, engage in comparison nor interpretive conclusions.

⁴ See Vickery 1993, and Vickery 1998.

⁵ Vickery, 1998p. 6.

inscriptions of Preah Ko and Lolei are much longer than those of the 7th-8th centuries; they list personnel in territorial groups, some quite distant from the political center at Roluos, and a feature which did not appear until the very end of the pre-Angkor records; and they show new terminology in designation of tasks and group organization. Some of this terminology, and the structure of the texts, are unique to this group of inscriptions, different from both the preceding pre-Angkor and subsequent Angkor records. Or, if not unique, the terms become very rare later on.⁶

Thus, in several respects the Preah Ko-Lolei corpus shows a transition in social and economic organization between the pre-Angkor and Angkor periods. This was already obvious in the edifices themselves, larger and more ornate than pre-Angkor constructions, but continuing the 8th-century development in which temples were larger and more ornate than those of the 7th century. Moreover, the very length of the inscriptions and numbers of people involved show greater control and exploitation of a larger population than appears in earlier records.⁷

I shall first describe the main features of the Preah Ko inscriptions, then those of Lolei, indicating similarities and differences, and then discuss names of donors, place names, special problems of vocabulary, and categories of personnel.

Preah Ko

The temple of Preah Ko consists of six towers in two rows, and all of the towers have Khmer inscriptions on the sides of the main doorways, and at the sides of some of their false doors. The towers of the front row are dedicated to males, kings Jayavarman/Parameśvara, Pthivīndravarman, and Rudravarman, and the towers of the second row are believed to have been dedicated to females presumed to have been their principal consorts. This is an assumption based on presumed symmetry of structure, for some of the relevant contexts are not legible. The inscriptions in the same positions of each tower are usually devoted to the same subject. Thus, the principal inscription of each tower, with an introduction including date and the royal persons and deities involved, begins on the south side of the main door and continues on the north side; and three inscriptions, K.312, K.316, and K.319, all contain lists of personnel with the same unusual appellations, and they are respectively on the east side of the southern false door of the central, southern and northern towers in the first row.

The principal texts on the tower doors

The inscriptions of the main doors of the first row towers, in order of precedence central (K.311, which was too damaged for publication of a plate but was described briefly by Aymonier), southern (K.315), and northern (K.318) all begin with an identical statement, that at a certain date in 801/A.D. 879, the king *dhūli jeñ vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrī Indravarmadeva* “whose reign was in 799” (*ta rājya ta gi 799 śaka*), inferentially “who began his reign”, at that date equivalent to A.D. 877, established a god, respectively, in the three towers, *parameśvara*, the posthumous name of Jayavarman II (802-834); *vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrī pthivīndreśvara*, father of Indravarman; and *vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrī rudreśvara*, Indravarman’s maternal grandfather.⁸

⁶ Wherever I refer to total occurrences of any Old Khmer term this is based on the index of Khmer inscriptions in Sakamoto, Yasuyuki. nd.

⁷ . The longest pre-Angkor inscriptions are K.137 and K.155, each with over 200 listed persons.

⁸ The full titles of Parameśvara were not supplied from the badly damaged K.311 by Aymonier, p. 441, and his remark that Jayavarman II had died only some 10 years earlier, is obsolete. Coedès 1964, p. 193, placed his death in 850, but the present consensus, based on

The door inscriptions of the southern and northern towers were legible enough for their rubbings to be published, and the details of interest here were probably the same on the central tower. The language of the reference to Indravarman's accession to the throne, *ta rājya ta gi 799*, 'whose reign was in 799', is different from the standard Angkorean style established by his son Yaśovarman at Lolei, *ta svey vraḥ rājya ta gi*, 'who ate the sacred realm in'. Also noteworthy is that these are the first Cambodian inscriptions in which the beginning of a reign is explicitly recorded, an innovation from the pre-Angkor corpus.

The royal titles continue the practice established by Queen Jayadev in A.D. 713 of adding *dhūli jen* 'dust of the feet' to titles of kings and queens, which permits a distinction between the titles of living royalty and gods which is not immediately possible in the pre-Angkor records, where the titles preceding the names of both living kings and gods, *vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrī*, were the same, and where titles ending in *īśvara* 'lord', which at Roluos refer to posthumously apotheosized individuals, were applied both to living lords and to gods since early 7th century. These inscriptions of Indravarman seem to begin a tradition in which *-varma* and *-varmadeva* rulers became *-īśvara* posthumously. Comparison throughout the corpus, however, shows that Indravarman's name-title, *indravarmadeva*, was of a type not in use in the 7th-8th centuries, but became the standard designation of a king at Angkor. Pre-Angkor kings' name-titles ended in *varma* only, as *vraḥ kamratāñ añ śrī Īśānavarma*. Note also that *deva* at the end of a title, although its literal meaning is 'god', nearly always designated living male royalty.⁹

K.315, the only clear context, shows Indravarman's name-title written with *śrī* separated from *indravarmadeva*, not, in accordance with Sanskrit *sandhi*, *śrīindravarmadeva*, as it appears in the title *śrīindravarmevara* in K.324 at Lolei.

After the introductory statement these inscriptions list different types of serving personnel, in K.311 over 500 persons, in K.315 over 300, and in K.318 287. These persons ranged from relatively high-status singers, dancers, and musicians to lowly guards and workers. This arrangement continues an epigraphic tradition from the 7th century, although some of the categories of personnel were not yet in vogue then, and the Roluos inscriptions show many more categories, and more complex divisions than any pre-Angkor text. They are also different from any pre-Angkor inscription in that the personnel were divided into two groups, one for each half of the month, first the half of the rising moon (*knet*), and the of the waning moon (*rnoc*). This division is also seen in K.809, noted above.¹⁰

Categories of personnel in the main texts

Most of the six door inscriptions show more or less severe damage. The least damaged is the north side of K.318, where a nearly complete list of personnel can be read; and comparison with the undamaged portions of the other door texts indicates that the same order of precedence was followed throughout. Since many of these terms are rare in the

Claude Jacques 1972 is that he died in 834. Pou 1996, p. 27, holds to the date 850. The identities of Pr̥thivīndreśvara and Rudreśvara are known from Indravarman's Sanskrit genealogical inscriptions, K.310, K.713, and K.826.

⁹ In writing *varma*, rather than *varman*, I follow L.-C. Damais 1957, p.608, n. 2, that "there is no reason to restore a form which, even in Sanskrit, is only theoretical [*varman*], for only the forms in *-warm(m)a* actually existed", and consequently Damais used the latter in his writings. I have found only one exception to the rule that *deva* designated living persons, in the pre-Angkor corpus, K.3, which is anomalous in several respects, and may not be decisive on the matter. See Vickery 1998, p. 187.

¹⁰ Because of Aymonier's remarks, I have assumed that the structure of K.311 was the same as that of K.315 and K.318.

epigraphic corpus, I include the K. numbers of other inscriptions in which they occur. In order they were dancers (*rmmām*) and singers (*caṃryan*), well known in many texts, several types of musicians--of percussion instruments, (*tmoñ*, K.415, K.809), small cymbals (*cmāp cheñ*, K.270), *tamlum* (?); of stringed instruments, *tmiñ vīna*, K.600, and *tmiñ trisarī* (three strings)--and at the end of this group *pamas jnau/jno* (see below).¹¹ Then the totals of each group are listed. All the foregoing were women (*tai*), there were from 1 to 3 per group, except for 20 singers, and, sometimes, as is usual in such texts, they were accompanied by small children, here 3 male (*si*) nursing (*pau*) infants and one female (*tai pau*), and 5, 3 boys and 2 girls, of “running” age (*si rat*, *tai rat*). The last category, *pamas jnau*, is puzzling, for it has not conventionally been interpreted as a type of entertainment *artiste*, as are all the others in this first section of the inscription, but rather *pamas* has been construed as ‘grinder’ and *jnau* as “herbs, condiments, spices”.¹²

These glosses seem inappropriate for persons listed along with dancers, singers, and musicians, unless it is simply that the *pamas jnau* were considered to be of similar status, and higher than the personnel of the following lists. *Pamas jnau*, and obviously related, perhaps identical, appellations derived from the same roots, are found in only three published inscriptions, all from the pre-Angkor corpus: K.46 (*pas jnau*), K.423 (*pas jaṃnau*), and K.956 (*pamas jnau*). In none of these are the person(s) concerned listed in proximity with musicians, but they are all listed in slots which indicated some prestige. In K.46, the *pas jnau* could replace the *mratañ yajamāna*, a very important official, often the principal in a foundation. In K.423 *pas jaṃnau* follows the principal official, a *poñ* who was also a *yajamāna*, and Coedès took it as a verbal expression indicating some act by the *poñ* who was *yajamāna*, but he noted that the conventional meaning of *pas* ‘crush’ (*écraser*) did not fit. In K.956 *pamas jnau* follows close after the official entitled *mratañ yajamāna*, and consisted of 2 women, but they seem to be among the donations of the *mratañ*, and are followed by several more female *tmāñ canlek* ‘weavers of cloth’.¹³ None of these contexts suggests that they were entertainers, and their task could have been related to condiment grinding, but the high status indicated for them suggests that their grinding was of special substances used in ceremonies.

The relative status of this first group of personnel is the same as in 7th-century texts where dancers, singers and musicians, where they are recorded, come at the beginning, just after the names of the officials responsible for the foundation.

The next group in the Roluos inscriptions is mostly male. It starts with the *kloñ sruk* ‘district officer’ of an unnamed district, and he is followed by several men whose tasks are uncertain, 1 each of *varī*, *pamek*, and *cmām pjuḥ*. Although Saveros Pou has interpreted the first as a type of elephant tender, this seems unlikely in lists like these in which all others are domestics whose functions are indoors. *Pamek* seems to derive from *pek* (modern εβικ), ‘open’, ‘pay’, and she has glossed it accordingly; and no one has successfully explained *pjuḥ*, although *cmām* is understood as some kind of keeper or guardian.¹⁴

¹¹ Where no other inscription is listed, it means the term is unique to Roluos. The term *tmiñ* without other qualification is also found in K.209. The glosses are from Pou 1992, and absence of a gloss, indicated with (?), means that neither Pou, Philip Jenner, nor Coedès was able to explain the term.

¹² See Pou 1992, pp. 301, 193, respectively, and Pou 1996, *pileuses d’aromates*.

¹³ Inscription K.956, “Dalle de Vat Samroñ”, has often been listed as a 10th-century record, and most of its contents is of that date, but the first 6 lines of the Khmer part are of the 7th century A.D. For discussion of *mratañ* and *poñ* see Vickery 1998, chapter 6.

¹⁴ See Pou 1992, pp. 432, 301, and 320 respectively. Pou 1996 treats *sruk* as ‘village’, but most contexts, from the 7th century onward, suggest greater importance. See discussion of

Then there is a *cmām mās prak*, ‘keeper of gold and silver’, a *pile* (? , K.155), an *ābhaṣa* (K.262, but a type of building, not a person), water heaters (*amuḥ dak sron*, K.124, K.231), garland makers (*mālakāra*, K.158, K.292), parasol carriers (*chatradhāra*, K.270, K.415, K.843), a *smañ* (?), several ‘keepers’ or ‘guards’ (*cmām*), of respectively, *vraḥ* (‘sacred’) *pitai* (?), *vraḥ vlen* (‘sacred fire’, many examples), *kanloñ* (a special building), *parihāra* (?), and *dvār* (‘door’, common). They are followed by a *vannāra* (? , K.270), 4 cooks (*mahānasa*, many examples), a baker (*taṃve naṃ*), a leaf artist (*patrakāra*, K.99, K.238, K.263, K.270, K.291, K.659), and then 5 male (*si*) musicians, a *caṃryañ stuti* (a praise singer, K.270), another singer (*gandharva*, K.129, K.155, K.270, K.659), and a 3-man instrumental ensemble (*tūrya*, K.270, K.659, K.989). Then come *cmām vraḥ śāla* (‘keeper of the sacred pavilion’), 7 female *mahāvrihi* (‘sacred rice’, K.270), female rice sorters (*rmeṣ rañko*), and female cooks for royal food (*taṃve sañvey*, K.99). Then follow totals for each of these types of domestic workers. Pou 1996, p. 50, suggests that *tūrya* could be ‘trumpet player’, as in “current Indian Hinduism”.

These lists of personnel differ sharply from pre-Angkor records, where, following *artistes*, and sometimes craft workers (*tmir slik* ‘leaf sewers’, *tmāñ* ‘weavers’, *rañhvai* ‘spinners’), there is a category of men called *caṃdak*, which has not been successfully explained. Many of the categories listed in the Roluos inscriptions are not found in any other records, either of the pre-Angkor or Angkor periods, except for several in K.270 of Prasat Kravan. Among unique or unusual terms are *caṃp cheñ*, *taṃlum*, *trisarī* (although other *tmir* are listed in K.809 and *tmir viṇā* appears in the first dated pre-Angkor inscription K.600 of A.D. 611); all of the *cmām* except *cmām dvār*; *pile*, *ābhaṣa* (known in Sanskrit as a type of building), *mālakāra*, *smañ*, *vannāra*, *taṃve naṃ*, *caṃryañ stuti* (although other *caṃren*, *caṃryañ* were common), *mahāvrihi*, *rmeṣ rañko*, *taṃve sañvey*.

These listings of categories of personnel are among the features which set the Preah Ko and Lolei inscriptions off as representing new institutional arrangements, different both from those prevalent in the 7th century, and from later Angkor practices.

Following the lists of apparently high-status domestic personnel, all three of these inscriptions then list 13 women as *dmuk varṣā*, a number which Aymonier believed was the same throughout, although the numbers of persons with other duties varies from one text to another. The function of the *dmuk varṣā* is not at all clear, and they appear in only two other texts, K.99 of A.D. 922 and K.989 of A.D. 1008. Aymonier just said ‘servants for the rainy season’, still very vague, and Pou treats *dmuk* as a ‘keeper’ or ‘caretaker’, in which case its difference from *cmām* should be discovered.

That is the end of the groups of inner servants. The inscriptions then go on to the enumeration of groups (*vṃvvak*) of presumably field workers from different districts (*sruk*), the legible names of which are *viṣṇupura* in K.315, and *loka/soka---* and *gajjita* in K.318. Those workers are divided further into *aṃraḥ*, the meaning of which is not at all certain (was it a type of ‘group’, or was the *aṃraḥ*, as the first person named, the foreman in charge of his group?). In addition to the Roluos inscriptions, including the published K.713 and K.809, the term *aṃraḥ* occurs in 12 pre-Angkor inscriptions, and in a few Angkor contexts, mostly in K.99 and K.270-271 which show other similarities to the Roluos texts.. Apparently because an *aṃraḥ* is sometimes the first in a list of workers (pre-Angkor K.127, K.155, K.562, K.689), Coedès on occasion translated it as ‘chief’ (K.138, K.155), but on other occasions he left it untranslated. Jenner 1981:386 has taken up that interpretation, as has Pou, with the gloss, “leader of a group of working men”.¹⁵

varī below.

¹⁵ See Coedès’ treatments in his publications of the inscriptions listed here.; Jenner 1981, p. 386; Pou 1976a, p. 353, and Pou 1992, pp. 20-21; Vickery 1998, p. 241, n. 208.

The personnel with each *amraḥ* were classified as respectively *gho*, *gvāl*, *tai*, and children (*tai* and *si pau* and *rat*), usually in that order, although in a few cases some *tai* are mentioned before the *gvāl*, or there are no *gvāl*. The *gho* always come first. The numbers were usually 3-5 *gho*, 2-3 *gvāl*, and the same number of *tai* as *gho*, although these numbers are tentative because some part of nearly every list has been effaced. Both *gho* and *gvāl* have always been presumed to be male agricultural workers, and the two categories appear first in a very few late pre-Angkor texts, where *gho* seems to have been an abbreviated form of *ghoda*, and then frequently in the Angkor period. These terms will be discussed below.

Front row towers, southern false doors

Another group of inscriptions at Preah Ko which show similar contents are those on the east faces of the southern false doors of the three first row towers. They are numbers K.312, K.316, and K.319, from, respectively, the central, southern and northern towers. Aymonier did not fully recognize their similarity, but because of this similarity his readings of sections in one text help in deciphering the same sections of others which are effaced.

In K.312 the first lines are partly effaced, but in the second half of line 2 it is possible to distinguish [*vraḥ*] *kamrateñ añ miśrabhoga nu ka-*, with the last *ka-* probably indicating the first syllable of another *kamrateñ añ* in the now effaced line 3, in which the first legible term, and the end of a sentence is *-īndradevī*. In the same section of K.319 Aymonier was able to discern *dalmak*, not visible on the published plate, and *miśra*, which is clear as the last word of the first line. This leads to recognition of traces of *dalmak* in the first line of K.312, and the clearer sequence of that text permits recognition of [*vraḥ ka*] *mratenñ añ* preceding *miśra* in K.319. That part of K.316 is completely illegible. Pou 1996 did not make these comparisons, and thus missed these readings.

Aymonier believed *dalmak* was a place name, and he interpreted *miśra* and *miśrabhoga* as the names of a chiefs or gods; and in K.312 he thought that it was a god or chief which was joined with another whose name ended in *-īndradevī*; Bergaigne thought that it was a question of “donations by a Miśrabhoga to (Dhara)īndradevī”; while Barth was of the opinion that “Miśrabhoga is not the proper name of a donor, but an adjective indicating that a donation is for the benefit of two (or several) deities...”¹⁶

Barth’s interpretation was best, but all were hindered by lack of knowledge of the pre-Angkor corpus in which *miśrabhoga* appears along with *saṃ/psaṃ paribhoga* and *upabhoga* as a technical term for the joining of two foundations.¹⁷ Thus in K.312 *miśrabhoga* cannot be a proper name, nor should the preceding title *vraḥ kamrateñ añ* be interpreted as qualifying *miśrabhoga*. That title must refer back to a name now effaced of a deity to be joined with *-īndradevī*. The foundation was thus of a type already known in the 7th century, and which continued on into the Angkor period.

At the time Aymonier wrote *dalmak* had not been identified as a special functional designation of persons, which these inscriptions help to illuminate, and which will be discussed below.¹⁸ In line 1 of K.312, it seems possible to discern the phrase “---- *cmāṃ nu*

¹⁶ . Aymonier, p. 442; Barth and Bergaigne 1885, p. 303. These details were missed in Pou 1996.

¹⁷ . See Coedès 1936, p.6, n. 10; Vickery 1998, chapter 5. The texts with *paribhoga* and *upabhoga* are all pre-Angkor, but *miśrabhoga*, found in the pre-Angkor K.563 and K.728, continued in use into the Angkor period, but in Sanskrit, not Khmer, where *saṃ gaṇa* became the usual expression.

¹⁸ For the conventional interpretation of *dalmak/dalmāk* as ‘elephant hunter’ see Coedès’ discussion of K.158 in *Inscriptions du Cambodge* vol. 2, p. 110, n.5; Pou 1992, p. 247. The earliest attestations of this term are in the Roluos inscriptions discussed here. See also

dalmak nu ---” and this tentative reading is supported by the totals at the end of K.319 which begin with “*piṅḍa* (total) *dalmak nu* (and) *cmām kloñ pley jnval...*”.¹⁹

The term *piṅḍa*, found frequently in these texts as ‘total’, is interesting in that it, along with the form *pinda*, is found only at Roluos, in pre-Angkor inscriptions, and in the 10th-century K.270-271 of Prasat Kravan.

The initial statement identifying the foundation in K.312 is immediately followed by a list of ordinary personnel in which one of the unique features of the Preah Ko inscriptions is seen. In the first 19 lines there is a list of women called *ye*, different from female titles both in pre-Angkor and Angkor inscriptions. They are not divided into occupational categories. Aymonier noted that this was different from “the general usage of the time” which called women *tai*, but he did not see just how different it was.²⁰ These women were accompanied by male and female children; and another anomaly, compared with previous and subsequent practice, is the use of *jmol* ‘male (animal)’ for the sons. Nowhere else in Khmer epigraphy is *jmol* used for humans, but Aymonier’s comment suggests he did not see the anomaly. Two more strange designations, not noticed by Aymonier, are ‘male child *ta amlañ*’, of which there were 4, and a single ‘female child *vanro*’.²¹ As in earlier texts, each name is followed by one to three vertical lines indicating the numbers ‘1’ to ‘3’, or by Khmer numerals for larger numbers. Thus line 7, nearly complete, records “...*ye* Mali 1, *kvann* (‘child’) *ye* 111 (three daughters), *ye* Manohar 1, *kvann jmol* 1, *ye* 1 (one boy, one girl)”. In other respects than *ye* and *jmol*, the enumeration follows earlier practice.

At the end of the list, lines 18-19, are the totals (*piṅḍa*) in Khmer numerals of each category and the general total 107.

The next section of K.312 begins at the end of line 19 with the name of a *sruk* (‘district’) *jlyak* followed by the words *dalmak dvan*, followed in turn by the first of several *mu*, which each introduce a group of personnel. Both Aymonier and Coedès read the toponym as ‘Jlyak Dalmak’, not taking note (and in Aymonier’s day this was not yet apparent) that *dalmak* is believed to denote a particular function. Aymonier did not notice *dvan* in this context, and he believed that it was a new term appearing only in the inscriptions

discussion in Vickery, *Society*, “Appendix”, ‘Dalmak’. Pou 1996, p. 51, read *dalmak* in K.319b, but did not comment on it.

¹⁹ That phrase of K.312 seems to continue with *karya vnus*, but since these terms are not identifiable, I have assumed a misreading due to damage.

²⁰ . Aymonier, p. 442. The most common terms for female and male workers respectively in the 7th century were *ku* and *va/vā*. Pou 1996, p. 31, called attention to this.

²¹ . Aymonier, 464 said only that children “are distinguished at times as Kūn Jmol ‘boys’ and Kūn Ye ‘girls’”. Pou 1992 did not list *amlañ* or *vanro*, and in Pou 1996, p. 29, lines 17 and 19, she read *amlañ* as *asāñ*, likewise missing from Pou 1992. Indeed, *vanro* might well have been missed. In K.312 *kvan vanro* might be construed as *kvan van* (name) *pau/po* (suckling), because the shape of the *r* in these texts surmounted by vowel *o/au*, hardly differs from *p*. Against this, however, is the same designation in K.316 where it is written with the *r* as a subscript below *n*, meaning that the reading *vanro/~au* is certain. The failure to compare these very similar texts in Pou 1996, in spite of a correct reading of *vanrau* in K.316 (Pou 1996, p. 45, lines 8, 9) led to the misreading *kvann vau pau ye* 1 in K.312b (Pou 1996, p. 29, line 18). This is in the list of totals, whereas in the damaged enumeration of individuals Pou read correctly *kvann -n pau ye* 1, yet did not see the connection. The error, *pau* for *rau*, is confirmed by the fact that in these inscriptions *pau* ‘suckle’ occurs nowhere else in the lists of *ye* and *jmol* children, only with children designated as *tai* and *si*. In structure *vanro* seems to be *vrau* with a nasal infix, but with only these two examples an explanation is impossible, particularly so long as *vrau* is not fully understood (see Vickery 1998, pp. 223-24).

of Lolei with the sense of “chiefs of gardens and plantations”, while *mu* were “chiefs of serfs”. Both *dvañ* and *mu* are special to the Roluos group. Pou, citing this context of K.312, treated both *dvañ*, and *mu*, construing the first as “male servant leading a group”, and the second as “chief servant standing next to a *dvañ*”. Pou’s explanations are certainly inadequate. It is not at all certain whether *dvañ* designated persons or functions, and in most contexts *mu* is not preceded by or in any relationship to *dvañ*. Their juxtaposition occurs only in totals of all categories at the ends of sections.²²

Examination of all the Roluos contexts might help reach an understanding in showing whether or not *dvañ* are counted in the totals of persons, but in most lists of totals there is some damage, and damage usually prevents comparing totals with lists of persons in the texts. In K.312 (East) *sruk jlyak dalmak dvañ* is followed by a list of 10 *mu*, each including varying numbers of personnel designated as *si* (adult male), *gvāl* (?), *tai* (adult female), and various types of children, but no *gho*. Following this is another *dvañ* with subordinate *mu* containing workers in the same way, and this pattern continues to the end of K.312 on the west side of the door, although damage to one section renders the precise count of *dvañ* and *mu* impossible. There seem to have been at least three units of *dvañ*. Pou 1996, p. 29, missed the first *mu*, in the beginning of line 20, following *dvañ* at the end of line 19. Thus she shows only 9 *mu*, although in the totals, p. 30, line 52, she recognized 10.

In the listing of the totals (*piñḍa*) at the end of the first section there is *dvañ* 1, *mu* 10, *si* 51, *gvāl* 24, *tai* 81, *lap* 12, *si rat* 4, *tai rat* 2, *si pau* 3, *tai pau* 11 etc., for a grand total of 199, against a recorded total of 200. This proves that *mu* were persons, but it is not conclusive concerning *dvañ*. Although it implies that *dvañ* should be construed as a person, there is an error. One possible error is in the ‘4s’, a figure which is easy to confuse with ‘5’, if the engraver was careless. If the correct reading were ‘5’ in both cases, we could conclude that *dvañ* was not a person, but if one was ‘4’ and the other ‘5’, then the *dvañ* must be counted a person; or perhaps ‘4’ is correct, and there is an error somewhere else. Such errors are not unusual in the epigraphic corpus. Another complete example of totals is in K.312 (West), with *dvañ* 1, *mu* 4, *si* 37, *gvāl* 13, *tai* 68, *lap* 10, *si rat* 9, *tai rat* 4, *si pau* 5, *tai pau* 7, adding up to 158, the recorded total, and implying that *dvañ* was a person. Nevertheless, the same possibility for errors of ‘1’ is present, and, as we shall see, another total in K.319 adds to the ambiguity. Pou, pp. 30, lines 52-53, and 26, lines 11-12, respectively, has misinterpreted the Old Khmer numerals and read 1-10-31-14-61-10-4-2-3-7, total “100”, while her figures add up to 147, and 1-4-37-13-48-10-6-4-4-7, “128”, with her figures making 134.

Each *dvañ* and *mu* was named, and the names could be construed as personal, that is the name of the group chief, or in some cases as place names. Most of the *dvañ* names are illegible. The first, not read by Pou, p. 29, may be *pit*, and the second begins with *ca-* (Pou, p. 30, *candravārah*). Only the last, in a group of persons whose task was *cmām klon* (‘gate guards’?), is clear, *dvañ ktir* (Pou, p. 26, line 12, *ktip*). The legible names of *mu* are *dai* (?), *śivaruci*, *kañyvan*, *gro/tro*, *kanloñ/kansoñ*, *kanlū*, *saṃap* (?), *kanloñ*, (?), *konmor* (?), *vrahey*, *śivabhāva*, *dai*, *kamalākṣāra*, *kāmpit*, *kanrat*, *ka□ri*.

These are almost certainly personal names, for several of them are found in these inscriptions attached to other categories of personnel. Thus a *mu* was a person, probably a man, but *dvañ* is still uncertain and could have been the designation for a type of group. The names of *mu* are read east to west (Pou K.312b > K.312a), and some of Pou’s readings are

²² Aymonier, 443, 464; Coedès 1966a, p. 33; Pou 1992, pp. 262, 374. Pou was also in error in assimilating a context of *dvañ* in the Angkorean K.99 to the Roluos contexts. In K.99 the expression is ‘*mradvāñ cāñ*’, which Pou considered as a category of males. But this reading clearly results from false segmentation, the correct terms being *tamra*, ‘seal’, *dvañ cāñ*, as it was analyzed in Sakamoto, but which, indeed, is so far incomprehensible.

slightly different.

In the total context of K.312 it should probably be understood that the name of the *sruk* was Jlyak (name of a tree), and that it provided a large number of personnel for different functions. They were divided into at least three groups called *dvañ*. The first *dvañ* was that of the *dalmak* and the last was that of *cmām kloñ*. No functional indication precedes the second *dvañ*, which perhaps means that it was also *dalmak*, although, since *dalmak* appears in the first line of K.312 and K.319, possibly all the personnel belonged to that category. This is also suggested by the totals at the end of K.319, in which “total [of] *dalmak* and *cmām kloñ* [and?] *pley jnval*” is followed, not by numbers of *dalmak* or *cmām kloñ*, but by “*mu* 11, *si* 48, *gvāl* 13, *tai* 97, *lap* 10, *si rat* 7, *tai rat* 7, *si pau* 8, *tai pau* 7”, grand total 208, also read by Aymonier, although it is illegible in the published plate. Here it is certain that the *dvañ* were not included in the list of persons. Pou 1996, p. 51, read the numbers as 11-28-13-79-10-9-9-8-9, total “100”, although her figures make 176.

The same structure, and same appellations, are seen in K.316 and K.319. After the lists of *ye* and *jmol* there are lists of *dvañ* and *mu*, including *dalmak*, which appears in K.316, line 10, “---*dalmak dvañ guṇādhivā*---”, and in the final totals of K.319. Because they are badly damaged, however, it is impossible to show textual continuity among the three texts, but in addition to the use of *ye* and *jmol* as in K. 312, in K.316 the mysterious term *vanro* again appears, designating here both boys and girls, and K.319 also lists male (*jmol*) and female (*ye*) grandchildren (*cov/cauv*).

The only other records with anything like the use of *ye* in these inscriptions are the appellations *ku ya* plus proper name in K.137, and *ku yi* plus proper name in K.24, both of the 7th century. The latter is from Angkor Borei, and the former is probably also from there, although its provenance is uncertain. Saveros Pou noted the possible equivalence of *yi* and *ya*, and treated them, along with *ye*, as terms meaning 'female'. This is based on modern *ñī*, ‘female animal’, and seems superficially reasonable, but it may not be accurate since *ku* already indicates females, and *ya/yi* in that sense would be redundant. At least *ya/yi* must be construed as denoting some quality in addition to what is denoted by *ku*. One of Pou's examples, *va ye* (K.24), is directly contradictory, but her other example of *ye*, in *tmur* (cattle) *jmol* (male)...*tmur ye*, fits.²³

Whatever the final decision about this, the *ku ya/yi* and *ye/jmol* names in their very restricted areas deserve attention. This unique use of animal terms for persons at Preah Ko may indicate that they were of an especially low class, perhaps really slaves, and this may have been the purpose of the designation *ya/yi* in K.137 and K.24. This manner of designating people, however, did not persist.

Peculiar to K.319, but perhaps only because the companion texts are effaced, are the expressions following *dalmak* in the final total, *cmām kloñ* and *pley jnval*. *Kloñ/kloññ* is found nowhere else, and Pou, although recognizing it in her citation of this context of *dalmak*, did not try to explain it. In the present contexts the modern *kloñ* ‘monumental doorway’ would fit perfectly well.²⁴ *Pley* and *ple*, literally ‘fruit’, are used clearly to designate some category of personnel in a number of pre-Angkor inscriptions, and *jnval/jnvāl* occurs in several Angkor inscriptions where it has usually been construed as having something to do with material transactions (modern *jual*, ‘rent’). Nowhere else, however, has

²³ Pou 1992, pp. 381, 386. Perhaps *va ye* is an early record of transsexuality.

²⁴ Aymonier, p. 466, apparently referring to the small inscription numbered K.319, Planche CLXVIII, said, “dans une petite inscription de fausse porte nous lisons l’expression ... de *Cmām Kloñ*”, which he considered equivalent to the *cmām kanloñ* in the major inscriptions, “qui devaient être les gardiens des portes monumentales ou les gardiens des urnes cinéraires” (p. 465-6).

pley/ple jnval been found. At least the expression *pley jnval*, joining a pre-Angkor and an Angkor concept, fits the transitional structure of these inscriptions.²⁵

Central tower, other inscriptions

The central tower of the first row has two more legible inscriptions, K.313 and K.314. They record offerings of lesser royalty and officials.

The northern face of K.313 contains 7 sections listing offerings by different persons of royal or elite status. The lists of offerings are similar to those of the main inscriptions discussed above, but shorter. The first concerns persons offered by *kamrateñ añ panlas rājaputrī dhūli jeñ vraḥ kamrateñ añ parameśvara*, that is, by a presumably royal person entitled *kamrateñ añ* “in place of”, “for” (*panlas*) the ‘royal daughter’ (*rājaputrī*) of Jayavarman II. Aymonier misunderstood *panlas* as her proper name, and thus did not recognize her filiation, and thought that she, ‘Princess Panlas’ had made a donation to *paramevara*.²⁶ Pou 1996, p. 35, recognized that she was a daughter of Jayavarman II, but still accepted that her name was ‘Panlas’.

The donations were a daily ration of white rice, and then several categories of high status servants, *chatradhāra*, *mālakāra*, *tmoñ*, *rmmam*, *cāmryañ*, and *pamas jnau*, just as are found in the main inscriptions of the central tower, although the order of precedence is different with the parasol holders, garland makers and percussion players preceding dancers and singers. This is followed by a group (*vnnvak*) in “the rice field (*sre*) of *travāñ* (‘pond’) *dralai*”. They consisted of one *amrah* plus the usual *gho*, *tai*, and children.

The second donation was “persons offered by *kamrateñ añ sasrapū* (or *sasrampū*) in *sruk nak guncha* (?)”.²⁷ Besides the usual *tai*, *lap*, and *pamas jnau*, there were two *gvāl* whose task was *cap vñe* (‘pick flowers’), which will be seen relevant in my discussion of *gvāl* below, and the list ends with three *dmuk varṣa*. Two more groups, presumably from the same donor show the usual mixture of *gho*, *gvāl*, *tai*.

The inscription continues with small groups of the same types of personnel offered by (1) *kamrateñ añ pi it acas* (?), (2) *kamrateñ añ lakṣmindradevī*, a female (3) *kamsteñ srañe*, (4) *tāñ steñ las kanmvay* (niece [of]) *vāp* (a title) *bhāgindra* in *sruk jaṃrās*, and (5) *tāñ steñ---* in *sruk vraḥ vināya*. The titles *kamrateñ añ*, *kamsteñ*, *tāñ steñ* are in order of rank and will be discussed below, the first two at least, at that time usually indicated royalty. Aymonier read the first as “Pit Acas (ou Acas)”, but the two syllables *pi it* are clear. *Pi* could be construed as ‘3’, and *it acas* means ‘without master’, although the significance is not

²⁵ See Pou 1992, p. 247. The form *pley* in this sense is found only in K.713, also from Preah Ko, and dated 893. As ‘fruit’ or ‘produce’ *phley* is also found in the 11th-century K. 598. *Ple* occurs in K.1, K.8, K.30, K.44, K.51, K.76, K.90,129, K.133, K.137, K.149, K.163, K.357, K.427, K.480, K.561, K.582, K.726, K.728, K.748, K.759, K.904, K.910, K.922, K.939, K.940. *Jnval/Jnvāl* occur in K.19, K.105, K.168, K.206, K.216, K.220, K.221, K.232, K.241, K.257, K.265, K.352, K.566, K.690, K.693, K.843, K.913, K.957, K.958.

²⁶ Aymonier, p. 443. The term *panlas/panlās* did occur frequently as a personal name, but all the examples in Sakamoto are of commoners, *gho*, *gvāl*, *lap*, *tai*, *si*. See further below.

²⁷ Aymonier, p. 443, wrote “Sarampū” and *sruk* “Uk Tūl (?)”, but *sasra-*, at least, is quite clear, and an *anusvara* nasal marker over the syllable *sra* is plausible, although not visible on the rubbing. Pou 1996, p. 34, has *samrapūta* and *sruk nak kuṣṭha*, ‘leper village’. The second is plausible, but the syllable *ta* goes with the following *ta gi sruk* ‘in the *sruk*’, just as in line 7, page 33, *ta gi sre* means ‘in the rice field’. Coedès and Pou 1992 did not cite any version of these names.

determinable.²⁸ *Pit*, however, was common as a name for high-status persons, and it might have been intended here, if an error by the engraver is assumed.

On its other face K. 313 begins with “persons given by ---- child of *mrateñ śunyaśiva* to *vraḥ kamrateñ añ parameśvara* in *sruk jayagrāma*, a name found in 4 other inscriptions. *Parameśvara* was of course the defunct and deified Jayavarman II, but his titles here, *vraḥ kamrateñ añ* are still identical to those of a living king, and, in pre-Angkor usage, to a god. Aymonier read the damaged name of the donor as “Tāñ Kloñ (?) Teñ”, an unusual, although plausible combination, but the published reproduction does not permit a better approximation, except that the final syllable of the titles, by comparison with the next section, appears to me to be *va*. Her donation consisted of one *amraḥ* of 22 mixed *gho*, *tai*, *lap*, *gvāl* and a child. Pou 1996, p. 31, lines 1-2, did not reproduce these donor titles in their entirety.

The next section is a list of persons offered by a *tāñ [klo]ñ vaḥ*, in which the last term is clear and was recognized as such by Aymonier, child of *mratañ dhrīguṇavijaya*.²⁹ Here also the title *tāñ kloñ* is not certain because of damage, although, especially in comparison with the first context, plausible. If this reading is accurate, we have a title unique to Preah Ko, for *tāñ kloñ* does not appear anywhere else in Khmer epigraphy, although *tāñ kloñ* is found once in K.9 of A.D. 639 from southern Vietnam, and the combination *kloñ tāñ*, which would be quite different from *tāñ kloñ*, is found in the pre-Angkorean K.493 of A.D. 657 and K.561 of A.D. 681. *tāñ*, especially in the Angkor period, usually indicated a woman of high status.³⁰ The donation here was also to *parameśvara*, but no *sruk* is named. In my reading both donors had the same appellation, which, if accurate, means that the entire expression *tāñ kloñ vaḥ* was a title, not the name of a single person, since the fathers were clearly different. An interesting detail is that the title of the father of the first was written *mrateñ*, and of the second *mratañ*. These are respectively the Angkor and pre-Angkor forms of the same title, showing, as expected in these inscriptions, some mixture of the two dialects.

The appearance of titles not found elsewhere and the hierarchy *mratañ* father of *tāñ kloñ* may indicate tentative experimentation with new hierarchies by the growing new elite of early Angkor.

The offerings in this case seem to be utensils and specified weights of precious metals, but the context is nearly half effaced. Aymonier said the same list continued with names of workers, but there is a clear mark for the end of a section following the above. Then the name *pramā[n] [bhī]mapura sruk pat varuṇa* (confirmed in Coedès, “Index”) *nu antām---* is legible. In such a context *nu* usually means ‘and’, and thus *antām* would indicate some

²⁸ The names *lakṣmindradevī*, *sraṇe*, *bhāgindra*, *jamrās*, and *vraḥ vināya* are confirmed in Coedès 1966a, but except for the last they are unique to this inscription. *vraḥ vināya* is also apparently a place name in K.22 in Kampot, but not a *sruk*. *Las* occurs as the name of persons entitled *loñ*, *steñ*, and *vāp* in three other Angkor inscriptions, but that type of name is too common to be of comparative significance. Aymonier translated *kanmvay* as ‘nephew’, but I, and Pou 1996, p. 36, have preferred ‘niece’, because in the Angkor corpus the title *tāñ steñ* usually designates women. It is not found in pre-Angkor inscriptions. Pou 1996, pp. 34, 36, line 28, did not try to read the first name.

²⁹ Coedès 1966a confirmed *vaḥ* in this case, as well as *śunyaśiva* of the preceding section, but listed the name of the *mratañ*, as *guṇavijaya*, ignoring the preceding syllable, no doubt because *dhrī* is otherwise unknown. The reading ‘*śrī*’, at least, is impossible, unless an error by the engraver is assumed. Pou 1996, p. 32, line 9, omitted the donor’s name and wrote *ś rīguṇavijaya*. The place name *jayagrāma* is in the Angkor inscriptions K.91, K.219, K.334, and K.923.

³⁰ For an explanation of such titles see Vickery 1998, chapter 6.

other location. Similar contexts, describing territory “in the North/in the South *nu antām*” are in K.238/A.D. 947 in Battambang, which was also the location of Bhmapura; and in the pre-Angkor K.877 *antam*, in a list of orchards and gardens seems to mean a type of agricultural land, which has led Pou to gloss it as “plantation, orchard”.³¹ Following the ensuing damaged sentence begins a list of one *amrah* with *gho*, *tai*, *lap*, and *si*, after which there is another list of persons beginning with a mysterious phrase which appears to be *anak* (persons) *ta lvan jau kaitvay*, or *jauk jtvay*, and the name of a place, *sruk yaman*.³² In the designation of persons only the term *lvan* is found in other texts and it has been glossed by Pou as “to crawl”, but that hardly fits the contexts, one of which, K.270 is comparatively significant.³³

The last inscription of the central tower, K.314, begins with a date later than the other texts, *aka* 813/A.D. 891, and a person with a very high title, *dhūli jeñ kamsteñ añ śrī īsvaravarmma*, a title in fact appropriate for a king, although one would expect *kamrateñ* rather than *kamsteñ*, but on this see further below. He made a donation to the *īsvārāśrama*, which Aymonier suggested was the name of Preah Ko, if so, the only record of it.³⁴ The donation was also for *vrah kamrateñ añ parameśvara*/Jayavarman II, who had been given particular honor by Indravarman at this temple. His offerings included several utensils, then a group of people from *sruk paṃnvas* in a *pramān* named ---*napura*, which Aymonier read as *īśānapura*, the 7th-century capital of Īśānavarman at Sambor Prei Kuk, Kompong Thom Province. Farther on there is mention of people “taken from *sruk stac* in [*pra*]mān *uttamapura*, and in the last line people taken from *sruk vrah so* in *pramān vigrānta*.”³⁵

No such king, nor anyone else with that name, however, is named in other Khmer texts. The date, moreover, is two years after Indravarman’s son and successor Yaśovarman dated the beginning of his own reign, as seen in the inscriptions of Lolei. Probably this *kamsteñ śrī īsvaravarma* was another son of Indravarman, making a donation to his father’s temple early in the reign of his brother Yaśovarman (see discussion below).

The inscriptions of the second row towers

Only the inscription of the central tower, K.320, is available in a published plate. The inscription of the southern tower is numbered K.322, but without a plate, and that of the

³¹ Pou 1992, p. 14, citing K.238 and K.877, and basing the gloss on the root *tam/tām* ‘to plant’. *Antām* as a type of location also occurs in the late Angkor K.523/A.D. 1118 and K.128/ A.D. 1204.

³² Coedès 1966a, confirmed the names *pat varuṇa* and *yaman*, the latter also found in K.958, and *pramān* Bhīmapura is well attested. Pou 1996, p. 32, line 19, construed the difficult phrase as *anak ta jvan dau aṅvay*, ‘persons sent to stay there’, a plausible interpretation.

³³ Pou 1992, p. 424. Since the term *lvan* occurs only once at Roluos and in such an uncertain context, it might be premature to make any comparison with other inscriptions. In K.270-71, however, *lvan* are very numerous, and according to Aymonier, p. 464, this is also true of the unpublished inscriptions of Koh Ker. Otherwise the term is found only in K.831/A.D. 890, K.879/A.D. 963, and K.584 of the 12th century, all in Battambang.

³⁴ Coedès 1966a noted that the name *īsvārāśrama* is also found in K.863, possibly of the same period, but he did not reproduce the text, nor explain it, and its location, at Phnom Bayang in the far South, means that the reference may be different.

³⁵ Aymonier, pp. 444 and 445. Coedès 1966a confirmed the readings *paṃnvas*, *uttamapura*, and *vrah so*, found nowhere else, and if *vigrānta*, which seems quite clear on the rubbing, could be read as *vikrānta*, as in Pou, p. 37, line 11, it is found at several locations and dates as name of a *grāma* (‘village’), *pura* (‘city’), and a *viśaya* (‘province, region’).

northern tower was so badly damaged that it does not even have a number. It has been presumed that their contents were similar, differing only in the identity of the person apotheosized, in K.320 *kanloñ kamrateñ añ śrī dharañīndradevī*, consort of Jayavarman II/*parameśvara*; in K.322, according to Aymonier who said the titles were legible, “*Kanloñ kamrateñ añ śrī Pṛthivīndradevī*”, consort of Pṛthivīndravarma; and it has been assumed that on the northern tower the inscription would have named Rudradevī, consort of Rudravarma.³⁶

Much of K.320 is also badly effaced, but it is clear that the lists of personnel were of the same type as in the inscriptions of the first row towers. Of special interest is the mention of *sruk vakoñ*, found also in K.809, and presumed to refer to the area of the neighboring Bakong temple (see Pou 1996, p. 54, line 22).

Different from, and unrelated to, the other texts is a short, 10-line text on the north side of the central tower of the second row, also numbered K.320. It is a list of donations from six men entitled *vāp*, of whom the first was a *kloñ vnnvak* (official of the group) attached to *ājñā kanloñ kamrateñ añ*, unnamed, but since this is on the central tower it probably refers to Dharañīndradevī. The last section beginning at the end of line 8, records [*anak*] *çmanvan* (persons offered) [by] *kamrateñ añ* (royal title) *panlas* (in place of) *pamas jno*, 2 names; and *anak çmanvan tāñ rok/mok pamas jno tai panlas*. Here Aymonier still understood *panlas* as a proper name and said it was probably the same princess as named *panlas* in K.313. Probably *panlas* was really the name of the last *tai*, who was a *pamas jno*, but following a royal title *panlas* more probably means ‘in place of’, and it shows a person entitled *kamrateñ añ* offering 2 persons to take the place of *pamas jno*. There is no way to relate this context to that concerning the daughter of Jayavarman II.³⁷

Lolei

The temple of Lolei consists of four towers in two rows, and it was the work of Yaśovarman, son and successor of Indravarma. The main text, K.324, on the south side of the door of the principal northern tower, begins with a 11-line Sanskrit introduction. Then the Khmer text opens with the date 815 *śaka*/A.D. 893, a statement that *dhūli jeñ vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrī yaśovarmadeva* “who reigned”, inferentially ‘who began his reign’ (*ta savey vraḥ rājya*) in 811/A.D. 889, established *vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrīndravarmeśvara*, an apotheosis of his father, and offered servants for the time of the waxing moon.

In general the types of personnel and their relative listings are as at Preah Ko. Interesting differences are that the first listed person is a *taṃrvac* ‘inspector’, who was a woman (*tai*), a function which did not appear at Preah Ko, and which, when it does appear in later Angkor inscriptions is always filled by males; the presence of a female *çamryañ stuti* among the first group of *artistes*, whereas at Preah Ko, it appeared only in the second listing, and was a male; *lmām*, instead of *cmām*, for the *vraḥ pitai*; a category of women, *cmām hajaya*, (a term unknown elsewhere) listed just before *dmuk varṣā*; and the presence of many *gvāl* among the inner servants.³⁸

³⁶ Aymonier, pp. 447-50. Pou 1996, p. 53, did not read the titles *kanloñ kamrateñ*. The title *kanloñ kamrateñ añ* indicates a deceased royal female.

³⁷ In Sakamoto’s index, there are 68 commoners named *panlas*, but in 9 contexts involving high-ranking persons *panlas* clearly refers to replacement or substitution. As examples see Coedès’ treatments of K.79, K.258, K.450, and K.521. Pou, pp. 57, 58, still took *panlas* as a proper name, but did not read it as the name of the last worker, whom she called *pandan*.

³⁸ Aymonier, p. 466, did not try to explain *hajaya*. Pou 1992, p. 545, and Pou 1996, p. 62, has proposed a gloss “shelter...for gardeners and fieldkeepers”, but that is extremely speculative and is based on another unique, or at least very rare, term *jei/jai* cited from a poor

That is, in K.324 following the *kloñ sruk*, the *varī*, the *pamek*, *cmām pjuh*, *pile*, and *cmām mās prak*, *gvāl* appear in the functions of *ābhaśa*, *smañ*, *mālkāra*, *amuḥ dik sroñ*, and *chatradhāra*, and there are also *gvāl* among the second group of entertainers, as *cāmryaṇ śikharā*, *gandharvva*, *tūrya*, and as *cmām śālā*, and even one *gvāl* near the end of the list of *dmuk varṣā*, otherwise, as at Preah Ko, entirely women with their children.

After this, at line 44, the list differs from Preah Ko. First comes a group of *cmām cpar*, ‘gardeners’, ‘orchard keepers’, beginning with a *dvañ*, and including one *gvāl* among the men (*si*), women (*tai*) and children. This is followed in line 47 by *cmām tpal*, ‘herders’? or ‘grove tenders’?, comprising one *gho*, one *si* and one *lap*; and a group called *anak pamre kloñ vnaṃ*, ‘servants of the temple officials’ (*kloñ*), taking *vnaṃ* ‘mountain’ in its subsidiary sense of ‘temple’. These servants also included one *gvāl*, and a *si caṃdak vraḥ*, a category (*caṃdak*) of worker prominent in 7th-century inscriptions, but still not understood.³⁹ There was one more group of *anak pamre*, badly damaged, but comparison with the companion inscription, K.324, north side, indicates that it was probably *pamṇvas smiñ*, ‘monks who conduct cult services’. There also *gvāl* were prominent. K.324 North lists the same categories, but has a shorter Sanskrit introduction without dates and two lines of Sanskrit at the end.

Similar inscriptions are K.327, the South and North sides of the door of the principal southern tower, K.330 on the sides of the doors of the second northern tower, and K.331 in the same situations in the second southern tower. These inscriptions all begin with the long Sanskrit introduction and the same two dates, the year in question and the year when Yaśovarman began his reign. The lists of personnel follow the same structure, although shorter. The main difference is in the persons apotheosized. In K.327 it was *vraḥ kamrateṇ aṅ śrī mahīpatiśvara*, in K.330 it was *vraḥ ājñā kanloṅ kamrateṇ aṅ śrī indradevī*, and in K.331 it was *vraḥ ājñā kanloṅ kamrateṇ aṅ śrī rājendradevī*. Thus, the four towers of Lolei were dedicated respectively to Yaśovarman’s parents Indravarman and Indradevī in the two principal towers, and to his maternal grandparents, Mahīpativarman and his consort Rājendradevī in the two secondary towers.

Lolei minor inscriptions

These are K.325A and B, K.326C and D, K.328, K.329B and C, K.332, and K.337, on the narrow sides of the false doors of the principal South and North towers, the second South tower, and a separate pillar.

The first two of these texts, K.325A,B, are on the North tower of the first row. K.325 is dated 815/A.D. 893, and is the donation of a very high-ranking person, *dhūli jeṇ vraḥ kamrateṇ aṅ śrī jayendravarma*, to *vraḥ kamrateṇ aṅ śrī indravarmeśvara*, the apotheosized form of Yaśovarman’s father Indravarman to whom the main inscription of this tower was dedicated. The donation list starts with the name of a district, *sruk tvañ*, otherwise unknown, in *pramān śrīndrapura*, probably the Indrapura known from pre-Angkor inscriptions and usually understood as located somewhere in Kompong Thom or Kompong Cham. Then a list

source, and with no better example supplied from the Middle Khmer literature where Pou says it occurs (see also Pou 1984, p. 95). It would have been better to just cite Cham *hajai*, some kind of ‘domain’, but which would still leave uncertainty about Old Khmer *hajaya*.

³⁹ Aymonier, p. 467, thinking of modern *tpāl* (/tbaal/), interpreted *cmām tpal* as “guardians of mortars or rice mills”, but no one else has construed Old Khmer *tpal/thpal* in that sense (see Pou 1992, p. 224). The subject of *caṃdak* has been discussed in Vickery 1998, pp. 232-34. In the 7th century a single *va caṃdak vraḥ* in a list of unspecified personnel is found in K.8, K.66 and K.600, the last the oldest dated Khmer inscription, A.D. 611.

of persons begins with *kloñ vnnvak* (group official) *kaṃloñ* (personal name of the official, or designation of the type of group?).⁴⁰ Then there is an *aṃrah* with a mixed group of 29 *gho*, *gvāl*, *tai*, and children, *dmuk varṣā*; and at the very end another donation by a royal person, *kamrateñ añ śrī narādhipativarma* [of] *sruk kvāc*, *pramān vyak*. The details of his donation are lost. Pou 1996, p. 65, line 35, wrote *pramān cyek*, but, as will be clear, this is incorrect.

The second part of this inscription, K.325B, lists donations of three lower-ranking persons, 2 *vāp* and one *mrateñ*. The persons offered are the usual mix of *gho*, *tai*, *gvāl*, and children. One detail of interest is that the second *vāp* was from *sruk stuk kak kat*, probably far in the Northwest (see below).

The two parts of K.326 contain a number of interesting details. First, K.326C begins with *amoy*, not found elsewhere, but obviously either an alternate form of, or an engraver's error for, *aṃnoy*, 'gift, donation', derived from *oy* 'give', and a usual form of introducing a foundation in pre-Angkor inscriptions which was replaced by other formulas in the Angkor period, although the word itself is still part of the current language.⁴¹ Then the list of donations starts with *vṛtti*, 'subsistence, supplies, provisions', in *sruk vralen*, offerings of *kamrateñ añ cneṃ*. The list of presumed *vṛtti* which follows is rather mysterious, containing 10 otherwise unknown names or terms, separated by the vertical line which indicates '1' in other lists of persons, and which ends, like other lists of persons, with "*psaṃ* ('altogether') 10". Aymonier construed it as persons "whose names all have a foreign appearance and seem to be taken from the dialects of the primitive tribes who live in the forests of eastern Cambodia". He thought that "they were attached to the cultivation of gardens or plantations of betel", which he also construed in K.326D, where the names of the *gho* and *tai* are in no way unusual. Apparently Aymonier understood *vṛtti* as 'betel'--at least there is no other term which could have been misunderstood that way--but this is no longer acceptable. As for the names in K.326C, they are not recorded elsewhere, and Pou did not list them in her *Dictionnaire*, so perhaps Aymonier's proposal about foreign names was correct, modified to take account of the name of their *sruk*, *vralen*. It is a perfect pre-Angkor correspondence to the Angkor form *vralyañ*, name of a *sruk* in K.843/A.D. 1025, situated in the *pramān* of Amoghapura, known to be in the Northwest. Of course, non-Khmer peoples were found there too.⁴² Pou 1996, pp. 67, 68, noted the exotic names, but did not comment on their possible origins, nor on Aymonier's construal of 'betel'; and she assumed the *kamrateñ añ* to be female, which is not at all certain. She read without question *dvañ āñāj*, but made it one of the 10 by eliminating the distinction between *āñ* and *vār*.

In K.326D, a very narrow inscription with only half a dozen characters per line, donations were recorded from [*ka*]nhyañ *kamrateñ añ* (a female title) *ame* (mother [of]) *kamrateñ añ jayendradevī*, obviously also a woman.⁴³ Jayendradevī was probably the consort

⁴⁰ *kaṃloñ* is a derivative of *kloñ*. Pou 1992, p. 89, glosses it as a 'group of *kloñ*', or 'their position, job, power'. Pou 1996, however, p. 65, line 8, transcribed it as *kanloñ*.

⁴¹ In the index of Sakamoto there are 128 occurrences of *aṃnoy* in pre-Angkor inscriptions, but only 1 from the Angkor period, in K.258/A.D. 1096, in a context quite different from its use in the pre-Angkor corpus. *Amoy* (*qmoy*) was noted correctly in Pou 1996, pp. 67, 68.

⁴² Pou 1992, p. 467; Aymonier, pp. 453-54. The 10 unusual appellations are: *ayaur*, *cāñlaur*, *āñ*, *vār*, *luñpiāñ*, *vāñtaun*, *caṃvaladak*, *vālaur*, *rāycāy*, *varvyañ*. Between the name of the donor *kamrateñ añ cneṃ* and the 10 names there is another mysterious term '-*vāñ āñāj*', possibly *dvañ āñāj*, and if so it reinforces the interpretation that *dvañ* was a type of group, not a person.

⁴³ Aymonier, p. 454, read *kanhyañ*, although in the published rubbing the first syllable is not visible.

of the *dhūli jeñ vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrī jayendravarman* who recorded his offerings in K.325A noted above. Neither of them is mentioned in other records, and thus their identities cannot be established. Jayendravarman, however, had titles which were equivalent to those of a king, which means he was probably a son or brother of either Indravarman or Yaśovarman, or possibly of one of their predecessors Jayavarman II or III.

The titles of Jayendradevī's mother are interesting. Their only other occurrence, with the spelling *kanheñ*, is as the hereditary titles of three queens of Śambhupura recorded in K.124 of A.D. 802, and whose close relationship to Jayavarman II seems secure. The *kanhyañ kamrateñ añ* of K.326 was probably a generation or two removed from the last queen of K.124, but bearing the same traditional title, and her appearance at Lolei illustrates the apparently peaceful amalgamation of Śambhupura with the main central Cambodian state, which was to become Angkor, at the time of Jayavarman II (see further below).

K.328 begins with the date 815/A.D. 893 and is a list of offerings from a royal person, *kamrateñ añ śrī narādhipativarma* to *vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrī mahīpativarma*, Yaśovarman's maternal grandfather who figured as the apotheosized object of the principal inscription of the same tower. The list of offerings starts with *sruk kvāc*, an *aṃraḥ*, 4 *gho*, 4 *tai*, and 2 children; then 1 *tai pamas jnau/jno*, and 1 *si mahānasa*, and the totals, where the *si mahānasa* is totaled with the *gho*. Thus, it is a short version of the main inscriptions. The donor, *narādhipativarma*, is the same person as recorded in K.325, with the identity supported by mention of his connection with *sruk kvāc*. Pou 1996, p. 24, line 4, inexplicably read *dharādhipativarma* instead of *narādhipativarma*.

The two parts of K.329, B and C, are quite different. The first lines of K.329 B are cut off at the ends, but they seem to record a sacred/royal offering (*vraḥ camnvan*) of or to a *kamrateñ añ a[?]le [=anle]----* (comparison with part C will indicate that 'to' was the intention). The offerings which follow are called *vṛtti* of *sruk* (illegible), *pramān malyāñ*, for one year (*cnām mvay*). *Pramān malyāñ* is well known by both this Angkor form of its name, and the pre-Angkor version *maleñ* as a region in Battambang or Pursat.⁴⁴ The *vṛtti* here are large quantities of provisions of cloth and foodstuffs.

The second part, K.329C, which is a separate section starting on line 12, is more difficult. It begins, *knar bhadāsannāha* [otherwise unknown expressions] *ti jvan ta* (offered to) *vraḥ kamrateñ añ* (god[s]) *anle 4* ([in]4 places). This is the evidence that the title [*kamra]teñ añ a[?]le* of the first part should be read *anle*, probably *anle 4*. Aymonier's version, "pious foundations of a Bhaṭa (for Bhaṭṭa, doctor) made to the divinities of four sanctuaries", is certainly not accurate. Pou has interpreted *knar* as a protective wall, or a protected domain, such as a village or temple, and has construed *bhadāsannāha* as an error for *bhadrasannāha* and glossed it as "having a beautiful or auspicious armour", but even if these two explanations are each plausible separately, they do not make sense together in the present context.⁴⁵

The Khmer text continues, after 'in 4 places', *ta* (who, which) *cām knar* (guard the *knar*) *aṅgarakṣa* (bodyguards) *nu* (and) *prīti* (favorites) *vṛtti* (supplies) *ta tapra* (in proper order) *cnām mvay* (one year); and then follow large quantities of salt, salted food, paddy, white rice, mats, lime, and other products. That is, a year's supply of provisions was donated for the bodyguards who guarded the *knar bhadāsannāha* offered to the divinities of the 4 places. Thus, *knar* cannot be construed precisely as Pou hypothesized, although the phrase

⁴⁴ On Malyāñ see Coedès 1964, pp. 192, 311, 329, 390.

⁴⁵ Aymonier, p. 455; Pou 1992, pp. 111, 349; Pou 1996, p. 76. *Sannāha* is from Sanskrit *saṃnāha* (See Monier-Williams, p. 1146). In fact, Pou did not base her gloss of *knar* on this phrase, but on the second occurrence of the term.

knar bhadassannāha does suggest something providing protection.⁴⁶

The author of the 8 surviving lines of K.332 was the same *kamrateñ añ śrī narādhipativarma* who was mentioned in K.325, and who was responsible for K.328. His third record also begins with the date 815/893, and its dedication is to *vraḥ ājñā kanloñ kamrateñ añ śrī rājendrudevī*, a representation of the consort of *mahīpatīśvara/mahīpativarma* to whom he dedicated K.328. The same locality, *sruk kvāc in pramān vyak*, is also named. The *pramān vyak* (or *vraḥ vyek/vek*) is known from pre-Angkor records as located somewhere between Kompong Thom and Kompong Cham, and this was probably Narādhipativarman's own district. Incidentally *vraḥ vek/vyek* in K.107 (probably 8th century) is the first *pramān* recorded. Here Pou 1996, p. 84, line 9, read *vyak* correctly (see p. 53 above).

The last inscription for which there is a published plate is K.337 from one of a gallery of pillars.⁴⁷ The first lines are obviously missing, and the first visible line begins with *vrahmalok* (Pou, p. 85, read *vrahma sot*), probably a proper name of a person listed, for it is followed by 3 named *tai*. The second line starts with *~marendrapura*, probably from *amarendrapura*, the name of a region in the Northwest, followed by an *aṃraḥ* and several of the usual personnel. Next comes a group from *sruk candoñvuro*, in *pramān śreṣṭhapura*, and personnel. Then there is a new category not named before, *psok*, from Śambhupura who were settled in *sruk stuk cok*. These *psok* were also *gho*, *gvāl*, and *tai*. More *psok* came from *tryamvakapura* to be settled in *sruk pralāy*, which Aymonier was able to read as 'Pralāy Vāt'. The inscription ends with totals which show that the original text listed 7 *sruk* and 396 persons.⁴⁸

Aymonier translated *psok* as 'emigrants', and "selon toute vraisemblance les gens des colonies, les serfs ou paysans qui avaient fondé de nouveaux villages". He offered no linguistic reason for this, and apparently derived it just from the fact that in these inscriptions the *psok* came from one place and were settled in another. This term does not occur in pre-Angkor inscriptions, but *phsok*, a normal Angkor form of *psok*, is found in several contexts as

⁴⁶ For *prīti* Pou 1992, p. 333, without citing this context, suggested "pleasure, affection, love". Pou 1996, p. 76, said "corps de gardes dévoués". Between 'mats' and 'lime' the list includes *sbak srāl pi pac*, listed by Pou 1992, p. 516, under *srāl* 'light', but she was unable to supply glosses for the other terms, which, indeed are unknown elsewhere. See also Pou 1996, p. 76, for other conjectures. For the gloss of *ta tapra* I have accepted the suggestion of Jenner 1981, pp. 112-13, that it is the same as Angkorean *ta tāpra*, found several times in K.235 (Sdok Kak Thom) in the phrase *ru ta tāpra*, and rendered there by Coedès as "suivant l'ordre établi". It occurs in a context similar to K.329, in connection with *vṛtti*, in K.124, in the phrase, *tapra mān ta gi vṛtī*. It was not treated by Pou 1992, although she cited it in the context of the 'slave' name *ku gui ru ta tapra*, under *ru* 'as, like', p. 403. In fact, *ta tapra* forms part of the appellations of three ordinary working persons in pre-Angkor inscriptions, that cited above in K.582, *va gi ru ta tapra* in K.709, and *ku cer ta tapra* in K.904. In none of these cases did Coedès offer an explanation in his publications of these texts. In K.124 he rendered the phrase in question as "qui recevront la subsistance", which is only a broad paraphrase. Pou, p. 76, rendered it reasonably as *régulier*.

⁴⁷ Aymonier, pp. 437-39, describes a gallery of very damaged pillars, from which he made rubbings of 8 inscriptions, all very ruined and not considered worthy of publication.

⁴⁸ Pou 1992, p. 336, read *gambhirapura* instead of *śambhupura*, but this is certainly not accurate, although it seems to me that what is visible on the published plate is *gapupura*, an unacceptable construal. If there must be an emendation, *śambhupura* is to be preferred. Coedès 1966a confirms the readings *candoñvuro* and *tryamvakapura*, but neither is known from other records.

name of individual laborers, and in two contexts in which it seems to indicate a category of persons. These are K.222, *cāp tai gandha jā phsok thvāy*, and in K.886, *phsok man cām jmaḥ tai*.... . In neither of these was Coedès able to explain *phsok*, and his translations were, respectively, “... avait pris la tai Gandha qui était *phsok* (?) pour l’offrir au roi”, and “*phsok* dont on se rappelle le nom”. It is at least clear that *phsok* was a category of person. Pou 1992 did not offer an explanation for *psok*, but she glossed *phsok* as “who takes away, steals”, without relating it to *psok*, and her gloss does not at all fit either the two contexts cited above, nor the *psok* of the Roluos inscriptions.⁴⁹ Pou 1996, p. 86, interprets *psok* as war prisoners, with a reasonable reference to K.1036 (pp. 160-61).

Conclusions

Having reviewed the major features of these inscriptions it may be possible to add to the general picture of the history of the period, and to explain some details which have hitherto remained obscure. From the above it should already be clear that the Roluos inscriptions, in their terminology, are of a genre to themselves, neither pre-Angkor nor Angkorean. In that sense they fit their geographical location which had not been important in the pre-Angkor period, at least not until the 8th century, and which did not persist as the political center of Angkor. They reflect well what is already believed known about the founder of Hariharlaya, ancient Roluos, as political center. Jayavarman II originated outside the main dynasties of pre-Angkor Cambodia, and probably came from an excentric region, the Southeast, and in these inscriptions we find the first occurrences of certain titles, such as *vāp*, which never appear in the pre-Angkor corpus, but which in Angkor inscriptions feature prominently in the records of families claiming descent from, or early collaboration with, Jayavarman II.⁵⁰

The Roluos inscriptions show an impressive increase in central control over both territory and population. They are of a type which only appeared at the end of the pre-Angkor period in the 8th century when working personnel (I prefer to avoid ‘slave’) began to be listed by territorial groups from places apparently subordinate to the chief responsible for the inscription. This type of inscription could be interpreted as revealing stronger control by one center whose leaders could call on groups of workers from surrounding areas, in contrast to the earlier texts from southern Cambodia which showed chiefs of equal rank pooling resources under a joint administrator. The listing of personnel, whether *kñum* or not, by territorial group seems to be a significant feature of 8th century development, with the earliest prominent list in the royal inscription of Queen Jayadevī, K.904, AD 713. In principle, identification of the territories enumerated should provide some indication of the extent of political hegemony. For example, the list of toponyms in Jayadevī’s K.904 indicates her realm may not have been as restricted as generally supposed.⁵¹

Even the division of personnel into sections for periods of the waxing (*knet*) and waning (*rnoc*) moon shows greater regimentation than in the pre-Angkor records which reflect a looser, probably more local, administration. Moreover, the very language of the

⁴⁹ Pou 1992, pp. 336, 340, but Pou referred only to one example of *phsok* as a personal name, and to *phsak*, which may not be assumed the same. K.886 is also from Roluos, it is dated A.D. 902 from the reign of Yaśovarman’s son Īśānavarman, and it is interesting for its 5-generation genealogy of commoners who were *phsok*. K.222 was from Battambang and the reign of Sūryavarman I.

⁵⁰ For detailed discussion see Vickery 1986, 1993, and 1998, chapter 6.

⁵¹ . At least 5 different types of foundations may be discerned in the numerous pre-Angkor Khmer records of the 7th century. See Vickery 1998, chapter 7 on types of foundations, and chapter 8 on Jayadevī; for the traditional view of Jayadevī see, Coedès 1964, p. 162.

Roluos texts shows tentative shifts in terminology which must reflect the innovative character of this institution which continued with different terminology into the Angkor period. Thus Indravarman's inscriptions list "persons serving in the *ver* ('shift', 'turn') *knet/rnoc*", an expression not found elsewhere, while Yaśovarman's lists are "persons serving *toy* ('by') *knet/rnoc*", a phrase found also in K.809, and in later Angkor inscriptions, although K.324, etc., and K.809 preserve the pre-Angkor spelling *knet* which in later inscriptions became *khnet*.

Categories of personnel

In several places above I have indicated that the special terminology of the Roluos inscriptions shows special relationships, or surprising absence of relationship, with texts from other areas or times. The relationship is especially close with the inscriptions of Prasat Kravan (K.270-271), and, according to Aymonier, with the long unpublished registers of Koh Ker. Several of the rare terms also appear in K.99 from Kompong Cham. All of these are from the middle of the 10th century, the time of Jayavarman IV. Sometimes the Roluos inscriptions continue pre-Angkor traditions, but in other details they show the first examples of Angkor features different from preceding records.

Of particular interest in this respect are certain terms indicating categories of personnel. Although some names of functions and work duties are still not understood, the Roluos inscriptions add to our knowledge of some terms, and in this area also show a difference from pre-Angkor, or Angkor, society, or both.

Gho

Prominent among the apparent field workers at Roluos were the *gho*, a word which occurs a few times in pre-Angkor records, but then very prominently at Angkor until mid-11th century, after which it is rare.. In their use of this term the Roluos inscriptions are in a chain of steady development from pre-Angkor to Angkor.

Saveros Pou has in different contexts offered two explanations of *ghoda*. Her first explanation was that "the word *ghoda*, probably of native origin,...I can only surmise that it belonged to a dialect other than that to which *si* belonged"; and "As far as I know, it has no cognates in any Austroasiatic language". Later she offered a different opinion, that *ghoda*, or *gho*, derived from Prakrit *ghoda* 'horse' (Sanskrit *ghoṭa*) and meant 'strong male slave', as it were, a stud.⁵² Most contexts indeed suggest that *gho* were field workers, but the Prakrit origin seems unduly forced. The Roluos records do not help with the etymology, but they reinforce the definition 'male field worker', although in K.328 a male cook (*si mahānasa*) was also a *gho*. Perhaps the lists of *gho* should be given more attention for other exceptions.

gvāl

For *gvāl*, however, the Roluos texts provide new evidence which permits greater understanding and should force modification of the standard view of the meaning and etymology of this term.

As in the case of *gho*, the Roluos texts show wide use of a term which is hardly known from pre-Angkor inscriptions, but which is frequent in Angkor records until the 11th century. Contrary to Pou, who wrote that it is "attested abundantly among slaves from the pre-Angkor epoch", the term *gvāl* is found in only two pre-Angkor contexts, but over 190 times in the post-Roluos Angkor corpus. Coedès first said *gvāl/ghvāl* was 'herdsman', based on the modern term /khveal/, written *ghvāl*. It seemed to make etymological sense too, for *vāl* is 'field', and the velar prefix might be assumed to give it a related nominal meaning. The

⁵² Pou 1976b, p. 766; Pou 1986; and Pou 1992, p. 145.

root *vāl* 'field' was also the explanation offered by Jenner and Pou.⁵³

The Khmer velar prefixed element, however, is unvoiced /k/, not /g/, *g*. This was no doubt what led Pou to reconsider it in her “Lexicographie”. She kept the gloss, ‘gardien d’animaux’, adding ‘gardien d’éléphants’, but derived it from Prakrit *govāla*, *goalla*, Sanskrit *gopāla*, ‘gardien des vaches’ (‘cowherd’). This does no violence to one of the pre-Angkor contexts, K.155, where it might be construed as ‘herdsman’, but in the other, K.689, the expression is “*tmur* [cattle] *gvāl*”, in which *gvāl* is not 'herdsman' but must be taken as qualifying a type of cattle, or action performed with the cattle. In K.99 there is a unique appearance of *gañvāl*, an obviously Khmer infixated form of *gvāl*, which weakens the hypothesis that *gv-* in *gvāl* derives from Indic. In the groups listed in K.315 and K.318 of the Roluos records, ‘herdsman’, even Pou’s ‘elephant keeper’ is plausible, but in other texts of this group *gvāl* are among the musicians, in K.313 two *gvāl* are among a group of *tai* and *lap* as ‘flower pickers’, another function otherwise mentioned only in K.99, although not there filled by *gvāl*, and in the inscriptions of Lolei there were *gvāl* who were *ābhaṣa*, *mālakāra*, *amuḥ dak sroṇ*, *smañ*, *chatradhāra*, *gandharva*, *tūryya*, and one *dmuk varṣā*, some of these being functions usually filled by women. Because of that I think that *gvāl* should be considered as indicating a category of person defined in some other way than by type of work, and perhaps including both men and women. It might thus not be related to modern *ghvāl* [/khveal/] ‘to herd’.

Dalmak/dalmāk

Understanding of *dalmak* is also improved by study of the Roluos inscriptions where this unusual term is found more than anywhere else, in K.312, K.316, and K.319. In spite of the notice given it in treatments of early pre-Angkor history, its first attested occurrence is in these texts, and it is found only four times in later Angkor inscriptions, K.105/A.D. 987, K.256/979, K.178/994, and K.158/1003, none of which gives a clue to its meaning.

Coedès considered that *dalmāk* was equivalent to Sanskrit *vyādha*, ‘hunter’, and that the Chinese name for the Funan capital, 'T'ö-mou/ T'e-mu', would have been pronounced, according to Karlgren, *d'i'k-miuk*, thus, hypothetically, '*dalmak*'. Coedès' purpose was to identify the Chinese report with Vyādhapura, a name found in Cambodian inscriptions, and which Coedès believed was the capital of Funan. P. Dupont even asserted mistakenly that that *dalmāk* was one of only three attested Funanese words.⁵⁴

Coedès hypothesized that in the manner of Old Khmer *kalmvan* > Mod. Khmer /kramuon/ 'wax', *dalmāk* was the ancient form of *dramāk* modern /tromāk, tromeak/, found in Khmer and some other Mon-Khmer languages. This is in principle acceptable, but /tromeak/ means 'mahout', perhaps also with the sense of 'lassooer'. Coedès, however, added that it "could have the meaning 'hunter' which would go well with *dalmāk* in the text above" (K.158). The last is certainly gratuitous. In that inscription there is just a single mention of a *dalmāk* as someone from whom a piece of land was purchased, and it could just as well have been a mahout, or any other function, as far as that context shows.

That linguistic reconstruction of the names is also of insufficient rigor. The apparent etymology of '*dalmk*', if it is a variant of /tromeak/, is 'lassooer', perhaps by extension 'hunter', although there is no evidence that it was a general term for 'hunter', while *vyādha* means "to pierce, transfix, hit, wound, one who pierces or wounds", and by extension "hunter".

⁵³ Pou 1984, p. 92; Coedès, discussion of K.155, p. 68, “gardiens de bestiaux”; Jenner and Pou 1980-81, p. 346. Pou 1996, p. 28, says “gardiens d’animaux, probablement de jeunes garçons”.

⁵⁴ Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge II*, p. 110, n. 5; Dupont 1943-46, p. 43, n. 1.

In the Roluos inscriptions, however, *dalmak* seems to be a designation for large groups of people, including men, women, and children, who were divided into all of the usual functional groups of the time. It is thus very unlikely that the term has anything to do with elephant lore, and, moreover, it is probably unrelated to Modern Khmer /tromeak/, which appears to be a loan word from some other Mon-Khmer language.⁵⁵

Vari/varī

Another term which Pou said indicated “servant tending elephants”, thus hardly different from *gvāl* or *dalmak*, is *vari/varī*. For an etymology justifying this gloss Pou refers to Sanskrit *vari* ‘water’, and *vāri*, “a place where elephants are enclosed or tied”. Interestingly, Aymonier also said that “les Varī étaient peut-être chargés des éléphants”, although without any explanation.⁵⁶

Here too the Roluos inscriptions are of interest, for the term *vari* is rare in pre-Angkor records and is not found at all in later Angkor inscriptions.

In the pre-Angkor corpus *vari/varī* occurs in five inscriptions, one of which (K.590) is too fragmentary for analysis. Only one, K.127/683, is dated. In two of them the *vari* occupy positions which indicate some importance, just after the initial statement concerning donations by the principal official. In K.129 their list comprised over 20 names of *vā*, males, of which two, *gandharva* and *vādya*, indicate musicians; and in K.127 from the same area, near Kratie, the nature of *varī* as some type of function is clear from the context “1 substitute *varī*, 1 *viśeṣagup* [presumably a title], *poñ----*”, thus obviously persons of high rank, and whom Coedès said were ‘respectable persons’ (*pādamūla*).⁵⁷ In the former they were followed by a list of some kind of sewers, *tmir sñak*. Similarly in K.155 the *vari* were 18 males, including again a *gandarva*, and a *vañśigīta*, probably ‘flute player’, and they were followed in the listing by female dancers, *pedānātaka rpam* with polysyllabic Sanskrit names. The other names do not immediately suggest artistic functions, but they are of forms which suggest work of some kind. One, (*vā*) *tvān* means a large type of machete, and perhaps further research into these mostly Khmer, or Mon-Khmer, terms will reveal other work associations, although modern Khmer is unhelpful on this point.

These contexts do not support an identification of *vari* with any kind of elephant workers, and rather suggest that the *vari* were relatively high-status *artistes* and craft specialists. This is also suggested by the place of *vari* at Roluos, in a middle group of apparently inner servants. Note that in the lists of persons following *vari* another unidentified function was *pile*, and that in the pre-Angkor K.155, the *pile* follow immediately after the *vari*. *Pile* too is a term more in evidence at Roluos than elsewhere. Other than in K.155, it appears only in the 10th-century K.56, in a sequence reminiscent of Roluos, “*rmām 2 caṃryyāñ 5 pile 1 uḥ dik sroñ mahānasa*.”⁵⁸

Lmām and pitai

⁵⁵ On the last point see Vickery 1998, “Appendix”, ‘*Dalmāk, dalmak*. Pou 1996 did not discuss this term.

⁵⁶ Pou 1984, p. 156, and 1992, p. 432; Aymonier, p. 465.

⁵⁷ On the high status of *poñ*, see Vickery 1986, and Vickery 1998, chapter 6. The contexts are K.155, K.427 (*vari*), K.127, K.129, K.590 (*varī*). In K.115 the term *vari* appears, but as a personal name of *vā* which may not be assimilated to the other contexts, and the same may be true of the badly fragmented K.590.

⁵⁸ Note that in contrast to the Roluos inscriptions, where *pile*, *amuḥ dik sroñ* (‘persons who heat [*amuḥ*] water for washing’) and *mahānasa* (a cook) are explicitly separate persons, the phrase in K.56 means literally that the *pile* heated (*uḥ*) the cook’s water.

The Lolei inscriptions record a function *lm vraḥ pitai*, replacing *cmām vraḥ pitai* at Preah Ko. Neither *lmām* nor *pitai* have been understood, although *cmām vraḥ pitai* no doubt meant ‘keeper/guard of the sacred *pitai*’. *lmām* occurs nowhere else, and *pitai* is found in only two other records, the pre-Angkor K.44, and the late Angkor K.277 in the form *pitay*, presumed to be the same as *pitai*. Both Coedès and Pou considered that they represent some kind of cakes.⁵⁹ In her *Dictionnaire* Pou ignores *pitay*, cites only *pitai*, and apparently bases the gloss ‘cake’ on the term *nam* ‘cake’ preceding *pitai* in the imprecation of K.44. This is not adequate, especially where, as in the imprecation of K.44, several other relevant terms preceding *pitai* are poorly understood. In pre-Angkor Khmer, however, *nam* also meant ‘lead, guide, take’, as in K.137, “*nam kñum vrau moy slicc*”, ‘take 400 *vrau* slaves’, and thus in 7th-century inscriptions there is possible confusion between ‘cake’ and ‘lead’, both written *nam* (vM). In Angkor period inscriptions ‘lead’ was written *nām* (vaM), as in modern Khmer.⁶⁰ Thus, the context of K.44 could mean ‘taking the *pitai*’.

Coedès, however, also accepted *nam* in K.44 as ‘cake’ because of the context of *pitay* in K.227 at Banteay Chmar where the inscription seems to describe a scene on a bas-relief which it accompanies, and in which defenders are throwing cake-like objects into the mouth of an attacking monster. Coedès interpreted them as some type of sacred cake, both because of this scene and because they are preceded by the term *vraḥ* indicating sacred objects or persons.

Assuming that is accurate for *pitai*, even if we do not know what *pitai* were made of nor why they were sacred or powerful, what is the significance of *lmām*, and why did it replace *cmām* for the persons concerned with *pitai* in the Lolei inscriptions? The term *lmām* consists of a base word *lām* with nasal infix indicating an agent, that is, the person who carries out the action of the verb. The word *lām* itself with a relevant meaning is not found either in modern Khmer or in ancient inscriptions, but Jenner and Pou have listed it with the gloss “to lead, guide” as the base form within *lamnām*, ‘guiding: guidance, direction, management’.⁶¹

If this is accurate, and at least formally it is acceptable, then *lmām* may be construed as the agentival derivative of the same base form *lām* from which *lamnām* also derived; and the change in language in the Lolei inscriptions would represent a more precise definition of the task of the persons concerned with the sacred *pitai*, not just to guard them, but to arrange them and move them about as required ceremonially.

Children

Throughout the Roluos inscriptions children, with a few exceptions (the mysterious *vanro* and *amlan*), are designated as *po/pau* ‘nursing’, or *rat*, ‘run’, that is, children able to move about on their own, with these terms preceded by ‘male’ or ‘female’, usually *si* and *tai*, but in K.312, K.316, and K.319, the animal terms *jmol* and *ye*. Both Aymonier and Pou 1992 construed the *si* and *tai rat* as adult laborers who had fled, but the position of their listings proves that they were children.⁶² These terms are not at all controversial, and in this respect

⁵⁹ Coedès, “Stèle de Práh Kuhã Lûon”, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* II, p. 10-13, inscription K.44; and Coedès, 1929, inscription K.227 of the time of Jayavarman VII (see p. 311, n. 2); Pou 1992, p. 313.

⁶⁰ I am not convinced by the conventional translation of *kñum* as ‘slave’, but it is of no import here. See Vickery 1998, pp. 225-31, 239-46. For *nām* see Pou 1992, p. 280.

⁶¹ Jenner and Pou 1980-81, p. 338. See also Pou 1996, p. 62.

⁶² Aymonier, p. 463, “Nous supposons qu’il s’agit des fugitifs”; Pou 1992, pp. 391-92, “il s’agit bien des serviteurs ‘revenus d’une fuite’”. Pou 1996, pp. 49, 66, 86, revised her view to

the Roluos inscriptions differ from pre-Angkor usage. There, in addition to *pau*, we see two other terms referring to children's ages, or growth stages, *der* and *lān* found in K.24, K.137, K.149, K.155, and K.505. Neither of these terms may be explained easily either by context or by Khmer etymology alone, but, on the basis of a Mon comparison *lān* may be understood as a child still carried on its mother's hip, while *der*, in sequence with *pau* and *lān* may be construed as 'pre-pubescent'. Possibly, *amlān*, of whom there were 4 male children in K.312, is a derivative of *lān*.⁶³

Another term peculiar to the Roluos group and to Prasat Kravan which may indicate children nearly grown, or which in fact may be a category of young adult, is *lap*, who occupy several functions, and in some totals are listed following adults and just before children (see the examples of K.312 and K.319 above). In other cases, however, *lap* were mixed among adult workers (K.313, under *sasrapū*); in K.324 the rice sorters, a female group in other texts, were 4 *lap*, and there were *lap* among the *tai* with their children in the *mahavrīhi* group. Here too the totals show *lap* between adults and children. Aymonier proposed that *lap* "semble indiquer des femmes, il se rapportait peut-être à un état de faiblesse", but he recognized that it meant a special condition, because it was sometimes joined with other qualifying terms. Pou was unable to propose an explanation, but glossed the word as "to move stealthily, secretly", which is certainly not relevant for these inscriptions, and there is no further explanation in Pou 1996.⁶⁴

The temples, the royalty, and wider political relationships

According to Claude Jacques, Preah Ko was intended by Indravarman as a temple for the spirits of his **predecessors**, "and not of his 'ancestors', as is often said". Jacques considered that Indravarman's origins were rather obscure, in particular that his relationship to Jayavarman II/Parameśvara was uncertain, and that the latter hardly qualified as an ancestor. As I have shown, however, Indravarman, although not a direct descendant of Jayavarman II, was a close relative in three different ways, and the latter, especially in Khmer terms, well qualified as an ancestor. On the other hand, Indravarman's immediate predecessor Jayavarman III, who was the immediate successor of Jayavarman II, is not mentioned at Preah Ko. Thus Preah Ko is more accurately termed an ancestor temple than one for Indravarman's predecessors. There has been no problem with Lolei, for it was dedicated to Yaśovarman's parents and maternal grandparents, all direct ancestors.⁶⁵

These inscriptions name several royal persons who are not recorded elsewhere, and whose relationships to the kings are obscure and intriguing. Perhaps most interesting is the *dhūli jeñ kaṃsteñ añ śrī īśvaravarmma* in K.314, whose titles are nearly equivalent to those of a king.

According to Claude Jacques the last recorded date of Indravarman is 886, and he was probably dead by 889, after which there was a civil war between contenders for kingship won by Yaśovarman who had not been the chosen heir.⁶⁶ If that is accurate, perhaps this

"en âge de courir".

⁶³ For the details of this analysis see Jacob 1979, 408, 423, n. 2; Pou 1992, pp. 253-4, 418; Jenner 1981, pp. 150, 263; Jenner and Pou 1980-81, p. 151 (doer~/təə/); Shorto 1962, p.182; and Vickery 1998, pp. 259-60.

⁶⁴ Aymonier, p. 463; Pou 1992, p. 415. Besides the Roluos group and K.270-271 of Prasat Kravan, where there are many, the term *lap* in apparently the same sense is found several times in K.56/10th century, and once each in K.164/A.D. 922, K.221/A.D. 1019, and K.420/12th century.

⁶⁵ Vickery 1986, pp. 102-08; Jacques 1990, pp. 45-46.

⁶⁶ See Jacques 1990, pp. 47-52. Jacques did not indicate his sources for this hypothetical

Īsvaravarman, who left his inscription in Indravarman’s ancestor temple, was another son of Indravarman and a rival, or an ally, of Yaśovarman, and was still alive and active in 891. Another hypothesis, suggested by his date, two years after Yaśovarman claimed kingship, is that he was Yaśovarman’s son and designated heir. In that case, however, his inscription would be expected at Lolei, Yaśovarman’s temple, not at Preah Ko; and it would probably not have been dedicated to *paramēśvara*/Jayavarman II, unmentioned at Lolei, and not given prominence in Yaśovarman’s genealogical inscriptions.⁶⁷

These explanations turn in part on the title *kaṃsteñ*. Comparison of the occurrences of this title indicate that it was a high rank, but lower than *kaṃrateñ*. It is absent from the pre-Angkor corpus; thus its first records are at Preah Ko. It is also found associated with Indravarman in K.923 from the Bakong, another of his works, but in a posthumous reference to him, *vraḥ kaṃsteñ añ ta stac dau īśvaraloka*, the last term being the well-attested posthumous designation of Indravarman. Given this it is probable that the reference to *vraḥ kaṃsteñ añ* in K.415, dated śaka 799/A.D. 877, the year Indravarman became king, is also to him.⁶⁸

Another comparable context of *kaṃsteñ* is in K.957 dated 941, near the end of the reign of Jayavarman IV, in which Rājendravarman, the prince who later succeeded him, and whom Jayavarman IV had called ‘elder brother’ in another inscription (K.677), is entitled *dhūli jeñ vraḥ kaṃsteñ añ*, the first two words of which with a few exceptions, indicates ruling royalty in the Angkor period.⁶⁹

These contexts suggest that the titles *vraḥ kaṃsteñ añ*, especially when preceded by *dhūli jeñ*, indicated either a designated heir of a king, or someone, such as Indravarman in K.415, who had definitively established his claim to paramountcy. Or, without *dhūli jeñ*, the title *vraḥ kaṃsteñ añ* might have indicated a second-level king in his own district, rather than the official paramount. The last hypothesis would help to explain the posthumous reference to him in K.923, referring to him by his local rank, as it were.⁷⁰

Comparison with the other occurrences of *vraḥ kaṃsteñ añ*, especially with *dhūli jeñ* as applied to Rājendravarman, suggests that Īsvaravarman was an elder brother, real or

reconstruction, nor his chain of reasoning. He probably based them on Yaśovarman’s Sanskrit inscriptions.

⁶⁷ Jayavarman II/*paramēśvara* does not have a prominent place in Indravarman’s official genealogy either, but he was the principal figure in one of Indravarman’s important foundations, Preah Ko. Probably, as I suggested in Vickery 1986, pp. 102-08, the purpose of the royal genealogies was not to record precise ancestral relationships, but to authenticate power positions in the present. As I showed there, p. 105, Indravarman was really a nephew of Jayavarman II, a detail which Coedès also read in Yaśovarman’s genealogical records (Coedès 1928, p. 126). In fact, the family connections were so complex that Indravarman, was nephew, great-nephew, and grandson-in-law of Jayavarman II.

⁶⁸ The date of this inscription, the title *vraḥ kaṃsteñ añ*, its recording of a *miśrabhoga*, and the categories of personnel showing several of the terms prominent in the Preah Ko inscriptions (*tmoñ*, *chatradhāra*, *mahānasa*) indicate that this inscription, “Inscription du Musée de Brest”, according to Coedès “of unknown origin”, really came from the region of Roluos.

⁶⁹ The first recorded use of *dhūli jeñ* is from K.904 of Queen Jayadevī, in A.D. 713. See discussion of these inscriptions and their implications in Vickery 1986, pp. 106-07.

⁷⁰ A western example of a single ruler with different titles of rank in different places is in the Habsburg Empire in the 16th-18th centuries when the Habsburg ruler was Grand Duke in Austria, Emperor in the Holy Roman Empire, and King in Bohemia and Hungary, and held still other titles elsewhere.

classificatory, of Yaśovarman, and was perhaps, early in Yaśovarman's reign, considered the second-ranking prince immediately after the king. For it is certain that ultimogeniture, that is, succession by younger sons in preference to still living elder brothers, was a normal order of succession in ancient Cambodia.⁷¹ This would perhaps cast doubt on Jacques' interpretation of a bloody fight for the throne among brothers on the death of Indravarman.

To be sure, nothing more is recorded of Īsvaravarman, and Yaśovarman passed kingship on to his sons, but as I have suggested elsewhere, this may have violated the norms of the time, and kingship returned to descendants of Indravarman following the short reigns of Yaśovarman's sons.⁷²

Another royal person with a kingly title, even superior to that of Īsvaravarman, is *dhūli jeñ vrah kamrateñ añ śrī jayendravarma*, responsible for the Lolei inscription K.325 dated 815/A.D. 893, and whose apparent consort, Jayendradevī, is mentioned in K.326D. It seems likely that he was a brother or son of Yaśovarman. Possibly, his royal titles were related to a particular administrative function, as a sort of vassal king in an outlying region. This is suggested by the mention of *pramān* Indrapura as either the place where he established his foundations, or the place where he resided. Indrapura had been an important region in pre-Angkor times, occasionally with its own second-level king. This interpretation is reinforced by the appearance at the end of his inscription of a dedication by a lower-ranking royal person, *kamrateñ añ śrī* Narādhipativarma of *sruk kvāc, pramān vyak*, also in the region where Indrapura has been localized. This Narādhipativarma seems to have been fairly important, for he was responsible for 3 inscriptions, K.325, part of K.328, and K.332, but he is not recorded anywhere else. The other named royalty cannot be situated, although it is interesting to note that a daughter of Jayavarman II was involved in one of the Preah Ko donations, K.313, which weakens any hypothesis that Indravarman was estranged from that branch of royalty.

These inscriptions thus support a hypothesis of a royalty linked in complex familial and political relationships over a wide area since Jayavarman II, not a situation in which petty princes of separate local dynasties fought for the paramount throne.

At the lower end of the royal and official hierarchy these inscriptions show the first extant records of *tāñ steñ*, a relatively high-ranking female title at Angkor, and *vāp*, who appear to have occupied important places in the administration until the 11th century. The title *tāñ* itself was used in pre-Angkor inscriptions, mostly, it seems, for females, and it continued in use at Angkor, along with the new, higher ranking, *tāñ steñ*, and very high *tāñ kamrateñ*, the personal title of Indravarman's mother Mahendradevī. *Vāp* is not found in pre-Angkor records, but in the first two centuries of Angkor they are prominent. Although most *vāp* bore simple Khmer names, some of them were very close to, even related to, royalty. The

⁷¹ Much confusion has occurred in the study of ancient Khmer kingship through the supposition that patrilineal primogeniture should have been the most legitimate path of royal succession. Examples of apparently peaceful ultimogeniture are Vīravarman > Citrasena-Mahendravarman, rather than to Bhavavarman I, in late 6th century; Īśānavarman > Bhavavarman II, rather than to Śivadatta; Jayavarman IV and his son Harṣavarman preceding Rājendravarman who was explicitly called 'elder brother' of both; Udayādityavarman I rather than his elder brother; and the sequence Yuvarāja > Jayavarman VI > Dharaṇindravarman I. Less certain but probable evidence for preferential ultimogeniture is in the succession to Fan Shih-man, and the Chinese story that Rudravarman had usurped kingship from a more legitimate younger brother, although the Chinese interpreted this according to their own standards (See Vickery 1986, pp. 101-02, 107-08, and 1998, chapter 2, and on the succession of Īśānavarman Vickery 1998, pp. 340-42.

⁷² See Vickery 1986, p. 107.

term is believed to derive from a Mon-Khmer word for ‘father’.⁷³

Relations with Śambhupura

These inscriptions contribute evidence for a close relationship between the first Angkor kings in Roluos and Śambhupura, an important pre-Angkor kingdom in Kratie Province. The most interesting record from Śambhupura is its inscription K.124/A.D. 803, listing three queens or princesses with the title *kanheñ kamrateñ añ*, descending one from another without mention of their consorts, and from a male ancestor in the fourth ascending generation named Indraloka; and, as noted above, the mother of *vraḥ kamrateñ añ* Jayendradevī, mentioned in K.326D, was *kanhyañ kamrateñ añ*. Another inscription from the Śambhupura area in the Angkor period, K.125/A.D.1001, refers to four ancestors important in the original foundation who were relatives of Jayavarman II *parameśvara*. Moreover, in his Bakong stèle, K.826/A.D. 881, Indravarman recorded the erection of a statue in memory to the queen of Indraloka, the ultimate ancestor of the Śambhupura queens as recorded in their K.124.

In his study of the career of Jayavarman II, Claude Jacques established that a certain Jayavarman whom Coedès had not been able to fit into the conventional pre-Angkor dynasties, and whom he had labeled ‘Jayavarman Ibis’, was really Jayavarman II before he had established himself as paramount king of the future Angkor in Roluos. There are two inscriptions attributed to this Jayavarman Ibis > Jayavarman II. One is K.103/A.D. 770 in Kompong Cham Province, and the other is K.134/A.D. 781 near Śambhupura. Pierre Dupont had concluded that a Jayavarman (Ibis) leaving an inscription with royal titles virtually in the center of the kingdom of Śambhupura during the reign of the last or next-to-last queen mentioned in K.124, could only have done that if he were her consort; and I have taken the further step of accepting Jacques’ ‘career of Jayavarman II’ together with Dupont’s hypothesis to conclude that a marriage alliance with the queen of Śambhupura was an important step in the unification of different minor kingdoms achieved by Jayavarman II.⁷⁴

This connection between the Roluos royalty and Śambhupura, in Coedès’ interpretation of K.826, the Bakong stèle, is reinforced by the mention there of another foundation by Indravarman, “at the invitation of the superior of the *āśrama* of Āmrātakeśvara”, known from the same Śambhupura inscription, K.124, which records the queens entitled *kanheñ kamrateñ añ*. The god Āmrātakeśvara (‘lord of mangoes’) is mentioned in several pre-Angkor inscriptions, along the Mekong between Kratie and the delta, but after K.826 it is not recorded again in the Angkor period.⁷⁵

Even the language of Roluos shows a connection to K.124 in the term *vṛtti* introducing the lists of donations in K.326C and D, and in K.329B and C. In the entire Old Khmer corpus this term has only been found here and in K.124. In K.124 it precedes a list of clothing and foodstuffs provided for the percussion players, and Coedès interpreted it as ‘subsistence [provisions]’, a standard Sanskrit gloss also taken over by Pou. This gloss fits the context of K.329, but in K.326D it precedes a list of persons called *gho* and *tai*, and if Aymonier was correct it heads a list of persons in K.326C. Probably the intention in K.326

⁷³ See Vickery 1986, pp. 105-08; Vickery 1993; and Pou 1992, pp. 438, 431.

⁷⁴ See Jacques 1972; Dupont 1943-46, pp. 31-32; Vickery 1998, chapter 8; Jacques 1990 seems to have renounced that interpretation of K.134, but I think his conclusion in Jacques 1972 was correct.

⁷⁵ The sites of foundations naming this god, south to north, are the Mekong delta (K.8), near Ba Phnom (K.54-55), Kandal (K.1003-1004), Prey Veng (K.493), Kompong Cham (K.115, K.725), and Kratie (K.124). Of these, five are dated: K.54-55/629, K.493/657, K.115/665, K.1004/691, and K.124/803.

was that subsistence provisions were offered to the persons listed, but the provisions themselves were not listed. This is also the interpretation in Pou 1996, pp. 67-68. Likewise the phrases, *tapra m̄an ta gi v̄rt̄i* in K.124, and *v̄rt̄i ta tapra* in K.329C, are other instances of linkage between K.124 and the Roluos inscriptions (see above).

Other areal relationships

One of the Khmer inscriptions of Roluos already published, K.713, has shown that King Indravarman had administrative control over a rather wide area, namely, *pram̄an jeñ* Tarāñ and *pram̄an jeñ* Vnaṃ in the Northwest and North, *pram̄an* Malyāñ in Battambang-Pursat, and *pram̄an* Śreṣṭhapura, east or northeast of Angkor.⁷⁶

This impression is reinforced by the inscriptions studied here, in which there are offerings in or from 8 named *pram̄an*, Bhīmapura, Indrapura, Īśānapura, Malyāñ, Śreṣṭhapura, Uttamapura, Vigrānta, and Vyak. References to some of these in other inscriptions indicate that Bhīmapura was in the Northwest (Battambang or Banteay Meanchey), Malyāñ probably south of Bhīmapura in Battambang or Pursat, Indrapura and Vyak between Kompong Thom and Kompong Cham, and Īśānapura in Kompong Thom. The conventional view of Śreṣṭhapura places it on the Cambodian-Lao border near Wat Phu, although I have argued that in the early Angkor period, at least, it should be localized east of Angkor in the direction of Kompong Thom.⁷⁷

Some of the *sruk* mentioned independently of *pram̄an* may also be localized. The name *sruk jlyak* from K.312 also occurs in K.221 of the reign of Sūryavarman I, from Battambang, in a text concerned with *viṣaya* ('province') Amoghapura, considered to be in the Northwest, and if the name of *sruk vralen*, as it would appear, is the same as Angkorean *vrlyan*, then it too was in Amoghapura.⁷⁸ Although in K.325 there is nothing to demonstrate the location of *stuk kak kat*, there is only one other place name of this type in the corpus, *stuk kat kat* in K.991, from a place now in eastern Thailand; and these names of course suggest the modern name of the location of one of the most famous inscriptions, K.235, Sdok Kak Thom, also in eastern Thailand. The name of *sruk yamañ* is known as a place in Śreṣṭhapura from K.958/A.D. 947, and *jayagrāma* is found in K.219 from Battambang. *Viṣṇupura*, however, is mentioned too often to be helpful, in K.56 and K.67 in Prey Veng, K.183 in Koh Ker, and K.420 in Siemreap, probably indicating that several places had that same name. There is only one other name of the form of *sruk pat varuṇa* in Bhīmapura, *pat tāntai*, also in the Northwest, and both of these names are reminiscent of modern Battambang (*pāt ḍampan*).⁷⁹

These inscriptions indicate that the polity centered at Roluos was dominant over a wide area of northern Cambodia extending from the present northwestern border to Kratie and including Kompong Cham and Kompong Thom. On the other hand, except perhaps for *vyak*, there is no sign of any authority over the heartland of pre-Angkor Cambodia, what is now the center and South.

Another type of relationship may be seen in the listing of categories of personnel. I

⁷⁶ See discussion of these locations in Vickery 1998, chapter 8. Because of its name, 'foot of the mountain(s)', Jeñ Vnaṃ is believed to have been near the Dangrek.

⁷⁷ See Vickery 1998, chapter 8.

⁷⁸ . The term *jlyak* also occurs in K.353 on the present northern border, but as the name of a rice field, thus not relevant for comparison (see Pou 1992, p. 195). On *vralen/vrlyan* see above.

⁷⁹ See inscription K. 208 from Battambang. Of course, the legends about the name 'Battambang' are without historical value. Pou 1992 was also mistaken in attempting to relate 'Battambang to *thpon*, 'head' via *taṃpon*, *taṃpvan*, unless it were related to *taṃvan*, which she does not cite.

have emphasized above that in general the lists of personnel at Roluos are quite different both from pre-Angkor and Angkor records. Thus the few similarities which may be discovered are important. The most striking is with the inscriptions of Prasat Kravan, K.270-271/A.D. 921, where the responsible official was a *kaṃsteñ añ*. Their service personnel include many of the categories found nowhere, or very rarely, except at Roluos, and in the same order: following the *rmmāṃ* and *caṃryyāñ* who are found in many records, there were *thmoñ*, *chmāp cheñ*, *thmiñ kinnara*, *khloñ sruk* heading a list without the name of a *sruk*, *pamek*, *chmāṃ mās prak*, *chatradhāra*, *mahānasa*, *vannāra*, *chmāṃ śāla*, *caṃryyāñ stutiy*, *gandharvva*, *pamas*, *mahāvṛīhi*. Inscription K.99 also includes many of the same rare terms.

Both Prasat Kravan and K.99 are from the time of Jayavarman IV, mid-10th century, the same period as the long unpublished lists of districts, regions, and personnel from Koh Ker, which Aymonier called “les grands registres”, and in which he saw similarities to the Roluos inscriptions. Those lists from Koh Ker, long neglected, should now be studied carefully for their contributions to the administrative and social history of Angkor

Bibliography

- Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres & École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
1926-1937 *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (Corpus de fac-similés). 6 vols. Paris and Hanoi: École Française d’Extrême-Orient.
- Aymonier, E.
1901 *Le cambodge II, Les provinces siamoises*. Paris, Ernest Leroux, Éditeur.
- Barth, M.A., and Abel Bergaigne.
1885 *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge; Inscriptions sanscrites de Camp. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Volumes 27, pt. 1.
- Coedès, G.
1928 “La tradition généalogique des premiers rois d’Angkor d’après les inscriptions de Yaçovarman et de *rājendrarvarman*”, EC XXI, BEFEO 28, pp. 124-144.
1929 “Nouvelles données chronologiques et généalogiques sur la dynastie de Mahdharapura”, EC 24, BEFEO 29, pp. 297-329.
1936 “A propos du Tchen-la d’eau: trois inscriptions de Cochinchine.” EC 31. BEFEO 36, pp. 1-14.
1937-1966 *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, Vols. 1-8. École Française d’Extrême-Orient. Collection de textes et documents sur l’Indochine III. Hanoi, Paris.
1951 “Inscription de Vt Tasar Moroy”, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* III, pp. 170-174.
1964 *Les états hindouisés d’Indochine et d’Indonésie*. Nouvelle édition revue et mise à jour. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard.
1966a “Index des noms propres de l’épigraphie du Cambodge”, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* Vol. 8, pp. 13-71.
1966b “Liste générale des inscriptions du Cambodge”, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* Vol. 8, pp. 76-225.

- Damais, L[ouis]-C[harles]
1957 Review of Prof. Dr. Poerbatjaraka. *Riwajat Indonesia*, djilid 1 (*Histoire de l'Indonésie*, vol. 1). Djakarta. Jajasan Pembangunan. BEFEO 48, pt. 2:607-49.
- Dupont, Pierre
1943-46 "La dislocation de Tchen-la et la formation du Cambodge angkorien (vii^e-ix^e siècle)." BEFEO 43, pp. 17-55.
- Jacob, J.M.
1979 "Pre-Angkor Cambodia: Evidence from the Inscriptions in Khmer concerning the Common People and their Environment." In *Early South East Asia. Essays in Archaeology, History and Historical Geography*. Edited by R.B. Smith and W. Watson. New York and Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, pp. 406-26.
- Jacques, Claude
1972 "La carrière de Jayavarman II", BEFEO 59, pp. 205-20
1990 *Angkor*, Paris: Bordas.
- Jenner, Philip
1981 *Lexicon of the Dated Inscriptions*, Southeast Asia Paper No. 20, Pt. 3, Honolulu, Center for Asian and Pacific Studies, Universiti of Hawaii.
- Jenner, Philip and Saveros Pou
1980-81 *A Lexicon of Khmer Morphology, Mon-Khmer Studies IX-X*, The University Press of Hawaii.
- Monier-Williams, Monier
1976 [1899] *A Sanskt-English Dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Pou, Saveros
1976a "Recherches sur le vocabulaire cambodgien" (IX), *Journal Asiatique* 264, pp. 333-55.
1976b "Note on words for *Male* and *Female* in Old Khmer and Modern Khmer." In *Austroasiatic Studies*, Pt. 2. Edited by Philip N. Jenner, Laurence C. Thompson, and Stanley Starosta. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii, Vol. 2, pp. 761-71.
1984 "Lexicographie vieux-khmère." *Seksa Khmer*. Revue du Centre de Documentation et de Recherche sur la Civilisation Khmère. No. 7: 67-179. Paris: Cedoreck.
1986 "Indic Loanwords in Khmer Other than Sanskrit." *Kambodschanische Kultur*, Nr. 1, pp. 48-55
1992 *Dictionnaire vieux-khmer-français-anglais*, Paris, Cedoreck.
1996 *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge II*. École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Collection de textes et documents sur l'Indochine XX, Paris.
- Sakamoto, Yasuyuki
n.d. *Kodai Kumrugo: KWIC sakuin* (Old Khmer: KWIC index). This was compiled privately for the use of the author, who personally provided

the copy which I have used.

Shorto, H.L.
1962

A Dictionary of Modern Spoken Mon. London, Oxford University Press.

Vickery, Michael
1986

“Some Remarks on Early State Formation in Cambodia”, in *Southeast Asia in the 9th-14th Centuries*, edited by David G. Marr and A.C. Milner, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University and ISEAS, Singapore.

1993

"Styles, Titles, and Names as Elements in Studying Khmer Inscriptions". In *Symposium, Les Sources de l'Histoire du Pays Khmer*, Paris, 28 June-4 July, 1993 (publication forthcoming).

1994

"What and Where was Chenla", *Recherches nouvelles sur le Cambodge*. Publiées sous la direction de F. Bizot. École française d'Extrême-Orient, Paris.

1998

Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia: The Seventh-Eighth Centuries. The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, The Toyo Bunko, Tokyo.