PRE-ANGKOR CAMBODIA: EVIDENCE FROM THE INSCRIPTIONS IN KHMER CONCERNING THE COMMON PEOPLE AND THEIR ENVIRONMENT

This paper is based on an examination of the texts of the pre-Angkor inscriptions in Khmer, of which virtually all legible material has been published by G. Coedès (1924, 1936, and 1937-66). The works of Aymonier (1900-3), Lunet de Lajonquière (1901), Parmentier (1927), Briggs (1951), Malleret (1959-63, and Groslier (1966) have been consulted too, in order to mark on the map (at end) the position of as many inscriptions as possible. It seemed that the geographical position of the inscriptions, seen in relation to the relief of the area, would be of interest and it was hoped that inscriptions of certain areas might show some features different from those of other areas. Inscriptions are referred to throughout by their inventory numbers, K.1, etc. In Appendix B the pre-Angkor inscriptions in Khmer are listed in numerical order with, for each inscription, a rough indication of the date and, where possible, a reference to a marked area on the map. The key indicating which dot on the map refers to which inscription(s) is also given in Appendix B.

The pre-Angkor inscriptions in Khmer were intended to record, for the benefit and instruction of the public, details of the religious foundations to which they were related. The maximum content of an inscription, in terms of items of information, is set out below in the order in which items usually appear:

(i) the date or name of the reigning king;
(ii) the title and names of donors;
(iii) the name of the god;
(iv) names of the people from whom the donor obtained land to offer to the foundation;
(v) details of the price paid to those who relinquished land for the foundation;
(vi) the extent, location and capacity of the donated ricefields;
(vii) the names of the donated slaves with an indication of their duties;
(viii) details of the subsistence to be given to the religious personnel;
(ix) details of other land given to the foundation: orchards, market gardens, etc.;
(x) list of precious objects given to the foundation;
(xi) the statement that the revenues are to be combined with those of another foundation;
(xii) warning of punishment for anyone using or abusing the belongings of the foundation.
Few inscriptions have even half of these items. Many are broken or partly illegible so that the total original content is a matter of guesswork. Others, however, seem to be complete, with perhaps only a few illegible characters, and it is clear that the information was intended to be less. Such inscriptions usually mention the donor, the gift, and the god. They may lack the date simply because this was given in an accompanying Sanskrit inscription. One suspects that when they lack details of duties of slaves or of lands other than ricefields or lists of precious objects it is because the foundation was not so rich or flourishing as others. With regard to details concerning the capacity and location of the ricefields and prices paid, one may speculate as to the reason why some inscriptions have them and some do not. It was advantageous to the foundation to have a clear statement written up about land transactions and personnel belonging to the god but perhaps not every locality could provide the people capable of writing down and inscribing all the names and composing a passage about the organization?

In spite of the restricted subject-matter and the lacunae which place even more restrictions on them for us, the Khmer inscriptions offer a wealth of information if studied minutely. Certain aspects of life in ancient Cambodia, its religions (Bhattacharya 1961), its political organization (Sahai 1970), the legal position of its slaves (Bongert 1959), etc. have been studied using the inscriptions as a major source. The aim of this paper is to assemble the information given by the pre-Angkor Khmer inscriptions about the populace: the work they did, the land they inhabited, the products they knew, the objects they made, and the conditions in which they lived. The material is set out in three sections with some subsidiary paragraphs. Lists of relevant vocabulary are given in Appendix A.

1. The Non-élite Free People

The inscriptions chiefly present to us the dignitaries on the one hand and the slaves they donated on the other, while we are hardly permitted more than a glimpse of those who lived in freedom but insignificantly. They surely included humble peasants, craftsmen, and traders who had not the misfortune to be carried off as slaves or bonded for debt or crime. They certainly included the religious personnel, the paññhos, who are mentioned on the inscriptions, chiefly as receivers of provisions, and the families of officials, themselves owners of household slaves. There are two direct references to people who had humble titles but owned land. A certain Nāgaṇudā who sold a piece of land is referred to as Va, ‘Mr.’ (K.22, 1. 26), while we know of the reservoir belonging to a Ku ‘Miss/Mrs.’ from K.561, 1. 19. The secular public were the ge ‘persons’ at whom warnings of punishment were directed. K.90, piédroit nord, ll. 4-7, reads ge ta dap gui, ge ta sak gui, ge emer $īñā, ge da$ñā ‘Anyone who causes any hindrance here, anyone who steals from here, any transgressors of the edict will be punished.’ From more detailed warnings of this kind, particularly in K.904, K.259, K.426, and K.451, it is clear that the public were known to take things, ask for things, use temple slaves as their own, seize slaves, cattle,
carts, and even build their homes on a grotto (K.724)! Much of the evidence which will be produced in connection with the slave population obviously applied also to the free: the features of their environment; the artefacts, precious and ordinary, with which they were familiar; the assessment of the values of slaves, objects, and land in terms of other goods.

2. The Slaves

In the briefest inscriptions, no more is said about the slaves than that a gift of kiñuñ was made to the god. More informative inscriptions give lists of names, men first, women and children second, each adult entry being preceded usually by a title (or kinship term serving as a title). Unusually, on K.137, the women are given titles and then men are not! After each name there is usually a stroke or, more rarely, a circle. This mark of each of the slaves or potential slaves (i.e. the young children) would make it easier to count the totals. The most detailed inscriptions indicate the duties of the slaves. The information about slaves will be presented in five paragraphs.

2.1. Categories of slaves

Sometimes the lists of slaves were preceded by the terms kīnuñ ta si or ghoda ‘menfolk’ and kīnuñ or just kantañ ‘womenfolk’. Further classification is found in connection with the status of the children, involving the following four categories:

- **der** Possibly to be connected with Mod. Khmer stōr(r) ‘on the point of’ and interpreted, like Mod. Mon hōmō (leñ) as ‘on the verge of (puberty)’. This interpretation arose from discussion of this and the next word with Professor Shorto.2


- **rat** ‘running, toddler’.

- **pau** ‘unweaned’.

The word *si* ‘male’ or *tai* ‘female’ follows this classification, e.g. K.149, l. 11, Ku Cāñhväy 1 kon Ku der si 1 pau si 1 ‘Ku Skein 1, ku’s child, male of der age 1, unweaned male 1.’

Two more words describing categories of slaves, occurring once each, are Skt. kārmanātika ‘workers’ (K.41, l.4) and klamañ ‘maidens’ (K.24, B, l. 12). List 1 in Appendix A includes all the pre-Angkor words denoting categories of slaves: such words are not followed by a personal name.

2.2. Slave duties

On the inscriptions which give information about individual duties, the lists of slaves are divided first into groups according to the duty carried out and secondly, within each such group, into the categories of age and sex etc., described in the last paragraph. Where information about duties is not given we may imagine that all personnel were commandeered to work in the ricefields, orchards, plantations, or market gardens in accordance
with the local requirements and that special tasks such as cooking, weaving, dancing were performed by the more talented and fortunate. Such people would probably help with the farming at harvest-time. However that may be, our evidence is that a great variety of duties is recorded. Some of the vocabulary is not yet understood but, since the context makes it clear that a duty is being mentioned, all such vocabulary is entered in the list. Many of the activities may easily be imagined by those familiar with South East Asia and will have been observed in Cambodia in the twentieth century. They include grinding, spinning, grooming the king’s elephant, moulding statues, singing, and playing musical instruments. Even tmir slik ‘ones who sew leaves’ recognizable through the modern makers of woven plates and other utensils for many occasions. Some roles are not so clear-cut. The positions held by the kñûn vrâh ‘slave of the god’ was probably privileged; usually only one or two slaves have this duty. Among the vocabulary is less clear come ‘heaters of water for ceremonial ablutions’ (Coedès’ interpretation of “muh as ‘heater’); ‘trappers’ (camdak, cf. Mod. K. teak ‘trap’?); slaves working inside either pi le ‘for above’ (i.e. on the floor, not under the building), or kamlûn vrâh ‘in the interior of the temple’. Slave duties are listed in Appendix A.2.

2.3. Slave titles

The words given in list 3, Appendix A are classed as titles on the criterion that they are followed immediately either by a personal name or, as in a minority of cases, by a word such as the title of a master or a description of a duty, which served equally well as an identification of the slave. Va and Ku occur the most frequently. The translations ‘male adult’, ‘female adult’ given in the list sound extremely impersonal, even inhuman, but it seems to the writer that the titles were not lacking in dignity. If the masters had been contemptuous in their attitude to the slaves they could have had them entered, as in fact they are on a few inscriptions, by name only, following the category indication ‘menfolk’, ‘womenfolk’. In the translations of citations Va and Ku have been left because, although ‘Mr.’ is satisfactory as a translation of Va, neither ‘Mrs.’ nor ‘Miss’ is suitable for Ku; only the cumbersome ‘Miss/Mrs.’ would be adequate.

Māh and Oñ, which occur on K.46 and K.76 are not known through Mod. Khmer and must be compared respectively with Old Mon māh (‘young) man’ and possibly uin, in, onomastic prefix (Shorto 1971: 18 and 25). K.76, l. 2 makes it clear that in that inscription the male slaves with this title were Mons: kñûn ramañ ta si, Māh . . . ‘Mon slaves, males, Māh . . .’

2.4 Kinship

All the kingship terms which occur in pre-Angkor inscriptions, whether or not they occur in connection with slaves, are given for the sake of completeness in list 4, Appendix A. The kinship terms occur in several kinds of context in the slave lists, chiefly, however, in the lists of women
and children. In some inscriptions a kinship term is used in place of the title Ku, e.g. K. 138, l. 7, *Me Kralañ 1; l. 9, *Me Naññañ 1 ‘Mother Kralañ 1... Mother Naññañ 1’. No dependent children are listed with these mothers. Sometimes a statement of kinship is a means of identification without a name being given, e.g. K. 766, l. 4, *me Va Kandot 1 ‘Mother of Va Kandot 1’. That *me is only an alternative title for Ku, when appropriate, is shown by K. 451, II. 6-7, *me Maññ, kon Ku 4 ‘Mother Maññ (and) her (Ku’s) 4 children’.

Sometimes a kinship term follows a title, as on K. 808, l. 1, Ku *me Kandai 1. Then it is grammatically ambiguous. It could mean ‘Adult female, Mother Kandai 1’ or, as seems to the writer far more likely, ‘Adult female, mother of Kandai’. The second way of interpreting the kinship term in such a context is sometimes supported by the occurrence of the name elsewhere in the lists, suggesting a reference to the child of that mother. In other cases the names of both mother and child are given, e.g. K. 127, l. 8, Ku *naññ 1 kon Ku Va Tlos 1 ‘Ku Anaññ 1; her child, Va Tlos 1’. The clearest statement of all occurs on K. 74, l. 9, Ku Droñ kon ku Droñ Va Tanlān 1 ‘Ku Droñ; child of Ku Droñ, Va Tanlān’.

The record of the children is made in various ways some of which have just been encountered. They may simply be entered as numbers but it is quite common for details to be given of their age and sex as has been shown in paragraph 2.1. Grandchildren are sometimes mentioned too, e.g. K. 562, l. 6, Ku Uy, kon ku 7, cau 2, ‘Ku Uy; her 7 children; 2 grandchildren’. Occasionally the order is reversed, e.g. K. 134, l. 16, *me Kañññañañ, Kañññañ 1, ‘Mother of Kaññañañ, Kaññañ 1, but l. 23, Kampañ 1, *me Kampaññ 1, ‘Kampaññ, mother of Kampaññ 1’. Perhaps in the first case the mother was elderly and dependent upon Kaññañ but was mentioned first because it was customary—see section on categories—to proceed from eldest to youngest. On a few inscriptions a father is identified via his children rather than by his own name, e.g. K. 357, l. 14, Va *ita Srañvä ‘Va, father of Srañvä’. In l. 15 we find his daughter (?) Ku Srañvä. This may also be because he was a dependent relative needing to be placed with his daughter.

A case suggesting two dependent parents is recorded on K. 904, A, l. 23, *me Kandan 1 *ita Kandan 1 Ku Kandan 1. *We must not interpret Kandan as a family name but we may nevertheless feel assured by this glimpse of a complete family, ‘mother of Kandan 1 father of Kandan 1 Ku Kandan 1’. Another is found on the same inscription expressed differently: A, l. 23, Va *ita Krasop 1 Kantai Ku Kamväi 1 kon Vä Krasop 1 ‘Va, father of Krasop 1; (his) wife, Ku Kamväi 1; (their) son, Va Krasop 1’. In K. 140 l. 11, a male slave is identified by his own name and that of both parents, if the stroke at the end of the long phrase is to be trusted and the reference is to one person only: Vä Kanton Naññ, kon Lanñkah Va Aras 1 ‘Va Kanton Naññ, child of Ku Lanñkah (and) Va Aras 1’. A clear indication is given on K. 388, C, l. 6, that, in spite of the enslaved status, a family was regarded as a unit. No names of wives and children are given but a group is recorded as follows: kyuiñ (sic for kñuiñ) vrah: Vodhigana, kantai gui, kon pi ‘Slaves of the god: Vodhigana, his
wife (and) three children'. The reader is reminded that normally the Va and Ku are listed separately. Similarly on K.657, ll. 2-3, two families are listed: Vā Samudra ku Dhan kon I Vā Hitāṅkara Ku Sam-ap kon I 'Vā Samudra, Ku Dhana, one child; Vā Hitāṅkara, Ku Sam-ap, one child'.

Younger siblings are also mentioned, accompanying older brothers and sisters, e.g. K.480, l. 12, Va Camkap 1 paon 2 'Va Camkap 1, 2 younger siblings', and K.926, l. 8, Ku Rahval 1, paon Ku 2 'Ku Busy 1, her 2 younger siblings'. We may imagine the local people queuing up, men in one place, women and dependents in another, and giving their names, probably to be written down on palm-leaf pages before being inscribed. Perhaps in some areas the palm-leaf list was the only record of the personnel.

2.5. Slave names

Until the registration of births, deaths, and marriages which began during French rule, it was the practice in Cambodia for ordinary people to have one personal name and no family name. The personal name might be a proper name or the name of an object, a descriptive word of good or bad import or even a made-up word. The names of slaves in pre-Angkor Cambodia suggest just this kind of custom, as will be seen from a glance at list 5 in Appendix A. Names reflected bad qualities more often than good. If this was to avert the evil eye, however, it seems strange that it was not still more common. Some names consisting of a phrase, e.g. cap pi hau (lit. 'catch so as to call') 'catch him if you want him' have a thoroughly individual flavour. Many names are recurrent, however, and are found in widely separated areas. Names of plants and animals were popular. Sanskrit names, which were the norm for the élite, were also common among all classes of slaves. Some musicians and dancers had very poetic Sanskrit names, e.g. Vasantamillikā 'Spring jasmine', K.577, est, l. 3. Some names suggest a non-Khmer origin.

2.6. Slave conditions

Slaves were treated as goods possessed by an owner. Of how they became slaves little is told. We know from their names that some were foreign and some were prisoners of war. K.1, ll. 1-2 tells of persons who cap Va Kandos Ku Tai dau jvan ta Mratāṅ Kloṅ 'seized Va Kandos (and) Ku Tai (and) went to offer them to Mratāṅ Kloṅ'. The owner could give them to a religious foundation. k̄ñūṁ aṁnoy . . . 'slaves, the gift of . . .' occurs passim. In some cases, e.g. K.49, l. 13, it was stated that the god had the exclusive right, prassidha, to their use. They could be priced, as on K.726, A, ll. 9-10, sre . . . pañjāv̄h teṁ kāryya sampol stri 'ricefield acquired for a capital sum representing a band of sampol women'. On K.493, l. 20, mention is made of two women slaves in exchange for land: sre . . . sare kanlah, jnāv̄h gui k̄nūṁ kantai 2 'half a ricefield; the price for this: 2 women slaves'. The phrase oy sre daṁ k̄nūm (K.18, l. 1) suggests 'gives ricefields complete with slaves' rather than merely 'gives ricefields and slaves'. This could mean not just that the gift consisted of the number of slaves required
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to work the land but that these slaves were the slaves who normally lived and worked there for an owner. Such slaves would probably not find their lives greatly changed. They would live where they had always lived and do the work they had always done. This may have been the case with the five groups of people of different localities referred to in K.134. the first of these groups was given, l. 21, nu sre nu pdai karom na damrin 'and the ricefields, lowland and orchards', while the third and fourth groups were given, ll. 24 and 25, nu sre nu pdai karom 'and the ricefields and lowland'. Perhaps in the pre-Angkor period slaves worked partly for the temple and partly for their private owners. On K.154, l.6, the word vera 'take turn and turn about, help each other in turn' occurs in the phrase vera k̄ëum 'rota of slaves', suggesting that the slaves given to the temple were on duty there only part of the time. It could of course also mean that they were off duty when not serving the god!

A glimmer of hope for the slaves is discernible on K.493, ll. 21-2, where there is mention of a Pòn (official) 'originally a servant' who had sōn ktiḥ 'paid a debt'. Could this be a slave for debt who had paid his way back to freedom? The word k̄ëum is not used with reference to him but the word which is used, pamre, occurs on K.129, l.1, with reference to k̄ëum: k̄ëum . . . ta pamre ta painnos 'slaves . . . those who serve the religious personnel'. On K.1 also the redemption (loh 'to redeem') of two slaves is mentioned, l. 5. Cases of slaves being freed are recorded occasionally in the Angkor period and more frequently on the Middle Khmer inscriptions (sixteenth or eighteenth centuries).

3. The Environment

The map shows the location of 125 pre-Angkor inscriptions in Khmer. Six further inscriptions have been attributed to an area, although the exact position of their place of origin is not known to the writer. Eight more inscriptions could not be attributed even to an area since no one knows where they were found. It will be seen that, while the heaviest concentration of finds is in the centre, the area covered by inscriptions extends in the north-west as far as Korat, in the north-east almost as far as Pakse, in the south-east as far as Kampot and in the south-west to Phu-Vinh in Viet-Nam. It indicates deep penetration of the Mekong basin and general avoidance of the hills. An examination of the inscriptions in groups according to the areas from which they came yielded no striking differences of content or language, apart from diphthongization in the Angkor and Thap-Moui areas. It may be mentioned here that a similar examination of the inscriptions in chronological order has led to no important conclusions.

3.1. Natural and man-made features of the environment

The extent of ricefields was often described by reference to landscape features such as woods, rivers, lakes, hills, paths, water-tanks, thickets of
bamboo. Orchards, plantations, groves of mango, and market gardens were given to the temples. Some of the work other than rice-growing which was done by the people has been mentioned in connection with slave duties. Coconut palms, arecas, pepper plants, beans, ginger, salt, goats, buffalo, elephant, and oxen came under their care. Lists 6 and 7 in Appendix A contains vocabulary connected with outdoor work. Building construction is not mentioned in the pre-Angkor inscriptions in Khmer but it will be seen from list 8 that quite a few constructions of one sort or another are mentioned. Some, such as \textit{mna}l ‘main road’ and \textit{janman} ‘causeway’ occur as place-names. Silver and cloth will be mentioned in the next paragraph as being among the valuable objects given as barter. These and other metals and artefacts known to the \textit{pre-Angkor} Khmers, though not necessarily recorded as being bartered, are given in 9 and 10.

3.2. \textit{The ricefields}

Our information is concerned with the acquisition of ricefields for religious foundations. Texts vary very greatly as to the amount of information they give. Many simply mention that slaves, ricefields, or both are given by an elevated person to the god. K.18, for example, tells, l. 2, that Mratān Bhāskarapāla \textit{oy sre dain kīm}ta \textit{Vrah Kairmratān} Añ ‘gives ricefields together with slaves to the god’. No further details of the gift are recorded. K.49, a very short, though virtually complete, inscription, gives more information; it emphasizes the terms concerning possession by the foundation. It gives no slave names but it clearly says, l. 12, ‘all these slaves, oxen, buffalo, ricefields (and) orchards which the Pu Cāh Añ gave to the god–plus slaves offered by persons joining in this foundation–are \textit{exclusively} given to the god and are to be administered by Poñ Čubhakīrtti \textit{exclusively}’.

Other inscriptions mention an exchange of goods given to the owner of the land which is given up for the god, e.g. K.910, l. 10, \textit{sre man jauhv nu caṅkha} ‘ricefield exchanged for a conch’. One of the most informative inscriptions in connection with land-transactions is K.79. This records the gift to a religious foundation by a Mratān Icānapavitra of several ricefields. These were obtained by him from the various Poñ (less elevated officials) who either owned them or simply used them. The Mratān obtained the land by giving goods to these owners or occupiers. A variety of goods given in exchange for land are recorded in this and other inscriptions. They include cloth, paddy, silver, etc. The exact nature of the exchange was probably decided by the owner or occupier. One such person for example received a bust of his son (K.79, l. 18), a thoroughly personal reimbursement! All the ‘prices’ mentioned in K.79 were paid by the same Mratān and constituted his gift, \textit{amnoy}. The word \textit{amnoy} is used also, however, with reference to the various owners or occupiers who give up the land they have been using. It seems quite possible that many other inscriptions which are brief and mention only the gift of a Mratān were concerned with transactions of this kind, where the Mratān was not the
landowner but the rich and powerful personage who gained land for the foundation from lesser landowners by persuasion or even coercion. However, in at least one case, the foundation itself provided the goods for exchange. K.41 begins: *sre Vrah Kamrmatān Aiñ Čri Pīngaleçvara amnoy Poñ Çivabhāsaça man jo nu dravya Vrah Kamrmatān Aiñ ‘Ricefield (for) the god, Čri Pīngaleçvara, gift of Poñ Çivabhāsaça, which was exchanged for goods of the god.’

One might be inclined to regard goods thus offered for the release of land for the temple as compensation. However, it is clear from K.124 that the exchange of goods is a normal method of buying. This inscription tells us, ll. 17-22, that ‘honey is given to buy oil, cloth to buy syrup, ... cotton to buy ginger conserve’. The word *duñ ‘buy’ and not *jau/jahv/jo ‘exchange’ is used here. Still other words occur on other inscriptions. Transactions may be described from the point of view of the Poñ or other person who relinquishes his land. In K.79, for example, l.9, we read *dmār gui Poñ Çveta ‘the claimant (of the exchange goods) was Poñ Çveta’. Sometimes the transaction is described from the point of view of the person who pays the ‘price’. Thus K.493 begins *Poñ Bhā Vinaya ktiṃ krapy canmat i ‘Poñ Bhā Vinaya gives-up-as-exchange-price a milk buffalο’. An apparently different kind of exchange and an extra condition about the land are recorded on K.726, A, ll. 6-11. The exchange goods given for the land and other gifts is paddy but its value is expressed in terms of silver and cloth which thus appear to have almost a monetary value. Ll.7-8 read *sre ai ņeh travān Devaçila jñahv gi srū mūlya prak tamliṅ 5 yugala yau l ‘A ricefield near the tank of Devaçila. The barter for it is paddy. The value of this is 5 ounces of silver and a *yau of double cloth.’ The text continues, ll. 8-9: dep ge crip ti ple jon ta Vrah Kamrmatān Aiñ ‘The land is reserved; the produce is given to the god.’

Although the meanings are clear we are left with many unanswered questions arising from these different statements. Are we to think that it is usual for the owner still to keep the land or is K.726, just cited, a special case? Is a transaction like the one cited above (K.49), in which ‘exclusive rights’ are mentioned, the less usual one? Later, in the Angkor period, inscriptions mention slaves working land for half the month and others working it in the other half (see K.809, l. 14). Does the original owner retain some use of his land even when it is ‘given’ to the god, and, if so, does this happen in some or all cases? Are the owners to expect the land back at some future date?

One of two further points about the actual transfer of land are of interest. Quite often more than one owner is mentioned as receiving goods in exchange for one ricefield, e.g. K.493, l. 20: *sre Phalada man jahv ta Kurāk Jmen don Poñ Vidyāçakti. ‘Phalada ricefield which was brought from Kurāk Jmeñ and Poñ Vidyāçakti’. K.79 similarly tells us, ll. 9-13, that five Poñ receive paddy, cloth and a ricefield in exchange for ricefields! Perhaps in such instances a vast area of riceland was involved, comprising contiguous ricefields belonging to more than one owner.
3.3. Land measurement

The measurements of rice-growing land were often given simply by reference to local landmarks, particularly reservoirs, travañ. This practice gives us no idea of their size. Sometimes numbers of ricefields, sare/sanre were given, e.g. K.557, l. 2, sre sanre 2 (lit. riceland 2 ricefields) ‘2 ricefields’. This leaves us to imagine the size of a ricefield. In other cases, however, a capacity measurement is stated; this almost certainly indicated the quantity of seed needed to sow the field. E.g. K.79, l. 13, sre...je 2; l. 14, sre...tloñ 1 ‘ricefield (needing)’ je (cf. Mod Khmer konceo: (20 litre basket?) (of seed); ricefield (needing) 1 tloñ (of seed)’. At first sight the variety of ways of stating the amounts of seed is confusing. On some inscriptions the word mā occurs followed by je, e.g. K.79, ll. 8-9, sre...mā je 2 while on others the form mās is found with je, e.g. K.18, l. 5, sre...mās 1 je 1. However, when all pre-Angkor statements on land measurement were collected for comparison, it became clear that:

(a) the numeral 1 is often absent, e.g. K.41, ll. 3-4, sre...tloñ mā 3 ‘ricefield (needing 1) tloñ 3 mā (of seed)’ and K.718 where both sre...pāda 1 and sre...pāda occur, both meaning ‘a piece of ricefield’.

(b) the terms tloñ, mās/mā and je were capacity measurements of decreasing size while pāda ‘a piece’ is probably not an exact measurement at all, any more than sanre/sare. The maximum number of je encountered is three, suggesting that 4 je = 1 mās/mā. The number of mās/mā however is most often no more than three but is occasionally much higher: 11 and 12 have been found. The number of mās in 1 tloñ is not certain therefore.

The exchange of goods for ricefields was discussed in the last paragraph. In all the pre-Angkor texts in Khmer we have only one, K.79, in which the capacity measurement of land is given with its price. Two items from this inscription are quoted here, although the evidence they produce adds to our confusion rather than to our enlightenment about ancient Khmer economics, since two pieces of land of identical capacity have different quantities of cloth as their prices! Presumably one was superior to the other in some respect which we are not to know: K.79, l. 13, sre...je 2. jnāhv (price)....canlek amval (double cloth) yau 1 vlah 1. l. 21, sre...je 2. jnāhv (price)....canlek amval (double cloth) vlah 1.
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## Lists of Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Slave categories</td>
<td>kantai</td>
<td>womenfolk. K.904, l. 1, etc.</td>
<td>camren, cam-uk (singer, K.137, l. 9, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kārmāntika</td>
<td>workers. K.41, l. 4 only</td>
<td>cmap (one who catches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kon</td>
<td>children. K.24, B. l. 3, etc.</td>
<td>cmuh (secretary, K.129, l. 5, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kīruh</td>
<td>slaves, passim.</td>
<td>cman (guard, K.939, l. 8, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>klārumh</td>
<td>maidens. K.24, B. l. 12 only.</td>
<td>tampeh (fruit-picker(?), K.137, l. 17 only.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gho</td>
<td>Short for ghoda. Occurs on K.134, 135, l. 24 and K.749, l. 13.</td>
<td>tmān (weaver, K.956, l. 2, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ghoda</td>
<td>menfolk. K.560, l.2, etc.</td>
<td>tmir slik (one who sews leaves)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tai</td>
<td>female. K.24, A.l. 2.</td>
<td>tmīn (player of stringed musical instrument)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>der</td>
<td>on the verge of puberty(?). K.149, l. 23, etc.</td>
<td>tmokin (played by plucking, K.557, est, l. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pau</td>
<td>unweaned. K.8, l. 8, etc.</td>
<td>tmon (? K.124, l. 9 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meh</td>
<td>children. K.134, l. 21.</td>
<td>dnuh (? (all men), K.155, II, l. 20 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rat</td>
<td>Seems to be equivalent to kon in this one inscription of the extreme north-east. Presumably related to Old Khmer kanmehn 'young'.</td>
<td>pamas (grinder (e.g. of perfume), K.124, l. 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lahn</td>
<td>running about. K.66, l. 18, etc.</td>
<td>pi le (for work inside? (lit. 'so as to be above'). K.155, I, l. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>si</td>
<td>strong, full-grown, having attained the age of puberty(?). K.149, l.21.</td>
<td>pedantaraka, rpam (dancers (female with Indian names), K.155, I, l. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>male, menfolk. passim.</td>
<td>primah (chief of women (?) K.137, l. 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Slave duties</td>
<td>kīruh vihāra</td>
<td>slave of the temple.</td>
<td>mahānasa (cook, K.155, I, l. 18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kīruh vrah</td>
<td>slave of the divinity.</td>
<td>rāhivai (one who spins thread, K.155, 11, l. 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kīruh vrah</td>
<td>slave of the sacred dance. K.137, l.18.</td>
<td>ramaḥ (dancer, K.557, est, l. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rapanh</td>
<td>slave of the ricefield. K.137, l.26.</td>
<td>vari (? (all men), K.129, l. 1, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gandharva</td>
<td>musician (male). K.155, I, l.7.</td>
<td>vādyā (musician, K.129, l.3 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gval</td>
<td>herdsman, K.155, II, l. 11.</td>
<td>samangajapati (chief of the king's elephant, K.140, l. 3 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>camdak</td>
<td>trapper (?). K.748, II, l. 9, etc.</td>
<td>smon (one who moulds (statues?)) (Mod. Khmer so:n), K.137, l. 21 only (all women), K.24, B, l. 13 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ārtta (chief of slaves (all men), K.423, B, l. 2, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amrah (heater (i.e. of water), K.127, l.6, etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Slave titles

ku female adult. passim.
mäh male adult (Mon).
K.46, B. l. 6 foll. and K.76, l.2 only.
ya Precedes female names and is preceded by ku.
cf. Mon ya, a female prefix. Cannot be held to refer to Mons since it occurs in the list of Prous in K.137.
yi Occurs in Prous list in K.137 preceded, like ya, by ku. ya occurs several times in the same list.
cf. Mod. Khmer ɲi: (female)?
va, væ male adult. passim.
on female adult (Mon).
K.46, ll. 7-9.

4. Kinship terms

gē kule members of the family.
K.561, l. 22, etc.
aj, ji ancestor. K.451, nord, 4, etc.
kamton on the grandmother’s side; (?)grandmother.
K.38, l. 13.
a, ta father, K.357, l. 14, etc.
me, me mother. K.138, l.7, etc.
ceōn elder sibling. K.79, l.10, etc.
paon younger sibling. K.480, l. 12, etc.
kōn child. K.451, l. 7, etc.
kōn prasā son/daughter-in-law.
K.51, l. 14.
kmoi, kanmoi nephew/niece; kanmoi kamton great-nephew on the female side.
K.38, l. 13.
cau grandchild. K.562, l. 6, etc.
cau dvot great-grandchild.
K.124, l. 5.

paem sweet
saap angya hating injustice
Suggesting bad qualities:
kreh afraid
egeo imperfect
vle forgetful
sa-ap hating
sgih sullen
slēn pale
sa-uy stinking
Suggesting activities:
campah warfare
jul mend
tpān weaving
reih do basket-work
rnhāp kill
soimn beggar
hăm forbid
Describing physical characteristics:
kamput having lost a limb
kmau dark
kvak blind
dāñhan weight
pdai stomach
muk kraham red-faced
skū white-haired
Suggesting non-Khmer origin:
floy prisoner-of-war
ramañ Mon
vrau Prous
syān Siamese(?)
Names of animals:
kantur mouse
kcau shellfish
ktān crab
klē tiger
cē dog
cmā cat
jēn leech
tākū maggot
tmāi vulture
bhe otter
mon silkworm
skār weasel
srān wasp
svā kmau black monkey
aŋdañ eel
anrok ox (cf. Kuy anrok?)
Names of plants:
candana sandalwood
pkā jhe blossom
vhe flower
vhe forest flower
smau grass

5. Examples of slave names
Suggesting good qualities:
jāpi sralañ made to be loved
tlai valuable
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svāy mango
anlik melon
ānvau sugar-cane
Names of inanimate things:
dik water
dyon carbon
pkāy star
Sanskrit names:
ksān peaceful
gurudeva divine teacher
daçami tenth
dvadaçi twelfth
dharmmadat given by the Law
dharmapāla protector of the Law
dharmmaçaṅka having power in Law
pañcamī fifth
lābha luck
vañān understanding
vidyā learning
saptami seventh
sudat given
ṭivādāsa slave of Civa
amṛta immortal
uptalā lotus
madhu honey, K.421, l. 8.
madhucchista wax, K.421, l. 8.
java grain, K.421, l. 4.
rahko husked rice, K.561, l. 8.
- so white rice, K.127, l. 10.
- samrat refined rice, K.30, l. 27.
lho sesamum, K.124, l. 11.
vanli ginger, K.561, l. 8.
santek beans, K.689, B, l. 12.
sru, srū paddy, K.424, l. 6.
ṭunthi ginger, K.124, l. 12.
ampel salt, K.30, l. 29.

8. Building and constructions
kadaṅ hut, K.425, B, l. 5.
kamḷuṅ interior, K.135, l. 10.
kralā court, room, K.557, est. l. 2.
gīha grotto, K.44, B, l. 1.
jamman causeway, K.561, C, l. 16.
tnāl roadway, K.560, l. 11.
travaṅ reservoir, K.561, l. 15, etc.
thalā paved open space, K.44, A, l. 11.
dok boat, K.426, l. 9, etc.
pranaṅ gutter. pnaṅ-cover for gutter, K.910, l. 14.
karap-yaṅ 1 cloth to cover the gutter, K.124, l. 13.
prāśāda (name) palace, K.557, est. l. 4.
āvāsā kḥuṅ living quarters of the slaves, K.582, l. 7.

6. Agricultural areas
karom low ground, K.426, l. 4.
canḵā place prepared for planting by burning (Coedès), K.426, l. 4.
camṇya pasture, K.341, nord, l. 9.
camnoṅ enclosure for animals, K.44, B, l. 2.
cpar garden, K.562, l. 21, etc.
dahriṅ orchard, K.426, l. 4, etc.

7. Agricultural products
kalmon wax, K.124, l. 12.
krarpās cotton, K.124, l. 10.
ksāra milk, K.689, B, l. 6.
gmūṅ honey, K.124, l. 11.
nārhor syrup, K.124, l. 18.
toṅ coconut, K.416, l. 1, 7, etc.
tvau sorghum millet, K.124, l. 11.
danḥuṅ perfume, K.877, II, l. 13.
pareṅ oil, K.451, nord, l. 7.

9. Metals and stones
tek iron, K.388, B, l. 18.
tmo stone, gem, K.134, l. 18.
prak silver, K.79, l. 17.
mās gold, K.21, l. 5.
lāngau copper, K.560, l. 2.
samrit bronze, K.505, l. 18.

10. Artefacts
kan jeṅ mās gold anklet, K.21, l. 5.
kansa[ta]ṭāla copper gong, K.424, B, l. 5.
kaṅje (name) basket, K.11, l. 1.
kataka bracelet, K.21, l. 3.
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kamrāl (name) rug. K.129, l. 2.
karap cover. K.21, l. 4.
kalaca flask. K.877, II, l. 12.
kirita diadem. K.21, l. 2.
knop belt. K.21, l. 4.
klas umbrella. K.560, l. 2.
cakra disc. K.21, l. 5.
candal support. K.877, II, l. 17.
canalak sculpted figure. K.79, l. 18—sahruk engraved in repoussé. K.21, l. 3.
canlek cloth:—yugala double (double-threaded?) cloth. K.79, l. 18. Other kinds of cloth: kañvar, kāpata, jī, uladdha, ple, vagraṣa, pan-eñ
cnành cooking pot. K.124, l. 9.
chāya object giving shade. K.877, II, l. 15.
chat (name) umbrella. K.44, B, l. 7.
jeih den chandelier. K.388, B, l. 18.
tampōn cane, stick. K.44, A, l. 11.
tān handle. K.877, II, l. 13.
tpān (name) weaving. K.66, B, l. 16.
thūs tray. K.505, l. 18.
prthivī the world (held in the hand of a statue of the Vishnu). K.21, l. 5.

pkā dmaeh or pkā jmeih artificial flowers of some kind. K.21, l. 5.
pnañ screen, cover (?). K.910, l. 14.
makuta diadem. K.910, l. 15.
rādeh cart. K.426, l. 9.
valvel candlestick-holder. K.21, l. 6.
siñhāsana throne with seated lion. K.877, II, l. 15.
svok tray. K.124, l. 9.
cañkha conch. K.877, II, l. 15.
cañvāna shallow dish or lid, K.877, II, l. 13.
črivatsa Exact translation cannot be given for this symbol of good fortune K.877, II, l. 15.
āṇjul (name) needle. K.137, l. 19.
ar dhacandra half-moon. K.877, II, l. 17.
āstharaṇa bed. K.388, B, l. 19.
"hvek ladle. K.124, l. 10.
udaravandha decorative band worn round the waist. K.21, l. 5.
APPENDIX B

1. The pre-Angkor inscriptions in Khmer.

All the published inscriptions are entered below, represented by their inventory numbers, in numerical order. They are placed in the appropriate column with regard to their date. An inscription which is dated or has a reference to a reign or is approximately dated by Coedès because of the orthography is placed in the first or second column accordingly. An inscription which can be attributed only to the pre-Angkor period is placed in the third column. The letters A-Z refer to the areal groups on the map. A bar, —, indicates that it is no longer known where the inscription was found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-A.D. 700 to 802</th>
<th>Post-A.D. 700 to 802</th>
<th>Pre-A.D. 700</th>
<th>Post-A.D. 700 to 802</th>
<th>Pre-Angkor</th>
<th>Post-A.D. 700 to 802</th>
<th>Pre-Angkor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Z</td>
<td>127 1</td>
<td>6 Z</td>
<td>124 1</td>
<td>126 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Z</td>
<td>133 1</td>
<td>11 X</td>
<td>134 1</td>
<td>135 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 X</td>
<td>137 —</td>
<td>24 U</td>
<td>138 K</td>
<td>145 K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 U</td>
<td>140 K</td>
<td>30 U</td>
<td></td>
<td>146 K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 T</td>
<td>149 H</td>
<td>38 U</td>
<td>154 R</td>
<td>155 —</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 U</td>
<td>159 G</td>
<td>44 X</td>
<td></td>
<td>163 G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 X</td>
<td>259 D</td>
<td>48 V</td>
<td>341 B</td>
<td>357 E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>51 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>388 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 V</td>
<td></td>
<td>66 Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>389 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 S</td>
<td></td>
<td>74 S</td>
<td></td>
<td>400 A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>416 S</td>
<td></td>
<td>421 Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78 O</td>
<td>422 X</td>
<td>79 —</td>
<td>423 X</td>
<td>424 S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 R</td>
<td>424 S</td>
<td>90 M</td>
<td>98 P 426 R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103 P 427 S</td>
<td></td>
<td>107 P</td>
<td></td>
<td>428 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre A.D. 700</th>
<th>Post A.D. 700 to 802</th>
<th>Pre Angkor</th>
<th>Pre A.D. 700</th>
<th>Post A.D. 700 to 802</th>
<th>Pre Angkor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>109 P</td>
<td>108 P</td>
<td>430 L</td>
<td>482 Q</td>
<td>748 U</td>
<td>739 = 560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 P</td>
<td>437 H</td>
<td>438 H</td>
<td>493 Q</td>
<td>749 D</td>
<td>q.v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 M</td>
<td>447 F</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>502 J</td>
<td>518 V</td>
<td>753 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 D</td>
<td>480 –</td>
<td></td>
<td>505 C</td>
<td>559 U</td>
<td>755 U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>548 U</td>
<td>765 T</td>
<td>757 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>557,</td>
<td>559 U</td>
<td>759 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600 U</td>
<td>765 T</td>
<td>764 T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>561 U</td>
<td></td>
<td>766 O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562 W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>582 T</td>
<td></td>
<td>768 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>583 T</td>
<td>590 F</td>
<td>790 –</td>
<td>See 557</td>
<td></td>
<td>808 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>590 F</td>
<td></td>
<td>607 H</td>
<td></td>
<td>808 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608 H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>648 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>810 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648 M</td>
<td>657 E</td>
<td></td>
<td>664 Q</td>
<td></td>
<td>811 R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>670 U</td>
<td></td>
<td>816 H</td>
<td></td>
<td>818 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>818 G</td>
<td></td>
<td>877 S</td>
<td></td>
<td>884 Z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688 D</td>
<td>904 D</td>
<td></td>
<td>903 R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689 X</td>
<td>709 U</td>
<td>910 R</td>
<td>710 T</td>
<td>911 Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>711 S</td>
<td></td>
<td>911 Y</td>
<td>922 D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>712 S</td>
<td>926 L</td>
<td></td>
<td>718 W</td>
<td>947 L</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>719 W</td>
<td>939 U</td>
<td></td>
<td>723 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726 N</td>
<td>724 A</td>
<td></td>
<td>940 R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1010 T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NOTES

1. The term 'slave'; which I have used throughout the paper caused a lively discussion at the Colloquy. This is summarized in a note at the end of the paper.

2. This interpretation, if correct, would explain why, while the order eldest to youngest is strictly maintained elsewhere, the classes der and lān have no fixed order. The order der 'on the verge of...' and lān 'having attained...' would be wrong from the human development angle but very understandable linguistically. The interpretation of lān as 'full-grown' would fit in with the occurrence of the word as a category of ox on K.748, 1.15.


4. I am indebted to Mrs. Stargardt for the suggestion that some indication of the relative size of ricefields may be obtained, as in Indonesia, from the number of tanks required to irrigate them.

5. I am grateful to Monsieur A. le Bonheur for help with the translation of some Sanskrit terms in this list.


7. The datings obtained by Monsieur R. Billard, who computerized the astrological information given on pre-Angkor inscriptions, were kindly made available to me by Monsieur C. Jacques. I have thus been able to ensure that the inscriptions are placed in the correct columns in accordance with the most reliable and up-to-date information.

8. The exact position of this inscription was communicated to me at the Colloquy by Monsieur C. Jacques.

Note on the discussion during the Colloquy concerning the translation of kñum as 'slave'

Monsieur Jacques was firmly of the opinion that the personnel listed as kñum, all of whom were working for the god in some capacity and were the property of the god, and many of whom actually worked in the temple, could not, consistently with this, be 'slaves', since slaves are persons of the most abject human conditions. The term 'slave' would seem particularly unsuitable when it referred to those personnel with the duties of dancer, musician, cook (for the god), kñum vrah, etc. but would, in his view, not be right even for those who performed more menial tasks. Monsieur le Bonheur supported this with the argument that in India the god and the temple could not possibly be associated with persons who might be described as 'déclassés'. Both these speakers also felt strongly that persons having Sanskrit names—a practice which was normal for the élite in Cambodia—could not be described as 'slaves'.

My own view was that people who are bought, sold, and given are not free and should therefore be termed 'slaves'. The translation 'serf' would possibly be appropriate for those who seemed tied to the land (see p. 301) but would not cover the kñum with other duties. I also felt that it should be borne in mind that classical Greek and Rome had slaves in temples and that, while such a practice might be unthinkable in India, we were not in fact discussing India! I do, however, appreciate that the word 'slave' is associated with degradation and that it might be desirable to avoid it. A solution which seemed to satisfy all was to leave the term untranslated.

In connection with the discussion of the kñum and the society in which they worked, Mrs. J. Stargardt suggested to me that the whole community may have been conscripted, and therefore not strictly free, not only at the level of temple personnel, but also at all other levels right up to that of the
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highest officials. Mrs. Stargardt mentioned the case of craftsmen in ancient Burma, who had no choice but to take up the craft which their fathers had worked at before them.

2. Key to the groups A-Z on the map.
For each group the positions marked on the map are dealt with from north to south (N-S) or from west to east (W-E). Inscriptions are identified by means of their inventory numbers. Where more than one inscription was found at one place the numbers are separated by a comma. Semi-colons separate the details referring to separate map positions.

A (N-S) 400; 388, 389.
B (N-S) 723; 724; 341.
C 505.
D Near Puok, 451; at Angkor, 749, 753, 904, 922; at Siemreap, 259; at Rolouos, 688, 808.
E (N-S) 657; 357.
F 590; 447.
G (N-S) 818; 159, 163.
H (N-S) 816; 149, 437, 438, 607, 608.
I (N-S) 127; 129; 133; 124, 126; 134, 135.
J 502.
K (N-S) 146; 145; and (W-E) 138; 140, 757.
L (N-S) 430; 926; 927.
M (W-E) 648; 90, 428; 115.
N 726.
O 766, 78
(Three northerly sites, W-E) 113; 103; 109; and (W-E) 107, 108; 98.
Q (N-S) 66; 493, 664.
R (Four most northerly sites, W-E) 903, 910; 759; 940; 426; (remainder W-E) 788; 810; 787; 80, 154.8
S 427; 416; 424; 784; 785; 877; 74; 73.
Exact position not known to the writer: 711, 712.
T (N-S) 76; 764, 1010; 563, 560; 765, 37; 710. Exact position not known to the writer: 582.
U (N-S) 811; 748; 41; 38; 755; 30; 28; at Angkor Borei, 24, 25, 548, 557, and 600, 939; 670. Exact position not known to the writer: 559, 561, 709.
V (Westerly sites, N-S) 956; 51; 54; 49; 48; (NE site) 518.
W (N-S) 562; 718; 719; 21; 18.
X (W-E) 423; 46; 44; 689; 11; 422; 22.
Y (N-S) 1; 911.
Z (N-S) 6, 7, 8, 421; 9; 884.
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