

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'¹ 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 *pāṃnos*, 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 Nāgavindu who sold a piece of land is referred to as *Va*, 'Mr.' (K.22, l. 26), while we know of the reservoir belonging to a *Ku* 'Miss/Mrs.' from K.561, l. 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 cmer ājñā, ge daṇḍa* '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 Slaves¹

In the briefest inscriptions, no more is said about the slaves than that a gift of *kñuñ* 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 *kñuñ ta si* or *ghoda* 'menfolk' and *kñuñ* or just *kantai* '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 *sto:(r)* 'on the point of' and interpreted, like Mod. Mon *həmœ (leañ)* as 'on the verge of (puberty)'. This interpretation arose from discussion of this and the next word with Professor Shorto.²
- lāñ* Perhaps 'having attained puberty'. cf. Mod. Mon *leañ* 'puberty' and Mod. Khmer *khlañ* 'strong'.
- rat* 'running, toddler'.
- pau* 'unweaned'.

The word *si* 'male' or *tai* 'female' follows this classification, e.g. K.149, l. 11, *Ku Cāñhvāy 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. *kārmāntika* 'workers' (K.41, l.4) and *klamum* '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 *kñuṃ vraḥ* 'slave of the god' was probably privileged; usually only one or two slaves have this duty. Among tasks for which 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 *kamluṃ vraḥ* '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.

Māñ and *Oñ*, which occur on K.46 and K.76 are not known through Mod. Khmer and must be compared respectively with Old Mon *māñ* '(young) man' and possibly *uñ*, *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: *kñuṃ ramañ ta si, Māñ . . .* 'Mon slaves, males, Māñ. . .'

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 Kralā 1*; l. 9, *Me Nañā 1* 'Mother Kralā 1. . . Mother Nañā 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'.³ That *me* is only an alternative title for *Ku*, where appropriate, is shown by K.451, ll. 6-7, *me Mañ, kon Ku 4* 'Mother Mañ (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 nañ 1 kon Ku Va Tlos* 'Ku Anañ 1; her child, Va Tlos 1'. The clearest statement of all occurs on K.74, l. 9, *Ku Droñ kon ku Droñ Va Tanlāñ* 'Ku Droñ; child of Ku Droñ, Va Tanlāñ.'

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 Kañjā 1, Kañjā 1*, 'Mother of Kañjā 1, Kañjā 1, but l. 23, *Kampañ 1, me Kampañ 1*, 'Kampañ 1, mother of Kampañ 1'. Perhaps in the first case the mother was elderly and dependent upon Kañjā 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 ta Sravāy* 'Va, father of Sravāy'. In l. 15 we find his daughter (?) *Ku Sravāy*. 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 a tā 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 a tā Krasop 1 Kantai Ku Kamvai 1 kon Vā Krasop 1* 'Va, father of Krasop 1; (his) wife, Ku Kamvai 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: *Vā Kantoñ Nañ, kon Lañkah Va Aras 1* 'Va Kantoñ Nañ, child of Ku Lañkah (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: *kyum (sic for kñum) 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 1 Vā Hitāṅkara Ku Sam-ap kon 1* '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 Mratāñ Kloñ* 'seized Va Kandos (and) Ku Tai (and) went to offer them to Mratāñ Kloñ'. The owner could give them to a religious foundation. *kñuṃ amnoy . . .* '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 . . . pañjāhv teṃ 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, jñāhv gui kñuṃ kantai 2* 'half a ricefield; the price for this: 2 women slaves'. The phrase *oy sre dan kñuṃ* (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

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 nu 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 as in the 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 kñum* '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 Poñ (official) 'originally a servant' who had *soñ ktiñ* 'paid a debt'. Could this be a slave for debt who had paid his way back to freedom? The word *kñum* is not used with reference to him but the word which is used, *pamre*, occurs on K.129, l.1, with reference to *kñum*: *kñum . . . ta pamre ta pannos* '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 *tnal* 'main road' and *jaṁṇan* '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 pre-Angkor Khmers, though not necessarily recorded as being bartered, are given in 9 and 10.

3.2. *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 Mratāṇ Bhāskarapāla *oy sre daṇ kṇuṇ ta Vrah Kaṁmratāṇ 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 Cah Añ gave to the god—plus slaves offered by persons joining in this foundation—are *exclusively* given to the god and are to be administered by Poñ Çubhakīrtti 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, *sre man jauhv nu çāṅkha* '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 Mratāṇ Içānapavitra of several ricefields. These were obtained by him from the various Poñ (less elevated officials) who either owned them or simply used them. The Mratāṇ 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 Mratāṇ and constituted his gift, *amṇoy*. The word *amṇoy* 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 Mratāṇ were concerned with transactions of this kind, where the Mratāṇ 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 Kaṁmrātāñ Añ Çri Piṅgaleçvara añnoy Poñ Çivabhāsaṇa man jo nu dravya Vrah Kaṁmrātāñ Añ* ‘Ricefield (for) the god, Çri Piṅgaleçvara, gift of Poñ Çivabhāsaṇa, 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 ktiñ krapī canmat 1* ‘Poñ Bhā Vinaya gives-up-as-exchange-price a milk buffalo’. 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 ñeñ travañ Devaçila jñahv gi srū mūlya prak tañlīñ 5 yugala yau 1* ‘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 Kaṁmrātāñ Añ* ‘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 jāhv ta Kurāk Jmeñ doñ 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.⁴ 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) 1 *je* (cf. Mod Khmer *kanceo*: (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. *jñāhv* (price). . . *canlek amval* (double cloth) *yau* 1 *vlaḥ* 1. l. 21, *sre*. . . *je* 2. *jñāhv* (price). . . *cnalek amval* (double cloth) *vlaḥ* 1.

APPENDIX Lists of Vocabulary

1. Slave categories

<i>kantai</i>	womenfolk. K.904, l. 1, etc. Sometimes to be translated 'wife'.
<i>kārmāmāntika kon</i>	workers. K.41, l. 4 only children. K.24, B. l. 3, etc.
<i>kñūm klamum</i>	slaves, <i>passim</i> . maidens. K.24, B. l. 12 only.
<i>gho</i>	Short for <i>ghoda</i> . Occurs on K.134, 135, l. 24 and K.749, l. 13.
<i>ghoda</i>	menfolk. K.560, l.2, etc.
<i>tai der</i>	female. K.24, A.1. 2. on the verge of puberty(?). K.149, l. 23, etc.
<i>pau meñ</i>	unweaned. K.8, l. 8, etc. children. K.134, l. 21. Seems to be equivalent to <i>kon</i> in this one inscription of the extreme north-east. Presumably related to Old Khmer <i>kanmeñ</i> 'young'.
<i>rat</i>	running about. K.66, l. 18, etc.
<i>lañ</i>	strong, full-grown, having attained the age of puberty(?). K.149, l.21.
<i>si</i>	male, menfolk. <i>passim</i> .

2. Slave duties

<i>kñūm vihāra</i>	slave of the temple. K.755, l.2.
<i>kñūm vrañ</i>	slave of the divinity. K.8, l.9, etc.
<i>kñūm vrañ rapañ</i>	slave of the sacred dance. K.137, l.8.
<i>kñūm sre</i>	slave of the ricefield. K.137, l.26.
<i>gandharva</i>	musician (male). K.155, I, l.7.
<i>gvāl</i>	herdsman, K.155, II, l. 11.
<i>camdak</i>	trapper (?). K.748, II, l. 9, etc.

camreñ
cam-uk

cmap

cmuh

cmañ
tañpeñ

tmāñ
tmir slik

tmīn

tmon
dnuk

pamas

pi le

pedanātaka
rpam

pramah

mahānasa
rañhvai

ramañ
vari

vādya

samantagajapati

smon

ārttai

añrah

a^umuh

singer. K.137, l. 9, etc.
? (all men). K.24, B. l. 10, etc.
one who catches. K.137, l. 21 only.
secretary, K.129, l. 5, etc.
guard. K.939, l. 8, etc.
(fruit)-picker(?). K.137, l. 17 only.
weaver. K.956, l. 2, etc.
one who sews leaves (Mod. Khmer *de-(r)*), K.137, l. 15.
player of stringed musical instrument (played by plucking), K.557, est. l. 1.
? K.124, l. 9 only.
? (all men). K.155, II, l. 20 only.
grinder (e.g. of perfume). K.124, l. 7.
for work inside? (lit. 'so as to be above'). K.155, I, l. 6.
dancers (female with Indian names). K.155, I, l. 9.
chief of women (?) K.137, l. 14.
cook. K.155, I, l. 18.
one who spins thread. K.155, II, l. 10.
dancer. K.557, est. l. 1.
? (all men), K.129, l. 1, etc.
musician. K.129, l.3 only.
chief of the king's elephant. K.140, l. 3 only.
one who moulds (statues?) (Mod. Khmer *so:n*). K.137, l. 21 only.
(all women). K.24, B. l. 13 only.
chief of slaves (all men). K.423, B. l. 2, etc.
heater (i.e. of water). K.127, l.6, etc.

3. Slave titles

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

4. Kinship terms

<i>ge kule</i>	members of the family. K.561, l. 22, etc.
<i>a²ji, ji</i>	ancestor. K.451, nord, 4, etc.
<i>kamton</i>	on the grandmother's side; (?)grandmother. K.38, l. 13.
<i>a²ta, ta</i>	father. K.357, l. 14, etc.
<i>a²me, me</i>	mother. K.138, l.7, etc.
<i>cpoñ</i>	elder sibling. K.79, l.10, etc.
<i>paon</i>	younger sibling. K.480, l. 12, etc.
<i>kon</i>	child. K.451, l. 7, etc.
<i>kon prasā</i>	son/daughter-in-law. K.51, l. 14.
<i>kmoy, kanmoy</i>	nephew/niece; <i>kanmoy</i> <i>kamton</i> great-nephew on the female side. K.38, l. 13.
<i>cau</i>	grandchild. K.562, l. 6, etc.
<i>cau dvot</i>	great-grandchild. K.124, l. 5.

5. Examples of slave names Suggesting good qualities:

<i>jāpi sralañ</i>	made to be loved
<i>tlai</i>	valuable

<i>paem</i>	sweet
<i>saap anyāya</i>	hating injustice
Suggesting bad qualities:	
<i>kreñ</i>	afraid
<i>cgoñ</i>	imperfect
<i>vlac</i>	forgetful
<i>sa-ap</i>	hating
<i>sgih</i>	sullen
<i>slāñ</i>	pale
<i>sa-uy</i>	stinking
Suggesting activities:	
<i>campañ</i>	warfare
<i>jul</i>	mend
<i>tpāñ</i>	weaving
<i>reñ</i>	do basket-work
<i>rañhap</i>	kill
<i>smoñ</i>	beggar
<i>hām</i>	forbid
Describing physical characteristics:	
<i>kāmput</i>	having lost a limb
<i>kmau</i>	dark
<i>kvak</i>	blind
<i>dāmñan</i>	weight
<i>pdai</i>	stomach
<i>muk kraham</i>	red-faced
<i>sku</i>	white-haired
Suggesting non-Khmer origin:	
<i>jloy</i>	prisoner-of-war
<i>ramañ</i>	Mon
<i>vrau</i>	Prou
<i>syām</i>	Siamese(?)
Names of animals:	
<i>kantur</i>	mouse
<i>kcau</i>	shellfish
<i>ktām</i>	crab
<i>klā</i>	tiger
<i>cke</i>	dog
<i>cmā</i>	cat
<i>jlēñ</i>	leech
<i>tañku</i>	maggot
<i>tmāt</i>	vulture
<i>bhe</i>	otter
<i>mon</i>	silkworm
<i>skār</i>	weasel
<i>srāñ</i>	wasp
<i>svā kmau</i>	black monkey
<i>añḍañ</i>	eel
<i>anrok</i>	ox (cf. Kuy <i>anrok</i> ?)
Names of plants:	
<i>candana</i>	sandalwood
<i>pkā jhe</i>	blossom
<i>vñe</i>	flower
<i>vñe</i>	forest flower
<i>smau</i>	grass

Pre-Angkor Cambodia: Evidence from Khmer Inscriptions

<i>svāy</i>	mango
<i>anlik</i>	melon
<i>aṃvau</i>	sugar-cane
Names of inanimate things:	
<i>dik</i>	water
<i>dyoñ</i>	carbon
<i>pkāy</i>	star
Sanskrit names:	
<i>ksān</i>	peaceful
<i>gurudeva</i>	divine teacher
<i>daçami</i>	tenth
<i>dvadaçi</i>	twelfth
<i>dharmaadat</i>	given by the Law
<i>dharmaapāla</i>	protector of the Law
<i>dharmaçakta</i>	having power in Law
<i>pañçami</i>	fifth
<i>lābha</i>	luck
<i>vañān</i>	understanding
<i>vidyā</i>	learning
<i>saptami</i>	seventh
<i>sudat</i>	given
<i>çivadāsa</i>	slave of Civa
<i>amṛta</i>	immortal
<i>utpala</i>	lotus

6. Agricultural areas

<i>karom</i>	low ground. K.426, l. 4.
<i>caṃkū</i>	place prepared for planting by burning (Coedès). K.426, l. 4.
<i>camnya</i>	pasture. K.341, nord, l. 9.
<i>camnoñ</i>	enclosure for animals. K.44, B, l. 2.
<i>cpar</i>	garden, K.562, l. 21, etc.
<i>dañriñ</i>	orchard. K.426, l. 4, etc.
<i>sre</i>	ricefield. <i>passim</i> . – <i>prañ</i> dry ricefield, K.79, l. 24.

7. Agricultural products

<i>kalmon</i>	wax. K.124, l. 12.
<i>krapās</i>	cotton. K.124, l. 10.
<i>ksīra</i>	milk. K.689, B, l. 6.
<i>gmūñ</i>	honey. K.124, l. 11.
<i>ñañhor</i>	syrup. K.124, l. 18.
<i>toñ</i>	coconut, K.416, I, l. 7, etc.
<i>tvau</i>	sorghum millet. K.124, l. 11.
<i>danhuñ</i>	perfume, K.877, II, l. 13.
<i>pareñ</i>	oil. K.451, nord, l. 7.

<i>madhu</i>	honey, K.421, l. 8.
<i>madhucchista</i>	wax. K.421, l. 8.
<i>yava</i>	grain. K.421, l. 4.
<i>rañko</i>	husked rice, K.561, l. 8 – so white rice. K.127, l. 10. – <i>samrat</i> refined rice. K.30, l. 27.
<i>lho</i>	sesamum, K.124, l. 11.
<i>vanli</i>	ginger, K.561, l. 8.
<i>santek</i>	beans, K.689, B, l. 12.
<i>sru, srū</i>	paddy, K.424, l. 6.
<i>çunthi</i>	ginger, K.124, l. 12.
<i>ampel</i>	salt. K.30, l. 29.

8. Building and constructions

<i>kadam</i>	hut. K.425, B, l. 5.
<i>kamluñ</i>	interior. K.135, l. 10.
<i>kralā</i>	court, room. K.557, est. l. 2.
<i>gūha</i>	grotto. K.44, B, l. 1.
<i>jamnan</i>	causeway, K.561, C, l. 16.
<i>tnal</i>	roadway, K.560, l. 11.
<i>travañ</i>	reservoir. K.561, l. 15, etc.
<i>thalā</i>	paved open space. K.44, A, l. 11.
<i>dok</i>	boat, K.426, l. 9, etc.
<i>prañāla</i>	gutter. <i>pnāñ</i> –cover for gutter, K.910, l. 14.
	<i>karap</i> – <i>yau</i> 1 cloth to cover the gutter, K.124, l. 13.
<i>prāsāda</i> (name)	palace. K.557, est. l. 4.
<i>āvāsa kñuñ</i>	living quarters of the slaves. K.582, l. 7.

9. Metals and stones

<i>tek</i>	iron. K.388, B, l. 18.
<i>tmo</i>	stone, gem. K. 134, l. 18.
<i>prak</i>	silver. K.79, l. 17.
<i>mās</i>	gold. K.21, l. 5.
<i>lañgau</i>	copper. K.560, l. 2.
<i>samrit</i>	bronze. K.505, l. 18.

10. Artefacts⁵

<i>kan jeñ mās</i>	gold anklet. K.21, l. 5.
<i>kañsa[ta]tāla</i>	copper gong. K.424, B, l. 5.
<i>kañje</i> (name)	basket. K.11, l. 1.
<i>kataka</i>	bracelet. K.21, l. 3.

<i>kamrāl</i> (name)	rug. K.129, I. 2.	<i>pkā dmeḥ</i> or	artificial flowers of
<i>karap</i>	cover. K.21, I. 4.	<i>pkā jmeḥ</i>	some kind. K.21, I. 5.
<i>kalaṣa</i>	flask. K.877, II, I. 12.	<i>pnaḥ</i>	screen, cover (?). K.910, I. 14.
<i>kirita</i>	diadem. K.21, I. 2.	<i>bhājana</i>	vessel. K.877, II, I. 13.
<i>knop</i>	belt. K.21, I. 4.	<i>makuta</i>	diadem. K.910, I. 15.
<i>klas</i>	umbrella. K.560, I. 2.	<i>rddeh</i>	cart. K.426, I. 9.
<i>cakra</i>	disc. K.21, I. 5.	<i>valvel</i>	candlestick-holder. K.21, I. 6.
<i>candal</i>	support. K.877, II, I. 17.	<i>vnāk</i>	arrangement, set (of jewels, utensils). K.21, I. 13.
<i>canlak</i>	sculpted figure, K.79, I. 18— <i>saṃruk</i> engraved in repoussé. K.21, I. 3.	<i>siṃhāsana</i>	throne with seated lion. K.877, II, I. 15.
<i>canlek</i>	cloth:— <i>yugala</i> double (double-threaded?) cloth. K.79, I. 8. Other kinds of cloth: <i>kaṃvar</i> , <i>kāpata</i> , <i>jli</i> , <i>uladdha</i> , <i>ple</i> , <i>vagr̥sa</i> , <i>pan-eṇ</i> steamer. K.877, II, I. 14.	<i>svok</i>	tray. K.124, I. 9.
<i>canhoy</i>	cooking pot, K.124, I. 9.	<i>ṣaṅkha</i>	conch. K.877, II, I. 15.
<i>chāya</i>	object giving shade. K.877, II, I. 15.	<i>ṣarāvana</i>	shallow dish or lid, K.877, II, I. 13.
<i>chat</i> (name)	umbrella. K.44, B, I. 7.	<i>ṣrivatsa</i>	Exact translation cannot be given for this symbol of good fortune K.877, II, I. 15.
<i>jeṇ den</i>	chandelier. K.388, B, 18.	<i>añjul</i> (name)	needle. K.137, I. 19.
<i>tanpoṇ</i>	cane, stick. K.44, A, I. 11.	<i>ardhacandra</i>	half-moon. K.877, II, I. 17.
<i>taṇ</i>	handle. K.877, II, I. 13.	<i>āstharaṇa</i>	bed. K.388, B, I. 19.
<i>tpāñ</i> (name)	weaving. K.66, B, I. 16.	<i>hvek</i>	ladle, K.124, I. 10.
<i>thās</i>	tray. K.505, I. 18.	<i>udaravandha</i>	decorative band worn round the waist. K.21, I. 5.
<i>pr̥thivī</i>	the world (held in the hand of a statue of the Vishnu). K.21, I. 5.		

APPENDIX B

1. The pre-Angkor inscriptions in Khmer.

All the published inscriptions⁶ 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.⁷ 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.

Pre-A.D. 700	Post-A.D. 700 to 802	Pre-Angkor	Pre-A.D. 700	Post-A.D. 700 to 802	Pre-Angkor
		1 Y		124 1	
		6 Z			126 1
	7 Z		127 1		
		8 Z	129 1		
9 Z			133 1		
		11 X		134 1	
	18 W			135 1	
22 X			137 —		
24 U			138 K		
		25 U	140 K		
28 U				145 K	
30 U				146 K	
		37 T	149 H		
38 U			154 R		
41 U					155 —
44 X			159 G		
		46 X			163 G
		48 V		259 D	
49 V			341 B		
51 V			357 E		
54 V					388 A
66 Q					389 A
73 S					400 A
74 S			416 S		
76 T					421 Z
78 O			422 X		
79 —			423 X		
80 R			424 S		
90 M			426 R		
		98 P	427 S		
		103 P			
		107 P		428 M	

Pre A.D. 700	Post- A.D. 700 to 802	Pre Angkor	Pre A.D. 700	Post- A.D. 700 to 802	Pre Angkor
109 P		108 P	430 L		
113 P			437 H		
115 M			438 H		
451 D			447 F		
			728 -		
482 -		480 -			739 = 560, q.v.
493 Q			748 U		
502 J					749 D
505 C				753 D	
		518 V			755 U
548 U					757 K
557,					759 R
600 U					764 T
		559 U	765 T		
560 T					766 O
561 U					784 S
562 W					785 S
563 T					786 -
582 T					787 R
	590 F				788 R
600			790 -		
See 557					808 D
607 H					810 R
608 H					811 U
648 M					816 H
		657 E			818 G
		664 Q			877 S
		670 U			884 Z
	688 D				903 R
689 X				904 D	
709 U			910 R		
710 T					911 Y
711 S					922 D
712 S			926 L		
718 W				947 L	
719 W					939 U
		723 B			940 R
		724 A			956 V
726 N			1010 T		

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.

3. cf teknonyms in Javanese (Damais 1970) and Pacoh (Watson 1969).

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.

6. Including K.1010, published by Monsieur C. Jacques, *BEFEO*, lvi, 70.

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 kñūm as 'slave'

Monsieur Jacques was firmly of the opinion that the personnel listed as *kñūm*, 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), *kñūm vraḥ*, 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 *kñūm* 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 *kñūm* 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

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. | L (N-S) 430; 926; 927. |
| B (N-S) 723, 724; 341. | M (W-E) 648; 90, 428; 115. |
| C 505. | N 726. |
| D Near Puok, 451; at Angkor, 749, 753, 904, 922; at Siemreap, 259; at Roluos, 688, 808. | O 766, 78
(Three northerly sites, W-E) 113; 103; 109; and (W-E) 107, 108, 98. |
| E (N-S) 657; 357. | Q (N-S) 66; 493, 664. |
| F 590; 447. | R (Four most northerly sites, W-E) 903, 910; 759; 940; 426; (remainder W-E) 788; 810; 787; 80, 154. ⁸ |
| G (N-S) 818; 159, 163. | S 427; 416; 424; 784; 785; 877; 74; 73. Exact position not known to the writer: 711, 712. |
| H (N-S) 816; 149, 437, 438, 607, 608. | T (N-S) 76; 764, 1010; 563, 560; 765, 37; 710. Exact position not known to the writer: 582. |
| I (N-S) 127; 129; 133; 124, 126; 134, 135. | 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. |
| J 502. | V (Westerly sites, N-S) 956; 51; 54; 49; 48; (NE site) 518. |
| K (N-S) 146; 145; and (W-E) 138; 140, 757. | 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. |

Map of Cambodia showing the location of pre-Angkor inscriptions. The map includes major cities like Bangkok, Korat, and Saigon, and geographical features like the Mekong River and the Dangrek Range. Numerous inscriptions are marked with letters (A-Z) and numbers (1-10). A scale bar indicates distances in kilometers and miles.

-

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aymonier, E., 1900-03, *Le Cambodge*. 3 vols. Paris.
- Bhattacharya, K. 1961. *Les Religions Brahmaniques dans l'Ancien Cambodge*. Paris, EFEO.
- Bongert, Y. 1959. 'Note sur l'esclavage en droit khmer', in *Études d'histoire du droit prive offertes a Pierre Petot*, Paris, Éditions Montchrestien.
- Briggs, L.P., 1951, *The ancient Khmer empire*, Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society.
- Cœdès, G., 1924, 'Études cambodgiennes XVIII: L'extension du Cambodge vers le sud-ouest au VIIe siècle (Nouvelles inscriptions de Chantaboun).' *BEFEO*, xxiv, 352-8.
- Cœdès G., 1936, 'Études cambodgiennes XXXI: A Propos de Tchen-la d'Eau: trois inscriptions de Cochinchine', *BEFEO*, xxxiv, 1-13.
- Cœdès, G., 1937-66, *Les Inscriptions du Cambodge*, 8 vols, Hanoi and Paris, EFEO.
- Groslier, B.P. and Arthaud, J., 1966, *Angkor*, 2nd edn., London, Thames and Hudson.
- Lunet de Lajonquière, E. 1901, *Atlas archéologique de l'Indo-Chine*, Paris, Leroux.
- Malleret, L., 1959-63, *L'Archéologie du Delta du Mékong*, 4 vols., Paris, EFEO.
- Parmentier, H., 1927, *L'Art Khmer Primitif*, 2 vols, Paris: EFEO
- Sahai, Sachchidanand, 1970, *Les Institutions Politiques et l'Organisation Administrative du Cambodge Ancien VIe-XIIIe siècles*, Paris, EFEO.
- Shorto, H.L. 1971. *A dictionary of the Mon inscriptions from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries*, London, Oxford Univ. Press.

SIAM SOCIETY LIBRARY
 สยามสมาคมในท มณราชูปถัมภ์
 131 ซอย โท (สุขุมวิท 21)
 ถ.สุขุมวิท ก.ท.ม. 10110 14616