Resolving the Chronology and History of 9th Century Cambodia

by Prof. Michael Vickery, Faculty of Archaeology, Royal University of Fine Arts, Phnom Penh

In his article "Considerations on the Chronology and History of 9th Century Cambodia" Dr. Karl-Heinz Golzio has performed a useful service in calling to our attention the defects in the conventional wisdom syntheses surrounding the time of Jayavarman II-III. His total reliance on Sanskrit inscriptions, however, and neglect of Khmer, has prevented him from reaching the best solutions; for R-jendravarman he relies exclusively on the Pre Rup inscription, whereas other of that king's genealogical records show different lines of descent; and the final two paragraphs exhibit confusion about the significance of certain dates.

First, Golzio is quite correct in insisting that the sources for the almost hagiographic biography of Jayavarman II all date from two centuries or later than his period in the 8th-9th centuries, while "in earlier inscriptions Jayavarman II is no extraordinary king who as a hero liberated his country from foreign sovereignty. He is only one king in a line of other kings", although even in those sources, he is of some special importance "as it was Jayavarman II who founded the nucleus of the later capital Angkor".

Then, the heart of Golzio's argument is that "Coedès and his successors did omit [sic] or suppress the kings between Jayavarman III and Indravarman I, viz. Rudravarman and P@thivindravarman". They, in Indravarman's inscriptions at Roluos, appear as his father and maternal grandfather; and Golzio avers that they were "‘normal’ kings [and] there is no reason to believe that those rulers were only royal kin-folk".

First, if these two ‘normal’ kings were ‘omitted’ and ‘suppressed’, it was not only by Coedès and his successors, but by all of the subsequent Angkor royalty and record keepers. After the inscriptions of Indravarman and his son Yaßovarman at Preah Ko and Lolei they never appear again. To be sure there are mysterious references to a Rudravarman who was not the one of Funan in the 6th century, and in at least one case he fits a time slot which could be construed as that of Indravarman's grandfather, but these late references are no more convincing than the late biographies of Jayavarman II.1

Golzio has started with an assumption that they must have been real kings, and has gone on from there to criticize accordingly the dates generally associated with Jayavarman II and III. The latter is a worthy effort, for there is indeed much confusion, together with unverified and unverifiable speculation, in the different treatments of those kings, but this is true regardless of how P@thivindravarman and Rudravarman are situated, and resolution of the Jayavarman problems does not help to resolve their case.

Moreover in the genealogies and other records of Indravarman, Yaßovarman and R-jendravarman there are other ‘-varman’ names which do not differ in form from names of kings whom all recognize as ‘real’ or ‘normal’; and if P@thivindravarman and Rudravarman are to be accorded true king status, so should several others.

Just to take names found in inscriptions more or less contemporary with their presumed lifetimes, ignoring the generations going back beyond parents and grandparents of Jayavarman II-III, Indravarman, Yaßovarman, and R-jendravarman, there is King Jayendr-dhipativarman, an uncle (mother's brother) of Jayavarman II (K.809); and this relationship, seen in comparison with genealogies of elite families in Angkor, suggests that Jayavarman inherited some kind of special status from him. There are also dhuli je© vra© kamrate© a© 8i jayendrvarma, whose titles are really those of a king, and, probably, his consort, vra© kamrate© a© jayendradevi in K.325 and K.326 D in Roluos. They were probably close relatives of Indravarman and Yaßovarman. Nearly as high in royal rank was dhuli je© vra© kamrate©
As I showed in an article several years ago, those — varman ancestors of Indravarman may easily be explained as posthumous upgrading of the king's parents, which perhaps already occurred within their lifetimes. Such procedures are known world wide, when new rulers accede to positions superior to those of their ancestors.  

There is a check on Indravarman's claims about his immediate ancestors in the Khmer inscription K.956 of Vat saú rôô in Ba Phnom. It is the record of an official family apparently written just after the reign of Yaóvarman (889-900), that is, by people who had lived during Indravarman's reign. Its authors state that in the time of Jayavarman II they had three ancestors on their mother's, and her mother's, side - two females and one male, presumably siblings, though this is not stated. The male was a general (sen-pati); one female, Teð Ayak, was a queen (deví) taken (kàpta) in, or from, Bhavapura; and the other married a kholô vâla (chief of troops, or personnel) of a kamrateð añ ta vrahê (a high royal, official, or sacerdotal title) who (the kholô vâla) was an ancestor (ajë) of Indravarman. Jayavarman II brought them from Bhavapura and engendered six children. Contrary to Coedès' hesitation in attributing parentage to the children, they can only be the children of Te Ayak and Jayavarman II, since the marriage and family of the other female are treated separately; and this answers the question whether she was queen of Jayavarman II or of another king of Bhavapura. She was queen of Jayavarman II in Bhavapura, or whom he took in/from Bhavapura. This is a definitive answer to the question of whether Bhavapura was an independent kingdom until R~jendravarman. It was not, as should have been clear already from the inscription of Sdok K ak Thom, in which the family responsible for that inscription wrote that their ancestors of the lineage (sant-na) of Aninditapura were given land in Indrapura by the chief (kuruð) of Bhavapura, implicitly at a time when Bhavapura, located at Ampil Rolu'm not far from Sambor Preî Kuk (ll'b-napura), would have been under its own family of ~ditya kings, and not long before the Sdok K ak Thom family joined Jayavarman II, at which time Hirayadma, brother of one of the Bhavapura ~dityakings, also followed Jayavarman, and later became officiant at the famous rites on Mahendraparvata, Phnom Kulen. All of this is sufficient to show that Jayavarman II acquired dominance over Bhavapura early in his career before proceeding to Angkor. If, as the inscription of Sdok K ak Thom says, he ruled in Indrapura, where the ruler of Bhavapura could distribute land to favorites, then certainly Bhavapura had also joined him.

Inscription K.956 then takes the family through three generations in which Indravarman is not only a descendant of one of that family, but also marries a granddaughter of Teð Ayak and Jayavarman II. This can be seen most clearly in schematic form, which shows Indravarman solidly situated in a family both descended from, and related by marriage to, Jayavarman II. The only difference from Coedès' schema for K.956, within the area of comparability, is to make explicit the marriage of Teð Ayak and Jayavarman II and their parentage of Teð Pavitra, and to insert Indravarman and his father. Although aji, the specified relationship of Loñ H aradh-rma to Indravarman, may mean any ancestor beyond the father's generation, the time span means he must in fact have been grandfather.

Although all of this is clear in Coedès' translation, he did not discuss it nor direct the reader to its implications, and in his genealogical table he disguised it, no doubt shocked at the way this inscription, studied near the end of his career, exploded the official genealogies which he and his cohorts had so carefully developed over the years.

Here then is the 'secret history' of Indravarman's family. It is not totally incompatible with his own official genealogy. His father could still have been named 'P ñhùvindravarman', but he is unlikely to have been a 'normal' king; and who, or what, was the kamrateð añ ta vrahê whom Indravarman's paternal grandfather served as kholô vâla? On the other side Indravarman's mother, and her brother the kamrateð añ vrahê mûla, another enigmatic high title, could have been children of a 'Rudravarman', as in the official genealogy. The latter then, would not be incorrect, except perhaps in the status implied by the names in - varman, which by the 9th century no longer denoted kings exclusively, but other dignitaries as well. The official genealogy was rather deliberately incomplete. The lower ranking relatives are excised as is the connection to Jayavarman II, the maternal grandfather of one of Indravarman's consorts as well as brother-
in-law of Indravarman's paternal grandfather. Indravarman's close connection to his predecessors' family is also emphasized in the Vat Saú roś text by the story of a fraternal elephant hunt on which he accompanied Jayavarman III.

The purpose of Indravarman's official genealogy was clearly not to record true ancestry, but was probably a semi-fictional claim to ancient lineage to justify his succession to the kingship over other members of his, and Jayavarman's, family. The necessity for such a claim would derive from the succession rule of the time, of which we know nothing, but which was certainly not patrilineal primogeniture, and about which we may eventually be able to make useful inferences through study of the genealogies as claims to status rather than statements of historical fact.¹¹

There is thus no need to worry about fitting Padvindravarman and Rudravarman as 'normal kings' into a slot between Jayavarman III and Indravarman. Contrary to the supposition of Golzio about their status, K.956 is evidence that the existence of the parents and grandparents of Indravarman was recognized, but they were not considered to merit having their names recorded. In his official family inscriptions, Indravarman, like many dynasts the world over who were not directly descended from previous rulers, posthumously promoted his parents to royal rank.

Golzio then goes on to discuss the putative Jayavarman Ibis, to whom Coedès attributed inscriptions K.103/AD 770 in Thbaung Khmum, Kompong Cham and K.134/AD 781 near ancient Ambhupura, Kratie province. Some years ago Jacques proposed that he was really Jayavarman II, but then reverted to the old view. Golzio seems to be undecided, but as evidence in favor of Jayavarman Ibis = Jayavarman II, he says that the Lolei inscription "bears only two, and not three, Jayavarnas, and it seems relatively unlikely that it should not have mentioned a king who is known by his own inscriptions and who ruled in the region of Ambhupura".

Although I favor the view that Jayavarman Ibis was really Jayavarman II, Golzio's suggestion does not help the case. No genealogical inscription is exhaustive, while some include invented characters. Of the sixteen named ancestors beyond the parents of the ninth-tenth-century kings named in the genealogical records of Indravarman, Yaśovarman, and Rudravarman, none may be identified, except speculatively, with any individual known from the pre-Angkor corpus, while none of the mainstream rulers of the pre-Angkor inscriptions, or the Ambhupura dynasty recorded in K.124 of 803, or any other supra-local chief mentioned in contemporary seventh to eighth century texts finds mention in the genealogies at all.¹²

Golzio's final point concerns the dates and career of Jayavarman II who, in the standard treatment of Coedès returned from Jav around 800, reigned in 802, and died in 850, while Jacques, in the article identifying Jayavarman I bis and II, discovered that the beginning of the reign of Jayavarman III, and hence the death of Jayavarman II, should be imputed to 834.¹³ For Golzio, "it seems rather doubtful whether one of these dates has any value at all", and one may certainly feel sympathy for that view, but we must nevertheless try to determine what they mean in the interests of producing the best synthesis of the records for that time.

The date for the beginning of the reign of Jayavarman II depends on the decision about Jayavarman Ibis. If he was really Jayavarman II, the latter began his political activity with a claim to kingship in the Southeast of Cambodia in 770, united his own domain with Ambhupura in 781, was called king in 790 in an unspecified place by some later scribes at Angkor, and must be considered to have died in 834 rather than 850, in order to avoid giving him an unreasonable age of around 100 years at death.

This scenario must be either accepted or rejected, for the written dates in those inscriptions are not in doubt. Acceptance depends on accepting 834, rather than 850, as the beginning of the reign of Jayavarman III, and those dates are found in contexts about which both Coedès and Jacques changed their minds twice each.

The controversial passage is in inscription K.521, and the date was difficult to read. Coedès first thought it was Paka 791/AD 869 and that Jayavarman III had then been king for 16 years. Later Coedès re-read the date as 772/850, but revised his translation to 'age 16' when Jayavarman III became king. He was influenced in this by K.834, which stated clearly that Jayavarman III ruled in 850. Inscription K.834, however, is a faked text. Much of the original text was cut away and replaced by new text, in which names of kings and dates were changed, and its fakery is plain in that it makes brothers of 13 officials who served a succession of kings for over 200 years. It will not do to accept, as Coedès did, that "the substitution of one king for another led to a corresponding substitution of date... which is rather proof of the accuracy of the date". The erroneous information is so overwhelming that no detail of this inscription may be taken as valid, as was the conclusion of Claude Jacques.¹⁴

Claude Jacques, is his "La carrière" decided on the reading 'had reigned for 16 years' in 850, then, apparently changed his view, although not explicitly, nor with any explanation (see further below).

It is time now to end this confusion. The sentence in question is simple Khmer, and cannot mean anything but 'reigned for 16 years'; and there is adequate confirmation in other structurally similar phrases in other inscriptions which Coedès consistently read as referring to a period of past time, not the age of the protagonist.¹⁵

| K.521: svey r-ja | chn-µ | tap pramv-γ |
| K.697: vraδ p-dakamratδ aiν | svey vraδ r-jaδ | chn-µ | vyar |

Coedès: "His Majesty, in the second year of his reign..."

K.353: khoñ valaaddhy-pakaθ thee srenoθ | chn-µ | dappiy (official title) cultivated that rice field years 13
Coedès: “the chief of the population, professor; cultivated this rice field for 13 years”

K.235: Sdok K. ak T hom: man vr| man vr| man vr| svey r-jal| chn-µ| 2 gu
when the king had reigned years 2 just
Coedès: “when H.M. had enjoyed royal power (during) two years only”

It is interesting that Khmers today, for instance my students in the Faculty of Archaeology in Phnom Penh, have no doubt about the meaning of the phrase in K.521, and laugh at any suggestion that it could mean the king’s age, at least until some of them in the 3rd and 4th levels have been brainwashed to believe that nothing Coedès wrote may be challenged. Among the latter there are some who insist that it could also mean age, but they are unable to explain how that fits with the structurally identical phrases from other inscriptions, which Coedès agreed meant periods of time, not age.16

Golzio unnecessarily confused the issue of the dates of Jayavarman III with his remark that “there are other inscriptions mentioning Jayavarman III which contradict his accession date”, and offering K.175 as an example. In that inscription there is no date for the reign of Jayavarman III, who is identified without doubt by his posthumous name viPhuloka. The inscription simply refers to an event of his reign. The date which Golzio says should be 960/AD 980 is the date of the inscription in the reign of Jayavarman V. Golzio’s other example concerning Jayavarman III is equally peculiar. The date associated with Jayavarman III in K.774, 879/AD 860-1, refers to an event in his reign, not his accession, and it fits his reign period whether dated from 850 or 834.17 Golzio’s further remarks about the reign of Jayavarman V are quite irrelevant. The dates in question have nothing to do with his accession, but refer to events within his reign, and thus the date ‘891’ is [not] in any case wrong. Of course ‘791’ for that context is wrong, and, pace Golzio, Coedès was quite right to revise Aymonier’s reading.18

Now where does this leave us with “the chronology and history of 9th century Cambodia”, especially if Jayavarman Ibis was Jayavarman II who died and left the throne to Jayavarman III in 834.

The outline of the conventional view à la Coedès has been stated above; and since then Claude Jacques has offered three different modifications.

First, in “La carrière de Jayavarman II”, he wrote that soon after his arrival in Cambodia, around AD 770, Jayavarman took power in Indrapura, and probably reigned over Vy-dhapura too; then he took over the kingdom of Šambhupura; after that, between 780 and 802, occurred the conquest of Bhavapura, perhaps, of the kingdom of Aninditapura, which Jacques believed was centered in the region of Angkor; K.ub east of Angkor; Harihar-laya, and Amarendrapura in Battambang.19

Then a few years later, Jacques wrote, “around 770 [AD] a young prince... seized the kingdom of Vy-dhapura in the Southeast of Cambodia, then that of Šambhupura, to the North of the former; both on the left bank of the Mekong. This prince, who was Jayavarman II, then installed his capital at Indrapura, a site which has been recognized with a certain degree of probability to the east of modern Kompong Cham, that is, between the two conquered kingdoms”.20

Unfortunately, Jacques did not provide notes on his sources, nor explanations for his conclusions, which are very important. We should take note of certain details, such as the words ‘seize’, ‘kingdom’, ‘conquered’.

The date 770 comes from inscription K.103 with a single line legible recording the existence of a king Jayavarman. This inscription was found not far from an ancient walled city now called ‘Banteay Prei Nokor’, where the single pre-Angkor inscription naming Vy-dhapura (K.109/AD 655.) was also found.21

But, to say that the prince named Jayavarman in K.103 and K.134 (Šambhupura) ‘seized’ the ‘kingdoms’ of Vy-dhapura (and Šambhupura) goes far beyond the content of the inscriptions. For the first, the hypothesis must be limited to the supposition that Jayavarman II began his career in a locality which may be called ‘Vy-dhapura’, which was perhaps his own country. For the second, nothing permits the conclusion that Vy-dhapura at that time, the end of the 8th century, was a kingdom, unless it be argued that the point is proved by that very K.103 inscription of Jayavarman. In K.109, the only evidence for the existence of Vy-dhapura in the pre-Angkor period (before the 9th century) indicates that Vy-dhapura was only a chieftain headed by a kur-kloñ, a title which is poorly understood but which was apparently of second rank, although in the Sanskrit part of his inscription he promoted himself to the status of ‘despoutavara, which may be translated as ‘seigneur de Vy-dhapura’.22

As for Šambhupura, the supposed relations between it and Jayavarman II derive from inscription K.134/AD 781 found in the region of ancient Šambhupura, not far to the north of Kratie. But neither does it allow the interpretation ‘seize’. At the time Šambhupura was ruled by its own dynasty of queens passing the throne from mother to daughter until 803, at least, and if Jayavarman II was able to put up an inscription calling himself ‘king’, there is a strong chance that, as was understood by Pierre Dupont, he married one of the queens.23

Then, according to Jacques, after having united Vy-dhapura and Šambhupura, Jayavarman “installed his capital at Indrapura”. This hypothesis concerning Indrapura is based on the inscription of Sdok K. ak Thom (K.235/1052), which says nothing about either Vy-dhapura or Šambhupura. Accepting that it is legitimate for a historian to synthesize data from K.103, K.134, and K.235, Jacques’ localization of Indrapura is nevertheless astonishing. That is, “a site which has been recognized with a certain degree of probability to
the east of modern Kompong Cham... between the two conquered kingdoms" follows the interpretation of Coedès who, without taking K.103 and K.134 into consideration, and believing that Vy-dhapura could be placed at Ba Phnom, located Indrapura at Banteay Prei Nokor, precisely at the place where Jacques implicitly proposed, and with which I am in agreement, to locate Vy-dhapura. If Vy-dhapura was really near the location of K.103 in 770, Indrapura may no longer be placed at Banteay Prei Nokor, unless it be argued that both were no more than family domains, not kingdoms or even large chieftoms.24

A still later synthesis on Jayavarman II by Claude Jacques is somewhat different. It begins in 790, when "a young prince was consecrated as king with the name Jayavarman II". After coming from Java, which Jacques considers unidentifiable, but "certainly not the island of Java itself", he "took power in the kingdom of Vy-dhapura", near the modern town of Prey Veng. There he had a religious ceremony performed to free him from the control of the King of Java (K.956). At the same time or later he took over the kingdom of §ambhupura, near Sambor north of Kratie, and as his capital chose Indrapura, probably at Banteay Prei Nokor, situated on "the presumed boundary separating the two kingdoms" of §ambhupura and Vy-dhapura. Continuing his conquests northward he reached Wat Phu, then "following on the south the Dangrek chain, he finally took the kingdom of Aninditapura [location unspecified] and settled in the city of Harihar~laya". Wishing to expand his realm westward, he founded Amarendrapura, at an unidentified location, but he must have suffered some reverses, for he soon abandoned it and settled in a city on the summit of Mahendraparvata. There, in 802, he had himself consecrated cakravartin. At a later date he returned to Harihar~laya where he died around 835.25

Without explanation, Jacques has implicitly rejected his earlier interpretation of inscriptions K.103/770 and K.134/781 found near Vy-dhapura and §ambhupura, and there is no mention of Bhavapura. The reason for the last is clear. In order to sustain his general hypothesis of multiple Cambodian kings under a King of Kings, Jacques has decided to accept as literal truth the Jayavarman II story, without telling his readers what the sources are, nor his chain of reasoning about them. This is historical romance, not history.

Finally, it may be wise to consider one of the late and unwisely rejected theories of Coedès, written long after his histories had been set in stone, as it were. "For Angkorean epigraphy...[the reigns] of Jayavarman II and his son...constitute a semi-legendary epoch, to which the great religious families refer the origin of their sacerdotal office, and the landowners their titles to property."26 If so, why not carry this hypothesis a step further, and say that perhaps the Jayavarman II myth, a king returning from a mysterious foreign country named Java, is equivalent to the Kauñña mythology of Funan, and to word-wide myths of a young foreign king from overseas marrying a daughter of a local chief and founding a dynasty?27


5. Coedès emendation of the text in his translation, to say that Loñ Haradh-rma brought them, is unjustified. As it is outside the focus of this article, I do not want to discuss it here, but the title kamrāṭēd aṃ ta vṝa, suggests one of the variants or predecessors of kamrāṭēd jagat ta r-jā/ r-ja, the mis-named devar-ja, of which the variants kamrāṭēd aṃ ta r-jāya and vṝa kamrāṭēd aṃ jagat ta r-jāya are noted in Coedès, “Le véritable fondateur du culte de la royauté divine au Cambodge”, *R.C. Majumdar Felicitation Volume*, Ed. by Himansu Bhusan Sarkar, Calcutta, Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1970; and Jacques,”Thē K'amrāṭēd Jagat in Ancient Cambodia”, *Indus Valley to Mekong Delta Explorations in Epigraphy*, Edited by Noboru Karashima, Madras, New Era Publications, 1985, pp. 269-86.

6 Claude Jacques, ‘Nouvelles orientations pour l’étude de l’histoire due pays Khmer’, *Asie du Sud-Est et Monde Insulindien*, vol.XIII, 1-4, Cambodia I, p.48. Teō Ayak’s title of ‘queen’ (devi) is qualified by kāta which Coedès translated as ‘emmenée’ (‘taken away’). That term seems to be Khmerized pseudo-Sanskrit, for Coedès said it “is unknown in Sanskrit”, and he took it as an incorrect spelling of kāṭa which, he said, “gives an acceptable meaning”. It occurs in a second context in which the “kamrāṭeṇa vṝa mūla kāṭa (‘took away’) Teō Pavitra’, his consort. A third context, however, cannot be translated that way, “kamrāṭeṇa aṇa kāṭindrādevi (a royal consort) kāṭa (‘persuaded’ [Coedès French, ‘incerter’) the king to give an order, etc...”.


9. I do not want to stray from the main point to argue the case here, but I think these combined data indicate that Indrapura was closer to Kompong Thom, rather than at Banteay Prei Nokor as has generally been hypothesized, and that Aninditapura was also in the Kompong Thom-Kompong Cham region. See Vickery, *Society*, pp. 382-5 (Aninditapura), 414-15 (Indrapura).

10. The symbol ‘/’ indicates female and ‘\’ male; ‘/ 0’ means the gender is unknown.

11. See Vickery, “Some Remarks on Early State Formation in Cambodia”, where I showed that most of the Angkor royal genealogies were of this nature. There were some errors in my analysis in that article which I have corrected in Vickery, *Society*, pp. 329, n. 22, 343-4, 399, n. 221.

12. It was once thought that the existence of Puṣkaraka of the genealogies was guaranteed by inscription K.121/716 AD, recording the erection of a Puṣkaraka by a person named Puṣkara. But as Claude Jacques has pertinently noted, Puṣkara was not a king, but an unidentified person, although no doubt of high rank, Puṣkaraka is Śiva, but Puṣkara is Viṣṇu, and usually means the god, not a human (Jacques, “Cours Année 1986-1987.” Paris: École Pratique des Hautes Études, IVes Section, typescript, 1987; and see Vickery *Society*, pp. 103, 386). Indravarman, though not in a genealogy, commemorated Inḍr-ṇī, queen of Indraloka, official founder of the sambůphura dynasty; and Jayavarman VII placed a Bhavavarman among his ancestors, but it is uncertain whether his scribes had a clear idea of Bhavavarman’s true situation.


15. In the illustrations below I have translated Coedès’ French into English.

16. I note that the proposed first session at the CKS Workshop is to be about “The State of Khmer Studies”. One problem with this state of Khmer studies, and not only in Cambodia, is a too widespread conviction that Coedès, in his work of general synthesis, which first appeared in 1944 and was too little changed thereafter, established, if not all details, at least a general framework valid for all time, and that new work must be suitable for fitting into that framework. Even the Khmer author of the best pre-1975 school manual in any language for the history of Cambodia, Mr. Trưng Ngea, did not think to consult original Khmer documents for any period of the country’s past. It is perhaps not sufficiently realized that many of Coedès’ own articles contradict parts of his general framework, and that with respect to the unnecessarily controversial phrase of K.521 he
changed his opinion twice. At the end of his life Coedès also denied that the important rite conventionally named devar-ja was that all, or that it had been established by Jayavarman II. On some aspects of this problem with Coedès see Vickery, “Coedès’ Histories of Cambodia”, Colloque George Coedès aujourd’hui, Bangkok, Centre d’Anthropologie Sirindhorn, 9-10 September 1999, publication forthcoming.

17. Another error by Golzio in this passage is “Paramesvara (= Yasovarman I)”. The inscription has ‘Paramasīvaloka’, the true posthumous name of Yasovarman.

18. Although, as I insisted in “Coedès’ histories”, Aymonier correctly saw some things which Coedès missed, there can be no doubt that Coedès’ readings of script and numerals are more reliable.


21. More precisely, inscriptions K.103 and K.109 were at locations not far apart about 30 km west of Banteay Prei Nokor.

22. Vickery, Society, p. 344.

23. Pierre Dupont, 1943-46. “La dislocation de Tchen-la et la formation du Cambodge angkoriens (vii-ix siècle).” BEFEO 43 (1943-46), 17-55. See pp. 31-32. At the time he wrote, of course, Dupont considered that the Jayavarman in question was Ibis, not II.

24. Note that on another occasion Jacques argued that a certain hitherto unknown place-name was “probably not very distant from the place where the stele [naming it] has been found” (“The Kamrateõ Jagat in Ancient Cambodia”, p. 283)


27. Besides Coedès’ publication of K.583, see Claude Jacques, “La carrière de Jayavarman II”, p. 211.


