

NORTH-WESTERN CAMBODIA IN THE SEVENTH CENTURY

By O. W. WOLTERS

I

In 1883 Hervey de Saint-Denys translated a passage from Ma Tuan-lin's *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, which mentions missions to China from *Sêng-kao* 僧高, *Wu-ling* 武令, *Chia-cha* 迦乍, and *Chiu-mi* 鳩密. Ma Tuan-lin states that these countries were conquered by *Chên-la* (Cambodia) after the *yung-hui* reign period (650–6).¹

Historians of Cambodia have not given much attention to this passage. Aymonier suspected that *Sêng-kao* was a variant form of *Sêng-chih* 僧祇, *Ch'ih-t'u*'s capital; believing that *Ch'ih-t'u* was in the lower Menam basin, he quoted Ma Tuan-lin as evidence of the extent of the Khmer empire in the middle of the seventh century.² Pelliot, observing that Ma Tuan-lin had incorporated information from the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, promptly denied that *Sêng-chih* and *Sêng-kao* were identical places and concluded that *Sêng-kao* could not be identified.³ The Chinese records of seventh-century Cambodia have not been re-examined since 1903 and 1904, when Pelliot published his studies of Funan and the early historical geography of South East Asia,⁴ and Ma Tuan-lin's passage has rarely been noticed. Gerini in 1909 decided that *Chiu-mi*, whose ruler sent a mission in 638, was a principality in south-western Cambodia.⁵ Many years later Briggs, probably impressed by *Chên-la*'s power in the seventh century, suggested that these countries were far north in present-day Laos.⁶ More recently, Professor Wheatley and the present author have drawn attention to *Chia-cha*, another of the mission-sending countries of 638. Professor Wheatley was more cautious in identifying it with Kedah in the Malay Peninsula.⁷

¹ Hervey de Saint-Denys, *Ethnographie des peuples étrangers à la Chine*, Genève, 1883, II, 461; Ma Tuan-lin, *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao* (Wan-yu Wên-k'u edition), 2602. Saint-Denys translated 'after the *yung-hui* period' as 'vers l'époque des années *yong-hoei*'. In this essay the expressions 'Funan' and '*Chên-la*', which are Chinese ones, are used only when quoting from Chinese sources or from studies by scholars who have accepted the expressions as representing political realities in Cambodia. Reasons will be given later in the essay why the author believes that Chinese nomenclature confuses rather than clarifies pre-Angkorian history.

² E. Aymonier, *Le Cambodge*, III, Paris, 1904, 429–30, 439; 'Le Founan', *JA*, x^e Sér., I, janvier-février 1903, 132–3, 149–50; 'Le Siam ancien', *ibid.*, mars-avril 1903, 190.

³ P. Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires', *BEFEO*, IV, 1–2, 1904, p. 290, n. 4; 403–4. Pelliot pointed out that the conquests, according to the text, took place after the 650–6 reign period. *Ch'ih-t'u*'s position on the east coast of the Malay Peninsula is definitively established by Professor Paul Wheatley, *The Golden Khersonese*, Kuala Lumpur, 1961, ch. iii.

⁴ P. Pelliot, 'Le Fou-nan', *BEFEO*, III, 2, 1903, 248–303; 'Deux itinéraires', 131–413.

⁵ G. E. Gerini, *Researches on Ptolemy's geography of eastern Asia*, London, 1909, 202–6.

⁶ L. P. Briggs, *The ancient Khmer empire*, Philadelphia, 1951, 50, 54. Briggs assigned the conquests to the 650–6 period.

⁷ Wheatley, *op. cit.*, 46, 278; O. W. Wolters, *Early Indonesian commerce*, Ithaca, 1967, 163. Ferrand also identified *Chia-cha* with Kedah; G. Ferrand, 'Le K'ouen-louen', *JA*, XI^e Sér., XIII, mars-avril 1919, p. 249, n. 1. Dupont, who was particularly interested in pre-Angkorian Cambodia, ignored these toponyms.

The information, quoted by Ma Tuan-lin, also appears in the *Hsin T'ang-shu* at the end of a miscellaneous section on Champa and several other countries.⁸

'In the twelfth year of the *chên-kuan* reign-period (21 January 638–8 February 639), the four countries of *Sêng-kao*, *Wu-ling*, *Chia-cha*, and *Chiu-mi* sent tribute (to China). *Sêng-kao*'s location is exactly north-west of Water *Chên-la* ('Water' Cambodia), and its customs are the same as those of *Huan-wang* (Champa). Thereafter *Chiu-mi*'s king, *Shih-li-chiu-mo* 尸利鳩摩 (Śrī Kumāra), with *Fu-na*'s 富那 king, *Shih-li-t'i-p'o-pa-mo* 尸利提婆跋摩 (Śrī Devavarman), again sent tribute. *Sêng-kao* and these countries were conquered by *Chên-la* after the *ying-hui* reign-period (which ended on 31 January 656).'⁹

This passage, which does not appear in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* or in other texts describing South East Asia during T'ang times,¹⁰ illustrates some of the difficulties caused by the compilers' intention of improving on the *Chiu T'ang-shu* by increasing the factual contents without increasing the length of the text.¹¹ The reference to the conquests 'after the *ying-hui* reign-period' is an unfortunate example of additional but condensed information. Part of the *Hsin T'ang-shu*'s information can, however, be verified by means of the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, compiled about 50 years earlier.¹² Evidently the large team of scholars, who produced the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, searched T'ang records for material on the 'barbarian' countries, and the following two passages probably came from the source summarized in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*.

⁸ *Hsin T'ang-shu* (Po-na edition), 222C, 2a.

⁹ For the suggested reconstruction of 'Śrī Kumāra' and 'Śrī Devavarman', see Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires', 404. A *Ch'ih-t'u* Brahman was called *Chiu-mo-lo* 鳩摩羅 = Kumāra; *Sui-shu* (Po-na edition), 82, 4b.

¹⁰ i.e. *T'ang hui-yao*, *T'ung-tien*, *T'ai-p'ing yü-lan*, *T'ai-p'ing huan-yü chi*, and *T'ai-p'ing kuang-chi*. Ssü-ma Kuang ignores the missions of 638. The *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao* and the *Yü-hai* (facsimile of an edition of 1337 in the National Central Library, Taipei, 1964, 2898) quote the *Hsin T'ang-shu*.

¹¹ See R. des Rotours, *Le traité des examens*, Paris, 1932, 56–64, for the intentions and performance of the compilers.

¹² On the *TFYK* see des Rotours, op. cit., 91–2, and Ssü-yu Teng and Knight Biggerstaff, *An annotated bibliography of selected Chinese reference works*, third ed., Cambridge, Mass., 1971, 89. Professor Hiraoka has noted that the 1642 edition of the *TFYK* is frequently dependable; T. Hiraoka and others, 'Tō-dai shiryō kō', *Kyōto Daigaku Jimbun Kagaku Kenkyūjo sōritsu nijūgo shūnen kinen ronbunshū*, Kyoto, 1954, 676 ff. The present writer is grateful to Professor C. A. Peterson for calling his attention to the textual status of the 1642 edition of the *TFYK*. This edition (Peking facsimile reproduction of 1960) is quoted below, but passages, for which parallel passages do not appear in texts other than the *TFYK*, have been checked against the Southern Sung wood-block print at the Seikado Bunko, Tokyo, by means of xerox copies kindly supplied by Professor Akira Nagazumi. The wood-block print is the oldest extant version of the *TFYK* and the earliest we can get to the original contents of the text. The passages in the 1642 edition which have been checked concern: the Funanese attack on Champa reported in 643 (999, 11721b), the missions of *Chiu-mi* and *Fu-na* in 671 (970, 11402b), Jayavarman I's mission of 682 (970, 11403a), the *Wên-tan* mission of 717 (974, 11445a), the *Chên-la* mission of 750 (971, 11413b), the *Wên-tan* mission of 753 (971, 11414a), the *Wên-tan* mission of 771–2 (976, 11461b), the *Wên-tan* mission of 798 (976, 11462b), and the *Chên-la* mission of 814 (972, 11417b). There are no significant differences between the Sung and 1642 texts.

‘ In the first month of the twelfth year of the *chên-kuan* reign-period (from 21 January 638, to 19 February 638) the four countries of *Sêng-kao*, *Wu-ling*, *Chia-cha*, and *Chiu-mi* sent envoys with tribute. They are all little countries of the southern tribes. Their obedience to China began from this time. Their dress and speech are similar to that of *Lin-yi* (Champa).¹³

In the eighth month of the second year of the *hsien-hêng* reign-period (from 9 September to 8 October 671) *Chiu-mi*’s king, *Shih-li-chiu-mo*, and *Fu-na*’s king, *Shih-li-t’i-p’o-pa-mo*, each sent envoys with local products.’¹⁴

The second of these passages does not appear in any other text, but it explains the *Hsin T’ang-shu*’s statement that ‘ thereafter ’ *Chiu-mi* and *Fu-na* sent tribute.

This clarification is the limit of the textual control provided by the *Ts’ê-fu yüan-kuei*. The dates of the conquests after 31 January 656, to which the *Hsin T’ang-shu* refers, could have been reported by the Khmer missions of 682 or 698¹⁵ or even in the eighth or ninth centuries. Moreover, no texts are available for verifying a remarkable detail in the *Hsin T’ang-shu*’s account of *Sêng-kao*, which is its location in terms of ‘ Water ’ *Chên-la*. The Chinese understood *Chên-la* to mean the expanding Khmer kingdom of the sixth and seventh centuries, which overthrew and absorbed its overlord, Funan, after a long series of campaigns.¹⁶ ‘ Water ’ *Chên-la*, on the other hand, was an expression which appears in Chinese records only as a result of *Chên-la*’s division after 706 into ‘ Land ’ and ‘ Water ’ *Chên-la*.¹⁷ The term persisted until at least as late as 838.¹⁸

The quest for the location of the place-names mentioned in the *Ts’ê-fu yüan-kuei* leads us to a region which will be defined as west or north-west of the Tonlé Sap or, in more general terms, as north-western Cambodia in the sense of being in the north-western corner of Cambodia south of the Dangrek mountains. The place-name which takes us most confidently to this region is *Wu-ling* 武令.

The T’ang officials understood the *Wu-ling* envoy in 638 to say that his country was called *Mïu-lïäng*,¹⁹ which represents ‘ Malyāng ’.²⁰ Malyāng is first mentioned in Cambodian epigraphy in 893.²¹ It was a *pramān*, or a definable

¹³ *TFYK*, 970, 11398b.

¹⁴ *TFYK*, 970, 11402b.

¹⁵ *TFYK*, 970, 11403a; 970, 11403b.

¹⁶ G. Cœdès, *The indianised states of Southeast Asia*, Honolulu, 1968, 65–70; 72–3.

¹⁷ Cœdès, *op. cit.*, 85.

¹⁸ *TFYK*, 995, 11688a.

¹⁹ B. Karlgren, *Grammata Serica recensa* (reprinted from *BMFEA*, 29, 1957, and henceforth cited as *GSR*), 104a, 823a.

²⁰ The equivalence of *-lïäng* and *-lyäng*, the stressed syllable, is not in doubt. In connexion with the first double vowel, Mrs. Judith Jacob informs the author that ‘ a variety of short vowels, *a*, *i*, and *u*, and sometimes both *i* and *u*, occur in both Old Mon and Old Khmer in first short syllables. The writers were trying to indicate a neutral vowel for which they had no symbol ’. Professor E. G. Pulleyblank informs the author that *mïu* 武 is in the rising tone, which was used at this period to represent short vowels in foreign words, and *mïu* would have been suitable to represent a neutral *shwa*, necessarily rounded after a labial in Chinese. The *i* in the transcription is not to be regarded as a distinct and separate ‘ vowel ’.

²¹ G. Cœdès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (henceforth cited as *IC*), I, 30.

territory in north-western Cambodia.²² The toponym also appears in Chou Ta-kuan's list of 'prefectures' in 1296.²³ Satisfactory evidence of the location of at least part of the area later known as 'Malyāng' is provided by the Stūng Crap inscription of 1003, found near the Tano village between Battambang and Mong in the southern part of the modern province of Battambang. The inscription records the donation of land to a temple, and a royal official in Malyāng was ordered to supervise the transaction.²⁴ The full extent of the territory is unknown. According to the Prasat Ta Kev inscription of the eleventh century, Vat Ek, a few miles to the north of the modern town of Battambang, was in the province of Bhimapura.²⁵ Malyāng's later importance is not in doubt. Its sense of regional identity survived until at least the end of the twelfth century, when its inhabitants rebelled after the Chams sacked Angkor in 1177.²⁶

One of the tributary states of 638 was therefore west of the Tonlé Sap. Malyāng's identification is the most certain among these principalities, and its ruler's initiative in 638 is the firmest basis for a construction of seventh-century Khmer history in the light of the *Hsin T'ang-shu's* evidence. An attempt will be made, however, to retrieve the other toponyms mentioned in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, being guided, where possible, by place-names appearing in the inscriptions.

The next toponym to be discussed is represented by the Chinese transcription *Fu-na* 富那, or *Piāu-ná*,²⁷ whose envoy came to China in 671. In the same year

²² I follow the most recent definition of the terms *pramān* and *visaya*, provided by Professor Claude Jacques in 'Études d'épigraphie cambodgienne: VII', *BEFEO*, LIX, 1972, 198-9. *Pramān* is a geographical term, referring to definable territory, while *visaya* is an administrative term, for which 'province' may be cautiously used. *Visaya* is an expression which begins to be used in the epigraphy of the second half of the tenth century. In the twelfth century Malyāng was known as a *visaya*; *IC*, VI, 314.

²³ Chou Ta-kuan, *Chên-la fêng-tu chi* (Li-tai Hsiao-shih series, *pén* 31, no. 103, Shanghai, 1940), 15a; P. Pelliot, 'Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge', *BEFEO*, II, 2, 1902, p. 173, n. 1. Chou Ta-kuan's transcription is *Muo/Mu-liang* 莫良; *GSR*, 802a, 735a. Pelliot, identifying Malyāng, was guided by Aymonier, and the identification has been upheld by Cœdès; G. Cœdès, *The indianised states*, p. 355, n. 147. Cœdès remarks that, phonetically, Malyāng would have been pronounced as 'Molieng' or 'Moling'; G. Cœdès, *BEFEO*, XXXII, 1, 1932, p. 80, n. 1. Professor John McCoy has informed the author that the *Hua-i i-yu*, a Sino-Mongolian glossary of 1389, supports the value *mo* for the character 莫 at that time. The author is grateful to Mrs. Jacob and Professors Pulleyblank and McCoy for their advice on the sounds represented by the Chinese transcriptions of place-names discussed in this study. Chou Ta-kuan describes Malyāng as a *chün* 郡, for which 'prefecture' is a more appropriate term than 'province', which Pelliot used. *Chün* and *chou* 州 had been used interchangeably for 'prefecture' since at least Sui times; *Wên-hsien t'ung-k'ao*, 315, 2470.

²⁴ *IC*, v, 209. For a discussion of the geographical significance of this reference to Malyāng, see Cœdès, *BEFEO*, XXXII, 1, 1932, p. 80, n. 1.

²⁵ *IC*, IV, 155. This inscription does not mention the status of Bhimapura, but *IC*, III, 11, also of the eleventh century, describes Bhimapura as a province (*visaya*). An inscription of 1145 mentions the 'district/village' (*sruk*) of Pūrvāśrama in the province (*visaya*) of Malyāng. The inscription is from near the present town of Battambang; *IC*, VI, 314. Pūrvāśrama is also mentioned in Vat Baset inscriptions of 1036 and 1042. Vat Baset is near Battambang; *IC*, III, 9, 23.

²⁶ Cœdès, *The indianised states*, 170. The suppression of the revolt was sufficiently important to be commemorated on the bas-relief of the Bayon.

²⁷ *GSR*, 933r, 350a.

an envoy came from *Chiu-mi*, whose ruler had also sent a mission in 638, when the Malyāng ruler sent his mission. The presumption is that the three states were in the same general area but that, because *Piṅu-nā* sent a mission as late as 671, its conquest by *Chên-la*, mentioned in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, was later than 671 on account of geographical circumstances.

In the Chinese Buddhist vocabulary *Piṅu-nā* renders *punya*, *punar*, and *purna*, or 'hungry ghost',²⁸ and this would be a strange name for the principality in question. No place-name in published Cambodian epigraphy corresponds to any of these names or to a word such as 'Puna'.²⁹ The equivalence of *-nā* and *-na* is not in doubt, and another possibility for the first syllable may exist. Seventh-century examples are available of the Chinese use of words beginning with *p* for transcribing *v* in foreign place-names.³⁰

Nevertheless, one would expect *Piṅu-nā* to be based on a name which began with a *p*, as in the example of *Puruṣa-(pura)*.³¹ The initial *v* is normally conveyed by a Chinese word beginning with *b*.³² Thus, *vana*, or 'forest', is transcribed as *b'ua-nā* 婆那,³³ and *vāna*, or 'weaving', as *b'iwan-nā* 防那.³⁴

Yet Vanapura, a toponym appearing in Cambodian epigraphy, suggests the word which *Piṅu-nā* conceals. Vanapura's location on the fringe of north-western Cambodia, for which the evidence is given below, is an appropriate site for *Piṅu-nā* in the seventh century. *Piṅu-nā*'s location would have been sufficiently far away from the Tonlé Sap for it to be able to survive as a Chinese tributary state until at least 671. Moreover, although in Angkorian times Vanapura was only a *sruk*, or 'district/village',³⁵ and therefore of lower administrative status than the province of Malyāng, its ruling family in 1041 belonged to the lineage of the Angkorian rulers, Harṣavarman I and

²⁸ W. E. Soothill and L. Hodous, *A dictionary of Chinese Buddhist terms*, London, 1937, 370b.

²⁹ G. Cœdès, 'Index des noms propres de l'épigraphie du Cambodge', *IC*, VIII.

³⁰ Hsüan-tsang transcribes *Vr̥ji* as 弗栗特 *Piṅt-ljet-zi*; *GSR*, 500a, 403a, 961y. He also transcribes *Vārāṇasī* as 波羅尼斯 *Puá-lá-(?)ní-siē*; *GSR*, 2511, 6a, 563a, 869a. Pelliot suggests that the seventh-century transcription 那弗那 *Ná-piṅt-ná* represents 'à la rigueur' *Na-va-na-(gara)*, which Cœdès subsequently identified from an inscription of 664 as 'Naravarānagara'; Pelliot, *BEFEO*, III, 2, 1903, 295; *GSR*, 350a, 500a, 350a; G. Cœdès, *BEFEO*, XLIII, 1943-6, 4.

³¹ 富婁沙 (*Piṅu...*) and 佛攞沙 (*B'iṅt...*); Soothill, op. cit., 370a, 228a.

³² A frequent example is 跋摩 (*b'uat-mua = varman*); *GSR*, 276b; B. Karlgren, *Analytic dictionary of Chinese and Sino-Japanese*, Paris, 1923 (cited as *AD*), 593.

³³ Soothill, op. cit., 347a; *GSR*, 25q, for 婆 = *b'ua*. Also see Soothill, op. cit., 449b, for 縛尼 = *vana = b'iwak... = GSR*, 771m.

³⁴ Soothill, op. cit., 248b; *GSR*, 740z, in respect of 防. Mrs. Jacob has remarked that, since *-pura* does not appear in the transcription, *vana-*, pronounced alone, may well have undergone a change of form from *vu* to *u-*. In this case the Khmers may have pronounced *vana* in such a way that the Chinese heard a *p*. The Chinese transcribed *Vr̥ji* as 跋闍 *B'uat-dz'ia*, where both syllables begin with a voiced consonant, but they also transcribed this word as 弗栗特 *Piṅt-ljet-zi*. In the latter form, the unvoiced *p* precedes two words beginning with voiced consonants, presumably to give greater effect to the stress in *-rji*.

³⁵ P. Dupont suggests that *sruk* was the equivalent of *-pura*; *BEFEO*, XLIII, 1943-6, p. 116, n. 5.

Īśānavarman II (910/912–28).³⁶ The lineage was sufficiently powerful to lead to a marriage alliance in the first half of the eleventh century between Sūryavarman I and Śrī Viralakṣmī, a member of this family, whose brother, Śrī Bhuvanāditya, is described in 1041 as the prince of Vanapura.³⁷

The inscription of 1041 describes the *sruk* of Vanapura as being at the Dangreks and in the western part, and it was therefore in north-western Cambodia. The location is consistent with the name's appearance in a land grant inscription from Arannyaprat'et of 941, containing the earliest epigraphic reference to Vanapura.³⁸ The Dangreks were known as Jeng Vnaṃ Kamveng or Jeng Vnaṃ or, in Sanskrit, as *Adripāda* and *Giripāda*,³⁹ and the territory of Jeng Vnaṃ existed by the end of the ninth century.⁴⁰ Its size is unknown, but its Sanskrit names, with their emphasis on 'the foot of the mountains', show that its territory was identified as being close to the range. Originally the area known in this way would not have extended westward beyond the present Khmer-Thai border, which seems to have been the limit of Khmer expansion in the west during the ninth century.⁴¹ The *sruk* of Vanapura is also unlikely to have been on the northern side of the range. On the north-western side of the Dangreks was the Virendra territory mentioned in an inscription of 928 and surviving until at least 1192, when Jayavarman VII built a hospital there.⁴² Another indication that Vanapura was on the southern side of the range may be the circumstance that an eleventh-century land inscription from near Svay Chek, also south of the Dangreks, mentions it.⁴³

Vanapura, on the southern side of the Dangreks, was some distance from the *Chên-la* heartland east of the Tonlé Sap, and its relative remoteness would explain why *Piṅṅu-nā*'s mission was as late as 671. The ruler lived too far away to be concerned by the situation which caused the other rulers to send missions in 638.

Vanapura's exact location is unknown, but some implications of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription of 1051 can be noted. At the end of the ninth century the

³⁶ Harṣavarman I's year of accession is according to C. Jacques, *BEFEO*, LVIII, 1971, 175.

³⁷ *IC*, VI, 266; *IC*, I, 196 (of 1041). The origin of the connexion between this family and Vanapura is unknown. Śrī Viralakṣmī is said to be of the Vraṣ Sruk; *IC*, VI, 266. Vat Ek, near Battambang, was in the Vraṣ Sruk; *IC*, IV, 153, 155.

³⁸ *IC*, VII, 139.

³⁹ *IC*, VII, 49; *BEFEO*, XLIII, 1943–6, p. 121, n. 7.

⁴⁰ *IC*, V, 89–90, describing Jeng Vnaṃ as a *pramān*. The Sdok Kak Thom inscription of the eleventh century refers to the *viṣaya* of *Adripāda* in the context of Jayavarman II's reign and to the *viṣaya* of Jeng Vnaṃ in Jayavarman III's reign; *BEFEO*, XLIII, 1943–6, 96, 111.

⁴¹ The Bo Ika inscription of 868, from Korat province, is in a region described as 'outside Kambudeśa'; *IC*, VI, 85.

⁴² *IC*, I, 53; *IC*, VII, 154. The former inscription, of 928, mentions a *pramān* and also a *sruk* of Virendra. *IC*, VII, 154, provides the site of the city of Virendra; it is north of the Dangreks and was the provincial capital. The inscription of 928 states that the province of Jeng Vnaṃ contained a *sruk* of Virendrapatṭana; *IC*, I, 30 and 54. It would have been a different place from the Virendra north of the Dangreks.

⁴³ *IC*, VII, 49.

descendants of Jayavarman II's *purohita*, Śivakaivalya, were granted the lands of Bhadrapaṭṭana and Bhadravāsa. Bhadrapaṭṭana was in the Dangreks territory⁴⁴ and is described as being 'close to Bhadrageri', which was in the same area.⁴⁵ The temples, subsequently founded on these lands, reached as far west as Bhadraketana, the site of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription and part of Bhadrapaṭṭana,⁴⁶ and Dupont believed that other foundations of Bhadrapaṭṭana were represented by some of the temples known today as Lbo'k Svay, Lbo'k Ampil, Rolom Crei, Srok Kok, and Tap Siem.⁴⁷ These temples, shown on Lunet de Lajonquière's map, are to the west of the Makkak river,⁴⁸ and Bhadrapaṭṭana and Bhadravāsa were probably in the western and under-populated part of the ancient Dangreks region, which extended some way south at its western end. Moreover, the region during the seventh century, and contemporaneous with *Piṅu-ná*, contained Jyeṣṭhapura, mentioned in an inscription from near the Aran frontier post,⁴⁹ and this may be another reason for not locating Vanapura at the extreme western end of the Dangreks. Vanapura was probably further east, and the area which suggests itself is immediately south of the Chup Smach and Chom Tup passes.⁵⁰ Aymonier was impressed by the denseness of the forests in this part of the Dangreks, contrasting the scene with what he saw elsewhere in the region.⁵¹ The dipterocarp forest, flourishing on the sandy soil, explains the origin of the name of Vanapura, 'the City of the Forest'.⁵²

Piṅu-ná was not the only principality to send a mission in 671. *Chiu-mi* 鳩密, or *Kiṅu-miēt*,⁵³ which had been among the mission-sending states of 638, did likewise. The *Hsin T'ang-shu* includes *Kiṅu-miēt* among the states conquered by *Chên-la* after the 650–6 reign-period, and its two missions of 638 and 671 suggest that it was some distance from Malyāng but not as far away as *Piṅu-ná*

⁴⁴ *IC*, v, 90, referring in 896 to the *pramān* of Jeng Vnam.

⁴⁵ *BEFEO*, XLIII, 1943–6, 114. Aymonier and Groslier suggest that Bhadrageri should be identified with the Tangko peak in the north-western part of the Dangreks; Aymonier, *Le Cambodge*, II, Paris, 1901, 265; G. Groslier, *BEFEO*, xxiv, 3–4, 1924, 366. The peak is north to north-west of the Sdok Kak Thom site.

⁴⁶ *BEFEO*, XLIII, 1943–6, p. 129 and n. 6.

⁴⁷ *ibid.*, 74.

⁴⁸ E. Lunet de Lajonquière, *Inventaire descriptif des monuments du Cambodge. Cartes*, Paris, 1911.

⁴⁹ *IC*, v, 23–4. This inscription, of Khau Noi, dated 637, is in Khmer and mentions a Mratañ Khloñ Jyeṣṭhapura.

⁵⁰ In Aymonier's day the Chup Smach was the main route for travellers from Laos to the Tonlé Sap and Bangkok; E. Aymonier, 'Notes sur le Laos', *Cochinchine Française. Excursions et Reconnaissances*, ix, 21, 1885, 11.

⁵¹ *ibid.*, 10–11: 'For an entire day, the traveller will walk in a dismal shadow which oppresses him like a nightmare, seeing nothing but enormous tree trunks. . . . When he leaves this gloom, he will greet the rays of the sun with joy, no matter how warm it is'.

⁵² On this forest see J. Delvert, *Le paysan cambodgien*, Paris, 1961, map 5. Lunet de Lajonquière's map shows a number of small temples and reservoirs in the fertile depression at the foot of the range, through which streams flow into the Tuk Chun river; Lunet de Lajonquière, *Inventaire descriptif des monuments du Cambodge*, III, 405–13, and *ibid.*, *Cartes*.

⁵³ *GSR*, 992n, 405p.

was. Unfortunately, only the beginning of its name can be restored, which was probably the syllable *Kum* and the first syllable in the name.⁵⁴ The cluster of temple sites in the vicinity of Svay Chek may correspond to part of the lands of *Kum*- but this is only a conjecture. Not enough is known of these temples, or of the temples in the area proposed for Vanapura, to justify attributing any temple sites to the seventh-century principalities.⁵⁵

Suggestions have now been made for the identification of three of the five principalities in question. Two more remain to be discussed. Because they were in the mission-sending group of 638 and were said to have been conquered later by *Chên-la*, they, too, were probably somewhere between the Tonlé Sap and the Dangreks. They are *Chia-cha* 迦乍, or *Ka-dz'a*,⁵⁶ and *Sêng-kao* 僧高, or *Sêng-kâu*.⁵⁷

The author once believed that *Ka-dz'a* represented *Katāha*, or Kedah,⁵⁸ but a principality in the south-western Malay Peninsula is a surprising item in a list of countries which includes Malyāng. The identification with *Katāha* must be discarded, and Gaja(-pura) is proposed as the correct restoration of the name. *Ka-* seems to be an acceptable equivalence of *Ga-*.⁵⁹ *Dz'a* was used in 1015 to render the last syllable in the name of a Tamil king, *La-ch'a-la-ch'a* 羅茶羅乍, or *Lá* (= *ra*) *d'a lá dz'a*.⁶⁰ The Tamil ruler in 1015 was Rājendracōla, who had just succeeded Rājarāja, but Professor Nilakanta Sastri is surely right in supposing that the mission left in Rājarāja's lifetime and reached China in his name after a long voyage.⁶¹ Chinese Buddhists rendered *gaja* 'elephant' in other ways,⁶² but the official who recorded the name of this 'little country of the southern tribes'⁶³ is unlikely to have identified it with 'elephant', a word hallowed in Buddhist texts and therefore requiring a transcription according to the rules observed by Chinese Buddhist scholars.

⁵⁴ See E. G. Pulleyblank, 'The Chinese name of the Turks', *JAOS*, LXXXV, 2, 1965, 121-5, on the use of entering tone words to represent a single consonant in a non-final position. Professor Pulleyblank transcribes 密 as *mijit*; *ibid.*, 123. Could *Kižu-mijēt* be an attempt to represent *Kam*, noted by Coedès as a probable abbreviation of a title of someone connected with Maleng = Malyāng in 987? See *IC*, VI, 186, note (1).

⁵⁵ For the temples in the Svay Chek area see Lunet de Lajonquière, *op. cit.*, 371-91. The area was sufficiently important in Yaśovarman I's reign at the end of the ninth century to justify the establishment of a royal monastery; *IC*, III, 65. Jayavarman V, in the second half of the tenth century, sought to recruit scholars from this area; *IC*, II, p. 62, n. 5.

⁵⁶ *AD*, 342; *GSR*, 806a. For 迦 Professor Pulleyblank, pointing out that the character was reserved for foreign words, writes *kjā*; *Asia Major*, NS, XI, 2, 1965, 202.

⁵⁷ *AD*, 1047; *GSR*, 1129a. For 高 Professor Pulleyblank writes *kau*; *Asia Major*, NS, X, 2, 1963, 220.

⁵⁸ Wolters, *Early Indonesian commerce*, 163.

⁵⁹ As in *gagana* and *garuda*, both of which begin with 迦; Soothill, *op. cit.*, 317a and 315b.

⁶⁰ *Sung-shih* (Po-na edition), 489, 21b.

⁶¹ K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, *The Cōlas*, second ed., Madras, 1955, 219. According to the *Sung-shih*, the voyage took 1,150 days to reach Canton; *Sung-shih*, 489, 23a.

⁶² See Soothill, *op. cit.*, 224b. The Chinese transcriptions are: *Ka-ja* (伽耶), *AD*, 342, *GSR*, 47b; *Ka-ja* (伽邪), *AD*, 342, *GSR*, 47a; *Ka-dz'ja* (伽關), *AD*, 342, *GSR*, 45h.

⁶³ *TFYK*, 970, 11398b.

Gaja(-pura) is another Cambodian place-name with associations with north-western Cambodia. It is mentioned in an inscription of 949, found at Phnom Prah Net Prah between Mongkolborei and Kralanh.⁶⁴ The inscription concerns the foundation of a Śivaite *āśrama* in 938, and the *āśrama*, which has been identified with the inscription's site, is described as being in 'the *sruk* of Tamvvang Chding in Gajapura'.⁶⁵ Evidently Gajapura included the site of the foundation. Gajapura's administrative status in early Angkorian times is indicated by a postscript, added to the inscription, which connects the province (*viṣaya*) of Sangkhah with the *āśrama*'s administration. Coedès suggests that the name of 'Sangkhah' survives today in the name of Prasat Sangkhah,⁶⁶ which is on the western side of the Sreng river and about five miles north-west of Kralanh and about 15 miles from Phnom Prah Net Prah, where the inscription of 949, mentioning Gajapura, was found. In the tenth century Gajapura therefore included territory south and south-east of the areas we have associated with Vanapura and *Kum-* but north-west of the Tonlé Sap. It was probably the name of a seventh-century town in the neighbourhood of one of the little hills in this part of the region. The name survives in an eleventh-century inscription from the Svay Chek area, which concerns the offering of slaves from several places to the Śiva-*liṅga* in the central tower of the Bantay Prav temple, also in north-western Cambodia.⁶⁷ The name is also mentioned in an inscription from the foot of Ba Phnom in southern Cambodia which lists the meritorious works of an official in the second half of the tenth century and is more or less contemporaneous with the inscription of 949.⁶⁸ The official undertook works in many parts of Cambodia, including Angkor and Bhīmapura. In Gajapura he built a reservoir. His interest in Gajapura suggests that the place still had some importance.

The last principality to be discussed is *Səng-kāu*, which is the first place to be mentioned in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*'s list of principalities. Cambodian inscriptions refer to the province (*viṣaya*) of Sangkhah, noted in the previous paragraph,⁶⁹ and to the *sruk* of Jaroy Sangke.⁷⁰ One is tempted to identify *Səng-kāu* with one or other of these names. Sangkhah's provincial status in Angkorian times would be an appropriate sequel for a seventh-century principality, and its association with Gajapura would identify it with north-western Cambodia.

⁶⁴ *IC*, III, 36.

⁶⁵ An inscription from this site shows that the site was called 'Giripura' in the eleventh century; *IC*, III, 39. Giripura was the name of the *āśrama* and not of the area.

⁶⁶ *IC*, III, p. 37, n. 1, and *IC*, III, 45.

⁶⁷ *IC*, III, 61. Also see *IC*, III, 63, for a similar reference to Gajapura.

⁶⁸ *IC*, VII, 14. The Khmer rendering of the name is 'Gahjahpure'.

⁶⁹ *IC*, III, 37, dated 949.

⁷⁰ *IC*, v, 207, dated 1003. The administrative status of Jaroy Sangke is not supplied. A Koh Ker inscription of 921 gives a list of *sruks*, including . . . *y Sangke*, and the indistinct part of this name may have been Jaroy; *IC*, I, 48. *Sruk* Sangke may also be mentioned in the Kralanh Thom inscription; *IC*, VII, p. 25, n. 3. Another inscription from near Koh Ker, of the tenth century, mentions a *sruk* Sangke; *IC*, I, 186.

Jaroy Sangke is another tempting possibility. An inscription which refers to it was found near Tano village, south-east of Battambang, and contains a reference to a royal official of the Malyāng territory. *Səng-kâu* and Malyāng are the first two names in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*'s list, and a connexion between Malyāng and Jaroy Sangke = *Səng-kâu* would be consistent with the Chinese juxtaposition of the two names.

Nevertheless, the final syllables of Sangkhah and Sangke are not very appropriate reconstructions of the syllable *-kâu* in the Chinese transcription, and another, though geographically ambiguous, possibility is suggested by the toponym 'Sangko'. Sangko is mentioned in a Vat Baset inscription of 1036 as the *sruk travang* Sangko, or the district of the Sangko reservoir.⁷¹ *Səng-* was used by the Chinese for transcribing *sang-* in *sangha*,⁷² and the diphthong in *-kâu* does not preclude the rendering of the sound by the single vowel *o*.⁷³

Vat Baset is a few miles to the north-east of the modern town of Battambang, and the Sangko toponym therefore appears in an inscription from north-western Cambodia. The inscription does not reveal Sangko's province, but its context suggests that the *sruk* in question was not a great distance from Vat Baset. Several heads of *sruks*, or districts, were involved in a land purchase transaction, and they included someone from the *sruk travang* Sangko. Two other persons were from areas which were certainly not far away; they were from the *sruk* of Pūrvāśrama, which was part of the province (*viśaya*) of Malyāng in 1138,⁷⁴ and from the *sruk* of Manggalapura, from which the name of Mongkolborei is derived.⁷⁵ Mongkolborei is not very far north-west of Battambang. All these persons were evidently representatives of small territorial units, who participated in an event of regional interest, which was no less than the offering of land to the Jayaksetra cult, the famous cult of Vat Baset itself.⁷⁶

Only the Vat Baset inscription of 1036 mentions Sangko. The *sruk* seems to have been in north-western Cambodia, but attempts to plot it on the map are bound to be conjectural. Some considerations can be noted.

Neither Malyāng nor Sangko are likely to have been north of the long river system, which stretches from the Aran region in the west to the northern end of the Tonlé Sap and divides north-western Cambodia into two parts.⁷⁷ To the

⁷¹ *IC*, III, 5 and 9.

⁷² Soothill, op. cit., 420a.

⁷³ Professor Pulleyblank informs the author that *-áu-* was sometimes used for a foreign *-o-*. *Tau JJ*, for example, is used as *manyōgana* for the Japanese *to*.

⁷⁴ *IC*, IV, 314.

⁷⁵ S. Lewitz, 'La toponymie khmère', *BEFEO*, LIII, 2, 1967, 431. A representative of the *sruk* of Manggalapura is mentioned in another Vat Baset inscription, together with a representative of Pūrvāśrama; *IC*, III, 16.

⁷⁶ The representatives of Sangko and Manggalapura were present at the time of the purchase of the land. The Pūrvāśrama representatives were among those who planted the boundaries of the land. The land was at Vak Tongting (*ibid.*, 8), but the location of this place is unknown.

⁷⁷ An excellent description of the geography of north-western Cambodia is given by Lunet de Lajonquière, *Inventaire descriptif*, III, 1-7. On p. 3 he stresses the dividing effect of this river system.

north of the river system, we have suggested, were the seventh-century kingdoms of Vanapura, *Kum-*, and Gajapura. In Angkorian times this northern area contained at least three provinces: the Dangreks province, Sangkhah, and Amoghapura. The first of these was at the foot of the mountains. Sangkhah included at least the territory between Kralanh and the site of the Phnom Prah Net Prah inscription between the river Sreng and the neighbourhood of the O Ta Siu river, which flows into the river system from the north.⁷⁸ To the west of Sangkhah between the Dangreks and Gajapura lay some, if not all, of the territory of Amoghapura province.⁷⁹ Several toponyms are therefore already associated with the northern part of north-western Cambodia.

A geographical factor can also be taken into account as a reason for not extending the territories of at least Malyāng to the north of the river system. In the summer months during the rainy season both sides of the waterway through north-western Cambodia are flooded, and the flooding is exceptionally severe in the neighbourhood of the Tonlé Sap. According to Aymonier, the flooded zone reaches north towards Kralanh, north-west towards Mongkolborei, and south towards Battambang.⁸⁰ The flooded zone separates the lands to the north and south, and the division is reflected by an absence of temple sites in this zone. The territory and province of Malyāng certainly included part of the

⁷⁸ Part of Sangkhah province's location is indicated in *IC*, III, 37, which connects the *viṣaya* of Sangkhah with the *āśrama* of Phnom Prah Net Prah. *IC*, III, 45, comes from the site of Prasat Sangkhah, not far from the previous inscription. Coëdes thinks that Sangkhah may be the ancient name of the temple.

⁷⁹ The Sdok Kak Thom inscription refers to Stuk Ransi in the province (*viṣaya*) of Amoghapura; *BEFEO*, XLIII, 1943–6, 117. The rice-fields of Ganeśvara, also in Amoghapura (*ibid.*, 115), provided support for foundations in Bhadrapaṭṭana in the Dangreks province; *ibid.*, 114–15. The same rice-fields also helped to support foundations in Stuk Ransi in Amoghapura (*ibid.*, 115), and Dupont believed that Bhadrapaṭṭana was the eastern neighbour of Stuk Ransi (*ibid.*, p. 121, n. 2) and that some of the Stuk Ransi temples were west of the Makkak river; *ibid.*, 74. The context of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, from which this information comes, is the progressive development of lands in the extreme north-western part of Cambodia by Śivakaivalya's descendants, and Dupont was justified in assuming that the Amoghapura lands in question were in this part of Cambodia. Amoghapura's connexion with the lands to the west of the Makkak river may also be reflected in *IC*, III, 55, an eleventh-century inscription which states that an Amoghapura provincial official witnessed the demarcation of the boundaries of land given to the Bantay Prav temple near Svay Chek.

Groslier believed that the Amoghapura province extended to the east at least as far as the Prasat Sangkhah region. He noted that revenue from Amoghapura was given to this temple; *BEFEO*, xxiv, 3–4, 1924, 361; *IC*, III, 53. The gift is not, however, evidence of the location of Amoghapura. Groslier also noted that the rice-field of Stuk Veng, which he believed to be in Amoghapura, was given to a temple at Cung Vis near Prasat Sangkhah; *art. cit.*, 364–5. For Cung Vis' position, see *IC*, III, p. 83, n.7. Yet the Koh Ker inscription, which Groslier quoted to connect Stuk Veng with Amoghapura, does not contain this information; *IC*, I, 47–71.

⁸⁰ Aymonier, *Le Cambodge*, II, maps facing p. 304. Also see map 3 in J. Delvert, *Le paysan cambodgien*. In the seventh century the Tonlé Sap was larger than it is today. Professor Delvert believes that it once reached to Mongkolborei and Sisophon; J. Delvert, *op. cit.*, 57. A vivid description of the situation in the summer months is contained in Brien, 'Aperçu sur la province de Battambang', *Cochinchine Française. Excursions et Reconnaissances*, x, 24, 1885, 343–4, in respect of the Battambang area. The writer refers to '... un spectacle des plus singuliers et des plus étonnants: la navigation à toute vapeur en pleine forêt!'

southern area in the Battambang–Mong region, and it would be surprising if the seventh-century principality of Malyāng extended north of the flooded zone.

Nevertheless, the assumption that Sangko was in the southern part of north-western Cambodia depends only on the fact that the toponym appears on the Vat Baset inscription, which is just south of the flooded zone. And if Sangko and Malyāng in the seventh century were both in the south, the problem remains of defining their geographical relationship.

One feature may be noted about the region south of the river system in the seventh century. The relative paucity of its extant temple remains does not mean that it was a wilderness in the seventh century.⁸¹ Two inscriptions of that century have been found there.⁸² From near Battambang, and probably connected with the Vat Baset area, has come an inscription with a date which corresponds to 14 June 657, which reveals that there was a religious centre in the neighbourhood.⁸³ Another inscription has been recovered from a cave at Phnom Bantay Nan immediately south of Mongkolborei, which refers to the gift of booty to a *līṅga* set up by the victorious Bhavavarman I.⁸⁴ This inscription is undated, but it was written at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century.⁸⁵ An important battle had taken place, and perhaps one of the mission-sending states of 638 was involved.

Further evidence can be considered in establishing the geographical relationship between Sangko and Malyāng. Sangko is the first place to be mentioned in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*'s list of states in 638. The last name is that of *Kum-*, whose association with *Piṅ-nā* in 671 suggests that it was some distance from the Tonlé Sap. The third toponym in the list is Gajapura, identified as being north of the river system. Malyāng, second in the list, in Angkorian times included lands south of Battambang. The sequence in which the names appear in the text does not seem to be haphazard. The juxtaposition of Malyāng and Gajapura may mean that these two names were recorded in terms of their respective proximity to the Tonlé Sap, while *Kum-*, which survived to send another mission in 671, may have been some distance away and therefore appears at the end of the list of these four principalities. The presumption would

⁸¹ The somewhat rare temple sites south of the river system extend from Mong towards Battambang and thence towards Mongkolborei; Lunet de Lajonquière, *Inventaire descriptif des monuments du Cambodge. Cartes*.

⁸² The only seventh-century inscriptions so far discovered from the north are three from the Aran region, two of which are dated 637 and 639. The names of kings are not mentioned; *IC*, v, 23–4.

⁸³ The author is grateful to Professor R. Billard, who, in a letter dated 23 June 1969, informs him that the inscription's horoscope shows that its date corresponds to Wednesday, 14 June 657, and about 8.30 a.m. local time. For this inscription see *IC*, II, 193–5. Its exact provenance is unknown. Professor Boisselier would not be surprised if a connexion exists between it and a lintel from the Baset hill, about 10 miles north-east of Battambang; J. Boisselier, 'Arts du Champa', *Artibus Asiae*, xix, 1, 1956, 204.

⁸⁴ A. Barth and A. Bergaigne, *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge et Champa* (henceforth cited as *ISCC*), Paris, 1885, 28.

⁸⁵ See G. Cœdès, *The indianised states*, 68–9, for the chronology of this period.

then be that the sequence was based on geographical considerations, recognized by the envoys of the four rulers who appeared in China in 638, and that Sangko's place at the head of the list reflected their sense of regional geography, implying that they regarded Sangko as being closest to the territories of the overlord whom they defied when they came to China as envoys of independent rulers. The Chinese understood the overlord in question to be the ruler of 'Chên-la'.

A final consideration can be noted for distinguishing the geographical relationship between Malyāng and Sangko in the seventh century. In Chou Ta-kuan's list of Angkorian 'prefectures' the first three are in southern Cambodia.⁸⁶ The fourth is Malyāng (莫良 = *Muo/Mu-liang*), which is followed by *Pwāt-siāt* 八薛.⁸⁷ Malyāng's northern neighbour is 'Baset'.⁸⁸

The modern town of Battambang is on the Sangke river about ten miles south-west of the Vat Baset hill. According to Pavie, writing in 1882,⁸⁹ before 1835 the present Battambang site was occupied by the small village of Sangke, while 'Old Battambang' was in the immediate neighbourhood of 'Baset'. Pavie's account explains why Mouhot, visiting the area in 1859–60, believed that a numerous population had lived a century earlier around the ruins of 'Bassette'⁹⁰ and why, some years later, Delaporte, quoting the explorer Faraut, refers to the 'former capital of Basset'⁹¹ and to the remains of the town's ramparts and moats.⁹² During the nineteenth century north-western Cambodia was ruled as a Thai dependency, and old Battambang was originally the provincial capital. In 1835, and again according to Pavie, the Vietnamese invaded Cambodia, and the decision was taken in Bangkok to pull down the old

⁸⁶ The first was reached by sea from Champa. The second has been identified as Kompong Chnang near the southern entrance to the Tonlé Sap; G. Cœdès, *The indianised states*, p. 355, n. 147. The third was on the coast. For these identifications, see Pelliot, *BEFEO*, II, 2, 1902, p. 138, n. 4, p. 138, n. 9, p. 170, n. 4; Pelliot, *Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge de Tchou Ta-kouan*, Paris, 1951, 70, 95–6.

⁸⁷ *Chên-la fêng-tu*, 15a; Pelliot, *BEFEO*, II, 2, 1902, 173; *GSR*, 281a, 289d.

⁸⁸ Today the Angkorian *p* has become *b*; *IC*, II, 3. An example of the equivalence of the two consonants is provided by *Pa-巴*, the first syllable in the Chinese transcription of 'Basan', the Khmer capital in 1371; *Ming-shih* (Po-na edition), 324, 12b. The following explanation is proposed for the consonants at the end of the Chinese words. Chou Ta-kuan came from Chekiang province, and most of his informants in Cambodia were probably southern Chinese. In the transcription of foreign words in modern Cantonese and lower Yangtse dialects the final consonant in the first syllable is lost or assimilated, but the final consonant in the second syllable is retained. These patterns are likely to be as old as Chou Ta-kuan's period. Thus 八思惟 = *pwāt-si-wi*, mentioned by Chou Ta-kuan, has been restored by Cœdès as (*ta*)*pasvi*; Pelliot, *Mémoires*, p. 65, n. 1. The consonant in the first syllable is also muted in numbers 24, 25, and 36 in Pelliot's list of Chinese transcriptions; *Mémoires*, 62–70. The retention of the final consonant in words of one or two syllables is illustrated by numbers 17, 30, and 34 in Pelliot's list. The author is grateful to Professor McCoy for advice on this subject.

⁸⁹ A. Pavie, *Cochinchine Française. Excursions et Reconnaissances*, IV, 12, 1882, 526–9.

⁹⁰ H. Mouhot, *Voyage dans les royaumes de Siam . . .*, Paris, 1868, 183.

⁹¹ L. Delaporte, *Voyage au Cambodge*, Paris, 1880, p. 132, n. 2.

⁹² *ibid.*, 137. 'Baset' is not mentioned in the Portuguese and Spanish texts quoted in B.-P. Groslier, *Angkor et le Cambodge au XVI^e siècle*, Paris, 1958. The letters of the French missionary, Langenois, who was in this area from 1790 to 1795, may contain information about Baset. On Langenois, see Groslier, *op. cit.*, 134.

town of Battambang and to rebuild it on the site of the Sangke village.⁹³ The provincial capital was now transferred to its present site, and the Dambang river, an arm of the Sangke river flowing by Vat Baset and entering the Tonlé Sap south of the present Sangke estuary, was blocked.⁹⁴

The Cambodian chronicles refer to Battambang but not to Baset,⁹⁵ and the antiquity of the name 'Baset' is unknown. Nevertheless, the Baset area was an important one in Angkorian times.⁹⁶ Archaeological evidence in the seventh century consists only of a lintel recovered from the Baset hill,⁹⁷ but, in later centuries, the site was famous on account of the Jayaksetra cult, first mentioned in inscriptions of the first half of the eleventh century.⁹⁸ The explanation of the word 'Baset', proposed by Professor Martini, connects the name with 'Jayaksetra'. He notes that the word *ba* 'father' is often embodied in the names of sacred hills in Cambodia, whose ancient cults were later subsumed by 'indianised' ones, and he suggests that 'Ba Set' is derived from *pā* = *ba* and *siddhi*. *Siddhi* is an epithet with the meaning of 'endowed with force or supernatural powers'.⁹⁹ This explanation of the origin of the name 'Baset' not only takes us back in time to the Jayaksetra cult but also makes it likely that the Baset hill had enjoyed the reputation of special sanctity long before the establishment of the cult. It is not surprising that Vat Ek, five miles to the north of Battambang and very close to Vat Baset, is described as being in the 'sacred *sruk*' (*Vrah Sruk*).¹⁰⁰ Vat Ek was built early in the eleventh century,¹⁰¹ when the term 'sacred *sruk*' was already current. The cult on Baset hill was probably responsible for the prestige of this *sruk*. A name corresponding to 'Baset' and

⁹³ Pavie, art. cit., 526–9. Aymonier suggests that masonry from the temple site was used to build the new town of Battambang; *Le Cambodge*, II, 292–3. The author is grateful to Mrs. C. A. Trocki, who informs him that, according to the Battambang Chronicle, in 1838 the Thai general Bodin was ordered to establish the foundations and wall of the city of Battambang. This account is somewhat different from Pavie's.

⁹⁴ Professor Delvert suggests that the Dambang river had been the more important arm of the Sangke river; J. Delvert, op. cit., 58. Also see L. Delaporté, op. cit., p. 132, n. 2. Pavie quotes a legend which connects the name of the town with that of the river; Pavie, art. cit., 528. On the derivation of 'Battambang' from *dāmbaṅ*, a 'club', see Lewitz, art. cit., 394.

⁹⁵ Because it lists 10 provinces, including 'Battambang' and not 'Baset', the 'Histoire d'un centenaire roi du Cambodge au XVII^e siècle' most clearly reflects the prevalence of the usage of Battambang; A. B. de Villemereuil, *Explorations et missions de Doudart de Lagrée*, Paris, 1883, 325.

⁹⁶ Sūryavarman I established a *līṅga* here some time before 1018; *IC*, VI, 269. Jayavarman VII erected a hospital here; *IC*, III, 25. Jayavarman VII's wife established a Maheśvara image here; *IC*, II, 179.

⁹⁷ J. Boisselier, art. cit., 204.

⁹⁸ *IC*, III, 3–33. A lintel in the Vat Baset complex is thought to be as old as the end of the tenth century, indicating early buildings on this site; B. Dagens, 'Étude iconographique de quelques fondations de l'époque de Sūryavarman I^{er}', *Arts Asiatiques*, XVII, 1968, 188.

⁹⁹ F. Martini, 'De la signification de "ba" et "me"', *BEFEO*, XLIV, 1, 1947–50, (pub.) 1951, 202–4, 207.

¹⁰⁰ *IC*, IV, 155, of the first half of the eleventh century. Narendragrama is the name by which Vat Ek was known.

¹⁰¹ The foundation of Vat Ek was probably not long after 1018; B. Dagens, art. cit., 176.

derived from *Pā-siddhi* is likely to be of great antiquity, and Chou Ta-kuan's reference to 'Baset' is not unexpected.

Chou Ta-kuan says that there were more than 90 'prefectures' in Cambodia. Each one contained an enclosure, with a wooden palisade. The large number of prefectures and the reference to their towns suggest that he was thinking of small-scale rather than of extensive areas, corresponding to Angkorian *viṣayas*, or 'provinces'.¹⁰² He, or his informants, were distinguishing the town of Baset from that of Malyāng, and the geographical relationship between the two places, implied in the sequence of prefectures named by him, is consistent with epigraphic evidence. The list begins with towns in the south, and, when it moves north, Malyāng is mentioned before Baset. The sequence agrees with what is known of Malyāng's location, provided by an inscription from near Tano village of 1003 which shows that a Malyāng official was ordered to perform duties in the neighbourhood; Tano is south-east of Baset.¹⁰³ Moreover, the 'holy *sruk*', containing Vat Ek and almost certainly Vat Baset as well, is not described as part of Malyāng but, instead, of Bhīmapura province.¹⁰⁴ Chou Ta-kuan does not mention Bhīmapura. After Baset are listed *B'uo-mai* 蒲買 and *D'i-kuaan* 雉棍.¹⁰⁵

Chou Ta-kuan's evidence raises the possibility that, already in the seventh century, the Vat Baset area did not belong to the principality known as Malyāng. For this reason, and also because of the importance of its holy site, the Baset area may correspond to part of the principality of Sangko, the rest of which lay to the immediate south of the flooded zone and close to the Tonlé Sap. The river system, with its spectacular floods, is the most prominent geographical feature in the region, and the four envoys in 638, who probably arrived together,

¹⁰² In China, too, *chün* is used ambiguously to refer to the area under the jurisdiction of the prefecture or to the town which served as the seat of the prefecture. Thus, according to Chou Ta-kuan, Malyāng would have meant a town and its immediate environs, though Malyāng was also the name of an Angkorian province. At the end of the twelfth century Jayavarman VII distributed 23 Jayabuddhamānātha images throughout the empire. This figure rather than Chou Ta-kuan's 'more than 90 prefectures' reflects the number of substantial territorial units in the kingdom at that time, which included some in the Menam basin. Chou Ta-kuan's figure corresponds more closely to the 50 and more towers on the Bayon of Jayavarman VII, which Mus suggested represented 'at least religious or administrative centres' of a province; G. Coëdès, *Angkor*, Hong Kong, etc., 1963, 65.

¹⁰³ *IC*, v, 209. The Palhal inscription states that Jayavarman III, in the second half of the ninth century, chased elephants from Pursat towards Malyāng; G. Coëdès, *BEFEO*, XIII, 6, 1913, 27. Pursat is to the west of the southern part of the Tonlé Sap and some distance south of Tano.

¹⁰⁴ *IC*, iv, 155, reveals that Vat Ek was in the 'holy *sruk*' and also in Bhīmapura. *IC*, III, 11, describes Bhīmapura as a *viṣaya* in the eleventh century. *IC*, iv, 71-3, shows that Bhīmapura was regarded as a 'territory' (*pramān*) in the tenth century.

¹⁰⁵ *GSR*, 102n, 1240c; 560e, 417a. *B'uo-mai* may have been intended to represent Bhīma-pura, but it is more likely to stand for *Bhūmi*. *Bhūmi*, which earlier meant a large extent of land, became equivalent with a *sruk*; Lewitz, art. cit., 407-8. In this case, part of the name is missing. The *sruk* of Bhūmyākara is mentioned in an unpublished tenth-century inscription from the Battambang region; C. Jacques, 'Supplement à l'index des noms propres', *BEFEO*, LVIII, 1971, 185.

would have found it convenient to distinguish their countries in terms of their respective locations on or near the river system, emptying into the Tonlé Sap, and the territories of princes living in southern Cambodia. This would explain why Sangko, near Baset, is the first state to be mentioned in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei's* list.¹⁰⁶ It was on the river, probably the Dambang, which was known to be the closest to the Tonlé Sap. In Angkorian times the 'holy *sruk*' of the former principality of Sangko would have become part of the province of Bhimapura, and the rest of Sangko's lands, together with its name, would have been a *sruk* in either Bhimapura or Malyāng.¹⁰⁷

Malyāng's capital in the seventh century cannot be identified. It could have been between Battambang and Mongkolborei, which, in the nineteenth century, were two travelling days apart.¹⁰⁸ Banan, not far south of Battambang, is another possibility. Banan is a temple site and happens to be associated with a legend of moisture and drought, mythology associated with other pre-Angkorian sites.¹⁰⁹ We can also bear in mind the Mong area south-east of Battambang. The Stu'ng Crap inscription, which contains an instruction to the Malyāng governor to supervise a land transaction, mentions a land grant made before the end of the ninth century.¹¹⁰

No more can be said by way of identifying the principalities of north-western Cambodia during the seventh century. We need not be disconcerted by the appearance at that time of toponyms attested in Angkorian epigraphy. South East Asia comprised many little regions, whose inhabitants had a stubborn sense of their group identity, and documents yield sufficiently numerous examples of ancient and persisting place-names to prevent us from being surprised that the name of Malyāng, for example, should have existed at least as early as the seventh century and until at least the thirteenth.¹¹¹ Seventh-century inscriptions from elsewhere in Cambodia reveal a similar patchwork of regional nomenclature.¹¹² The *Sui-shu*, referring to the early seventh century,

¹⁰⁶ The toponym 'Sangke', the name of a woody plant associated with lac production as well as of the river flowing through modern Battambang and, according to Pavie, of the ancient village on the site of modern Battambang, is also very old, appearing at least as early as the eleventh century; *IC*, v, 207. The reference is to 'Jaroy Sangke' and is on the Tano inscription. Mme. Lewitz defines *jaroy* as 'avancée de terre dans l'eau'; Lewitz, art. cit., 420.

¹⁰⁷ The significance of the Bhimapura toponym has not been determined. Bhimapura and Amoghapura are seventh-century as well as Angkorian toponyms; *ISCC*, 42. In Angkorian times both had associations with north-western Cambodia. The Chinese evidence of the seventh century mentions neither of them. They could have been alternative names for two of the principalities mentioned in the Chinese records, imposed on conquered lands by southern overlords. In the seventh century they were under the control of the lord of Tāmrapura, another unknown toponym.

¹⁰⁸ E. Aymonier, *Géographie du Cambodge*, Paris, 1876, 54.

¹⁰⁹ E. Porée-Maspero, *Étude sur les rites agraires des Cambodgiens*, I, Paris, 1962, 100.

¹¹⁰ *IC*, v, 206.

¹¹¹ Barus, Dvāravatī, and Malayu are familiar examples of ancient toponyms which lingered on for centuries. The antiquity of the 'Lavapura' name has come to light; J. J. Boeles, 'A note on the ancient city called Lavapura', *JSS*, LV, 1, 1967, 113-14.

¹¹² The inscriptions mention Tāmrapura, Ugrapura, Pasengga, Indrapura, Vyādhapura, Dhruvapura, Bhavapura, Amoghapura, Bhimapura, Cakrangapura, and Jyesthapura.

states that there were 30 towns in Cambodia with more than 1,000 inhabitants in each one,¹¹³ and the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, referring to the eighth century, states that to the east of 'Water' *Chên-la* there were 'little towns', 'all of which are called kingdoms'.¹¹⁴ This evidence reflects the multiplicity of regional centres in the lands which, for convenience, we call 'Cambodia'.

Nevertheless, because of the phonological problems created by the Chinese transcriptions and the impossibility of precise geographical definition, the prudent reasons for accepting the Chinese evidence, reviewed above, as information about north-western Cambodia are the identification of *Mü-liäng* with Malyāng, Malyāng's association with the other three countries in the missions of 638, and the statement in the *Hsin T'ang-shu* that they were all conquered by *Chên-la*. The missions were from states whose rulers were capable of organizing parties of envoys to China.

We need not doubt that the ruling groups in Malyāng and its neighbours were Khmers.¹¹⁵ A Khmer-language inscription, written in the sixth or seventh century, has recently been found a short distance south of Battambang town.¹¹⁶ Two other inscriptions, containing passages in the Khmer language and dated 637 and 639, have also been found in the extreme west of this region at Aran.¹¹⁷ They commemorate gifts to Samareśvara and to a Buddhist *vihāra* respectively. Neither of them mentions a king's name, which is not surprising; in 638 the chiefs of Malyāng and the other three little principalities were asserting their independence.

The principalities were small in size. Their rulers would have been territorial chiefs, whose influence was probably confined to the immediate neighbourhood of their strongholds. An impression of the distances between them is conveyed by the fact that Svay Chek, as the crow flies, is only about 50 miles from Battambang, that the Chup Smach pass through the Dangreks is only about 75 miles from the northern end of the Tonlé Sap, and that the distance between Aran and Angkor is only about 150 miles, or an afternoon's bus ride. On the other hand, travelling in the seventh century was slow, and the chiefs' strongholds were much more isolated from each other than these distances suggest. Even in the nineteenth century Pavie estimated the duration of an elephant journey in the dry season from Battambang via Kralanh to Siem Reap near

¹¹³ *Sui-shu* (Po-na edition), 82, 5b.

¹¹⁴ *Chiu T'ang-shu* (Po-na edition), 197, 2b.

¹¹⁵ The *TFYK*, in the passage quoted on p. 357 above, states that the 'dress and speech (of the four tributary countries of 638) are similar to that of *Lin-yi* (Champa)'. This description of people in north-western Cambodia must be ignored. The Chinese court officials would have been perplexed by the identity of envoys from a hitherto unknown part of South East Asia, especially when their envoys insisted that their countries were not subordinate to any Khmer kingdom known to the Chinese. A cultural comparison with *Lin-yi*, the best known country in this part of mainland South East Asia, may have been regarded as an acceptable description.

¹¹⁶ Personal communication by Mr. Dam Chhoeurn, who discovered the inscription. The inscription, which mentions no king's name, describes gifts to the god Śrī Prabhāsasomeśvara.

¹¹⁷ *IC*, v, 23-4.

Angkor as being five days.¹¹⁸ Aymonier considered that the Chup Smach pass was four days away from Sisophon, which is about 20 miles south of Svay Chek,¹¹⁹ and that Battambang and Mongkolborei, about 30 miles apart, were separated by two days of travel.¹²⁰

The physical environment north of the river system, dividing the region, would have encouraged the formation of small and independent territorial units, situated above the flooded zone and nestling around small hills, today often occupied by temple remains.¹²¹ These lands lie north of the monsoon forests, which, in other parts of Cambodia, protect the soil. Here is the savannah (*veal*), where trees are sparse and soil laterizes readily.¹²² Water is scarce in the dry season. The Khmer response to this type of environment was to conserve monsoon rainfall in reservoirs built above the ground, and a feature of the archaeological remains north of the river system are *loboks*, or tanks.¹²³ Only irrigated fields close to the tanks would have been intensively cultivated, and the towns supported by the *loboks* would have resembled a series of strong-points, where economic and political resources were concentrated.¹²⁴ The politics which developed would have been different from those in the swamplier lands of southern Cambodia, where extensive drainage canals were necessary,¹²⁵ requiring more extended, and therefore more vulnerable, political control to maintain and protect the canals.

Savannah conditions also prevail to the immediate south of the river system, but the soils deposited by the rivers flowing from the southern mountains are relatively rich. Today the areas near the Mongkolborei and Sangke rivers are regarded as well-favoured agricultural land.¹²⁶

Lunet de Lajonquière's archaeological map reveals a span of monuments extending from the Angkor area into the lands of the north-west.¹²⁷ These temples were built on land granted by the Angkor rulers, and the study of pre-Angkorian religious foundations has depended on surviving pieces of architecture and sculpture. Nevertheless, further research, including excavation in

¹¹⁸ A. Pavie, *Cochinchine Française. Excursions et Reconnaissances*, v, 14, 1882, 295.

¹¹⁹ E. Aymonier, *ibid.*, ix, 21, 1885, 13.

¹²⁰ Aymonier, *Géographie du Cambodge*, 54.

¹²¹ Aymonier describes how, when one descends the Dangreks, one sees the scattered peaks and hills of Sisophon, Battambang, Phnom Srok, Chongkal, and Siem Reap; *Cochinchine Française. Excursions et Reconnaissances*, ix, 21, 1885, 12.

¹²² On the subject of the *veal* see Delvert, *op. cit.*, 127-30.

¹²³ See Lunet de Lajonquière, *op. cit.*, *passim*. The inscriptions of the region often contain toponyms which incorporate what Lewitz calls 'elements hydrographiques'; Lewitz, *art. cit.*, 418-24. A reservoir was built in the Gajapura area in the tenth century; *IC*, vii, 14. Sūryavarman I built a dyke and reservoirs in the same area; C. Jacques, 'La stèle du Phnom Sres', *BEFEO*, liv, 1968, 616-17.

¹²⁴ The lands north of the river system are today regarded as being among the poorest in Cambodia; Delvert, *op. cit.*, 632-4.

¹²⁵ On the canals of southern Cambodia, see P. Paris, 'Anciens canaux khmers', *BEFEO*, xli, 2, 1941, map facing p. 372.

¹²⁶ Delvert, *op. cit.*, 88, 97-9, 634-40.

¹²⁷ Lunet de Lajonquière, *op. cit.*, *Cartes*.

depth, may help to establish the location of ancient and continuously occupied settlements. Beneath the rubble may be buried artifacts of very early times. This area contains one of the most ancient inhabited sites so far investigated in Cambodia,¹²⁸ and the possibilities may one day be narrowed down for a more exact location of some of the five principalities discussed in this study.

In the meantime, sufficient is known, in addition to inscriptions, to make it certain that, by the seventh century, this region belonged to a lively world of religious activity. A lintel recovered from Baset has been attributed to the middle of the seventh century.¹²⁹ A statue, dated on stylistic grounds between 620 and 640, exhibits affinities with the art of Sambor in the first half of the seventh century,¹³⁰ and the Aran area has yielded a statue of Uma.¹³¹ The Baset inscription of 657 is evidence of the Bhāgavata-Pāñcarātra cult of Viṣṇuism.¹³² Moreover, north-western Cambodia was by no means an isolated region on the fringe of the Khmer world. Although its sculpture can be studied by means of art history elsewhere in Cambodia, evidence of the early influence of the Theravāda of Dvāravatī in the Menam basin is also coming to light.¹³³ The future will surely show that we shall be looking at north-western Cambodia through the eyes of the Chinese annalists if we regard it as being a South East Asian backwater.

We should also remember that, although these principalities were small, the rulers of two of them, *Kum-* and *Piṅu-nā*, modelled their royal names on Indian titles. The name of the ruler of Gajapura is unknown, but his state had an indianized name. Moreover, in addition to ruling in lands exposed to a variety of religious ideas, these rulers' knowledge of other realities in the outside world was considerable, for they took the initiative of sending missions to China. The missions are all we know of the political history of north-western Cambodia in the seventh century, and their significance will be examined in the second part of this study.

II

In the last years of the sixth and the early years of the seventh century, north-western Cambodia lay within the sphere of influence of Bhavavarman I and his cousin, Mahendravarman. Bhavavarman I erected an inscription near Mongkolborei¹³⁴ and his cousin did likewise in the Arannyaprat'et area.¹³⁵ They

¹²⁸ C. and R. Mourer, 'The prehistoric industry of Leang Spean, province of Battambang, Cambodia', *Archaeology and Physical Anthropology in Oceania*, v, 2, 1970, 127-46.

¹²⁹ J. Boisselier, 'Arts du Champa', *Artibus Asiae*, xix, 1, 1956, 204.

¹³⁰ J. Boisselier, 'Une statue féminine inédite du style de Sambor', *Arts Asiatiques*, II, 1, 1955, 25-31.

¹³¹ *ibid.*, 25.

¹³² K. Bhattacharya, *Les religions brahmaniques*, Paris, 1961, 98.

¹³³ J. Boisselier, 'Travaux de la mission archéologique française en Thaïlande', *Arts Asiatiques*, xxv, 1972, 53.

¹³⁴ *ISCC*, 28. Barth refers to it as being 'short and proud, worthy of a conqueror'; *ibid.*, 27.

¹³⁵ *IC*, vii, 152.

were conquering princes,¹³⁶ and they are believed to have come from the Vat Phu area near the confluence of the Mekong and Mun rivers at the eastern end of the Dangreks.¹³⁷ Their inscriptions have not been found south of Kratié on the Mekong, but Bhavavarman's capital, Bhavapura, has recently been identified with Sambor Prei Kuk in southern Cambodia.¹³⁸ Mahendravarman was succeeded by Īśānavarman I, whose latest dated inscription is of 627.¹³⁹ The latter's capital was also at Sambor Prei Kuk, and his inscriptions have been found in southern Cambodia.

The conquest of north-western Cambodia in the early seventh century is evidently an early phase in a series of victories which the northern princes won at the expense of the Khmer overlords in the south.¹⁴⁰ The climax is suggested by the *Hsin T'ang-shu's* statement that Īśānavarman I conquered Funan.¹⁴¹

The significance of the missions of 638 from the four north-western principalities is now apparent. At least in this part of Cambodia the conquerors' successes were not enduring. In 638 the north-western princes had sufficient freedom of action to be able to establish their independence in the eyes of the Chinese court.

One more seventh-century inscription throws light on the political situation in the north-west. The evidence comes from Baset, with a date corresponding to 14 June 657.¹⁴² The king in question is Jayavarman I, whose other first known date is also of 14 June 657.¹⁴³ No conquest is mentioned, but the Viṣṇu-worshipper, responsible for the Baset evidence, certainly recognized Jayavarman I's authority. The king is described as 'the conqueror of his enemies and a living incarnation of victory'. By 657 part of the north-west had therefore been reconquered.

To this extent the history of north-western Cambodia provides a bench-mark for measuring the fortunes of Khmer overlordship in the seventh century. Yet no more than the missions of 638 is known of happenings in the north-west during the period between Mahendravarman's inscription and 657. Moreover, the situation elsewhere in Cambodia between 627, Īśānavarman I's latest known date, and 657 is obscure. The only king known to have reigned is Bhavavarman II, whose single attested date is of 639, mentioned in an inscription from southern

¹³⁶ Dupont remarks that the *linga* foundations, attested by these inscriptions, commemorate the taking possession of the soil; P. Dupont, *La statue prékankorienne*, Ascona, 1955, 76.

¹³⁷ Cœdès, *The indianised states*, 66-9.

¹³⁸ Jacques, *BEFEO*, LIX, 1972, 217.

¹³⁹ *ISCC*, 38-44.

¹⁴⁰ Pelliot noted a statement in the *T'ang hui-yao* that *Chên-la* (the northern base of these conquerors) began to bring Funan (the southern overlordship) into submission in the 535-45 period; 'Deux itinéraires', 368. He also noted Funanese missions in 559, 572, and 588; *ibid.*, 389.

¹⁴¹ Cœdès, *The indianised states*, 69.

¹⁴² *IC*, II, 193-5.

¹⁴³ *IC*, II, 149-52, found not far south of Ba Phnom. The author is grateful to Professor Roger Billard, who, in his letter of 23 June 1969, supplied this date.

Cambodia.¹⁴⁴ Only with Jayavarman I, whose name is found at Baset in 657, does the political situation become clearer. His reign was a long one, comprising at least the period from 657 to about 690.¹⁴⁵ It is by far the longest reign in the seventh century, and a long reign in early South East Asia is testimony of sustained royal prestige as well as of good health. Inscriptions from many parts of Cambodia consistently describe him as a warrior. His military prestige is emphasized as early as 657 and as late as 674.¹⁴⁶ After his death his power is recalled by his daughter, Jayadevi.¹⁴⁷ She also refers to troubled times, presumably after her father's death.¹⁴⁸ Striking evidence of his status during his lifetime is supplied by the undated Vat Phu inscription. Here he is attributed with one of the marks of a *cakravartin* and said to be 'the master of the earth'.¹⁴⁹ Not surprisingly, he was also able to appoint a chief of Śreṣṭhapura, a town in the neighbourhood of Vat Phu.¹⁵⁰

Jayavarman I's enemies are never identified. For example, on 14 June 657, and in what must have been an early period in the reign, the inscription from Ba Phnom in the south, erected by a royal servant, merely describes the king as 'the conqueror of the circle of his enemies'.¹⁵¹ But the location of the other inscription of 14 June 657, from Baset, can be related to the statement of the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, examined in the first part of this study, that *Chên-lu* conquered *Seng-kâu*, Malyāng, Gajapura, *Kum-*, and *Piṅṅ-nā* after the *yung-hui* reign-period, which ended on 31 January 656. These two pieces of evidence point to the conclusion that, in the dry season towards the end of 656 and early 657, or perhaps even in the remaining part of the dry season early in 656, Jayavarman began campaigning in north-western Cambodia.¹⁵² *Seng-kâu*, the first place to be mentioned, probably fell first and by the middle of 657 at the latest. The suggestion has been made in this study that *Seng-kâu* corresponds to 'Sangko', a toponym which appears in the Baset inscription of 1036, and the circumstance that the Baset area has also yielded the inscription of 657 tends to support the identification. The dates of the other conquests cannot be ascertained. According to the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, *Kum-* and *Piṅṅ-nā* sent missions

¹⁴⁴ G. Coedès, *BEFEO*, IV, 4, 1904, 691-7; *IC*, II, 70. The exact provenance of the inscription is unknown.

¹⁴⁵ For his death after 690, see Coedès, *The indianised states*, p. 291, n. 70, which corrects the date in *IC*, II, 40.

¹⁴⁶ 657 (*IC*, II, 149-52); 664 (*IC*, VI, 8); 667 (*ISCC*, 70); 673 (*IC*, I, 14-15); 674 (*IC*, II, 12). Two undated inscriptions refer to the king in a similar manner; *IC*, I, 10; *IC*, III, 163.

¹⁴⁷ *IC*, VII, 56: 'His power was well known'.

¹⁴⁸ *IC*, IV, 60. Jayadevi's relationship with Jayavarman I is established in *IC*, VII, 51.

¹⁴⁹ A. Barth, *BEFEO*, II, 3, 1902, 239. A *cintarātna* is attributed to him. The inscription extols his military skills.

¹⁵⁰ *IC*, I, 11, verse xii.

¹⁵¹ *IC*, II, 195, with the date supplied by Professor Billard. It is remarkable that two inscriptions, some distance apart, have identical dates. The reason may be that the astrologer of this already powerful king had prepared a calendar of auspicious days for that year.

¹⁵² The Han Chey inscription refers to a king's departure to war in autumn. His enemies' moats were dry; *ISCC*, 17. Fighting in the flooded zone of north-western Cambodia would have been impossible during the wet season in the middle of the year.

in 671; their relative distance from the Tonlé Sap would have given them protection for a number of years.

The conquest of north-western Cambodia by Jayavarman I therefore seems to explain the statement in the *Hsin T'ang-shu* that the five kingdoms were progressively conquered by *Chên-la* after January 656. Their rulers, having thrown off vassal status imposed on them by Bhavavarman I and Mahendrarvarman by the beginning of the seventh century, were again reduced to submission by a Khmer overlord.

Before the circumstances that permitted the missions of 638 are considered, two questions arise concerning the Chinese evidence of the reconquest of north-western Cambodia 'after 31 January 656'. The first question is the time when the Chinese emperor was informed of Jayavarman's successes.

After Jayavarman's death no Khmer ruler before the ninth century possessed enough power to make his authority felt in the remoter parts of Cambodia.¹⁵³ The conquests could, of course, have been reported after Jayavarman's death towards the end of the seventh century, but it is reasonable to assume that the conqueror himself announced them. Two missions can be considered as the occasion when he did so: 682 and 698.¹⁵⁴ But in 698 the king would have been very old and probably already dead. 682 is the more likely year when the news of the conquests reached China.

682 is not many years after 671, when, according to the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, *Kum-* and *Pi-qu-nâ* were still able to send their own missions to China. The *Hsin T'ang-shu's* manner of dating the conquests is certainly curious; they are said to have occurred 'after 31 January 656'. The explanation is probably connected with the compilers' intentions.¹⁵⁵ They wished to improve on the performance of their predecessors, the compilers of the criticized *Chiu T'ang-shu*, and they chose to do so by introducing new material on north-western Cambodia. The missions of 638 were their pretext for doing so, and their concern was simply to record additional Chinese 'vassals'. For this reason Jayavarman's victories are not included in the section on *Chên-la*. The information at their disposal was sufficiently specific to enable them to state that the conquests began after a certain date, customarily indicated by means of Chinese reign-periods, but they also wanted their new entry to be as brief as possible. The appropriate conclusion to their new entry would therefore have been the summary statement that these countries were (progressively) conquered after January 656, and could no longer behave as Chinese vassals. The date when the conquests were completed did not interest them, but it was certainly after 671. The mission of 682 from Jayavarman is close to 671, and we can suppose that in 682 the king, still in the first flush of his final victory, decided to announce the recent conclusion of a series of campaigns which had spanned about 20 years.

¹⁵³ See P. Dupont, 'La dislocation du Tchen-la', *BEFEO*, XLIII, 1943-6, 17-55, for a study of the eighth-century evidence.

¹⁵⁴ *TFYK*, 970, 11403a and 11403b.

¹⁵⁵ See p. 356, above, for the intentions of the *Hsin T'ang-shu's* compilers.

The Khmer evidence in support of 682 as the date of the mission and *terminus ad quem* for the conquests is slight. Only the Baset inscription of 657 shows that Jayavarman controlled part of north-western Cambodia. All that is available are two details which may reflect his authority on the fringe of north-western Cambodia not long before 682.

The first of these details is an inscription of 680 from the Puok district near Angkor, which mentions the 'Kurung Maleng'. This person may be the now obedient vassal of Malyāng.¹⁵⁶ The other detail is contained in an inscription from southern Cambodia of 674, which states that Jayavarman issued a royal order (*ājñā*) at the residence (*mandira*) of Purandarapura.¹⁵⁷ Purandarapura's location has not been established. During the ninth century a little hill near Bantay Srei in the neighbourhood of Angkor was called Purandaraparvata.¹⁵⁸ A geographical precision has survived concerning Purandarapura in the Angkorian period; it was 'to the east of Śrī Lokanātha'.¹⁵⁹ Perhaps this is a reference to the Lokanātha shrine which existed near the future site of Angkor at the beginning of the eighth century, when Jayavarman's daughter, Jayadevī, endowed it with land. Though this evidence is insufficient to prove that Jayavarman's capital was Purandarapura at the northern end of the Tonlé Sap, the circumstance that his daughter managed to retain some authority near the future Angkor site suggests that there was a special connexion between Jayavarman and territory on the fringe of north-western Cambodia. Jayadevī probably ruled in the area where her father had organized his campaigns against the north-west. His line of march is indicated in the *Hsin T'ang-shu*'s statement that 'Səng-káu's location is exactly north-west of Water Chên-la'.¹⁶⁰ Presumably the detail was supplied by the king's envoys in 682.

The second question now arises concerning the accuracy of the Chinese evidence of the reconquest of north-west Cambodia 'after 31 January 656'. The *Hsin T'ang-shu* in the same passage describes Səng-káu as being 'exactly north-west of Water Chên-la'. But no other Chinese document uses the expression 'Water Chên-la' except in the context of the eighth century, when Cambodia was believed to be divided into two parts; according to the *Chiu T'ang-shu* and the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, the northern and southern parts were 'Land' and 'Water Chên-la' respectively. The appearance of the expression 'Water Chên-la' in the context of a seventh-century situation is unexpected and may mean that the *Hsin T'ang-shu*'s evidence is an unreliable basis for reconstructing seventh-century Khmer history.

¹⁵⁶ *IC*, v, 49-52.

¹⁵⁷ *IC*, II, 12. For the meaning of *ājñā* see Hubert de Mestier du Bourg, 'Ājñā, praçasta, gāsana', *JA*, CCLV, 3-4, 1967, 375-82. The name 'Purandarapura' is at least as old as 14 June 657, when it is mentioned in an inscription which also mentions one of Jayavarman I's counsellors; *IC*, II, 151.

¹⁵⁸ C. Jacques, 'Deux inscriptions du Phnom Bakheñ', *BEFEO*, LVII, 1970, 62.

¹⁵⁹ *IC*, VII, 14, verse xxxii.

¹⁶⁰ *IC*, VII, 56.

Before we question the accuracy of the *Hsin T'ang-shu's* reference to 'Water *Chên-la*' in the seventh century, we should bear in mind the perspectives which shaped the Chinese understanding of the evidence available to them from Cambodia. In particular, we should consider the significance of their expressions 'Funan' and '*Chên-la*'.

When, in the third century A.D., Chinese envoys visited Cambodia, they were satisfied that what they saw could be described as a *kuo*, or country or state, in the sense that it represented a definable unit of space. The unit in question could be identified in terms of its geographical location, the approximate size of its territory, its main physical features, and especially its situation in the system of communications which led from it to China or the Indian Ocean. Its identity was also believed to be reflected in the inhabitants' speech, their customs, and their products.

The Chinese chose to call this *kuo* 'Funan' for reasons which have not been established beyond doubt.¹⁶¹ The Chinese also described the chief whom they met as a 'king', and historians have become accustomed to regard the country or state of 'Funan' as a 'kingdom'. They have been encouraged to do so for two reasons. The first reason is that the imperial historians of subsequent Chinese dynasties, reviewing the records of tributary missions from Cambodia to China, retained the name 'Funan' as the entry in their histories under which to include additional information supplied when Khmer 'kings' sent tribute. Century by century the geographical location of 'Funan' on the sea route seemed, from the Chinese point of view, to become more distinct and therefore reinforced the Chinese sense of the country's identity. The second reason for sustaining the notion of a 'kingdom' is that the Chinese historians also assumed that there was an unbroken line of kings. Already in the records of the third century there is a reference to 'the hereditary line of kings'.¹⁶² The *Liang-shu*, which, more than any other early imperial history, professes to supply a more or less continuous chronological account of 'Funan', uses the expression 'the later kings',¹⁶³ implying that, in spite of usurpations and unruly vassals, there was an unbroken sequence of rulers in this 'kingdom' until the seventh century. In the seventh century, however, 'Funan' was believed to have been conquered by vassals from a place called *Chên-la*. It was therefore now deemed to be appropriate for the Chinese historians to abandon the name 'Funan' and to call the kingdom by its new name of '*Chên-la*'.

But different realities had been responsible for the political momentum

¹⁶¹ Cœdès, *The indianised states*, 36, discusses the transcription of 'Funan'. Professor Jacques, however, reminds us that the equivalence of the local term *bnam* 'mountain' and *fu-nan* is only a hypothesis. He notes that no inscription mentions a 'king of the mountain', the ruler of an important kingdom; C. Jacques, *Annuaire, 1971-1972* (École Pratique des Hautes Études, IV^e section), 610.

¹⁶² *Chin-shu* (Po-na edition), 97, 10b.

¹⁶³ *Liang-shu* (Po-na edition), 8b, 10a.

within the territories seen by the Chinese as a *kuo*.¹⁶⁴ As the information about north-western Cambodia in the seventh century has shown, Cambodia comprised a number of independent principalities, and the evidence does not permit us to suppose that there was an unbroken sequence of overlords. The chequered record of overlordship in the seventh and eighth centuries shows that there were often intervals when the principalities went their own way. We do not know which principalities produced overlords or even for how long the town visited by the Chinese in the third century remained an overlord's base. Above all, we do not know at what rate the territorial scale of overlordship grew over the centuries.

The Chinese historians knew nothing of these Khmer political realities, and the compilers of the *Chiu T'ang-shu* and the *Hsin T'ang-shu*, writing after the fall of the T'ang dynasty in 905, continued to maintain the convention of a single and identifiable 'kingdom'. Thus, when the mission records at their disposal indicated a crisis at the beginning of the eighth century, they chose to believe that *Chên-la* was then divided into two parts, corresponding to the northern and southern parts of the 'kingdom'. They called these two parts 'Land *Chên-la*' and 'Water *Chên-la*' respectively. Yet no more had happened than that a number of territorial chiefs were asserting their independence after Jayavarman I's death.

One Chinese source, however, exposes the way in which the T'ang imperial historians later misconstrued the situation. This source is the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, which records the notices compiled when Khmer missions came to China in the eighth century.

According to the T'ang histories, the 'division' took place some time after 31 August 707.¹⁶⁵ The *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* mentions the first mission to arrive in China after the division; it reached the T'ang capital between 4 February and 4 March 710, and it came from 'Chên-la'.¹⁶⁶ But the same text also states that, between 14 June and 12 July 717, a mission arrived from 'Chên-la Wên-tan'.¹⁶⁷ This statement can only mean that *Wên-tan* had been part of the 'kingdom of *Chên-la*'. It does not support the statement in the *Chiu T'ang-shu* that 'Land *Chên-la* is also called *Wên-tan* country'. Moreover, when the compilers of the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* record the missions of 753, 771-2, and 798, they always refer to *Wên-tan*, never qualifying it as 'Land *Chên-la*'.¹⁶⁸ Similarly, they always

¹⁶⁴ Professor Jacques shares the present writer's doubts concerning the suitability of the terms 'Funan' and 'Chên-la' as categories for Khmer history; Jacques, *Annuaire, 1971-1972*, 609-10.

¹⁶⁵ *CTS*, 197, 2b; *HTS*, 222C, 3a. The division is said to have occurred after the *shên-lung* reign-period, which ended on 31 August 707. A mission had arrived from 'Chên-la' between 5 June and 3 July 707; *TFYK*, 970, 11404a.

¹⁶⁶ *TFYK*, 970, 11404a.

¹⁶⁷ *TFYK*, 970, 11405b.

¹⁶⁸ *TFYK*, 971, 11414a; 975, 11458b (753); 976, 11461b; 999, 11719a-b (771-2); 976, 11462b (798). The last mission came to the capital in the first month of 798 (22 January-20 February), and Pelliot's statement that 799 was the year of the mission should be amended; Pelliot, 'Deux itinéraires', 212.

record missions from 'Chên-la' and never from 'Water Chên-la'. The T'ang historians describe the mission of 813 as coming from 'Water Chên-la', but not so the compilers of the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*.¹⁶⁹ The 'Chên-la' mission of 814, mentioned in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, can also be presumed to have come from the country known to the T'ang historians as 'Water Chên-la'.¹⁷⁰

Because the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* never refers to 'Land Chên-la' but only to *Wên-tan*, the Chinese expression 'Land Chên-la' should be understood as a geographical rather than a political one, and the correct context for this geographical usage is indicated in the second and third sentences in the following passage in the *Chiu T'ang-shu*.

'After the 705-7 reign-period *Chên-la* was divided into two parts. Because the south was near the sea and had many marshes, it was called the Water *Chên-la* half. Because the north had many mountains, it was called Land *Chên-la*, and it was also *Wên-tan*.'¹⁷¹

The key phrase in this passage is 'it was called 謂之', and the explanation must be that Khmer envoys, probably on the occasion of the first *Müan-tán* mission in 717, said that Khmers discerned two geographical regions in lands occupied by Khmer-speaking peoples, commonly known to them as 'dry' and 'watery' lands.¹⁷² They are unlikely to have used whatever local word is concealed by 'Chên-la', for only the Chinese were in the habit of thinking of Cambodia as a *kuo* and of giving the *kuo* a name. The envoys would have gone on to say that, as a result of political disturbances, these two geographical regions now happened to contain two important centres of political power.

The compilers of the T'ang histories, writing what they hoped would be an intelligible narrative and not merely recording missions as the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* compilers were doing, construed the data as meaning that the terms for the two types of terrain were also official names of the two eighth-century 'kingdoms'. They had, however, forgotten that these different types of terrain had been identified at least as long ago as 616, when Īśānavarman I's mission came to China. The *Sui-shu*, incorporating material recorded on this occasion, describes the same geographical situation which, in the *Chiu T'ang-shu*, is said to explain why the two new 'kingdoms' were called 'Land' and 'Water' *Chên-la*. According to the *Sui-shu*, 'In the north of *Chên-la* there were many mountains. The south had water and marshes'.¹⁷³

The background to the *Sui-shu*'s statement is that, by 616, the northern

¹⁶⁹ *TFYK*, 972, 11417b.

¹⁷⁰ *TFYK*, 972, 11417b (814). Only once does the *TFYK* refer to 'Water *Chên-la*', which is in a chapter on 'raids' and not on 'missions'. 'Water *Chên-la*' attacked Champa in 838; *TFYK*, 995, 11688a.

¹⁷¹ *TFYK*, 957, 11259a, is identical with this passage. *Wên-tan* 文單 can be restored as *Müan-tán*, and the name may be derived from 'Mun', the river which drains the Korat Plateau and enters the Mekong north of the Dangreks in the neighbourhood of Vat Phu; G. Cœdès, *BEFEO*, xxxvi, 1, 1936, 2.

¹⁷² 陸 is better rendered as 'dry land', contrasting it with the 'wet land' in the south.

¹⁷³ *Sui-shu* (Po-na edition), 82, 7a.

and mountainous area of Vat Phu had become part of a wider overlordship, which also included parts of the southern territories. Again the envoys cannot be presumed to have had in mind anything more precise than the Khmer-speaking lands. They merely wanted to explain that their overlord's authority had been extended over the mountainous and swampy lands. Thereafter these two geographical regions were not always ruled by one person, but both were under Jayavarman I's authority. The circumstance that Khmers lived in dry and watery lands would have been common knowledge among informed Khmers during the seventh century and long before then, and the use of the term 'Water *Chên-la*' in the context of Jayavarman I's conquests is no more than another politically-construed reflection in Chinese records of a Khmer geographical perspective.¹⁷⁴

Thus, the Chinese description of *Səng-káu* in terms of its location *vis-à-vis* 'Water *Chên-la*' is not an anachronism. Jayavarman's envoys were well aware that the southern part of their king's overlordship contained a great deal of water, and they found it convenient to describe the location of the conquered *Səng-káu*, the first target on the king's line of march, in terms of the watery part. Their description strengthens the view that the real name of *Səng-káu* was 'Sangko', immediately west and north-west of the Tonlé Sap. No swampy area in southern Cambodia would have been more conspicuous than the Tonlé Sap, which is a vast marsh in the dry season and an even vaster flood in the wet season. The *Hsin T'ang-shu*'s reference to 'Water *Chên-la*' is not an objection to the conclusion reached above that Jayavarman I announced the final conquest of north-western Cambodia during his mission of 682.

The chronology of the political fortunes of north-western Cambodia in the seventh century is now reasonably clear. The general background, explaining the missions of 638, remains to be considered.

The missions of 638 are not in doubt, and they imply that the authority of Khmer overlords in north-western Cambodia had disappeared after the reigns of Bhavavarman I, Mahendrarvarman, and perhaps Īsānavarman I. The southern Khmer king in 638 was probably Bhavavarman II, whose single attested date is on an inscription of 639.¹⁷⁵ He has also been associated with two other inscriptions, extolling royal exploits,¹⁷⁶ but Professor Jacques has recently suggested that these inscriptions may refer to Bhavavarman I.¹⁷⁷ Bhavavarman II's military stature is now in doubt, and nothing is therefore certainly known to indicate that he could prevent disaffection in north-western Cambodia. Moreover, evidence is available for believing that, not long after 639, conditions

¹⁷⁴ A tenth-century inscription may reflect the same perception of mountains and waters; *IC*, iv, 96, and notes (5) and (6). This inscription includes references to an ancestor of the Vat Phu principality and also to Rudrarvarman, who ruled in southern Cambodia in the first half of the sixth century.

¹⁷⁵ G. Cœdès, *BEFEO*, iv, 4, 1904, 691-7.

¹⁷⁶ *IC*, i, 3-5; *ISCC*, 16-21, and Cœdès, *The indianised states*, 72.

¹⁷⁷ Jacques, *Annuaire*, 1971-1972, 608.

in south-eastern Cambodia were disturbed and would have distracted the attention of a would-be overlord from north-western Cambodia.

The evidence in question is a passage from the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*, which records that, in the seventeenth year of the *chên-kuan* reign-period (643–4), the Chams complained to the T'ang emperor of attacks by 'Funan' and asked for reinforcements.¹⁷⁸

Pelliot mistrusted this passage. According to him, the Chams should have feared the powerful *Chên-la* and not the defeated Funan.¹⁷⁹ Moreover, no other text states that Champa sent a mission in 643–4. A mission came in June 642,¹⁸⁰ and the copyist may have confused the seventeenth with the sixteenth year of the *chên-kuan* period. Alternatively, the Cham mission of 642 may have remained some time in China before its request for help was acknowledged. No less than 18 foreign missions came in 642.¹⁸¹ But the correct interpretation of the evidence is more likely to be that, because the Chams appealed for help, their appeal was not regarded by the T'ang court as a conventional tributary mission. Support for this interpretation is provided by the fact that the mission of 643–4 is recorded in the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei*'s chapter on 'requests from vassals' and not on missions bringing 'tribute'. Not every mission brought tribute. The emperors were prepared to accept missions sent with special requests for help,¹⁸² and the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* contains several instances. For example, a Korean country in 625–6 sent a request for study facilities, but the *Ts'ê-fu yüan-kuei* excludes it from its list of tribute-bearing missions.¹⁸³

The reference to the mission in 643–4 can be understood to mean that in 642, and after the Cham tributary mission had left for China that year, Khmers attacked Champa and that the Cham ruler sent an urgent request for assistance. The pressure on him was probably severe and at the expense of his prestige. In 645 he and the male members of his family were killed by a usurper.¹⁸⁴

But what is the identity of the 'Funan' to which the attacked Cham king referred? The answer may never be known. By 'Funan' the Chinese meant the 'kingdom' which they believed was overthrown by the 'kingdom' of *Chên-la* in the first half of the seventh century. The same 'kingdom' may have sent the mission or missions in the 618–49 period and have had sufficient resilience to

¹⁷⁸ *TFYK*, 999, 11721b.

¹⁷⁹ Pelliot, *BEFEO*, iv, 1–2, 1904, 390–1.

¹⁸⁰ *TFYK*, 970, 11399a. The next mission came in 653; *ibid.*, 11401b.

¹⁸¹ *TFYK*, 970, 11399a.

¹⁸² *TFYK*, 999, 11719b.

¹⁸³ *TFYK*, 999, 11721b. Vassals sent 'request' missions in 320 (11720a); 450 (11720a); 488 (11720a); 450 (11721a); 472 (11721a); 493 (11721a); 508 (11721a). The *T'ang hui-yao* also contains an example of a request mission which was not regarded as a tributary one; *THY*, 36, 667 (*Hsin-lo* 新羅 in 686), which is not recorded in the *THY*'s section on this country or in the *TFYK*. In 663 the Khmer king successfully requested that a Buddhist teacher should be allowed to return from China to Cambodia; W. Pachow, *JGIS*, xvii, 1–2, 1958, 16. No Khmer tributary mission is registered under this date. The Khmer king was Jayavarman I, who protected some Buddhist foundations in 664; *IC*, iv, 6–9.

¹⁸⁴ Pelliot, *BEFEO*, iv, 1–2, 1904, 195, quoting the two T'ang histories.

attack Champa. But, as was suggested above, the term 'kingdom' is misleading in the context of seventh-century Cambodia. There was no such unit as a kingdom possessing a permanent geographical and institutional identity and able to survive the turmoil of civil war. The area known today as 'Cambodia' comprised an unknown number of independent principalities, each of which was under the control of a local ruling family. Political initiative was exercised by the heads of these families, who sought by conquest or alliance to impose temporary overlordship. During the period of political disturbance when Bhavavarman II may be presumed to be 'reigning', a territorial chief could have taken the opportunity of raiding Cham lands, and, with the evidence at present available, it is useless to speculate concerning his identity.

The evidence concerning 'Funan' and Champa in 643-4 is significant only because it reveals an unsettled situation in southern Cambodia not long after 638. The period between Īśānavarman I's last dated inscription of 627 and Jayavarman I's first dated ones of 657 may have seen considerable warfare in the south. Here, then, is the probable reason why the missions could be sent from north-western Cambodia in 638. Only with the appearance of Jayavarman I does the evidence point to greater stability in the south. He was able to establish a new overlordship in both southern and northern Cambodia, and, as we have suggested, the north-western political centres were progressively conquered in campaigns which probably took as long as 20 years to accomplish.

Some general comments on Cambodian history can now be suggested in the light of what has been disclosed about north-western Cambodia in the seventh century.

Cambodia was still studded with local chieftainships, whose rulers by no means felt that they already normally belonged to a larger and permanent political unity. Ambitious chiefs would emerge from time to time, but the path to overlordship was never an easy one. Only Jayavarman I stands out as a person who could hold together a large territory for a considerable length of time, and even his achievement did not survive him. The chiefs in north-western Cambodia were not the only ones who exploited the vacuum caused by the decline of an overlordship in order to resume what they regarded as a normal state of independence. In this situation the term 'kingdom' as something distinct from the temporary territorial influence of a successful soldier-chief is an inappropriate one. Greater unities were still only the fragile consequence of the prowess of an individual leader. This kind of unity quickly dissolved when an overlord died or lost the confidence of his allies.

On the other hand, the evidence has an important implication. Jayavarman I evidently felt obliged to compel the submission of north-western Cambodia. The five chiefs there can hardly have represented a genuine threat, and his motive for attacking them in the early years of his reign must have been that he could not justify his claim to be the new overlord if he did not wage successful warfare in the north-west. Bhavavarman I and Mahendrarvarman had controlled

this area several decades earlier, and Jayavarman's overlordship had to be comparably extensive. Here, then, is a measure of the scale of territorial influence expected of a Khmer overlord in the seventh century. The time taken by Jayavarman I to complete his conquests is a comment on the genuineness of his achievement.

A further implication may be noted in the evidence about north-western Cambodia in the seventh century, and it has a bearing on our understanding of what happened in the eighth century. Towards the end of that century Jayavarman II fought his way to the Khmer overlordship, in abeyance since Jayavarman I's death. Jayavarman II's military power must have been considerable. Yet only one of his victories is specifically mentioned in the posthumous inscriptions which provide the evidence of most of his reign. This victory was at the expense of Malyāng. Because of what is known of Malyāng's history in the seventh century, one is justified in believing that Jayavarman II's victory in north-western Cambodia was supported by great military power.¹⁸⁵ One whose territories included Malyāng was bound to have been seen by his contemporaries as enjoying a status at least as high as that of any earlier overlord in Khmer history.

¹⁸⁵ In 'Jayavarman II's military power: the territorial foundation of the Angkor empire', *JRAS*, 1973, 1, 21-30, the author invokes the earlier history of north-western Cambodia as a basis for interpreting Jayavarman II's military achievements. Professor Jacques's 'La carrière de Jayavarman II', *BEFEO*, LIX, 1972, 205-20, with its revised chronology for this reign, was not then available to the author. Both Professor Jacques and he agree, however, that Dupont had greatly underestimated the scale of Jayavarman II's territorial power.