

КЛАССИЧЕСКИЙ ВОСТОК

DOI: 10.31857/S086919080006819-7

THE INSCRIPTION K. 733 FROM PHNOM PREAH VIHEAR
AND THE ROOT VIDYĀ- IN CAMBODIA

© 2019

Anton O. ZAKHAROV ^{a, b, c}^a – Institute of Oriental Studies, Moscow, Russia^b – Moscow State University of Psychology and Education, Moscow, Russia^c – Oriental University, Moscow, RussiaORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3654-9551>

Zakharov_anton@mail.ru

Abstract: Early political, social and cultural history of Cambodia remains the realm of enigmas. Traditional accounts of a succession of the great kingdoms of Funan, Chenla and Angkor Empire (Briggs 1951; Cœdès 1968) seem but a simplification. Recent scholarship tends to view the early political landscape of Cambodia in terms of many small principalities and unstable claims to sovereignty (Vickery 1998). Furthermore, scholars have changed the term ‘Indian’ to ‘Indic’, stressing the local culture substratum prevalence over external influence and the outward resemblance of scripts, linguistic features and sculptural styles.

In 1937, the famous French historian and epigrapher George Cœdès opened his seminal *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (1937–1966) with the Sanskrit Phnom Preah Vihear inscription K. 733. He gave its French translation and chose this text because of its brilliant Sanskrit poetry and many references to Indian culture. Recently Swati Chemburkar and Shivani Kapoor (2018), and Dominic Goodall (2019) made use of this text examining the Pāśupata School in early Cambodia.

My present article focuses on a few points. First, I discuss how many kings named Bhavavarman are known from early Cambodian inscriptions of the sixth and seventh centuries. Second, I offer English and Russian translations of the Phnom Preah Vihear inscription K. 733. Third, I hope to bring together all the references to the Sanskrit root vidyā- in Cambodian Sanskrit and Old Khmer epigraphy and to examine its relation to the Pāśupata School of Shaivism. Fourth, I aim to show the Indic or Indian traits in ancient and medieval Cambodia.

Keywords: Cambodia, inscriptions, epigraphy, Sanskrit, Indian philosophy, vidyā-, King Bhavavarman, Funan, Chenla.

For citation: Zakharov, Anton O. The Inscription K. 733 from Phnom Preah Vihear and the Root vidyā- in Cambodia. *Vostok (Oriens)*. No. 5. 2019. Pp. 21–32. DOI: 10.31857/ S086919080006819-7

INTRODUCTION

The National Museum of Cambodia possesses many unique objects of ancient Khmer art and sculpture as well as inscriptions written on various materials. The early history of Cambodia is still full of mystery. The earliest kingdom in the Lower Mekong Delta known from the Chinese texts was Funan 扶南, which emerged in the beginning of the Common Era. During the sixth century CE, another kingdom emerged in the areas of the Tonle Sap Lake and the Dangrek Mountains. The medieval Chinese authors called this kingdom Zhenla, or Chenla 真臘; the latter spelling still predominates in modern scholarly discourse.

But recent historians, and Michael Vickery (1998) among them, have pointed out that there were many political centres in the territories of Cambodia during the first millennium CE. These centres often left few or no signs of their activity, but there is no contemporary text, written in

Since George Cœdès (1964: 156–158) had published the inscription K. 978 from around Si Thep in the Phetchabun Province of Thailand (see the *Map I*), the number of Bhavavarman's in early Cambodia again became a point at issue. The French scholar read the inscription as follows:

1. – – śakapatisaṃva[tsare]
2. – – śubhrāṣṭamo – – –
3. – [di]kṣūrvy advayā na pra – – –
4. – ler abhyastabhūri – – –
5. ... nanda – –
6. vidito dikṣu vikhyāta – –
7. kāṭā vai – – bhūtyaiṣa –
8. śivāṃs sthāpayet so pi rā[jā]
9. śrīcakravartinaptā śrī
10. prathivīndravarmmatanayo ya[h]
11. śrībhavavarmmendrasamas tasya
12. ca rājyodbhave kāle || (Cœdès 1964: 158)

He translated it as follows:

“In the year of the Śaka king..., in the eighth day of the waxing (or crescent) Moon... the eastern earth, undivided by two... famous in the east... (The statues of) Śiva were erected by this king, a grandson of Śrī Cakravartin, a son of Śrī Prathivīndrarvarman, (named) Śrī Bhavavarman, who is like Indra, when he ascended the kingdom” (Ibid.).

Cœdès was convinced that the inscription K. 978 did mention Bhavavarman I. He knew well that several inscriptions of Citrasena-Mahendrarvarman detail his pedigree. The king and his elder brother Bhavavarman were the sons of a certain Śrī Vīravarmman and grandsons of a certain Śrī Sārvvabhauma; see inscriptions K. 496–497 from Pak Mun or Khan Thevoda¹, K. 508 from Tham Prasat or Tham Phu Ma Nai in the Ubon Province, Thailand; K. 1102 from Khon Kaen, and K. 1106 from Phimai in Thailand (Barth 1903: 445; BEFEO 1922: 385; Cœdès 1931, pl. I; Cœdès *apud* Seidenfaden 1922: 58; Jacques 1986: 66; Vickery 1998: 74–75). Cœdès identified Śrī Vīravarmman with Śrī Prathivīndrarvarman and Śrī Sārvvabhauma with Śrī Cakravartin. His main argument was the similarity of the names' meanings: Sārvvabhauma means ‘the universal monarch’ and Cakravartin means ‘the sovereign of the world or the ruler of the country that borders with the sea everywhere’ (Cœdès 1964: 157).

Pace Cœdès, the difference between the inscriptions issued by Bhavavarman I and that of Si Thep is striking. First, the texts of Bhavavarman I are poetic: they are composed in verse, whereas the K. 978 from Si Thep lacks evidence of any poetic nature; it looks like a damaged prose text. Second, the inscriptions of Bhavavarman I give no chronological data, contrary to the Si Thep text. Third, Cœdès took for granted that there could be only one monarch who claims a universal sovereignty but this is not self-evident. Last but not least, the identification of Śrī Vīravarmman and Śrī Prathivīndrarvarman remains hypothetical. We know that Citrasena adopted a royal name Mahendrarvarman but it gives no proof that the king could have two royal *abhiṣeka*, or consecration, names with the root *-varman*.

While Cœdès' hypothesis is still feasible, it is more probable that K. 978 was issued by the third Bhavavarman. The location of the Si Thep inscription in the Pa Sak area is rather remote from the places where the inscriptions of Bhavavarman I were found. Even the inscription K. 213 from Phnom Banteai Neang in the Battambang Province of Cambodia, issued by Bha-

¹ The inscriptions K. 496–497 are engraved on two sandstone stelae. The height of both stelae is 1.7 m. Both stelae have a Sanskrit inscription of six lines. Their texts are poetic and composed as three stanzas in the *anuṣṭubh* metre. The stelae are located on a Khan Thevoda Hill on the right bank of the Mun River near her confluence to the Mekong River.

vavarman, is composed in the *tristubh* metre and engraved in the single line (Barth 1885: 26–28). This source is also located far from the Si Thep area. Śrī Vīravarmman was mentioned in the inscription K. 359 from Veal Kantel in the Stung Treng Province, Cambodia. The text mentions his daughter who married a certain Somaśarman. This daughter was called a sister of Śrī Bhavavarman. She and Somaśarman were the parents of Hiraṇyavarman who erected the sculpture, perhaps, a lingam, of Śrī Tribhuvaneśvara (Barth 1885: 28–31).

THE INSCRIPTION K. 733 FROM PHNOM PREAH VIHEAR (KOMPONG CHNAN, CAMBODIA)

The Phnom Preah Vihear inscription (*figs. 1–2*) opens the first volume of Cœdès' seminal *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (1937: 3–5). It was especially attractive for him because of its Sanskrit text, clear script and rich Hindu references. The inscription is engraved on the stele of 0.76 m high and 0.63 m wide. It consists of 9 lines of Sanskrit poetic text. The first eight lines contain the *śloka* metre and the last line is in *āryā* metre. Cœdès dated the inscription to the reign of Bhavavarman II because of its script and the absence of the characters *jihvāmūlīya* × and *upadhmaniya* ✱ that were in constant use in earlier inscriptions (1937: 3). The Phnom Preah Vihear text was published in Devanagari by Ramesh Chandra Majumdar (1953: 18) but he gave no translation. I offer English and Russian translations with a commentary in English. The Latin numbers refer to the strophes whereas Arab numbers mark the lines of the inscription K. 733.



Fig. 1: The EFEO Print no. 928 / K. 733. Courtesy: École française d'Extrême-Orient.



Fig. 2: The EFEO Print no. 928 / K. 733 – text only. Courtesy: École française d'Extrême-Orient.

The text of K. 733

- | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------|--|
| I.(1). | jayatīnduravivyoma- | vāyvātmakṣmājālānalaiḥ |
| | tanoti tanubhīś śambhur | yyo ṣṭābhīr akhilañ jagat |
| II.(2). | vijitya yaḥ kṣitipatīn | nītiśauryyavalānvitān |
| | divaspr̥ṣaṃ samārabhya | yaśa[ḥ] ² stambham akīlayat |
| III.(3). | rājā śrībhavavarmmeti | bhavaty adhikaśāsanaḥ |
| | somavañśyo py aridhvānta- | pradhvañsanadivākaraḥ |
| IV.(4). | tasya pāśupatācāryyaḥ | vidyāpuṣpāhvayaḥ kavīḥ |
| | śabda ³ vaiśeṣikanyāya- | ta[t]tvārthakrtaniścayaḥ |
| V.(5). | śrāyasīm gatim uddīśya | śrīśiddheśapraṇālikām |
| | rājatīm rājato la[b]dhvā | kārayitvāpy atiṣṭhipat |
| VI.(6). | tatas sa niṣkramad nānā- | tīrthāyatanaparvvatān |
| | kathañ cid ānīta iha | svapnānte śrītrīśūliā |
| VII.(7). | yathā pradarśitaṃ svapne | dṛṣṭavān iha śāṅkaraṃ |
| | liṅgaṃ padaṃ goṣpadañ ca | bhasma tuṅgīśaparvva[t]e |
| VIII.(8). | pradānāni pradāyāsmāi | dāsādīni śivāya saḥ |
| | punaś śaivena vidhinā | taptvā śaivaṃ pa.am |
| IX.(9) | yāvat pradānam asmai | |
| | śivāya gobhūhiraṇyadāsādi | |
| | bhogyam pāśupatānām | |
| | ahāryyam a ... | |

THE ENGLISH TRANSLATION WITH A COMMENTARY

I.(1). Conquers Śambhu (Śiva) who extends to all this world by his eight forms: Moon, Sun, Sky, Wind, Mind (*ātman*), Earth, Water, and Fire!⁴

² Correction by Ramesh Chandra Majumdar (1953: 12). Cœdès does not comment upon that obvious omission.

³ My own correction is due to the print of the inscription made for the École Française d'Extrême-Orient. Cœdès writes *çapda* (*śabda* in current transliteration norms, 1937: 4).

II.(2). Having conquered the kings, who possessed political wisdom (*nīti*), prowess/valour and armies, he (the king Śrī Bhavavarman) did stake this beautiful column to touch the sky.⁵

III.(3). The king Śrī Bhavavarman, whose rule is excellent, annihilates his enemies like the sun [destroys] night; despite that he is of the Lunar dynasty!⁶

IV.(4). His teacher, a *Pāśūpata* (an adept of Śiva) whose name is Vidyāpuṣpa ('Flower of wisdom'), is a poet and connoisseur of truth, language (grammar) and the [doctrines of] *Vaiśeṣika* and *Nyāya*.⁷

V.(5). Having shown the path to welfare and obtaining silver, [he] ordered the building of the silvery channel⁸ for the illustrious Lord of the Magic (Śrī Siddheśa).⁹

VI.(6)–VII.(7). Going out to various places of pilgrimage, sanctuaries and mountains, he was brought here (in this world) during his sleep, by Śrī Triśūlin ('The Bearer of Trident,' i.e. Śiva), | since he, instructed in his dream, saw here (in this world) Śiva's male organ, footprints and puddles (which covered the latter), and ashes [on which Śiva sits] on the Mount Tuṅṅīśa (Śiva's mountain).

VIII.(8). He gave donations/bestowals to this Śiva, including slaves,¹⁰ again being practiced ascetics as a devotee of Śiva in a Śaiva [manner]...

⁴ Cf. the Canggal inscription of Sañjaya from Central Java dated from 732 CE saying *yo śṭābhistanubhirjagatkaruṇayā puṣṇāti*, "who flourish by his eight forms for the compassion to this world" (line 8, strophe 4; Sarkar, 1971, p. 17).

⁵ Cœdès translates *yaśastambham* as "the column of his glory" (« le pilier de sa gloire »; 1937: 4).

The term *śaurya* occurs in the Canggal inscription from Central Java. The text was issued by the king Sañjaya. It ascribes to king Sañjaya 'many qualities beginning with prowess, like Raghu' (*śauryyādiguṇyo raghuriva*; line 22; Sarkar 1971: 18, 21: 'excelling in bravery and other virtues... like Raghu').

Curious, however, is the occurrence of the compound *nītiśauryya* in the copper-plate inscription No. 2 from the Shimoga District (Taluk) in Karnataka dated from 1641 CE:

pātusāha-mahāsenā-trasta-dakṣiṇa-bbūbhhu(IIa)jām |
 abbayasya vidhātodyan-nīti-saurya-vivekavān ||
 rāya-simhāsānārudhair agrahārān kṛtān purā |
 vicārya pālayan dharmā-sūkṣma-tatvavidām varaḥ || (Rice 1902: 5 [Texts], 3 [Translations]).

Rice translates it as follows: "To the Southern kings alarmed by the great army of the Pātusāha he gave protection, distinguished for his enlightened policy and bravery. Enquiring after the *agrahāras* [lands given to Brahmins] formerly established by kings on the throne, he protected them; skilled in minute researches into the essence of religion". *Pātusāha* means 'powerful protector' or 'protective power'.

The term *valānvita* of the K. 733 may be compared with the fifth century Kutai inscription of the king Śrī Mūlavarman from Southeast Borneo (present-day East Kalimantan in Indonesia): *tapo-bala-damānvitah*, "having possessed self-discipline and the power of ascetics" (cf. Vogel 1918: 213 – "distinguished by austerity, strength and self-restraint" or "distinguished by [lit. provided with] the power of austerity and by self-restraint", Chhabra, 1965: 85, pl. 8).

The same term *valānvita* occurs in the Talcher Plate of Gayādatuṅgadeva published by R.D. Banerji and dated to the eleventh century. The line 15 reads as follows: *ta rājā Śr (Śrī) Jagattuṅga rūpa-viryā valānvita tasy ānvaye* "...the king Śrī Jagattuṅga. In his family, possessed of beauty, prowess and strength..." (Banerji 1916: 295).

⁶ Cœdès treats the compound *aridhvāntapradhvaṅsanadivākaraḥ* as « c'est un soleil anéantissant l'obscurité des ennemis » that lacks comparison of 'night' (*dhvānta*) and 'day' (*div*). He also translates *adhikaśāsana* as « doué d'une autorité sans égale » (gifted by unmatched power) that seems likely too.

⁷ I discuss the question of Indian philosophic and religious schools below, in a separate section of the article.

⁸ *Praṇālikā* is a form of the term *praṇāla* 'a channel from a pond' (Monier-Williams 1899: 660). The first word corresponds with the word *rājatīṃ* (Acc. Sg. fem.) 'silvery; (of) silver' in the stanza V.

⁹ Cœdès offers another translation: « Ayant en vue une condition supérieure et l'ayant obtenue du roi, il fut faire pour Śrī Siddheśa une rigole en argent et l'installa » (1937: 5). Personally I see no mention of the 'king' in the strophe V, if one agrees that *īśa* from *siddheśa* refers to the name of a deity or a divine title. Even if one admits that *īśa* means 'lord, king', this word stays in a position of the compound type *tatpuruṣa* before the word *praṇālikā* where the compound means "a channel for the Lord of Magic".

Cœdès translates *rājato la[b]dhvā* as « l'ayant obtenue du roi » (received by the king) that seems less probable.

¹⁰ The term *dāsa* usually means 'slave or servant'. I follow scholarly convention but one should remember that the legal status of the dependent persons in Ancient Cambodia remains problematic (see Vickery 1998; Jacques 2014; Zakharov 2019).

IX.(9). These large donations of the *Pāśupata* (adepts of Śiva) to Śiva, including cattle (oxen and cows), land, gold, slaves and money, should not be taken away...

THE INDIAN PHILOSOPHY IN CAMBODIA

The fifth stanza of the K. 733 mentions *śabdavaiśeṣikanyāya* or the grammar and doctrines of the Indian philosophical schools Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya (see also Goodall 2019: 27). Another ancient Cambodian inscription, also written in Sanskrit and found in Sambor Prei Kuk, K. 604, contains the same compound:

(15) śabdavaiśeṣikanyāya-samīkṣasugatādhvanām |

(16) dhuri yo likhito nekaśāstraprahatauvuddhibhiḥ || (Goodall 2019: 45; Finot 1928: 44).

The translations of the term by Finot and Goodall are different. Finot translates it as follows: « Celui-ci fut proclamé par les connaisseurs de multiples sciences comme la plus haute autorité dans les systèmes de la Grammaire, du Vaiśeṣika, du Nyāya, du Samīkṣa (= Sāṅkhya) et du bouddhisme » (1928: 46). But Goodall, following a suggestion proposed by Arlo Griffiths, offers another translation: “The experts of many sciences inscribed him at the head of the list of those who have followed [to the end] the paths of grammar, of Vaiśeṣika, of Nyāya, and of the philosophy [of the Sāṅkhya] (*samīkṣā*)”, (2019: 49), omitting the reference to Buddhism that appeared in Finot’s understanding of the passage. Finot adds Buddhism due to a meaning of the word *sugata* but Goodall believes that *sugatādhvanām* should be connected with the technical phrase *dhiri likhito* that ‘requires a plural genitive’ and denotes ‘accomplished people’ (2019: 48–49).

Be that as it may, the most important reference is the one to the Vaiśeṣika and Nyāya in both K. 733 and K. 604. Goodall cites the third inscription K. 364 (Section 3, stanza 18) from Ban That where these schools are listed with the Sāṅkhya, the Grammar of Pāṇini and its Commentary by Patañjali: *nyāyasāṅkhyaḥkaṇabhuṁmataśabdaśāstrabhāṣyārthasomam* (Goodall 2019: 50; cf. Finot 1912: 16, 25). The list calls the Vaiśeṣika School *kaṇabhuṁmata*, the *terminology* stressing an Atomistic philosophy because *kaṇa* means ‘atom’. I would suppose these references show the acquaintance of ancient Khmers with the Vaiśeṣika Atomistic viewpoint of Indian scholars, suggesting that the widely-held view that Indic influences in Cambodia should be viewed in only in religious, linguistic and cultural spheres needs to be refined to include the domain of sophisticated philosophy.

THE PĀŚUPATA SCHOOL AND THE ROOT VIDYĀ- IN CAMBODIA

The *Pāśupata* tradition in Indochina was recently examined in detail by Goodall (2019) and by Swati Chemburkar & Shivani Kapoor (2018). Goodall supposes the root *Vidyā-* may refer to a *Pāśupata* follower; he gives a list of inscriptions containing this root, and a half of them, – namely, K. 80, K. 733, K. 54 of 629 CE, K. 13 of 614 CE, and K. 604 of 627 CE, – have explicit references that the bearers of *Vidyā-*names were *Pāśupata* (2019: 27). He gives the following names:

“Vidyākumāra K. 79/639,8 K. 561/681.

Vidyākīrti K. 127/683.

Vidyādeva*¹¹ K. 80.

Vidyādhara deva K. 561/681.

¹¹ Goodall’s asterisk points out the inscriptions with clear references to the *Pāśupata* followers.

Vidyāpuṣpa* K. 733.

Vidyāvarabindu K. 652/687.

Vidyāvinaya* K. 54/629.

Vidyāvindu* K.13/624.

Vidyāviśeṣa* K. 604/627.

Vidyāśakti K. 493/657”.

But Goodall’s list seems exemplary rather than exhaustive, and further attestations of the term suggest that it is not always the case that the *Vidyā*-denominated name confirms the presence of a Pāśupata.

For example, the Prasat Ampil Rolum inscription K. 163, dated to the seventh century, mentions *kñuṃ ‘aṃṇoy poñ vidyā -n ta vraḥ kaṃṃmrātāñ ‘añ śāstā vraḥ kaṃṃmrātāñ ‘añ maitreya vraḥ kaṃṃmrātāñ ‘añ śrī avalokiteśvara ... (II.5–7): “Slaves given by the poñ Vidyā- to My Holy High Lord Śāstṛ (Teacher or Buddha, or Vishnu), My Holy High Lord Maitreya, My Holy High Lord Śrī Avalokiteśvara” (Cœdès 1954: 101; Jenner 2009a–b, <http://sealang.net/ok/>, with minor corrections¹²). Here we see the mention of the root *Vidyā*- in the Buddhist context.*

The seventh century inscription from Tan Kran K. 726 mentions a certain *poñ Vidyācaññ* or *Vidyācandra* (B.5; Cœdès 1953: 76, Cœdès’ conjecture) along with *poñ Īśānagupta*; the text also includes the phrase *svarga śivapura* (A.3) that means “the heaven of Shiva’s abode”. The Sambor inscription K. 132 dated to 708 CE, mentions the image of Śrī Vidyādharaṇī erected by a certain physician in 693 CE; this pious man passed away in 629 CE (Cœdès 1942: 85). The seventh century Phnom Ho Phnou inscription K. 76 refers to a certain *poñ Vidyādhivāsa* (Cœdès 1953: 8). The text is Old Khmer but it includes names of Sanskrit origin, Candrakumāra, Viṣṇu, Rudra and Siṅha among them.

The pre-Angkorian Vat Thlen inscription K. 1 refers to *poñ Vidyābhadra* (Cœdès 1954: 29). This text is of great value because it describes the actions by certain ‘governors’ – *mrātāñ kloñ* of Jyeṣṭhapura, *mrātāñ kloñ* of Bhavapura, and *ācārya Īśānadatta* (Goodall 2019: 71–72) – as well as the erection of an image of the deity Śrī Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa, who is Viṣṇu, Śiva, or Harihara (Lavy 2003: 21–39).

Less important is the tenth century mention of two *Vidyāguru* whose images were probably installed by a certain *Yajñavarāha*, who erected an image of *Vāgīśvarī* according to the Banteai Srei inscription K. 575A (Majumdar 1953: 281–282). *Vāgīśvarī* may denote *Brahmā*, *Sarasvati* or else an orator (Monier-Williams 1899: 936). Another 949 CE inscription from Tuk Chum K. 238 mentions a certain *steñ añ*, or ‘My Venerable’, *Vidyādhīpa* who obtained a rice-field for a deity. The context shows many *ācārya* and *Trailokyanātha*. According to Cœdès (1954: 120–121), this *Trailokyanātha* the ‘lord of three worlds,’ is not an image of *Lokeśvara* but may be *Rāma* from the *Rāmāyaṇa*. Another inscription from Kok Samron dated to 966 CE also mentions *steñ* or venerable *Vidyādhīpa* (Cœdès 1951: 82). This text seems Buddhist because of its beginning praising the Buddhist community: *namas sa[m]ghāya* (Cœdès 1951: 80).

The eleventh century Trapan Kramal inscription from the present Ubon Province of Thailand mentions a *mrateñ Vidyāpandita* (Cœdès 1964: 62). The deity here is *Vinaya* and corresponds to the Buddhist discipline but the context is unclear. The tenth century Prasat Kantop inscription K. 353 mentions a certain *vāp Vidyāśiva* twice (Cœdès 1953: 135). The term *vāp* is a ‘courtesy title for commoner men’ (Jenner 2009a, <http://sealang.net/ok/>, s.v. ‘id.’). The name of a *loñ* – an official of unclear function – *Vidyāśiva* occurs in the Kuk Prasat inscription K. 741 of 994 CE (Cœdès 1953: 161).

¹² Jenner did change the name *Vidyā* to *Prajñācandra* who occurs in the first part of the inscription; I also added the meanings of the term *śāstā* < *śāstṛ*.

The place name *Vidyāśrama* occurs several times in the Old Khmer epigraphy. It appears in the Preah Einkosei inscriptions K. 262 of 983 CE (southern part, lines 46, 47 – *anak vidyāśrama* “the folk of Vidyāśrama or the Abode of Wisdom”; Cœdès 1952: 113, 118), and K. 263 of 984 CE (D.60, 63; Cœdès 1952: 129, 138). The twelfth century Angkor Wat inscription K. 298 mentions *anak sañjak Vidyāśrama* “loyal folk of or the most trusted servant (named) Vidyāśrama” (cf. Aymonier 1883: 208). An official *steñ añ Vidyāśrama* occurs in the Prasat Kok Po inscription K. 814 of 1004 CE (Cœdès & Dupont 1937: 407, 412). Another official or member of a court *vrah sabhā Vidyāśrama – kaṃmrateñ añ Vidyāśrama* – who demarcated land possessions and obtained some cloths, occurs in the Vat Baset inscription K. 206 of 1042 CE (Cœdès 1951: 11, 13, 16). He also occurs in another Baset inscription of the same date, K. 207 (Cœdès 1951: 18, 19, 21, 23). In that text, Vidyāśrama is called the teacher (*adhyāpaka*) of the temple of Śrī Jayakṣetra and the reciter of Dharmaśāstra (*svat vrah dharmmaśāstra*). Philip Jenner translates it as “...My Holy High Lord of the Vidyāśrama, reciting the Dharmaśāstra...” (2009a–b; <http://sealang.net/ok/>, accessed 13.07.2019).

The eleventh century Phnom Chisor inscription K. 34 (A.18) mentions a place or personal name *Vidyādharmma*; its text refers to Hiraṇyagarbha, Hari and Śaṅkara – the Hindu triad of Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva (Cœdès 1951: 153–154). The Old Khmer Stung Chrap inscription K. 693 of 1003 CE mentions a certain *vāp Vidyānanta* (Cœdès 1953: 205). The main actors of the inscription K. 693, Brahmaṇḍa and his brother Amarānanta, both bear the title ‘*vāp*’; one may translate it as ‘respectable’. The Prasat Trapang Run inscription K. 598 of 1006 CE mentions a certain *vāp Vidyāmaya* and a *vāp Śivavrāhmana* (Finot 1928: 68); the text is clearly Hindu and not Buddhist as it opens with a eulogy to Viṣṇu, Śiva, and Brahma.

The Old Khmer Trapang Don Mas inscription K. 843 of 1025 CE mentions another Vidyāmaya thrice but as a *chloñ* ‘an unidentified official rank’ (A.35–36, B.10–11, C.29–30; Cœdès 1964: 110–112). The pertinent deities are *Vrah*, or Holy, Guru and Śivaliṅga. The K. 843 also mentions a high official *mrātāñ khloñ Śrī Vijayendrapandita* who read *dharmmaśāstra* in Īśvarapura (A.19–20; Cœdès 1964: 110). The Preah Nan inscription K. 89 of 1002 CE contains a name Vidyāvīraloka (Cœdès 1951: 166). Cœdès (1951: 169, n. 2) believes it was a posthumous name.

The tenth century Prasat Chen inscription K. 182-I from Koh Ker mentions a certain *gho* or male slave Vidyāmaya (Chhom 2011: 32; Jacques 2014: 294, 296).¹³ Another Prasat Chen inscription K. 182-II refers to *gho Vidyābhāva* in the line 54 (Chhom 2011: 42) or line 58 (Jacques 2014: 286–287).¹⁴ The two *gho* named *Vidyābhāva* occur in the Prasat Kracap inscription K. 183-10 (Chhom 2011: 115–116; Jacques 2014: 146–148). The same name appears in the Prasat Kracap inscription K. 183-25 (Chhom 2011: 176; Jacques 2014: 206–207). According to Kunthea Chhom (2011: 151, 315), the Prasat Kracap inscription K. 183-19 presumably mentions *tai khñuṃ [kule] vidyābhāva* ‘a female servant [of/from the family of] Vidyābhāva,’ but Claude Jacques (2014: 168) reads *tai (khñuṃ) k(u)le* – – – only. The EFEO print published by Jacques shows no clear sign in the place of possible mention of Vidyābhāva (Jacques 2014: 169). A *gho* or slave Vidyā occurs in the Prasat Kracap inscription K. 183-20 (Chhom 2011: 154–155; Jacques 2014: 170–171)¹⁵ and in the Prasat Kracap K. 183-23 (Chhom 2011: 167;

¹³ Jacques puts the name in the line 17, and he is right, if one follows the number of lines in the biggest part of the fragment 2 on the EFEO print n 92-1 fragment 2 / K. 182-I. But the smaller upper part of the fragment clearly shows that there was at least one upper line in the text (see Jacques 2014: 296; Chhom 2011: 36).

¹⁴ Despite the reading seems clear, I cannot establish the number of lines in the inscription without inspecting its fragments personally *in situ*. Therefore I give different numberings by Chhom and Jacques.

¹⁵ Jacques places the sign *v* in round brackets but without explanation. The picture of the EFEO print clearly reveals the sign in the beginning of line 5.

Jacques 2014: 178–179). A *gho* Vidyādeha occurs in another Prasat Kracap inscription K. 183-21 (Chhom 2011: 159–160; Jacques 2014: 174–175).

The root *vidyā-* can be found in the Prasat Chen inscription K. 182-III, line 57 (Chhom 2011: 46) and in the Prasat Kracap K. 183-10 (Chhom 2011: 116; Jacques 2014: 146–147, 149). Jacques (2014: 289) reads the K. 182-III in another way, enlisting 87 lines and reading *gho avidyāghana* in the line 69. Unfortunately, the damage of the inscription itself – clearly seen on the EFEO print (Jacques 2014: 291) – gives no way to restore the reading.

The eleventh century Prasat Sek Ta Tuy inscription K. 617 mentions a certain Vidyāvāsa (A.19, Finot 1928: 56). A *khloñ* Vidyāvāsa occurs in the Phnom Bayan inscription K. 852 of 1107 CE (Cœdès 1937: 267). The Phnom Aksar inscription K. 523 of 1118 CE mentions a guru Vidyāvāsa and *tapasvi(n)* or ascetic Vidyāspada (Cœdès 1951: 137, 139).

The term *vidyā* also appears in compounds. The thirteenth century Angkor Wat inscription K. 300 makes use of the term *vidyeśavid* as personal name “One who knows the Lord of Knowledge or Śiva” in the stanza 40 of its side A, and that person knew all the sciences (*sarvvadā sarvvavidyābhis sevito vedyam āvīdan | tasmād vidyeśavid iti nāmnā yaḥ prathito bhuvī*) (Barth 1885: 571, 583). The same text mentions the name *Vidyēśadhīmat* in the concluding stanza 103 (side B):

vidyābhis sakalābhiryas sarvvadā sevito bhṛśam |
vidyeśa iva vidyeśadhīmānityativiśrutaḥ || (Barth 1885: 578; Majumdar 1953: 557).

“All the sciences live in him like in the Lord of Knowledge (i.e. Shiva), and he is known by another name Vidyēśadhīmat (Learned in sciences)”. I would suppose that Vidyēśadhīmat and Vidyēśavid was the same person who served as the main priest under the king Jayavarman VII and his predecessors.

The Prasat Kantop inscription K. 353 of 1046 CE four times mentions *vraḥ kaṃmrateñ añ* Vidyēśvarapandita who was a teacher (*adhyāpaka*) of Śivapāda (Cœdès 1953: 136–137); he lived during the reign of Suryavarman I and bore the name *Bhadrāspada* earlier.

As can be seen, the root *vidyā-* was popular in ancient Cambodia. It may denote a *Pāśupata* follower, and it did occur in the Angkorian inscriptions of the eleventh and thirteenth centuries as the reference to ‘all knowledge’ or ‘all sciences’. But it also had been used in Buddhist context and in the Old Khmer names of servants without proper reference to any religious school. These Old Khmer names were of Sanskrit origin but during the Angkor times the root *vidyā-* lacked any specific reference to high social groups and in fact became a popular root for the personal names of servants or ‘slaves’.

RUSSIAN TRANSLATION = РУССКИЙ ПЕРЕВОД

I.(1). Побеждает Шамбху (Шива), который простирается на весь мир своими восьмью формами: Луной, Солнцем, небом, ветром, сознанием (атман), землёй, водой и огнём!

II.(2). Победив царей, знающих политическое искусство, доблестных и имевших войско, он (царь Бхававарман) вначале повелел воздвигнуть прекрасную колонну, чтобы касалась неба.

III.(3). Хотя царь Шри Бхававарман, чья власть превосходна, принадлежит к Лунной династии, он уничтожает врагов подобно тому, как Солнце [изгоняет] ночь!

IV.(4). Его наставник-*наушунат* (шиваит) – поэт по имени Видьяпушпа («Цветок мудрости»), знаток истины, грамматики и [учений] *вайшешики* и *ньяи*.

V.(5). Указав путь к процветанию и получив серебро, [он] повелел построить серебряный канал для прекрасного Владыки красоты/йоги/чародейства/святости/рая (или: для почтенного Прекрасного владыки).

VI.(6)–VII.(7). Уходя в разные места паломничества, святилища и горы, он был принесён сюда (в этот мир) во время сна Шивой (Владыкой трезубца), | поскольку он, получив видение во сне, и здесь (в этом мире) видел половой орган и отпечатки ног Шивы, а также лужи (собравшиеся в этих отпечатках), и пепел[, на котором восседает Шива,] на горе Тунгиша (Горе Шивы).

VIII.(8). Он совершил дарения этому Шиве, в том числе рабов, снова практикуя аскезу, как шиваит, в шиваитском [духе]...

IX.(9). Столь большие дары шиваитов (*nauyunatov*) этому Шиве, включая скот (быков и коров), землю, золото, рабов и деньги, никто да не отнимет!..

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, the K. 733 inscription reveals many Indic signs in ancient Khmer culture. It confirms a deep knowledge of Indian philosophy and religion in early Cambodia. The analysis of the early Cambodian inscriptions reveals the diverse functioning of the Sanskrit root *vidyā-* which may have denoted a *Pāsupata* follower as well as a servant or a Buddhist. Finally, this essay shows that there were at least three kings named Bhavavarman in the sixth and seventh centuries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am deeply grateful to Jeffrey Sundberg for his invaluable comments on the draft of my paper and for its English editing.

REFERENCES

- Aymonier E. (1883). Quelques notions sur les inscriptions en vieux khmèr (suite et fin). *Journal asiatique* 1883, pp. 199–228.
- Banerji, R.D. (1916). Talcher Plate of Gayadatungadeva. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, New Series 12, pp. 291–295.
- Barth, Auguste (1885). *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge*. P.: Imprimerie Nationale, 1885.
- Barth, A. (1903). Inscription sanskrite de Phou Lokhon (Laos). *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient* (further – *BEFEO*) 3/3, pp. 442–446.
- BEFEO* (1922) – *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*. T. 22.
- Briggs, L.P. (1951). *The Ancient Khmer Empire*. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, Held in Philadelphia for promoting useful knowledge, New Series 41.1).
- Chemburkar, Swati, & Kapoor, Shivani (2018). The Pāsupata sect in Ancient Cambodia and Champa. Trần Kỳ Phương, Võ Văn Thắng, Peter D. Sharrock (eds.) *Vibrancy in Stone: Masterpieces of the Đà Nẵng Museum of Cham Sculpture*. Bangkok: River Books, pp. 45–56.
- Chhom, Kunthea (2011). *Inscriptions of Koh Ker I: Publications of the Hungarian Southeast Asian Research Institute* 1. Budapest: Hungarian Southeast Asian Research Institute.
- Cœdès, G. (1931). Études cambodgiennes. XXV. Deux inscriptions sanscrites du Fou-nan. XXVI. La date de Kôh Ker. XXVII. La date du Bâphûon. *BEFEO* 31/1, pp. 1–23.
- Cœdès, G. (1937). *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. T. I. Hanoi: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient, 1937.
- Cœdès, G. (1942). *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. T. II. Hanoi: Imprimerie d'Extrême-Orient, 1942.
- Cœdès, G. (1943). Études cambodgiennes. XXXVI: Quelques précisions sur la fin du Fou-nan. *BEFEO* 43/1, pp. 1–8.
- Cœdès, G. (1951). *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. T. III. P.: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1951.
- Cœdès, G. (1952). *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. T. IV. P.: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1952.

- Cœdès, G. (1953). *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. T. V. P.: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1953.
- Cœdès, G. (1954). *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. T. VI. P.: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1954.
- Cœdès, G. (1964). *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. T. VII. P.: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1964.
- Cœdès, G. (1966). *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. T. VIII. P.: École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1966.
- Cœdès, G. 1968. *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia* / Ed. W.F. Vella, translated by S. Brown Cowing. Honolulu, Hawaii: East-West Center Press.
- Cœdès, G., & Dupont, Pierre (1937). Les inscriptions du Pràsàt Kòk Pò. *BEFEO* 37, pp. 379–413.
- Finot, Louis (1912). Notes d'épigraphie : XIII. L'inscription de Ban That. *BEFEO* 12, pp. 1–28.
- Finot, Louis (1928). Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge. *BEFEO* 28 (1), pp. 43–80.
- Goodall, Dominic (2019). Nobles, Bureaucrats or Strongmen? On the “Vassal Kings” or “Hereditary Governors” of Pre-Angkorian City-States: Two Sanskrit Inscriptions of Vidyāviśeṣa, Seventh-Century Governor of Tamarāpura (K. 1235 and K. 604), and an Inscription of Śivadatta (K. 1150), Previously Considered a Son of Īśānavarman I. *Udaya* 14, pp. 23–85.
- Jacques, Claude (1986). Le pays Khmer avant Angkor. *Journal des savants* 1986/1–3, pp. 59–95.
- Jacques, Claude (2014). *Koh Ker: Temples et inscriptions avec une étude sur le roi Jayavarman IV et un essai sur l'« esclavage » dans l'ancien pays khmer*. Budapest : Institut de recherche hongrois en Asie du Sud-Est.
- Jacques, C., Lafond, Ph. (2007). *The Khmer Empire: Cities and Sanctuaries, Fifth to the Thirteenth Centuries*. Bangkok: River Books.
- Jenner, Ph.N. (2009a). *Dictionary of Pre-Angkorian Khmer*. Canberra, 2009 (Pacific Linguistics. 597; <http://sealang.net/ok/>).
- Jenner, Ph.N. (2009b). *Dictionary of Angkorian Khmer*. Canberra, 2009 (Pacific Linguistics. 598; <http://sealang.net/ok/>).
- Lavy, Paul A. (2003). As in Heaven, So on Earth: The Politics of Viṣṇu, Śiva and Harihara Images in Preangkorian Khmer Civilisation. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 34(1), pp. 21–39.
- Majumdar, R.Ch. (1953). *Inscriptions of Kambuja*. Calcutta, 1953 (The Asiatic Society Monograph Series, Vol. VIII).
- Monier-Williams, M. (1899). *A Sanskrit–English Dictionary Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European languages*. Oxford, 1899.
- Rice, B. Lewis. (1902). *Epigraphia Carnatica: Vol. VII: Inscriptions in the Shimoga District (Part I)*. Bangalore: Mysore Government Central Press (Mysore Archaeological Series).
- Seidenfaden, E. (1922). Complément à l'Inventaire descriptif des monuments du Cambodge pour les quatre provinces du Siam Oriental. *BEFEO* 22, pp. 55–99.
- Vickery, Michael (1998). *Society, Economics, and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia: The 7th–8th Centuries*. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for UNESCO, 1998.
- Zakharov, Anton O. (2016). Inscription K.557/600 611 CE from Angkor Borei (Cambodia): Translation and Commentary (in Russian). *Scripta antiqua. Voprosy drevnei istorii, filologii, iskusstva i material'noy kul'tury* 5, Moscow: Sobranie, pp. 190–213 [Захаров А.О. Надпись К.557/600 611 г. из Ангор Борея (Камбоджа): перевод и комментарий. *Scripta antiqua. Вопросы древней истории, филологии, искусства и материальной культуры. Альманах*. Гл. ред. М.Д. Бухарин. Т. 5. М.: Собрание, 2016. С. 190–213].
- Zakharov, Anton O. (2019). The earliest dated Cambodian inscription K. 557/600 from Angkor Borei, Cambodia: an English translation and commentary. *Vostok (Oriens)*. 2019, No. 1, pp. 66–80.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR / ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ

Anton O. ZAKHAROV, Dr. Habil. (History), Leading Research Fellow, Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences; Professor, Moscow State University of Psychology and Education; Moscow, Russian Federation; Professor, Oriental University, Moscow, Russia.

ЗАХАРОВ Антон Олегович, доктор исторических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института востоковедения РАН; профессор Московского городского психолого-педагогического университета, Москва, Россия; заведующий кафедрой регионоведения и международных отношений Института стран Востока, Москва, Россия.