K. 1426. Stela found during excavation in Oc Eo archaeological site (An Giang Province, Vietnam), 7th century CE

Kunthea Chhom, Dominic Goodall and Arlo Griffiths

Authors of digital edition: Kunthea Chhom, Dominic Goodall, Arlo Griffiths

Identifier: DHARMA_INSCIK01426

Repository: Khmer (tfc-khmer-epigraphy)

File path: texts/xml/DHARMA_INSCIK01426.xml

Languages: Old Khmer [Khmer], Sanskrit [Khmer]

Commit: 2026-11-14 14:32 (f68ac07), last modified 2026-09-19 07:30 (6c36829)

Summary

Face A contains seven Sanskrit stanzas in anuṣṭubh meter. The first is an invocation to the Buddha. Stanzas II and III praise the fieriness and righteousness of the ruling king Jayavarman I. The raison d'être of the inscription is mentioned in stanzas IV and V: these constitute an edict of King Jayavarman I concerning a monastery called Candana "sandalwood" (*candana-vihāra*) and they decree the use of funds (not given by the king) for the annual procession of the image of the Buddha on the full moon day of the month of Vaiśākha (April-May). Stanzas VI and VII stipulate that the slaves, cows, buffaloes, gardens, fields, servants, etc., given to the Buddha are not to be stolen and are under the protection of the Governor of Tamandarapura.

Face B is a fourteen-line text in Old Khmer. It echoes the Sanskrit text in what is said about the annual procession of the Buddha's statue of Candana Monastery on the full moon day of Vaiśākha as an order of King Jayavarman I. It also provides details of the management of the wealth of the monastery including servants, slaves, cows, buffaloes etc. The last two lines warn that those who flout the order of the king shall be punished.

Palaeographic description

The lettering is characteristic of the seventh century CE.

Edition

Face

1. Anuṣṭubh

〈A1〉 〈Column a〉 jayaty aśeṣa-bhuva¿ṇ?〈n〉a-
〈Column b〉 -dhvānta-dhvaṅsana-bhāskaraḥ
〈A2〉 〈Column a〉 jino vineya-kamala-
〈Column b〉 -pravodha-prathitodayaḥ

2. Anuṣṭubh

〈A3〉 〈Column a〉 dagdhe sva-tejasaivāri-
〈Column b〉 -vaṅśe nir-avaśeṣataḥ
〈A4〉 〈Column a〉 vane ’(p)i ka(ṇṭa)ka-bhaya〈Column b〉m
prajā yasya na lebhire

3. Anuṣṭubh

〈A5〉 〈Column a〉 catur-āśramiṇā(ṁ) dharmma-
〈Column b〉 -samatām ānayan prajā(ḥ)
〈A6〉 〈Column a〉 yas samānārthatāyogā〈Column b〉t
tulā-daṇḍa Ivābhavat·

4. Anuṣṭubh

〈A7〉 〈Column a〉 tena rājādhirājena
〈Column b〉 nāmnā śrī-jayavarmmaṇā
〈A8〉 〈Column a〉 śrī-candana-vihārāya
〈Column b〉 dattam arthāya śāsanam·

5. Anuṣṭubh

〈A9〉 〈Column a〉 mādhave mādhave māsi
〈Column b〉 pūrṇṇodita-niśākare
〈A10〉 〈Column a〉 [ta]thāgatasya pratimā-
〈Column b〉 -gamanan niyatotsavaṁ

6. Anuṣṭubh

〈A11〉 〈Column a〉 [Eta](s)[y](ai) kena cid api
〈Column b〉 śraddhayā pratipāditaṁ
〈A12〉 〈Column a〉 dāsa-go-(mah)i(ṣ)ārāma-
〈Column b〉 -kṣetra-karmmakarādi yat·

7. Anuṣṭubh

〈A13〉 〈Column a〉 tad ahāryyam asa[ṁ]bho(g)ya〈Column b〉m
anivāryyaṁ sva-karmmasu
〈A14〉 〈Column a〉 tamandarapurādhyakṣa-
〈Column b〉 -bhāro ya(m avagam)[yatām·]

Face

〈B1〉 Ājñā vraḥ kamratāṅ· Añ· ni roḥ parihāra man·〈B2〉 Oy· ta nā vraḥ kamratāṅ· Añ· śrīcandana〈B3〉vihāra _ gan· vnok· vraḥ kamratāṅ· Añ· dai lah·〈B4〉 gan ta saṁ paribhoga lah· _ gan· pradāna qnak·〈B5〉 lah· pre gui siddhi ta vraḥ kamratāṅ· Añ·〈B6〉 pre ge ta kloñ ñan· Ai taṁrāṅ· tve prāsāda pan·〈B7〉ter· vraḥ ta gui pūrṇṇamī vaiśākha cracar· cnaṁ〈B8〉 voṁ pre hau pak· tok· cmap· vnas· Aṁvi ta ge〈B9〉 qnak· vrahha _ kñuṁ tmur· krapī daṁriṅ· tpal·〈B10〉 sre karoṁ dok· _ voṁ tel· pre qnak· cralak·〈B11〉 [voṁ] pre pāk· slā voṁ pre knar· c(k)op· ge voṁ〈B12〉 [dap·] qnak· naṁ pitai col· [ka](ṁl)uṅa Aṅgana〈B13〉 ge [ta ce]r· gui ne(ḥ pa)r[i]hāra ta roḥ gui nehha〈B14〉 ge (ce?)[r· Ā](jñā) vraḥ kamratāṅ· Añ· ge daṇḍa

Translation

1.

He is victorious (*jayati*), the Buddha (*jinaḥ*), a sun to destroy darkness (*dhvānta-dhvaṅsana-bhāskaraḥ*) throughout the world (*aśeṣa-bhuvana-*), whose rise is proclaimed by the awakening of his lotus-like disciples (*vineya-kamala-prabodha-prathitodayaḥ*).

2.

After he burnt (*dagdhe*) completely (*nir-avaśeṣataḥ*) the race of his enemies (*ari-vaṅśe*) merely (*eva*) by his fieriness (*sva-tejasā*), his subjects (*prajāḥ*) experienced (*lebhire*) no (*na*) fear of thorns (*kaṇṭaka-bhayam*) even 〈when they were〉 in a forest (*vane 'pi*).

3.

Leading (*ānayan*) his subjects (*prajāḥ*) to a state of being in balance with the Dharma (*dharma-samatām*) of those belonging to the four 〈orthodox〉 walks of life (*catur-āśramiṇām*), he became (*abhavat*), it seemed (*iva*), 〈impartial〉 like the rod of a pair of scales (*tulā-daṇḍaḥ*), because he possessed a sense of each 〈walk of life〉 being of equal value (*samānārthatāyogāt*).

4.

This (*tena*) overlord of kings (*rājādhirājena*), by name the illustrious (*śrī*) Jayavarman, gave (*dattam*) the 〈following〉 charter (*śāsanam*) for the sake of wealth (*arthāya*) 〈given〉 for the benefit of the venerable (*śrī*) Sandalwood Monastery (*candana-vihāra*):

5.

"In spring (*mādhave*), in the month of Mādhava (*mādhave māsi*) 〈i.e., Vaiśākha〉, when the risen moon is full (*pūrṇṇodita-niśākare*), the procession of the image (*pratimā-gamanam*) of the Buddha〈's statue〉 (*tathāgatasya*) is to have a fixed festival (*niya-totsavam*)."

6.

"〈And〉 whatever (*yat*) is dedicated (*pratipāditam*) to this 〈image〉 (*etasyai*), out of devotion (*śraddhayā*) — slaves, cows, buffaloes, gardens, fields, servants and so forth (*dāsa-go-mahiṣārāma-kṣetra-karmmakarādi*) — by anybody at all (*kena cid api*),

7.

"... that (*tad*) is not to be stolen (*ahāryam*), not to be enjoyed (*asambhogyam*), not to be withheld (*anivāryam*) for 〈the accomplishment of some individual's〉 own works (*sva-karmasu*). May 〈the responsibility of ensuring〉 (*ayam*) be understood (*avagamyatām*) to be the burden 〈of duty〉 (*bhāra*) of the Governor of Tamandarapura (*tamandara-purādhyakṣa-bhāraḥ*)."

〈B1–B12〉 Order of My Lord concerning the modalities (*roḥ*) of management (*parihāra*),

- assigning (*oy*) to My Lord (the Buddha) of the venerable Sandalwood Monastery some laborers of other Lords, some (laborers) who are a shared resource, (and) some who are gifts from people;
- enjoining that they become the exclusive property of My Lord (of the Sandalwood Monastery);
- enjoining that Kloñ Ñan at Taṁrāṅ build a shrine (for) a procession on the Lord〈's image〉 on the Full-moon Day of Vaiśākha, every year;

- forbidding that he summon to break (*pak*), to uproot (*tok*), to seize (*cmap*) more (*vnas*) from the Lord's servants;
- ⟨regarding⟩ the slaves, cows, buffaloes, orchards, groves, low-lying rice fields, boats, absolutely forbidding that people cause damage (*cralak*);
- forbidding that they break areca (palms);
- forbidding that they obstruct taxation (*ckop*) of others;
- absolutely forbidding that *naṁ pitai* people enter inside the precincts (of the Lord).

⟨B13–B14⟩ Those who transgress the above (*gui neḥ*) — the modalities of management as above —, (i.e.) those who flout the order of My Lord, are punished.

Commentary

The stela appears to be of sandstone and measures 50 × 28 × 5 cm. Its upper silhouette has the shape of a downturned curly brace. The stela has no tenon at its base, but the bottom 15 cm were left blank, as though this part was originally intended to be inserted into the ground or into a stone mortise. When discovered, it lay on the ground, somehow broken into two fragments on one face and in four fragments on another. The pre-modern breakage has not been repaired yet. The stela is now kept in the storage room of Óc Eo Museum.[1]

The stela is inscribed on its two broad faces, face A in Sanskrit verse and face B in Old Khmer prose. Both faces are decorated with a blossoming lotus above one or two strings of pearls (two on A, only one on B) at the top of fourteen lines of text and one string of pearls below the text on each face. The Khmer text runs continuously in one column whereas the Sanskrit one is arranged in two columns, even-numbered verse quarters (*pāda*)s in one and odd-numbered ones in the other. Both texts are written in an early form of Khmer script typical of the second half of the seventh century, without long descenders on the characters *ka* and *ra*. Since no other king going by the name Jayavarman is known to have ruled in the seventh century, it is clear that the king Jayavarman mentioned in the Sanskrit text must have been Jayavarman I (657–681 CE). Besides its paleographic aspect, the inscription shares two main features of its content with other inscriptions of the same king: the opening expression *ājñā vraḥ kamratāṅ añ ni* "order of My Lord" (with addition of the particle ni where the

[1] At the time we finish this article, none of us has yet had the chance to observe the stone directly. We rely on information shared by Nguyễn Khánh Trung Kiên (2019) and Đỗ Trường Giang (2023)

inscriptions belonging to the reigns before and after use the phrase *ājñā vraḥ kamratāṅ añ* without said particle) and the details of the threat of punishment at the end of the Khmer portion.[2]

The character *ra* consists of a double stroke and does not extend farther down than the body of other characters. While the subscript of the character ṇa in the word pūrṇṇamī in the Khmer text and pūrṇṇodita- in the Sanskrit one still preserves the "x" shape (characteristic of the fifth and sixth centuries), the character *ṇa* above it has the two sides of the 'x' split and connected by a stroke at the bottom. The decoration of the stela and the paleographic characteristics of the script present similarities with several other inscriptions of Jayavarman I. The stela from Phum Chrei (K. 563, Kompong Speu, 7th century CE), for example, also has a decorative lotus at the top and a string of pearls below the text. The character ka does not have a long descendant loop, except the ones in the lines 9 and 12 of the Sanskrit text. The dominance of the ka without the descendant loop can also be found in the doorjamb from Tuol Kuk Preah (K. 493, Prey Veng, 657 CE); by contrast, the stela from Preah Kuhea Luong (K. 44, Kampot, 674 CE) presents more characters ka with the descendant loop than the other type, whereas the two types are equally represented in K. 563. The shapes of the vowel-markers markers *i* and *ī*. The first one is written as a round small circle and the latter is slightly larger with a horizontal stroke in the middle. In some cases, the vowel marker *ī* appears like a spiral turning to the left, which is comparable to that in the inscription K. 493.

1.

As Diwakar Acharya pointed out to us (personal communication of 28.vi.2023), *vineya* could refer also to the king's subjects (for cf. vinayādhāna in Raghuvaṁśa 1.24). This means that a second punning interpretation is at least suggested, even if it is not perhaps meant to expand fully in the mind of the reader, in which the king is the subject of the stanza, his name, Jayavarman, being already adumbrated or suggested by the opening word: He is victorious, that Victor (*jinaḥ*), a ⟨veritable⟩ sun for destroying the darknesses of all the world, whose rise spreads out to awaken the lotuses that are ⟨his subjects who are⟩ to be disciplined. For a handful of comparable instances of pre-Angkorian Śaiva inscriptions that open with a verse that is manifestly in praise of Śiva but that allow themselves also to be interpreted as referring to the ruling king, see Goodall and Revire (2021, p. 270). This is a trope we find elsewhere, for instance in the 5th-century Guḍnāpur pillar inscription from Karnataka (India), commemorating the creation and endowment of a temple of Kāmadeva. Its first verse, as Cecil and Gomes suggest (2021, p. 16, n. 16), could describe both Kāma and the ruling king Ravivarman.

[2]For discussion of the characteristics of the inscriptions of King Jayavarman I, see Vickery (1998, pp. 26, 165–168), and for his dates see Goodall and Revire (2021, p. 271, n. 21).

2.

The use of *kaṇṭaka* (literally "thorn") to refer metaphorically to enemies or trouble-makers within the realm is an old cliché (see for example Raghuvaṁśa 14.73). One is thus meant to understand *kaṇṭakabhayam* simultaneously as "fear of thorns" and "danger of trouble-makers". Although the "burning of enemies" might in such a Buddhist context allude to the destruction of Māra, it seems more likely to us that this stanza speaks about the king. The correlative *yasya* shows that this stanza is to go with the next two stanzas which contain yas and then *tena*, each time denoting the king. The vocabulary (*tejas*, *prajāḥ*, *arivaṁśe*) also suggests that this stanza is only about the king.

3.

One could imagine a layer of meaning in which he "was ⟨straight⟩ as the rod of a pair of scales because of ⟨the fact that he was engaged in cultivating⟩ a meditative state of awareness that all things are of equal value". Such a yogic awareness is spoken of as sāmarasya in Śaiva traditions, or as *śaktisamarasa* (e.g. in 5:36 of the Uttarasūtra of the Niśvāsatattvasaṁhitā and in 4:61 of the Nayasūtra, both edited in Goodall et al. (2015)).

4.

As Diwakar Acharya observed to us (personal communication of 28.vi.2023), the combination of a genitive and a dative (*candanavihārasya arthāya*) would be more normal for expressing this sense. Nonetheless, the first dative could be the result of attraction to the case of the second. Or we can interpret as we have, with two parallel purposive datives: "for wealth" and, at the same time, "for the vihāra". He further suggested that arthāya might mean simply "for the purpose / sake of". So "he gave this charter for the sake of the Śrī Candana Monastery". Note that it is not said that the king made any donation himself. Pre-Angkorian inscriptions that record expenditure by the ruling king seem to be rare (Goodall (2023, pp. 27–36). Here no benefactor is mentioned, which perhaps suggests that the king's edict relates to the disbursement of wealth that is regularly donated in small amounts by many individuals.

5.

We could have taken the expression *mādhave mādhave* distributively to mean in "every month of Vaiśākha", but since the element niyata- already expresses fixedness and therefore calendrical regularity, there is no need for the repetition of mādhave to express this. Indeed this repetition seems elegant precisely because the word is used in two different senses. Admittedly one could argue that *niyata-* is instead used to qualify the festival as "restrained", in other words a ceremony in which the participants were expected to restrain themselves from sensual enjoyment and fix their minds on the

Buddha and his teachings. But this might seem an anachronistically post-protestant interpretation, since Hindu and Buddhist festival processions often allow a joyful inversion of norms. This is furthermore arguably suggested by the opening *mādhave*, "In Springtime !...", a time for joyous festivals all over the world from time immemorial. We have silently assumed that *pratimā-gamanam* is intended as a metrically expedient alternative to some more standard expression for a procession, such as *pratimāyātrā*, although it is just conceivable that it refers to "the approaching of the Buddha image (for veneration)" (*pratimā-āgamanam*). Still, this is less likely, since the image, once installed, was presumably always there to be approached, not just on some calendrical festival. Festivals archetypically involve processions (in South India invariably so, to the point that utsava is often used to mean "procession", e.g. in the expression *utsavamūrti*). For other allusions to religious processions in the Khmer epigraphical corpus, see K. 290 (9th c., st. LXVI–LXVII, Buddhist); K. 853 (9th c., st. XIV, Śaiva); K. 356 (10th c., st. XI, a processional image, described as *utsavayāyin*, of a golden Viṣṇu mounted upon a silver Garuḍa); K. 276 (11th c., lines 4–6, Śaiva); K. 277 (11th c., lines 33–34, Śaiva); K. 1222 (12th c., Southern face, Śaiva). See also the passages referred to by Bhattacharya in his brief discussion of the subject (1961, pp. 89–91, to which we have alluded above. There are numerous other references of course to utsavas, such as a Śaiva one in K. 55, st. 14, which also belongs to the seventh century, but without explicit references to processions or processional images.

6.

As for *dāsa* and *karmakara* (which latter are presumably servants with a different legal status from the *dāsa*s, perhaps because they are not as completely owned), the Śaiva author Brahmaśambhu draws this distinction in his Naimittikakriyānusandhāna of 938 CE. According to this text (f. 73v), when the religious master (*ācārya*) transfers his responsibilities to his successor, he should say: *idaṁ sthānam iyaṁ vṛttir iyaṁ pustakasaṁhatiḥ amī vai bharaṇīyās tu dāsāḥ karmakarāś ca naḥ etat sarvaṁ mayā tubhyaṁ dattam adya tvayāpi ca pālanīyaṁ tathā samyag yathāsmābhiḥ prapālitam* "Such is the foundation; such is the revenue; such is the library; and these are the slaves and workers that are to be supported. All this I have given to you this day, and you should properly maintain it as I have done."

7.

The Governor mentioned here is presumably one of the successors to Vidyāviśeṣa, the governor of Tamandarapura who authored K. 604 and K. 1235 in 627 CE (for editions and translations of which, see Goodall (2019)). The fact that this figure is assigned the administrative burden of ensuring the correct use of these resources seems indeed

to confirm that we may speak of him as a "governor" (as argued by Goodall, 2019 passim). It was clear already that the various other mentions of Tamandarapura in the epigraphic corpus (K. 9, K. 604 and K. 1235), when all taken together, suggested the location somewhere in South Vietnam. The discovery of K. 1426 at Oc Eo might indicate that Tamandarapura was in fact the ancient name of Óc Eo. As for the nature of the compound name Tamandarapura, which, apart from the element -pura, does not seem to be Sanskrit, see the summary of past discussions given by Goodall (2019, p. 29), quoting Vickery (1998, pp. 182–183) and correspondence with Griffiths, and see Chhom and Griffiths (forthcoming, p. 102), where we conclude: While *pura* means 'city' in Sanskrit, the element *tamandara* is hard to explain in Sanskrit or Khmer and may perhaps reflect an indigenous language of the Austronesian family: in Malay, for instance, *taman darat* could mean 'flatland garden', and it is likely that a very similar expression also existed in the ancient Cham language. So the name may be an indication that the ethnolinguistic profile of the ancient Mekong Delta, and the polity of Fu-nan, included other people beside Khmers.

〈B4〉 Regarding the term *saṁ paribhoga*, the reproductions at our disposal make it imaginable that the dot we interpret as anusvāra is actually accidental, which would allow reading *saparibhoga*. Previous scholars have sometimes hesitated between *saṁ paribhoga* and *saparibhoga* (see e.g. the note in Cœdès 1936 on the inscription K. 6). But it is probably undesirable to read *saparibhoga*, as the expression is attested multiple times with or without *p-* prefix as *psaṁ paribhoga*, often with clear presence of *anusvāra* (see further occurrences in the inscriptions K. 51, K. 163, K. 426, K. 561, K. 582, K. 600, K. 818, K. 904, K. 926 and K. 1275).

〈B6〉 Taṁrāṅ is a rare toponym. In a variant spelling (of presumably trivial significance), it appears, as Taṁraṅ in the inscription of Ban Hin Khon (Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand, 7th c.). Is Taṁrāṅ the Khmer form of the Sanskrit Tamandara〈pura〉? To give an example of the sometimes rather substantial differences between (presumably primary) vernacular names and their guise in Sanskrit context, we may first refer to the epigraphy of Campā, where Panrāṅ is the vernacular toponym to which Pāṇḍaraṅga (or Pāṇduraṅga) corresponds in other contexts (Griffiths and Southworth (2011, pp. 285–291)). We are also reminded of the possible correspondence between the Sanskrit name Kāmaraṅga for Arakan (in present-day Burma) and the Old Burmese toponyms Kaṁ Raṁ or Kamḥ Yaṁ ((2015, p. 307)). If Taṁraṁ does indeed form a pair with Tamandara, then the Malay or Cham explanation of the latter, proposed just above, may need to be reconsidered, or else it must be assumed that the vernacular Khmer term came into existence only after the Sanskritization of an originally Austronesian name had taken place.

〈B6〉 Regarding ther term *kloñ ñan*, it might be read *kloñña n(aṁ)* "superintendent of temple (*naṁ* = *vnaṁ*)" but this would yield a unique example of the word vnaṁ followed by the preposition *ai* "at". Nevertheless, there are several examples in the pre-Angkorian inscriptions where *vnaṁ* stands in front of a name.

〈B7〉 The word cnaṁ is clearly the Old Khmer word meaning "year", as found for instance in the inscription K. 90 (Kampong Cham, 6th c., lines N7–10) *nivandha ge ta gui utsava ta pon hvat ta gui cnaṁ ta moyya* "Provision for the people at the four festival occasions in one year". The word *cracar*, by contrast, is not recorded in Pou's Old Khmer dictionary (Pou2004_01) while in Jenner's dictionary of pre-Angkorian Khmer (2009, p. 144), based on a single attestation in the inscription K. 1004 (Kandal, 691 CE), it is analyzed as a derivation from the verb *car* "to write (note, jot) down in order". However, in unpublished notes on that inscription, to which we have access, Jenner translates the word *cracar tṅai* "daily" (literally *cracar* "every" and *tṅai* "day"). If our intuition is correct that the context in which the word *cracar* appears in the inscription K. 1426 is comparable to the one where *cracar tṅai* appears in K. 1004, our translation of *cracar cnaṁ* as "every year" stands to reason. We would then propose a different morphological analysis from Jenner's: *cracar* could be derived from the (otherwise unknown) Old Khmer antecedent of the word *cuor* word that means "line, row" in modern Khmer. With the prefix of intensification *cra-*, the resulting meaning could then be "one after another in a line or a row", somewhat like the words "règle" and "régulier" in French which can refer both to straight lines and regularit[3].

〈B8〉 The word *cmap* is formed with the infix *-m-* whose original function seems to have been to create agent nouns, so *c-m-ap* "seizer" from cap "to seize" (2015, p. 307). However, it needs to be recognised that the inherited affixation of Khmer had already become fossilized to a certain degree by the stage of Old Khmer.[4] In the context where cmap occurs in K. 1426, it is likely that the word functions as equivalent to the verb *cap* although the alternative interpretation as an agent noun cannot be entirely dismissed. The syntactic context is similar to that where *c-m-er* occurs, interchanging freely, it seems, with unaffixed *cer* "to transgress", in the formulaic phrase of King Jayavarman I's inscriptions: *ge cer/cmer ājñā vraḥ kamratāṅ añ ge daṇḍa*. This can be translated by "those who transgress the order of My Lord, are punished" if cmer is understood as

[3]For a discussion of the prefixes *c-* and *cra-* in Khmer, see Jenne and Pou (1980–1981, pp. xxxvii–xxxviii)

[4]Cf. Jacob (1976, p. 608): "The fossilization may be described as follows. Although the function of many Mod.K. words containing an O.K. affix could in a given context be recognized by means of the affix, there are also many words of similar construction in the use of which the original function does not operate any more. In addition to this, other, newer affixes have confused the picture. The infix m occurring between two consonants, for example, can be nominalizing or causative, at least since the Mid.K. period."

a verb or “those who are transgressors of the order of My Lord, are punished” if it is taken as an agent noun.

〈B10〉 Like the word *cracar*, *cralak* is formed with the prefix of intensification *cra-*, here attached to the verb *-lak* “to cut a notch, groove, make an incision; to hollow out; to trim, clip; to cut into; to scratch, score, groove, mark; to incise, engrave; to gouge, chisel”. The resulting meaning “to cut intensely” underlies our interpretation “to cause damage” in the context of the inscription ((2009, p. 417)). To date, the word *cralak* appears in three inscriptions, i.e. K. 502 (Chanthaburi, 7th c.; this inscription is fragmentary), K. 1267 (Kompong Speu, 7th c.) and K. 1426. The context in which the term *cralak* appears in K. 1267 seems to confirm our interpretation. The sentence *ge ta cralak gui paṅ tiṅ ti mās kaddi moy* can thus be translated as “Persons who cause damage 〈to the donation of the king〉 shall pay a fine of one *kaṭṭi* of gold” ((2001, p. 194)).

〈B11〉 Analogously to the word *cmap* above, the noun *k-n-ar* is derived from the verb *kar* “to obstruct” with another affix, *-n-*, whose original function was likewise to form agent nouns, but contextually more likely to have been intended as a verb.

〈B12〉 The expression *qnak naṁ pitai* “*naṁ pitai* people” cannot be entirely understood: while the meaning of *qnak* “person” is certain, that of the word *pitai* remains obscure and the word naṁ might be a noun meaning “cake” or a verb meaning “to lead, bring, take”. According to Jenner (2009, p. 310), *pitai* is the name of an unidentified cake (*naṁ*) which was presumably offered to the dead. However, if one considers *naṁ* to be a verb, then pitai must be its object and it may no longer be assumed to be any kind of cake. The expression *qnak naṁ pitai* figures also in another inscription of King Jayavarman I, i.e. the stela of Preah Kuhea Luong K. 44. The text alludes to the presence of some *naṁ pitai* people within the precincts of a sanctuary. Similarly, these people in K. 1426 probably had the privilege of entering the precincts of the Lord.

〈B12〉 The restitution of the world *dap* is based on both the meaning and the space on the stone. Given that the prohibitive word *dap* is followed by the word *pre* or *tel pre* in three previous phrases, the same wording is expected in the lost passage here. Nevertheless, the available space is too large for the word *pre* and too small for *tel pre*. The meaning of *dap* suits the context better than that of *pre* “to use, to order”.

Bibliography

Edited by Kunthea Chhom, Dominic Goodall and Arlo Griffiths (2025, pp. 141–164) from photos of stela and estampage received by email on 11 Oct. 2019 from Dr. Nguyễn Khánh

Trung Kiên, Director - Center for Archaeology Southern Institute of Social Sciences, 49 Nguyen Thi Minh Khai, District 1, Ho Chi Minh city, Vietnam.

Primary

[..] Chhom, Kunthea, Dominic Goodall & Arlo Griffiths. 2025. “A Buddhist Procession Inaugurated in a Seventh-century Inscription from Óc Eo (K. 1426) and the Ancient Toponym Tamandarapura.” JSS 113, pp. 141–164. [URL]. Pages 141–164.