

កំណត់នៃនិពន្ធនាយក

ប្រទេសកម្ពុជាទើបនឹងដើមផុតពីកងយុទ្ធពលកម្ម ហើយកំពុងរំកិលខ្លួនជាលំដាប់ទៅរកស្ថិរភាព។ ក្នុងន័យនេះហើយដែលយើងឱ្យឈ្មោះទស្សនាវដ្តីស្រាវជ្រាវវិជ្ជាខ្មែរនេះថា “ឌុំយ” ត្បិតយើងប្រាថ្នារួមចំណែកក្នុងការស្វែងរកវប្បធម៌ខ្មែរទៅរកពន្លឺដែរ។

វិជ្ជាខ្មែរ – ពេលក្នុងទស្សនៈសិក្សានិងស្រាវជ្រាវដែលពិភពលោកទាំងមូលបានត្រួសត្រាយនិងដើរតាមក្នុងសម័យទំនើបនេះ – ផ្ដើមចេញដំណើររវាងពេលដែលកម្ពុជាចុះសន្ធិសញ្ញាដាក់ខ្លួននៅក្រោមអាណាព្យាបាលបារាំង។ ក្នុងបរិបទនេះ បើពេលឱ្យច្បាស់ទៅទៀត គឺវិជ្ជាខ្មែរក្លាយខ្លួនអស់រយៈពេលយ៉ាងយូរទៅនឹងប្រវត្តិវិទ្យា “សាលាបារាំងចុងបូព៌ា” (*Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient*)។ តាមពិតទៅ ចំនួនច្រើនលើសលុបនៃប្រាសាទបុរាណ, បដិមា, សិលាចារឹក... នៅកម្ពុជា ជាកត្តាដ៏សំខាន់មួយដែលជម្រុញឱ្យគេបង្កើតស្ថាប័ននោះនាឆ្នាំ១៨៩២។ នេះជាឱកាសនិងជាមធ្យោបាយឱ្យអ្នកប្រាជ្ញដើរឆ្លើយចំណេះដឹងការស្រាវជ្រាវព្រមទាំងផ្សព្វផ្សាយលទ្ធផលទាំងពួងជាហូរហែរឿងមក។ ប៉ុន្តែវិទ្យាសកម្មដែលរាតត្បាតកម្ពុជាទាសវត្សរ៍នេះបានបញ្ឈប់ការរីកចម្រើននោះឱ្យនៅនឹងថ្កល់មួយកន្លែង។

សព្វថ្ងៃ ស្ថានភាពចាប់ផ្ដើមប្តូរផ្លាស់ហើយ គឺប្រទេសវិវត្តន៍ទៅរកភាពចម្រើន រីឯ “ឌុំយ” ក៏ចាប់កំណើតឡើង ហើយពង្រឹងខ្លួនបន្តិចម្តងៗទៅអនាគត សម្រាប់ជាឧបករណ៍ ឬឃ្លាននៃវិទ្យាសាស្ត្រ។ ឌុំយ ជាទីកាមួយនៃការស្រាវជ្រាវនិងផ្សព្វផ្សាយ។

យើងជឿជាក់ថា ការរីកចម្រើនក្នុងការស្រាវជ្រាវពុំអាចផ្តាច់បានពីទិដ្ឋភាពផ្សេងៗក្នុងវិស័យសង្គម, នយោបាយនិងសេដ្ឋកិច្ចនៃប្រទេសបានឡើយ។ ឌុំយ មានបំណងយ៉ាងមាំមួនដើម្បីឱ្យការសិក្សាពីសំណាកអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវនិងនិស្សិតខ្មែរមានសន្ទុះកាន់តែខ្លាំងឡើង។ គឺអ្នកទាំងនេះហើយដែលអាចនឹងផ្តុំគ្នាបង្កើតជាចលនាបញ្ញាវន្តមួយធំបាន នៅក្នុងប្រទេស ព្រមទាំងក្រៅប្រទេសផង។

ហេតុនេះ ឌុំយ ពុំមែនគ្រាន់តែជាទស្សនាវដ្តីស្រាវជ្រាវសុទ្ធសាតប៉ុណ្ណោះទេ ប៉ុន្តែជាឧបករណ៍សម្រាប់ប្រឡូកក្នុងការវិវត្តន៍ដែលពេលមកខាងលើ ព្រមទាំងដែលជម្រុញការវិវត្តន៍នោះឱ្យទៅតាមទេសកាល។

ឌុំយ ផ្សព្វផ្សាយដោយនាយកដ្ឋានវប្បធម៌និងរមណីយដ្ឋាន នៃអាជ្ញាធរអប្សរា ពោលគឺស្ថាប័នដែលរាជរដ្ឋាភិបាលដាក់បន្ទុកឱ្យការពារនិងលើកស្ទួយតំបន់សៀមរាប-អង្គរ។ ឧបករណ៍នៃការគ្រប់គ្រងនេះ ផ្អែកមូលដ្ឋានទៅលើនីតិក្រមពិសេសមួយចំនួន។ គួរបញ្ជាក់ថាមិនមែនជាការចែងឱ្យឡើងដែលនីតិក្រមទីមួយ ដែលព្រះមហាក្សត្របានឡាយព្រះហស្តលេខបន្ទាប់ពីត្រឡប់មកគ្រងរាជ្យក្លាយគឺ “ព្រះរាជក្រឹត្យស្តីពីការកំណត់និងការចាត់ចែងគ្រប់គ្រងតំបន់សៀមរាបអង្គរ”។ នេះសូមឱ្យយើងស្រាវជ្រាវសំខាន់ពិសេសនៃតំបន់នេះ ដែលមិនត្រឹមតែជាតំបន់ភូមិសាស្ត្រធំមួយពោរពេញទៅដោយមរតកបុរាណប៉ុណ្ណោះទេ ប៉ុន្តែដែលប្រមូលផ្តុំទិដ្ឋភាពផ្សេងៗនៃអារ្យធម៌ខ្មែរទាំងមូល។ ពោលឱ្យខ្លីមកគឺ អង្គរជាប្រាសាទខ្មែរ។

ចំពោះរចនាសម្ព័ន្ធនៃអាជ្ញាធរអប្សរា បើសង្ខេបទៅគឺជាបណ្តាញអន្តរក្រសួងមួយ ត្បិតភាគពួកវាដែលត្រូវបំពេញទាក់ទងនឹងសមត្ថកិច្ចច្រើនជំពូក មានវប្បធម៌, ទេសចរណ៍, ហិរញ្ញវត្ថុ, សន្តិសុខ, បរិស្ថាន។ ឈាមដ្ឋាន “វប្បធម៌និងរមណីយដ្ឋាន” ដែលជាចង្កោមមួយក្នុងចំណោមចង្កោមបច្ចេកទេសបរិវេណអាជ្ញាធរអប្សរា មានតួនាទីធំធេងដូចឈ្មោះខ្លួននោះអាចនឹងបញ្ជាក់ស្រាប់។ “រមណីយដ្ឋាន” នៅទីនេះ គឺជារមណីយដ្ឋានរស់រវើក – ត្បិតអង្គរជាតំបន់ដែលមានភូមិសាស្ត្រ ពុំមែនគ្រាន់តែជាប្រាសាទដែលត្រូវស្រាវជ្រាវនិងជួសជុលស្តារប៉ុណ្ណោះទេ – ដូច្នេះការលើកស្ទួយនោះ រាប់បញ្ចូលទាំងអភិវឌ្ឍន៍សហគមន៍ផង។ ក្នុងន័យនេះហើយដែលយើងយល់ថា នាយកដ្ឋានវប្បធម៌និងរមណីយដ្ឋានត្រូវមានទីក្នុងការផ្សព្វផ្សាយ ឌុំយ។

ទស្សនាវដ្តីនេះបើកចំហទៅរកការសិក្សាលើវិស័យនានានៃអារ្យធម៌ខ្មែរ។ “អារ្យធម៌” នេះសោត ក៏ពោលក្នុងន័យទូលំទូលាយ មានការប្រៀបធៀបនិងប្រទេសជិតខាង ឬបញ្ចូលក្នុងបរិបទនៃតំបន់អាស៊ីភាគអាគ្នេយ៍ជាដើមផង។ ពេលណាដែលយើងយល់ថា ទេសកាលមានសារៈសំខាន់

^១ បើពេលពីការពាក់ព័ន្ធនឹងអាជ្ញាធរអប្សរា គឺមាននីតិក្រមច្រើនទៀតដែលបញ្ជាក់ពីការកិច្ចដូចពោលខាងលើ រាប់តាំងពីអនុក្រឹត្យរហូតដល់ព្រះរាជក្រម។

ពិសេសម្តង។ យើងអាចចេញ ឧទ័យ ជាលេខពិសេសដែរ ដោយផ្ដោតការសិក្សាទៅលើប្រធានបទតែមួយ។ លេខ១២៣៤... ក្នុង ករណីនេះឯង។ រីឯប្រធានបទ គឺកុលាលក្ខណ៍នៃខ្មែរ។ ហេតុផលនិងពន្យល់នៅខាងក្រោយ។

យើងទទួលជាប់ខ្លួនសំណើអត្ថបទទាំងអម្បាលមាណ ហើយជាមួយគ្នានោះ យើងរក្សាសិទ្ធិក្នុងការពិនិត្យជ្រើសរើសល្អិតល្អន់ ដើម្បីស្វ័យ គុណភាពនៃទស្សនាវដ្តី។

ក្រៅពីជំពូកដ៏ទីមួយដែលជាទីប្រជុំនៃអត្ថបទ យើងមានជំពូកមួយទៀតដែលហៅថា "របាយការណ៍"^២។ ជំពូកនេះមិនសម្រាប់ការសិក្សា ពិចារណាលើអត្ថបទ គឺសម្រាប់ចុះផ្សាយព័ត៌មានបួលទូលំទូលាយនៃការងារស្រាវជ្រាវ ឬជួសជុលស្តារផ្សេងៗនៅប្រទេសកម្ពុជាទាំងមូល។ នៅលេខក្រោយទៅទៀត យើងអាចនឹងចុះរបាយការណ៍សង្ខេបនៃសៀវភៅ ឬសំណេរថ្មីៗខ្លះដែលមានសារៈសំខាន់។ ម្យ៉ាងទៀត តាមលទ្ធភាព ដែលអាចធ្វើទៅបាន លេខនីមួយៗអាចមានការបកប្រែមកជាភាសាខ្មែរ នូវអត្ថបទជាភាសាបរទេសណាមួយដែលយើងយល់ថាមានខ្លឹមសារជា ពិសេស មិនថាសំណេរនោះកើតឡើងថ្មី។ ឬចេញផ្សាយយូរហើយទេ។

ក្នុងប្រវត្តិរបស់ខ្លួនអង្គរជាមណ្ឌលនៃការប្រាស្រ័យទាក់ទងផ្នែកពាណិជ្ជកម្ម, សិល្បៈ, ស្ថាបត្យកម្ម, សាសនា... មកពីគ្រប់ទិសទីលើ លោកៈ ព្រាហ្មណ៍ក្លិន, អ្នកការទូតចិន, ពុទ្ធសាសនិកជប៉ុន, អ្នកផ្សព្វផ្សាយសាសនាអេស្បាញ៉ុលនិងព័រទុយហ្គាល់, ធម្មជាតិវិទូបារាំង...។ លក្ខណៈ អន្តរជាតិនេះមិនបានផ្លាស់ប្តូរឡើយ គឺអង្គរសព្វថ្ងៃជាទីប្រជុំនៃសហគមន៍អ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវច្រើនជាតិសាសន៍។ មកទល់ពេលនេះ ការដឹកជញ្ជូនព្រឹក្សាពី សំណាក់អ្នកជំនាញជាន់ខ្ពស់អន្តរជាតិអំពីទស្សនៈនិងបច្ចេកទេសនៃការជួសជុលស្តារប្រាសាទ មានមកបួនឆ្នាំជាប់គ្នាមកហើយ ក្នុងក្របខណ្ឌនៃ សន្និសីទប្រចាំឆ្នាំហៅថា *Bayon Symposium* ដែលប្រព្រឹត្តទៅទៀងពេលនៅក្រុងសៀមរាប។ នេះគ្រាន់តែជាឱកាសណាមួយប៉ុណ្ណោះ ដែល បង្ហាញពីលក្ខណៈអន្តរជាតិនៃអង្គរ។ នាយកដ្ឋានវប្បធម៌និងរមណីយដ្ឋាននិងខិតខំរៀបចំទស្សនាវដ្តី ឧទ័យ របស់ខ្លួនឱ្យកាន់តែទូទៅជាងមុនជាតិនិង អន្តរជាតិ ស្របទៅតាមកិត្តិនៃអង្គរ។ និស្សិត, សាស្ត្រាចារ្យ, អ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវជាតិ និងបរទេស, ក្នុងឬក្រៅក្របខណ្ឌរដ្ឋាភិបាល... អាចប្រាស្រ័យ គ្នាក្នុងរង្វង់នេះ។

ភាសាដែលប្រើក្នុង ឧទ័យ មានខ្មែរ, អង់គ្លេស និងបារាំង។ នេះពុំមែនជាជម្រើសអ្វីមួយពិសេសឡើយ គឺការពិតជាក់ស្តែងតម្រូវឱ្យធ្វើ ដូច្នេះ។

ភាសាខ្មែរ៖ យើងពុំមែនចុះសំណេរជាខ្មែរ ដោយសារតែជាភាសាជាតិប៉ុណ្ណោះទេ។ គោលបំណងយើងគឺជម្រុញឱ្យនិស្សិត, អ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវ ជាតិ... អាចបញ្ចេញគំនិតនិងលទ្ធផលនៃការសិក្សារបស់ខ្លួនបានងាយ។ ម្យ៉ាងទៀត នរណាដែលដឹងថាភាសាជាយាននៃគំនិតផង ជាកញ្ចក់ចុះ បង្ហាញទស្សនៈវប្បធម៌នីមួយៗផង។ កម្មវត្ថុតែមួយ ជួនកាលទទួលការបកស្រាយខុសគ្នាពីវប្បធម៌មួយទៅវប្បធម៌មួយទៀត។ ឱកាសណា៖ ទស្សនៈ នៃបច្ច័យប្រទេសគឺសត្វស្លាបច្រៀង ឯចំពោះខ្មែរគឺសត្វស្លាបច្រៀង។ អាស្រ័យហេតុនេះ សរសេរជាខ្មែរ ឬជាបារាំងអំពីសត្វស្លាបតែមួយ ដែល បញ្ចេញសម្លេងតែម្យ៉ាងនោះ បញ្ចេញទស្សនៈពីរខុសគ្នា។

ភាសាអង់គ្លេសជាភាសាអន្តរជាតិដែលជាយានឱ្យអ្នកនិពន្ធជាតិសាសន៍ទាំងពួងបង្ហាញលទ្ធផលនៃការស្រាវជ្រាវរបស់ខ្លួន។ គួរកត់ សម្គាល់នៅទីនេះថា រវាងមួយទសវត្សរ៍មកនេះ ដែលកម្ពុជាបើកទ្វារចំហទៅរកសាកលលោកឡើងវិញ មានអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវជាតិសាសន៍ផ្សេងៗ ដែល ប្រើភាសាអង់គ្លេសជាយាន។

ភាសាបារាំងគឺយើងទុកជាសំខាន់ដែរ ដោយសារការស្រាវជ្រាវនិងផ្សព្វផ្សាយអំពីអង្គរនិងអារាមខ្មែរជាទូទៅដែលមានពីមុនមក ធ្វើ ឡើងភាគច្រើនបង្អស់ជាភាសាបារាំង។ ទំនៀមនេះក៏ពុំបាត់បង់ដែរ។ សព្វថ្ងៃនេះតែមានអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវជាតិបារាំង (ឬប្រើភាសាបារាំង) មកប្រឡូកក្នុង វិជ្ជាខ្មែរយ៉ាងសកម្ម។

ចំពោះការប្រែសំណេរជាភាសាបរទេសមកភាសាខ្មែរដែលបានពោលពីលើមកបន្តិចនេះ ទិសដៅរបស់យើងលើសអំពីការចងឱ្យខ្មែរយល់ អត្ថបទដែលពាក់ព័ន្ធនោះទៅទៀត។ យើងអាចពោលបានថា ជាទូទៅ ការបកប្រែភាសាបរទេសមកខ្មែរនាបច្ចុប្បន្ននេះ ភាគច្រើនសឹងឥតប្រយោជន៍

^២ ធ្វើនេះ គឺយកគម្រោងតាម *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient* ដែលតែងមានជំពូកមួយហៅថា « *Chroniques* » ហើយដែលយើងយល់ថាមានប្រយោជន៍។

ត្បិតជាការប្រែប្រួលទៅតាមកម្រិត ដែលធ្វើឡើងដោយពុំខ្វល់ថា អ្នកស្តាប់ឬអ្នកអានខ្មែរអាចយល់ន័យទៅឬអត់។ ស្ថានភាពនេះខុសពីកម្ពុជា សម័យបុរាណច្បាស់ណាស់។ កាលពីដើម ឥទ្ធិពលនៃអារ្យធម៌មកពីក្រៅ ខ្មែរទទួលយកបានពេញលេញដោយចម្រើនយ៉ាងខ្លាំងអម្បាលមាណ ទៅក៏ក្នុងរយៈពេល ឬក៏ម្រង់ទៅតាមសេចក្តីត្រូវការនិងការខ្វះខាតរបស់ខ្លួន ពុំខុសអ្វីពីអាហារដែលចិញ្ចឹមសត្វបានឆាប់ ដោយសារយន្តកម្មនៃការ ក្របដេញកំដៅនិងការបំភ្លឺកែប្រែ - ការទំពារ, រំលាយអាហារ, ធ្វើឱ្យជាតិសំខាន់ផ្សេងៗទៅជាឈាម, បំបែកកំណកដែលឥតប្រយោជន៍ឱ្យចេញ ផ្សេង...- នោះប្រព្រឹត្តទៅតាមរបៀបរបបត្រឹមត្រូវ។ ប្រសិនបើខ្មែរពុំដែលរើបប្រទះនឹងអារ្យធម៌ឥណ្ឌា ច្បាស់ជាខ្មែរពុំបានសាងអង្គរវត្តឡើយ។ ប៉ុន្តែអង្គរវត្តឥតមាននៅប្រទេសឥណ្ឌា ឬទីណាទៀតទេ មានតែនៅស្រុកខ្មែរប៉ុណ្ណោះ។ អង្គរវត្តជាការរៀបចំឡើងនៃបុព្វការីខ្មែរ ដែលធ្វើឡើងនៅលើ មូលដ្ឋានសាសនានិងស្ថាបត្យកម្មនៃឥណ្ឌា។ នាបច្ចុប្បន្ន ឥទ្ធិពលដែលចូលមកពីក្រៅមាននៅលើគ្រប់វិស័យ មិនថាក្នុងមនុស្សស្រ្តីឬក្នុងអេឡិចត្រូនិកទេ។ ប៉ុន្តែបញ្ហារបស់ខ្មែរសព្វថ្ងៃនេះ បើយកការឧបមាអម្បាលមិញមកពោល គឺប្រៀបបីដូចជាគេលេបអាហារចូលដោយពុំបានឃើញរាងកាយធំ ឆាត់ប៉ុន្មាន ដោយសារយន្តកម្មនោះគាត់ ធ្វើឱ្យអាហារគ្រប់បែបយ៉ាងជុំគ្នាបានជាឈាមកិច្ចចូលស្លូតស្តើង រីឯភាគច្រើនចេញមកវិញតាមរូបភាពចុះ មូលនិងក្អក។ ទោះជាការប្រៀបធៀបនេះអាចមានភាពជ្រុលបន្តិច ក៏បញ្ហាជាមូលដ្ឋានដែលលើកមកនោះតែជាការពិត។

ពីលើមក យើងបានពោលអំពីទិសដៅដំបូងនៃខ្មែរ។ លើកស្ទួយវិជ្ជាខ្មែរនៅក្នុងប្រទេស ដោយបើកវេទិកាចំហទៅរកអន្តរជាតិ។ ក្នុង នោះ ការផ្តល់ព័ត៌មានថ្មីពីការស្រាវជ្រាវ ឬការដ្ឋានជួសជុលជាដើម ក៏ជាផ្នែកមួយដែរ ត្បិតជាមធ្យោបាយសម្រាប់បុគ្គល ឬស្ថាប័នស្រាវជ្រាវ ឬធ្វើ ការអភិវឌ្ឍន៍... បានដឹងពុំអំពីគ្នាព្រមទាំងប្តូរយោបល់គ្នាទៅវិញទៅមក។

កុលាលកាដនី

លេខលើកដំបូងនេះផ្ដោតទៅលើប្រធានបទតែមួយ៖ កុលាលកាដនីខ្មែរគ្រប់បែបៗដែរ។ ហេតុនៃការជ្រើសរើសនេះមានច្រើន ហើយទាក់ទងទៅនឹងបច្ចុប្បន្នភាពនៃប្រទេសកម្ពុជា, ទៅនឹងស្ថានភាពនៃវិជ្ជាខ្មែរ ព្រមទាំងប្រវត្តិនៃអាជ្ញាធរអប្សរាផង។

នាឆ្នាំ១៩៩៩-៩០ អ្នកស្រុកព្រមទាំងក្រុមអ្នកដោះមិនមួយពួកបានរាយការណ៍ប្រាប់អ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវនៅតំបន់អង្គរថា មានឡបុរាណមួយ ចំនួននៅម្តុំខ្ពង់រាបដីដុំក្នុងបូក ដែលពេលនោះទើបតែបានទទួលការគ្រប់គ្រងឡើងវិញដោយរាជរដ្ឋាភិបាល។ ប៉ុន្តែការកាប់គាស់យកកុលាលកាដនីមក លក់នៅផ្សារសៀមរាបមានរួចមកហើយ ពុំតែប៉ុណ្ណោះបន្តកាន់តែខ្លាំងឡើងៗ។ អាជ្ញាធរអប្សរាដែលទើបតែចាប់កំណើតមក ក៏ត្រូវប្រឈមមុខនឹង ការបំផ្លិចបំផ្លាញដើម្បីធ្វើដំនូរក្នុងស្រុក ឬក្រៅស្រុកនេះ។ ទន្ទឹមនឹងនោះ អ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវអន្តរជាតិដែលប្រកបការងារនៅអង្គរ ក៏មានការចាប់ អារម្មណ៍ខ្លាំង លើការសិក្សាអំពីកុលាលកាដនីព្រមទាំងអំពីឡបុរាណ។ ពីមុនមក គេបានដឹងថាមានឡនៅតែកន្លែងមួយនៃភូមិលេខតែប៉ុណ្ណោះ។ ម្យ៉ាងទៀតពុំទាន់មាននរណាម្នាក់បានសិក្សាបញ្ហានោះឱ្យបានជ្រៅជ្រះនៅឡើយ ឯទីតាំងឡនោះក៏ទើបតែអាចទៅដល់វិញនៅឆ្នាំ១៩៩៩ដែរ។ មានតែ ឡបុរាណខ្មែរដែលបច្ចុប្បន្ននេះស្ថិតនៅទីកន្លែងដ៏ប៉ុណ្ណោះទេ ដែលគេបានធ្វើការសិក្សា រីឯរបស់របរដែលធ្វើឡើងនៅទីនោះ ក៏គេយល់ថា មានលក្ខណៈដាច់លិកផល 'ខេត្ត' មិនដូចនៅជុំវិញរាជធានីអង្គរដែលជាមណ្ឌលនៃអាណាចក្រឡើយ។ ចំពោះអង្គរ គេស្គាល់កុលាលកាដនីខ្លះ។ តែ មិនបានស្គាល់ឡដែលផលិតវត្ថុទាំងនោះសោះ។ ម្យ៉ាងទៀតកុលាលកាដនីដែលស្គាល់នោះក៏មិនទាន់បានសិក្សារៀបចំធ្វើ 'ចំណាត់ប្រភេទ' (typology) តាមលក្ខណៈលំអិតនៃការស្រាវជ្រាវសព្វថ្ងៃផង។ ពីមុនមក មានតែលោក Bernard-Philippe Groslier ដែលចាប់ផ្តើមធ្វើការសិក្សាជាមូល ដ្ឋានលើបញ្ហានេះ។ ការងាររបស់លោកពាក់ព័ន្ធនឹងកុលាលកាដនីមុនសម័យអង្គរវត្ត ក្នុងសម័យអង្គរវត្ត ជាពិសេសដោយផ្អែកលើលទ្ធផលនៃ កំណាយផ្សេងៗនាទសវត្សរ៍១៩៥០ និង១៩៦០។ លោកបានត្រួសត្រាយកាលប្បវត្តិទូទៅនៃរូបរាងកំនីភាគវត្ថុ ព្រមទាំងស្រទាប់រំលោង។ ចំពោះមុខ ងារនៃកាដនី លោកបានយកការសង្កេតលើការប្រើប្រាស់សព្វថ្ងៃនេះជាដំនូយក្នុងការធ្វើសមត្ថិកម្មមួយចំនួន។ ការសិក្សានោះ ផ្ដោតការពិចារណាដែរ ទៅលើឥទ្ធិពលដែលទទួលមកពីក្រៅ - ជាពិសេសពីឥណ្ឌានិងចិន- ទៅលើបច្ចេកទេសផលិត។ ប៉ុន្តែនេះគ្រាន់តែជាដំណើរដំបូងប៉ុណ្ណោះ។ សង្គ្រាមបានបង្អាក់ការសិក្សានៃលោក Groslier និងអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវទៀតឱ្យនៅទ្រឹងមួយកន្លែង។

ប្រសិនបើមានការសិក្សាលើអំពីចំណាត់ប្រភេទដែលពោលខាងលើ ជាពិសេសបើគេអាចភ្ជាប់ប្រភេទនីមួយៗទៅនឹងកាល សម័យ ព្រមទាំងទីកន្លែងផលិតផ្សេងៗផង ការកំណត់អាយុកាលស្រទាប់ដ៏ណាមួយក្នុងការធ្វើកំណាយនឹងផុតអំពីការលំបាកច្រើន ដោយសារចំណាត់ ប្រភេទនោះ ជាឧបករណ៍ស្រាវជ្រាវមួយដ៏សំខាន់។ យើងពុំទាន់មានការស្រាវជ្រាវអំពីរបៀបប្រើប្រាស់វត្ថុទាំងអម្បាលមាណនៅតាមប្រាសាទ, នៅ

ព្រះរាជវាំង ឬនៅតាមផ្ទះអ្នកស្រុកជាដើមឡើយ អាស្រ័យហេតុនេះ យើងក៏ពុំមានទិន្នន័យអ្វីដែលច្បាស់ពីពិធី, របៀបរស់នៅ, ឧស្សាហកម្មនៅសម័យ បុរាណដែរ។ ស្ថានីយ៍ឡូដែលយើងទើបនឹងស្គាល់ថ្មីៗនេះ ជាឱកាសឱ្យយើងអាចធ្វើការស្រាវជ្រាវរុករកក្នុងវិស័យនេះឯង។ ជួនជាអកុសល មានការ ដឹកតាស់យកកុលាលក់ដំណើរទៅលក់កើនឡើងផង យើងក៏ពុំអាចបង្កើនបង្គំឯកទៅទៀតបាន។

នៅឆ្នាំ១៩៩៦ អាជ្ញាធរអប្សរាភីរូសរាងរៀបចំកម្មវិធីការពារនិងស្រាវជ្រាវស្ថានីយ៍ដែលប្រទះឃើញនៅតំបន់ទំនាបអង្គរ។ ការងារទាំង ពីរមុខនេះ មិនអាចព្យាករណ៍ពីគ្នាឡើយ ហើយមិនអាចផ្តាច់ចេញពីសហគមន៍អ្នកស្រុកដែលពាក់ព័ន្ធនៅទីនោះដែរ។ ដើម្បីការពារស្ថានីយ៍ទាំងនេះ ឱ្យផុតពីការដឹកកកាយទៅទៀត យើងបានប្រាស្រ័យជាមួយប្រជាជនគ្រប់ជាន់ថ្នាក់ (រាប់បញ្ចូលទាំងអាជ្ញាធរដែនដី ទាំងព្រះសង្ឃ...) ដើម្បីជ្រុញ ជ្រុយអំពីកាតព្វកិច្ចក្នុងការរក្សា និងប្រយោជន៍ដែលនឹងមានមកពីការស្រាវជ្រាវទៅអនាគត។ ការជ្រុញជ្រុយនោះធ្វើឡើងក្រោមរូបភាពផ្សេងៗ មានជាអាទិ៍ សិក្ខាសាលានៅវត្តរុនដែលសហគមន៍ពាក់ព័ន្ធនោះជាចំណុះ, ការចែកចាយកូនសៀវភៅស្តីពីបញ្ហានោះជាភាសាជាតិនិងអន្តរជាតិ...។ ទោះជាលទ្ធផលពុំបានពេញលេញដូចប្រាថ្នាក្តី^៧ ក៏យ៉ាងហោចណាស់ គេលែងឃើញមានកុលាលក់ដំណើរឬរាងកាយដាក់លក់ជាច្រើនទៅទៀតនៅ ផ្សារសៀមរាបដែរ។

ឯការងារនយោបាយវិញ គឺរាជរដ្ឋាភិបាលបានរៀបចំឯកសារអំពីបុរាណវត្ថុខ្មែរជាបីក្រុម (ថ្ម, លោហធាតុ, កុលាលក់ដំណើរ) ហើយបាន ដាក់សំណុំរឿងទាំងមូលបញ្ជូនទៅរដ្ឋាភិបាលអាមេរិកាំង ជាដំណើរការដល់តុលាការប្រទេសនេះ ព្រោះជាការសម្រួលដល់ការងារត្រួតពិនិត្យវត្ថុនាំ ចូល ដើម្បីមានប្រសិទ្ធភាពក្នុងការទប់ស្កាត់ការនាំចូលដោយខុសច្បាប់នៃបុរាណវត្ថុខ្មែរ។

ស្ថានភាពសព្វថ្ងៃមានដូចតទៅ៖ ស្ថានីយ៍ឡូដែលយើងស្គាល់ទាំងប៉ុន្មាននៅតំបន់អង្គរ សុទ្ធតែបានរងគ្រោះដោយការដឹកកកាយខុសច្បាប់ ទាំងអស់ ប៉ុន្តែសកម្មភាពនេះឥតមានបន្តទៅទៀតទេ។ ដូច្នេះឱ្យមួយភាគធំបាត់បង់ខូចខាតជាស្ថាពរ ឯខ្លះទៀតខូចខាតតែផ្នែកផ្ទៃលើ តែបន្សល់លទ្ធភាពឱ្យអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវធ្វើកំណាយតាមក្បួនខ្នាត ដើម្បីយល់រចនាសម្ព័ន្ធបាន។

ក្រោយពីអាជ្ញាធរអប្សរាធ្វើការអំពីរចនាសម្ព័ន្ធនៃស្ថានីយ៍នានា ឱ្យមកប្រាស្រ័យការងារនឹងខ្លួនមក ក្រុមស្រាវជ្រាវដំបូងពីរបានឆ្លើយ តបនឹងសំណួរនេះ។ ក្រុមទីមួយគឺក្រុម Sophia University International Angkor Mission ឯក្រុមទីពីរគឺ Nara National Cultural Properties Research Institute។ ការងារស្រាវជ្រាវផ្ដើមឡើងពីដ្ឋានរេខា តមកការស្ទង់លើផ្ទៃទូទៅតាមមាស៊ីនពិនិត្យកម្លាំងម៉ាញ៉េទិក ហើយ ដំណាក់កាលទីបីគឺការធ្វើកំណាយ។ លទ្ធផលបណ្តោះអាសន្នក្នុងដំណាក់កាលបច្ចុប្បន្ន មានចុះក្នុង ឧទ្ទិស លេខនេះស្រាប់។

គួរអធិប្បាយបន្តិចអំពីវិធីដែលធ្វើការស្រាវជ្រាវនេះប្រព្រឹត្តទៅស្រួលនៅភូមិតានី។ ភូមិនេះនៅចុងភាគមាត់ព្យាប ប្រជាជនក៏រងគ្រោះ ដោយសង្គ្រាមច្រើន ហើយទីទាល់ក្រខ្លះនៅឡើយ។ តាមរយៈវត្តរុន (ដែលភូមិតានីជាចំណុះ) យើងបានប្រាស្រ័យជិតស្និទ្ធជាមួយអ្នកស្រុកនិងព្រះ សង្ឃដើម្បីជួសជុលស្ថានីយ៍ចំនួនដែលខូចខាតបាត់បង់ ដើម្បីឱ្យបានចូលទៅដល់ស្ថានីយ៍ឡូនោះ។ គឺអ្នកស្រុកតានីនេះឯងហើយ ដែលក្លាយទៅជា កម្មករធ្វើកំណាយស្រាវជ្រាវមរតកវប្បធម៌ដូនតាខ្លួន (លែងជាអ្នកដឹកតាស់កកាយយករបស់ទៅលក់ដូចមុន)។ អាជ្ញាធរអប្សរាបានចាប់កុសល តាមមធ្យោបាយដែលខ្លួនមានក្នុងការកសាងវត្តរុននោះដែរ។ ឯក្នុងការធ្វើកំណាយមួយវត្តៗវិញ មាននិស្សិតខ្មែរមករួមចំណែករាល់ពេលវេលា ដើម្បី ក្រេបជញ្ជក់ចំណេះពីអ្នកឯកទេសដំបូង។ សព្វថ្ងៃ អតីតនិស្សិតម្នាក់ក្លាយជាអ្នកឯកទេសខ្មែរដំបូងបង្អស់ក្នុងវិស័យកុលាលក់ដំណើរ ដោយសារបានទៅ បន្តវិជ្ជានៅសាកលវិទ្យាល័យក្សត្យ។ ការងារនៅស្ថានីយ៍តានីនឹងបន្តច្រើនឆ្នាំទៅមុខទៀត។ យើងមានគម្រោងធ្វើសារៈមន្ទីរតូចមួយនៅទីឡូតែម្តង ដើម្បីជាការស្វែងរកដាច់ស្រយាលនេះ ឱ្យមានមោទនភាពនឹងបេតិកភណ្ឌរបស់ខ្លួន។ ទៅអនាគត ស្ថានីយ៍ដទៃទៀតអាចនឹងមានការស្រាវជ្រាវធ្វើ កំណាយដែរ។ លទ្ធផលទាំងនេះ ពុំមានន័យថាជាការដកក្នុងការស្រាវជ្រាវបានពេញលេញទេ។ កិច្ចការពារត្រូវបន្តនិងបង្កើនជាងសព្វថ្ងៃខ្លាំងទៅ ទៀត ដរាបណាផ្សារអន្តរជាតិនៃបុរាណវត្ថុនៅតែមាន, ដរាបណាសារមន្ទីររបរទេសខ្លះ (ក្នុងនោះមានសារមន្ទីរឯកជននៅប្រទេសដំបូងដែរ) នៅ តែប្រាថ្នាចង់ធ្វើសម្បជញ្ជក់កុលាលក់ដំណើរខ្មែរ, ដរាបណាជនប្រដាប់អាវុធគឺ ឥតអាវុធគឺ នៅតែធ្វើការរាតត្បាតនៅតាមជនបទ។

ចំពោះការស្រាវជ្រាវសុទ្ធសាត កុលាលក់ដំណើរខ្មែរវាវិស័យមួយនៅក្មេង ដូច្នេះជាវិស័យដែលគួរឱ្យចាប់ចិត្តខ្លាំង ត្បិតទិន្នន័យអំពីអារាធម៌ ខ្មែរអាចកើនឡើងច្រើនដោយសារការសិក្សានេះ។ កន្លងមក ការសិក្សាលើបុរាណកាលខ្មែរតែងសង្កត់ធ្ងន់ទៅលើសំណង់ (ប្រាសាទ, ទំនប់, បារាយណ៍...) និងសិល្បៈ ពោលគឺវត្ថុដែលឃើញនៅលើដី។ ដោយមានការសិក្សាខាងសិលាចារិកយ៉ាងជ្រៅជ្រះផង អស់លោកអ្នកប្រាជ្ញបានត្រួសត្រាយ

^៧ នៅតំបន់ភ្នំគូលែន ស្ថានីយ៍ឡូបុរាណផ្សេងៗត្រូវបានរកឃើញការបំផ្លិចបំផ្លាញយ៉ាងដំណាច់។

ឃើញលំអានប្រវត្តិសាស្ត្រខ្មែរជាទូទៅ។ ពេលនេះក្នុងន័យទូលំទូលាយផង គឺមិនគ្រាន់តែកាលប្បវត្តិទេ តែគេដឹងអំពីជំនឿនិងកិច្ចប្រតិបត្តិសាសនា, សិល្បៈ, ការវិវត្តន៍នៃការរៀបចំដែនដី ។ល។ ដើម្បីមកដល់លទ្ធផលដ៏ធំធេងនេះ ការស្រាវជ្រាវធ្វើឡើងជាទូទៅលើវត្ថុដែលនៅ "លើដី" តែប៉ុណ្ណោះ។ ការធ្វើកំណាយដើម្បីរកទិន្នន័យពី "ក្នុងដី" ធ្វើឡើងគ្រាន់តែអប្បបរមាប៉ុន្មាននឹងការជួសជុលប្រាសាទ ឬបុរាណដ្ឋានផ្សេងៗប៉ុណ្ណោះ។ ការស្រាវជ្រាវអំពី "ឧស្សាហកម្ម" នៅសម័យប្រវត្តិសាស្ត្រស្ទើរតែគ្មាន។ នេះពុំមែនជាកំហុសឬការខ្វះខាតរបស់នរណាទេ ទេសកាលធ្វើឱ្យដូច្នេះឯង។ ក្នុងន័យនេះហើយ ដែលការចាប់ផ្តើមស្រាវជ្រាវស្ថានីយ៍ឡូហ្គូទាំងការលំអិតទៅមុខ ក្នុងវិស័យវត្ថុដែលឡូនោះផលិត ជាប្រភពទិន្នន័យដ៏សំខាន់មួយ។ ការសិក្សានេះ តម្រូវឱ្យមុខវិជ្ជាផ្សេងៗឆ្លងបញ្ជាត់គ្នាទៅវិញទៅមក។ ឧទាហរណ៍ នរវិទ្យាព្រមទាំងកាសាបុរាណនិងទំនើបនាទីនេះ មាននាទីសំខាន់ណាស់ ថ្វីត្បិតតែវត្ថុដែលសិក្សានោះកើតឡើងរវាងមួយពាន់ឆ្នាំមុននេះ ឬជួនកាលមុននោះផង។ កុលាលភាជន៍ពុំមែនជាវត្ថុប្រើប្រាស់ផ្តាច់មុខនៅរវាង ឬនៅតាមប្រាសាទនានាទេ អ្នកស្រុកទូទៅក៏ប្រើប្រាស់ដែរ។ ឧទ្ទិស លេខដំបូងនេះ ហាក់ដូចជាម្ចាស់បើកឆាកឱ្យសកម្មភាពធម្មតាប្រចាំថ្ងៃនៃរាស្ត្រ សាមញ្ញទូទៅ ទទួលបានការចាប់អារម្មណ៍ដែរ។

ក្នុងលេខដំបូងនេះ

ឡូហ្គូរាណ៍ដែលទើបនឹងប្រទះនៅតំបន់អង្គរឬខ្ពង់រាបប៉ុន្មានឆ្នាំថ្មីៗកន្លងមក ត្រូវបានលោកអ៊ាដាវិទ្យាកម្មកបង្ហាញត្រួសៗនៅក្នុងអត្ថបទរបស់ខ្លួន។ អ្នកនិពន្ធចាប់ផ្តើមលាតត្រដាងលទ្ធផលនៃការស្រាវជ្រាវក្នុងដីហានទីមួយ ដែលអាជ្ញាធរអប្បបរមាធ្វើឡើង ក្នុងសហការណ៍ជាមួយអ្នកដទៃរៀបចំឡើងវិស័យ កុលាលភាជន៍និងឡូ រៃស្ថាប័នដំបូង។ ស្ថានីយ៍ដែលលើកយកមកបង្ហាញមាន តានី, ខ្នារពោធិ៍, បារកាំង (ទាំងបីនេះនៅរាល់ទំហំខាងកើតនៃ ឧទ្យានអង្គរ), សោះសែ, អង្គជំរំ (នៅតំបន់ភ្នំគូលែន)។ លើចំណុចនេះ គេអាចបានទិន្នន័យបន្ថែមទៀត ដែលយើងចុះផ្សាយនៅផ្នែកខាងក្រោយ ហើយដែលរៀបរៀងដោយក្រុមស្រាវជ្រាវសាកលវិទ្យាល័យសូហ្វីយ៉ានិងវិទ្យាស្ថានណារ៉ា។ លោកអ៊ាដាវិទ្យាកម្មកបង្ហាញប្រាប់អំពីស្ថានីយ៍នីមួយៗនូវទីតាំង, រូបរាងទូទៅ...។ បន្ទាប់មកមានពិពណ៌នាអំពីប្រភេទកុលាលភាជន៍ ដែលគេអាចដឹងបានដោយសិក្សាលើបំណែក, ទំហំ, កិនភាគនិងស្រទាប់ រលោង។ ទិន្នន័យដែលផ្តល់ឱ្យច្រើនជាងគេគឺកុលាលភាជន៍នៅស្ថានីយ៍កូមិតានី ដោយសារអ្នកនិពន្ធបានប្រាស្រ័យការងារខ្លះខាងក្នុងការធ្វើកំណាយ នៅទីនោះ។ អ្នកនិពន្ធបានធ្វើការប្រៀបធៀបរបស់របរព្រមទាំងបច្ចេកទេសដែលខ្មែរបុរាណអនុវត្តនៅឡូតានី ជាមួយទិន្នន័យអំពីឡូហ្គូរាណ៍ខ្មែរដែល សព្វថ្ងៃនៅទីកន្លែងប្រទេសថៃឡង់ដ៍ ហើយដែលគេបានធ្វើកំណាយស្រាវជ្រាវនៅទសវត្ស១៩៧០-១៩៨០។ ប្រភេទដីកន្លែងដែលប្រើនៅឡូតានី ក៏មានយក មកពិនិត្យដែរ។

បន្ទាប់មកអ្នកស្រី Louise Cort ព្រមទាំងលោក Leedom Lefferts បង្ហាញលទ្ធផលនៃការសិក្សារបស់ខ្លួនលើកុលាលភាជន៍ខ្មែរសម័យ បច្ចុប្បន្ន ដែលគ្រាន់តែជាដីដុត ឥតស្រទាប់រលោង។ ការសិក្សានេះ ពុំធ្វើនៅតែប្រទេសកម្ពុជាប៉ុណ្ណោះទេ គឺមានធ្វើនៅកម្ពុជាក្រោម និងនៅ សហគមន៍ខ្មែរនៃភូមិភាគឦសានប្រទេសថៃឡង់ដ៍។ ការប្រៀបធៀបផលិតផលនិងបច្ចេកទេសដែលអនុវត្តនៅតំបន់ទាំងបីនេះ ធ្វើយ៉ាងលំអិតគួរជាទី កត់សម្គាល់ ហើយនេះគ្រាន់តែជាផ្នែកមួយនៃការសិក្សាទូទៅរបស់អ្នកនិពន្ធទាំងពីរនៅអាស៊ីភាគអាគ្នេយ៍ដ៏គោកទាំងមូល។ ដូច្នេះហើយបានជាគេ ឃើញមានការប្រៀបធៀបរវាងតំបន់ខ្មែរទាំងបីខាងលើជាមួយតំបន់ចុងក្រោយនេះ។ អ្នកនិពន្ធបង្ហាញឱ្យឃើញភាពដូចគ្នាច្រើន ក្នុងចំណុចពិចារណា ផ្សេងៗ ជាអាទិ៍មានការរីករាលដាលក្នុងកាលដលិត ដែលបញ្ជាក់ថាថ្វីត្បិតតែសព្វថ្ងៃប្រជាជនអស់ទាំងនោះរស់នៅដាច់ឃ្លាតគ្នាដោយព្រំដែនប្រទេស និង ដោយការវិវត្តន៍ប្រពៃណីរៀងខ្លួនទីតាំងក៏ដោយ ក៏គេអាចស្មានបានថា នៅបុរាណកាល (រាប់បញ្ចូលទាំងសម័យបុរេប្រវត្តិផង) អ្នកទាំងនោះមាន ទំនាក់ទំនងគ្នាជិតស្និទ្ធ ជួនកាលនៅក្នុងសង្គមតែមួយផង។

អត្ថបទទីបី អ្នកស្រី Miriam Stark រៀបរៀងឡើងអំពីកុលាលភាជន៍នៅតំបន់អង្គរបុរី ដែលមានចំណាស់ជាងសម័យអង្គរទៅទៀត។ ការសិក្សានេះបង្ហាញអំពីបរិបទប្រវត្តិសាស្ត្រទូទៅនៃការកើតរដ្ឋផ្សេងៗនៅអាស៊ីអាគ្នេយ៍ ជាពិសេសនៅតំបន់ដីសណ្តទន្លេមេកុង។ អ្នកប្រាជ្ញដ៏ទាន់ មុខក៏បានធ្វើការស្រាវជ្រាវដ៏មានសារៈសំខាន់ក្រៃលែង។ ទិន្នន័យទាំងនោះត្រូវបានអ្នកស្រី Miriam Stark យកមកប្រៀបធៀបនឹងលទ្ធផលនៃ

^៤ មានឧទាហរណ៍ស្តុចស្តើង ដែលកំណាយធ្វើឡើងឥតមានទាក់ទងនឹងការជួសជុលស្តុច៖ ស្រះស្រង់ (អង្គរ), មេមត់ (កំពង់ចាម), សម្បូណ៌ព្រៃតុក (កំពង់ធំ)...

កំណាយដែលខ្លួនបានដឹកនាំមកប៉ុន្មានឆ្នាំនេះ ក្នុងក្របខណ្ឌនៃសហការណ៍រវាងសាកលវិទ្យាល័យហាវ៉ៃ និងសាកលវិទ្យាល័យភូមិន្ទវិចិត្រសិល្បៈ។ យើងអាចសន្និដ្ឋានថា សព្វថ្ងៃក៏មាននិងការយល់ដឹងអំពីតំបន់ដីសណ្ត មានការរីកចម្រើនទៅមុខច្រើន។ អ្នកស្រី Miriam Stark បានធ្វើចំណាត់ ក្រុមផ្សេងៗ នៃកុលាលភាជន៍អង្គរបុរីជាបីដំណាក់កាល រាយគ្នាពី៤០០ឆ្នាំមុនគ្រិស្តសករាជ ដល់៣០០ទៅ៦០០ឆ្នាំក្រោយគ្រិស្ត។ នេះអាចចាត់ទុកថាជា ជំហានដំបូងនៃការស្រាវជ្រាវលើតំបន់អង្គរបុរី ត្បិតក្រៅអំពីទិន្នន័យស្តីពីប្រភេទរបស់របរនិងបច្ចេកទេសប្រើប្រាស់នោះ យើងអាចចាប់ផ្តើម គិតពីការណាវែងឆ្ងាយលើសពីនេះទៅទៀត ដូចជាអំពីឧស្សាហកម្ម ព្រមទាំងបណ្តាញពាណិជ្ជកម្មនៃតំបន់ដ៏ទាំងមូលនោះផង។

អត្ថបទបន្ទាប់មករៀបរៀងដោយលោក Marc Franiatte។ អ្នកនិពន្ធចាប់ផ្តើមសិក្សាលំអិតអំពីកុលាលភាជន៍ខ្មែរដែលប្រទះឃើញនៅ អតីតព្រះបរមរាជវាំងអង្គរធំ ហើយដែលក្រុមបុរាណវិទូបារាំងដឹកនាំដោយសាស្ត្រាចារ្យ Jacques Gaucher បានធ្វើកំណាយ។ នេះជាការសិក្សា លំអិតលើកុលាលភាជន៍ ដែលប្រើប្រាស់នៅលើមណីវង្គនៃតែមួយ ចាប់ពីស.វ.ទី១០ ទៅទល់ពេលបោះបង់ចោលរាជធានីអង្គរនៅស.វ.ទី១៩។ ក្នុង ជំហានដំបូង អ្នកនិពន្ធបានធ្វើការបែងចែកសម្បត្តិយដ្ឋាននេះ ជាក្រុមបុរេភេទផ្សេងៗ។ រីឯវិធីសាស្ត្រដ៏ល្អិតល្អន់ដែលយកមកអនុវត្តដើម្បីធ្វើការ បែងចែកនោះ ក៏អ្នកនិពន្ធបានយកមកលាតត្រដាងដែរ។ ចំណុចបូកគ្នាទាំងឡាយដែលយកមកធ្វើជាលក្ខណៈវិនិច្ឆ័យមានសមាសធាតុនៃដីឥដ្ឋ, ស្រទាប់រលោង, ទឹកថ្នាំ, របៀបលុក, សួន និងដុត។ មិនតែប៉ុណ្ណោះ រូបរាង, កិនភាគ, ក្បូរក្បាច់លំអនៃវត្ថុក៏សុទ្ធសឹងជាលក្ខណៈវិនិច្ឆ័យដែរ។ អាស្រ័យដោយសម្បត្តិយដ្ឋាននេះ លោក Marc Franiatte អាចចាប់ផ្តើមបង្ហាញទិដ្ឋភាពទាំងមូលនៃកុលាលភាជន៍ខ្មែរដលិតនៅអង្គរ តាមរយៈការប្រើ ប្រាស់នៅអតីតព្រះរាជវាំង។ ក្នុងដំណាក់កាលតទៅថ្ងៃមុខ គេអាចយកលទ្ធផលទីមួយនេះ ទៅប្រៀបនឹងការសិក្សាស្រាវជ្រាវដ៏ដ៏ទៃផ្សេងៗ ដើម្បី យល់ឱ្យបានត្រឹមត្រូវនូវកាលប្បវត្តិលំអិតនៃការតាំងទីនៅលើដីរាំង ព្រមទាំងជីវិតរាំង។

អត្ថបទរបស់លោក Jacques Dumarçay ដែលតមកនោះ ជាសេចក្តីសង្ខេបអំពីការវិវត្តន៍នៃរឿងប្រើប្រាស់នៅអង្គរពីស.វ.ទី១១ ដល់ ស.វ.ទី១៦។ ការវិវត្តន៍នោះ អាស្រ័យយ៉ាងជិតស្និទ្ធជាមួយការវិវត្តន៍នៃស្ថាបត្យកម្មសាសនា ព្រមទាំងលំនៅដ្ឋានសំខាន់ៗ ពោលគឺជាវិស័យដ៏ទៃនៃ លោក Dumarçay ដែលធ្លាប់មានបទពិសោធដាច្រើនទសវត្សក្នុងការសិក្សានិងជួសជុលស្ថានីយដ្ឋានអង្គរ។

បន្ទាប់មកអ្នកស្រី Dawn Rooney បង្ហាញការសិក្សាមួយបែបទៀតអំពីកុលាលភាជន៍នៅអង្គរ៖ ទំនាក់ទំនងរវាងរូបរាង និងតួនាទីនៃ វត្ថុនីមួយៗ។ ការសិក្សានេះផ្អែកលើទស្សនៈសិល្បៈ, ប្រវត្តិសាស្ត្រ និងនរវិទ្យា។ អត្ថបទរបស់អ្នកស្រីផ្តល់ប្រភពទិន្នន័យដែលមានទាំងប៉ុន្មានមកទល់ ថ្ងៃនេះ អំពីកុលាលភាជន៍ខ្មែរ ដោយរៀបរាប់រក្សាភាពអំពីការស្រាវជ្រាវក្នុងទសវត្សថ្មីៗកន្លងមក នៅស្ថានីយ៍ខ្មែរនៃភូមិភាគកណ្តាលប្រទេសថៃ ឡង់ដ៍។ ការបកស្រាយអំពីមុខងារនៃវត្ថុផ្សេងៗនៅសម័យអង្គរ ធ្វើឡើងដោយបញ្ចូលវត្ថុទាំងនោះទៅក្នុងបរិបទនៃអារ្យធម៌ខ្មែរបុរាណនិងបច្ចុប្បន្ន។ ចំណុចបីដែលយកមកពិចារណាគឺ ប្រាសាទ, រាំង និងលំនៅដ្ឋានអ្នកស្រុក។ អ្នកនិពន្ធគ្រោងអារម្មណ៍ខ្លាំងទៅលើវត្ថុដែលខ្លួនយល់ថាប្រហែលជាទៅ ដំនាន់បុរាណគេប្រើប្រាស់សម្រាប់ពិធីឆ្លងរំយោង។

អត្ថបទនៃអ្នកស្រី Ingrid Muan និងលោក លី តារាវុធ ជាការពិចារណាលើការងារនៃមហាវិទ្យាល័យស្ថានបុគ្គលវិស័យកុលាលភាជន៍។ គេដឹងថាស្ថាប័នសិក្សានេះត្រូវបានបង្កើតឡើងដោយលោក George Groslier ដែលជាសិល្បករគំនូរផង ជាអ្នកស្រាវ ជ្រាវផង ហើយជាពិសេសជាមន្ត្រីនៃរដ្ឋបាលអាណានិគមផង។ ចំណុចពិចារណានេះគួរឱ្យចាប់អារម្មណ៍ ត្បិតមរតកសិល្បៈដែលមានពីបុរាណមកត្រូវ បានទទួលការថែទាំគ្រប់គ្រងក្នុងបរិបទអាណានិគម និងដោយរដ្ឋបាលអាណានិគម ហើយតមកទៀតរហូតដល់បច្ចុប្បន្នត្រូវបានរដ្ឋអំណាចជាតិទទួល នាទីបន្ត។ ការលំបាកសព្វថ្ងៃ គឺត្រូវរកលំនឹងឱ្យបាន រវាងការរក្សាគោរពប្រពៃណីបុរាណនិងការរីកចម្រើនបច្ចេកវិទ្យា លើមូលដ្ឋាននៃសិល្បៈបុរាណនោះ។

ជំពូកដំបូងនៃលេខនេះ សុទ្ធសឹងជារបាយការណ៍នៃស្ថាប័នផ្សេងៗដែលប្រាស្រ័យការងារនេះរួមគ្នា ហើយដែលស្តីពី កុលាលភាជន៍រកឃើញសព្វថ្ងៃនៅតាមការដ្ឋានស្រាវជ្រាវនិងជួសជុលស្ថានានា។

អ្នកស្រី Naho Shimizu នៃក្រុម Japanese Government Team for Safeguarding Angkor បានបង្ហាញលទ្ធផលនៃកំណាយដែលធ្វើ ឡើងក្នុងឱកាសជួសជុលស្ថានីយហោត្រ័យខាងជើងនៃប្រាសាទបាយ័ន។ អ្នកស្រីបានធ្វើវិភាគបំណែកកុលាលភាជន៍ខ្មែរនិងចិន ដោយប្រៀបធៀបនឹង ស្រទាប់ដីពាក់ព័ន្ធនៅទីនោះ។ ដោយសារការបែងចែកប្រភេទកុលាលភាជន៍ខ្មែរពុំទាន់មានការកំណត់ច្បាស់លាស់នៅឡើយ ការស្ថានអាយុនៃ ហោត្រ័យនោះ ធ្វើឡើងតាមបំណែកកុលាលភាជន៍ចិន ត្បិតជាវិស័យដែលគេស្គាល់ច្បាស់ជាទូទៅ។ នេះជាមធ្យោបាយមួយដែលសម្រាប់ធ្វើការប៉ាន់ ស្មានចំណាស់នៃកុលាលភាជន៍ខ្មែរដែលនៅក្នុងស្រទាប់ដីជាមួយគ្នា។

ស្ថាប័ន Nara National Cultural Properties Research Institute ព្រមទាំងអាជ្ញាធរអប្បបរមាបានបញ្ចេញរបាយការណ៍រួមមួយស្តីពី ផែនទីដ្ឋានវេទនៃស្ថានីយ៍ឡបុរាណនៅភូមិតានី។ ថ្វីត្បិតតែពេលនេះយើងចាប់ផ្តើមមានលទ្ធផលពីកំណាយច្រើនបង្អួចហើយក៏ដោយ តែគោលបំណង នៅទីនេះ គឺចង់បង្ហាញពីការងារដ៏ហ្មត់ចត់ក្នុងការធ្វើដ្ឋានវេទ ព្រមទាំងវិធីសាស្ត្រដែលយកមកអនុវត្ត។ ភ្ជាប់នឹងរបាយការណ៍នេះ មានព័ត៌មានខ្លី មួយស្តីពីការពិនិត្យមួយគ្រួសទៅលើស្ថានីយ៍ ថ្នល់ម្រេច នៅជិតភូមិអន្តងធំ លើភ្នំគូលែន។

នៅស្ថានីយ៍ភូមិតានីដែល ក្រុម Sophia University Angkor International Mission ក៏កំពុងធ្វើការស្រាវជ្រាវលើឡមួយចំនួនទៀត ដែរ។ របាយការណ៍របស់គេ ស្តីពីលទ្ធផលនៃការធ្វើកំណាយលើឡមួយកន្លែង, រចនាសម្ព័ន្ធនៃឡនោះ ព្រមទាំងបច្ចេកទេសដុតឡ។

ក្នុងនាមនៃក្រុម The World Monuments Fund លោក ឆាន់ចម្រើនបានធ្វើរបាយការណ៍មួយស្តីពីបរិវេណកុលាលភាជន៍ដែលយកចេញ ពីដីក្នុងរយៈពេលប៉ុន្មានឆ្នាំកន្លងមកនេះក្នុងឱកាសធ្វើកំណាយនៅប្រាសាទព្រះខ័ន។

របាយការណ៍ចុងក្រោយនៅក្នុងដំណាក់កាលនេះ ធ្វើឡើងដោយក្រុម Chinese Government Team for Safeguarding Angkor។ កុលាលភាជន៍ដែលសិក្សានៅក្នុងនោះ ប្រមូលបានពេលធ្វើកំណាយនៅប្រាសាទចៅសាយ ដែលក្រុមបច្ចេកទេសនេះកំពុងជួសជុលស្តារសព្វថ្ងៃ។ មិន ត្រឹមតែកុលាលភាជន៍ប៉ុណ្ណោះទេ របាយការណ៍នេះបញ្ចូលទាំងវត្ថុខ្លះទៀតដែលធ្វើអំពីថ្មផង ហើយដែលរកឃើញក្នុងឱកាសជាមួយគ្នានោះ។

ការប្រែប្រួលបទ* ចាប់ផ្តើមសិក្សាកុលាលភាជន៍... នៃលោក Groslier

អត្ថបទនេះត្រូវបានចុះផ្សាយដំបូងជាភាសាអង់គ្លេស ដើម្បីជាការផ្តើមបើកកាតាឡុកនៃពិព័រណ៍មួយស្តីអំពីកុលាលភាជន៍ខ្មែរ ដែលរៀបចំ ឡើងនៅសិង្ហបុរីនៅឆ្នាំ១៩៨១។ ជិតមួយទសវត្សក្រោយពីអ្នកនិពន្ធជើមរណកាលទៅ នៅឆ្នាំ១៩៩៩ ទស្សនាវដ្តី Péninsule បានចុះផ្សាយសំណេរ នេះជាភាសាបារាំង។ ចំពោះព័ត៌មានពិស្តារជាងនេះ សូមអានកំណត់អ្នកប្រែនៅក្រោយអត្ថបទជាភាសាខ្មែរនោះ។ ការដែលសព្វថ្ងៃ ការសិក្សាលើ កុលាលភាជន៍ស្ទើរតែទាំងអស់តែងតែយកសំណេររបស់លោក Groslier ជាឯកសារយោង ជាភស្តុតាងបញ្ជាក់ពីសារៈសំខាន់នៃឯកសារនេះ ថ្វីត្បិត តែការអះអាង ឬសមត្ថកិច្ចខ្លះត្រូវអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវជំនាន់ក្រោយមិនរាប់យកក៏ដោយ។

ការលំបាកមួយភាគធំដែលជួបប្រទះក្នុងការប្រែនោះ ម្យ៉ាងជាបញ្ហាដែលតែងតែមានក្នុងការប្រែភាសាអឺរ៉ុបមកខ្មែរ ម្យ៉ាងទៀតពាក់ព័ន្ធ ផ្ទាល់នឹងវិស័យកុលាលភាជន៍ដែលតម្រូវឱ្យប្រើពាក្យបច្ចេកទេសច្រើន។ ពាក្យបច្ចេកទេសទាំងនេះជាច្រើនបាត់បង់ ដោយសារឧស្សាហកម្មកុលាល ភាជន៍ដែលមានជាធម្មតានៅសម័យអង្គរ (និងមុនអង្គរ) ត្រូវខ្វះចេះបង់ចោលយូរហើយ។

"កុលាលភាជន៍" ជាពាក្យដែលទើបនឹងបង្កើតថ្មីនេះប៉ុណ្ណោះ ដើម្បីប្រើពាក្យអង់គ្លេស ceramics (បារាំង céramique)។ បើរកពាក្យ ពាក្យចាស់នេះទៅឃើញមានន័យថា "ភាជន៍ធ្វើអំពីដី"។ ដូច្នេះ កូនបដិមា, ក្បឿង, ស្លឹករកា... ជាដើម ដែលធ្វើពីដីដុត មានបុគ្គលស្រទាប់រលោង ពុំរាបចូលក្នុងន័យចង្អៀតចង្អល់នេះទេ។ ប៉ុន្តែអ្នកប្រែបានសន្មតយកពាក្យកុលាលភាជន៍មកប្រើក្នុងន័យទូលំទូលាយ តាមទម្លាប់ដែលចាប់ផ្តើមមានថ្មី។ មកនេះ ដើម្បីចៀសវាងប្រើពាក្យ ceramics។

បញ្ហាម្យ៉ាងទៀត ទាក់ទងនឹងវប្បធម៌ផ្ទាល់នៃជាតិនិមួយៗ។ ឧទាហរណ៍ លោក Groslier ប្រើពាក្យ jar (បារាំង jarre) ដើម្បីសំដៅ លើកាដន៍មួយចំនួនដែលខ្មែរហៅខុសៗគ្នា តាមទីបំណងតាមមុខងារ ដូចជា ពាង, ក្រឡ, ឌីទិន ។ល។ ឯជំនួយក្នុងការប្រែកុំឱ្យឆ្គងឆ្គាយនោះ គឺ មានតែរូបថតនៅក្នុងកាតាឡុកតែប៉ុណ្ណោះ។ បើវត្ថុដែលលោក Groslier រៀបរាប់គ្មានរូបទេ ការប្រែនោះជួនកាលធ្វើឡើងដោយស្មាន ឬប្រថុយផង ក៏សិនមាន។

ទស្សនៈ "វប្បធម៌" ដែលលើកមកនេះ ទាក់ទងតាំងពីបញ្ហាពណ៌ឡើងទៅ ដែលជាចំណុចមួយសំខាន់ក្នុងការពិពណ៌នាកុលាលភាជន៍។ ឧទាហរណ៍៖ ជាទូទៅក្នុងលោក គេនិយមប្រើពាក្យ celadon ដើម្បីសំដៅលើពណ៌ខៀវខ្ចីមួយប្រភេទ។ ពាក្យនេះជាឈ្មោះតូក្កុងរឿងព្រេងបារាំងមួយ ដូច្នេះពុំអាចប្រែជាខ្មែរឡើយ។ ម្យ៉ាងទៀត លោក Groslier បានបង្កើតការហៅពណ៌ឈាមជ្រូកម្យ៉ាងថា lie de vin។ ពាក្យនេះសំដៅដំបូងបង្អស់ លើកំណកស្រាទំពាំងបាយជូក្រហម ដែលអាចមាននៅបាតដបបូកតែវា។ សព្វថ្ងៃអ្នកស្រាវជ្រាវក្រៅពីជាតិពាងក៏ពុំប្រែដែរ គឺទុកពាក្យពាង ដដែល ទោះជាក្នុងភាសាដទៃក៏ដោយ។ ដូច្នេះយើងក៏ពុំបានប្រែជាខ្មែរដែរនៅទីនេះ។

ដូចអ្នកអាចអោយលំអ្នកបំរើ មិនត្រឹមតែរបៀបហៅពណ៌ទេ ដែលប្លែកគ្នាពីជាតិសាសន៍មួយទៅជាតិសាសន៍មួយ សូម្បីតែនៅក្នុងអារ្យធម៌ ជាមួយគ្នាក៏ដូចកាលមនុស្សពុំមើលឃើញពណ៌ដូចគ្នាពីភ្នែកម្នាក់ទៅភ្នែកម្នាក់ឡើយ។ ដូច្នេះកាលណាមានអ្វីដែលស្រដៀងគ្នា ឬអាចដ៏ខុសគ្នាបាន ក៏ឆ្លើយតបកមកប្រើ។ ឧទាហរណ៍ពណ៌ Olive green ប្រែនៅទីនេះថាពណ៌ផ្លែម្ពៅ ត្បិតផ្លែ olive បៃតង និងផ្លែម្ពៅមានរូបរាងនិងពណ៌ ប្រហាក់ប្រហែលគ្នា។ នេះជាឧទាហរណ៍អំពីពណ៌។ បើពោលពីរូបរាងក៏មានបញ្ហាចោទមួយចំនួនទៀត។ រូបរាងកាដេនីដែលដូចផ្លែ pear (បារាំង poire) ត្រូវរៀបរាប់ជាខ្មែរវែងអន្លាយ ព្រោះគ្មានរូបរាងអ្វីអាចយកមកដ៏ខុសបាន។

ផ្ទុយពីនេះទៅវិញ ថ្វីត្បិតតែប្រពៃណីកុលាលភាជន៍បុរាណត្រូវបានបង់ ភាសាខ្មែរមានបន្សល់ទុកនូវពាក្យខ្លះដែលមានទំនាក់ទំនងផ្ទាល់ ទៅនឹងមុខងារនៃភាជន៍, ទំហំ និងរូបរាងទូទៅ ដូចជាពាក្យ 'ខូច', 'តន្លាប់'...។ អាស្រ័យហេតុនេះ កន្លែងខ្លះដែលក្នុងភាសាបរទេសត្រូវនិយាយ វែងខ្លីថាតែមួយមាត់ ដោយសារនៅទីនេះ (ពាក់ព័ន្ធនឹងវត្ថុពីរនេះ) វប្បធម៌ខ្មែរពុំទាន់បាត់។

នៅសតវត្សទី៩ ព្រះបាទជ័យវរ្ម័នទី៣ បោះព្រះពន្លាទៅព្រៃមួយកន្លែង ក្នុងតំបន់អង្គរ ហើយចង់ទុកដីមួយដែលទើបនឹងទាក់បាន។ ប៉ុន្តែ ដីនោះដោះខ្លួន រត់ចូលព្រៃបាត់។ ព្រះអង្គធ្វើពិធីបន់ស្រន់មួយដើម្បីបានដីមកវិញ។ រីឯទេពដែលព្រះអង្គឧទ្ទិសទៅនោះ ក៏ឃាត់មកឱ្យឃើញ ហើយ តម្រូវឱ្យព្រះរាជាបញ្ជាក់អំពីសាទ្វាពិតប្រាកដនៃព្រះអង្គ។

ឧទេយគុះ អំបាចិតម្យនោះ^៥

សូមឱ្យ 'ឧទ័យ' នាំមកនូវភាពចម្រុះចម្រើនតទៅ។

^៥ 'ត្រាន់តែច្នៃរះភ្លាមពេលណា ក៏បានដីនោះ (មកវិញ)'

From the Editors

“... tai udaya ...”

(K. 316, Preah Ko temple, 801 A.D.)

A new Khmer Studies journal

ଉଦୟ, a Sanskrit word assimilated into Old Khmer, means “rising” or “coming up” and by extension, notably in its Khmer usage, “dawn,” or “rebirth.” The choice of this name, *udaya*, as it is spelled in transliteration, reflects our hope that the journal will participate in a profound transformation already underway in Cambodia and with respect to Cambodia: a transformation which, in other cultural spheres, might be called enlightenment or renaissance.

Udaya has indeed been conceived as a means of training new lights on Cambodia and its culture in the broadest sense. The academic domain now known as Khmer Studies came into being, more or less, with the French Protectorate. The remarkable achievements that were made within this new domain were linked to a great extent to the fortunes of the *École Française d'Extrême-Orient*. Indeed Cambodia's innumerable monuments, statues and inscriptions weighed heavily in the decision to create the *EFEO*, which was founded in 1898, and which coordinated the work of a long line of illustrious scholars. However, the terrible wars, destruction and massacres that engulfed Cambodia in the second half of the twentieth century have also taken a heavy toll on research. This is only one of many factors involved, but the fact is that Khmer Studies have remained relatively isolated from the important intellectual innovations and reassessments that have taken place since the 1960s in so many related fields of the social sciences. Change is in the air, however, and *Udaya* is designed to provide a forum and a vehicle for this long overdue renewal, by actively encouraging high-level research and publication in the field of Khmer Studies.

And yet it is our belief that the vital renewal of this academic discipline cannot be entirely isolated from the political, social, economic aspects of a larger cultural transformation of which Cambodia is the theater. This is the second sphere in which we hope *Udaya* will play a small but active role, in particular by contributing to the development of the nascent community of Cambodian students and scholars working on various aspects of Khmer civilization and culture. These young people are the vanguard of what promises to become a broad intellectual movement within but also beyond Cambodia and the traditional limits of Khmer Studies.

Understood in this context, the editorial project of which *Udaya* is the expression is historically determined, and intentionally so. In its name, its form and its aims, *Udaya* is a product and a reflection of the current moment in the history of Khmer Studies, of Cambodia and in fact of the world. Rather than taking an ahistorical universalist approach to the domain, we have conceived of *Udaya* as an *engaged* journal: engaged in the lives and times of its “subject.” And yet, if we have chosen this Sanskrit word that has prospered throughout more than a millenium of Khmer civilization, it is also to suggest that rebirth—as a form of continuity in the very process of change—can be seen as a cultural universal. That the singularity of the present moment in the history of Cambodia, and of Khmer Studies, may indeed be pertinent to the study of culture in general.

Udaya is produced by the Department of Culture and Monuments of the Authority for the Protection and Management of Angkor and the Region of Siem Reap (APSARA), a young and relatively independent organ of the Cambodian government, overseen by an inter-ministerial board. APSARA is charged with developing modern structures and methods for harmonizing the various initiatives associated with Angkor at the local, national and international levels. Given the unusual concentration of activities and resources in this unique region, APSARA was created to respond in an efficient and reflective manner to the needs and expectations of a broad and heterogeneous spectrum of interested parties. One of APSARA's early assignments was to establish the legal and cadastral framework of a five-tiered zoning plan for the Angkor / Siem Reap region. Adopted by Royal Decree in 1994, this plan continues to play an essential role in efforts to protect the site. Yet in spite of these necessary demarcations, the projects coordinated and carried out by APSARA are not strictly limited to Angkor as a geographical region today or as a cultural phenomenon confined to the influence of the Angkorian Empire. Indeed Angkor is not an isolated self-contained whole, but itself a complex region with profound and ancient ties to the rest of Cambodia—and beyond. Of course Angkor also holds great symbolic power as a fundamental reference at many levels of Khmer culture.

In short, Angkor is not limited to Angkor. This applies in paradigmatic fashion to the Authority's Department of Culture and Monuments, which is responsible for overseeing, coordinating and promoting work concerning the interrelated domains of conservation, cultural heritage protection, community development and research at Angkor. It may seem obvious that genuine research can never be held within preordained limits, spatial or otherwise, but this is also the case for programs aimed at cultural heritage protection for instance, or community development, which are only effective when formulated within the context of larger social and economic networks. The Department of Culture and Monuments is thus a privileged institutional point of anchorage for *Udaya* as a forum for scholarly and professional exchange in the rapidly evolving domain of Khmer Studies.

Our goals in creating such a forum are multiple, and they have dictated in many ways the structure, the organization and the editorial orientations of *Udaya*. The main body of each issue will consist in a series of full-length articles. As a rule we will welcome articles on any aspect of Cambodian culture in its largest sense, including comparative or regional studies. However from time to time we will produce a thematic issue, when the general context and the state of research suggest that a more focused concentration on a particular domain will be particularly useful or revealing. Such is the case with this inaugural issue on Cambodian ceramics. In selecting and editing contributions we aim to be at once resolutely open and highly demanding. Contributions are accepted in Khmer, French and English. Each issue will also contain a section of "Field Reports," in the tradition of the famous "Chroniques" of the *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*. These reports will be produced by institutions or individuals carrying out research and conservation work in Cambodia. Future issues will also include a section for book reviews. Finally, when possible given limited human resources, each issue will reprint in Khmer translation one of the seminal articles in the field (by Aymonier, Coedès, Groslier...) previously unavailable in Khmer.

Udaya is meant to serve as a vehicle for sustained and meaningful collaboration between different types of research communities. This is one of the primary missions of the Department of Culture and Monuments. For centuries Angkor has attracted envoys, merchants and voyagers from the four corners of the earth. Indian Brahmans, Chinese emissaries, Japanese pilgrims, Portuguese missionaries and French surveyors were among the innumerable visitors to Angkor before there were satellites, airplanes or cars. This long cosmopolitan tradition continues today, as strong as ever. Needless to say there are as many styles and objectives as there are actors on this little world stage. Yet all stand to gain from the enlightened

coordination of their various efforts. And notably the Cambodian actors.

Developing national skills has been one of APSARA's top priorities since its creation. The Department of Culture and Monuments in particular has devoted a great proportion of its resources and efforts to elaborating long-term projects to this end, and has engaged in an ongoing reflection on the subject. Here too, *Udaya* has a crucial role to play. As we have mentioned, a serious and innovative Cambodian research community is coming into existence today, formed of young Khmer intellectuals interested notably in Khmer archaeology, iconography and ethnology. This is largely a result of the remarkable collaboration between a new generation of dynamic Cambodian students and various international research groups established at Angkor and elsewhere in Cambodia. In collaboration with a range of national and non-governmental institutions, these groups have been participating in a genuine exchange, through assistance in teaching as well as technical and on-site training, that goes beyond the typical economy of many guest-host relationships.

The question of language is, as always, decisive. We are publishing in English because it is the lingua franca of academic exchange, in French because the Protectorate left us an inestimable body of material and a continuing tradition of French scholarship on Cambodia and in Khmer to directly encourage research by Cambodian nationals, and to reinforce the production of solid academic literature in Khmer. To publish the three side by side is in itself a meaningful gesture, a way of celebrating the historical and cultural diversity of Khmer Studies as a domain. It simultaneously serves to invite all parties to consult the spectrum of materials available. The Khmer translation included in each issue can be seen, somewhat paradoxically, to guide this policy of exchange in diversity. Of course the questions and problems involved in translation are those of cultural exchange itself, and so by adopting a determined policy of careful academic translation, *Udaya* is doing more than simply making the information-content of a certain number of publications available in Khmer. Translation, when the stakes are high as they are here, always involves a reinvention of the target language to some degree. The canonical example is the profound transformations that took place in Old Khmer with the influx of Sanskrit vocabulary, as well as the writing system itself, in pre-Angkorian times. A powerful Khmer elite, conscious of the advantages of cultural technology transfer, presumably coordinated this campaign of massive linguistic import in collaboration with Indian Brahmins. However the context is quite different today. Indeed one could argue that it is Cambodia's weak position relative to other countries on many planes that makes translation so particularly prevalent, especially in the domains of culture, politics and development. And yet the financial, educational, logistical means for responding to these enormous translation needs are sorely lacking in Cambodia. What is more, decades of intense state intervention in linguistic usage for political ends has reduced the grammatical, semantic and phonetic flexibility of language use and the familiarity of many speakers with ordinary modes of integration and adaptation of foreign terms and concepts. As a result, poor, frequently incomprehensible translations abound in Cambodia today. One typically finds unpronounceable neologisms and term by term imitations of linguistic structures proper to the source language which are inassimilable by Khmer grammatical structures. Though translation is everywhere, these are signs of the general lack of a "culture of translation." Such a culture will take long and persistent efforts to develop, especially given the inherent difficulties of the task. However these hurdles must be overcome in order to establish a tradition of modern intellectual exchange in and on Cambodia.

The very title of the journal serves as a prime example of the issues at hand. Having named the journal ឧទ័យ in Khmer, we were confronted with the necessity of making the name legible to non-Khmer readers. A translation such as *Dawn (Levant, Asahi...)* would have conveyed some of the meaning that can

be read in ឧទយ. Yet the translation would have over-domesticated the Khmer, erasing the word's unique visual, phonic and semantic structure, while necessarily privileging a linguistic constellation proposed by the other tongue. Another option was to phonetically transcribe the word, "outey," in order to transmit the Khmer pronunciation, allowing those who speak but do not read Khmer to recognize the word. Yet privileging the oral over the written in this way would have meant eliminating the concrete traces of this word's long history. The form we settled on, transliteration, each letter replaced by its roman equivalent, preserves spelling and the corresponding etymological information, at the expense of phonetics. *Udaya* stands thus as a proper name, untranslatable in its essence, but translated to the letter; a foreign word (Sanskrit or Khmer) which makes itself at home as such in another tongue (Khmer, English, French...).

A final goal we have set for *Udaya*, on perhaps a more immediately practical level, is to serve some of the documentation and information needs of APSARA and of other institutions or individuals. A considerable amount of research has been undertaken in and on Cambodia by scholars, conservation specialists and development workers over the last decade or so with the opening of the country. Through *Udaya* we hope to tap this expanding body of work in order to provide tools for the conception and realization of a great variety of culture-related projects and activities in Cambodia.

This issue: on Khmer ceramics

This inaugural issue of *Udaya* concerns Khmer ceramics: earthenware and stoneware, glazed and unglazed. The reasons for choosing to make the first issue thematic, and for choosing Khmer ceramics as the theme, are relatively complex, and relate to the history of Cambodia, of Khmer Studies, and also to the history of APSARA.

Over the course of 1995 and 1996 Angkor area villagers and mine clearance teams reported the existence of a number of ancient kiln sites to scientific authorities in the region. The sites were primarily located in areas which had only recently been resettled or come under government control. The reports accompanied a simultaneous and unprecedented increase in the quantities of ancient Khmer ceramics for sale in Siem Reap markets. The nascent APSARA Authority was confronted with the urgency of curbing the illegal sale and export of the ancient objects as well as the pillaging of the kiln sites from which many of the objects emanated. At the same time, the international community of archaeological researchers at Angkor took a keen interest in the kiln sites. The one Angkorian kiln site previously known, in the Kulen mountains northeast of the Angkor plain, had never been systematically investigated and only became accessible again in 1999. The only ancient Khmer kilns which had by that time been excavated are located in modern-day Thailand, representing provincial production of the Angkorian Empire. In addition, while Angkorian ceramics were and still are better known than the kilns in which they were made, no systematic typology of the ware had ever been established. Bernard-Philippe Groslier's pioneering research in this field had laid out a general framework for understanding pre-Angkorian and particularly Angkorian ceramics. From the results of excavations carried out in the 1950s and '60s, Groslier established a rough chronology of forms and glazes; furthermore, combining archaeological work with ethnographic research, he was able to formulate hypotheses as to the use of distinct vessel types. Groslier also analyzed outside influence, primarily Indian and Chinese, on Khmer ceramic production technique, object forms and aesthetics. However this work remained unfinished, as the war prevented Groslier and other scholars from pursuing

the fieldwork necessary to expand and confirm hypotheses.

A reliable and detailed typology of Khmer ceramics, particularly if clearly associated with production localities and periods, would be an invaluable tool for archaeologists, by permitting the precise dating of stratigraphic layers. This gap in knowledge of ceramics has long represented a hindrance to furthering our understanding of the evolution of Angkorian civilization. Furthermore, research on ceramics, these everyday objects used in and around temples, palaces, homes and worksites is itself a vital source of information on the rituals, living patterns, industries and social structures of ancient Cambodia. The discovery of kiln sites in the Angkor region opened up the possibility of launching this research in earnest; the flowering ancient ceramics market and the associated looting of the kiln sites made it urgent to seize the research opportunity—as any delay meant irreparable loss.

In 1996, APSARA began to formulate and implement a multi-faceted program for ancient ceramics and kiln site protection and research. From the beginning the two were seen as necessarily linked, and dependent on the possibility of contributing in a lasting way to the development of the local communities. APSARA is committed to establishing meaningful long-term relationships with the individuals and communities that constitute the living fabric of the region. Though there are no easy solutions in the domain of development, at each step of the conception and implementation of its research and protection activities, the Department of Culture and Monuments has proceeded with these concerns in mind. The protection component of the project has several aspects. Cultural heritage protection awareness campaigns have been carried out on the local, provincial and national levels. Brochures presenting the problem and current legal protection measures were published in Khmer, English and Japanese. In 1999 the Khmer government made an official request to the United States government for the imposition of importation restrictions on cultural objects at risk. Ancient ceramics were one of three types of objects for which restrictions were requested. A number of community development projects in the kiln site areas have been undertaken. These efforts have proven insufficient to halt the traffic of ancient ceramics and the pillaging of ancient kiln sites, particularly in the Phnom Kulen where there has been terrible recent destruction, yet they have undeniably had a positive influence on the situation. Ancient ceramics are no longer openly sold in Siem Reap markets; those sites selected for initial research are no longer looted and have thus been saved for research and for the future benefit of associated communities.

Research and on-site training programs were devised in collaboration with two Japanese archaeology teams: the Sophia University International Angkor Mission and the Nara National Cultural Properties Research Institute. Preliminary results of on-going work focusing on the kilns of Tani village are included in the present volume. The practical applications of this work for cultural heritage protection are perfectly evident at Tani. The Department of Culture and Monuments has fostered personal relationships with local lay and religious authorities, and a considerable number of villagers from the immediate vicinity have been employed in a variety of tasks associated with the research: from building and maintaining bridges to site clearing and assistance in excavations. More than a dozen Khmer archaeology students have been working closely with the Japanese experts. In addition to gaining technical skills, they are developing broad knowledge of Khmer ceramics and kiln structures and familiarity with the complex issues involved in ensuring the protection of this relatively unspectacular component of the Angkorian heritage. However, as mentioned above, efforts must not stop here. Despite zoning regulations, the Khmer military maintain bases and activities in the Angkor Park. Importation restrictions on Khmer ceramics have yet to be granted by the U.S. government. Numerous recently constituted Khmer ceramics collections in private Japanese museums indicate that Japan, like many other countries, continues to harbor a flourishing market for Angkorian ware... Providing a space for academic reflection and exchange without losing sight of the very

complex problems of which the pillaging is a sad symptom, this issue on Khmer ceramics constitutes one element in a continuing effort to raise awareness about this aspect of the Khmer heritage in view of ensuring its protection.

At the same time, Khmer ceramics promises to be one of the most exciting and fruitful domains in Khmer Studies over the coming years. This situation is due in part to contingent factors, the end of the war, with its legacy of rural poverty and other forms of injustice, the chance discovery made by a rice farmer or a development agency bulldozer. However, seen within the context of the history of Khmer Studies, the unprecedented level of activity concerning ceramics at the present moment is not without meaning. For over a century scholars and conservators in Cambodia were kept busy with the vast quantities of ancient Khmer tangible cultural heritage to be found *above ground*: the stones and bricks of temples with their sculpture and inscriptions. Little time was left for searching *underground*. There have always been more architects than archaeologists in Cambodia. The work is far from finished, and yet one of the central and necessary goals that has presided over Khmer Studies since the beginning has been attained thanks to the concerted efforts of several generations of dedicated specialists: the general outline of the history of royal power in ancient Cambodia has been written. In this way too we are at the *dawn*, indeed, of a new era in Khmer Studies. Future research will necessarily tend to be more interdisciplinary in all ways: iconography, archaeology, epigraphy will be cross-fertilized with ethnography and folklore studies for instance. Insights into one period of Khmer history will be used to illuminate others. The current interest in ceramics is the perfect example of these developments. Rather than the official history composed by monarchs in Khmer or Sanskrit verse and inscribed on temple doorjambs or stelae, ceramics tell a parallel but very different story. It is this story, based largely on the daily activities of ordinary people—in the provinces, around the capital or in the Palace...—, that the present issue of *Udaya* begins to recount.

Another reason behind the decision to concentrate here on Khmer ceramics is precisely the focused, concrete nature of the topic. Angkor is an enormous and complex site, rich in irreplaceable tangible and intangible cultural heritage that is at unprecedented risk as insufficient post-war development efforts encounter the growth of international art markets and mass tourism. Faced with the task of preserving such a site, we have sought to implement relatively small-scale projects integrated into a hopeful larger vision for Angkor's future. It is our belief that effective plans of action can only be formulated in keeping with such a vision if they are predicated on an intimate knowledge of the field—Angkor's earth, stones and people—gained through basic research and hands-on project implementation. The goals are lofty, but the approach is quite pragmatic.

On a more symbolic or metaphorical level too, ceramics seemed like an appropriate place to start. Pottery is all about people and earth. The potter's task, like that of the archaeologist, working the earth and making sense of it, serves as a kind of model for *Udaya*. This is not a journal of archaeology. Yet we are convinced of the necessity of this gesture: getting down on one's knees to dig with two hands into the depths of Cambodian culture.

Continuity and Rupture

A number of the questions raised by the study of ceramics in Cambodia are fundamental to Khmer Studies as a whole; indeed, beyond the specific contexts in which they arise, these questions are pertinent to any study of the ways and means of culture. Based on what criteria can we speak of continuity in tradition over time? Where, when and why do we see rupture? In what ways does the Angkorian Empire

represent an anomaly in Cambodian history and culture? And to what extent can we take Angkor to be the apogee of a culture which preceded and followed the Empire? In the field of Khmer ceramics, these questions frequently arise in connection with generally perceived historical and cultural distinctions between earthenware and stoneware. Researchers and amateurs alike have long been tempted to see in contemporary Cambodian earthenware production a tradition uninterrupted since prehistoric times. On the other hand, the appearance of glazed stoneware at the beginning of the Angkorian period, and its disappearance at the fall of the Empire, seems to indicate radical rupture in tradition with neither indigenous precedent nor lasting legacy, not entirely unlike the Angkorian innovation of the baray.

Taken together, the contributions in this issue of *Udaya* problematize approaches to the Cambodian ceramics tradition which lean heavily on a simple opposition between continuity and rupture. Louise Cort and Leedom Lefferts reveal the existence of a contemporary earthenware production technique which they consider to be specifically “Khmer,” and the result of a long tradition. Yet they caution in their article against directly deducing ancient earthenware production technique in the region from earthenware production technique observable in Cambodia today. The authors note, for instance, that similarities between pre-historic and modern potters’ tools found in the region does not ensure that those tools were wielded in the same manner over time. Miriam Stark’s archaeological work at the southern site of Angkor Borei complements these reflections on regional earthenware traditions. Analyzing diversity and evolution in ceramic assemblages at Angkor Borei from pre-historic to historic times, Stark opens yet another dimension to the field of study. She indicates that exterior influence or imports may have played a crucial role in pre-historic and pre-Angkorian earthenware production. This obliges us to consider that the originality of indigenous innovations did not consist in some invention or creation *ex nihilo*, but precisely in the reusing and reinterpreting of borrowed techniques or forms. The purity of the origin is thereby compromised irremediably. Angkor Borei ceramic assemblages testify to the importance of trade exchange in the formation of the region’s early polities, and notably of Angkor Borei itself, a trade center connected to maritime ports through extensive canal systems. Changes in pottery form, with or without changes in production technique, take on importance in gauging cultural and societal evolution during these times. Nonetheless, the similarities between ancient and contemporary earthenware are such that, in his careful study of Khmer ceramic findings at the Royal Palace of Angkor Thom, Marc Franiatte is able to draw on contemporary earthenware forms to deduce those to which earthenware fragments from the site may have belonged. In her presentation of Angkorian ceramics, Dawn Rooney recalls that some Khmer ware seems to imitate Indian or Chinese vessels; other vessels however find no model beyond the limits of the Empire. Tiles and roofing techniques may have developed on foreign models, but Jacques Dumarçay demonstrates how small evolutions in form and technique responded to those of specifically Khmer architectural design. Despite a remarkable homogeneity in tile form and roofing technique, close study shows that experience and experimentation in construction over the course of the Angkorian period, and after, led to modifications of associated ceramic forms. Marc Franiatte questions the very viability of definitively distinguishing between earthenware and stoneware through simple macroscopic observation. Temperature variation in a single kiln, the author notes, created in some cases a “hybrid” vessel, composed of both earthenware and stoneware. Franiatte recalls moreover that earthenware and stoneware vessels identical in form may have served different purposes. Continuity with regard to one criterion (form) does not preclude rupture in the other (function). Analyses of the Royal Palace collection lead the author to challenge a generally accepted hierarchization of ware types in which earthenware is assigned a domestic role and stoneware, especially glazed stoneware, is principally associated with ritual use. Franiatte notes the existence on some Angkorian stoneware vessels of an incised decor typical of Angkorian earthenware. Suggesting that

stoneware may have been used more extensively than has previously been imagined for domestic purposes in Angkorian times, these findings obscure hierarchical divisions. Yet, it is the discovery of certain earthenware objects that proves the most surprising: the existence of decorated earthenware pedestals unearthed at the Royal Palace site suggests that earthenware objects may themselves have been used for ritual purposes in the Angkorian royal context. In this same vein, Ea Darith's survey of production at each of the recently discovered Angkorian kiln sites confirms that the typical Khmer earthenware water-carrying vessel, called today *k-am* —or a vessel quite similar to the *k-am* in form— was also produced in glazed stoneware in the Angkorian period. It remains unclear however whether the function of this “upmarket” version of the well-known pot corresponded to that of its earthenware counterpart, ancient or contemporary.

The information and the analyses furnished by this new body of research on Khmer ceramics suggest that the rupture which the appearance of glazed stoneware no doubt reflects was nonetheless mediated in essential ways by various forms of cultural continuity. The analytical paradigm within which exogenous influence is opposed term for term to indigenous creation is thus also put into question here. Like that of continuity vs. rupture, this binary opposition has long constituted one of the most popular theoretical frameworks for considerations of Cambodian culture. Yet it is the interchange between the two poles of the dichotomy which begins to unfold here, like a successful translation in which foreign expressions take indigenous form and where the success depends on a sort of foreign familiarity. Louise Cort and Leedom Leffert's anthropological study of contemporary earthenware production reveals telling similarities in a series of regions disconnected geographically but perhaps linked historically. By contrasting production technique and final decorated form, they reveal the paradoxical existence of an “indigenous” Khmer tradition perpetuated in and through centuries-old diasporas and the encounter with “outside” aesthetic demands.

Ingrid Muan and Ly Daravuth's discussion of the Ceramics Section of Phnom Penh's Department of Plastic Arts raises similar questions in another contemporary setting, that of the Protectorate's promotion of indigenous arts, and the aftermath of that initiative as it has been reappropriated and reformulated by Khmer artists and authorities today. Why and how did a foreign power set about rekindling what it perceived as a dying if not already dead culture? How might the Protectorate's efforts to ensure the authenticity of Cambodian artistic production have contributed to a certain idealization, rigidification or hierarchization of Cambodian arts? And to what extent did Khmer tradition, prior to and in the encounter with the Protectorate, itself incorporate such structures? Ceramics play a pivotal role in disturbing distinctions frequently made by cultural authorities between “crafts” and “art.” In the Angkorian art history context, glazed stoneware is at best considered a minor art, yet an art which proves a useful tool for ethnological research; in the larger cultural context, Angkorian glazed ware, in contrast to the earthenware “craft,” takes on enhanced artistic value. This mediating position of Angkorian ceramics is pointed out in the introductory sections of several articles included here. Dawn Rooney opens by noting the lack of attention given to Angkorian ceramics relative to their contemporary correlates in architecture and sculpture. Cort and Lefferts, on the other hand, note the lack of attention paid to Khmer earthenware relative to Angkorian glazed stoneware. As a form of cultural expression in which functionality can be seen to override esthetics, or in which the value is derived from the harmony of the two, ceramics challenge limiting definitions of art. A number of authors here recall that the textured “decor” of earthenware vessels may often have its origin in utilitarian purposes. Texturing intended to make wet pots less slippery participates in the aesthetic value of pottery, and over time may be refined, embellished upon, varied, to enhance this “secondary” value, and even eclipse the “primary” purpose. Even for Angkorian ware, Marc

Franiatte notes that decorative evolution is inseparable from technical and morphological criteria, such that all “stylistic” analyses should take these elements into consideration as an ensemble and in conjunction with stratigraphic information. In this context, contemporary instruction in and production of arts-and-crafts in the capital incites potent questioning of relationships to the past, represented both by village tradition perceived to have maintained some uninterrupted authenticity and Angkorian art. If Angkorian art, and particularly Angkorian glazed ware, signified a rupture with or an anomaly in tradition, contemporary artists and artisans throughout the country continue to capitalize on this past glory in many forms of plastic expression. And then, if earthenware production is not considered art, earthenware objects, particularly the water-carrying vessels known as *k-am*, have great iconographic power in contemporary Phnom Penh paintings of village life. In these ways, the “inside” and the “outside” are not defined only by the nation’s or the culture’s borders; within we find also a without, influences come from Angkor, from the village, from the capital and from abroad... to form a complex system of cultural exchange as culture itself.

This is of course not a modern phenomenon, and is one reason why our frequently monolithic understandings of “Angkor,” “the Protectorate” or “Phnom Penh today” themselves require reinterpretation and refinement. In his presentation of kiln sites now known in the Angkor region, Ea Darith begins to reveal such nuances. Within the spatial and temporal limits of Angkor, different kilns clearly served different purposes, producing vessels and other objects with great variety in size, form and decor, all nonetheless sharing distinctively Angkorian traits. The influence of central authorities in all kinds of production at Angkor was undoubtedly powerful, reference to dominant models inevitable. Yet in this zone of production that evidently responds to highly centralized demands, Ea Darith leads us to discern distinctions from one site to another, and we can begin to sense the individuals and villages at work.

In this issue

The volume opens with APSARA’s point of departure for this ceramics odyssey: newly discovered kiln sites at Angkor. In an article that records preliminary findings of ongoing research undertaken by Japanese groups in collaboration with APSARA, Ea Darith surveys five sites, in villages of the plain (Tani, Khnar Po, Bakaong) and in the Phnom Kulen (Saser and Anlong Thom). Other associated information can be found in reports by the Sophia University and Nara teams included in the present issue. Ea Darith provides a description of each site, including the location and general exterior form of the kilns as far as they can be determined from ground survey. He then presents the types of ware found at each site, including descriptions of sizes, forms and glazes. More detailed analyses are given for the Tani site, where the author has participated in recent excavation campaigns. The forms and deduced firing techniques of the excavated Tani kilns are compared with those of Khmer kilns in Thailand excavated in the 1970s-80s. Consideration is also given to clay types used for different wares at the Tani site.

This Angkorian kiln site survey is followed by Louise Cort and Leedom Leffert’s study of contemporary earthenware production in three distinct areas: in Cambodia, Kampuchea Krom (South Vietnam) and Northeast Thailand. As one element in a wide-ranging study of ceramics production across mainland Southeast Asia carried out by the authors, this article is based on extensive comparative analyses. In particular, the techniques used within the three areas in question are contrasted with other techniques employed across the region. By scrupulously recording production processes, Cort and Lefferts demonstrate how physical gestures and preliminary production forms may reveal historical links between peoples separated today by political boundaries and important cultural differences.

that the lively University and associated atelier production today is largely due to the initiative of one artist to renew and innovate on tradition. Through this homage, we can read a contemporary search for a delicate balance in Khmer artistic production, and even more, an active interaction, between personal signature and collective creation, between innovation and repetition.

A series of field reports on ceramic findings by archaeological teams currently working at Angkor makes up the second section of the journal. At varying stages of field work and coming from quite different cultural and scientific backgrounds, each team offers different kinds of information on its work and on the subject at hand. Naho Shimizu of the Japanese Government Team for Safeguarding Angkor reports on findings from excavations carried out in the course of restoration of the Bayon temple's northern "library." Analyzing stratigraphic information along with Khmer and non-Khmer shards, Shimizu arrives at a hypothetical dating of the "library" structure. In the absence of a solid typology of Khmer ware, the author constructs her hypotheses primarily on well-established dating of Chinese ware. This comparative work also contributes to dating Khmer finds at the "library." The Nara National Cultural Properties Institute of Japan and the APSARA Authority report together on a topographical survey carried out at the Tani kiln site on the Angkor plain. Though this preliminary work has since been followed up by geophysical prospections and excavations of certain kiln mounds at the site, the team chose to present the topographical survey methods and findings here as they have laid the basis for a general understanding of the site and subsequent choices for further archaeological work. This report also includes a presentation of a brief investigation of the Thnal Mrec kiln site near Anlong Thom village in the Phnom Kulen. Archaeological work at the Tani kiln site is reported by the International Angkor Mission of Sophia University, Japan. This team presents the excavation of one of the larger kiln mounds at the site. We learn of methodology as well as findings concerning the structure and firing techniques of the excavated kiln. World Monuments Fund team member Chhan Chamroen reports on ceramic shards unearthed during excavations over the past few years in disparate areas of the vast temple complex of Preah Khan at Angkor. The final field report is from the latest team to have joined in restoration work at Angkor: the Chinese Government Team. Before inaugurating restoration of Chau Say Tevoda temple, the team undertook archaeological surveys and excavations. As the first report to be published by this team, its scope exceeds that of ceramics findings to include presentation of other material, notably stone objects, found during the archaeological campaign.

Translating Groslier's "Introduction"

The final contribution to this issue is a Khmer translation of Bernard-Philippe Groslier's seminal article on Khmer ceramics. The piece appeared first in English translation as the introduction to a catalogue for a 1981 exhibit of Khmer ceramics in Singapore.¹ In 1995, nearly a decade after the author's death, the journal *Péninsule* published a French version of the introduction based on an unpublished French typewritten text that seems to be a pre-version of the introduction, which was completed with additions retranslated from the published English version.² The notes to this edited version make reference to conferences given by Groslier on the topic in Cambodia and France as well as other relevant publications

¹ Bernard-Philippe Groslier, "Introduction to the Ceramic Wares of Angkor," in D. Stock, ed., *Khmer Ceramics 9th—14th Century*, Singapore, 1981: 9-39.

² Bernard-Philippe Groslier, "Introduction à la céramique angkorienne (fin IXe-début XVe s.)," *Péninsule* 31, Metz, 1995: 5-60.

by the author. *Udaya*'s Khmer translation was done from the English version, primarily in order to simplify the editorial apparatus. However frequent reference was made to the French version when necessary to clarify obscure meanings. If Groslier's article may in some respects be outdated, this is precisely because of the progress made in the field of Khmer ceramics as a result of a research dynamic for which the "Introduction" was to a great extent responsible, and its continuing importance for the domain is attested by the fact that it is cited in all but one of the other articles included in this issue of *Udaya*.

The numerous difficulties encountered in rendering this article into Khmer are at once typical of the problems posed by translation in general and specifically tied to the topic at hand, as well as the current socio-cultural context of Cambodia. It is often said that Khmer abounds in precise terminology concerning "traditional" domains even as its reserves of generic or theoretical terms are relatively limited. "Ceramics" is indeed a case in point. Since there is no Khmer term grouping together different types of ceramic objects, the word *kulālabhāj(n)*, a Pali compound literally meaning "clay vessel," was recently created to render the French "céramiques" and its English equivalent. Though generally used in contemporary academic Khmer as the equivalent of "ceramics," *kulālabhāj(n)* designates only vessels, and as such does not cover the range of the French and English term used to designate a variety of Khmer objects including figurines and architectural accessories (roof tiles, applied decor and finials, or other utilitarian objects such as stoves, loom weights or net sinkers). We have decided, somewhat reluctantly, to conform to current practice in using the Pali neologism here, offering additional paraphrastic explanation when necessary. The counter-example is found in the English "jar." In Groslier's article a range of objects labeled "jars" are only sometimes qualified according to usage: water jars, alcohol jars, etc. Khmer, on the other hand, has a multiplicity of terms designating these types of vessels: *kraḷa*, *bāñ*, *udīn*, etc., each term designating a form and associated function. In those instances where Groslier's "jar" is not qualified, the translation into Khmer is informed by accompanying illustrations when available; when such graphic support, compensating for the limited English (or French) vocabulary, is not available, inferences must be made based on frequently inadequate contextual clues.

Yet simple gaps in the lexicon of one or the other language are not the most difficult problems. A "missing" signifier can be replaced, so to speak, by a descriptive phrase. More problematic are discrepancies on the order of the signified, in systems of meaning or sense interpretation. What Groslier may identify as dark red, for example, appears more like *tnot* in Khmer, a word usually translated in English as a type of brown. However, working with Groslier's text and accompanying photographic reproductions rather than with the actual objects in question, we have systematically adhered to the author's color interpretations. Cultural references play an intriguingly important role in these types of "subjective" descriptions. Since a literal translation of "Venetian red," for instance, would not be understood by the large majority of Khmer readers, we opted instead for *krahām jāṃ*, "deep (brownish) red." On the other hand, the French term "*lie de vin*," introduced by Groslier to describe the color of a particular Angkorian glaze he saw as resembling red wine dregs, has been taken up as the standard name by scholars of Khmer ceramics, regardless of linguistic or cultural background, since the publication of Groslier's "Introduction." For this reason, the term is maintained here, accompanied by a parenthetical explanation at its first appearance in the text. Celadon is likewise translated as "celadon," given the universal usage of this term, the name of a character in a 17th-century French pastoral novel, presumably taken from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, i.e. a Khmer-English-French-Latin translation of the Greek... "Olive green", to give yet another example of the translator's mediating task, is rendered here as the "color of *mteñ*," for a native fruit similar to the green olive in color... and taste.

Similar problems are encountered in the identification of forms. Groslier describes one type of vessel as pear-shaped. Since pears, like olives, are perhaps even more unfamiliar in Cambodia than wine, it would be of little help to retain his “pear” or “*poire*” in the Khmer text. In this case, the form in question was instead described in translation. Groslier also makes extensive use of more sophisticated cultural references. Comparison with Greek “craters” and “gutta percha” resin, or reference to Lévi-Strauss and “structural anthropology” – terms explained and sometimes maintained in the translation – may, for example, escape some readers, yet they do participate in the realization of another of *Udaya*’s goals: to broaden the horizons of reflection beyond Angkor and indeed beyond Cambodia through assiduous study of things Khmer. Rather than seeing a simple source of frustration in the fact that the terms used to describe Khmer ceramics are not directly translatable into Khmer, we hope readers will profit from the ways in which the questions raised by translation, and notably a certain resistance to translation that arises in the very process of translating, point up the richness of cultural differences. This in itself is a sort of homage to Groslier’s remarkable contribution to Khmer Studies, combining as he did great personal investment and experience in the field, patient attention to detail, and unfettered intellectual freedom.

Another interesting problem encountered involves translation “within” Khmer, from ancient to modern times. Many Angkorian ceramic forms bear resemblance to contemporary forms and are thus naturally given their modern appellation by Khmer today. This means that Groslier’s often lengthy discussions of a vessel form can in many cases be most easily rendered by a single word in Khmer. While this would facilitate a Khmer reader’s immediate grasp of the shape of the object under discussion, it would not encourage the same sort of reflection on modeling that the English or French passage does. The word would moreover carry immediate connotations regarding function in ancient times, connotations often but not always evoked by Groslier. The object today called *khuoc*, for example, is a small recipient produced in ancient times and used in contemporary ritual practice. A like example is the *tanlāp*, a small container, today typically made of wood, used for holding wax and frequently associated with love charms. Since we do not know if the Angkorian objects were called *khuoc* and *tanlāp*, or whether contemporary use perpetuates ancient tradition, naming them with the contemporary term may not be justified. Yet refraining from doing so and simply translating Groslier’s description would be somewhat artificial. In these situations, we have translated the full descriptions and added mention of the contemporary Khmer name of the objects.

N.B. Unless otherwise indicated, all illustrations accompanying articles or reports were supplied by the corresponding authors.

“... tai udaya ...”

(K. 316, Temple de Preah Ko, 801 A.D.)

Une nouvelle revue d'études khmères

Terme sanskrit qu'intégra le vieux khmer il y a plus d'un millénaire, ឧទ័យ signifie "montée" ou "levée" et, par extension, notamment en khmer, "aurore" ou "renaissance". Le choix de ce nom, écrit *udaya* en translittération, reflète notre espoir que la revue participe à une profonde transformation, déjà en cours, au Cambodge, ou exerçant de l'extérieur un impact direct sur le pays : c'est une transformation qui s'appellerait peut-être renaissance ou lumières dans d'autres sphères culturelles.

Nous avons en effet conçu *Udaya* comme un moyen d'apporter de nouveaux éclairages sur le Cambodge et sa culture au sens le plus large. Le domaine connu aujourd'hui sous le nom d'"Etudes khmères" est apparu, plus ou moins, avec le Protectorat français. Les remarquables travaux de recherches entrepris dans ce jeune domaine sont liés dans une large mesure à l'histoire de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient. Les innombrables temples, statues et inscriptions du Cambodge ont en effet fortement motivé la création de l'EFEO qui, à partir de sa fondation en 1898, a coordonné le travail d'une longue lignée d'illustres chercheurs. Mais les terribles guerres, destructions et massacres qu'a connus le pays durant la seconde moitié du XX^e siècle ont aussi longuement freiné la recherche. Tels sont quelques-uns des facteurs qui expliquent l'isolement relatif des études khmères par rapport aux importantes innovations et réévaluations intellectuelles qui s'opèrent depuis les années '60 dans divers secteurs des sciences sociales. Le changement est toutefois dans l'air, et *Udaya*, forum et véhicule de ce renouveau tant attendu, veut encourager fortement la recherche et la publication dans ce domaine.

Nous croyons cependant que le renouveau vital de cette discipline de recherche ne peut être complètement isolé des aspects sociaux, politiques et économiques d'une vaste transformation culturelle dont le Cambodge est actuellement le théâtre. C'est une seconde sphère dans laquelle nous espérons qu'*Udaya* jouera un rôle actif, même modeste, en contribuant particulièrement au développement d'une communauté naissante de chercheurs et étudiants cambodgiens travaillant sur divers aspects de la culture et de la civilisation khmères. Cette jeune génération constitue les prémisses d'un futur mouvement intellectuel au Cambodge et au-delà.

Dans ce contexte, le projet éditorial d'*Udaya* s'inscrit dans un processus historique et ce, de façon délibérée. De par son nom, sa forme et ses finalités, ce journal est le produit et le reflet d'un moment précis de l'histoire des études khmères, du Cambodge et, bien évidemment, du monde. Plutôt que d'adopter une démarche universaliste et anhistorique, nous avons conçu *Udaya* comme une revue engagée : engagée dans l'histoire et les vies de son "objet". En même temps si nous avons choisi un mot sanskrit qui a traversé plus d'un millénaire de civilisation khmère, c'est aussi pour rappeler que la renaissance — en ce qu'elle représente une certaine continuité dans le processus même du changement — peut se lire comme phénomène universel, commun à toutes les cultures. Le caractère singulier de l'histoire strictement contemporaine du Cambodge et, par contre-coup, des études khmères, n'est pas sans lien avec l'étude de la culture en général.

Udaya est édité par le Département de la Culture et des Monuments de l'Autorité pour la Protection du Site et l'Aménagement de la Région d'Angkor (APSARA), une jeune institution gouvernementale dotée d'une certaine autonomie et supervisée par un conseil d'administration interministériel. APSARA est chargée de développer les structures et méthodes nécessaires à l'harmonisation des diverses initiatives concernant Angkor, aux niveaux local, national et international. Étant donné la concentration exceptionnelle des ressources et des activités dans cette région unique, APSARA a été créée pour répondre de façon efficace et réfléchie aux besoins et attentes, souvent incompatibles, des divers acteurs impliqués à Angkor. L'une des premières tâches d'APSARA a consisté à établir le cadre légal et cadastral d'un plan de zonage en cinq secteurs du Parc Archéologique et de la région de Siem Reap-Angkor. Adopté par décret royal en 1994, ce plan joue un rôle essentiel dans les efforts entrepris pour la protection du site. Cependant, en dépit de cette nécessité de démarcation, les projets coordonnés et réalisés par APSARA ne se limitent pas strictement à Angkor : ni en tant que région géographique contemporaine, ni en tant que phénomène culturel confiné à l'Empire angkorien. Angkor en effet n'est pas une entité isolée et refermée sur elle-même, mais une région complexe aux attaches profondes et anciennes avec le reste du Cambodge — et au-delà. Bien entendu, Angkor détient aussi un grand pouvoir symbolique, une référence fondamentale pour de nombreux aspects de la culture khmère.

En bref, Angkor n'est pas limité à Angkor. Ceci s'applique d'une manière paradigmatique au Département de la Culture et des Monuments, qui est responsable du contrôle, de la coordination et de la promotion de tout ce qui concerne la conservation, la protection du patrimoine culturel, ainsi que la recherche et le développement communautaire à Angkor — domaines indissociables les uns des autres. S'il peut sembler évident qu'une véritable recherche ne peut se cantonner dans des limites — spatiales ou autres — prédéterminées, c'est aussi le cas des programmes visant par exemple à la protection du patrimoine culturel ou au développement communautaire : ils ne peuvent porter des fruits que s'ils sont intégrés à de larges réseaux sociaux et économiques. Le Département de la Culture et des Monuments constitue un point d'ancrage institutionnel privilégié pour *Udaya*, en tant que forum d'échanges dans ce domaine, en rapide évolution, des études khmères.

Les multiples objectifs qui ont motivé la création de ce forum ont en quelque sorte dicté la structure, l'organisation et le choix éditorial d'*Udaya*. En règle générale, la partie principale de chaque numéro sera constituée d'articles relatifs à la culture cambodgienne dans son sens le plus large, y compris des études comparatives ou régionales. De temps en temps cependant, lorsque les circonstances et l'état de la recherche justifient que l'attention soit portée sur un domaine particulièrement sensible ou révélateur, nous proposerons des numéros à thème. Tel est le cas de ce numéro inaugural, consacré à la céramique cambodgienne. Toute proposition de contribution fera l'objet d'un examen attentif, avec toute la rigueur qui s'impose dans l'édition. Les contributions seront acceptées en khmer, français, et anglais. Chaque numéro inclura aussi une rubrique "Rapports", suivant en cela la tradition des fameuses "Chroniques" du *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*. Ces rapports d'activités sur le terrain seront produits par des institutions ou chercheurs individuels conduisant des travaux de recherche et de conservation au Cambodge. Les numéros à venir comporteront également une section de comptes rendus de nouvelles publications dans le domaine. Enfin et si possible, étant donné nos ressources humaines encore limitées, chaque numéro comprendra la réédition en traduction khmère d'un article essentiel ou particulièrement fécond en études khmères (par exemple des écrits d'Aymonier, de Coedès, de Groslier...).

Udaya se veut véhicule d'une collaboration riche et soutenue entre les différentes communautés de recherche. C'est en effet l'une des missions premières du Département de la Culture et des Monuments. Pendant des siècles Angkor a attiré des envoyés, des marchands et des voyageurs des quatre coins du globe.

Brahmanes indiens, émissaires chinois, pèlerins japonais, missionnaires portugais et explorateurs français ont figuré parmi ses innombrables visiteurs, avant l'apparition des satellites, avions ou voitures. Cette longue tradition cosmopolite se poursuit de nos jours, plus forte que jamais. Il va sans dire qu'il y a autant d'objectifs et de façons d'agir que d'acteurs sur cette petite scène mondiale. Pourtant tous ont quelque chose à gagner d'une coordination réfléchie des divers efforts. Et notamment les acteurs cambodgiens.

Développer les compétences nationales a été l'une des priorités d'APSARA depuis sa création. Le Département de la Culture et des Monuments consacre une grande partie de ses efforts et de ses ressources à l'élaboration d'un projet à long terme dans ce sens, et a engagé depuis ses débuts une réflexion à ce propos. Ici aussi, *Udaya* a un rôle crucial à jouer. Comme on l'a déjà mentionné, une remarquable communauté de chercheurs cambodgiens, composée de jeunes intellectuels notamment spécialisés en archéologie, iconographie et ethnologie khmères, se forme actuellement. Ceci est pour une grande part le résultat d'une collaboration riche entre une nouvelle génération dynamique d'étudiants cambodgiens et des groupes de chercheurs internationaux établis à Angkor et ailleurs au Cambodge. En collaboration avec des institutions nationales et non-gouvernementales, à travers l'aide à l'enseignement, la formation technique et le travail sur le terrain, ces groupes participent à de vrais échanges qui dépassent les simples "intérêts mutuels".

La question de la langue est, comme toujours, décisive. Nous publions en anglais car c'est la lingua franca de la recherche, en français car le Protectorat nous a légué un corpus inestimable de matériaux et une tradition toujours vivace de travaux savants sur le Cambodge, et en khmer pour encourager la recherche chez les Cambodgiens et de renforcer l'édition scientifique en langue khmère. Publier dans ces trois langues dans un même volume est en soi un geste symbolique, une façon de célébrer la diversité culturelle et historique des études khmères. Tous chercheurs confondus sont donc invités à prendre conscience de ce vaste éventail des documents existants. La traduction khmère que nous souhaitons inclure dans chaque numéro pourrait orienter, même si cela apparaît comme un paradoxe, cette politique d'échanges. Les questions et les problèmes soulevés par la traduction sont bien sûr ceux que soulèvent les échanges culturels eux-mêmes ; en adoptant une politique de traduction scientifique méticuleuse, *Udaya* cherche à faire plus que simplement mettre à la disposition des lecteurs khmers le contenu en information d'un certain nombre de publications. Lorsque l'importance de l'enjeu le commande, comme dans le cas présent, la traduction implique, jusqu'à un certain point, une réinvention dans la langue de destination. La transformation profonde qu'a connue le vieux khmer dès l'époque pré-angkorienne, avec l'afflux de vocabulaire sanskrit ainsi que l'adoption d'un système d'écriture, en est un exemple canonique. On imagine une puissante élite khmère, consciente des avantages que représente un transfert de technologie culturelle, coordonnant cette campagne d'importation linguistique massive, en collaboration avec des brahmanes indiens. Le contexte est toutefois bien différent de nos jours. On pourrait en effet considérer que c'est la position de faiblesse du Cambodge, à bien des égards, par rapport à d'autres pays, qui explique l'omniprésence aujourd'hui des phénomènes de traduction dans la société khmère, tout particulièrement dans les domaines de la culture, de la politique et du développement. Les moyens financiers, éducatifs, et logistiques font cependant cruellement défaut à cet énorme besoin de traduction au Cambodge. De plus, des décennies d'intervention étatique forte dans les usages linguistiques, à des fins politiques, ont réduit la souplesse grammaticale, sémantique et phonétique de l'usage ; peu de locuteurs arrivent actuellement à intégrer et à adapter de façon naturelle des termes et concepts étrangers. En conséquence, les traductions maladroites voire incompréhensibles sont actuellement chose courante au Cambodge. On relève fréquemment des néologismes imprononçables et des retranscriptions mot à mot de structures linguistiques propres à la langue d'origine, et inassimilables par les structures grammaticales khmères. Bien que la traduction semble se propager partout, il manque une véritable "culture de traduction" au Cambodge. Compte tenu des

difficultés inhérentes à la tâche, une telle culture ne se développera qu'à travers de longs et persistants efforts. Toutefois, il faudra bien prendre ces problèmes en compte, à défaut de pouvoir les résoudre d'un coup, si on espère établir une tradition moderne d'échanges intellectuelles au Cambodge même, comme entre le Cambodge et le reste du monde.

Le titre même de la revue sert à illustrer ces questions. L'ayant nommé ឧទ្យា en Khmer, nous avons été confrontés à la nécessité de rendre le nom intelligible à des lecteurs non khmérophones. Une traduction telle que *Levant (Dawn, Asahi...)* n'aurait rendu qu'une partie du sens d'ឧទ្យា. Cette traduction aurait en outre plus que "domestiqué" le khmer, en effaçant l'originalité de la structure visuelle, phonétique et sémantique de ce mot, au profit d'une constellation linguistique propre à l'autre langue. Nous aurions pu choisir de transcrire phonétiquement le mot "outey" afin de conserver la prononciation khmère, permettant ainsi à ceux qui parlent mais ne lisent pas le khmer de reconnaître le mot. Mais privilégier de la sorte l'oral par rapport à l'écrit aurait entraîné l'élimination des traces concrètes de la longue histoire de ce mot. La forme pour laquelle nous avons opté, la translittération, où chaque lettre est remplacée par son équivalent romain, préserve l'orthographe et l'étymologie correspondante, aux dépens de la phonétique. *Udaya* se présente donc comme un nom propre, intraduisible dans son essence, mais traduit à la lettre, bref un mot étranger (sanskrit ou khmer) adopté comme tel dans une autre langue (khmer, anglais, français...).

Enfin un des objectifs que nous nous sommes fixé en créant *Udaya*, pour répondre à un besoin avant tout pratique est de fournir les informations et documentations utiles à APSARA et à d'autres institutions ou chercheurs individuels. Au Cambodge et sur le Cambodge, quantité de travaux ont été entrepris par les chercheurs, les spécialistes de la conservation et les acteurs du développement, durant la dernière décennie, suite à l'ouverture du pays. Nous espérons, avec *Udaya*, transformer ces ressources en outils accessibles et ainsi utilisables pour la conception et la réalisation, au Cambodge, d'une grande diversité de projets et d'activités liés à la culture.

Un numéro sur la céramique khmère

Ce numéro inaugural d'*Udaya* traite de la céramique khmère : en terre cuite et en grès, avec ou sans glaçure. Les raisons pour lesquelles nous avons opté pour un premier numéro à thème, et choisi le thème de la céramique, sont relativement complexes et liées à l'histoire du Cambodge, à celle des études khmères, mais aussi à l'histoire d'APSARA.

Au cours des années 1995 et 1996, des villageois de la plaine d'Angkor et des équipes de démineurs signalèrent aux autorités scientifiques œuvrant dans la région la présence d'un certain nombre de fours anciens. Ces sites sont pour la plupart localisés dans des endroits qui n'ont été que récemment repeuplés ou repris par le Gouvernement royal. Très vite ces découvertes ont débouché sur une incroyable augmentation de la quantité de céramique khmère ancienne en vente sur les marchés de Siem Reap. L'Autorité APSARA, qui venait de voir le jour, fut confrontée à l'urgence de mettre un frein à la vente et à l'exportation illégales de tels objets, ainsi qu'au pillage des sites de fours dont beaucoup de pièces provenaient. En même temps, la communauté d'archéologues internationaux travaillant à Angkor commença à s'intéresser aux sites en question. Le seul site de fours angkorien connu auparavant, dans les monts Kulên, n'avait jamais été étudié de manière systématique et ne redevint accessible qu'en 1999. Seuls des fours khmers de l'époque angkorienne mais situés dans la Thaïlande actuelle, et donc représentant une production provinciale, avait été étudiés jusque là. De surcroît, bien que la céramique angkorienne ait été et soit toujours mieux connue

que les fours qui l'ont produite, il n'existe pas de typologie affinée et sûre de cette production. Par ses recherches pionnières dans ce domaine, Bernard-Philippe Groslier a jeté les bases nécessaires à l'appréhension de la céramique pré-angkorienne, et plus particulièrement angkorienne. D'après les résultats des fouilles menées dans les années '50 et '60, Groslier a établi une chronologie générale des formes et des glaçures ; combinant recherches archéologiques et ethnologiques, il formula, en outre, des hypothèses quant à l'emploi des différents types de récipients. Groslier a aussi entrepris les premières analyses approfondies des possibles influences extérieures —surtout indiennes et chinoises— sur les techniques de production de la céramique khmère, ainsi que sur ses formes et ses glaçures. Le travail de Groslier est resté toutefois inachevé, la guerre l'empêchant, comme pour d'autres chercheurs, de poursuivre le travail de terrain nécessaire à l'avancement ou à la confirmation des hypothèses.

Une typologie solide de la céramique khmère, particulièrement si elle est associée à des périodes et des lieux de production, constituerait un outil archéologique précieux, permettant une datation relativement précise des couches stratigraphiques. Cette carence dans la connaissance de la céramique a longtemps fait obstacle à un certain approfondissement de nos connaissances de l'évolution de la civilisation khmère. La recherche sur ces objets quotidiens utilisés dans et autour des temples, palais, maisons et lieux de travail promet aussi d'apporter des données importantes sur les rituels, les modes de vie, les industries et les structures sociales du Cambodge ancien. La découverte des sites de fours dans la région d'Angkor a ouvert la possibilité de relancer sérieusement la recherche ; le marché florissant de la céramique ancienne et, lié à cela, le pillage des sites de fours nous a obligés à en saisir l'occasion rapidement —tout retard signifiant une perte irréparable.

En 1996, APSARA a commencé à formuler et à mettre en œuvre un programme associant recherche et protection de la céramique et des sites de fours découverts sur la plaine. Dès le début nous avons cherché à traiter la recherche et la protection comme un ensemble indissociable du développement durable des communautés concernées. APSARA s'est engagé à instaurer des relations solides et à long terme avec les individus et communautés qui constituent le tissu vivant de la région. Bien qu'il n'y ait pas de solutions faciles dans le domaine du développement, à chaque étape de la conception et de la mise en œuvre de ses activités de recherche et de protection, le Département de la Culture et des Monuments garde constamment à l'esprit ces préoccupations. La partie protection de ce programme comprend plusieurs volets. Des campagnes d'information sur la nécessité de protéger le patrimoine culturel ont été organisées aux niveaux local, provincial et national. Des brochures présentant les problèmes et les réglementations de protection en vigueur ont été publiées en khmer, anglais et japonais. En 1999, le Gouvernement royal a déposé auprès du gouvernement américain une requête officielle portant sur le contrôle de l'importation des objets culturels en danger. La céramique ancienne est l'un des trois types d'objets pour lesquels des restrictions ont été demandées. Parallèlement, un certain nombre de programmes de développement communautaire ont été lancés dans les régions où sont situés les fours. Si ces efforts se sont avérés insuffisants pour arrêter le trafic de la céramique ancienne et le pillage des fours, particulièrement dans les Phnom Kulên où ont eu lieu récemment encore de terribles destructions, ils ont pourtant eu une influence indéniablement positive sur la situation. La céramique ancienne ne se vend plus ouvertement sur les marchés de Siem Reap, les sites sélectionnés pour entamer la recherche ne sont plus pillés et sont donc sauvés pour les chercheurs comme pour les habitants des lieux.

Nous avons conçu des programmes de recherche et de formation sur le terrain en collaboration avec deux équipes archéologiques japonaises : la *Sophia University International Angkor Mission* et le *Nara National Cultural Properties Research Institute*. Les résultats préliminaires des travaux en cours, concentrés sur les fours du village de Tani, paraissent dans le présent volume. L'impact de ces travaux de recherche sur

la protection du patrimoine culturel sont évidents dans le cas du village de Tani. Le Département de la Culture et des Monuments a dès le début favorisé l'établissement de relations personnelles avec les autorités laïques et religieuses, et un grand nombre de villageois résidant dans les environs immédiats ont été employés à diverses tâches associées à la recherche : de la construction et la maintenance des ponts au déblayage des sites et à l'assistance lors des fouilles. Plus d'une douzaine d'étudiants khmers en archéologie ont jusqu'ici bénéficié d'une formation continue sur le site auprès des experts japonais. En même temps qu'ils acquièrent des compétences techniques, ces jeunes voient leurs connaissances de la céramique et des fours khmers se développer, et se familiarisent avec les multiples enjeux qu'implique la protection de cette composante finalement peu spectaculaire de l'héritage angkorien. Toutefois, comme nous l'avons déjà signalé, les efforts ne doivent pas s'arrêter là. En contradiction avec les réglementations de zonage en vigueur, la présence militaire dans le Parc archéologique reste toujours de mise. Les restrictions à l'importation de la céramique khmère n'ont toujours pas été accordées par le gouvernement américain. De nombreuses collections de céramique khmère récemment constituées dans des musées privés japonais montrent que le Japon, comme beaucoup d'autres pays, continue à représenter un marché florissant pour cet art angkorien... Proposant un espace pour la réflexion et l'échange, sans perdre de vue les problèmes complexes dont le pillage est un triste symptôme, ce numéro sur la céramique khmère constitue un élément important des efforts soutenus pour faire mieux connaître cet aspect du patrimoine khmer en vue d'assurer sa protection.

En même temps, la céramique khmère constitue l'un des domaines les plus prometteurs des études khmères pour les années à venir. Ceci est dû en partie à des facteurs contingents, la fin de la guerre, avec son héritage de pauvreté rurale et autres formes d'injustice, ou la découverte fortuite des fours par un fermier ou le bulldozer d'une agence de développement. Toutefois, si nous l'envisageons dans le contexte de l'histoire des études khmères, le niveau des activités présentes autour de la céramique, est sans précédent et lourd de signification. Pendant plus d'un siècle les chercheurs et les conservateurs travaillant au Cambodge se sont consacrés au patrimoine khmer tangible se trouvant *à la surface* : les pierres et briques des temples, avec leurs sculptures et leurs inscriptions. Il était moins urgent de fouiller *sous la surface*. Il y a toujours eu plus d'architectes que d'archéologues au Cambodge. Le travail est certes loin d'être achevé, mais l'un des objectifs premiers des études khmères est atteint grâce aux efforts concertés de générations successives de spécialistes : les grandes lignes de l'histoire du pouvoir royal dans l'ancien Cambodge sont déjà bien tracées. En ce sens aussi nous sommes à l'aube d'une ère nouvelle dans les études khmères. À l'avenir la recherche tendra nécessairement à l'interdisciplinarité : iconographie, archéologie, épigraphie seront croisées avec l'ethnographie et les études du folklore par exemple. Les données obtenues sur une période de l'histoire khmère serviront à en éclairer d'autres. L'intérêt actuel porté à la céramique illustre parfaitement ces développements. Plutôt que l'histoire officielle composée par les monarques en vers khmer et sanscrit, inscrits sur les piédroits et les stèles des temples, la céramique nous raconte une histoire parallèle, mais autre. C'est cette histoire fondée notamment sur les activités quotidiennes des gens ordinaires, que le présent numéro d'*Udaya* commence à raconter.

La nature concrète et focalisée du sujet constitue une autre raison motivant notre décision de nous concentrer sur la céramique khmère. Angkor est un site complexe et gigantesque, riche d'un patrimoine culturel irremplaçable, tangible et intangible, mais qui encourt des risques sans précédent au moment où l'insuffisance des efforts de développement d'après-guerre rencontre la croissance des marchés internationaux de l'art et du tourisme de masse. Pour répondre à la nécessité de préserver un tel site, nous cherchons à mettre en œuvre des projets relativement modestes, mais inscrits dans une large vision de

l'avenir d'Angkor. Nous croyons que tout plan d'action ne peut être efficace que s'il est fondé sur une connaissance intime du terrain —le peuple, les pierres et la terre d'Angkor— acquise à travers la recherche fondamentale et la mise en œuvre directe des projets. Les objectifs sont ambitieux, mais l'approche est, croyons-nous, pragmatique.

A un niveau plus symbolique ou métaphorique, la céramique nous apparaît comme un point de départ pertinent. La poterie concerne la terre et les gens. La tâche du potier, comme celle de l'archéologue —travailler la terre et lui donner du sens— constitue une sorte de modèle pour *Udaya*. Ce n'est pas une revue d'archéologie. Et pourtant nous sommes convaincus de la nécessité de ce geste : s'agenouiller pour creuser de ses propres mains dans les profondeurs de la culture cambodgienne.

Continuité et Rupture

Un certain nombre de questions soulevées par l'étude de la céramique au Cambodge renvoient à des problématiques constitutives des études khmères en général ; en effet, ces questions s'étendent bien au-delà de leur contexte spécifique pour toucher toute étude des chemins de la culture, de ses modes de production. Sur quels critères peut-on se fonder pour parler de continuité de la tradition à travers le temps ? Où, quand et pourquoi décelons-nous une rupture ? Dans quel sens l'Empire angkorien représente-t-il une anomalie dans l'histoire et la culture khmères ? Et dans quelle mesure peut-on considérer Angkor comme l'apogée d'une culture qui a précédé et suivi l'Empire ? Dans le domaine de la céramique khmère, c'est souvent en rapport avec des distinctions de nature historique et culturelle établies entre la production en terre cuite et celle en grès que ces problématiques sont soulevées. Les chercheurs comme les amateurs ont souvent tendance à voir dans la production contemporaine de poterie en terre cuite une tradition ininterrompue depuis des temps préhistoriques. D'un autre côté, on interprète l'apparition de poteries glaçurées au début de la période angkorienne, et sa disparition à la chute de l'Empire, comme la marque d'une rupture radicale avec la tradition, rupture parce qu'il n'y a ni antécédent ni postérité, à l'instar d'autres innovations angkoriennes telles que les barays.

Prises dans leur ensemble, les contributions rassemblées dans ce numéro d'*Udaya* problématisent toute approche de la tradition de la céramique cambodgienne s'appuyant sur une opposition simple entre continuité et rupture. Louise Cort et Leedom Lefferts soulignent l'existence d'une technique de production contemporaine de poterie en terre cuite qu'ils considèrent comme spécifiquement "khmère", et résultant d'une longue tradition. Pourtant, ces auteurs se gardent bien de déduire de toute technique de production observable au Cambodge de nos jours une quelconque technique ancienne, remarquant, par exemple, que la ressemblance entre les outils de fabrication de poterie pré-historiques et modernes trouvés dans la région ne constituent pas en elles-mêmes la preuve que ces outils ont été de tous temps utilisés de la même manière. Le travail archéologique de Miriam Stark sur le site méridional d'Angkor Borei nourrit ces réflexions sur les traditions régionales de production de poterie en terre cuite. Analysant la diversité et l'évolution des assemblages de céramiques de la préhistoire aux temps historiques, Stark ouvre une autre dimension du champ d'étude. Elle signale que les importations ou l'influence extérieure peuvent avoir joué un rôle crucial dans la production d'objets en terre cuite aux périodes pré-historiques et pré-angkoriennes. Nous devons donc tenir compte du fait que l'originalité des innovations indigènes ne consistait pas en inventions ou créations ex nihilo, mais précisément en réutilisation et réinterprétation de formes et techniques empruntées. La pureté de l'origine est par là même irrémédiablement compromise. Les assemblages de céramiques d'Angkor Borei témoignent de l'importance des échanges commerciaux dans la

formation des premières unités politiques de la région, notamment à Angkor Borei, centre de commerce lié aux ports maritimes par un système extensif de canaux. Les changements de formes, accompagnés ou non de modifications des modes de production, acquièrent une importance considérable dans l'évaluation de l'évolution culturelle et sociale de ce temps. Néanmoins les ressemblances entre les productions anciennes et moderne d'objets en terre cuite sont telles que, dans son étude méticuleuse de la céramique khmère trouvée au Palais royal d'Angkor Thom, Marc Franiatte peut se référer aux formes modernes pour déduire celles auxquelles des fragments provenant du Palais royal auraient pu appartenir. Dans sa présentation de la céramique angkorienne, Dawn Rooney rappelle que certains ustensiles khmers semblent imiter des récipients indiens ou chinois ; d'autres, toutefois, ne trouvent pas de modèle au-delà des frontières de l'Empire. Les formes des tuiles et les techniques de construction des voûtes angkoriennes ont certes pu se développer d'après des modèles étrangers, mais Jacques Dumarçay démontre que certains détails de leur évolution ont correspondu à l'évolution de l'architecture khmère en tant que telle. Malgré une remarquable homogénéité dans la forme des tuiles et la technique de construction des voûtes, une analyse approfondie montre que les expériences acquises et les innovations intervenues dans la construction au cours de la période angkorienne ont apporté certaines modifications aux formes de la céramique architecturale. Marc Franiatte met en doute la pertinence d'une démarche qui consisterait à opérer, à partir d'une simple observation macroscopique, une distinction nette entre grès et terre cuite. Selon cet auteur, la variation de température dans un même four a pu produire dans certains cas des objets hybrides, composés à la fois de terre cuite et de grès. Franiatte rappelle de plus que les récipients en terre cuite et en grès de forme identique peuvent avoir eu des usages différents. La continuité selon un critère (la forme) n'exclut pas la rupture selon un autre (la fonction). Les analyses de la collection du Palais royal conduisent l'auteur à remettre en cause la hiérarchisation généralement admise entre ces types d'objets, selon laquelle les terres cuites sont assignées à un rôle domestique, tandis que les grès, particulièrement ceux avec glaçures, sont principalement associés à l'emploi rituel. L'auteur note l'existence sur quelques grès angkoriens d'un décor incisé caractéristique des terres cuites de la même époque. Suggérant que le grès a pu connaître dans le contexte domestique angkorien un usage plus extensif qu'on ne l'a imaginé jusqu'ici, ces découvertes remettent en question de telles divisions hiérarchiques. C'est pourtant la découverte de certaines terres cuites qui s'est révélée la plus surprenante : l'existence de piédestaux de récipients en terre cuite décorée, déterrés du site du Palais royal, suggère que la terre cuite elle-même a été parfois utilisée à des fins rituelles dans le contexte royal angkorien. Dans la même veine, l'examen par Ea Darith de la production des différents fours angkoriens récemment découverts confirme que la cruche employée couramment au Cambodge moderne, appelé *k-am* de nos jours —ou bien un récipient fortement ressemblant— était aussi produit en grès glaçuré à l'époque angkorienne. On ne peut toutefois toujours pas déterminer si la fonction de cette version "de luxe" de la fameuse cruche correspond à celle de son équivalent ancien ou contemporain en terre cuite.

Les informations et les résultats des analyses provenant de ces nouvelles recherches sur la céramique khmère suggèrent que la rupture, indubitablement reflétée par l'apparition d'objets en grès, fut néanmoins atténuée considérablement par des formes de continuité culturelle. Le paradigme analytique selon lequel l'influence exogène s'oppose mécaniquement à la création indigène est ainsi lui aussi remis en question. Cette opposition binaire, comme celle qui concerne la continuité et la rupture, s'est longtemps posée comme cadre rigide de débats dans la recherche sur la culture cambodgienne. Mais c'est plutôt l'échange entre les deux pôles de la dichotomie qui commence à se révéler ici, comme une traduction réussie dans laquelle les expressions étrangères prennent une forme indigène et dont le succès dépend de l'accueil des récepteurs. L'étude anthropologique de Louise Cort et Leedom Lefferts sur la production de poterie en terre cuite relève de frappantes ressemblances entre des régions distantes sur le plan géographique mais peut-être

liées historiquement. En examinant les techniques de production utilisées chez les différentes diasporas, les auteurs démontrent l'existence d'une tradition "indigène" khmère localisée sur plusieurs aires, que seuls les goûts et les demandes, reflétés par les formes et les décors des objets, viennent parfois dissimuler.

Dans leur étude sur la section céramique de la Faculté des Arts Plastiques de Phnom Penh, Ingrid Muan et Ly Daravuth soulèvent des questions semblables mais dans un contexte plutôt contemporain, celui de la promotion des arts indigènes par le Protectorat, et des conséquences de cette initiative telle qu'elle a été réappropriée et reformulée par les autorités et les artistes khmers de nos jours. Pourquoi et comment une puissance étrangère a-t-elle voulu réanimer ce qu'elle percevait comme une culture mourante sinon morte ? Comment les efforts du Protectorat pour s'assurer de l'authenticité de la production artistique cambodgienne ont-ils pu contribuer à une certaine idéalisation, rigidification ou hiérarchisation des arts cambodgiens ? Et dans quelle mesure la tradition khmère, avant et pendant la rencontre avec le Protectorat, a-t-elle pu elle-même incorporer de pareilles structures ? La céramique dérange les distinctions habituellement opérées par les institutions culturelles entre "artisanat" et "art". Dans le contexte de l'histoire de l'art angkorien, la céramique en grès est considérée au mieux comme un art mineur, mais en même temps comme un instrument utile pour la recherche ethnologique ; à un niveau plus général, la céramique angkorienne, par opposition à la production "artisanale" en terre cuite, acquiert une valeur artistique. Cette position en quelque sorte mitoyenne de la céramique angkorienne est relevée dans l'introduction de nombreux articles publiés ici. Dawn Rooney commence par rappeler le manque d'attention porté à la céramique angkorienne par rapport aux productions qui lui sont contemporaines en architecture et en sculpture. Louise Cort et Leedom Lefferts, d'un autre côté, remarquent les lacunes en ce qui concerne la recherche sur la production en terre cuite par rapport aux grès angkoriens. En tant que forme d'expression culturelle dont la fonction semble l'emporter sur l'esthétique, ou dont la valeur provient de l'harmonie des deux, la céramique remet en cause toute définition rigide de l'art. Quelques auteurs rappellent ici que le décor en relief des récipients en terre cuite trouve ses origines dans des fins utilitaires. La texture en léger relief des décors incisés, qui, sur le plan pratique, rend le pot mouillé moins glissant, participe aussi à la valeur esthétique de l'objet, et peut être, au fil du temps, affinée, embellie, variée, pour augmenter cette valeur "secondaire", jusqu'à éclipser la raison d'être supposée "initiale" de tels décors. Marc Franiatte note que, même pour la céramique angkorienne, l'évolution de la décoration apparaît comme indissociable des critères techniques et morphologiques, de telle sorte que les analyses stylistiques devraient prendre tous ces éléments en compte en tant qu'ensemble, et en conjonction avec l'information stratigraphique. Dans ce contexte, la production et l'enseignement contemporain de l'art et de l'artisanat dans la capitale incitent à repenser des questions sur les relations avec le passé, représenté à la fois par l'art angkorien et par les traditions villageoises considérées comme renfermant une sorte d'authenticité inchangée. Si l'art angkorien, et plus particulièrement la production en grès avec glaçures, a signifié une rupture ou une anomalie dans la tradition, les artistes et artisans actuels tirent parti de cette gloire passée dans de nombreuses formes d'expression plastique. Et si la production en terre cuite n'est pas considérée comme un art, certains objets en terre cuite, notamment la cruche appelée *k-am*, jouissent d'un rôle iconographique majeur dans la représentation phnompenhoise contemporaine de la vie rurale. En ce sens, l'"intérieur" et l'"extérieur" ne se définissent pas seulement selon les frontières nationales ou culturelles ; au dedans nous retrouvons également un dehors ; des influences proviennent d'Angkor, du village, de la capitale ou de l'étranger... pour former un système complexe d'échanges culturels qui sont au cœur même de ce qu'on appelle, après coup en quelque sorte, la culture.

Ces phénomènes d'échanges originels ne sont bien évidemment pas nouveaux et constituent une des raisons pour lesquelles nos perceptions trop souvent monolithiques d'"Angkor", du "Protectorat" ou de

"Phnom Penh aujourd'hui" nécessitent réinterprétation et affinement. Dans sa présentation des fours actuellement connus dans la région d'Angkor, Ea Darith commence à dégager de telles nuances. Dans la seule circonscription temporelle et spatiale d'Angkor, les différents fours ont connu des usages variés, produisant des récipients et autres objets d'une grande variété de taille, forme et décor, tous partageant néanmoins des traits distinctifs de l'art angkorien. L'influence des autorités centrales sur tous les aspects de la production à Angkor a été sans doute considérable, la référence au modèle dominant étant inévitable. Mais dans cette zone de production qui, à l'évidence, répondait à des demandes fortement centralisées, Ea Darith nous invite à distinguer un site d'un autre, de sorte que nous commençons à pouvoir nous représenter les individus et les villages au travail.

Dans ce numéro

Ce numéro s'ouvre sur le point de départ d'APSARA pour cette exploration de la céramique khmère : les fours nouvellement découverts à Angkor. Dans un article relatant les résultats préliminaires d'une recherche entreprise par une équipe japonaise en collaboration avec APSARA, Ea Darith étudie cinq sites, dans des villages de la plaine (Tani, Khnar Po, Bakaong) et dans les Phnom Kulên (Saser et Anlong Thom). On trouvera également dans le présent volume des informations complémentaires dans les rapports de l'Université de Sophia et de l'équipe de Nara. Ea Darith fournit une description de chaque site, y compris l'emplacement et la morphologie générale des fours pour autant que cette dernière puisse être déterminée à partir d'un examen de surface. L'auteur présente ensuite les différents types d'objets découverts sur le site, avec description des tailles, des formes et des glaçures. Il présente des analyses détaillées sur le site de Tani, où il a récemment participé à des campagnes de fouilles. Formes et techniques de cuisson à Tani sont comparées à celles des fours khmers fouillés en Thaïlande dans les années '70-'80. Sont aussi attentivement examinés les types d'argile utilisés pour les différents objets découverts sur le site de Tani.

Cette analyse de la production angkorienne est suivie d'une étude de Louise Cort et Leedom Lefferts sur la production contemporaine des récipients en terre cuite dans trois régions distinctes : au Cambodge, au Kampuchea Krom (Sud Vietnam) et dans le Nord-Est de la Thaïlande. Ce deuxième article fondé sur des analyses comparatives approfondies, ne représente qu'un élément d'une étude plus étendue de la production de céramique en Asie du Sud-Est continentale. Ainsi les techniques utilisées dans les trois lieux sont comparées à d'autres techniques employées dans la région. En examinant minutieusement les procédés de fabrication, Cort et Lefferts démontrent que les gestes des artisans et les formes générales des objets peuvent révéler des liens historiques entre des peuples aujourd'hui séparés par des frontières politiques et des différences culturelles importantes.

Dans le troisième article, Miriam Stark nous ramène au temps d'Angkor Borei, site préhistorique et pré-angkorien d'une importance particulière. Stark place sa recherche dans une large étude politico-historique sur la genèse des Etats du Sud-Est Asiatique, passant en revue la littérature existante sur le sujet, surtout celle concernant le Delta du Mékong. Comparant les matériaux collectés au cours des récentes fouilles et études de terrain menées par une équipe de l'Université de Hawaï qu'elle a elle-même supervisées, avec des objets pillés mais intacts conservés dans un nouveau musée créé sur le site, ainsi qu'avec des pièces de céramique découvertes dans d'autres secteurs du Delta du Mékong, l'auteur propose un nouvel éclairage sur la production primitive de céramique dans cette région. Stark établit une typologie de base des objets d'Angkor Borei, discernant des assemblages distincts correspondant à trois périodes d'occupation générale du site, de 400 av. J.-C. à 300-600 apr. J.-C. Cette étude représente une phase d'un travail de recherche

continu à Angkor Borei, qui inclut des analyses de ces assemblages basées sur leurs caractéristiques physiques et les technologies de leur fabrication, et qui vise notamment à développer nos connaissances de la production locale et des réseaux d'échange régionaux.

L'article suivant de Marc Franiatte offre les premiers éléments d'une étude approfondie en cours de la céramique khmère découverte ces dernières années sur le site du Palais royal d'Angkor Thom par une équipe archéologique de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, sous la direction de Jacques Gaucher. L'objectif de l'auteur est de développer une typologie détaillée de cette collection d'une importance singulière provenant d'un site occupé depuis au moins le Xe siècle et jusqu'à la période moyenne. L'auteur fournit les premiers éléments d'une typologie, mais aussi une explication de la méthodologie extrêmement rigoureuse mise en place par l'équipe au cours et en vue de l'établissement de cette typologie. Reprenant les analyses techniques en tenant compte de la composition de la pâte, des glaçures et autres enduits, du modelage et de la cuisson, ainsi que des analyses de la morphologie et du décor, le travail minutieux de Franiatte sur un corpus très riche en fragments lui permet d'entrevoir une vision globale de la production de céramique angkorienne telle qu'elle se manifeste sur le site du Palais royal. Prévoyant l'association future de la typologie avec les données stratigraphiques et archéologiques afin de déterminer les phases d'occupation du site, et de révéler ainsi l'utilisation de l'espace autour du Palais ainsi que son évolution, cet article représente la première étape d'un effort soutenu vers une interprétation de la céramique angkorienne en étroite association avec un contexte archéologique spécifique.

Jacques Dumarçay puise dans ses décennies de travaux de recherche et de restauration à Angkor pour offrir une présentation concise de l'évolution des tuiles angkoriennes en céramique du XI^e au XVI^e siècle. Son approche architecturale associe la forme et la fonction dans le contexte de l'évolution des structures des palais et temples angkoriens.

Ensuite, c'est Dawn Rooney qui entreprend une autre sorte d'étude des relations entre forme et fonction dans la céramique angkorienne, mais envisagées du point de vue de l'histoire, de l'histoire de l'art et de l'ethnologie. L'auteur présente d'abord les sources scientifiques disponibles à ce jour sur la céramique khmère, avec des informations détaillées sur les recherches effectuées ces dernières décennies sur les sites khmers en Thaïlande. Dans le corps de son article, Dawn Rooney rassemble un large éventail de données sur la société et la culture khmères, tant sur le passé que sur le présent, pour construire des hypothèses sur les diverses fonctions de la céramique à l'époque angkorienne. Elle prend en compte trois espaces d'occupation majeurs dans la société angkorienne : le temple, le palais et le village, en prêtant une attention particulière à des objets en céramique que les anciens Khmers auraient pu employer dans les rites de passage.

La présentation d'Ingrid Muan et Ly Daravuth sur la section céramique de la Faculté des Arts Plastiques de l'Université Royale des Beaux-Arts de Phnom Penh clôt la série d'articles inédits de cette première partie. Examinant l'histoire des perspectives modernes sur la céramique angkorienne, cet article pose la question de l'héritage laissé à la fois par le Protectorat français et par Angkor dans la production contemporaine. Un certain travail de réinscription du passé apparaît ici fermement ancré dans le présent. Et pourtant c'est l'aspect dynamique de la tradition plutôt qu'un quelconque statisme qui est souligné. Les auteurs rappellent que la renaissance de l'Université et des ateliers de production associés est en grande partie due à l'initiative d'un seul artiste soucieux de renouer avec la tradition tout en innovant. A travers cet hommage, nous apercevons la recherche contemporaine d'un équilibre à atteindre dans la production artistique khmère, voire une interaction, entre la signature personnelle et la création collective, entre l'innovation et la répétition.

Une série de rapports de terrain sur les pièces de céramique découvertes par les équipes archéologiques travaillant actuellement à Angkor constitue la seconde section de la revue. A différentes

étapes du travail de terrain et selon ses perspectives culturelles et historiques propres, chaque équipe offre des informations de différentes sortes sur ses recherches et sur le sujet en question. Naho Shimizu de la *Japanese Government Team for Safeguarding Angkor* rapporte les résultats des fouilles menées au cours de la restauration de la "bibliothèque" nord du Bayon. En analysant l'information stratigraphique, ainsi que des fragments de poterie khmère et non khmère, Shimizu parvient à une hypothèse de datation de la structure de la "bibliothèque". En l'absence d'une typologie solide de la céramique khmère, l'auteur construit ses hypothèses principalement à partir de la céramique chinoise, précisément datée. Ce travail comparatif contribue à son tour à la datation des pièces khmères trouvées lors de fouilles à la "bibliothèque". Le *Nara National Cultural Properties Institute* du Japon et l'Autorité APSARA rapportent ensemble les résultats de l'étude topographique menée sur le site des fours de Tani, situé dans la plaine d'Angkor. Bien que ce travail préliminaire ait depuis été suivi de prospections géophysiques et de fouilles de certains fours du même site, l'équipe a choisi de présenter ici les méthodes et les découvertes de l'étude topographique car celle-ci a posé les fondements d'une appréhension générale du site et des choix conséquents du travail archéologique ultérieur. Ce rapport inclut aussi la présentation d'une brève investigation sur le site de fours de Thnal Mrec, près du village d'Anlong Thom dans les Phnom Kulên. Des travaux archéologiques effectués sur le site de Tani sont relatés par la Mission Internationale d'Angkor de l'Université de Sophia, Japon. Cette équipe présente les travaux de fouilles de l'un des fours, et nous en explique la méthodologie. Nous sommes également renseignés sur la structure et les techniques de cuisson du four mis à jour. Chhan Chamroen de l'équipe du *World Monuments Fund* fait un rapport sur les fragments de céramique exhumés au cours des fouilles effectuées ces dernières années dans le vaste complexe de Preah Khan à Angkor. Cette section se termine par un rapport rédigé par la dernière équipe à avoir rejoint la communauté scientifique à Angkor : la *Chinese Government Team for Safeguarding Angkor*. Avant d'inaugurer les travaux de restauration du temple de Chau Say Tevoda, l'équipe a entrepris fouilles et études archéologiques. Premier rapport publié par cette équipe, il dépasse le cadre des seules découvertes de céramique, pour inclure la présentation d'autres objets, dont certains en pierre, trouvés pendant la campagne archéologique.

Traduire l'"Introduction" de Groslier

Une traduction khmère de l'article fondamental de Bernard-Philippe Groslier sur la céramique khmère conclut la première section de ce premier numéro d'*Udaya*. Cet écrit paru pour la première fois en traduction anglaise comme Introduction au catalogue d'une exposition de céramique khmère organisée à Singapour en 1981¹. En 1995, presque une décennie après la mort de l'auteur, le journal *Péninsule* en a publié une version française fondée sur un texte manuscrit français non publié qui semble être la pré-version de l'Introduction anglaise, complétant ainsi celle-ci par des additions retraduites de la version anglaise publiée². Les notes de cette version font référence à des conférences données par Groslier sur ce thème, au Cambodge et en France, ainsi qu'à d'autres publications de l'auteur se rapportant à la céramique. La traduction khmère publiée ici est faite à partir de la version anglaise afin, entre autres, de simplifier le

¹ Bernard-Philippe Groslier, "Introduction to the Ceramic Wares of Angkor," in D. Stock, ed., *Khmer Ceramics 9th—14th Century*, Singapore, 1981: 9-39.

² Bernard-Philippe Groslier, "Introduction à la céramique angkorienne (fin IXe-début XVe s.)," *Péninsule* 31, Metz, 1995: 5-60.

dispositif éditorial. Toutefois la version française a servi de repère pour certains passages peu clairs. Si l'article de Groslier peut sous certains aspects paraître dépassé, c'est précisément à cause des progrès réalisés dans le champ de la céramique khmère, grâce à une dynamique de recherche dont l'"Introduction" est en grande partie le moteur. Son importance toujours d'actualité est prouvée par le fait qu'elle est citée dans la quasi-totalité des articles contenus dans ce numéro d'*Udaya*.

Les nombreuses difficultés rencontrées lors de la traduction sont à la fois typiques des problèmes posés par la traduction en général et spécifiquement liés au thème, ainsi qu'au contexte socio-culturel actuel du Cambodge. On dit souvent que le khmer dispose d'une terminologie abondante et précise dans les domaines "traditionnels", alors que son stock de termes génériques ou théoriques est relativement limité. Le mot "céramique" en est un bon exemple. Comme il n'y a pas de terme khmer pour regrouper les différents types d'objets en céramique, le mot *kulālabhāj(n)*, composé pali signifiant littéralement "récipient (en) argile", a été récemment créé pour rendre le français "céramique" et son équivalent anglais. Bien que généralement employé par les chercheurs khmers comme équivalent de "céramique", *kulālabhāj(n)* désigne dans son sens stricte, étymologique, des récipients, par conséquent ne couvre pas l'étendue du terme utilisé en français et anglais pour désigner un ensemble d'objets khmers incluant les figurines et les accessoires architecturaux (tuiles, décors appliqués, épis de faîtage ou autres objets utilitaires tels fourneaux, poids de métiers à tisser ou de filets de pêche). Nous avons choisi, non sans réticence, de nous conformer à l'usage actuel en utilisant le néologisme pali, ajoutant des périphrases d'explication quand il y a nécessité. On trouve le contre exemple de ce problème dans le terme français "jarre". Pour la vaste gamme d'objets désignés sous "jarre", Groslier donne souvent des spécifications selon l'usage présumé : jarre à eau, jarre à alcool, etc... Le khmer, de son côté, dispose d'une multiplicité de termes pour désigner ce type de récipient : *kraḷa*, *bāri*, *udin*, etc., chaque terme désignant une forme associée à une fonction. Lorsque Groslier utilise le terme "jarre" sans autre précision, la traduction khmère a été déterminée, lorsque c'était possible, par les illustrations accompagnant le texte ; en l'absence d'un tel support graphique permettant de compenser les lacunes du vocabulaire anglais (ou français), la traduction n'a pu se faire qu'en se référant à des indices contextuels souvent insuffisants.

Mais les vraies difficultés se situent au delà des limites lexicales d'une langue comme d'une autre. Un signifiant "manquant" peut être rendu par une phrase descriptive. Plus problématiques sont les divergences de l'ordre du signifié, dans les systèmes d'interprétation des sens et significations. Ce que Groslier identifie comme rouge foncé, par exemple, paraît à l'œil khmer plutôt comme *tnot*, mot habituellement traduit en français par brun. Toutefois, ne disposant que du texte de Groslier et des reproductions photographiques accompagnant celui-ci, nous avons choisi d'adhérer strictement à l'interprétation des couleurs donnée par l'auteur. Les références culturelles jouent un rôle important dans ce type de description "subjective". Puisqu'une traduction littérale de "*Venetian red*", par exemple, ne serait pas comprise par la majorité des lecteurs khmers, nous avons opté à la place pour *krahām jāṃ*, "rouge (marron) foncé". D'un autre côté, le terme "lie de vin", introduit par Groslier pour décrire la couleur d'une glaçure angkorienne particulière, a été adopté par les chercheurs en céramique khmère depuis la fameuse Introduction, quelles que soient les expériences culturelles ou linguistiques de chacun. Pour cette raison, le terme est ici maintenu, accompagné d'une explication entre parenthèses à sa première apparition dans le texte. Céladon est de la même façon rendu par "céladon", étant donné l'usage universel de ce terme, nom de l'un des personnages d'un roman pastoral français du XVII^e siècle, probablement issu des *Métamorphoses* d'Ovide, à savoir une traduction khmer-anglais-français-latin du grec... "*Olive green*", pour donner un autre exemple de la tâche médiatrice du traducteur, a été ici rendu par la "couleur de *mteñ*", qui se réfère à un fruit local dont la couleur —et le goût— rappellent l'olive verte.

L'identification des formes présente de semblables difficultés. Groslier décrit un type de récipient en forme de poire. Étant donné que les poires, comme les olives, sont peut-être encore moins connues au Cambodge que ne l'est le vin, garder le terme "poire", ou "*pear*", dans le texte khmer n'aurait guère de sens. La forme en question a donc été décrite en khmer. Groslier fait aussi un usage fréquent de références intellectuelles et culturelles sophistiquées. La comparaison avec les cratères grecs ou la résine "*gutta percha*", les références à l'anthropologie structurale et à Levi-Strauss —termes expliqués et quelquefois maintenus dans la traduction— peuvent, par exemple, échapper à certains lecteurs. Mais cela participe en même temps d'un autre défi d'*Udaya* : élargir l'horizon de la réflexion au-delà d'Angkor, et au-delà du Cambodge, précisément en approfondissant la culture khmère. Au lieu de voir dans ces écarts linguistiques une source de frustration, nous espérons que les lecteurs pourront en tirer profit, dans la mesure où les questions soulevées par la traduction, soulignent les richesses des différences culturelles. En cela nous pensons rendre hommage à la remarquable contribution de Groslier aux études khmères, combinant comme il l'a fait forte implication personnelle, longue expérience sur le terrain, attention soutenue aux détails et grande liberté intellectuelle.

Évoquons enfin l'intéressante problématique de la "traduction" de l'ancien khmer en khmer moderne. Puisque de nombreuses formes de céramique angkorienne ressemblent aux formes contemporaines, les Khmers de nos jours nomment ces objets anciens selon la terminologie moderne. Ceci signifie que les descriptions parfois longues de Groslier sur la forme d'un objet peuvent dans de nombreux cas être rendues par un seul mot khmer. Bien que cela facilite pour un lecteur khmer l'appréhension immédiate de la forme de l'objet en question, cela n'encourage pas la même sorte de réflexion sur le modelage que celle qui est à l'œuvre dans le passage en anglais ou en français. Le mot khmer apporterait de plus des connotations immédiates sur la fonction à l'époque ancienne, connotations souvent mais pas toujours évoquées par Groslier. Un type de récipient appelé aujourd'hui *khuoch* est systématiquement perçu par les Khmers d'aujourd'hui comme fabriqué à l'époque ancienne alors qu'il est employé encore de nos jours dans certaines pratiques rituelles. On peut, dans le même ordre d'idée, citer l'exemple du *tanlāp*, un petit récipient aujourd'hui fait le plus souvent en bois, destiné à contenir de la cire souvent utilisée comme charme d'amour. Comme nous ne savons pas si les objets angkoriens étaient appelés *khuoc* et *tanlāp*, ou si l'usage contemporain perpétue une tradition ancienne, leur attribuer leur nom moderne pourrait ne pas être justifié. Mais ne pas le faire et traduire simplement la description de Groslier serait en quelque sorte artificiel. Dans ces situations, nous avons traduit les descriptions complètes et y avons adjoint la mention du nom khmer contemporain des objets en question.

N.B. Sauf indications contraires, toutes les illustrations accompagnant les articles et les rapports ont été fournies par les auteurs respectifs.