

IV. The genealogy and successors of Sivāchārya. Suppression of the great sacerdotal families by Sūryavarman I

Lawrence Palmer Briggs

Citer ce document / Cite this document :

Briggs Lawrence Palmer. IV. The genealogy and successors of Sivāchārya. Suppression of the great sacerdotal families by Sūryavarman I. In: Bulletin de l'Ecole française d'Extrême-Orient. Tome 46 N°1, 1952. pp. 177-185;

doi : <https://doi.org/10.3406/befeo.1952.5161>

https://www.persee.fr/doc/befeo_0336-1519_1952_num_46_1_5161

Fichier pdf généré le 08/02/2019

THE GENEALOGY AND SUCCESSORS OF ŚIVĀCHĀRYA

SUPPRESSION OF THE GREAT SACERDOTAL FAMILIES BY SŪRYAVARMAN I

by

Lawrence Palmer BRIGGS

The early kings of Cambodia were served by members of great sacerdotal families which had been granted hereditary — sometimes exclusive — rights to furnish certain functionaries. Thus, the family of Śivakaivalya had the exclusive right of furnishing purohitas of the Devarāja. The family of Pranavātman had the hereditary right to furnish royal hotars. The family of Haripūrā seems to have acquired a hereditary charge as priests of Jalangeśa and Kapāleśa⁽¹⁾ and of inspectors of qualities and defects⁽²⁾ on Hemaśringagiri (Phīmānākās).

The Identity of the Śivāchāryas of the Inscriptions of Sdōk Kāk Thom, Vat Thīpdēi B and Tà Kèv B.

Four inscriptions mention one or more functionaries named Śivāchārya who in one or another of these charges served various kings from Īśānavarman II (924-928) to Sūryavarman I (1002-1050). The inscription of Sdōk Kāk Thom⁽³⁾ (about 1052 A. D.) tells of a priest of that name, of the family of Śivakaivalya, who served as purohita under Jayavarman V (968-1001) and Sūryavarman I and perhaps also

⁽¹⁾ Kapāleśa means «Lord of the Skulls» = Śiva, who is often pictured with a necklace of skulls. Barth thinks Jalangeśa is a local name of Śiva (ISC, p. 112, n. 11).

⁽²⁾ The Inspector of Qualities and Defects seems to have presided at cremation ceremonies, in representation of Dharmarāja, Judge of the Dead. This ceremony was at first held at the Phīmānākās; later, apparently, on what is now called the «Terrace of the Leper King».

⁽³⁾ Louis Finot, «Notes d'Épigraphie : 16. L'inscription de Sdōk Kāk Thom», *Bulletin de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient* (hereafter cited as BEFEO), 1915, p. 53-106; G. Cœdès et P. Dupont «Les stèles de Sdōk Kāk Thom, etc.», BEFEO, 1943, p. 57-134.

under Udayādityavarman I (1001-1002) and Jayavīravarman (1002-1010)⁽¹⁾. The inscription of Vat Thīpdēi B, whose last date is 1005, but which must have been carved a few years later⁽²⁾, mentions a Śivāchārya, of the family of Pranavātman, who served as royal hotar under Jayavarman V and Sūryavarman I. An inscription of Tà Kèv (B)⁽³⁾, whose last date is 1007, says a Śivāchārya, of the house of Haripūrā, served as priest and judge under Jayavarman V and Sūryavarman I. And the inscription of Bantāy Kdēi⁽⁴⁾ (apparently of the reign of Rājendravarman II) mentions a Śivāchārya who served as hotar under Īśānavarman II, Jayavarman IV (921-942), Harshavarman II (942-944) and Rājendravarman II (944-968).

Georges Cœdès, who translated and edited the inscription of Vat Thīpdēi thought he could identify the Śivāchārya of that inscription with that of Sdōk Kāk Thom. The Śivāchārya of Sdōk Kāk Thom was grand nephew of Ātmaśiva, his predecessor as purohita⁽⁵⁾; that of Vat Thīpdēi was the nephew of the brothers Śāngkara and Nārāyana, who had served as hotar for Rājendravarman II and Jayavarman V, respectively. According to the inscription of Vat Thīpdēi, Śivāchārya succeeded Nārāyana some time during the reign of Jayavarman V. Cœdès has shown that, if the matrilineal descent is uterine, the corresponding members of the two families will be the same persons and he demonstrates the identity of the individuals by charting and numbering them. Variation from this rule of identity would be possible only in the case in which one of the lines recognized descent by consanguinean relationship. Assuming that the line of Vat Thīpdēi B recognized consanguinean relationship, Prof. Cœdès connects the two tables to show what seems to be the only possible way that two matrilineal lines (one consanguinean) can merge into one descendant. This table shows not only that Śivāchārya was the son of a daughter (x^2) of a sister (x^3) of Ātmaśiva of the inscription of Sdōk Kāk Thom but also the son of a sister (x^2) (consanguinean) of Śāngkara of the inscription of Vat Thīpdēi B⁽⁶⁾. This is in accordance with the statements of those two inscriptions, if we accept the system of consanguinean relationship for the inscription of Vat Thīpdēi. The mother (x^2) would be the same in both cases; but the grandmothers x^3 and x^3 are two wives of the same husband. Above these (x^3 and x^3) the two lines diverge.

Neither of the above-named inscriptions mentions Śivāchārya's father. The inscription of Tà Kèv B, which is not matrilineal like the other two, says Śivāchārya was the grandson of Paramāchārya⁽⁷⁾. Paramāchārya's son must have married Ātmaśiva's niece (x^2), for the inscription of Sdōk Kāk Thom says that Śivāchārya was son of a daughter of the sister of Ātmaśiva⁽⁸⁾. There seems to be no doubt of the identity of the Śivāchāryas of these three inscriptions. The accompanying table shows the merger of these three lines into Śivāchārya in the reign of Jayavarman V.

(1) George Cœdès, «Les deux inscriptions de Vat Thīpdēi», *Mélanges d'indianisme offert par ses élèves à M. Sylvain Lévi*, 1912, p. 213-229.

(2) The inscription of Vat Thīpdēi B praises Sūryavarman. Until late in 1006, that region was in the hands of Jayavīravarman. The inscription says that in 1005 some one — apparently Kritindrapandita — erected a high liṅga, formerly erected by Śikhaśiva. The inscription was evidently carved later, after the region had come into the hands of Sūryavarman I.

(3) Auguste Barth, «Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge» (hereafter *ISC*) : 15. Prea Kèv, *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres : Notices et Extraits de Manuscrits*, p. 97-117; G. Cœdès, «La date de Tà Kèv : III. Epigraphie», *BEFEO*, 1934, p. 417-427.

(4) Louis Finot, «Inscriptions d'Angkor : 6. Bantāy Kdēi», *BEFEO*, 1925, p. 354-363.

(5) Finot, «Inscription de SKT», p. 91.

(6) See accompanying chart. Also Cœdès, *op. cit.*, p. 217.

(7) Barth, *op. cit.*, B, st. 5-6.

(8) Finot, «SKT», p. 91.

The Isolation of Śivāchārya of the Inscription of Bantāy Kdēi.

Louis Finot, who edited the inscription of Bantāy Kdēi, questioned the identity of the Śivāchāryas of Vat Thīpdēi and Sdōk Kāk Thom. The inscription of Bantāy Kdēi says the Śivāchārya of that inscription was hotar of Īśānavarman (II), Jayavarman (IV), Harshavarman (II), and Rājendravarman (II)⁽¹⁾ and that his guru⁽²⁾ (who was apparently his predecessor) served under Indravarman and Yaśovarman. Finot identified this guru with Sikhāśiva of the family of Pranāvātman. This is very satisfactory; for the inscription of Vat Thīpdēi B says that Sikhāśiva had served Indravarman (I) and had been hotar for Yaśovarman (I) and does not mention another hotar of this family until the reign of Rājendravarman (II)⁽³⁾ Finot thought the Śivāchārya of Bantāy Kdēi was «evidently the same as that of the temple of Vat Thīpdēi»⁽⁴⁾ and that he therefore belonged to the family of Pranāvātman. He thought the Śivāchārya of Vat Thīpdēi could not have been identical with that of Sdōk Kāk Thom, because that would have made him hotar of kings from Īśānavarman II to Sūryavarman I, and would have given him a life of about 100 years⁽⁵⁾. In his recent work, Cœdès seems to have accepted this view of the matter and to have reversed his earlier opinion⁽⁶⁾. The writer thinks Professor Cœdès's former opinion is the correct one.

The writer believes there were two brahmins named Śivāchārya mentioned in the inscriptions of this period. One was hotar (Vat Thīpdēi B), priest and judge (Tà Kèb B) and purohita (Sdōk Kāk Thom) of kings from Jayavarman V to Sūryavarman I, as shown in the accompanying chart. The other, who served as hotar for kings from Īśānavarman II to Rājendravarman II (Bantāy Kdēi) can be completely dissociated not only from the Śivāchārya of the other three inscriptions but also from the family of Pranāvātman (Vat Thīpdēi). The reasons are as follows: 1. There seems to this writer to be no bar to the identity of the Śivāchāryas of Vat Thīpdēi B and Sdōk Kāk Thom. Those inscriptions say they served under the same kings. The objection on the ground of length of reign arises only when an attempt is made to identify the Śivāchārya of Bantāy Kdēi with any of the other three. 2. No inscription of which the writer has knowledge connects the Śivāchārya of Bantāy Kdēi with the house of Pranāvātman. The inscription of Bantāy Kdēi says he was hotar of Īśānavarman, Jayavarman, Harshavarman and Rājendravarman and praises his guru, who seems to have been his predecessor. Finot thought this guru was Sikhāśiva of the house of Pranāvātman, who the inscription of Vat Thīpdēi B says was hotar of Indravarman (I) and Yaśovarman (I). This is very probable, but Finot says on two occasions that this Śivāchārya was the grand-nephew of Sikhāśiva⁽⁷⁾, and for this statement this writer finds no justification.

(1) Finot, «Bantāy Kdēi», st. 34.

(2) *Ibid.*, st. 41, 42.

(3) Cœdès, «Vat Thīpdēi», st. 11-12.

(4) Finot, «Bantāy Kdēi», p. 354.

(5) *Ibid.*, p. 353.

(6) Cœdès, *Histoire ancienne des États hindouisés d'Extrême-Orient* (Hanoi, 1944), p. 148, n. 4. This note refers to BEFEO, 1925, p. 365 (*sic*, p. 355). *Ibid.*, p. 354, n. 3, refers to BEFEO, 1915, p. 54-55. Here Finot explains that the hypothesis of consanguinean relationship is not necessary to show the relationship given by the two different *vamśas*. The author of this article is unable to follow M. Finot's explanation.

(7) Finot, «Bantāy Kdēi», p. 355.

The family of Pranavātman had the hereditary right to furnish royal hotars, but it does not seem that this right was exclusive. 3. The inscription of Bantāy Kdēi says the Śivāchārya mentioned in that inscription was issue of a pure Vishnuite family which bore the name of Hrishikeśa and, consequently, not of the family of Pranavātman. He was a disciple of Sikhāśiva, but there seems to be no indication that they were related. 4. According to the inscription of Vat Thīpdēi B, Sikhāśiva's successors of the line of Pranavātman were his grand-nephews, Śāngkara and Nārāyana, who served respectively, under Rājendravarman II and Jayavarman V⁽¹⁾. 5. While not a member of the family of Pranavātman, the Śivāchārya of the inscription of Bantāy Kdēi seems to have filled a gap in that family between the Sikhāśiva of that inscription and that brahman's grand-nephews. This gap may have been due to the minority of these nephews, but, as will be seen presently, there may have been another reason for it. The successor of Nārāyana in the Pranavātman line, according to this inscription⁽²⁾, was his nephew Śivāchārya, who was hotar to Jayavarman V and Sūryavarman I and who was succeeded as hotar of this family by his nephew, Kirtīndrapaṇḍita, during the reign of the last-named monarch⁽³⁾. 6. If Finot's hypothesis of the identity of the Śivāchāryas of the inscriptions of Bantāy Kdēi and Bat Thīpdēi were true, Śivāchārya would have been the predecessor of the brothers Śāngkara and Nārāyana and, after a lapse of apparently 50 or 60 years, their successor.

It has been noted that there was a gap in the line of Pranavātman and it has been suggested that this may have been due to the minority of Sikhāśiv's grand-nephews, Śāngkara and Nārāyana. There may have been another reason. This gap extended from the reign of Īśānavarman II (925-928) to that of Rājendravarman II (944-968). It thus corresponded to the period when the usurper, Jayavarman IV and his son Harshavarman II, were reigning at Chok Gargyar. Perhaps the family of Pranavātman did not wish to serve under the usurper and his son. Thus the civil war of this period may have had a deeper significance than has generally been supposed. The family of Śivakaivalya, on the other hand, seem to have favored Jayavarman IV. Kūmarasvāmi, nephew of Vāmaśiva, served Harshavarman I and Īśānavarman II. Īśānamūrti, who served Jayavarman IV, was called grand-nephew of Vāmaśiva, and not nephew of Kūmarasvāmi, by the inscription of Sdōk Kāk Thom⁽⁴⁾ and his successors trace their filiations through Īśānamūrti rather than through Kūmarasvāmi. Jayavarman IV's claim to the throne was that he married a sister of Yaśovarman I. He succeeded in securing the succession for his young son, Harshavarman II, who reigned only two years. Rājendravarman II, son of an elder sister of Yaśovarman I, seems to have had a better right to the throne, which he finally secured apparently as a result of civil war. The early demise of Harshavarman II may not have been due to natural causes. When Rājendravarman II came to the throne, he moved the capital back to Yaśodharapura and restored the family of Pranavātman to its privilege of furnishing hotars to the Crown by replacing the Śivāchārya of the inscription of Bantāy Kdēi by Śāngkara, grand-nephew of Sikhāśiva and no known relation to this Śivāchārya, who seems to have been an interloper filling the gap during the reign of the usurper and his son.

(1) Cœdès, «Vat Thīpdēi B», st. 12-13.

(2) *Ibid.*, st. 14.

(3) *Ibid.*, st. 9, 15.

(4) Finot, «Sdōk Kāk Thom», st. 54. Of course, they may simply have been son and grandson of different sisters of Ātmaśiva; but other reasons cannot be excluded.

The Nature of the Devarāja and of its Service under Sūryavarman I.

Śivāchārya, in whom the functions of the three great hereditary sacerdotal families centered in the last years of the reign of Jayavarman V, probably exercised those functions during the reign of Udayādityavarman I and the early part of the reign of Jayavīravarmān, until Sūryavarman I got possession of the capital late in 1006. The purohitas, hotars and other priests and functionaries of the great hereditary sacerdotal families seem to have held their positions for life and to have served the Devarāja under whatever king happened to be on the throne, regardless of the nature of his accession. (The possible exception, so far, seems to have been the case of Jayavarman IV, who ruled at Chok Gargyar, while the sons of Yaśovarman I were ruling at Yaśodharapura. In that case, Jayavarman IV's purohita was a member of the same family as that of the sons of Yaśovarman I, while his hotar seems to have been a disciple of the preceding hotar of the regular line, but not related to him.) So, in the absence of reasons to the contrary, it seems permissible to think that the hereditary purohitas, hotars and other functionaries of Jayavarman V continued under Udayādityavarman I and Jayavīravarmān, both of whom seem to have acceded regularly and without trouble at the capital.

What has just been said probably did not apply, however, to Sūryavarman I, who was an alien of a new religious faith, and an ill-disguised usurper. At first his functionaries must have been aliens and a few partisans, until the Cambodians went over to him as he conquered the country. When he first invaded Kambujadesa and invited his partisans to join his standard of revolt against what appears to have been the regularly-constituted government, he doubtless found his rivals in possession of the regular hereditary functionaries and hierarchichal officials and this is probably true even of the minor officials. It has been noted, for instance, that Sūryavarman's lapidists lacked the skill and grace of his rivals⁽¹⁾.

Early in the reign of Sūryavarman I — apparently as soon as that king acquired possession of the capital, probably in 1006 — Śivāchārya, who seems to have been serving at the capital under Jayavīravarmān, began to serve under Sūryavarman I, in some at least of his many sacerdotal functions. When Sūryavarman I established the division of the castes, Śivāchārya was placed at the head of his caste⁽²⁾. He died early in this reign⁽³⁾. Then, or perhaps partly before his death — during the reign of Jayavīravarmān — the functions performed by him were again separated and distributed among his heirs.

In spite of the fact that Śivāchārya performed some of his functions for a few years under Sūryavarman I and that his nephew Sadāśiva succeeded him as purohita under that monarch, it appears that the family of Śivakaivalya did not enjoy the fullest confidence of that monarch⁽⁴⁾, who seems to have deprived this family of

(1) Cœdès, «La date de Tà Kèu : III. Épigraphe», *BEFEO*, 1934, p. 425-426.

(2) Cœdès, «Vat Thīpdei B», st. 8.

(3) Finot, «Sdōk Kāk Thom», st. 40-43. The date of Śivāchārya's death may be ascertained approximately from the inscription. It says that Sūryavarman had been reigning two years, when Śivāchārya restored the sanctuaries which had been destroyed when Sūryavarman invaded this region and that, before he finished his task, he (Śivāchārya) died. If this means that the death occurred after Sūryavarman had reigned two years at the capital, it would have occurred after 1008. If it meant — as Dupont seems to think («S. D. K.», *BEFEO*, 1943) — two years after some inscriptions of his reign say the reign began (i. e. 1002), he would have died after 1004.

(4) This, despite the statement of the inscription. He was in high favor with the king as a brother-in-law and loyal guru and chief of works and not as a member of the house of Śivakaivalya.

the exclusive privilege of furnishing the purohita of the Devarāja and to have named a purohita of the family of Saptadevakula to which the mother of Sūryavarman I belonged. The inscription of Lovék says Śaṅkara was the purohita of three kings, one of whom must have been Sūryavarman I⁽¹⁾. The king's preference for this family may have been due to the fact that Śivāchārya had served his rivals; or it may have been that Sūryavarman I, introducing a new religion, found Śivāchārya and his family too closely identified with the statecult of the Devarāja.

On the other hand, Sūryavarman I chose Śivāchārya's nephew, Sadāśiva, who seems to have had an elder brother⁽²⁾, drew him out of the religious life, made him head of the family of Śivakaivalya with the title of Jayendrapaṇḍita and made him Chief of Works of the First Class, thus putting him in charge of the great building program which was to carry out during the latter part of Sūryavarman's reign; but not until he had insured his personal loyalty by marrying him to a younger sister of the queen⁽³⁾. The Usurper-King, who originated the Oath of Allegiance still used at Cambodia, seems not to have taken any chances, even with the oldest and most distinguished of the hereditary sacerdotal families, whose members had served the kings of Kambujadesa faithfully for more than two centuries.

It is possible that some members of the family of Śivakaivalya continued to exercise the functions of purohita of the Devarāja, which continued to be the state-worship, and that Śaṅkarapaṇḍita was purohita of a sort of Buddharāja, private idol of the king. Indeed, the inscription of Sdōk Kāk Thom, which was probably indited by Jayendrapaṇḍita (Sadāśiva) says Sadāśiva was purohita of the Devarāja under Sūryavarman and that his family served the Devarāja to the exclusion of all others⁽⁴⁾; but later it says that king took him out of the religious life, made him enter the secular life and gave him for a wife the sister of Queen Viralakshmi⁽⁵⁾. From that time, no member of this family seems to have been specifically mentioned as purohita or specifically charged with the service of the Devarāja. When Udayādityavarman II restored the Devarāja, Jayendrapaṇḍita continued as guru of the new king and busied himself with the public works⁽⁶⁾; while Śaṅkarapaṇḍita alone is mentioned as purohita. And when Udayādityavarman II built his new central temple — the Bāphūon — and installed therein his Devarāja, the famous golden liṅga, it seems to have been Śaṅkarapaṇḍita who officiated as purohita⁽⁷⁾.

What was the nature of the Devarāja or other deity which Śivāchārya, Sadāśiva and Śaṅkarapaṇḍita served under the reign of Sūryavarman I? It seems clear that it could not have been a Śivaliṅga like those of previous kings or like that of his successor — the material symbol of the «subtle me of the king», under the king's name combined with that of Śiva — for Sūryavarman was a Buddhist and no inscription yet published mentions a *Sūryeśvara*. It seems possible that there may have been two royal deities during this reign: the first an impersonal Śivaliṅga, symbolizing the essence of royalty, presided over by the purohita, and the other, symbolizing the personal essence of Sūryavarman combined with Buddha — a foreshadowing of the later Buddharāja of Jayavarman VII.

(1) Barth, *ISC*, «N° 17, Lovék», B, st. 32.

(2) Cœdès, «Vat Thīpdēi», B, st. 21.

(3) Finot, «Sdōk Kāk Thom», B, st. 74.

(4) G. Cœdès et P. Dupont, «Les stèles de Sdōk Kāk Thom, etc.», *BEFEO*, 1943, st. 61-63.

(5) *Ibid.*, st. 74; D, st. 42-45.

(6) Finot, «Sdōk Kāk Thom», D, st. 64, p. 93.

(7) At least, he is the only one mentioned as purohita during this period. Barth, «Lovék», B, st. 32.

Redistribution of Sacerdotal Functions under Sūryavarman I.

As has been seen, at the beginning of Sūryavarman's reign the functions of the three great hereditary sacerdotal families centered in Śivāchārya. Perhaps before the death of that ecclesiastic, which seems to have occurred after 1008 (see above), the functions of purohita as head of the family of Śivakaivalya seem to have fallen to his nephew, Sadāśiva, who was taken out of the religious life, married to the queen's sister, given the titles of rajapurohita and Jayendrapaṇḍita, became Vrah Guru and was put in charge of the Public Works. He remained at the head of the family and indited the inscription of Sdōk Kāk Thom in 1052; but the function of purohita of the Devarāja seem to have passed to Śangkarapaṇḍita of another family.

The family of Pranayātman, as has been seen, furnished hereditary hotars to the kings of Cambodia. Śivāchārya's successor as head of this family was his nephew. Kirtindrapaṇḍita, possibly an elder brother of Sadāśiva⁽¹⁾, possibly son of another sister. Sūryavarman appointed him *upadestār* (hotar?). The pillar-inscription of Vat Thīpdēi B, near Siemrāp, which he probably indited, praises him for his wisdom and charity. It says that, in 1005, Kirtindrapaṇḍita reerected a high liṅga at Vat Thīpdēi which had previously been erected by Śikhāśiva of the same family⁽²⁾, who was hotar of Yaśovarman (see above). The re-erection of this liṅga seems to have been the occasion of the inscription mentioned above. It shows that Kirtindrapaṇḍita served under Jayavīravarman, for that king was reigning over this region at that time. It also shows that the inscription was carved at a later date than the erection of the liṅga, for the inscription praises Sūryavarman.

The family of Hyang Pavitrā, as has been noted, was not matrilineal like the other two. Śivāchārya's successor as head of this family was his grandson, Śivavindu, who became hereditary priest of Kapāleśa and Jalāngeśa and Inspector of Qualities and Defects on Hemaśringagiri. He became a great minister of Sūryavarman I, erected many monasteries, images and liṅgas and dug many ponds. In 1707, according to the inscription of Tà Kèv B, he erected a liṅga and several images at Tà Kèv⁽³⁾, which seems to have been the occasion of that inscription, which seems to have been indited by Śivavindu probably some time afterward. Thus, this redistribution of functions, like the others, seems to have taken place chiefly before the death of Śivāchārya, some of it under Jayavīravarman.

The Disappearance of the Great Hereditary Sacerdotal Families.

A fact which may be noted here is that all these great hereditary sacerdotal families, which had furnished priests, chaplains and ministers to previous kings, seem to have terminated these connections early in the reign of Sūryavarman I or shortly after its close, which seems to have been part of a significant religious administrative reform during the reign of that king. The line of Bhās-svāmanī, after 1003

(1) Cœdès, «Vat Thīpdēi», B, st. 21.

(2) *Ibid.*, B, st. 20.

(3) Barth, *ISC* : «Prea Kèv», B, st. 16, 20-28.

(Prea Kèv A), that of Pranavātman, after 1005 (Vat Thīpdēi B), of Jayendrādasa, after 1006 (Trapāñ Run), Hyang Pavitrā, after 1007 (Prea Kèv B) and Śivaśakti, in 1047 (Prah Vihār I) — one by one carved their swan-songs and disappeared from history. A representative of the house of Śivakaivalya survived until 1052 (Sdōk Kāk Thom), but only after he had been safely attached by marriage to the house of Lovék (Śaptadevakula) and then in another capacity.

THE GENEALOGY AND SUCCESSORS OF ŚIVĀCHĀRYA

INSCRIPTION OF SDÖK KĀK THOM

INSCRIPTION OF TĀ KĒV B

INSCRIPTION OF VAT THĪPDĒI B

