

THE DEVARĀJA CULT

by Hermann Kulke



DATA PAPER NUMBER 108
SOUTHEAST ASIA PROGRAM
DEPARTMENT OF ASIAN STUDIES
CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA, NEW YORK
JANUARY 1978

PRICE: \$4.50

THE DEVARĀJA CULT

THE CORNELL UNIVERSITY SOUTHEAST ASIA PROGRAM

The Southeast Asia Program was organized at Cornell University in the Department of Far Eastern Studies in 1950. It is a teaching and research program of interdisciplinary studies in the humanities, social sciences, and some natural sciences. It deals with Southeast Asia as a region, and with the individual countries of the area: Brunei, Burma, Indonesia, Kampuchea, Laos, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam.

The activities of the Program are carried on both at Cornell and in Southeast Asia. They include an undergraduate and graduate curriculum at Cornell which provides instruction by specialists in Southeast Asian cultural history and present-day affairs and offers intensive training in each of the major languages of the area. The Program sponsors group research projects on Thailand, on Indonesia, on the Philippines, and on linguistic studies of the languages of the area. At the same time, individual staff and students of the Program have done field research in every Southeast Asian country.

A list of publications relating to Southeast Asia which may be obtained on prepaid order directly from the Program is given at the end of this volume. Information on Program staff, fellowships, requirements for degrees, and current course offerings will be found in an *Announcement of the Department of Asian Studies*, obtainable from the Director, Southeast Asia Program, 120 Uris Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14853.

THE DEVARĀJA CULT

Hermann Kulke

Translated from the German by I. W. Mabbett with an Introduction
by the Author and Notes on the Translation of Khmer Terms by
J.tM. Jacob

Originally published as "Der Devarāja-Kult," *Saeculum*, XXV,
1 (1974), pp. 24-55, by the Verlag Karl Alber, Freiburg.

Data Paper: Number 108
Southeast Asia Program
Department of Asian Studies
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
January 1978
\$4.50

© CORNELL UNIVERSITY SOUTHEAST ASIA PROGRAM 1978

International Standard Book
Number 0-88727-108-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Translator's Preface	vii
Introduction	xv
The Devarāja Cult: Legitimation and Apotheosis of the Ruler in the Kingdom of Angkor	1
I. Preliminary Remarks	1
II. Previous Theories	4
III. The Sdok Kak Thom Inscription and the <i>Devarāja</i> Cult	14
IV. Devarāja--a " <i>Calantī Pratimā</i> " of the God Śiva?	24
V. Were the Kings of Angkor "Participants" in Divine Rule?	29
VI. Conclusion	36
Abbreviations	41
Bibliographyt.	42
Appendix: Notes on the Translation of the Khmer Text	48

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

Dr. Kulke should need little introduction to Indologists who do not read German, for his studies on Orissan history have yielded a number of articles in English which offer interesting parallels to the themes discussed in the present work on Angkor.¹ This study on the *devarāja* or so-called "god king" cult in Cambodia is among his most challenging contributions; the propositions it advances are found at least to provoke a general and earnest reexamination of accepted ideas about the significance of the cult.

The implications of this are far-reaching, for the discussion to which this study is a contribution is not merely of an isolated ritual in a single kingdom: it bears on our understanding of the role and limits of royal authority in ancient Southeast Asia generally; the term *devarāja* has been (perhaps illegitimately) taken from its original Cambodian context and, interpreted as "god-king," applied to various other places which appear to have had similar institutions. Indeed such institutions may have been similar, but if Dr. Kulke is right they do not amount to the sort of "god-kingship," or to the *plenitudo potestatis* which may be glibly read into the term, that are so often inferred by those who write in any way about the "Indianized" kingdoms of ancient Southeast Asia. Evidence of the *devarāja* cult is one of the main props for the widely accepted notion that Indochinese monarchs were "god-kings"; if the prop is removed the notion must be questioned; thus the desirability of an English translation of this study is too self-evident to require detailed justification.

Nor is it necessary to explore here the ramifications of the cult across Asia or the historiographical background to it, because they are compendiously discussed and documented below by the author. He examines in some detail the previously advanced theories about the cult, several of them addressed to the question whether the term *devarāja* refers to a central cult object, such as a Śiva *liṅga* on one of Angkor's numerous pyramidal monuments, or to the ritual as such, and argues that the views advanced by such authorities as G. Coedès are commonly unsatisfactory or inconsistent. The chief difficulty in identifying the *devarāja* with the

¹H. Kulke, "Some Remarks about the Jagannātha Trinity," *Indologentagung*, eds. Herbert Härtel and Volker Moeller (Berlin, 1971), pp. 126-39; "'Kṣatriyaization' and Social Change: A Study in Orissa Setting," *Changing India: Studies in Honour of Ghurye*, ed. S. D. Pillai (Bombay, 1976), pp. 398-409; "Kings without a Kingdom: The Rājas of Khurda and the Jagannātha Cult," *South Asia*, 4 (October 1974), pp. 60-77.

monumental Śiva *lingas* is that, whereas each ruler wished to re-create his kingdom symbolically upon a new shrine of his own with its own *linga* or statue, the epigraphic references indicate that there was one *devarāja*, which could follow kings about. The chief difficulty in identifying it with an abstract ritual is that, on the author's interpretation, it had a physical personality. At this point the argument turns partly on the meaning of certain terms in the Old Khmer part of the Sdok Kak Thom stele inscription, and the notes on Old Khmer terms contributed by Mrs. J. Jacob in the appendix, as well as the author's further discussion in his Introduction, are particularly valuable on this account. The author's novel solution is to propose that the *devarāja* was a sort of palladium of royalty, a portable substitute for an original "fixed" temple cult object established by Jayavarman II, who founded the cult in the ninth century.

Integral to the author's method, and a major contribution to the methodology of the subject whatever conclusions one may reach, is his rigorous separation of the two categories of evidence which may otherwise be misleadingly confused: the inscriptions mentioning the *devarāja* cult, and the monuments which used to house *lingas* as the centers of royal cults. We are not obliged *a priori* to infer that the two sorts of evidence refer to the same thing, and the reasoning noticed above leads the author to the conclusion that in fact they do not. When they are separated, it becomes easier to recognize that the epigraphically attested *devarāja* does not have to mean "god-king," and may well, on the indications provided by J. Filliozat's recent article using Tamil material,² refer to Śiva as "king of the gods." Similarly, in the monuments, we can observe the importance of royal cults without being obliged to treat them as the cults of "god-kings."

Dr. Kulke's Orissan researches, like J. Filliozat's article just mentioned, point to the value of Indian analogies in reaching an understanding of Indochinese material; and indeed the progress of research tends to emphasize the similarities rather than the differences which are sometimes postulated. These similarities stem in part of course from the direct influence of Indian culture upon Southeast Asia. In part also they stem from a common ancestry in the web of territorial cults that were dotted all over monsoon Asia in prehistoric times, influences or vestiges of which survive in folk religion still. Since the *devarāja* cult may well have in it echoes of such archaic religious sensibilities, this is one dimension of the subject, easily overlooked by historians, which deserves brief notice here.

In enquiring into the motifs in prehistoric religion discussed by such authorities as R. von Heine-Geldern³ and H. G. Quaritch

²J. Filliozat, "New Researches on the Relations between India and Cambodia," *Indica*, III (1966), pp. 95-106. See also the author's Introduction, below, where further evidence is cited.

³In English, see his "Conceptions of State and Kingship in South

Wales,⁴ certainly, we enter dark and speculative realms. What should not be particularly controversial is the general observation that in prehistoric China, India, and Southeast Asia there was a nexus between earth gods, phallic cults, and ancestor worship. For example, the original element 土 in the Chinese character *tsu* meaning "ancestor" is derived from a phallic pictograph, while 土 "earth" appears to have been a representation of a pole or tree branch stuck in the ground as a focus of a fertility ritual.⁵ Links between gods, kings, ancestors and a sacrificial ritual appear in the varying meanings attached to the character *ti*, 帝 "emperor" in its more modern meaning, according to Fu Ssu-nien's analysis of sixty-four instances on oracle bones: sometimes the character refers to a sacrifice to a god, sometimes to royal ancestors as people, sometimes to a cult object representing an ancestor in heaven, and sometimes to a high god.⁶ Karlgren's researches point to megalithic cults in China linking an earth god with phallicism conducted on an earth or stone platform, and in later times perhaps on a stepped pyramid.⁷ Lin Shun-sheng has pointed to the originally phallic significance of the rock in which the earth-god is focused.⁸ W. Eberhard refers to a phallic god called *tsu* (ancestor) in the Me Ti and called "field ancestor" in the Shih Ching.⁹

Southeast Asian prehistoric cults in which such associations were made, and correspondences with India and China, are discussed in some depth by P. Mus in his seminal article which was originally published in 1933.¹⁰ He attempts to reconstruct the structure and religious thought

East Asia," *Far Eastern Quarterly* (Nov. 1942), pp. 15-30, also published as Data Paper No. 18, Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University (Ithaca, 1956; fourth printing, 1972).

⁴H. G. Q. Wales, *The Making of Greater India* (London, 1961); *Prehistory and Religion of Southeast Asia* (London, 1957).

⁵See B. Karlgren, "Some Fecundity Symbols in Ancient China," *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities*, 2 (1930), pp. 1-66.

⁶In Chinese; cited by D. H. Smith, "Divine Kingship in Ancient China," *Numen*, IV (1957), p. 189.

⁷B. Karlgren, "Some Fecundity Symbols," pp. 1-66.

⁸Lin Shun-sheng, "Ancestor Temple and Earth Altar among the Formosan Aborigines," *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology*, Academia Sinica, 6 (1958), pp. 1-57.

⁹W. Eberhard, *The Local Cultures of South and East China* (Leiden, 1968), p. 188.

¹⁰P. Mus, "Cultes Indiens et Indigènes au Champa," *BEFEO*, XXXIII (1933), pp. 367-410. English translation as *India Seen from the East*, Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University, Monash Papers on Southeast Asia, No. 3 (Clayton, Vic., 1975).

of earth-god cults across monsoon Asia, in which an originally inaccessible abstract divinity identified with the earth was made concrete and accessible in a cult object such as a stone: community chiefs as priests provided a bridge between community and divinity, becoming, during each ceremony, further embodiments of the divinity themselves, and their ancestors, literally absorbed by the tutelary earth, were divine embodiments also. The stone slabs known as *kut* in Champa, the focus of Mus's study, represent the survival of the ancient cult stones into historical times under a new aspect;¹¹ and, with the importation of Indian religions, it was the Śiva *liṅga* which lent itself especially to the service of the old ideas; the anointing of a *liṅga*, in which sacral fluids poured down into the stone cistern representing the earth, evoked for the Southeast Asians the fertility ritual of their cults of stones or mounds of earth.¹² Dr. Kulke cites below the literature on royal cults in various other parts of Southeast Asia;¹³ there are interesting parallels in Java, where rituals were conducted to "open" the eyes of the statues of dead kings, vestiges of ancestor cults are implied in the practices of placing the statue of a dead king over a receptacle containing his remains, and of placing remains of royal bones in model stone houses on posts at Hindu and Buddhist burial sites.¹⁴

As for India, it is likely that the *liṅga* similarly served the purposes of prehistoric cults, attested for example in the Harappan civilization;¹⁵ the *yakṣas*, "demons," of later Hindu myth are likely to represent territorial gods of indigenous communities absorbed into the new composite culture,¹⁶ and reverence for ancestors, though more thoroughly submerged than in other parts of Asia by the celestially oriented religion of the Aryans, may be detected in the rich complex of myths associated with the *pitṛyāna*, "way of the fathers," in which the underworld of the dead, the idea of reincarnation, and cults of moon, waters, snakes and so forth were bound together.¹⁷

¹¹Ibid., Eng. trans., pp. 36-43.

¹²Ibid., p. 31.

¹³See pp. 1-2.

¹⁴See W. F. Stutterheim, "Iets over Prae-Hinduïstische bijzettingengebruiken op Java," *Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen*, n.s. 2, 5 (1939), pp. 105-40.

¹⁵See Sir Mortimer Wheeler, *The Indus Civilization*, 3rd ed. (Cambridge, 1968), p. 109.

¹⁶See P. Mus, "Cultes Indiens," Eng. trans., pp. 28 f.

¹⁷See S. Bhattacharji, *The Indian Theogony* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 76.

The prehistoric background may thus shed a little light on the purposes and origins of the cults of *liṅgas* on stepped pyramids at Angkor. What is particularly significant is that they embody the idea of bi-presence: in itself, a divinity was abstract and unapproachable, but it could through ritual acquire also a concrete form in which it could communicate with its devotees. Since it was essentially abstract, there was no contradiction if there were two or more concrete forms: the sacred cult object, the community chief who was thus temporarily and ritually divinized, and his ancestors. Each of these was a partial manifestation of a divinity that was everywhere and nowhere. As with the prehistoric cults, so, perhaps, with the pyramid-studded religious landscape of Angkor.

These considerations apply to the pieces of archaeological evidence, the monuments with their *liṅgas*, that are not central to Dr. Kulke's study: he identifies them in order to distinguish them from the epigraphic material that bears on the *devarāja* cult properly so called. But the idea of bi-presence without contradiction is relevant to one of his main suggestions--that the *devarāja* was a secondary, portable, image distinct from the various fixed images in permanent shrines. If this suggestion is correct it finds parallels in the practice of reduplicating embodiments of the primal divinity, as if by mirrors, without implying that the divinity itself was anything but a single eternal unity. In China, the god of the soil could be embodied in two tablets, one fixed, the other transported in procession or carried into war by the commander-in-chief; while in India fixed *liṅgas* in temples could be duplicated by processional images, *utsavaviḡraha*.¹⁸

Such a processional image is involved in the nexus between ruler, ancestors, soil, and fertility, and means as much and as little for the question of "god-kingship" as the nexus as a whole. Perhaps, if we wish to refine this question, we must adjust ourselves to a vocabulary of ideas different from our own. What can be asserted, negatively, is that there is no warrant in the archaeological evidence for the conclusion that the kings of Angkor, individual human beings, were made into gods in their own right. For more specific conclusions, it is to the epigraphic evidence that we must turn, and it is to the epigraphic evidence that the bulk of Dr. Kulke's study is addressed.

There is only one really informative inscription, and that is the Sdok Kak Thom stele inscription; but as it is a long one, and as it contains a Sanskrit section and an Old Khmer section paraphrasing it, it might be thought that the meaning of the *devarāja*, both as a term and as an institution, could be derived from the inscription without ambiguity. However, this is not so. The Sanskrit *devarāja* can mean either "god-king" or "king of the gods." The Old Khmer paraphrase is *kaṃrateñ jagat ta rāja*. The meaning of this in the context is open to discussion, a discussion which must be left to those proficient in Old Khmer; my own understanding, on the basis of the opinions of others, is that the expression

¹⁸These examples are given by P. Mus, "Cultes Indiens," Eng. trans., p. 47.

suffers from much the same ambiguity as *devarāja* and that the problem can only be solved, if at all, by a thorough study of the contexts.¹⁹

This being the case, there seems to be good warrant for Dr. Kulke to accept the indications of J. Filliozat's research that Śiva was worshipped as king of the gods. Further, he points to the distinction between the expressions *kamrateñ phdai karom*, "lord of the lower plane/earth," often used to designate a human king, and *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*, "lord of the world, who is king," arguably applied to an opposite, divine, pole. The earthly ruler was "protected" by the latter. Dr. Kulke concludes unambiguously that "the Sdok Kak Thom inscription offers no warrant at all for the theory that the kings of Angkor were 'god-kings.'"²⁰

If this is so, it is ironic that there is *less* evidence of the identification of kings with gods in Angkor, the home of the *devarāja*, than in India, where a division of powers between royal and brahmanical orders may in a sense fairly be seen, but where nevertheless authoritative texts tell us that the king is a god in human form,²¹ that he is a god on earth,²² that the coronation of a king is really the coronation of Indra,²³ and that even an infant king is not to be despised as he is a god.²⁴ (As Dr. Kulke remarks in his Introduction, however, such references embody literary theory, not epigraphically attested fact.)

These remarks must on no account be taken as an attempt to gild the lily; they are intended only to introduce the reader to certain aspects of the background to the cults discussed by Dr. Kulke, and to point to the significance of his study against this background. The study is an important one, and in bringing a translation of it before the public I must first acknowledge with considerable gratitude the kind interest which the author himself has taken in the project and the great care he has taken in going through drafts of the manuscript. I am also happy to acknowledge the encouragement of Professor O. W. Wolters, who inspired the project and brought the translation to the Southeast Asia Program for publication, and my wife, who has looked at the English style of the translation with fresh eyes and suggested improvements.

Further, the present publication benefits considerably from the contribution of Mrs. J. Jacob who, in discussion with the author, has

¹⁹I am indebted in this connection to S. Pou, personal communication.

²⁰See below, p.

²¹*Mahābhārata*, 12.68.40.

²²*Ibid.*, 12.59.128 ff.

²³*Ibid.*, 12.67.4.

²⁴*Manusmṛti*, 8.8.

suggested a number of changes to bring the English here more in line with the Khmer terms translated (which is why the reader may notice a few discrepancies between the English and the original German in such contexts), and who has supplied some notes on Khmer terms in the Sdok Kak Thom stele inscription which appear as an appendix.

I.W.M.

INTRODUCTION

This study began as part of a broader project on the cult of divine royalty in Southeast Asia, with an emphasis on the Vaiṣṇava apotheosis of Hindu rulers of that region, a rather late development. This idea is well known, for example, by the idealized "portrait sculpture" from Belahan showing the Javanese king Airlangga (1016-49) as the god Viṣṇu, and by Angkor Vat itself which is supposed to have been dedicated to king Sūryavarman II (1113-ca. 1145) deified as Viṣṇu. The study on monarchy and divinity was extended to Orissa, India, where the author as a member of the Orissa Research Project worked on the Vaiṣṇava Jagannātha cult and its influence on Hindu kingship ideology in Orissā.¹ The medieval kings of Orissa, too, are famous for their alleged divinization as "Moving Viṣṇu" (*calantī Viṣṇu*) and as son and viceroy (*putra, rāuta*) of the god Viṣṇu-Jagannātha. There was an even more direct correspondence between this part of Eastern India and early twelfth century Cambodia. In the same generation, in the early twelfth century, the two largest temples of India and Southeast Asia were constructed and dedicated to Viṣṇu by rulers whose forefathers and predecessors until then had been strong adherents of the Hindu god Śiva (i.e., the Jagannātha-temple in Puri, ca. 1135, by King Coḍagaṅga, and Angkor Vat by Sūryavarman II).

Although the leaning of kingship ideology towards Vaiṣṇavism during these centuries was evident on both sides of the Gulf of Bengal, a critical analysis of Orissa's rich epigraphical sources completely disproved the theory that there ever existed anything like a genuine deification of living kings in this part of India, irrespective of Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism. A further and more general study of the epigraphical sources of India showed that this result is quite representative for the whole of medieval Hindu India. The discussion of the Hindu kingship ideology as a whole so far seems to have been unintentionally overloaded by interpretations of *texts* of legendary origin which described the *ideal* kings of the hoary past, neglecting the rich epigraphical evidence of India's historical kings. With this experience in my mind I returned to my Southeast Asian studies, still believing that at least in the Indianized States of Southeast Asia "men were worshipped as gods" (G. Coedès). But the reassessment of the evidence from Angkor whose Devarāja has become a synonym for the divinized "god-king" soon resulted in very similar conclusions. It was not the king of Angkor who was praised as the *devarāja*, but the god Śiva himself as "king of the gods." And the famous temple mountains

¹*Jagannātha-Kult und Gajapati-Königtum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte religiöser Legitimation hinduistischer Könige* (Universität Heidelberg, Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts, Bd. 23), in press.

and the royal *liṅgas* (named after their founder-kings) were dedicated not to "the king who was the great god of ancient Cambodia" as G. Coedès assumed, but to Śiva.

Further comparisons with Hindu rituals in India, especially with the well-known institution of worshipping "moving images" (*calantī pratimā*) of sometimes far-away original cult images (*mūla bera*) made it highly probable that the Devarāja of Angkor was nothing else but a bronze image of Śiva which was worshipped as a substitute for the original *liṅga* which had been established in 802 A.D. when Jayavarman II founded the Angkorian empire. As one of its palladia it was carried by the kings of Cambodia to their successive capitals. Besides this "impersonal" state cult there existed the "personal" royal *liṅgas* which were again and again newly established by the various kings on top of their famous temple mountains of Angkor. It was their cult which dominated the ideology of kingship in Angkor from the tenth century. Because the idea of the *devarāja* cult as an all-pervading state cult of Angkor was due mainly to the absence of any distinction between these two separate cults by modern scholars, it is the consequence of this interpretation that the *devarāja* cult as the cult of the deified living "god-king" never existed. This result corresponds to the findings in India.

But in the course of my further research it became evident that there is at least one distinction between the Hindu kingship ideology of India and Cambodia. In their inscriptions, the living Indian Hindu *rājas* often were venerated in a rather functional comparison with the gods and their cosmic duties and only very rarely were they praised as their earthly representatives. In Cambodia, however, the kings of Angkor went a step further than the Indian kings. From the time of Jayavarman IV (921/28-941) onwards they claimed in their inscriptions to be part (*aṃśa*) of Śiva. Their "subtle inner self" (*Sūkṣma-antara-ātman*) met with the "royal self" (*niyoktra-ātman*) of the god Śiva in the personal royal *liṅgas* on top of the temple mountains erected by the respective kings. Although the idea of the Hindu king's being an *aṃśa* of the god is known in the sacred texts of the Hindus (e.g., in the Bhāgavata Purāṇa) in connection with the ideal kings of the past, the application of this idea to living kings of Angkor certainly meant a further step towards royal divinization. It is not unlikely that this more accentuated development of the idea of a communion between kings and gods on the sacred temple mountains of Angkor is the heritage of an autochthonous Southeast Asian mountain cult with a Hindu blending, known since the days of Funan. But again, this idea also proves that even in Angkor Hindu kings thus claimed to be *part* of the god, not the god himself.

As "the subject of monarchy and divinity in Angkor is not new" and "the field of Angkor studies is an arena trodden by giants of scholarship" as I. W. Mabbett rightly puts it,² I gratefully acknowledge the support

²I. W. Mabbett, "Devarāja," *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, X (1969), p. 203.

which I found in J. Filliozat's and I. W. Mabbett's articles,³ both of which had already questioned Coedès' famous interpretations of the *devarāja* cult (see pp. 4 ff. and notes 17 and 51). Furthermore my thanks are due to Professor H. von Stietencron, Tübingen, for his criticisms and numerous comments after he had thoroughly read the first draft of the article.

After its publication in 1974, I received several encouraging communications by friends and colleagues and further suggestions. Professor E. H. S. Simmonds traced back aspects of the Thai shadow play to Cambodian influence of the Ayudhya period and concluded that "it is not impossible that there is reference to the concept of the *devarāja* which, as far as Thailand is concerned, is derived from the Khmers,"⁴ and Professor H. D. Evers recently suggested an influence of the *devarāja* cult on "the idea of a combined Bodhisattva-God-King Role"⁵ in Ceylon. A very important supplementary reference I owe to Dr. Friedhelm Hardy, London, who drew my attention to the fact that in South India *devarāja* was also a rare but well-known name of Viṣṇu (e.g., of Varadarāja-pperumāḷ in Kanchipuram). It was precisely in the eleventh century, when the name *devarāja* was used for the first time in Cambodia in the famous Sdok Kak Thom inscription, that Tirukacci Nampi composed a hymn on Varadarāja under the title of "Devarājāṣṭakam."⁶ Hardy thus fully corroborates J. Filliozat's arguments pointing out that (in the context of the ninth century's South Indian Śaivism) "Devarāja, meaning 'king of gods,' designates Śiva himself" and not the kings of Cambodia. (See below, pp. 13-14.)

I am very much obliged to the Centre of South East Asian Studies of the School of Oriental and African Studies and its members for giving me, in February 1977, the opportunity of a thorough discussion of the problems of the *devarāja* cult. I am particularly grateful to Mrs. J.nM. Jacob. As my former teacher in Old Khmer she took the trouble to read most thoroughly the German version and its English translation. In connection with the Khmer text of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription she suggested a few slight alterations to its translation and wrote some notes on key Khmer expressions (see Appendix). These notes represent a few points discussed in this past February by J.M.J. and H.K. at the stage of preparation of the English translation by Dr. I. W. Mabbett.

Perhaps the two most important key expressions referred to by her notes are *man* and *daiy*. I have argued (pp. 20 ff.) that the transfer of

³J. Filliozat, "New Researches on the Relations between India and Cambodia," *Indica*, III (1966), pp. 95-106; I. W. Mabbett, "Devarāja."n

⁴E. H. S. Simmonds, "New Evidence on Thai Shadow-play Invocations," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, XXIV (1961), p. 555 (see below, n. 13).

⁵H. D. Evers, *Monks, Priests and Peasants: A Study of Buddhism and Social Structure in Central Ceylon* (Leiden, 1972), p. 66.

⁶Friedhelm E. Hardy (London), personal communication.

the *devarāja* from Roluos to the newly established capital at Angkor and the consecration of the "personal" royal *liṅga* on the central temple mountain (Bakheñ) were two distinct actions by Yaśovarman (899-900), which are clearly separated in the Skok Kak Thom inscription (D, 12) by the word *man*. I translated it with "*dann*" in the sense of "*darauf*" (then), which indicates a time interval between the two actions. Mrs. J.nM. Jacob's interpretation of *man*, however, does not exclude a synchronism. But still there is the fact that the consecration (*sthāpanā*) of the "holy *liṅga* at the center" (*vraḥ liṅga āy kantāl*) is described in a separate sentence (D, 13; see below, notes 77 and 81).

The expression *daiy* "various (ly)," "different (ly)" is one of the most crucial of the Khmer portion of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription. To some extent it depends on its translation in C, 81 whether there existed *various devarājas*, an interpretation which would lead again to Coedès's theory of an identity between the *devarāja* and the various "personal" *liṅgas* on the temple mountains. But it has been shown that Coedès in his most famous article on the *devarāja* cult (1952) brought the word *daiy* in relation with *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* (= *devarāja*). Therefore he spoke in this article of "*les divers rois-dieux*," whereas in the translation of the relevant portion of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription together with P. Dupont, he had written in 1943/46: "*Le dieu-roi changea de résidence suivant les capitales où le monarque le conduisit*" (see below, p. 11). In her note in the Appendix Mrs. J.nM. Jacob shows it to be highly probable that *daiy* has to be understood as some sort of pluralizer of the capitals (*nagara*) in which the kings variously stayed. Consequently the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* should thus be understood as an "idole unique."

Finally, a statement of the article needs some correction. I have written that "after 1052 A.D., the date of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, we hear nothing more of the *devarāja* cult" (p. 39). However, one inscription of the late twelfth century at the Bayon mentions the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*.⁷ In his article on the *devarāja*, I. W. Mabbett, following G. Coedès, has already mentioned these inscriptions which list obviously the various sculptures which once stood in the chambers of the Bayon temple.⁸ G. Coedès concluded from this inscription that the *devarāja* seems to have been relegated to a chapel in the outside galleries, although the Bayon itself must have been associated with the cult of the king.⁹ It is a pity that I had missed this inscription when I wrote the German version of the present article in 1973 and I owe my knowledge of it to I. W. Mabbett's article. This inscription, I am sure, verifies beyond doubt the hypothesis that the famous *devarāja* of the Angkor period was a *single sculpture* which was the *calantī pratimā* or substitute of the *liṅga* which had been

⁷G. Coedès, "La date du Bayon. Appendice. Les inscriptions du Bâyon," *BEFEO*, XXVIII (1928), pp. 81-112 (inscriptions, pp. 104-12).

⁸I. W. Mabbett, "Devarāja," p. 209.

⁹G. Coedès, "La date du Bayon," p. 100.

installed by Jayavarman II on the Mahendragiri in 802t This is corroborated by the fact that the same inscription which mentions the *devarāja* lists also the names of other deities whose temples are outside Angkor: e.g., *kamrateñ jagat chok gargyar* and the *kamrateñ jagat śambhupura*.¹⁰ These names can refer to nothing else but to *calantī pratimās* or substitutes for the deities of Koh Ker and Sambor which had been brought with miscellaneous other sculptures to the Bayon, which had become the new state temple of Angkor in the late twelfth century.t

I am most grateful to Dr. I. W. Mabbett who has given so generously of his time and his own great knowledge in the field of Cambodian studies to translatethe article. And I am highly indebted to Professor Wolters for his great interest in the article and for his consent to publish it in the Cornell University Southeast Asia Data Papers.

H. Kulke

Heidelberg, May 1977

¹⁰Ibid., p. 105, inscription No. 2.

THE DEVARĀJA CULT

Legitimation and Apotheosis of the Ruler in the Kingdom of Angkor¹

I. Preliminary Remarks

We would probably not go far wrong if we described the *devarāja* cult as the most widely discussed state cult of the Hindu middle ages in South-east Asia. In Cambodia, the country where it acquired its distinctive hallmark, the "*devarāja*" has become a synonym for the divinized "god-king."¹ In the cult of this divinized kingship, it is believed that we have found the essential "source of inspiration for the great monuments of Angkor,"² and that we see "the fundamental unifying element in the ancient Khmer society"³ of the ninth to thirteenth centuries A.D.

The quest for the origins and ramifications of this cult reveals a web of connections spreading out widely across south, southeast and east Asia. In the voluminous literature concerning the *devarāja* cult we find indications of influences stemming from India,⁴ China,⁵ Yunan,⁶ Chenla,⁷ Champa,⁸ and Indonesia,⁹ and from the megalithic culture of the whole

¹The author wishes to thank the South Asia Institute of Heidelberg University for the provision of a grant for a field trip to Southeast Asia in 1971, and to express his gratitude to his teachers in Cambodian, F. Huffman (Yale University) and J. Jacob (S.O.A.S. London), and to Professor H. von Stietencron (Tübingen), who read a draft of the article and made valuable suggestions.

²Coedès, 1952a, 1952b.

³O'Sullivan, 1962, p. 88.

⁴Sastri, 1957; Majumdar, 1963, p. 189; Chatterji, 1964, p. 226; Filliozat, 1966.

⁵Coedès, 1952a, pp. 17 ff.; Coedès, 1952b, pp. 52 f.

⁶Briggs, 1951a, p. 25; Coedès, 1968, p. 36.

⁷Coedès, 1970, p. 58.

⁸Bhattacharya, 1961, p. 21; Briggs, 1951a, pp. 15, 38, 44.

⁹Groslier, 1960, p. 109; Coedès, 1968, p. 100; Stierlin, 1970, p. 14.

region as well.¹⁰ Furthermore, with respect to the world mountain motif, the cult has been linked to the ziggurat in the Near East.¹¹ The ramifications of the *devarāja* cult in Indonesian¹² and (especially in the Ayudhya period) Thailand¹³ have been pointed out. The influences of this originally Śaivite cult have been discovered in Cambodia, no less in the Vaishnavite temple of Angkor Wat than in the Mahayāna Buddhist temple of the Bayon, where we see the Śaivite *devarāja* cult reincarnated variously in a *Visnurāja* and a *Buddharāja*.¹⁴ We also have numerous evidences of the continued efficacy of the influences of this cult down to the present time. Thus, the life-size statue of a standing Buddha in the central (Theravada Buddhist) temple of Wat Preah Koh in Pnom Penh could represent "in reality" the idealized statue of the Cambodian king Norodom (1859-1904 A.D.), a statue which Coedès considers to be closely associated with the statues of the "Lord of the world" (Kamraten Jagat) in the temples of Angkor.¹⁵ Even Sihanouk's "Buddhist socialism" exhibits belated Buddhist vestiges of the *devarāja* cult.¹⁶

For all that the *devarāja* cult is accorded a dominant importance in numerous studies of the history of Cambodia and Southeast Asia, this role stands in striking contrast to the meager number of assertions¹⁷ that can be made about the cult with any confidence. For example, whereas it had commonly been confidently assumed that the *devarāja-liṅga* embodied the divine essence of the kings of Angkor, or even represented the kings themselves, it was possible for J. Filliozat a few years ago to demonstrate convincingly that it is not the kings of Angkor but the Hindu god Śiva (as

¹⁰Wales, 1953, p. 167; Wales, 1957, p. 128, note 1.

¹¹Heine-Geldern, 1930, pp. 75 ff.; Bhattacharya, 1961, pp. 23 f.

¹²Coedès, 1934; Coedès, 1968, pp. 88 f.; Groslier, 1960, pp. 96 f.

¹³Wales, 1931, p. 60; Dhani, 1954, p. 171; Coedès, 1967, pp. 146 f.; Bechert, 1967, p. 222.

¹⁴Briggs, 1951b, pp. 237, 246.

¹⁵Coedès, 1966, p. 33.

¹⁶Osborne, 1966, pp. 4 ff.; Bechert, 1967, pp. 253 ff.; Sarkisyanz, 1969, p. 1; Kulke, 1970, p. 336.

¹⁷Mabbett, 1969, p. 204: "The *devarāja* cult is not synonymous with the general practice of king-worship. It is, on the contrary, a specific practice known only from a handful of references in the inscriptions. The meanings of these references have to be conjectured from their contexts, and the association that we may make between the cult so named and other apparent evidences of a cult surrounding the king is not explicit in the sources so much as reasoned out by modern scholars."

"king of the gods") that is to be understood by the designation *devarāja*.¹⁸ Filliozat's propositions are of great importance for the whole complex of questions about the deification of the ruler in the realm of Indian culture, because the *devarāja* serves as a paradigm for the "god-king" in Southeast Asia. However, if the considerations advanced by Filliozat are correct, it follows that one of the propositions essential to the previously accepted theory of the divinization of Angkorian kings as *devarāja* is disproved.¹⁹ It is therefore all the more curious that, so far as I know, no serious attempt has yet been made to take up Filliozat's "challenge" and either refute his claim or else draw the logical implications for the theory of the *devarāja* cult.

However, it is not only Filliozat's research data that call for a renewed examination of earlier theories about the *devarāja* cult. In what follows it will become apparent that there is a whole series of further propositions which do not stand up to critical examination, or at least must be considered as not yet established.²⁰ There are Angkorian inscriptions from the ninth to the eleventh centuries which have, previously, been adduced as testimony to the significance of the *devarāja* cult. However, an examination of these has the effect, on the contrary, of raising questions which finally compel us to forsake the picture we had previously formed of the *devarāja* cult. If the propositions to be advanced below should eventually be confirmed, then indeed the *devarāja* rite played a central role in the legitimation of the newly established régime at the beginning of the ninth century, during the sacral foundation ceremony of the Angkorian kingdom. However, in the course of the following centuries (the tenth and eleventh), the significance of the *devarāja* cult as Cambodian state cult was eclipsed by the cult of the royal *liṅgas* (which is to be distinguished from that of the *devarāja*). These were the *liṅgas* which were erected by all great kings up to the eleventh century on the monumental "stepped pyramids" or "temple mountains" that are so characteristic

¹⁸ Filliozat, 1966, p. 103; Mabbett, 1969, p. 207.

¹⁹ This conclusion is also important for India in that there too we have no historical proof, in the sense of inscriptional evidence, of a genuine divinization of the king going beyond an apotheosis of the ruler, for example, in respect of his functional proximity to particular gods. "Historically speaking we have, in ancient India, no evidence at all of the actual worship of the king or of the theoretical advocacy of it" (Varma, 1959, p. 237). In this connection see also B. B. Mishra, *Polity in the Agni Purāṇa* (Calcutta, 1965), p. 33: "The divinity of the king is vigorously criticized by Bāna [Kādambarī, *Pūrvabhāga*, para. 107]. Though a brāhmaṇa, he calls it an invention of unscrupulous flatterers of the king. The minister Śukanāsa informs the prince Chandrāpīḍa that the king is made by the flatterers to consider himself to be four-armed Viṣṇu and three-eyed Śiva, and in trying to act like them he becomes an object of public ridicule" (See also note 50.)

²⁰ In this connection see also Mabbett, 1969, p. 204.

of the architecture of Angkor. It is this Śaivite cult of the royal *liṅgas* on the temple mountains of Angkor, and not the *devarāja*, which we reencounter later in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, in the form of a Vaiṣṇavite and Buddhist syncretism, in Angkor Wat and in the Bayon. The reason why the striking decline in the importance of the *devarāja* has not previously been recognized may, perhaps, be attributed to the fact that, hitherto, the royal *liṅgas* on the temple mountains of Angkor have invariably been seen as "*devarājas*." Hence it must be one of the pre-eminent concerns of the following discussion to demonstrate that this conception of the identity of the *devarāja* with the royal *liṅgas* is not tenable.

But this could have far-reaching implications for the whole legitimating system of Angkor. In relation to the content and ideology of this system, it will in future no longer be possible to treat the *devarāja* as the kingpin of the royal *liṅga* cult that was crucial to the legitimation of Angkorian rulers. In the same way, it could no longer be appropriate to characterize the *devarāja* cult with the help of the inscriptions which describe the disposition of these same *liṅgas* on the temple mountains. The most important consequence for the question of legitimation in the Angkorian kingdom could, however, be the recognition that there was no cult for the divinization of the king as "god-king," a recognition which could certainly be of significance for the whole complex of problems concerning the Indian influence in Southeast Asia. In connection with the social aspects of this legitimating system it will be necessary to give new thought to the function and significance of the family of the foundation priest Śivakaivalya. This family, among other things on account of its centuries-long monopolistic status in the *devarāja* cult, has been labeled as the most important priestly family in Southeast Asia and as Angkor's "shadow dynasty." This high valuation of the family of Śivakaivalya is derived in part from their position in the *devarāja* cult and from the supposition that this cult was at the same time the important cult of the royal *liṅgas* on the temple mountains of Angkor. However, if it should turn out that, once the inauguration of the empire had been enacted, the *devarāja* was only one of various regalia of royal might in the Angkorian kingdom, can this assessment of the Śivakaivalya family be sustained in its entirety?²¹

II. Previous Theories

Before we turn to the examination of the epigraphic sources, some of the previous theories about the *devarāja* cult should be briefly outlined. Deliberately, no attempt at exhaustiveness is made here, as a

²¹The answer to this question must wait on a later study. Here it may simply be remarked that the Sdok Kak Thom inscription reports in only one instance that a member of this family also consecrated a royal *liṅga*. (See pp. 30-31.)

number of recently published works have reviewed the discussion of the *devarāja* cult in its several phases.²²

It is George Coedès, without any question, who is to be credited with the most thorough investigation of the *devarāja* cult and who produced the contributions which were essential for the working out of the theory.²³ Since his "Note sur l'apothéose en Cambodge," which appeared in 1911, the problem of interpreting the *devarāja* cult runs like a red thread through his monumental work. Even after his death, there appeared in the R. C. Majumdar Felicitation volume of 1970 his important contribution on Jayavarman IV (921/28-941 A.D.) as "le véritable fondateur du culte de la royauté divine au Cambodge," in which he substantially enlarged our knowledge of the *devarāja* cult. Probably the best known synthesis of his research findings is to be found in his masterly introduction to the world of Angkor, "Pour mieux comprendre Angkor."²⁴ In the section on "personal cults"²⁵ Coedès brings together the results of the researches which he had presented in various articles, and which in the following sections were to be investigated in even greater detail.

In the Cambodian cult of the *devarāja* or "god-king," according to Coedès, one propensity of Śaivism came to be more conspicuous than in India, its country of origin, and developed into the cult of the kingdom. The "essence" of the reigning king, his "subtle, inner self" (*sūkṣmāntarātman*), was located in a *liṅga* on a temple mountain which stood in the exact center of the capital of the empire and thus in the center of the cosmos. The supernatural *liṅga*, the phallic symbol of the god Śiva, was

²²Filliozat, 1966; Mabbett, 1969; de Bourg, 1968/69.

²³The best known and probably also the most comprehensive description of the *devarāja* cult in German is to be found in R. Heine-Geldern's "Weltbild und Bauform in Südostasien" (1930), pp. 33-45. Integral to his analysis is the role of cosmography as the determinant of planning. It is to be regretted that Heine-Geldern completed this work before Stern, Coedès, etc., in the early thirties, made possible the definitive dating of the most important central temple mountains of Angkor such as the Bakheñ and the Bayon. There is an excellent summary in German of the theories of Coedès in "Angkor. Die Hauptstadt des alten Kambodscha--ein Abbild des Kosmos," *Saeculum*, VI (1955), pp. 154-165. See also Werner Müller, *Die heilige Stadt* (Stuttgart, 1961), pp. 135-45. For comprehensive accounts in German of the culture of Angkor see B. P. Groslier, 1958 and 1960, and also Stierlin, 1970.

²⁴The version cited below is the English translation (Coedès, 1966). [This is the author's note. The English translation is cited in the original.] On the organization of the *devarāja* cult see Coedès/Dupont, 1943/1946a, pp. 65-68.

²⁵Coedès, 1966, pp. 22 f.

generated directly by Śiva and was received by a brahman who passed it on to the first king of the Angkor dynasty. This solemn foundation of the *devarāja* cult²⁶ took place at the beginning of the ninth century under Jayavarman II on Mount Mahendraparvata,²⁷ the present-day Phnom Kulen to the northeast of Angkor. According to Coedès, it is further known that Indravarman, a successor of Jayavarman, established the *liṅga* Indreśvara on the Bakoñ at Roluos (= Hariharālaya) for the cult of the *devarāja*, and that shortly before 900 A.D. Yaśovarman, the founder of Angkor, consecrated the *liṅga* Yaśodhareśvara for the *devarāja* cult on the first central mount of Angkor, the Bakheñ. Then, in the year 921 A.D., King Jayavarman IV moved the *devarāja* to the temporary new capital Koh Ker, where it was honored on the Prasat Thom under the name *Kamrateñ jagat ta rājya* as "Lord of the world who is royalty." After the reversion of the capital to Angkor the *devarāja* was, at the beginning of the eleventh century, consecrated on the temple mountain Phimeanakas that was built specially for the purpose in the Angkorian palace precincts. Towards the end of the eleventh century, Udayādityavarman constructed the Baphuon in order to embody the "inner self" of the king in a golden *liṅga*. Then, towards the end of the twelfth century, after the victory of Buddhism, the *devarāja* "forsook" the Śaivite *liṅga* and was worshipped at the Bayon as "Jayabuddha," in a statue of the Buddha--a statue in which Jayavarman VII, the builder of the Bayon, was divinized.²⁸ "From all this evidence it is safe

²⁶This ceremony on Mahendraparvata seems to have been preceded, in the injunction of Jayavarman II, by an "auspicious magic rite" (*kalyāna-siddhi*) in the south of Cambodia, at Ba Phnom, "destinée à empêcher que le Kambujadeśa ne pût être pris par Javā" ["intended to prevent Cambodia from being annexed by Java"]. Inscription of Vat Samroñ (K.956), lines 15-16 (*IC*, VII, p. 133). In this connection see also Jacques, 1972, p. 212, and Wolters, 1973, p. 22.

²⁷The chronology of Jayavarman II's reign most generally accepted at the time, 802-850 A.D., has been a subject of continuing keen dispute (on this see Majumdar, 1943, pp. 52 ff.; Briggs, 1951a, p. 81; Dupont, 1952, pp. 157 ff.). Very recently there have appeared almost at the same time two more articles which review the whole range of problems once again (Jacques, 1972; Wolters, 1973). The most difficult problem is the question whether the year 802 A.D. represents the date of Jayavarman's coronation or that of a later consecration of the *devarāja* cult on Mahendraparvata.

²⁸Elsewhere, Coedès (1952b, p. 51) lists altogether thirteen royal temple mountains: Prasat Ak Yom, Krus Prah Aram Roñ Chen, Bakoñ, Bakheñ, Prasat Thom in Koh Ker, Baksei Chamkroñ, the Eastern Mebon, Pre Rup, Ta Keo, Phimeanakas, Baphuon, Angkor Wat, Bayon: "Thus of the thirteen temples enumerated six were certainly dedicated to the royal *liṅga* between the ninth and eleventh century, a seventh, Angkor Wat, became a mausoleum of its founder, and, finally, the last contained a Buddhist image of which the name recalled that of Jayavarman VII. The association of this particular architectural type, the pyramid, with royalty is therefore certain."

say that *it was the king who was the great god of ancient Cambodia*, the one to whom the biggest groups of monuments and all the temples in the form of mountains were dedicated.²⁹

Thus, according to Coedès, the cult of the *devarāja* was founded by Jayavarman II on Mount Mahendra and continued by his successors through the consecration of new *lingas*,³⁰ which commonly bore the names of their respective founding kings. So for Coedès the *devarāja*, the imperial paladium of Angkor, is identical with the current personal *lingas* on the temple mountains. On the other hand, as Coedès says in other places,³¹ it remains unclear whether the *devarāja-linga* of these temple mountains was regularly one and the same cult object or whether on the accession of a new king a new cult object was regularly consecrated. According to Coedès, moreover, the "inner self" of the kings of Angkor was located in the *devarāja-linga* on the temple mountains of Angkor. To these kings, as "god-kings" (*deva-rāja*) were the great temples of Angkor dedicated.

In the abovementioned, posthumously published, article on Jayavarman IV (921/28-941 A.D.) as "the veritable founder of the cult of divine kingship in Angkor," Coedès brings together a series of arguments which he had already advanced in various places.³² They represent an important

²⁹Coedès, 1966, p. 31 (emphasis added). Here, Coedès sees the kings as the actual gods of Angkor, whereas in other contexts his argument is more qualified. It is therefore regrettable that this particular passage, whose thesis (as we are attempting to show) is untenable, is all too frequently the authority followed by general works on Southeast Asian history. In this category can perhaps be included Lê Thành Kôi (1967, p. 36) "Letroi était le Dieu à qui de son vivant le temple était dédié" [The king was the god to whom in his lifetime the temple was dedicated]; and Hall (1966, p. 99) "He himself [the king as *devarāja*] was the god to whom in his own lifetime the temple was dedicated." Stierlin (1970, p. 22) even goes a step further when he writes, "As he [the ruler of Angkor] was the king of the gods, he was also the king of men."

³⁰Coedès, 1952b, p. 52: "The royal essence was identified for each reign with the subtle ego of the reigning king, and . . . the *devarāja*, unique when considered as a philosophical and religious conception implying the existence of an image of the abstract king, was in reality multiple, each reign having its own."

³¹Coedès, 1968, p. 119: "We do not know whether this [*devarāja*] *linga* that contained the 'royal essence,' the 'moi subtil' of the king remained the same *linga* throughout the successive reigns or whether, on the other hand, each of the various *lingas* consecrated by the kings upon their accession and bearing their names (Indreśvara, Yasodhareśvara, Rajendreśvara) was in turn the *Devarāja*."

³²Coedès, 1931a; 1952a/b; 1961; and *IC*, I (1937), pp. 70 f.

supplement to the earlier discussion. Starting from the fact that the *liṅgas* on the central temple mountains of the ninth century are known only by the names of their builders (Indreśvara on the Bakon at Roluos and Yaśodhareśvara on the Bakheñ), Coedès expresses legitimate doubt whether the royal *liṅgas* of the ninth century were yet called *devarāja* (or, in Khmer, *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*). All that is so far certain is that both expressions occur for the first time in the famous inscription of Sdok Kak Thom in the year 1052 A.D. However, as the kings Bhavavarman, Īśānavarman and Puṣkarākṣa in the pre-Angkorian period of Chenla (sixth to ninth centuries) had previously erected *liṅgas* under their own names (Bhaveśvara, Īśāneśvara and Puṣkareśvara), this would necessarily leave as the sole demonstrable innovation of the Cambodian rulers of the ninth century the idea of consecrating the royal *liṅga* on a stepped pyramid in the center of their capitals.

According to Coedès, the decisive step to the divinization of king and the kingship in the *devarāja* cult presumably did not happen until Jayavarman IV. As a usurper, he transferred his capital to Chok Gargyar, the present-day Koh Ker, about eighty kilometers to the northeast of Angkor. There he constructed the Prasat Thom, the highest Cambodian temple mountain built to that time. However, he did not name the *liṅga* of this temple after himself as his predecessors had done, but instead he dedicated it to Tribhuvaneśvara, the "lord of the three worlds," a familiar name of Śiva. The Khmer inscriptions at Koh Ker praise the god, first of all, as "the divine lord who is lordship" (*vrah kamrateñ jagat ta rājya*).³³ In his discussions Coedès accords special significance to the Sanskrit expression *rājya* (kingdom, royalty, lordship) in the Khmer name of the *liṅga*. In contrast to the Khmer name of the *devarāja* in the later Sdok Kak Thom inscription, *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* ("the lord of the world, who is king"), here at Koh Ker it is called *kamrateñ jagat ta rājya* ("lord of the world, who is lordship"). According to Coedès, the rule of Jayavarman IV is thus divinized, with the name Tribhuvaneśvara, as "lord of the three worlds." While Jayavarman II, as *cakravartin* at the beginning of the ninth century, aspired after unlimited dominion over the earth, Jayavarman IV a century later went a step further: "Sa fondation du liṅga Tribhuvaneśvara, 'Seigneur des trois mondes' qui est le *rājya*, doit lui assurer une sorte de souveraineté cosmique, identifiant la royauté khmère à la maîtrise des trois mondes qui constituent l'univers."³⁴ Coedès then sets out which successors of Jayavarman IV followed his innovation in their inscriptions, and, similarly, which kings again resumed the tradition of his predecessors and, in the *liṅgas* of their temple mountains, conjoined their own names to that of Śiva (Īśvara).

³³This name appears with several variations: *vrah kamrateñ an ta rājya*; *vrah kamrateñ an jagat ta rājya* and *vrah kamrateñ jagat ta rājya*; *vrah* is here equivalent to "holy, exalted," and as substantive significantly "temple," "king," and "god"; *kamrateñ* = Lord; *jagat* (Sanskrit) = "world"; *aṅga* = "my"; *taa* = relative pronoun; *rājya* (Sanskrit) = "kingship," "kingdom," "sovereignty."

³⁴Coedès, 1970, p. 60.

In consideration of the fact that the name *kamraten jagat ta rājya*, which was to reappear in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription in the form *kamraten jagat ta rāja*, is first documented in the inscriptions of Jayavarman IV, we must agree with Coedès that Jayavarman IV is the veritable founder of the divinization of kingship in Cambodia.³⁵ It will be shown below, however, that the transformation under Jayavarman IV could have taken a basically different course, as Coedès appreciated.³⁶

Coedès developed his views about the *devarāja* cult over the course of almost sixty years. During this time, the reflections of his colleagues in the Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient also drew him into earnest debate.³⁷ In this connection the studies of L. Finot and Ph. Stern should particularly be mentioned; they advanced, against Coedès, the contention that the *devarāja* was a "roi abstrait" (Finot), or, again, "plus un rituel qu'un symbole matérialisé" (Stern). The discussion was pursued by Coedès with almost the same involvement as his famous debate with J. Przyluski over the question whether Angkor Wat was a vaiṣṇavite temple or a mausoleum for its royal builder Sūryavarman II (1113-ca. 1150 A.D.).³⁸ However, whereas the latter discussion was more or less settled by an agreement that Angkor Wat was a vaiṣṇavite mausoleum for Sūryavarman II deified as Paramaviṣṇuloka, the discussion between Coedès, Stern and Finot led to no definitive explanation of the nature of the *devarāja* cult. The reason for this may lie, as will be shown in the following sections, in the conflicting interpretations of the epigraphic data, especially those

³⁵The expression *devarāja* appears, certainly, as early as in an inscription of King Indravarman (see note 134). The discussion of the divinization of the king is here deliberately confined to the epigraphically attested royal cult in Hindu Angkor. The question of royal cults in Southeast Asia in megalithic times, in which for example Quaritch Wales sees the essential foundations of the *devarāja* cult, is not taken into consideration here. "It is when we compare the peculiarities of the Khmer religion with the Older Megalithic beliefs in South-East Asia, that the similarity of concepts is so striking that there seems little doubt as to the direction in which to look for the cause of the distinctive Khmer traits" (H. G. Quaritch Wales, 1961, p. 128).

³⁶See below, pp. 38 ff.

³⁷Summaries of this discussion are to be found in Coedès, 1952a, and de Bourg, 1968/69.

³⁸J. Przyluski, "Pradakṣiṇa et Prasavya en Indochine," in *Winternitz-Festschrift* (Leipzig, 1933), pp. 326-32; idem, "Is Angkor Vat a Temple or a Tomb," *JISOA*, V (1937), pp. 131-44; G. Coedès, "Angkor Vat, temple ou tombe," *BEFEO*, XXXIII (1933), pp. 303-9; idem, "Etudes cambodgiennes XXXIII: La destination funéraire des grands monuments Khmèrs," *BEFEO*, XL (1940), pp. 315-43; idem, "Le grands monuments d'Angkor, sont-ils des temples ou des tombeaux?" *Cahiers de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient*, XXVI (1941), pp. 26-29.

of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription. Today, Coedès's contentions about the *devarāja* cult are generally accepted, and those of his opponents are mentioned almost only in footnotes,³⁹ but the reputation which Coedès's life work has justly earned should not be allowed to close the door to a re-examination of his arguments.

Finot writes of the *devarāja* cult: "Ce roi, ainsi élevé aux honneurs de l'apothéose, n'est pas le roi fondateur, car dans ce cas, l'idole eût reçu, selon la règle, son nom, et elle fût restée dans son temple sans suivre le roi régnant dans toutes ses résidences. Le *devarāja* est le roi abstrait, dans sa nature surhumaine, l'essence royale confondue avec l'essence divine sous l'apparence du *liṅga*. C'est pourquoi il accompagne partout le roi régnant qui est comme l'émanation changeante de sa substance immuable et ne saurait se séparer de lui."⁴⁰ Hence, Finot seems to distinguish between the *liṅga* of the king (such as Indreśvara) and the *devarāja*. The former, in obedience to the rules of Hinduism, was a fixture in a temple and thus could not follow the king to his various residences. The *devarāja*, on the other hand, was the "abstract king," which was united, as the ruler's supernatural essence, with the divine in a *liṅga*. In this immaterial form the *devarāja* followed the kings of Cambodia to their various capitals.

According to Coedès, Finot was thus defending the idea of an "idole unique," against which he maintained that previously the search in Angkor for a temple which could have been the shrine of a "permanent" *devarāja* sculpture had been in vain. As evidence in refutation of the idea of the "idole unique" Coedès then adduces the Tribhuvaneśvara-*liṅga*, which for him was the *devarāja* of king Jayavarman IV in Koh Ker. It would be highly improbable that the potent Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* should have been "carried off" by Jayavarman IV from Angkor to Koh Ker, only to be subsequently transported back to Angkor again in the reigns of his successors. On the contrary, according to Coedès, the *liṅga* of Koh Ker is the pre-eminent example of a royal *liṅga* that was consecrated for a particular king and for a particular temple. So, if inscriptions mention kings taking the *devarāja* with them when they change capitals, this must in Coedès's view be understood as referring to the cult and ritual, but not as denoting the *devarāja* sculpture.⁴¹ Coedès then seeks to trace the whole idea of

³⁹Exceptions in this respect are de Bourg, 1968/69, and Sahai, 1970, pp. 41 ff.

⁴⁰Cited by Coedès, 1952a, p. 12.

⁴¹Coedès, 1952a, p. 13: "Et quand les textes nous disent que tel roi changeant de capitale emmena avec lui le *devarāja* il faut évidemment comprendre qu'il en transféra le culte, le rituel, et non pas l'idole elle-même." ["And when the texts tell us that such-and-such a king, in changing capital, took with him the *devarāja*, it is evidently necessary to understand that he transferred the cult, the ritual, and not the idol itself."] Here Coedès comes very close in his reasoning to Stern, 1934.n

the "idole unique" back to a misinterpretation of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, "qui, loin de parler comme on l'a cru d'une seule et même image 'residant dans toute capitale où les rois le conduisirent,' dit textuellement: 'Quelle que soit la capitale où les rois sont allés résider, *les divers rois-dieux* y ont été emmenés aussi.'"⁴² We must agree with Coedès that this interpretation rules out the notion of an "idole unique." Still, the question remains open whether the interpretation of the text which Coedès offers here in his debate with Finot is tenable.

To begin with, it is enough here to point to the striking fact that Coedès (in collaboration with Dupont) translates the corresponding part of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription in exactly the sense understood by Finot: "*Le dieu-roi* changea de résidence suivant les capitales où le monarque le conduisit. . . ."⁴³

In 1934 Philippe Stern put together his views on the *devarāja* cult in his important article, "Le temple-montagne khmère Le culte du *līṅga* et le *devarāja*" After enumerating the great temples of Angkor and arranging them chronologically, Stern counts up the Angkorian temple *līṅgas* whose names are known to us. We have the Indrēśvara of the Bakon, the Yaśodhareśvara of the Bakheñ, the Rājendrēśvara of the East Mebon, and the Rājendrabhadreśvara of Pre Rup. Further, the *līṅga* of Baphuon is worshipped as the "golden *līṅga*" (*suvarṇa-līṅga*). Stern then poses the decisive question of the relationships between these *līṅgas* known by name and the *devarāja*, "ce dieu-roi sous forme du *līṅga* symbole de la royauté, qui résidait dans chaque capitale?" He seeks to supply the answer in the example of the Yaśodhareśvara-*līṅga* on the Bakheñ: Stern believes it can be established from the Sdok Kak Thom inscription that, when Yaśodharapura (= Angkor) was founded, the Yaśodhareśvara-*līṅga* was consecrated on the Bakheñ in the center of Angkor as the *devarāja* of Yaśovarman.⁴⁴ However, he warns against the "simple and logical hypothesis" that the erection of every temple mountain in Angkor coincides with the accession of a new king and the dedication of a new *līṅga* as *devarāja*. "The reality is, on the contrary, more flexible and less logical." As evidence against this same "simple and logical hypothesis," Stern adduces the East Mebon and Pre Rup, both of which were built by Rājendravarman II (944-968). These examples

⁴²Coedès, 1952a, p. 14 (emphasis added). ["Which, far from speaking, as has been thought, about a single unique image 'residing in each capital to which the kings conducted it,' says, in the context, 'to whatever capital the kings went to take up residence, *the various king-gods* were taken thither also. . . ."]

⁴³Coedès et Dupont, 1943/46a, p. 110 (emphasis added). ["The *god-king* changed its residence according as the monarch conducted it to different capitals. . . ."]

⁴⁴Stern, 1934, p. 613. It will be shown below (p. 33) that this identification of the Yaśodhareśvara with the *devarāja* in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription is, specifically, *not* admissible.

demonstrate that a king could have built, one after the other, *two* temple mountains for two *liṅgas* named after him, Rājendreśvara (952 A.D.) and Rājendrabhadreśvara (961 A.D.). These two temple mountains of one and the same king contradict the proposition that every king built *one* temple for his royal *devarāja-liṅga*.⁴⁵ The difficulties which are bound to arise if one attempts to demonstrate the connections, and also the distinctions, between the *devarāja* and the *liṅgas* of the Angkorian temple mountains can only be obviated, according to Stern, by the proposition that the *devarāja* was a "movable cult."⁴⁶ This cult, says Stern, could be celebrated as a rule (among other occasions) when a new royal temple was consecrated. Hence Stern is inclined to see in the *devarāja* rather "a rite than a material symbol."⁴⁶ As confirmation of this proposition, Stern adduces the data of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, which indeed bring the ritual (*siddhividyā, vidhi, etc.*) of the *devarāja* into the foreground. Hence Stern comes to the conclusion that, in the central sanctuaries on the temple mountains of Angkor, there was invariably (or commonly) a *liṅga* which invariably (or commonly) united the name of the reigning monarch with Īśvara, the name of Śiva. In contrast to these royal *liṅgas*, however, the *devarāja* seems to have been the ritual of a cult rather than the cult object of a particular cult in a particular temple. This *devarāja* cult could have been celebrated "around" the royal *liṅga*. In Stern's view this interpretation would explain how and why the cult was celebrated in various temples.⁴⁷

On the views of Finot and Stern it may be said by way of summary that both distinguish at least partially between the *devarāja* and the personal king-*liṅgasa*. Finot sees in the *devarāja* the abstract royal essence ("essence royal"), which existed as it were independently of the currently reigning king and independently of his personal *liṅgas* established on the temple mountains. The suprapersonal royal essence was united with the god Śiva in a *liṅga* that was passed down from king to king through the agency of brahmins. Stern, on the other hand, appears to have in mind a *devarāja* ritual independent of the personal *liṅgas* of kings and without any definite temple. This ritual was celebrated in various places, and this could include the temple mountains of the personal *liṅgas* belonging to the kings of Angkor. But Finot and Stern both studiously refrain from

⁴⁵Coedès (1952a, p. 51) included the Mebon and the Pre Rup in a list of the royal temple mountains of Cambodia. It is not clear why, in a similar list (1955, p. 158), he did not mention the Mebon temple mountain.

⁴⁶Stern, 1934, p. 614.

⁴⁷Stern, 1934, p. 615: "Quant au *devarāja*, il paraît être un rituel célébré autour d'un *liṅga* au nom royal, plutôt qu'un *liṅga* déterminé ayant son temple particulier. S'il en est ainsi, ce culte a pu être célébré dans des temples différents." ["As for the *devarāja*, it seems to have been a ritual celebrated in the royal name before a *liṅga*, rather than a specific *liṅga* with its own unique temple. If such is the case, this cult could have been celebrated in different temples."]

indicating, even by so much as a hint, what this "abstract" cult--a cult without definite cult object and without permanent temple--could have looked like. This uncertainty impelled both scholars to revert, in particular cases, to the identification of the *devarāja* with the personal *liṅgas* of the kings; in so doing they fell back into the circular argument from which they had originally wished to escape.

The most important contribution of recent years, whose implications reveal new avenues to the explanation of the *devarāja* cult, comes, as was mentioned above, from J. Filliozat. On the basis of a series of data from the Tiruvāśagam of the South Indian Śaivite sacred Māṅikka-vāśagar (which Filliozat dates to the ninth century), he is enabled to demonstrate that in South India Śiva was worshipped as "king of the gods" on Mount Mahendra:⁴⁸ "So it is unnecessary to suppose peculiar Khmer ideas of the king as god to understand how the *devarāja* was established on the Mahendraparvata in the shape of a *liṅga*. *Devarāja*, meaning 'king of gods', designates Śiva himself, normally represented by a *liṅga* and established on the very mountain referred to by Māṅikkavācakar."⁴⁹ After taking account of the custom, familiar throughout India, of naming the *liṅga* of a king with his name in combination with Īśvara (= Śiva),⁵⁰ Filliozat

⁴⁸"If we now refer to the Tamil Śaivite literature of the time when Jayavarman II first established the *devarāja* on the Mahendraparvata . . . we meet with a very simple explanation of all the facts" (Filliozat, 1966, p. 101). As an example, Filliozat cites from the Tiruvāśagam, *inter alia*, "O God of the gods themselves" (XXVIII, 9), or "On King of those who are above" (XXVII, 7). "Taking as his abode the great mountain Mahendra where he established his seat and his glory, there he granted the grace of manifesting the tradition (*āgamam*)" (II, 8-10). The historically most familiar example in India of the worship of Śiva on a Mount Mahendra is Śiva Gokarṇasvāmin (or, Gokarṇeśvara) on the Mahendraparvata (Mahendrācala) as state divinity of the eastern Gaṅgas of the Kalinga kingdom, from about the sixth to the twelfth centuries (see, for example, the Ponnunturu inscription of Samantavarman from the year 64 of the Gaṅga era, whose beginning is usually dated to 496 A.D. S. N. Rajaguru, *Inscriptions of Orissa*, II [Bhubaneswar 1960], p. 10).

⁴⁹Filliozat, 1966, p. 102 (emphasis added).

⁵⁰"So in Cambodia, an Indreśvara, for example, was the Lord of King Indravarman, that is, simply Śiva, the Lord of the Universe, as worshipped by this king in a peculiar place." Filliozat, 1966, p. 102. In this connection see also J. Duncan M. Derrett, *The Hoysaḷas, a Medieval Royal Family* (Madras, 1957), p. 223: "Without a word of explanation it might be supposed that if the Hoysaleśvara, or Liṅga of Śiva dedicated by the Hoysaḷa, or in the name of the Hoysaḷa, were the product of a figment of the king's own brain, it would be tantamount to an admission that the medieval India was a 'divine king'a This, of course, was not the case. The custom of naming a Liṅga either after the person who had the temple built and the consecration performed or a nominee of his . . . was indeed

comes to the conclusion that "the Khmer expression *kamraten jagat ta rāja* means simply 'the lord of the World (jagadīśvara) who is King,' not 'who is the [Khmer] king,' having performed the *lingasthāpanaa*"⁵¹

This brief review of various theories about the *devarāja* cult has served not only to demonstrate in outline the development of the royal cults in Angkor, but also to point to a few of the controversial questions about the nature of the *devarāja* cult, to which we shall now address ourselves. The most important problem is certainly the question raised by Filliozat: who was venerated in Angkor as *devarāja*, Śiva or the Cambodian kings? On the basis of South Indian sources, Filliozat was able to show convincingly that in the *devarāja* the Hindu god Śiva was venerated; but he stopped short of going on to make a more thorough examination of the Cambodian epigraphic sources. We shall revert more than once to the question how far Filliozat's thesis is valid for Angkor as well.

III. The Sdok Kak Thom Inscription and the *Devarāja* Cult

The most important source for the *devarāja* cult is rightly considered to be the famous inscription of Sdok Kak Thom from the year 1052 A.D. In it the brahman Sadāśiva recounts the history of his family, which possessed an uncontested monopoly in the discharge of priestly office pertaining to the *devarāja* cult. The part played by the family of Śivakaivalya in the *devarāja* cult parallels the role which the Sdok Kak Thom inscription plays in our knowledge of the *devarāja* cult. Without the data from this inscription about the foundation of the cult, and the precise enumeration of the various priestly functions of the seven forebears of Sadāśiva, it would not be possible to fit such isolated references to the *devarāja* cult as occur in other inscriptions into any broader pattern. The inscription, which has been edited and translated several times,⁵² consists of a Sanskrit part and a Khmer part. About the *devarāja* cult,

not unconnected with vanity, since by this means the donor achieved a kind of immortality." It is obviously one of the gravest errors in the discussion of the *devarāja* cult, and the question of divinization of rulers in general, to perceive in the attempt to achieve salvation in a particular god (perhaps by the erection of a statue of oneself in the likeness of the god, a "portrait sculpture") a process of divinization of the one striving after salvation.

⁵¹Filliozat, 1966, p. 103 (emphasis added); Mabbett, 1969, p. 105: "Neither this passage, nor any other, says that Jayavarman is a *devarāja*. The term appears as the name of a rite, and should be thought of as such. The occurrence of the term alone is not enough to show that anybody identified a king with a god."

⁵²F. Aymonier, 1901; Finot, 1915; Coedès/Dupont, 1943/46a. Where not otherwise specified, the edition of Coedès and Dupont is cited.

the Khmer version is substantially more informative. In it is recounted how King Jayavarman II came from Java⁵³ to Indrapura in Cambodia. There Jayavarman nominated the priest Śivakaivalya as his teacher (*guru*) and court chaplain (*rājapurohita*). After two shifts of capital, to Hariharālaya and Amarendrapura, it was established upon Mahendraparvata (C, 70). "At that time⁵⁴ there came a brahman named Hiraṇyadāma from Janapada, a savant versed in magical science (*siddhi vidyā*)^a He was invited by His Highness, Parameśvara [posthumous name of Jayavarman], in order to conduct a ceremony (*vidhi*) which should prevent this land of Kambuja from ever being dependent (*āyatta*) on Javā, and to bring about [instead]⁵⁵ that there should be only one single 'Lord of the lower earth' [= King; Khmer: *kamrateñ phdai karom*], who would be *Cakravartin* [universal lord]. This brahman conducted the ceremony in accordance with the Vināśikha. He consecrated (*pratiṣṭhā*) the lord of the World, who is king [*kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* = Skt: *Devarāja*] (C, 71-74). This brahman taught the holy Vināśikha, Nayottara, Saṃmoha and Śiraścheda [Tantras?],⁵⁶ all of which⁵⁷ he recited from beginning to end, in order to have them written down and to teach them to Steñ añ Śivakaivalya. He gave instruction to Steñ añ Śivakaivalya, so that the latter could perform the ritual (*vidhi*) in the presence of (*nā*) the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* (C, 74-76). His Royal Highness Parameśvara and the brahman Hiraṇyadāma granted a concession and swore an oath, ordaining that the family line of the Steñ añ Śivakaivalya should officiate in the presence of⁵⁸ the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*, forbidding that other people should officiate. Steñ añ Śivakaivalya, the *purohita*, appointed his whole family to the service of the ritual (C, 76-78). Then His Royal Highness Parameśvara, the king, went back again to be ruler⁵⁹ in the royal city of Hariharālaya. His Highness the

⁵³*manavrah pāda Parameśvara mok amvi Javā pi kurun ni anau nagara Indrapura* (C, 61). According to the recent researches of Professor Boechari, cited by O. W. Wolters as an authority, it is not to be ruled out that the expression "*bhūmi Jāva*" in the nearly Śrīvijaya inscription from Kota Kapur (686 A.D.) refers to the extreme south of Sumatra. Wolters, 1973, p. 22, note 8.

⁵⁴Or "In that a brahman came. . . ." See Appendix under *man*.

⁵⁵See Appendix under *leḥ*.

⁵⁶*vrāhmaṇa noḥ thve vidhi toy vrah Vināśikha. pratiṣṭhā kamrateñ jagat ta rāja. vrāhmaṇa noḥ paryyan vrah Vināśikha. Nayottara. Saṃmoha. Śiraścheda* (C, 73-74). The substantive *pratiṣṭhā*, like *sthāpanā*, is used without a verb. On these texts, see note 74 below.

⁵⁷See Appendix under *man* and *syāñ*.

⁵⁸See Appendix under *nā*.

⁵⁹See Appendix under *kurun*.

kamrateñ an ta rāja was conducted (*nāṃ*)⁶⁰ back also. Śivakaivalya, together with his whole family, officiated according to the rules (C, 78-79). Steñ añ Śivakaivalya died during this reign [of Jayavarman]. His Royal Highness Parameśvara went to heaven while [residing] in the city of Hariharālaya (C, 80). The *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* moved from place to place,⁶¹ accompanying the king to the respective capital cities, in order to protect (*cāṃ*) the rule (*rājya*) of future kings (*kamrateñ phdai karom*) (C, 80-82).

Here follows a short description of the activity of the priest Sūkṣmavindu, who was the *purohita* of the *devarāja* and successor to Śivakaivalya, under King Jayavarman III. With regard to the *devarāja* cult we are told merely: "During the reign of His Royal Highness Viṣṇuloka [Jayavarman III], the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* resided in Hariharālaya." Steñ añ Sūkṣmavindu "was *purohita* of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*. The whole family officiated in the presence of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*." (C, 82-84)

The following sixty-four lines of the inscription's Khmer text recount, in practically the same terms, the careers of the successors of Sivakaivalya who celebrated the official ritual of the *devarāja* under the various kings of Angkor, up to the priest Sadāśiva in Udayādityavarman II's reign (1050-1066 A.D.).⁶² Additional information about the *devarāja* in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription is to be obtained only from the time of Angkor's foundation during Yasovarman I's reign (889-ca. 910 A.D.), and from the time of Jayavarman IV (921/28-941), who temporarily moved the capital to Chok Gargyar (Koh Ker), north of Angkor.

Under Yaśovarman, Vāmaśiva was the tutor of the king, and his "whole family officiated in accordance with the rules in the presence of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*. When⁶³ His Royal Highness Paramaśivaloka [Yaśovarman I] founded the city of Srī Yaśodharapura he transferred the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* from Hariharālaya to place it in this city⁶⁴ (D, 11-12).⁶⁵ His Royal Highness Paramaśivaloka then constructed (*sthāpanā*) the central

⁶⁰ See Appendix under *nāṃ*.

⁶¹ See Appendix under *daiy*, and Introduction, p. xviii.

⁶² Even if Sadāśiva's religious functions were reduced under Sūryavarman (Briggs, 1951b, pp. 242 f. and 1952, pp. 180 ff.), there is still no question of any weakening of Sadāśiva and his family. The service of the *devarāja* was carried out by his family both under Sūryavarman and under the latter's successor Udayādityavarman (D, 44; D, 64)n

⁶³ See Appendix under *man*.

⁶⁴ See Appendix under *nāṃ*.

⁶⁵ Here I follow the translation of Finot (1915, p. 89, lines 12 f.).

(temple-) mountain (*vnām kantāl*).⁶⁶ The lord of the Śivāśrama [= Vāmaśiva] erected the sacred *liṅga* in the center.⁶⁷ (D, 12-13)⁶⁷

Concerning Jayavarman IV, we learn of "the reign of His Royal Highness Paramaśivapada [Jayavarman IV]; then His Highness left the city of Śrī Yaśodharapura in order to be ruler (*kurun*) in Chok Gargyar. He took with him also the *kamrateñ jagat ta rājaa* [thither]." (D, 31-32) Under Harṣavarman II (941-944 A.D.), the successor of Jayavarman, the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* continued to reside in Chok Gargyar. Not until the time of his successor, Rājendravarman II (944-968 A.D.), did the capital move back to Angkor. "Then His Royal Highness Śivaloka (Rājendravarman II) returned again to be ruler in the city of Śrī Yaśodharapura, and he conducted the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* back with him. The whole family officiated in the presence of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* in accordance with the rules."⁶⁸ (D, 36-37)

Let us now glance briefly at the Sanskrit part of the inscription, which recounts the solemn inauguration of the *devarāja* cult. Here it is said that Hiranyadāma taught the śāstra texts *Śiraścheda*, *Vināśikha*, *Sam̐moha*, and *Nayottara*, "the four faces of Tumburut" "When this brahman, full of zeal, employing his knowledge and experience in occult science, had brought together the essence of the śāstras, then, for the increase of the well-being of the earth, he performed the success-ensuring (ritual) called *devarāja*."⁶⁸ Besides the important designation of the *devarāja* ritual, the Sanskrit version of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription contains little concrete evidence. The name *devarāja* crops up only twice more at the end of this family chroniclet. There it is said that Śivācārya, the penultimate member of the line of priests from the family of Śivakaivalya, "offered worship (*arcā*) daily, full of zeal and excluding other priests" to the *devarāja* (B, 34), and that Sādāśiva, the last chief of the Śivaṭ kaivalyas, honored the *devarāja* (B, 37).

It is significant for our further consideration that, in connection with the founding of Yaśodharapura, the consecration of the *liṅga* upon the Yaśodharagiri (Bakheñ) is especially stressed, as it is also in the Khmer

⁶⁶ Bakheñ = Yaśodharagirit

⁶⁷ In later inscriptions this *liṅga* of Yaśovarman is called "Śrī Yaśodhareśvara"; for example the Bakheñ inscriptions K. 464 and K. 558, line 6 (Jacquest, 1970, p. 65).

⁶⁸ śāstram śiraścheda-vināśikhākhyam
sam̐mohanāmāpi nayottarākhyam (55)
tat tumvuror vaktra-catuṣkram asya
siddhyeva vipras samadarśayat saḥ (56) XXVIII
divijas sammuddhṛtya śāstra-sāram
rahasya-kaustalyadhīyā sayatnaḥ (57)
siddhīr vvaḥantīḥ kila devarājā
bhikhyām vidadhrē bhuvana-rddhi-vṛddhyai (58) XXIX

version of the inscription: Vāmaśiva, the *guru* of Yaśovarman (887-ca. 910 A.D.), "erected a Śiva-*liṅga* on the king's request upon the Srī Yaśodhara-giri, equal in splendour to the King of the Mountain [Meru]" (B, 15). Further, it is said of Īśānamūrti, the *hotar* of Jayavarman IV (921/28-940 A.D.), that, full of devotion (*bhaktiā*), he honored Tribhuvaneśvara (B, 27) --the *liṅga* that Jayavarman IV caused to be erected on the Prasāt Thom in Koh Ker.

In attempting to solve the problems posed for us by the *devarāja* cult, scholars have sometimes been all too readily tempted to see certain enigmatic allusions to the *devarāja* cult in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription as having an immediate bearing on the archaeological problems of Angkor. Sometimes it seems that a number of the difficulties attending research into the *devarāja* cult can be reduced to a methodological problem. We have been attempting to elucidate the nature of a cult whose existence is known, ultimately, only from an inscription, by using archaeological means, and we have even been trying to solve further problems by the same means, before the possibilities of clarifying the problem through the inscription have been completely exhausted.⁶⁹ However, as the Sdok Kak Thom inscription is still, as it always has been, the only source which makes possible any sort of coherent statement about the *devarāja* cult, we shall here deliberately follow the opposite path--that is, we shall in the first instance assess the data of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription in their own right. It will be apparent that the analysis of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription yields a relatively clear picture of the *devarāja* in at least three particulars: (1) the *devarāja* is Śiva; (2) it is worshipped in a *movable* cult image, which (3) is not identical with the *liṅgas* of the large temple mountains of Angkor. Hence the temple mountains of Angkor, rich as they are in abundant archaeological and epigraphic indications of their cosmographic significance, are ruled out as sources for the *devarāja* cult in the strict sense. They are, however, of crucial significance for the problem of royal apotheosis in the kingdom of Angkor in the wider sense.⁷⁰

⁶⁹Certainly, when we think of the size and number of the at first apparently almost insoluble archaeological problems confronted by archaeologists in Angkor, this methodical approach becomes entirely comprehensible. It seemed capable not only of relating the large number of undated Angkorian temple buildings to a chronological sequence, but also of providing a key to the question why this prodigious building activity had been undertaken in Angkor. The constantly repeated references of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription to the priests who carried out the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* rite under the various kings immediately presented themselves as a key to the solution of this problem. It followed from the theory that after their death, the temple mountains of Angkor became the mausolea of the men who built them, that the new kings were virtually compelled to erect new temples for "their" *devarājasa*.

⁷⁰Heine-Geldern, 1930, pp. 33-45; Coedès, 1955; Filliozat, 1954; Stierlin, 1970, pp. 81 ff. See also Mus, 1933, pp. 696-710 and M. Eliade,

If we read the Sdok Kak Thom inscription bearing in mind the familiar theory that the *devarāja* was consecrated by the kings from time to time on the temple mountains built by them, it instantly strikes us that, on the contrary, the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* was consecrated, or even solemnly inaugurated (*pratiṣṭhā*) only once, namely under Jayavarman II, on Mahendraparvata.⁷¹ Thereafter, repeating itself almost mechanically, it is said only that, under the supervision of a particular successor Śivakaivalya, the latter's "whole family officiated in the presence of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* in accordance with the rules."⁷² From this, to my understanding, it can only be concluded that a particular cult object, perhaps a sculpture, was consecrated *once*,⁷³ and that the further celebration of the ritual pertaining to this same cult object was observed by the successors of the foundation priest. This signification is confirmed in the inscription where it is said that the brahman Hiraṇyadāma, as a savant of occult magic, consecrated the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* according to the Vināśikha ritual. Then he recited the four presumably tantric texts⁷⁴ from beginning to end, and wrote them down in order to instruct the court priest Śivakaivalya. "He taught Steñ añ Śivakaivalya to celebrate the rite (*vidhi*) performed in the presence of the *kamrateñ añ ta rāja*."⁷⁵ One of the consequences of this prominence accorded in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription to the texts and to the rite (*vidhi*) based on them has been that Philippe Stern presumed the *devarāja* to be a rite

"Centre du monde, temple, maison," in *Le symbolisme cosmique des monuments religieux* (Roma, 1957), pp. 57-82 (Série Orientale Roma, XIV).

⁷¹Before the passage translated above (C, 73-74), in which the brahman Hiraṇyadāma performed the consecration, the assertion was made right at the beginning of the Khmer text that "then His Royal Highness Paramesvara consecrated the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* in the city of Śrī Mahendraparvata" (*man vrah pāda Paramesvara pratiṣṭhā kamrateñ jagat ta rāja Anau nagara Śrī Mahendraparvata*, C, 56). See also Coedès/Dupont, 1945/46, p. 103, note 2.

⁷²*gi kule phon siñ nā kamrateñ jagat ta rāja ru ta tāpra Anau* (D, 11-12). This explanation is repeated almost word for word, nine times altogether, for the reigns of all the Angkor kings up to Udayādityavarman II.

⁷³Briggs advanced most emphatically the opposite interpretation (1951b, p. 233): "Hiraṇyadāma taught Śivakaivalya the magic ritual to enable the purohita or other members of the family to create a new *devarāja* on the accession of a new king."

⁷⁴As early as 1915, Finot supposed (1915, p. 57) that Tantric texts were involved here. See P. C. Bagchi, "On Some Tantrik Texts Studied in Ancient Kambuja," *Indian Historical Quarterly*, V (1929), pp. 754-69, and VI (1930), pp. 97-101. Dupont and Coedès (1943/46, p. 64), on the other hand, referred cautiously to "śāstra śivaites."

⁷⁵*gi ta thve vidhi nā kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* (C, 75-76).

rather than a particular cult object. But, if we start from the premise that the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* or the *devarāja* was a particular sculpture, then it is only to be expected that, once the cult object had been consecrated, the rite should occupy the foreground in the view of the successors of Śivakaivalya; for the celebration of it, and, even more, the knowledge of the secret texts on which the whole cult rested, were the most important possession of this priestly family.

As we have already observed, there are pre-eminently two objections to the theory of the *devarāja* as an "idole unique." Coedès adduces, against it, above everything else, the grandeur of the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* of King Jayavarman IV, and Stern sees the *liṅga* of Yaśovarman on the Bakheñ temple mountain as clear evidence that on occasion the *devarāja* as *liṅga* was erected for a particular ruler on the temple mountain built by him.

Bearing in mind these objections, let us first examine the text of the inscription in relation to the *liṅga* which Yaśovarman erected upon the foundation of Angkor.⁷⁶ Yaśovarman's procedure at the founding of Angkor is very clearly described in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription. In the relevant passages of the text in the Khmer version, four successive transactions are portrayed: (1) Yaśovarman founded the city of Yaśodharapura (Angkor); (2) he transferred the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* from Hariharālaya, his previous seat of government, to this city; (3) thereupon Yaśovarman founded (*sthāpanā*) the "central mountain" of Angkor, the Bakheñ temple mountain; and (4) the guru Vāmaśiva founded (*sthāpanā*) the sacred *liṅga* in the center--quite obviously referring to the *liṅga* on the central temple mountain, the Bakheñ.⁷⁷

The inscription makes it clear that first the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* was brought to Yaśodharapura and only *later* was a *liṅga* consecrated on the central temple mountain built in the meantime. Even Coedès, who argues vehemently for the identity of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* / *devarāja* with the *liṅgas* on the Angkorian temple mountains,⁷⁸ comes, together with

⁷⁶On the *tribhuvaneśvara liṅga* of Jayavarman, see below, pp. 38 ff.

⁷⁷*man vraḥ pāda Paramśivaloka cat nagara Śrī-yaśodharapura nāṃ kamrateñ jagat ta rāja aṃvi Hariharālaya yok duk ta nagara noḥ man vraḥ pāda Paramaśi valoka sthāpanā Vnāṃ Kantāl. kamrateñ Śivāśrama sthāpanā vraḥ liṅga āy kantāl* (D, 12-13).

⁷⁸In 1932 Finot (*BEFEO*, XXXII [1932], p. 3, note 1) raised the question of why then Bakheñ, which was consecrated in 889 A.D. [allegedly!] to the *devarāja* should in a later inscription, in 968 A.D. be eulogized under the name of Yaśodhareśvara. Coedès answered (communication cited by Finot, *BEFEO*, XXXII [1932], p. 3, note 1) with the following suggested alternative explanations: (1) In the beginning, the Bakheñ was possibly consecrated not to the *devarāja* but to the Yaśodhareśvara. This supposition is, however, certainly not confirmed by the Sdok Kak Thom inscription

Dupont, to the same conclusion in their translation of the inscription: "Le développement du récit montre clairement que le transfert du *devarāja* à Yaśodharapura constitue un épisode défini, tandis que la fondation du Mont Central, où un *liṅga* est placé, en constitue un autre. Chaque épisode est d'ailleurs introduit par *man*, 'alors, qui indique une reprise dans la narration."⁷⁹ So we can take it as certain that, in the Khmer version of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, for one thing, the transfer (*nām*) of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* is recounted, and, for another, it is reported that thereafter⁸⁰ (*man*) a *liṅga* was consecrated on the central temple mountain. It is not legitimate to infer the identity of both icons from the inscription, as Stern did.⁸¹ So we may dispose of a major argument that has in the past been adduced for the identity of the *devarāja* with the *liṅgas* of the temple mountains of Angkor.

(which is at least two hundred years later). (2) After his return from Koh Ker (944 A.D.) Rājendravarman did not reconsecrate the Bakheñ, alienated as it had been from its original purpose by Jayavarman IV, to the *devarāja*, but instead he erected a new temple mountain to the *devarāja* and consecrated the Bakheñ to the Yaśodhareśvaran. In his article of 1970 about Jayavarman IV, Coedès raises the question whether the expression *devarāja* was known at all as early as the ninth century.

⁷⁹Coedès and Dupont, 1943/46a, p. 113, note 6.

⁸⁰On *man* see Appendix, and Introduction, p. xviii where the author makes the qualification that *man* is consistent with the transfer and the consecration occurring at the same time.

⁸¹Stern (1934, p. 613), on the basis of the text, reasons from a presumed simultaneity of the above-mentioned sequence of events to an identity of both icons: "la partie khmère du texte indique, avec précision, que le *Kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*, au moment de la fondation d'Angkor (Yaśodharapura) fut érigé dans cette ville sur le mont central; or la partie correspondante sanskrite se bornenà signaler (BEFEO, XV [1915], p. 80, verse 43) que, d'après les ordres du roi, au moment de la fondation d'Angkor, il (le Guru) érigea un *liṅga* sur le mont Śrī Yaśodharagiri, égal en beauté au roi des Monts" (emphasis added). [The Khmer section of the text indicates precisely that the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*, at the moment when Angkor (Yaśodharapura) was founded, was erected in this town upon the central mountain; but the corresponding Sanskrit passage confines itself to the information (BEFEO, XV [1915], p. 80, verse 43) that, following the orders of the king, at the moment when Angkor was founded, he (the guru) erected a *liṅga* on mount Śrī Yaśodharagiri, equal in beauty to the king of the Mountains."] This synchronism of the erection of a *liṅga* and the shift of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* must, however, rest on an error: the expression "at the moment of the foundation of Angkor" does not occur either in the text or the translation of Finot cited: "D'après les ordres du roi, il érigea un *liṅga* sur le mont Śrī Yaśodharagiri, égal en beauté au Roi des monts (l'Himālaya)." [Following the king's orders, he erected a *liṅga* on Mount Śrī Yaśodharagiri, equal in beauty to the King of the Mountains (the Himalaya)."] Finot, BEFEO, XV (1915), p. 80, at verse XLIII.

A further feature of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription counts, to my understanding, just as unambiguously against the notion that from time to time the *devarāja* was consecrated afresh for a new ruler in the *liṅga* of a new temple. In the Sdok Kak Thom inscription it is certainly explained what "personal *liṅgas*" the various successors of Śivakaivalya caused to be consecrated in their respective villages. In the same way, we are told, in chronological sequence, under which family chiefs of this priestly dynasty the "whole family officiated in accordance with the prescriptions in the presence of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rājaa*" On the other hand, we hear nothing about the *devarājas* alleged to be rededicated constantly. If the *devarājas* always had to be consecrated afresh in the royal *liṅgas* of the reigning kings, then it becomes a problem for us to see why these *liṅgas* and their consecration are not named in the inscription in association with their constantly repeated references to the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*, especially since we know that the names of the *liṅgas* of these temples were in no way forgotten or altered with the death of their founders. As a particularly good example in this connection, the *Indreśvara* on the Bakoñ in Hariharālaya (Roluos) may be noticed. If this *liṅga*, which was still known by its founder's name generations after its founder Indravarman,⁸² and famed for the magnificence of its temple, had been consecrated as the *devarāja* by a member of the family of Śivakaivalya, then it would be incomprehensible why this consecration is not mentioned in the inscription.⁸³ The only answer to this question that can properly be given is that the *Indreśvara* was not the *devarāja* during the reign of Indravarman.⁸⁴

A number of further controversial problems which have arisen in the course of debate about the *devarāja* cult can be largely resolved by reference to the Sdok Kak Thom inscription. Thus, the Khmer rendering of it leaves no doubt that a cult image and not an abstract rite occupies the central position in the *devarāja* cult. For it is said constantly, as had already been mentioned more than once, that the members of the Śivakaivalya family officiated *in the presence of*⁸⁵ the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*.

⁸²In an inscription of 960 A.D. it is named *vrah kamrateñ añ Śrī-Indreśvara* (IC, IV, p. 103 [K. 265] A, 14-15).

⁸³Instead, however, we find only the laconic statement that "under the reign of His Royal Highness *Īśvaraloka* (Indravarman I) the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* was in Hariharālaya, (and) the whole family officiated according to the rules in the presence of the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*" (D, 4-5). As further examples the *liṅgas* of Rājendravarman in the Eastern Mebon and Pre Rup may be cited. Moreover, there is the *liṅga* of Śiva erected around 1000 A.D. by Śivācārya on the Hemaśṛṅga (Ta Keo); cp. the Stele of Tūol Ta Pecñ śloka XCI (IC, V, p. 256).

⁸⁴In the foundation inscription of the Bakoñ is clearly written: *Śrī-Indreśvara iti liṅga* (IC, I, p. 32, śloka XXIII). See also Baksei Chamkroñ, śloka XXVI (IC, IV, pp. 88 ff.).

⁸⁵Or "in connection with." See Appendix under *nā*.

This "in the presence of" is invariably represented in Khmer by *nā*, which has an unambiguously locative significance, and here it can only be said that a rite was performed in front of a *cult image*.⁸⁶ The word *nām*,⁸⁷ which is always used when the *devarāja* follows the king on a change of capital, points in the same direction. *Nām*, which is equivalent in meaning to the expression "to escort a person," is applicable rather to a cult image than to an abstract rite. So also with *arcā* or *arcana* in the Sanskrit version of the inscription, which is the equivalent of "veneration, worship." In a context such as, "they offered worship to the *devarāja*" (*devarāja cakrur arcām*, B, 34), *devarāja* can only represent a cult object, but not its ritual.⁸⁸

A further question, critical for the problem of the divinization of rulers in Cambodia, is likewise clearly answered in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription. That is, in complete accordance with Filliozat's interpretation, we find absolutely no indication in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription that the kings of Angkor were worshipped as *devarāja* or *kamrateñ jagat tarāja*. On the contrary, it is stated unambiguously that the rite on Mahendraparvata was performed by Hiranyadāma at the request of Jayavarman II so that there should be "only one king who was *cakravartin*" (C, 73).⁸⁹ A further indication of the "earthly" character of the rule wielded by the kings of Angkor may be seen in the expression *kamrateñ phdai karom* which is used many times in the inscription for "king." *Phdai karom* means "lower plane, the earth," so *kamrateñ phdai karom* is equivalent to "lord of the lower plane, lord of the earth."⁹⁰ While the conceptions *kamrateñ jagat tarāja* ("lord of the world, who is king") and *kamrateñ phdai karom* ("the lord of the lower plane/earth") seem indeed to be parallel ideas, in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription they in fact designate two poles of

⁸⁶Mabbett, 1969, p. 206.

⁸⁷See Appendix under *nām*.

⁸⁸Sahai, 1970, p. 41: "Notre texte indique clairement que le *devarāja* n'était pas un simple rituel, mais une divinité adorée avec des rites précis." [Our text shows clearly that the *devarāja* was not a mere ritual but a divinity worshipped with specific rites.]"

⁸⁹It is not in the least disputed here that the idea of a "universal ruler" (*cakravartin*) contained in itself a species of divinization of the ruler. The concern here is merely to establish whether the conception of the *devarāja* assumed proportions exceeding those of its Indian models--perhaps in the sense of an outright identification: the king is God.

⁹⁰Lewitz, 1971, p. 98: "*Kamrateñ phdai karom*, Lit. 'seigneur de la surface inférieure, c'est-à-dire 'le roi' régnant sur 'la terre', laquelle s'oppose au ciel qui est 'la surface supérieure' (*phdai le*)." ["*Kamrateñ phdai karom*, lit. 'lord of the lower surface', that is, 'the king' reigning over 'the earth', as opposed to the sky which is 'the upper surface' (*phdai le*)."]

lordship. The god Śiva is the "lord of the world, who is king" (one might say: the highest king), while here below the king rules as "lord of the earth."⁹¹ This antithesis becomes even clearer when we read that the "lord of the world, who is king" protects (*cām*) the "lord of the earth" (C, 81-82). One must therefore ask how the king of Angkor can be the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* himself when he is actually protected by the latter. We may take it as established, then, that the Sdok Kak Thom inscription offers no warrant at all for the theory that the kings of Angkor were "god-kings" (*devarāja*): on the contrary, it is stated unambiguously that the "lord of the earth" is protected by the "lord of the world."

IV. Devarāja--a "*Calantī Pratimā*" of the God Śiva?

In the foregoing discussion we were able to establish that an analysis of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription shows the *devarāja* to have been of necessity a cult object and that this cult object was not identical with the *liṅgas* which the kings of Angkor had erected on the monumental temple mountains of their capitals. But the Sdok Kak Thom inscription does not help us any further with the question what sculpture or what cult object was worshipped as *devarāja*, as it contains no relevant data. In any event, the inscription allows the legitimate supposition that, in the domain of royal Śaivism, a Śiva *liṅga* could have been involved.⁹² It is likewise unclear in which temple the conjectural *devarāja* sculpture was worshipped. Indeed the fact that to date it has not been possible to assign this function to an Angkorian temple induced Coedès to reject Finot's theory of the "idole unique."⁹³ Since neither epigraphic nor

⁹¹A verse of the Prah Bat inscription cited by Filliozat (1954, p. 550) seems to point in a similar direction. Here it is said that the two worlds have two protectors: "this world" has the king (Yaśovarman) and the heavens have the Great Indra.

⁹²Coedès, 1968, p. 23: "Most of the kingdoms founded in Farther India soon adopted the Śaivite conception of royalty, based on the Brahman-Kshatriya pairing and expressed in the cult of the royal *liṅga*."

⁹³Coedès, 1952a, p. 13: "L'hypothèse d'un *devarāja* unique à travers les siècles soulève de grandes difficultés car on a vainement cherché son sanctuaire parmi les grands monuments de la capitale." ["The hypothesis of a single *devarāja* enduring through centuries raises great difficulties, because its sanctuary has been sought in vain among the great monuments of the capital."] See further Coedès, 1952b, p. 52. Possibly it is Dupont who is responsible for the suggestions in the Preface to Coedès's and Dupont's edition of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription where it is said, characteristically, that "L'objet, un *liṅga* sans doute, auquel s'adressait le culte, était *unique* et pouvait être déplacé. L'inscription de Sdok Kak Thom mentionne à plusieurs reprises que le *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* a été transporté à la suite de tel roi, installé dans telle capitale. Il

archaeological sources seem to afford us any information showing in which sculpture and in which temple the *devarāja* was worshipped, and since we have now had to dispense with the theory of identity between *devarāja* and the temple pyramid *liṅgas*, only the avenue of hypothesis remains open to us at present if we are to approach the solution to this problem.

It appears that in the past, whenever discussion has turned on the *devarāja* as "idole unique," it is only the central god statue, or the *liṅga* in the central sanctuary of the relevant state temple, that has been considered. But there is a further form of the *mūrti* of a god that still plays an extremely important role today in the Hindu temples of India. This further form, found in very many of the larger temples of India, is the *calantī pratimā*, which takes the form of a (usually) bronze "mobile image" of the chief divinity. These movable god-images are an important constituent of the cult, especially during the major temple festivals, when they are conveyed through the streets of the temple city. At that time, they are carried on temple carts or litters as *utsava mūrti* ("festival image") of the god--whosenprimary image remains standing in the temple. A *calantī pratimā* was and is especially important in Śaivite temples, in which a *liṅga* is worshipped. As indeed Finot has remarked, this *liṅga* that stands fast in the temple naturally cannot be carried out on the occasion of festivals, and certainly it cannot be taken to the new capitals.⁹⁴

One of the most famous of the Śiva temples of India is the Liṅgarāja temple in Bhubaneswar, Orissa (in eastern India).⁹⁵ This temple provides us with a good example. At the center point of the Liṅgarāja cult stands a *svayambhū-liṅga*, a "self-existent" manifestation of the god Śiva, in massive stone. It goes without saying that this "self-generated" image of Śiva cannot be removed from the spot where Śiva originally manifested himself. So, during the numerous Liṅgarāja festivals, the function of

avait donc une personnalité physique et n'était vraisemblablement pas remplaçable" (1943/46a, p. 64). ["The object to which the cult was directed, doubtless a *liṅga*, was *unique* and could be moved. The Sdok Kak Thom inscription mentions repeatedly that the *kamraten jagat ta rāja* was transported in the retinue of this or that king, installed in this or that capital. Thus it had a physical personality and probably was not replaceable." (Emphasis added.)] This explanation of the *devarāja* cult comes closest to the one offered here, but clearly contradicts earlier and later statements by Coedès.

⁹⁴ Thus, it is stated unambiguously: "A *Śivaliṅga* may not be moved" (*Śivaliṅgaṃ na cālayet*)

⁹⁵ This, the largest Śiva temple in eastern India, is evidently a "contemporary" of the largest Śaivite temple mountain of Angkor, the Baphuon, which was built at the beginning of the second half of the eleventh century. K. C. Panigrahi, *Archeological Remains at Bhubaneswar* (Calcutta, 1961), p. 166.

"deputy" for Śiva outside the temple is discharged by a four-armed bronze sculpture, about 45 cm. in height, which represents Śiva as Candrasekhara.⁹⁶ During the festivals, this sculpture is the focus of all those royal rituals that are directed to the Liṅgarāja as "(Śiva-)Liṅga which is the king."⁹⁷

In Orissa, just as in other parts of India, *calantī pratimā* sculptures played an important role which could be of very considerable significance for the meaning of the *devarāja*. There are numerous examples of the elevation of powerful regional deities to the status of imperial divinities (*rāṣṭradevatā*) of the ruling dynasties. Especially on occasions when the holy places of these divinities were remote from capitals established by new dynasties, it seems to have been only a matter of time before bronze sculptures were made of the original god-images (*mūla bera*) and worshipped in the imperial capitals, usually in the immediate vicinity of the palace. Aniconic effigies of *Ṭhākuraṅīs* or *Svayambhū-liṅgas* especially are thus embodied as Hindu divinities with particular regularity. A familiar example from Orissa would be perhaps the *Ṭhākuraṅī Bhaṭṭārikā*. While she is worshipped in her original site on the River Mahānadī in an uncarved stone, she is at the same time in the palace of Barāmbā as *Durgā-Mahiṣāsura-mardīnī*, the imperial divinity (*rāṣṭradevatā*) of the former princely state of Barāmbā.⁹⁸ The rite of this "deputy" sculpture was performed in the palace of the king's court chaplain "with the exclusion of other people"--just as the Sdok Kak Thom inscription says with regard to the *devarāja*. Just as the *devarāja* as "source of the treasure of power" seems to have been held most precious in the sight of the king, so in Orissa it was permitted only to the king and his court priest to set foot in the sanctuary of the *rāṣṭradevatā* in the palace precincts. Naturally

⁹⁶Rajendralala Mitra, *The Antiquities of Orissa* (Calcutta, 1875, new impression Calcutta, 1963), II, pp. 133 ff. [Indian Studies, Past and Present]. On Śiva's Candrasekharamūrti, see J. N. Banerjea, *The Development of Hindu Iconography*, 2nd ed. (Calcutta, 1956), p. 463.

⁹⁷The name Liṅgarāja is not without interest for our discussion of the *devarāja*. The two names are constructed in parallel ways. If we relate *liṅga* to Śiva=Deva, then the name *liṅgarāja* comes very close to the name *devarāja* in meaning as well. In the case of *liṅgarāja*, indeed, we have to reckon with a double meaning: "the king of the *liṅgas*" (in regard to the rest of the *liṅgas* in India) and "the king who is a *liṅga*." In ritual, *liṅgarāja* receives royal honors and attributes, possibly in emulation of the state cult of the vaiṣṇavite Jagannātha in Orissa and in competition with it.

⁹⁸For an aetiological explanation of this "metamorphosis" see *Pilāṅka Badāmbā Itihāsa*, 1940, p. 26. The example best known throughout Orissa of the promotion of an originally tribal, regional divinity to the rank of a "Hinduized" state divinity is the Viṣṇu-Jagannātha in Puri (see Kulke, 1973, pp. 129 f.). On the "promotion" of *Durgā* see Goetz, 1974, pp. 70 ff.

enough, the observance of this cult, just like that of the *devarāja*, was made hereditary in the family of the court priest. Like the *devarāja* of Angkor, the sculpture as *rāṣṭradevatā* was always transferred on a change of capital, while the primal divinity remained as ever in its original abode. It seems that sometimes these bronze *rāṣṭradevatās* were even taken into battle to protect "their" kings. It is not difficult to surmise the reason why a *calantī pratimā* was brought into the vicinity of the palace. It was held to make the power of the state divinity effective for the legitimation of rulership. In the later middle ages, the kings of the central Orissan dynasty were reigning as *rāuta*, regents of their imperial tutelary divinity.⁹⁹ Almost simultaneously in tenth and eleventh century Angkor, the notion prevailed that the king was a "part" (*aṃśa*) of the state god Śiva (see below, pp. 29 ff.).

When we examine the evidence in the Angkorian inscriptions where references to the *devarāja* cult are made, we find one inscription which could perhaps offer confirmation of the hypothesis that the *devarāja* was also worshipped in the form of a *calantī pratimā*. An inscription of Kok Rosei enumerates the endowments made by the priest Sivācārya, who was presumably the famous *purohita* of the *devarāja* under kings Jayavarman V and Sūryavarman I at the end of the tenth and the beginning of the eleventh centuries. In this inscription it is reported that he had made three presentations to Bhadreśvara (the state divinity of the pre-Angkorian Chenla state), "my divine lord, who is lordship" (*vraḥ kamraten añ ta rājya*), and to the "Lord of the world" in Liṅapura (Koh Ker). Now, the immediate context in which "the divine lord who is lordship" is named should strike us: *ta vraḥ kamraten añ ta rājya sru vra(ḥ) vlen pratidina liḥ mvāy*--"for the divine lord who is lordship, daily one *liḥ* of rice for the holy fire."¹⁰⁰ The holy fire (*vraḥ vlen*) of Angkor here stands in a close relationship with the *kamraten añ ta rājya*, or rather the two together seem actually to compose a unity. The holy fire must have played a prominent role in the state cult of Angkor. Thus in 1001 A.D. the dignitaries of the Cambodian empire swore their famous oath of allegiance to

⁹⁹Kulke, 1974. See also G. Sontheimer, "Religious Endowments in India: The Juristic Personality of Hindu Deities," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft*, LXVII (1964), p. 76: "The king's being an agent of the god proved to be a very effective assurance of the loyalty of the subjects and prevented any further disturbances from the side of the people, which shows that the deity can be a very potent force."

¹⁰⁰IC, VI, pp. 173-80 (K. 175). Stele of Kōk Rosei, A, 16-17: "au Dieu royal (*V.K.A. ta rājya*) quotidiennement: 1 *liḥ* de paddy pour le Feu sacré." ["Daily, to the royal God (*vraḥ kamraten añ ta rājya*) one *liḥ* of paddy for the Sacred Fire."] The damaged west side of the stele mentions the family (of Sivācārya?) in connection with the *vraḥ kamraten añ ta rājya* (IC, VI, p. 176, lines 5-6).

Sūryavarman I in front of the holy fire,¹⁰¹ and in the magnificent "historical gallery" of Angkor Wat, in the scene showing Sūryavarman II's military parade, the holy fire is clearly visible on a litter carried before the *rājapurohita* and the brahmins.¹⁰² Significant for our hypothesis is the fact that the holy fire here appears in the form of a *calantī pratimā*. Its outward, cylindrical, form, from whose upper curve fan-shaped flames seem to spring forth, was explained by Groslier as a miniature *stūpa* and by Bosch as a *liṅga*.¹⁰³ Bosch bases his explanation chiefly on the mythologically derived and epigraphically attested relationship between the *liṅga* and fire.

None of this should be allowed to give the impression that the *devarāja* is identical with the holy fire of Angkor. The intention here is merely to point to the possible "functional" contiguity of both cult objects. If, as has commonly been assumed in the past,¹⁰⁴ the "lord who is lordship" endowed by Śivācārya should be identical with the *devarāja*, then this "functional" contiguity emerges from Śivācārya's inscription: *Vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ ta rājya* and *vraḥ vleṅ* obviously belong closely together in the cult realm, in that the holy fire seems to have been almost a constituent of the *devarāja* cult. In this connection, a conclusion established by Bhattacharya has definite significance for our discussion: "Certains textes permettent même de conclure que le Feu était gardé en permanence dans le palais royal. Les inscriptions de Phimānakas et de Prasat Tor (règne de Jayavarman VII) parlent de la 'salle du Feu' (*agnigr̥ha, vahnyāgarā*)."¹⁰⁵

With the help of parallels from eastern India (where *calantī pratimās* of imperial divinities were kept in palaces of their precincts), and information gained from analysis of both the Sdok Kak Thom inscription and that of Śivācārya, the following hypothetical explanation may be ad-

¹⁰¹Coedès, 1913a, pp. 12 ff. Likewise the author of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, Sadāśiva, was married to the sister-in-law of Sūryavarman I before the Sacred Fire.

¹⁰²Coedès, 1932, pl. 549.

¹⁰³Bosch, 1932, p. 11: "l'objet porté en procession solennelle est, soit un *liṅga* vénéré comme le feu sacré, soit un réceptacle du feu sacré en forme de *liṅga*." ["The object carried in solemn procession is either a *liṅga* venerated as the Sacred Fire or a receptacle of the Sacred Fire in the form of a *liṅga*."]]

¹⁰⁴IC, VI, pp. 173-80; Sahai, 1970, p. 43; Coedès, 1970, p. 59.

¹⁰⁵Bhattacharya, 1961, p. 148 (emphasis added). ["Certain texts even allow the conclusion that the Fire was kept permanently in the royal palace. The inscriptions of the Phimānakas and at Prasat Tor (reign of Jayavarman VII) mention the 'chamber of the Fire' (*agnigr̥ha, vahnyāgarā*)."]]

vanced: the *devarāja* was a *calantī pratimā* in the form of a bronze sculpture representing Śiva in one of his divine embodiments. This sculpture was worshipped in successive capitals, either in the palace or within the palace grounds in a special building, which, in the style of the royal palaces of Angkor, was built for the "god who is the king" of perishable but valuable material. When kings removed to other palaces or new capitals, this *calantī pratimā* of the *devarāja* was escorted there (*nāṃ*) as palladium of the empire. It had to remain close to the king in order to watch over (*cāṃ*) the "lord of the earth" as "the lord of the world."¹⁰⁶

V. Were the Kings of Angkor "Participants" in Divine Rule?

With these hypotheses envisaging the *devarāja* as a *calantī pratimā* of an original *liṅga* on Mahendraparvata, this discussion's immediate task, in the strict sense, is now concluded. But the *devarāja* cult belongs also to a broader context--the glorification and divinization that characterize the proceedings of kingship (*rājya*) and kings (*rāja*) as bearers of dominion in India and the regions influenced by India. Though we cannot attend here in any greater detail to the various forms the Cambodian rulers' apotheoses have taken, still there is one reason that requires us to establish more specifically how we should regard some aspects of the Angkorian kings' divinization. The inscriptions of Angkor contain allusions to the divine essence of the kings as a "portion" (*aṅśa*) of Śiva that is located, as the king's "subtle inner self" (*sūkṣmāntarātman*), in a Śiva *liṅga*, and these allusions regularly refer to the *liṅgas* which the kings caused to be consecrated on the temple mountains built by them. Since these *liṅgas* have previously been seen as the *devarāja* of successive kings, the inscriptional references concerning these *liṅgas* have commonly been applied directly to the interpretation of the *devarāja* cult as a whole. This is true in large measure for the central *liṅgas* of the Bakheñ, the Prasat Thom in Koh Ker, and the Baphuon, which have previously been seen as the *devarājas* of their founders, kings Yaśovarman I, Jayavarman IV, and Udayādityavarman II, and which therefore played a crucial role in the discussion of the *devarāja* cult. However, as the opposite theory is advanced here, it is therefore necessary to make clear at the outset that these *liṅgas* are not identical with the *devarāja*. After clarifying this matter, we may briefly notice the significance of these royal *liṅgas* on the temple mountains for the royal cult in Angkor. These observations are so to speak extraneous to our discussion of the *devarāja* cult as such.

Having cited above evidence refuting the identification of the Bakheñ *liṅga* with the *devarāja*, we may now turn to the Tribhuvaneśvaran *liṅga* of the usurper Jayavarman IV. At the very outset of his reign in his new capital of Chok Gargyar (Koh Ker) to the northeast of Angkor, Jayavarman appears to have begun with the construction of what was then

¹⁰⁶Majumdar (1963, p. 210) even designates the *devarāja* as the "tutelary deity of the kingdom."

the largest temple mountain of Cambodia, the Prasat Thom. On it he consecrated the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga*, which was to play a prominent role in the legitimation of his rule. In the inscriptions of Koh Ker this *liṅga* is called *kamrateñ jagat ta rājya* as well as *tribhuvaneśvara* ("lord of the three worlds"). Now as Coedès sees both the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* in the Koh Ker inscriptions and the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* familiar to us from the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, similarly as names of the *devarāja*, it follows that the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* represents for him the demonstration par excellence that the *devarāja* was erected and consecrated afresh by successive reigning monarchs on their new temple mountains.¹⁰⁷

To the arguments previously adduced against this theory, touching on the *devarāja* cult as a whole, may be added two more important ones which in connection with Koh Ker militate against Coedès's theory. Through them it is possible to establish that, on the one hand, the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* cannot have been the *devarāja* of Jayavarman, and that, on the other, in the first years of his reign Jayavarman ruled in Koh Ker without the legitimation of the *devarāja* cult. In an inscription of Koh Ker dated 923 Śaka (1001 A.D.) it is reported that high officials in the service of King Udayādityavarman I (ca. 1001-1002 A.D.) bestowed endowments upon the *kamrateñ añ jagat ta rāja* in Chok Gargyar (Koh Ker).¹⁰⁸ So there can be no doubt that in 1001 A.D. the *kamrateñ añ jagat ta rāja* = *tribhuvaneśvara* was still in Koh Ker. At this time the original *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* = *devarāja* had already been back in Angkor for about half a century, since Rājendravarman II (944-68 A.D.) had returned the capital to Angkor and "taken back the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* at the same time."¹⁰⁹ It should therefore be apparent that the name *kamrateñ jagat ta rājya* was applied to the *tribhuvaneśvara* and not to the *devarāja*.

In another inscription of Koh Ker it is mentioned that as early as 921 A.D. Jayavarman IV had the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* consecrated in Koh Ker.¹¹⁰ Elsewhere, however, in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, we learn

¹⁰⁷Coedès, 1970, pp. 58 ff., and 1968, p. 314, note 86. See also Sahai, 1970, p. 42.

¹⁰⁸Koh Ker, Prasat Thom (K. 682), lines 3-6 (*IC*, I, p. 50).

¹⁰⁹Sdok Kak Thom inscription, D. 36-37.

¹¹⁰The *vrah kamrateñ añ jagat ta rājya* is named in other inscriptions of Koh Ker as early as 921 A.D. (Coedès, 1931a, p. 15). On the chronology of Jayavarman IV see Jacques, 1971, pp. 168 ff. He contradicts Coedès's contention that by 921 A.D. Jayavarman had already assumed power as usurper. Jacques bases himself on two inscriptions (Prasat Nāñ Khmau, *IC*, II, p. 32, verse III, and Tūol Ta Pec, *IC*, V, p. 256, verse LXXXVI), which both date Jayavarman's accession to Śaka 850 = 928 A.D. For Jacques, the royal titles of Jayavarman and the mention of *rājya* in his early inscriptions of 921 and 922 A.D. apply to Jayavarman as "roi de Koh Ker, et non pas roi des Khmèr" (p. 169) ["king of Koh Ker, and not king

that the priest Kumārsvāmin and his whole family "officiated before the *kamraten jagat ta rāja*" under kings Harṣavarman I and Īśānavarman II (D, 29). Yet until about 922 A.D. or 925/928 A.D. these kings were ruling in Angkor.¹¹¹ From this, to my understanding, it can only be concluded that in the first years of his reign as opposition king in Koh Ker Jayavarman IV was not in possession of the *devarāja*.¹¹² In the Sdok Kak Thom inscription it is said that Jayavarman IV "went forth from the city of Srī Yasodharapura to be ruler in Chok Gargyar, (and) took with him the *kamraten jagat ta rāja* (D, 31-32). Accordingly the second part of this statement, concerning the *devarāja*, can only apply to the period after the end of the rule of Īśānavarman, when Jayavarman IV was sole ruler of Cambodia, and when he had already consecrated the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* in Koh Ker and installed it at the center of his religio-legitimizing system.

The history of political ideas as a whole, in Cambodia and, in a measure, in Southeast Asia, has been strongly influenced by the fact that Jayavarman IV must have reigned as a usurper without the sanction of legal succession, and, for several years, without legitimation by the *devarāja* cult. To use Max Weber's terms,¹¹³ Jayavarman must have striven to establish a new legitimacy of his own stemming from the "charisma of office"¹¹⁴ in opposition to the legitimacy stemming from the "charisma of succession"

of the Khmers"]. But it still remains unclear how, in Jacques's view, it can have been possible for the kings of Angkor to grant Jayavarman "voluntarily" the liberty to build himself such a "bastion" in Koh Ker, north of Angkor, equipped with all the insignia of royal dominion, including then tallest temple mountain in Cambodia--while at the same time the construction of the Baksei Chamkron temple was manifestly a far less pretentious undertaking.

¹¹¹Coedès, 1968, p. 114; Jacques, 1971, pp. 168 ff.

¹¹²Briggs (1951a, p. 116) attempts to resolve the difficulties with the idea of a schism in the *devarāja* cult: "The existence of two God-Kings would not seem so strange if, as Stern thinks, the *kamraten jagat ta rāja* was a ritual, which could transform any *liṅga* into a God-King." It is remarkable that, as far as I know, Coedès did not explore this obvious contradiction to his theory in the epigraphic evidence.

¹¹³Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Studienausgabe*, ed. J. Winkelmann (Köln/Berlin, 1964), pp. 184 ff., 865.

¹¹⁴Another alternative to legitimacy based on the "charisma of succession," less familiar in Angkor, was constituted by charismatic rule on the strength of divine election. This method of legitimizing a *coup d'état* retrospectively, which was common especially in India and Indonesia, was usually mediated by the "court mythographers" who concocted legends recounting how the usurper became the elect of the national divinity. On this, see for example C. C. Berg, "Javanische Geschichtsschreibung," *Saeculum*, VII (1956), pp. 168-181; VIII (1957), pp. 249-66; also Kulke, 1969.

possessed by the kings rightfully enthroned in Angkor. This occurred when Jayavarman caused the then-biggest temple mountain erected in Cambodia to be built, the architectural austerity of which generated a stark monumentality that was not exceeded even by later buildings. However, instead of combining the name of the *liṅga* of this temple with his own name ("Jayeśvara"), he dedicated it to Śiva Tribhuvaneśvara, the "Lord of the three worlds."¹¹⁵ To this divinity, the lord of his "own" state temple, Jayavarman gave veneration as the supreme lord of the world, and thereby attributed sovereignty to it so that in future he would rule as "part" of (*amśa*) or participant in Śiva. So, as "deputy" for Śiva he was accountable only to the god. Thus Jayavarman derived the legitimacy of his rule directly from Śiva. An attack on the king would be tantamount to an attack on the rule of Śiva.¹¹⁶ Hence Jayavarman IV, the usurper, possessed a higher legitimation for his rule than the kings of Angkor whose legitimacy was derived from the "charisma of succession."¹¹⁷

This development can easily be discerned in the inscriptions of Jayavarman. As early as 921 B.C., we read, "In his humility, this vic-

¹¹⁵What Filliozat says of the *devarāja* in general is especially true of the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga*--it is not the kings of Angkor that are worshipped in it but the god Śiva (as king). Thus the name of the *liṅga* in Koh Ker is not that of the king who endowed it, but that of the same Śiva Tribhuvaneśvara, and its designation as the *liṅga* of Śiva is made explicit in many ways--for example *ugrasya liṅgam, liṅgam idaṃ śivasya* (Koh Ker, Prasat Damrei, K. 677, verses XV, XIX, IC, I, pp. 58 f.), *Sambhor liṅgam* (Koh Ker, Prasat Andet, K. 675ṅ verse XXVIII, IC, I. p. 64). The name Tribhuvaneśvara, for Coedès an index of Jayavarman's claim to "cosmic dominion," is also another name of Śiva current in Cambodia. Thus the inscription of Palhal from the year 1069 A.D. records the consecration of a Tribhuvaneśvaradeva (Coedès, 1913c, p. 28). Jacques (1971, p. 169) follows the views of Filliozat concerning the Tribhuvaneśvara.

¹¹⁶From Orissa in India we have a convincing parallel to this. King Kapilendra, who usurped the throne in 1435 A.D. and founded the Sūryavaṃśa dynasty, had himself extolled as the elect of the Orissa state divinity Jagannātha, transferred sovereignty (*sāmrājya*) to this divinity, and reigned as its servant (*sevaka*). As such he threatened in numerous inscriptions that opposition to his own orders would be treason (*droha*) towards the state divinity Jagannātha. On Kapilendra's inscriptions see K. B. Tripathi, *The Evolution of Oriyā Language and Script* (Cuttack, 1962), pp. 251-73; see also Kulke, 1974.

¹¹⁷"If the legitimacy of the ruler is itself not secured by the charisma of succession in accordance with unambiguous rules, he then requires legitimation by another form of charismatic power, and in the normal way this can only be the hierocratic form. This is also, and especially, true for the ruler who embodies a divine incarnation and thus possesses the highest 'personal charisma.'" Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, p. 865.

torious Śrī Jayavarman caused to be remitted to Tribhuvaneśvara the entire glory and the power of sovereignty."¹¹⁸ In the same year, we find the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* eulogized as *vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ jagat ta rājya*--"My Divine Lord of the World Who is Lordship."¹¹⁹ In the undated inscription of Jayavarman from Prasat Daṃrei in Koh Ker, it is further announced that Śiva came down to earth in order to protect the steadfast [King Indravarman] who was part (*aṃśa*) of his own self.¹²⁰

In the inscriptions of the two most powerful rulers of Angkor in the eleventh century, we came across the influence of this idea that the king is a part of the god who wields supreme sovereignty as tutelary state divinity--the idea which began to produce marked effects on the legitimization ideology of Cambodia only under Jayavarman IV.¹²¹ Sūryavarman I (1002-1052 A.D.), who is generally considered to have been a Buddhist, endowed "his" temple mountain in Angkor, Śrī Sūryaparvata, with a Śiva-*liṅga* under the name of Śaṃbhu.¹²² In doing so he was following the example of Jayavarman IV in bestowing one of the names of Śiva, and not his own name, upon the *liṅga* endowed by him on the royal temple mountain. Just as Jayavarman, in his inscription, is lauded as "fixed portion" of Śiva, for whose protection Śiva descended to earth, so a hundred years later we find King Sūryavarman I eulogized as an "enduring image of Śiva upon earth."¹²³ There is another relevant inscription which is essentially

¹¹⁸"[te] na [Śrījaya] varmaṇā vijayinā rājyasya sārādbhutaṃ bhaktyā sarvaṃ adīyata tri. . . ." (Prasat Thom inscription, in A. Barth and A. Bergaigne, *Inscriptions Sanskrites du Champa et du Cambodge*, LXIV, verse III), following the construction of Coedès, 1931a, pp. 13 f. He relates *sarvaṃ* to the endowment recorded by the inscription: "ce [Śrī Jaya] varman victorieux a donné avec dévotion tout ceci, merveille et essence de la royauté." ["This victorious Jayavarman has in devotion granted all this, the wonder and the essence of royalty."]

¹¹⁹Coedès, 1931a, p. 15. Inscription of Prasat Thom, eastern gopura, second prakāra-wall.

¹²⁰(K. 677) Koh Ker, Prasat Daṃrei, śloka XVII (*IC*, I, p. 58). This very likely represents the influence of the vaiṣṇavite *Avatāra* doctrine. The *aṃśa* idea points in the same direction, for this too seems to belong in the realm of Vaiṣṇavism rather than Śaivism. Thus, in the *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*, the Ur-king Prthu is praised as *aṃśa* of Viṣṇu (*Harer aṃśaḥ*, XV, 6, or again Viṣṇoḥ kalā, XV, 3).

¹²¹For Rajendravarman also the claim was made in an inscription of 948 A.D. that he was a "portion" of Śiva (*ayam mama-aṃśo bhūmīśaḥ*). Inscription of Prasat Pram, A XIX (Coedès, 1913b, p. 19).

¹²²Lovek inscription of Harṣavarman III, śloka XXXVII; Majumdar, 1953, p. 423. See also Ta Keo inscription, A 5-6 (Coedès, 1931b, p. 18).

¹²³*īśvarasya kṣitau vaddha-mūrti*. Stele of Tūol Ta Pec (K. 834)† śloka XCII (*IC*, V, p. 256).

concerned with the accession of Sūryavarman even though it dates from the period of Udayādityavarman's reign (1050-1068 A.D.): here too Sūryavarman is eulogized as a portion of Śiva (*Śiva-aṃśa*)¹²⁴ This testimony is important for the reason that the inscription begins with an invocation to Śiva in which reference is made to the portions (*aṃśa*) which must be familiar to those who strive for salvation. Included among these portions of Śiva is, surprisingly, the "ruler's self" (*niyoktrātman*).

What is the relationship between the *aṃśa*, the "ruler's self" of the god Śiva, with King Sūryavarman, who for his part is eulogized in the same inscription as an *aṃśa* of Śiva?¹²⁵ It is very probable that in the tenth and eleventh centuries the kings of Angkor were extolled as *aṃśa* of Śiva, and that this *aṃśa* of the god was seen in direct association with the *aṃśa* of Śiva which was eulogized as his "ruler's self."

The reign of Udayādityavarman II (1050-1066 A.D.) also plays an important part in our knowledge of the *devarāja* cult and of the ritual significance of the royal temple mountains of Angkor. For one thing, the Sdok Kak Thom inscription dates from the beginning of his reign (1052 A.D.)--the only source which makes possible any coherent statement about the *devarāja* cult. For another, we find for the first time in inscriptions concerning Udayādityavarman clear epigraphic evidence about the function of the royal *liṅgas* in the state cult of Angkor. Thus, the famous Lovek inscription of the priestly Saptadevakula family, dating from the reign of Harṣavarman III (1066-1080 A.D.), gives a clear account of the cosmographical import of Udayādityavarman's Baphuon temple mountain. From it we learn how Udayādityavarman erected a golden mountain (the Baphuon) in his own city, vying with the abode of the gods, the golden Mount Meru standing in the middle of Jambudvīpa. On the summit of this golden mountain in a temple resplendent with divine radiance, he consecrated a Śiva-*liṅga* with the name of the "Golden Liṅga."¹²⁶ In the Praḥ

¹²⁴Inscription of Prasat Khna (K. 661), B, śloka LXI (*IC*, I, p. 202). While in Cambodia the king is exalted as the "fixed image" of the god on earth, in Orissa even to modern times he bears the name Calanti Viṣṇu ("Record of Rights" of 1955). As the "Moving Viṣṇu" he is the deputy for the "fixed" Viṣṇu-Jagannātha in the temple. The name Calanti Viṣṇu in Orissa does not in any way--as one might at first suppose--embody a divinization of the king as the great god Viṣṇu. Here, too, it is simply a question of a functional similarity between the state divinity and the king of the state. As such he functions as the former's *rāuta* (deputy) and is as *bhakta* its "first servant" (*sebaka*)

¹²⁵It is not to be ruled out that we see here the influence of the Buddhist *bodhisattva* ideal, as it is the supreme task of the *bodhisattva* to obtain the salvation of all men--an idea which is alien to the śaivite conception of royalty in the eleventh century.

¹²⁶Lovek inscription of Harṣavarman III, verses 40-43; Majumdar, 1953, p. 44. Similarly, Inscription of Phnom Sandak and Praḥ Vihār, line 9 (Coedès and Dupont, 1943/46b, p. 141)

Nok inscription, General Saṃgrāma sought permission to endow this golden *liṅga*, which harbored within itself the "subtle inner self" of Udayādityavarman, with his spoils of war.¹²⁷

Here, in a few lines, we find in epitome the apotheosis of the ruler in eleventh century Angkor. The "subtle inner self" of the king ("le roi abstrait" according to Finot) dwells in a *liṅga*, the phallic manifestation of the god Śiva, which a king has consecrated in the course of his reign in a temple mountain, and which is a guarantee of fecundity and strength. When the kings of Angkor are exalted as a "portion" (*aṃśa*) of the god Śiva, it appears that this portion and the "subtle inner self" of the king are one and the same.¹²⁸ Hence the god Śiva and the king of Angkor are united in a *liṅga* upon the topmost step of a temple pyramid which constitutes a microcosmic replica of Mount Meru, the above of the gods, and represents the center of the Angkorian Kingdom. Now, as "fixed image" of Śiva on earth, the king of Angkor in his capacity as "lord of the earth" (*kamrateñ phdai karom*) wields dominion on behalf of the "lord of the world who is [the possessor of] sovereignty" (*kamrateñ jagat ta rājya*, and *deva-rājya*). After his death the king enters the region (*pada*) of the highest god.

Whereas these inscriptional data concerning the divinization of the kings of Angkor have in the past been regularly applied directly to the *devarāja* cult, it should now be apparent from the testimony of the passages cited above that they refer exclusively to the cult of the royal *liṅgas* on the temple pyramids of Angkor.¹²⁹ The only conclusion that can be drawn is that it was these *liṅgas* and their temples, and not the *devarāja*, which were the focus of the state cult. These *liṅgas* on the temple mountains were the visible manifestation of the god Śiva.¹³⁰ Here

¹²⁷Prah Nok Stele inscription, verse 159 (Majumdar, 1953, p. 398)n

¹²⁸In the Pre Rup foundation inscription of 961 A.D., it is said of the *liṅga* in the southeast of the upper platform of the temple that King Rājendravarman "erected the Lord (Īśvaraṃ Rājendravarmaśvara for his own salvation, just as if it were itself imbued with the royal essence" (IC, I, p. 102, verse CCLVIII).

¹²⁹It is apparent also in the case of the *liṅga* of the Baphuon that it was not, as Coedès among others supposed (Coedès, 1931b, p. 22), the *devarāja*. In the Khmer section of the inscription of Lovek mentioned above, the reference is clearly made to the *kamrateñ jagat survarṇaliṅga* (IC, VI, p. 285, line 17), and the inscriptions of Phnom Sandak and Prah Vihār speak of a *kamrateñ an survarṇaliṅga* which King Udayādityavarman caused to be erected (Coedès and Dupont, 1943/46, p. 141, line 10).

¹³⁰There can be no doubt that, from the time when the idea became current that the king was an *aṃśa* of Śiva, the kings of Angkor increasingly preferred to name their royal *liṅgas* explicitly as the *liṅga* of the god Śiva, and so they forbore to associate their own names with the

"dwelled" the "ruler's self" belonging to the god, which was lodged in the reigning king of Angkor as his "subtle inner self." Through this connection, the king of Angkor became "participant" in the divine rule of Śiva.

VI. Conclusion

It has been the object of the foregoing discussion to call into question the previous explanation of the *devarāja* cult as a cult of the divinized ruler, and thus to work out with greater clarity the role of the *devarāja* cult in the legitimating system governing Angkorian kingship. At the same time, a fresh examination of the Sdok Kak Thoṃ inscription has successfully shown that the *devarāja* cult can in no way be identified with the cult of the royal *liṅgas* upon the great temple mountains of Angkor. The two should therefore be examined in isolation from each other in order to avoid confusing their peculiar characteristics at the outset. For the interpretation of the *devarāja* cult, we should appeal only to inscriptions which refer unambiguously to it and not to the cult of the royal *liṅgas*. In the first instance this requirement confines us almost exclusively to the Sdok Kak Thoṃ inscription. Most of the other sources which have previously been seen as sources for the *devarāja* cult¹³¹ concern the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* on the Prasat Thoṃ temple mountain in Koḥ Ker, and so do not qualify as evidence about the *devarāja* cult.

From the Sdok Kak Thoṃ inscription we learn that the magic ritual enactment of the presumably tantric consecration took place on Mount

liṅgas. The royal dominion of the "lord of the world" had to be "unbounded" if the legitimation of the king as *aṃśa* of Śiva was to be seen to be efficacious.

¹³¹See Coedès/Dupont, 1943/46a, p. 64. Still unclear is the explanation of verse VI of the inscription, dating from the years 877 and 879 A.D., commemorating the foundation of the Praḥ Kō temple built by Indravarman. In it there is reference to the divine rule (*devarājya*) of Mahendra which was established by Svayaṃbhū (Brahmā). This verse is often seen as an allusion to the foundation of the *devarāja* cult on Mahendraparvata (Coedès, *IC*, I, p. 25, note 1; Dupont, 1952, pp. 171, 175; Bhattacharya, 1964, p. 45). In spite of an ambiguity which is undeniably inherent in the text, the term *devarājya* is more likely to refer to the "Great Indra" (Mahendra) whose "dominion over the gods" had been founded by Brahmā. By this same rite, the inscription says, King Indravarman ("he whose protection is Indra") was consecrated. After this consecration Indravarman acquired [earthly!] dominion (*labdha-rājya*, verse VII). Certainly, there is here in addition an allusion to Śiva, the "true" king of the gods, and his dominion, in the sense demonstrated by Filliozat. A direct allusion to the foundation of the *devarāja* cult would on the other hand be difficult to prove.

Mahendraparvata. The object of this solemn ceremony was, firstly, to free Cambodia from dependence on Java and to consecrate King Jayavarman II as sole earthly universal ruler (*cakravartin*) of Cambodia. Secondly, at the same time that the kingdom was founded by this solemn rite, the *devarāja* was consecrated. The inscription now leaves no doubt that the king of Cambodia was not, as previously believed, consecrated as god-king. On the contrary, this consecration took place around an image of the god Śiva, who, as "god, who is king" and as "lord of the world" protected the kings of Cambodia (as "lords of the earth"). After making an examination of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, and appealing to Indian parallels, we may draw the initially hypothetical conclusion that Jayavarman caused a *liṅga* to be consecrated on Mahendraparvata, and that a movable image (*calantī pratimā*) of this was made and venerated as the *devarāja* in the successive capitals of the kingdom at least up to the eleventh century.

The state ceremony of Mahendraparvata at the beginning of the ninth century pre-eminently facilitated the achievement of a domestic policy objective. According to the recent researches of Jacques and Wolters, the solemn consecration was preceded by decades of struggle by Jayavarman for mastery in Cambodia. By the "political sacrifice"¹³² on Mount Mahendra Jayavarman elevated himself, after substantial territorial gains, to the status of sole *cakravartin* ruler of Cambodia. This explanation of the *devarāja* cult as a *unique political act* on the occasion of the territorial unification of Cambodia would make sense of the relatively trivial significance of the *devarāja* cult in the following centuries,¹³³ when the principle of the unity of the Angkorian kingdom was no longer in question.¹³⁴ There is much to be said for the supposition that a century later the opening regnal years of Jayavarman IV between 921 and 925/928 A.D. contributed to a weakening of the *devarāja* cult. It was the usurper Jayavarman IV who was able to succeed in setting himself up, without the legitimation of the *devarāja*, against the kings of Angkor, whose rule the *devarāja* was supposed to protect. Jayavarman's challenge must have been all the graver when, in the interim, he publicly and deliberately caused to be consecrated a "rival" state divinity in the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga*

¹³²"The political sacrifices were the concrete mechanisms not only for obtaining the blessings of the gods but also for asserting the political power of the king." V. P. Varma, 1959, p. 222.

¹³³This necessarily hypothetical contention is based on the striking fact that *royal* inscriptions scarcely mention the *devarāja* cult at all. The Sdok Kak Thom inscription and presumably that of Śivācārya, on the contrary, originate from the family of Śivakaivalya, to whose benefice the *devarāja* cult is specifically assigned: "Aucun autre texte royal n'en parle." ["No other royal text mentions it."] Coedès/Dupont, 1943/46a, p. 64.

¹³⁴Wolters, 1973, p. 30: "Local independence was no longer the acceptable objection as it had been in the eighth century. The integrity of the Angkorian kingdom was no longer in question."

upon the then-highest temple mountain of Cambodia.¹³⁵ To this *liṅga*'s service he committed his sovereignty in order to constitute himself a portion (*amśa*) of this divinity and thus to possess a higher legitimation than the legal kings of Angkor. The idea of participating as an *amśa* of the god in divine lordship (*devarāja*) decisively affected the apotheosis of the ruler in the Angkorian kingdom from the time of Jayavarman IV on. Thereby the king became a participant in divine lordship, without himself being a god.

A further reason for the decline in significance of the esoteric-tantric *devarāja* cult of Śiva, as against the cult of the royal *liṅgas* on central temple mountains, may lie in the growth in the personal power of the kings of Angkor. At the center of the royal temple cult stood *liṅgas* which sometimes bore the names of the kings who endowed them, and which were venerated as abodes of their "subtle inner selves." These indeed constituted the essential royal cult of Angkor. Even in the late period, when Buddhism was already dominant in the Cambodian state cult, the temple mountains were still at the heart of the "state-sustaining" cult. This is what the famous Chinese traveler Chou Ta-kuan reported at the end of the thirteenth century about a ritual union of the king with a snake princess, the "snake mistress of the country," which lasted through the night.¹³⁶ This union took place within the palace precincts on a "golden tower," in Phimeanakas. By contrast, the cult potentialities of the *calantī pratimā* of a remote foundation *liṅga* consecrated generations before, must have paled to insignificance. Indeed, the *devarāja* cult was preserved as one of the sources of magic power, but we may presume that its significance was very markedly diminished in the course of time, and came to approximate that of the holy fire (*vraḥ vleṅ*) or the holy sword (*praeh khan*) in the state cult of Angkor.

The fortunate circumstance that the *devarāja* cult is in its broad outline familiar, through the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, we owe presumably to the biography of Sadāśiva, the last *purohita* of the *devarāja* known to us. Sūryavarman I (1002-1050 A.D.) married Sadāśiva to his sister-in-law, withdrew him from religious functions, named him as his royal chaplain (*rājapurohita*), and invested him with one of the highest state offices (D, 44-45). Under Udayādityavarman II he became the king's *guru* and even received the highest royal title *dhūli jeṅ vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ* and the name Śrī Jayendravarman. In spite of this dizzy career of Sadāśiva there is no mistaking that his family had forfeited its monopolistic position as the most important priestly family of the kingdom.¹³⁷ In its stead, the Saptadevakula priestly family, connected to Sūryavarman I by bonds of kinship, advanced further and further into the foreground under Sūryavarman

¹³⁵From this point of view one could presumably speak of a schism in the *devarāja* cult in the sense employed by Briggs (see note 112 above).

¹³⁶Heine-Geldern, 1930, pp. 37 ff.; Pelliot, 1902, pp. 144 f.

¹³⁷Briggs, 1951a, p. 150; 1952, p. 178.

and his successors. The head of this family, the famous Śaṅkarapaṇḍita, became sacrificial priest (*hotar*) and teacher (*guru*) of Sūryavarman. Under the latter's successor Udayādityavarman he also became the sacrificial priest (*yājaka*) of the "golden *liṅga*" on the Baphuon temple mountain,¹³⁸ which (similarly to the Tribhuvaneśvara *liṅga* under Jayavarman IV) stood right at the center of the state cult under Udayādityavarman. The final passing over of the cult in the statensanctuary of the Baphuon seems to have induced Sadāśiva, at the peak of his (no longer temporal) power, to establish, in the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, a lasting monument to the dominant role which his family had played right from the beginning in the state cult of Angkor. However, it was not through the inscription alone that Sadāśiva sought to announce the greatness of his family to future generations. In the small temple in Bhadrāniketana (= Sdok Kak Thom) in which the inscription was found, Sadāśiva endowed a Brahmā sculpture for the priest Hiraṇyadāma and a Harihara sculpture jointly for his ancestor Śivakaivalya and the priest Śivāśrama, the co-founder of the Śiva-Āśrama that was so important to the Śivakaivalya family (C, CXXVII). We must agree with Briggs when he describes the temple of Bhadrāniketana as a sort of "family pantheon" and the inscription as the "swan-song" of the Śivakaivalya family.¹³⁹

In our present state of knowledge, it seems probable that we should see the endowments of Sadāśiva as the swan-song of the *devarāja* cult as well. After 1052 A.D., the date of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription, we hear nothing more of the *devarāja* cult. Certainly, it was not "abolished" in the twelfth century; but it was more and more downgraded to the status of a stage property in the royal apparatus of magic power. The fate of the *calantī pratimā* of the *devarāja*, the sometime state palladium of Angkor, may have been finally sealed soon after the overthrow of Angkor by the Chams (1177 A.D.), when Jayavarman VII came to power and, as a convinced Buddhist, had Angkor completely rebuilt. It was no longer the old Śaivite central temple mountain (*vnām kantāl*) of the Bakheñ that stood at the midpoint of the new city of Angkor Thom, but the Buddhist temple complex of the Bayon. In his inscription Jayavarman declared allegorically that the mountain of Śiva in the Himalayas was uprooted (*unmūlita*) so that new kings had recourse to him, Jayavarman, in order to obtain security. The god Brahmā had fashioned Jayavarman out of a half each from Śiva and Viṣṇu, so that the king thereby surpassed Śiva in majesty and virility. Even more unmistakably, it is said elsewhere that Brahmā took from the god Śiva the power (*śakti*) which he had formerly conquered the Tripura demons and handed it over to King Jayavarman.¹⁴⁰

Indeed it was not only in Cambodia that the Śaivite ideology of legitimation had lost its *śakti* in the twelfth century. In all the states

¹³⁸ Lovek inscription, ślokas 37-43; Majumdar, 1953, pp. 423 f.

¹³⁹ Briggs, 1951a, p. 170.

¹⁴⁰ Inscriptions of Prasat Chruñ, Angkor Thom (K. 281, K. 288), IC, IV, pp. 207-50.

of southern and eastern India as well, Śaivism as an ideology of state experienced a crisis which was generally connected directly or indirectly with the activities of the great vaiṣṇavite reformer Rāmānuja. Thus, at the beginning of the twelfth century, King Sūryavarman II (ca. 1113-50 A.D.) in Cambodia submitted to the "allure" of Vaiṣṇavism at the same time as Anantavarman Cōḍagaṅga, king of Orissa (ca. 1112-46) in eastern India. Both gave up the Śaivite state religion of their forefathers and built their gigantic new state temples in honor of the god Viṣṇu. So, on either side of the Bay of Bengal, huge vaiṣṇavite temples appeared simultaneously--the Jagannātha temple of Puri, in Orissa, and Angkor Wat. In Orissa and large parts of India, however, Vaiṣṇavism increasingly succeeded during the following centuries in adapting itself to the popular *bhakti* cults, and thus resolved the legitimation crisis in the Hindu realm, whereas Cambodia was no longer affected by this last mediaeval reform movement in Indian Hinduism.

After the devastating defeat of Angkor in 1177, Jayavarman VII inherited a realm in which Śiva's mountain of the gods, the Hindu symbol of the temporal dominion of Angkor's earlier kings, was uprooted.¹⁴¹ Misconstruing the "Indian" signs of the times, he adopted the path of the esoteric Mahāyāna Buddhist Lokeśvara cult, and saddled the population of his state with a form of royal apotheosis that was so far unknown. Having covered his kingdom with a network of temples, statues of gods, and hospitals in a frenzy of missionary zeal, he expressed his compassion for suffering humanity in the moving language of his inscriptions. But his words could no longer reach a people afflicted by wars and compulsory labor. The people, exhausted by the burden which the Hindu apotheosis of the ruler and its later Buddhist form placed upon them, turned to the Ceylonese Theravāda Buddhism which from the end of the twelfth century began to spread across Burma to the rest of Southeast Asia.

¹⁴¹The reason why the night-long ritual union between the snake princess and the king upon the Phimeanakas, described by Chou Ta-kuan at the end of the thirteenth century, had such a long continuous history may lie in the "pre-Hindu" origin of the snake mythology which can be traced back through the Funan empire to the foundation legend of Cambodia; see Heine-Geldern, 1930, pp. 37 f.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BEFEO</i>	<i>Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient</i>
<i>IC</i>	<i>Inscriptions du Cambodge (see Coedès, 1937-64)</i>
<i>JISOA</i>	<i>Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art</i>
<i>JRAS</i>	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of the Siam Society</i>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aymonier, E.

- 1901 "La stèle de Sdok Kak Thom," *Journal Asiatique*, Ser. 9, XVII, pp. 5-52.

Bechert, H.

- 1967 *Buddhismus, Staat und Gesellschaft in den Ländern des Theravāda Buddhisma* Voln II, Birma, Kambodscha, Laos, Thailand. Schriften des Institutes für Asienkunde in Hamburg, voln XVII, 2. Wiesbaden.
- 1969 "Zum Ursprung der Geschichtsschreibung im indischen Kulturbereich," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I. Philologisch-Historische Klasse* (1969), pp. 35-38n

Bhattacharya, K.

- 1961 *Les religions brahmaniques dans l'ancien Cambodge*. Publications de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. XLIX. Paris.
- 1964 "Recherches sur le vocabulaire des inscriptions sanskrites du Cambodge," *BEFEO*, LII, pp. 1-72.
- 1964 "Hari-Kambujendra," *Artibus Asiae*, XXVII, 1/2, pp. 72-78.

Bosch, F. D. K.

- 1932 "Notes archéologiques VI.--Le temple d'Angkor Vatn a) La procession du Feu Sacré," *BEFEO*, XXXII, pp. 7-11n

Bourg, H. de Mestier du.

- 1968 "Anpropos du culte du Dieu-Roi (devarāja) au Cambodge En hommage au professeur George Coedès," *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale*, XI, pp. 499-516.

Briggs, L. P.

- 1951a *The Ancient Khmer Empire*. Transactions of the American Philological Society, New Series, vol. 41, pt. 1. Philadelphia.
- 1951b "The Syncretism of Religions in Southeast Asia, Especially in the Khmer Empire," *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, LXXI, pp. 230-49.
- 1952 "The Genealogy and Successors of Śivāchārya. Suppression of the Great Sacerdotal Families by Sūryavarman I," *BEFEO*, XLVI, pp. 177-85.

Chatterji, B. R.

1964 *Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia*. 2nd rev. ed. Calcutta.

Coedès, G.

1911 "Note sur l'apothéose au Cambodge," *Bulletin de la Commission Archéologique de l'Indochine* pp. 38-49.

1913a "Etudes cambodgiennes.--IX. Le serment des fonctionnaires de Sūryavarman I," *BEFEO*, XIII, 6, pp. 11-17.

1913b "Etudes cambodgiennes.--X. Inscription de Prasat Pram," *BEFEO*, XIII, 6, pp. 17-26.

1913c "Etudes cambodgiennes.--XI. La stèle de Palhal," *BEFEO*, XIII, 6, pp. 27-36n

1931a "Etudes Cambodgiennes XXVI. La date de Koh Ker," *BEFEO*, XXXI, pp. 12-18.

1931b "Etudes Cambodgiennes XXVII. La date du Baphuon," *BEFEO*, XXXI, pp. 18-23.

1932 *Le temple d'Angkor Vat*. Avec une introduction de G. Coedès, 3 vols. La galerie de bas-reliefs, troisième partie. Mémoires archéologiques, publiés par l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. II. Paris.

1934 "On the Origin of the Sailendras of Indonesia," *Journal of the Greater India Society*, I, pp. 61-70.

1937-64. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. Vols. I-VII. Collection de textes et documents sur l'Indochine. Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient. Hanoi, Paris.

1951 "La divinisation de la royauté dans l'ancien royaume khmèr à l'époque d'Angkor," *Proc. 7th Congress History of Religions*, Amsterdam, pp. 141-42.

1952a "Le culte de la royauté divinisée, source d'inspiration des grands monuments du Cambodge ancien," *Série Orientale Roma*, V, 1, pp. 1-23. Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente. Roman

1952b "The Cult of the Deified Royalty. Source of Inspiration of the Great Monuments of Angkor," *Art and Letters: India, Pakistan and Ceylon*, XXVI, 1, pp. 51-53.

1955 "Angkor. Die Hauptstadt des alten Kambodscha--ein Abbild des Kosmos," *Saeculum*, VI, pp. 154-65.

1961 "Les expression vrah kamratenñ añ et kamratenñ jagat en vieux-khmèr," *The Adyar Library Bulletin*, XXV, pp. 447-60.

- Coedès, G.
 1966 *Angkor. An Introduction.* Translation of *Pour mieux comprendre Angkor.* 2nd impression. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- 1967 *The Making of South East Asia.* Translation of *Les peuples de la péninsule indochinoise.* 2nd ed. London.
- 1968 *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia.* Edited by W. F. Vella. Translation of *Les Etats hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie.* Honolulu.
- 1970 "Le véritable fondateur du culte de la royauté divine au Cambodge," *R. C. Majumdar Felicitation Volume*, pp. 56-66. Edited by H.nB. Sarkar. Calcutta.
- Coedès, G., and Dupont, P.
 1943/46a "L'inscription de Sdok Kak Thom," *BEFEO*, XLIII, pp. 57-134.
- 1943/46b "Les stèles de Phnom Sandak et de Praḥ Vihar," *BEFEO*, XLIII, pp. 134-54n
- Dhani, P.
 1954 "The Old Siamese Conception of the Monarchy," *The Siam Society Fiftieth Anniversary*, II, pp. 160-75. Reprinted from *JSS*, XXXV, 2.
- Dupont, P.
 1952 "Les débuts de la royauté angkoriennne," *BEFEO*, XLVI, 1, pp. 119-76.
- Filliozat, J.
 1954 "Le symbolisme du monument du Phnom Bakheñ," *BEFEO*, XLIV, pp. 527-54.
- 1966 "New Researches on the Relations between India and Cambodia," *Indica* (Heras Institute, Bombay), III, pp. 95-106n
- Finot, L.
 1912 "Notes d'Epigraphie, XIII: L'inscription de Ban That," *BEFEO*, XII, 2, pp. 1-28n
- 1915 "L'inscription de Sdok Kak Thom," *BEFEO*, XV, pp. 53-106.
- 1932 "Le Yaśodharagiri et laPhimānākas," *Journal Asiatique*, CCXX, pp. 47-59.
- Goetz, H.
 1974 *Studies in History, Religion and Art of Classic and Medieval India.* Edited by H. Kulke. Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, vol. XVI. Wiesbaden.
- Gonda, J.
 1966 *Ancient Indian Kingship from the Religious Point of View* Leiden.

Griswold, A. B.

- 1970 "The Real Founders of the Cult of Divine Royalty in Cambodia"
(English summary of Coedès, 1970), in *R. C. Majumdar Felicitation Volume*, pp. 63-64n Edited by H.nB. Sarkar. Calcutta.

Groslier, B. P.

- 1958 *Angkor. Eine versunkene Kultur im indochinesischen Dschungel.*
Köln.
- 1960 *Hinterindien. Kunst im Schmelztiegel der Rassen.* Kunst der Welt.
Baden-Baden.

Hall, D. G. E.

- 1966 *A History of South-East Asia.* 2nd ed.n London.

Heine-Geldern, R.

- 1930 "Weltbild und Bauform in Südostasien," *Wiener Beiträge zur Kunst und Kulturgeschichte Asiens*, IV, pp. 28-78.

Hoffmann, H.

- 1953 "Die Begriffe 'König' und 'Herrschaft' im indischen Kulturkreis,"
Saeculum, IV, pp. 334-39.

Jacques, C.

- 1970 "Etudes d'épigraphie cambodigienne.--IV. Deux inscriptions du Phnom
Bakheñ," *BEFEO*, LVII, pp. 57-67.
- 1971 "Etudes d'épigraphie cambodigienne.--VI. Surnles données chrono-
logiques de la stèle de Tūol ta Pec (K. 834)," *BEFEO*, LVIII, pp.
163-76.
- 1972 "Etudes d'épigraphie cambodigienne.--VIII. La carrière de Jayavar-
man II," *BEFEO*, LIX, pp. 205-20.

Kroef, J.nM. van der

- 1968 "Kingship and Political Legitimacy in Southeast Asia: Patterns of
an Enduring Tradition," *Asiatische Studien*, XXII, pp. 68-87.

Kulke, H.

- 1969 "Funktionale Erklärung eines südindischen Māhātmyas. Die Legende
Hiranyavarmans und das Leben des Cōḷa-Königs Kulottuṅga I,"
Saeculum, XX, pp. 412-22.
- 1970 *Cidambaranāhātmya. Eine Untersuchung der religionsgeschichtlichen
und historischen Hintergründe für die Entstehung der Tradition
einer südindischen Tempelstadt.* Freiburger Beiträge zur Indologie,
vol. III. Wiesbaden.
- 1970 "Der Sturz Sihanouks--Angkors zweiter Tod?" *Internationales
Asienforum*, I, pp. 325-40.

Kulke, H.

1973 "Some Remarks about the Jagannātha Trinity," *Indologen-Tagung 1971*, pp. 126-39. Edited by Herbert Härtel and Volker Moeller. Berlin.

1976 "'Kṣatriyaization' and Social Change in Post-Medieval Orissa," *Changing India. Studies in Honour of Ghurye*. Edited by S. D. Pillai. Bombay.

Le Thành Khôi

1967 *Histoire de l'Asie du sud-est*. "Que sais-je?" No. 804. Paris.

Lewitz, S.

1971 "L'inscription de Phimeanakas (K. 484) (Etude linguistique)," *BEFEO*, LVIII, pp. 91-103.

Mabbett, I. W.

1969 "Devarāja," *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, X, pp. 202-23.

Majumdar, R. C.

1943 "The Date of Accession of Jayavarman II," *Journal of the Greater India Society*, X, pp. 52-55.

1953 *Inscriptions of Kambuja*. The Asiatic Society Monograph Series, vol. VIII. Calcutta.

1963 *Hindu Colonies in the Far East*. 2nd ed. Calcutta.

Mus, P.

1932-34 "Barabudurn Les origines du stūpa et la transmigration, essai d'archéologie religieuse comparée," *BEFEO*, XXXII, pp. 269-439; XXXIII, pp. 577-980; XXXIV, pp. 175-400.

Osborne, M. E.

1966 "History and Kingship in Contemporary Cambodia," *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, VII, pp. 1-14.

O'Sullivan, K.

1962 "Concentric Conformity in Ancient Khmer Kinship Organisation," *Bulletin of the Institute of Ethnology (Academia Sinica, Taipei)*, 13, pp. 87-96.

Pelliot, P.

1902 "Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge, par Tcheou Ta-kuan," *BEFEO*, II, pp. 123-77.

Sahai, S.

1970 *Les institutions politiques et l'organisation administrative du Cambodge ancien*. Publications de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient, vol. LXXV. Paris.

Sarkisyanz, E.

1965 *Buddhist Backgrounds of the Burmese Revolution*. The Hague

1969 "Die Neutralität Kambodschas--ihre Geschichte und ihr Wesen,"
Verfassung und Recht in Übersee, Heft I, pp. 1-12t

Sastri, K. A. N.

1957/58 *The Cult of Devarāja in Kambujā*. Transactions of the Archaeological Society of South India.

Sedov, L.

1969 "La société angkoriennne et le problème du mode de production asiatique," *Sur le "mode de production asiatique."* Foreword by R. Garaudy. Editions sociales Paris.

Stern, Ph.

1934 "Le temple-montagne khmère. Le culte du linga et le devarāja,"
BEFEO, XXXIV, pp. 611-16.

Stierlin, H.

1970 *Angkor*. Weltkulturen und Bauform. München.

Varma, V. P.

1959 *Studies in Hindu Political Thought and Its Metaphysical Foundations*. 2nd ed. Delhi.

Wales, H. G. Q.

1931 *Siamese State Ceremonies. Their History and Function*. London

1953 *The Mountain of God*. London.

1957 *Prehistory and Religion of Southeast Asia*. London.

1961 *The Making of Greater India*. 2nd enlarged ed. London.

Wolters, O. W.

1973 "Jayavarman II's Military Power: The Territorial Foundation of the Angkorian Empire," *JRAS*, I, pp. 21-30.

APPENDIX

NOTES ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE KHMER TEXT

By J. Jacob

man is not really equivalent to an adverb or adverbial phrase such as "alors," "damals," "at that time." It needs to be understood (though not necessarily translated) as a conjunction introducing a subordinate clause, "whereas, inasmuch as, in that, which, when." On C. 70 "*man vrāhmaṇa . . . mok . . . pi . . .*" may be literally translated as "In-that a Brahman . . . came, it-was-because. . . n . ." Similarly on D. 12 "*man vrah̄ pāda cat . . . , nām̄ . . .*" may be understood as "When His Majesty founded . . . , he took. . . n . ." On C. 74 it must be translated as "which.n̄"

leḥ C. 72. This word may be understood by reference to Modern Khmer *mleḥ* "so, like that.n̄"

syān̄ C. 74. In spite of the Modern Khmer meaning "almost," in Old and Middle Khmer this word implies plurality, often linking a remote plural subject to a following verb. Here it gathers up the list of texts, "all of" which the Brahman recited.

kurun̄, C. 78, occurs as a verb "to govern."

nā C. 77. "at, (place or time), with reference to, in respect of, when, where." Note that on D. 5 *nā* occurs in combination with *anau* "at, remain." In occurrences where "*kamrateṅ jagat ta rāja*" follows, it might be translated "in connection with" just as well as by the more precise "*aupres deq*" "*vor*" or "in the presence of."

daiy C. 81. "various(ly), different(ly)." In this sentence, "*daiyḍ*" seems to need to be construed as follows: "the *kamrateṅ jagat ta rāja* stayed *variously/in different places* according-to the cities to-which the lord of the world below, he (particle) took (him) there also." Note that *tadaiy* on D. 17 and 25 is the form which means "other."

nām̄ D. 12. "*nām̄ . . . yok duk.*" *nām̄* "take" usually has a person as object. *yok* "take" usually has a thing as object. "*duk*" means "put in the proper place, put away, keep."