spill, C E *ḳʷäm*, En *ḳʷä'ä*, Gt *ḳo'ä*, Ed *ḳʷo'yä*, H *ako'a*; Gz Tna *kä'awä* 'spill,' Te *kä'a*.

stone, C E En *əmər*, Gt *ə̃mər*, Ed *äwn*, M Ms *əmən*, G *əmmañ*, A *əmmayyä*, S W *un*, H *ūn*, Z *umun*; Gz *'əbən*, Tna *'əmni*, Te *'əbən*; Semitic; Hebrew *'ə̄ḇen*.

sun, A *imər*, Gf *aymərä*, with weakening of *m* in S W *ayr*, Z *arit*; Gz *'amir* and *'er* (Brauner-Plazikowski, *Ein aethiopisch-amharisches Glossar* 110). Cerulli, *Studi etiopici* 2. 190, under *arrišo*, considers the SE words borrowings from Cushitic, but in view of the attested Ethiopic root *'mr* it might be possible to consider the Cushitic words taken from Ethiopic-Semitic.

sweep, E M *aǧgäm*, Ms *aǧǧä*; 'dung,' H *ādu*; Gz *'adäwä* 'sweep,' *'ədaw* 'dirt, dung' (Polotsky, *JAOS* 69. 39).

threshing-floor, C E M *od*, En Gt Ed Ms S W Z *awd*, A *awdä*, H *ūd*; Gz *'awd*, Tna *'awdi*; Cerulli, *Studi etiopici* 1. 230 connects this root with Galla *ogdi, obdi*.

throw away, see 'abandon.'

today, S W *awǧe*, Z *awǧi*, H *ḥoǧi*; Tna *ḥəzi, ḥəǧi*, and probably also Gz *yə'əze* 'now,' Te *'aze*.

together, H *mässä* (from the root *msl*); Gz *məslä* 'with,' Te Tna *məs*.

tomorrow, S W Z *ges*, H *giš*; Gz *gesä, gešä* 'get up in the morning, come in the morning,' Te *gesa* 'travel (in general, at any time of the day).' In view of Tna *gäsgäsä* 'leave in the morning, fast and in a hurry' (reduplication of the root *gys*), the Amharic *gäsäggäsä* 'travel fast' is to be connected with the same root.

tooth, C E Gt M Ms H Arg G A Z *sən*, Ed *šən*, S *isən*, W *əsən*, Gf *sənä*: Gz *sən*, Tna *sənni*; Semitic.

toward, see 'go toward.'

tree, C Gt *äčč̣ä*, E M Ms G *äčč̣ä*, En *e'ä*, Ed *yä'ä*, S W *ənče*, Z *ənṭet*, Gf *ənčä*; Gz *'əḍ* 'wood, tree,' Te *'əčč̣ät*; Amh *ənčät* only 'wood' ('tree' is *zaf*); Semitic; Hebr. *'ēṣ*.

wash, S W *tä-raṭä*, Z *at-raṭä*, Gf *tä-raṣä*; Gz *rəḥḍä* 'sweat,' Tna *räḥaṣä*; Semitic; Hebr. *råḥaṣ* 'wash.'

water, S *mäy*, W *me*, Z *may*; G Te Tna *may*; Semitic.

These common features in the morphology and in the vocabulary discussed above bring us nearer to a possible conclusion that South Ethiopic and North Ethiopic are to be derived from a common language. The absence of these features in Amharic is due to the fact that in some respects Amharic represents an innovated type in the South Ethiopic group. These few common features between the South Ethiopic languages (other than Amharic) and North Ethiopic should not distract us, however, from stating the many differences between the two groups. These existing differences are numerous enough to justify the classification of Ethiopic from a descriptive point of view into North Ethiopic and South Ethiopic.

THE SYNCRETISM OF RELIGIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, ESPECIALLY IN THE KHMER EMPIRE

LAWRENCE PALMER BRIGGS

I. NATURE OF THE MOVEMENT

ONE OF THE MOST ENGAGING movements of the history of Southeast Asia during the first millenium or more of the Christian era was the syncretism or partial syncretism of religions there. The two most important phases of this movement were (1) the syncretism of Śivaism and Vishṇuism and (2) the syncretism of Hinduism and Buddhism, particularly that of the Śivaic Maheśvara and the Mahāyānist Lokeśvara. Both movements seem to have begun, in Indo-China, as early as the Funan period (about the middle of the first to the middle of the sixth century), but neither reached significant proportions there until near the beginning of the decline of Khmer culture, in the twelfth century.

Regarding the relationship between Śivaism and Vishṇuism, it must be borne in mind that they are not distinct religions, but related branches of Hinduism, born, in the fourth to the ninth cen-

turies, of the union of the vague aerial deities of Aryan Brahmanism and local Dravidian deities, to meet the challenge of the new Buddhism for a single anthropomorphic deity. The Śiva of this Neo-Hinduism developed from the Vedic god Rudra the Terrible and his attendants, the demons of the storm (of which, in the later Vedic period, Śiva was one), and Śiva, a popular Dravidian deity; while the Vedic Vishṇu, a somewhat obscure solar deity, absorbed the countless nature myths connected with the local Dravidian deity Krishṇa. Under the aegis of these two deities, by means of the many forms of Śiva and the numerous avatars of Vishṇu, a whole multitude of aboriginal gods were absorbed. Thus Neo-Hinduism was an attempt to combine the monotheisms of Śiva and Vishṇu worship with a vast polytheism, and these two great personal deities took the place of the pantheon of the Vedas. To satisfy the desires of the monotheists, Vishṇu and Śiva were sometimes considered as one—Harihara. The Trimūrti was completed by the addition of Brahmā, drawn from *brahman*, on the model of Śiva and Vishṇu. To the Vishṇuite, the Trimūrti consisted of Vishṇu, Śiva as Vishṇu, and Brahmā as Vishṇu, and similarly to the Śivaites, with Śiva as pivot of the Trimūrti. Brahmā in Neo-Hinduism was scarcely more than the third member of the Trimūrti.[1]

The relations between Śivaism and Vishṇuism (which in Indo-China were rival branches of Hinduism, with the same related fellow-deities) were close during the Chenla period (about A. D. 550 to 802)[2] and progressed intermittently until the reign of Sūryavarman II, in the first part of the twelfth century, when a Vishṇurāja seems to have replaced the Śivaite *devarāja* as the central deity of the royal worship and the great Vishṇuite temple of Angkor Wat adopted the form of a pyramid-temple, a form hitherto found in Cambodia only in Śivaite sanctuaries, especially those devoted to the worship of the *devarāja* and other lingas. From that time on, these two religions seem to have been almost completely amalgamated.

The syncretism of Hinduism and Buddhism, which in Indo-China came to be chiefly the amalgamation or near amalgamation of Maheśvara and Lokeśvara, may have had a faint beginning as early as the Funan period; but Buddhism was scarcely dominant in Cambodia—not even during the reign of the first Buddhist king, Sūryavarman I—until the reign of Jayavarman VII when, with the building program of the second and third periods of that reign, images of Lokeśvara appeared everywhere.

The religions mentioned above, it must be understood, served only the ruling class, which governed the country, designed the monuments and supervised their construction, carved the statues and bas-reliefs and composed and engraved the inscriptions. The mass of the Khmer population continued in the animism and ancestor-worship common to all monsoon Asia, unaffected by the worship of the intelligentsia, except to pay perfunctory homage to the state cult of the *devarāja* and to perform forced labor in the construction and maintenance of the magnificent, but undoubtedly detested, monuments.

II. Syncretism of Śivaism and Vishṇuism

(a) *Vishṇuism in Funan and Chenla—Harihara*

The close relationship between Śivaism and Vishṇuism appeared in Cambodia, as has been said, as early as the beginning of the seventh century, perhaps earlier. Its first manifestation seems to have been the appearance of Harihara, in a form perhaps never found elsewhere—a curious combination of Vishṇu and Śiva in a single body, Vishṇu on the right, Śiva on the left (Hari = Vishṇu; Hara = Śiva). The many statues found in Chenla during the seventh and eighth centuries represent this deity with four arms and two distinct parts from head to foot—on the Śiva side, the ascetic chignon, half the frontal eye, a simple belt around the waist, attributes of Śiva in the two left hands; on the Vishṇu side, hair dressed in a high cylindrical cone, cloth falling from waist to knees, with a fold in front, attributes of Vishṇu on the two right hands.[3]

This curious deity, said to be mentioned in the *Harivaṃśa*, seems to have made its first appearance in sculpture in the rock-temple of Bādāmi in the Pallava country of Southeast India, which is dated 578.[4] Eliot thinks it may have reached

[1] J. Kennedy, "The Hindu Period in Northern India, 650-1200," *The Imperial Gazetteer of India* (Oxford, 1908), II, 305-306.

[2] For the periods and reigns of Cambodian history, see Lawrence Palmer Briggs, "A Sketch of Cambodian History," *Far Eastern Quarterly* (*FEQ*), VI (1947), 345-363—hereafter cited as "A Sketch."

[3] Larry Briggs, *A Pilgrimage to Angkor* (Oakland, 1943), pp. 77-79, gives illustrations.

[4] Sir Charles Eliot, *Hinduism and Buddhism* (London, 1921), III, 114, note 1.

Funan in the sixth century. Paul Mus thinks it was mentioned by the Chinese in their description of the customs of Funan in 503,[5] and Parmentier believes the earliest statues of Harihara found in Cambodia belong to the Funan period.[6] It did not appear in an inscription until the reign of Īśānavarman I, early in the seventh century, when it appears to have been the prevailing form of worship. At least two inscriptions of this reign—Vat Chakret and Ang Pou [7]—record the erection of images of Harihara, and some of the stone and bronze figures of that deity are among the best specimens of early Khmer statuary. The cult of this peculiar deity seems to have been an important, when not the leading, form of worship in Chenla during the seventh and eighth centuries and gave its name to a site—Hariharālaya, "abode of Harihara"—a few kilometers southeast of Angkor, where Jayavarman II located one of his early capitals.

Curiously enough, the cult of this deity does not appear to have had a wide acceptance in India and is confined almost exclusively to Cambodia among the Hinduized states of Southeast Asia. It appears very seldom in the epigraphy or iconography of Champa (where, however Vishṇuism does not occupy a prominent place) and then under the name of Śaṅkara-Nārāyaṇa.[8] It appeared only once—very doubtfully—in Java, at the end of the thirteenth century, when Harihara was all but forgotten in Cambodia and Vishṇuism and Śivaism seem to have been almost, if not completely, merged. In the Batavia Museum there is a figure supposed to be a statue-portrait of Raden Vijaya (who founded the Majapahit dynasty in 1294), under the semblance of Śiva. This statue is believed to have come from that king's funerary temple of Simping, where the Chronicle says a statue of Śiva was erected. Among the attributes carried by this figure were the conch and the mace of Vishṇu, which have led Dutch archeologists to classify it as Harihara.[9] It is elaborately dressed and richly jewelled and has no trace of the division of the body into two parts found in the images of that deity in Cambodia. The conch has the unusual form of the snail and the mace is held in the left hand. A combination of Śiva and Vishṇu it seems to be, but not a Harihara in the Cambodian sense of the term. Perhaps it is a symbol of the complete syncretism of these two deities which at that time seems to have been attained in Cambodia, if not in Java.

(b) *The Legend of Vishṇu in Chenla and Java*

There is evidence that the legend of Vishṇu, in some of his manifestations other than Harihara, was known in the early inscriptions of the Chenla period. An inscription of Bhavavarman I, first king of Chenla, shows that a sister of that king married an Indian brahman and that they made gifts to a temple, on the Mekong near the present border of Laos, of copies of the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* and apparently of the *Purāṇas* and that they installed regular readings of these works in the sanctuary, promising benediction to those who participated in these readings and pronouncing imprecations against those who damaged any of the precious volumes.[10] But not too many inferences should be drawn from these facts. While the great Indian epics portray a part of the Vishṇu tradition, their use in legend and sculpture is part of inheritance of Hinduism in its widest sense (including Buddhism) and does not necessarily indicate the presence of Vishṇuism in any great degree. In Java, the earliest inscriptions compare the king with Vishṇu,[11] and scenes from the legends of Rāma and Krishṇa, avatars of Vishṇu, decorate the panels of the temple of Prambanan, an early shrine dedicated to Śiva;[12] but no shrine of this early period seems to have been dedicated to Vishṇu. Java does not seem to have had close commercial connections with India during the ante-Śailendra period. Vogel says that "in the gigantic literature of ancient India, both Sanskrit and Pāli, there is but a single mention of Java, which occurs

[5] Paul Mus, "L'Hindouisme et le bouddhisme dans l'Indochine," in Sylvain Levi, *L'Indochine* (Paris, 1931), I, 103-106.

[6] Henri Parmentier, "L'Art presumé du Funan," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* (*BEFEO*), 1932, 183-189.

[7] Auguste Barth, "Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge" (*ISC*), *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits* (Paris, 1885), No. 6, Vat Chakret; No. 8, Ang Pou.

[8] Georges Maspero, *Le royaume de Champa* (Paris, 1928), p. 11; R. C. Majumdar, *Champa* (Lahore, 1927), II, 169.

[9] J. Ph. Vogel, "The relation between the art of India and Java," in *The Influences of Indian Art* (London, 1925), pp. 82-87.

[10] Barth, ibid., No. 4, Veal Kantel.

[11] Vogel, 50.

[12] Vogel, 73.

in the fourth Canto of the *Rāmāyaṇa.*"[13] Their knowledge of Indian deities and heroes was obtained largely, it seems, from the sacred books which fell into their hands and especially from the Indian epics, particularly the *Rāmāyaṇa.* These they translated into their language and assimilated so completely that all trace of their Indian origin was obliterated. Even today, the uneducated inhabitant of Java or Bali, whose knowledge of Indian gods and heroes is confined to the native shadow-plays and the sculptures he sees on the walls of the temples, does not for a moment doubt that the Pāṇḍavas for instance, figure among his native ancestors and that the scenes displayed are those of his native Java, whose landscape is covered with names of mountains, rivers and regions, which names have been naturalized from India.

(c) *Vishṇuism flourished under Jayavarman II and Jayavarman III*

At the beginning of the reign of Jayavarman II, first king of the Kambuja, or Angkor, period, Śivaism became firmly established as the royal worship of the Khmer Empire. In 802, that monarch established his capital on Mahendraparvata (Phnom Kulen) and founded the Khmer Empire, in consequence of a ceremony in which that king was supposed to have received divine power from Śiva through the intervention of a brahman versed in magic, named Hiraṇyadāma. This brahman used four Tāntric texts to make a ritual so that Kambujadesa should have a chakravartin[14] king, thus vesting the king with divine power. The central divinity of this new state-cult was the king himself—conceived as an emanation of Śiva—combined with that deity as a sort of god-king, or *devarāja,* whose visible symbol was a linga set up on the central altar of a pyramid temple, the symbolic center of the Empire, in imitation of Mount Meru, center of the universe in Hindu cosmology.[15] And, as in Indian philosophy the very essence of an individual is found in germ in his name, the *devarāja* came to be given the name of the king plus *īśvara* (from *Īśvara,* "Lord," an epithet of Śiva).[16] Jayavarman II appointed his *hotar* (royal chaplain), Śivakaivalya, as *purohita,* or chief priest, of the *devarāja,* and made the function of celebrating the rites in connection with that deity hereditary and exclusive in the family of Śivakaivalya, following matrilineal lines, thus creating a sort of hereditary supreme pontiff. Hiraṇyadāma taught Śivakaivalya the magic ritual to enable the *purohita* or other member of the family to create a new *devarāja* on the accession of a new king. The inscription of Sdok Kak Thom, dated 1052, shows that the hereditary successors of Śivakaivalya served as priests of the *devarāja* for at least 250 years.[17] Thus at the beginning of the Khmer Empire, Śivaism, in the form of the worship of the *devarāja,* was firmly established as the state-cult. This did not, however, interfere with other forms of worship nor prevent a king of another faith from ascending the throne and building a chief temple of his own faith, as long as he loyally maintained the state-cult. Thus the worship of the *devarāja* in Cambodia was more a state-cult than a religious sect.[18]

Although the worship of the *devarāja* was established as a state-cult, Vishṇuism was very popular during the reigns of Jayavarman II and his son and successor, Jayavarman III. There are no inscriptions of these reigns, but many monuments were dedicated to Vishṇu on Mahendraparvata, early capital of Jayavarman II, and many statues of that deity, found there and elsewhere, date from those reigns. In fact, statues of Vishṇu seem to have succeeded those of Harihara as the chief objects of Khmer iconography.[19] And at least one,

[13] Vogel, 47.

[14] Chakravartin means "universal sovereign"; but the King of Kambujadesa was a universal sovereign only in the sense that every Indian or Indianized capital was supposed to be the center of the universe. He did not attempt to be more than sovereign in his own kingdom, to accomplish which was one of the stated purposes of the ritual. G. Coedès and Pierre Dupont, "L'Inscription de Sdok Kak Thom" (*BEFEO,* vol. XLIII, 1943-46), stanzas 70-77, hereafter *SKT*; G. Coedès, "Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie" (Paris, 1948), pp. 171-173, hereafter, "États hindouisés."

[15] Robert Heine-Geldern, "Conception of State and Kingship in Southeast Asia," *FEQ,* 2 (1942), 15-30; Coedès, *Pour mieux comprendre Angkor* (Paris, 1947), pp. 87-88.

[16] Thus the *devarāja* of Indravarman I was called *Indreśvara.* It is not known that this system came into use before Indravarman I. No *Jayeśvara* for the first two kings has been found in the inscriptions. Coedès, *États hindouisés,* pp. 188-189.

[17] Louis Finot, "Notes d'épigraphie, No. 16: Inscription de Sdok Kak Thom," *BEFEO,* 1915, 2, 53-106; Coedès et Dupont, op. cit., 57-134.

[18] Not to be confounded with certain sects, like Pāśupata and Lingayats, which were worshippers of the linga.

[19] Pierre Dupont, "L'Art de Kulen et les débuts de la statuaire angkorienne," *BEFEO,* 1936, pp. 415-426.

perhaps two, of Jayavarman II's queens seems to have been Vishṇuite. An inscription of a later reign says his wife, Bhās-svāminī, was a daughter of a Vishṇu brahman.[20] Another inscription says his wife, Kambujalakshmī, had a brother named Vishṇuvāla, who received the name of Lakshmīndra and became administrator of the private treasury.[21] These feminine names may denote the same wife and she seems to have been Vishṇuite. At any rate, Jayavarman III was Vishṇuite—the only Vishṇuite king of Cambodia of whom we are certain, except Sūryavarman II, founder of Angkor Wat, nearly two centuries later. The inscription mentioned above says: "This brahman, Krishnapāla Amarendra, called Keśavabhaṭṭa, received the name of Arimathana and became *purohita* of the king."[22] Now, we know that the post of *purohita* of the *devarāja* was hereditary with the family of Śivakaivalya. The Vishṇuite names of this "*purohita*" suggest that the King may have had, in addition to the *devarāja* of the state-cult, a sort of Vishṇurāja, or center of the king's Vishṇu worship, of which Arimathana was *purohita*. The *guru* of this king, named Nivāsakavi, was given the name of Prithivīndrapaṇḍita and founded the central sanctuary of Kok Po, in what was probably the region of the old Amarendrapura, one of Jayavarman II's early capitals. This group of temples seems to have been an important Vihṇuite center for several generations.[23] On Jayavarman III's death, he received the posthumous name of Vishṇuloka.[24]

(d) *Vishṇuism Subordinate during Śivaite and Mahāyānist Periods*

During the tenth and eleventh centuries, the worship of Vishṇu was not often mentioned in the inscriptions of Cambodia. This was a period of Śivaite development, followed by Mahāyānist toleration, then Śivaite reorganization. Vishṇuism, as such, was quiescent. The resurgence of Neo-Hinduism in India, after Mahāyānism—the cult of the bodhisattvas—had triumphed over Hīnayānism at Kanauj and had established itself at Nālandā, was fraught with danger for Mahāyānism, which, sheltered in Bengal and Berar, was the only form of Buddhism still flourishing in any part of India. This Hindu reaction, which had its origin in the appearance of the worship of Śiva and Vishṇu in the second century, appeared under the Gupta dynasty in the fourth and fifth centuries[25] and was spurred to action by the triumph of Mahāyānism and the beginning of its decadence at Nālandā. The chief enemy of Buddhism was probably the Vedantic philosopher, Śaṅkara. Born of a Śivaite brahman family, native of Malabar, Śaṅkara travelled all over India to combat Buddhism, with the disappearance of which he is credited with being chiefly responsible. He labored, not so much for the new Śivaism as for the restoration of ancient Brahmanism—the survival of the tradition of the past, amplified by the many changes which had taken place.[26] Absolute being (*brahman*), Śaṅkara taught, is "unique, spiritual, internal. The contingent, the relative, the plurality—cosmic as well as psychic—does not exist." Its appearance is due only to illusion (*māyā*).[27] Thus did Śaṅkara reconcile his acceptance of the pantheism of the Vedas with his belief in ideal monism. He was not a sectarian, but was essentially a traditionalist whose religious ideal was a manhood devoted to ritual observance.[28]

Śaṅkara's teachings found their way to Cambodia, although we do not know the extent of his influence there. Coedès has pointed out that Śivasoma, who was a cousin of Jayavarman II, had studied the *śāstras* under Śaṅkara.[29] Śivasoma seems to have been chief minister of Indravarman I (877-889) and was the tutor of Vāmaśiva, who was a nephew of Sūkshmavindu and apparently his legitimate heir as *purohita* of the *devarāja*. Together, Śivasoma and Vāmaśiva founded an *āśrama* (monastery) near Angkor. Vāmaśiva was also *guru* of the young prince who was to reign as Yaśovarman I (889-900).[30] Śaṅkara's enemies have charged that he defeated Buddhism in India by absorbing it and have stigmatized him as a Buddhist in disguise.[31] One of his chief loans

[20] A. Barth, *ISC*, No. 15, Prea Kev A, st. 2.
[21] Abel Bergaigne, *ISC*, No. 61, Phnom Preah Vihear, A, st. 6.
[22] Ibid., st. 11.
[23] Coedès et Dupont, "Les inscriptions du Prasat Kok Po," *BEFEO*, 1937, 379-413.
[24] Finot, *SKT*, p. 88; Coedès, *États hindouisés*, p. 178.
[25] Eliot, op. cit., I, XXXVIII.
[26] Eliot, I, XI, 125; II, 315.
[27] Réné Grousset, *Histoire d'Extrême-Orient* (Paris, 1929), V, 131.
[28] Eliot, I, X.
[29] Coedès, op. cit., p. 87.
[30] Finot, *SKT*, p. 89.
[31] Eliot, I, X.

from Buddhism was monastic institutions and discipline. It may not have been just a coincidence that Śivasoma and Ātmaśiva founded the first great Śivāśrama in the Angkor region and that a great outburst of *āśrama*-building took place during the reign of Yaśovarman I, when Vāmaśiva was *Vrah Guru* and chief minister of the king, as well as Lord of the Śivāśrama and chief of the service of the *devarāja*.[32]

The worship of Harihara seems to have lingered on for a while in Cambodia. An inscription of Bakong [33] says Indravarman I erected an image of Īśvara and Śārṅgin in an undivided body, apparently of Harihara. During the reign of Yaśovarman I, a temple was erected on Phnom Dei to Śaṅkara-Nārāyaṇa, a not uncommon epithet of Harihara,[34] and that monarch dedicated one of his twelve digraphic inscriptions—the only one not dedicated to Śiva—to Nārāyaṇa, at Ba Phnom [35] and also erected a Vaishṇavāśrama (Vishṇuite monastery) along with Brahmanist and Buddhist monasteries, in the region to the south of the southeast corner of East Baray,[36] as well as many Yaśodharāśrama (Śivaite monasteries) in many parts of the kingdom, wherever digraphic inscriptions are found. An inscription, apparently of the reign of Harshavarman I, son and successor of Yaśovarman I, whom it speaks of in the past tense. is dated 910. It was found in the Phimeanakas,[37] but was apparently re-employed from an earlier sanctuary. It begins with homage to Śiva, Vishṇu, and Brahmā, and relates the erection of an image to Mādhava (Vishṇu-Krishna) under the unusual vocable of Trailokyanātha,[38] a name sometimes applied to the Buddha.[39] In 921, under the same king, Prasat Kravan was dedicated to Krishṇa—an avatar of Vishṇu—also under the vocable of Trailokyanātha.[40] The bas-reliefs of this temple—among the earliest in Cambodia—show Vishṇu and his *śakti*, Lakshmī, in several legendary scenes and poses.[41] It seems to have been Īśānavarman II, younger brother and successor of Harshavarman I, who, on the death of Śikhāśiva, of the house of Praṇavātman, appointed as his successor, his disciple, Hṛishīkeśa, "issue of a pure Vishṇu family," who was baptized and consecrated under the name of Śivācārya [42] and continued as *hotar* of Jayavarman IV, Harshavarman II, and Rājendravarman II.[43] During the sojourn of Jayavarman IV and his son, Harshavarman II, at Chok Gakgyar (921-944), only one sanctuary—the little temple of Prasat Chen—was dedicated to Vishṇu and that under the unusual vocable of Śrīpati.[44] Under Rājendravarman II (944-968), who moved the capital back to Yaśodharapura (Angkor Thom), an inscription records the foundation of a domain to Vishṇu and Lakshmī.[45] It was probably during his reign that Śivācārya erected the two lateral towers — dedicated respectively to Brahmā and Vishṇu — at the linga-sanctuary of Kutīśvara and indited there the inscription, later found re-employed at the neighboring temple of Banteay Kdei.[46] Indralakshmī, sister of Jayavarman V (968-1001), seems to have been a worshipper of Vishṇu. She married a distinguished *bhaṭṭa* from North India named Divākara and together they established images of that deity at what is now Siemreap.[47] The names of the *guru*, Yajñavarāha and his brother Vishṇukumāra, who built the temple of Banteay Srei, indicate that they may have been Vishṇuite and a wing of that temple was dedicated to Vishṇu.[48] An inscription of Vat

[32] Coedès et Dupont, *SKT*, st. 10-13.

[33] Coedès, "Stèle de Bakoṅ," *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, I (Hanoi, 1937), B. st. 21.

[34] Coedès, "Études Cambodgiennes, 6, L'Inscription de Phnoṃ Dei," *BEFEO*, 1918, 9.

[35] A. Bergaigne, *ISC*, "Inscriptions digraphiques: stèle de Vat Kandal," pp. 386-387.

[36] Georges Trouvé, "Étude sur le Prei Prasat, le Prasat Koṃnap et l'édicule qui abritait la cinquième stèle inscrite du Baray Oriental," *BEFEO*, 1922, p. 63, note 1.

[37] Étienne Aymonier, *Le Cambodge* (Paris, 1901-4), III, 14-16.

[38] Bergaigne, *ISS*, No. 62, "Phimeanakas," p. 549.

[39] Erick Seidenfaden, "Complement à l'inventoire descriptif des monuments du Cambodge pour les quatre provinces du Siam oriental," *BEFEO*, 1922, pp. 62-64.

[40] H. Parmentier, "L'Art d'Indravarman," *BEFEO*, 1919, pp. 57-59; Guides H. Parmentier, *L'Art en Indochine*: 13, Prasat Kravan, Pre Rup and Mebon Oriental (1936).

[41] Coedès, "Inventaire des inscriptions du Champa et du Cambodge," *BEFEO*, 1908, p. 68.

[42] Briggs, "Genealogy and Successors of Śivācārya."

[43] Finot, "Les Inscriptions d'Ankor: 6, Banteay Kdei," *BEFEO*, 1925, pp. 354-362.

[44] Coedès, "Nouvelles Inscriptions de Koh-Ker," *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, I, pp. 55-56.

[45] *BEFEO*, 1933, 1137.

[46] Finot, "Banteay Kdei," pp. 54-55.

[47] Barth, *ISC*, Prea Eynkosei, pp. 77-97.

[48] Finot, "Le Temple d'Īçvarapura (Bantei Srei, Cambodge)," *Mémoires Archéologiques*, I (Paris, 1926), 69-123. Coedès, "Quatre Nouvelles Inscriptions de Bantei Srei," *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, I, 143-157.

Thipdei mentions a Nārāyaṇa as *hotar* of the family of Praṇavātman under Jayavarman V[49] and inscriptions of Kok Po of this reign speak of a donation to that temple by the mother of Nārāyaṇa.[50] That Vishṇuite center seems to have been thriving under the reign of this king.

In judging the strength of Vishṇuism, during these reigns, by names and foundations, it must be borne in mind that Śivaism and Vishṇuism are related cults of Hinduism, differing from each other chiefly by the relative rank assigned to the two deities. Śivaites sometimes bore Vishṇuite names and the most ardent Śivaite monarch could, with perfect propriety, make a foundation to Vishṇu, and vice versa. Still, the existence of Vishṇuite names and foundations is in some sense a measure of the strength of Vishṇuism during the period.

A dynastic revolution brought a Buddhist king to the throne at the beginning of the eleventh century and a Śivaite reaction—or, rather, reorganization — followed, about the middle of the century. Vishṇuism seems to have received scant patronage during this period. Its only foundation during the reign of Sūryavarman I (1002-50), the first Buddhic king, seems to have been Prasat Khna, which was dedicated to Krishna.[51] Sūryavarman I dug the West Baray and his Śivaite successor, Udayādityavarman II (1050-66) erected the West Mebon there,[52] both dedicated to Vishṇu. The latter monarch made great use of the Vishṇuite epics (*Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*) in decorating the new Central Temple, the Baphuon, which he erected for the *devarāja*. No important Vishṇuite foundation marked the reign of Harshavarman III (1067-90).

(e) *The Development of Vishṇuism under the House of Mahīdharapura*

The triumph of Vishṇuism in Cambodia seems to have had its faint beginnings with the coming of the dynasty of Mahīdharapura at the end of the eleventh century. There is a great deal of obscurity about the beginnings of this dynasty; but its kings were clearly usurpers, and not until the sixth king (Jayavarman VII), did they claim any relationship whatever with any preceding dynasty of Cambodia. The first king of this dynasty, Jayavarman VI, seems to have reigned for several years in the upper Mun valley before he conquered the capital and even then he did not completely subdue the preceding dynasty. Among his followers at the beginning of his reign seems to have been the celebrated Śivaite family of the inscriptions of Ban That and Prasat Tor, which produced the brilliant Tilakā and her son, the first of the three Bhūpenrapaṇḍitas who served this dynasty.[53] But the inscription of Preah Vihear says Jayavarman VI adored Campeśvara (Vishṇu)[54] and he made a rich donation to the Vishṇuite temple of Kok Po.[55]

Meanwhile, Vishṇuism itself was undergoing a transformation in India. Rāmānuja, founder of the Vaiśṇava sect and of modern Vishṇuism, though himself a Vedantist, revolted against the absolute monism of Śaṅkara and advocated a qualified monism.[56] In order that positive religion might subsist, he said, it was necessary to distinguish man from divinity, to abandon the idea of illusion and to base religion on devotion, or personal piety (*bhakti*).[57] Faith, not recognition of Indian tradition, was to Rāmānuja the way to Salvation.[58] Rāmānuja was born in a village near Madras, lived a long life, travelled all over India, and is believed to have died in 1137. He was thus active in India during the early days of the Mahīdharapura dynasty in Cambodia, but nothing definitely attaches his name to the country of the Khmer. In Java, as Coedès points out, kings of Kadiri during this period were claiming to be incarnations of Vishṇu.[59]

Some of the leaders of the revolt of Jayavarman VI have been identified as later ministers of the Vishṇuite king, Sūryavarman II; and the brahman

---

[49] Coedès, "Les deux inscriptions de Vat Thipdei," in *Mélanges S. Levi* (1911), pp. 213-219.

[50] Coedès et Dupont, "Kok Po," 383-387.

[51] Coedès, "Deux nouvelles inscriptions de Prasat Khna (Mlu Prei)," *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, I, 195-197.

[52] Mme Gilberte de Coral Rémusat, *L'Art khmèr: Les grandes étapes de son evolution* (Études d'art et d'ethnologie asiatique I; Paris, 1940), pp. 123, 129; Philippe Stern, *Le Bayon et l'evolution de l'art khmer* (Paris, 1927), pp. 79, 84; "Mebon occidental," *BEFEO*, 1936, 611.

[53] Finot, "Notes d'Épigraphie: 13, L'Inscription de Ban That," *BEFEO*, 1912, 2, 127; Coedès, "La stèle de Prasat Tor," *Inscriptions du Cambodge* I, 229-47.

[54] Aymonier, II, 214.

[55] Coedès et Dupont, "Kok Po" (pillars 3-4), st. 4-7.

[56] H. C. Raychaudhuri, *An Advanced History of India* (London, 1946), p. 203.

[57] Grousset, I, 134.

[58] Eliot, II, 210.

[59] Coedès, *États hindouisés*, p. 275; N. J. Krom, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis* ('S-Gravenhage, 1931), p. 289.

Divākarapaṇḍita, who seems to have been the guiding spirit of Jayavarman VI, became the chief adviser of Sūryavarman II and has been given credit for formulating that monarch's Vishṇuite doctrine and even for the plan of the Vishṇuite temple, Angkor Wat.[60] We do not know much about Jayavarman VI's elder brother and successor, Dharaṇīndravarman I (1107-13); but his posthumous name, like that of Jayavarman VI, was Śivaite and all his inscriptions which have come down to us are Śivaite. This, however, may be of little significance, at this time. Vedantic philosophy and especially the teachings of its greatest apostle, Śaṅkara, brought about the anomaly that, at the very moment when the formation of Hindu sects was being consummated, they were all becoming more conscious of their essential unity in mutual dependence on the Vedas and as parts of one great religion, Hinduism.

There is no mention of the *devarāja* in any inscription of the reigns of Sūryavarman II or Dharaṇīndravarman I. The Baphuon was the Central Temple of Udayādityavarman II, where he housed his Udayādityeśvara,[61] and was doubtless his funerary temple after his death.[62] What sanctuary housed the *devarāja*, if any, of the early kings of the Mahīdharapura dynasty or their remains after their death, is not known.

(f) *The Triumph of Vishṇuism under Sūryavarman II—The Vishṇurāja*

The reign of Sūryavarman II (1112-50) was the golden age of Vishṇuism in Cambodia. Buddhism, which had had a brief day under Sūryavarman I and was to blossom forth in great splendor under Jayavarman VII, was temporarily quiescent. The Śivaism of this period—if the state-cult of the *devarāja* can be so called—was official and perfunctory. Inscriptions show that foundations were still made at the old Śivaite shrines of Preah Vihear, Vat Phu, and Phnom Sandak, and the Bhūpendrapaṇḍitas—apparently fervent Śivaites and identified with the dynasty of Mahīdharapura from the beginning—still served the king. We hear no more of a *devarāja*, but if such a deity still existed—and it almost certainly did—the office of chief priest seems to have been performed by Divākarapaṇḍita,[63] who had crowned three kings in succession and had received the honors of apotheosis, never before accorded to a brahman of his rank in Cambodia. But, if Divākara held such a position, it did not prevent him from taking the lead, as he seems to have done, in the development of the new cult of the Vishṇurāja and the erection of its great temple, Angkor Wat.[64]

It seems that Sūryavarman II did not, any more than his Buddhic namesake and predecessor, identify himself with the worship of the *devarāja* to the extent of having his own image combined with that of Śiva and set up in his temple as a *Sūryeśvara*. Apparently under the aegis of Divākarapaṇḍita, the idea of a Vishṇurāja began to replace that of a *devarāja*. This spirit seems to have developed slowly under Śivaic forms. Beng Mealea, Chausay Tevoda, Thommanon, Banteay Samré, Angkor Wat, were the architectural manifestations of it. It was a Vishṇuism strangely interwoven with the old state Śivaism. Like Buddhism during the reign of Jayavarman V, Vishṇuism was raising itself to a position of equality under the guise of Śivaism. Finally, the Central Temple, the ultimate architectural symbol of Śivaism, with its *prasats*, terraces, and concentric galleries, and even a central deity, was taken over by Vishṇuism, and Angkor Wat—the *summum bonum* of Śivaic architectural aspiration—became the abode of a Vishṇurāja. The syncretism of Śivaism and Vishṇuism seems from this time to have been complete—in a larger Hinduism. It seems incorrect to say that Śivaism triumphed over Vishṇuism in Cambodia. The last great Śivaic temple of Cambodia was the Baphuon. Angkor Wat was the last great Hindu temple in Cambodia and was dedicated to Vishṇu and its decorations were Vishṇuite; only its forms were Śivaic. The worship of the *devarāja* seems to have been merely a state-cult.

Then followed a period of Mahāyāna Buddhism

[60] Aymonier believed that the construction of Angkor Wat was the personal work of Divākara (*Le Cambodge*, III, 521).

[61] Barth, *ISC*, p. 17, Lovek, B, 23-26.

[62] Coedès, "Études Cambodgiennes: 33. La destination funeraire des grands monuments khmèrs," *BEFEO*, 1940, 315-343.

[63] Udayādityavarman II had named Divākara, then a young brahman, to assist Śaṅkarapaṇḍita in the dedication of the Baphuon. Coedès et Dupont, "Les steles de Phnom Sandak et de Prah Vihar," *BEFEO*, 43 (1943-6), st. 9-11.

[64] This Divākarapaṇḍita is not to be confounded with the Divākarabhaṭṭa who married the sister of Jayavarman V.

under Jayavarman VII (1181-1219), when both Śivaism and Vishṇuism were relegated to the background and the *devarāja* and Vishṇurāja were superseded by, or at least subordinated to, a Buddharāja—still, however, maintaining many of the forms of Śivaism. An attempt at Śivaic reaction seems to have occupied much of the thirteenth century; but by this time, the syncretism of the two great Hindus sects was complete and at the end of that century, Chou Ta-kuan seems to picture Buddhism as the chief religion of the capital (he did not distinguish well between Mahāyānism and Hīnayānism) and seems to group Śivaism and Vishṇuism—and perhaps also some elements of Mahāyānism—under the name of *Pan-Ki*.

III. The Syncretism of Śivaism and Mahāyānism

(a) *The Rise of Mahāyānism and the Bodhisattvas*

Still more intriguing is the syncretism of Śivaism and Mahāyānist Buddhism, especially that of Maheśvara, a manifestation of Śiva, and the bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, or Lokeśvara as he was generally called in Indo-China. This syncretism seems to have had its roots in the birth of Mahāyānism in India. When, about the second century of our era, the bodhisattvas were added to Mahāyānism, some of them derived their names and some of their characteristics from the Brahmanic gods. Thus, Vajrapāṇi took his name from the thunderbolt (*vajra*) of Indra along with some of the characteristics of that deity. Thus, Avalokiteśvara was compounded of two Sanskrit words, *avalokita* 'looking on' and *īśvara* 'lord,' a vocable of Śiva. Already when Lokeśvara first became prominent in Cambodia, in the latter part of the reign of Jayavarman VII, his representations had many of the characteristics of Śiva.[65].

The first three Buddhic councils in North India developed the *Tripiṭaka*. At the second general council, held at Veśāli, one hundred years after the death of the Buddha (i. e. about 483 B. C.), difficulties developed between the Sthaviravādins (traditionalists) and the Mahāsāṁghikas (who dissented on points of discipline and on the question of the position of the laics). After the secession of the Mahāsāṁghikas, Aśoka called a council of the Sthaviravādins at Pāṭaliputra, in the eighteenth year of his reign (i. e., 256 B. C.). This Council completed the Tripiṭaka and decided to send out missionaries. After this Council, many of the Sthaviravādins went to Ceylon, which became their principal center, and there (89 B. C.) they decreed the *Pāli canon* and took the name of Theravādin (Pāli for Sthaviravādin). Those of this sect remaining in the North came to be called Sarvāstivādins (at Mathurā) and Mulasarvāstivādins (in Cashmere). About A. D. 125, the Kushan (Indo-Scythian) king, Kanishka, called a Council at Jālandhara on the border of Cashmere, and there, under the guidance of the buddhic poet and seer, Aśvaghoṣa, it fixed the *Sanskrit* canon.[66] Aśvaghoṣa (of Ayodhya) was joined by Nāgārjuna (of Andhra, Central Deccan), founder of the first great Buddhist school, the Madhyamika, and together they began to develop the bodhisattvas as a protest against the cold, inexorable doctrines of transmigration based on retribution.[67] From the original Mahāsāṁghikas and the Madhyamika dissenters were developed the Mahāyānist (Great Vehicle); while the remaining Sarvāstivādins (Sanskrit) of the North and the Theravādin (Pāli) of Ceylon were called Hīnayānist (Little Vehicle).[68]

The bodhisattvas, developed by Aśvaghoṣa and Nāgārjuna in the second century, were, in the fourth century, elaborated by Asaṅga and his brother Vasubandhu (founder of the Yogācāra [mystic] or Vijñānavādin [idealist] school) into a complex system. "Developing a transcendental conception of the Buddha, it multiplied this great personality, created a hierarchy of Buddhas, divine and eternal, surrounding them with bodhisattvas, their emanation. These marvellous personages were charged with leading the Universe to its supreme end: the transformation of all beings into Buddhas at the end of the metamorphoses."[69] These brothers were natives of Purushapura (Pe-

[65] Grousset, p. 73; E. J. Thomas, *History of Buddhist Thought* (London, 1933), p. 194; T. A. Gopinatha Rao, *Elements of Hindu Iconography* (2 v. in 4, Madras, 1914-16).

[66] Hendrik Kern, *Manual of Buddhism* (Strassburg, 1896), pp. 101-112, 121-126; Grousset, I, 33, 38-39, 64, 69, 78; Jean Przyluski, Le concile de Rājagṛiha (Paris, 1926).

[67] Kern, pp. 122, 126-127; Grousset, I, 76-79, 122-123; P. Masson Oursel, *L'Inde antique et la civilisation indienne* (Paris, 1933), pp. 217, 319-321.

[68] Grousset, I, 69-70.

[69] Paul Mus, "L'Hindouisme et le bouddhisme dans l'Indochine," *Indochine*, ed. by Sylvain Levi (Paris, 1931), p. 107.

shawar), in Gandhara, in contact with Sassanid Persia, and may have been directly influenced by the Syrio-Persian schools, more or less the heirs of the school of Alexandria. They lived at the court of the Guptas.[70] Their followers taught at Nālandā from the fifth to the beginning of the eighth century.

(b) *Buddhism in Southeast Asia during the Pre-Angkor and Early Angkor Periods*

Indications of the close relationship between Maheśvara and the bodhisattva Lokeśvara appeared in Indo-China as early as the fifth century, during the Funan period. About 484, King Kauṇḍinya Jayavarman sent the Buddhist monk Nāgasena on an embassy to the Emperor of China. This monk told the Emperor that it was the custom of Funan to render a cult to Maheśvara and that that deity made supernatural power descend on Mount Motan. Nāgasena wrote: "He spreads goodness in the world and his benevolent influence acts upon the living. All the kings receive his benefits and all the people are calm. It is because this benefit descends on all that his subjects have submissive sentiments." From this eulogy of Maheśvara, he passed abruptly to the praise of Buddhism. "The Bodhisattva practises mercy. Originally, he was of humble origin. But since he has manifested a heart worthy of the bodhi, he has arrived where the two vehicles cannot attain. The reforming influence of the Buddha extends over the ten regions. There is no one who does not receive his aid." [71]

Here we have Maheśvara and the Bodhisattva worshipped in the same place, spoken of in the same breath and each in his characteristic role of god of mercy. These remarks seem to show that Lokeśvara was meant; [72] but there is nothing else to indicate the worship of Lokeśvara in Indo-China during the Funan period. In the latter part of that period, two Buddhist monks went to China to interpret Buddhist documents into Chinese,[73] and the Buddhic images of Angkor Borei—believed to be of the fifth-sixth century, perhaps the earliest specimens of Khmer statuary — may be of the Funan period.[74] The Buddhism of Southeast Asia of this period was Mahāyānist.[75]

During the early Chenla period, Buddhism played an even smaller part, and Lokeśvara appeared scarcely at all. Īśānavarman I (ca. 610-ca. 635) seems to have been the king who I-Ching says persecuted Buddhism until there were hardly enough Buddhists left to be worth mentioning.[76] Under later kings, there were Buddhic inscriptions; but in these inscriptions, the name of Lokeśvara appears only twice. One inscription records a gift of slaves to three bodhisattvas: Śastra, Avalokiteśvara, and Maitreya,[77] and another, in the West Baray region near Angkor, dated 791, mentions Lokeśvara under that name.[78] The only Lokeśvara images attributed to this period are that found at Rachgia, of uncertain date and origin,[79] and the bronze figures at Ak Yom, in the West Baray region.[80] The latter are believed to be of the sixth and seventh century; but they could have been brought to that sanctuary at a later date.

Meantime, Buddhism had been undergoing some vicissitudes in its homeland. In 643, at a council called at Kanauj by King Harsha — at which the Chinese Buddhist pilgrim, Hsüan-chuan, was present — Mahāyānism was approved and Hīnayānism was rejected.[81] Those of the latter sect who were not absorbed by other sects withdrew to Ceylon, and Hīnayānism all but disappeared from the land of its birth. It is now quite generally believed that Hīnayānism was not driven out of India by persecution. It lost in fair competition, because its strict monasticism, its lack of a metaphysical creed, and its inexorable doctrines of transmigration and retribution did not meet the desires and needs of the Indian people as well as

[70] Grousset, I, 120. Vasubandhu is thought by some to have been the *guru* of Samudragupta (A. D. 330-380).

[71] Pelliot, "Fou-Nan," *BEFEO*, 1903, 257-258.

[72] Mus thinks the Bodhisattva here means the Śākyamuni Buddha (op. cit., pp. 103-104).

[73] Pelliot, pp. 284-285.

[74] Georges Groslier, "Note sur la sculpture khmère ancienne," *Études asiatiques* (Paris, 1925), I, 309, 311-312; A. K. Coomaraswamy, *History of Indian and Indonesian Arts* (London, 1927), pp. 182-183.

[75] I-Tsing, *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and the Malay Archipelago* (671-695 A. D.), translated by J. Takakusu (Oxford, 1896), p. 12.

[76] I-Tsing, p. 12.

[77] Aymonier, I, 142.

[78] Bergaigne, "Chronologie," p. 61; Finot, "Lokeçvara," 235.

[79] Parmentier, "Notes archéologiques Indochinois: 4, Note sur diverses sculptures indochinoises d'origine précise inconnue." *BEFEO*, 1923, 291.

[80] Henri Marchal, *Musée Louis Finot: La Collection khmère* (Hanoi, 1933), p. 99.

[81] Grousset, I, 99.

the reforms of the Mahāyānists did. Whereas the Hīnayānist hope of deliverance lay in the attainment of Nirvāṇa, the Mahāyānists offered the more attractive prospect of universal attainment of buddahood through bodhisattvaship.[82]

After the death of Harsha (A. D. 647), the kingdom of Kanauj declined and the hegemony of the Ganges valley fell to the kingdom of Bengal. Here, under the protection of the Pāla dynasty (730-1060), the Mahāyānists, already surcharged with a whole hierarchy of bodhisattvas and other supernatural beings, became indoctrinated with mysticism, magic practices, Shamanism, Tantrism and what not, which the new popular Śivaite sect was beginning to take on. As this dynasty extended its power over Assam and the Kalinga coast and as Mahāyānism began to lose ground to the new Hindu sects, Mahāyānist monks spread to Burma and Southeast Asia. It is known that Sanskrit Buddhism, impregnated with Tantrism, came to Burma at an early date.[83] The Śailendra dynasty which ruled over much of Java, Sumatra and the Malay peninsula during the eighth and ninth centuries, became a great center from which Mahāyāna was relayed to all parts of Indo-China and to Western Indonesia until it became the chief form of Buddhism in those regions. It is known that this dynasty was in close contact with northern India at this time. A copper-plate inscription found at Nālandā records a grant to that monastery by a king of Suvarṇadvīpa (Sumatra), grandson of the king of Yavabhūmi (Java), of the Śailendra dynasty.[84] Inscriptions of Java, Champa, and Cambodia, as well as accounts of Arab travellers and the record of the arrival of embassies at the court of China, make it certain that the Śailendra was reigning in West and Central Java and Southeast Sumatra about the middle of the ninth century, the date of the Nālandā grant.[85] The outburst of Buddhist architecture and art in Central Java—of which Borobudur is the chief specimen—bears witness to this Buddhist movement, mixed, however, as in India, with Hindu elements. Coèdes points out [86] that the inscription of Ligor, 775, in the Malay peninsula, mentions foundations to the bodhisattvas Padmapāṇi and Vajrapāṇi; that of Kalasan, 778, in Java, records a sanctuary to Tārā, that of nearby Kelurak, 782, records the erection of an image of Mañjuśrī, while a Cambodian inscription, dated 791, mentions the erection of an image of Lokeśvara, the only such inscription during the Chenla period.

A Cham inscription, dated 829, made by a Buddhist *sthavira*, says the father of the *sthavira* erected temples and monasteries to both the Buddha and Śiva.[87] Finot lists several statues of Lokeśvara, in Champa.[88] The dates, however, are uncertain. In 875, Lakshmīndra Bhumīśvara Grāmasvāmin came to the throne of Champa and ruled as Indravarman II, the first Buddhic king of Champa, and founded the new dynasty of Chan-Ch'eng, with its capital at Indrapura. The first year of his reign, he founded a great monastery at Dong Duong, dedicated to himself jointly with Lokeśvara, under the name of Lakshmīndra-Lokeśvara. This is the earliest inscription to show the presence of Mahāyānist Buddhism in Champa. The same inscription speaks of receiving from Śiva, via Bhṛigu and Uroja, a Śivalinga called Bhadreśvara, apparently the talisman of the new dynasty.[89] Relations between Champa and Java seem to have been close at this time,[90] which may account for the upsurge of Mahāyānism in Champa. Cambodia, recently at war with the Mahārāja, seems to have been little affected by the Mahāyānist movement at this time or for some time later.

(c) *Buddhism Assumes Śivaic Forms in Cambodia*

With the establishment of the Khmer Empire and the state cult of the *devarāja* in 802, Buddhism

[82] See note 69.

[83] Finot, "Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme birman," *J. A.*, ser. 10, 20 (1912), 121-136; Charles Duroiselle, "The Art of Burma and Tāntric Buddhism." *Annual Report of the Archeological Survey of India* (*ARASI*), 1915-16, 79-93.

[84] Hirananda Śastrī, "The Nālandā Copper Plate of Devapāladeva," *Epigraphia Indica*, 1923-24, 17, 310-327; Briggs, "The Origin of the Śailendra Dynasty: Present Status of the Question," *JAOS*, LXX (1950), 85.

[85] Briggs, "The Khmer Empire and the Malay Peninsula," *FEQ*, 1950, 279.

[86] Coedès, *Les états hindouises*, pp. 165-166.

[87] Majumdar, "Bakul Stele Inscription, dated *śāka* 751," *Champa* (Lahore, 1927), book 3, 66-67.

[88] Finot, "Lokeçvara," pp. 233-235.

[89] Majumdar, "Dong Duong Stele Inscription of Indravarman II, dated *śāka* 797," *Champa*, book 3, 74-88.

[90] A Cham inscription (Nhan-Bieu, 911) says that during the reign of Jaya Simhavarman I (ca. 895-ca. 904) and Bhadravarman III (ca. 905-ca. 910) a Cham envoy was sent three times on a mission to Java. Majumdar, 3, 133-7; Georges Maspero, *Le royaume de Champa* (Paris, 1928), pp. 115-117.

fell into the background and played a very minor role in Cambodia until the reign of Rājendravarman II, near the middle of the tenth century. It scarcely appears in the epigraphy or iconography of Jayavarman II, Jayavarman III, and Indravarman I (802-889). Under Yaśovarman I (889-900), it was of enough importance to merit a monastery (Saugatāśrama),[91] near the capital but not a Yaśodharāśrama, as these were dedicated only to Śiva and (one) to Vishṇu. Buddhism seems to have been wholly absent from Chok Gargyar.

With Rājendravarman II came a new era of tolerance, probably partly related to the circumstances of his succession. Rājendravarman, who had been nearest in line to the throne after the sons of Yaśovarman I, saw his uncle, Jayavarman IV, come to the throne by force and on his death secure the succession of his son, Harshavarman II (942-44). Rājendravarman seems to have won after a hard struggle.[92] In his efforts to gain the throne, he doubtless sought the assistance of every faction he could, including the Mahāyānists, who seem to have been out of favor with Jayavarman IV. An inscription tells us that Rājendravarman II made a study of the Buddhic doctrine;[93] and, although he rejected it, as his many lingas and other foundations and his posthumous name testify, still he appointed as his great minister, Kavīndrārimathana—apparently the first Buddhist minister of the Kambuja period—and, on his return to Yaśodharapura, he entrusted that minister with the construction of a new capital and new religious center. Kavīndrārimathana, erected a sanctuary at Bat Chum, apparently the first Buddhic sanctuary of the Angkor period, dedicated to the Buddha and to the bodhisattvas Lokeśvara, Vajrapāṇi, and Prajñāpāramitā, and made Buddhist foundations at other sanctuaries.[94] According to the inscription of this sanctuary, brahmans could use the *tīrtha* (bathing-place) at Bat Chum, but only the *hotar* and the best among them, i. e., those who knew the Vedas.

[91] Coedès, "La Stèle de Tep Pranam," *J. A.*, ser. 10, 8 (1911), 203-225.

[92] Finot, "Inscriptions d'Angkor: 4, Mebon," *BEFEO*, 1925, st. 53; Coedès, "La Stèle de fondation de Pre Rup," *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, I, st. 76.

[93] Finot, "Mebon," st 172.

[94] Coedès, "Les Inscriptions de Bat Chum," *JA*, ser. 10, 8 (1912), 12A, st 21.

The inscription of Srei Santhor,[95] whose last date is 968, the first year of the reign of Jayavarman V (968-1001), son and successor of Rājendravarman II,[96] shows that the latter had another Buddhist minister, Kīrtipaṇḍita, who had served also under Rājendravarman II. This minister is said by an inscription to belong to the school of Yogācāra (see above III a), "pure doctrine of the void and of subjectivity," which Coedès says borrowed a part of its terminology from the Hinduist rituals, and consisted especially of the cult of the bodhisattva Lokeśvara.[97] With the support, or at least the acquiescence, of Jayavarman V, Kīrtipaṇḍita labored to establish Mahāyānism in Cambodia, and not without success. He brought from foreign lands a great many treatises and commentaries on Mahāyānism and books on Mahāyānist philosophy. Buddhist inscriptions of the reign of Jayavarman V show the development of Buddhism under these two kings. The inscription of Phum Banteay Neang, in the province of Battambang, whose last date is 986, celebrates the erection of images of Prajñāpāramitā, "Mother of the Buddhas," and Lokeśvara.[98] An undated inscription of Prasat Pra Dak, Angkor, begins with an invocation to the three Buddhic ratnas—*śrīgaṇa*, *dharma*, and *saṃgha*.[99] Emile Senart and Hendrik Kern have shown how Buddhism was raised to a level with Śivaism during the reign of these two kings by dressing it in Śivaic forms, drowning, as Senart puts it, fundamental differences in superficial analogies. Brahmans could bathe in the *tīrtha* at Bat Chum. The inscription of Srei Santhor provided that a *purohita* should be versed in Buddhist doctrine and on festival days should bathe the image of the Buddha and recite Buddhist prayers.[100] Thus Buddhism was raised by having its rites performed in the same forms as Śivaism and through Śivaite agencies.

But, although Rājendravarman II and Jayavarman V helped to establish Buddhism on a sound footing in Cambodia and were also friendly to

[95] Aymonier, I, 261-270; II, 308-318.

[96] In a previous article (*FEQ*, 1947, 351), this author erroneously stated that Jayavarman V was a *brother* of Rājendravarman II.

[97] Coedès, *États hindouisés*, p. 201.

[98] Bergaigne, *ISC*, No. 52, Phum Bantei Neang, p. 178.

[99] Bergaigne, *ISC*, No. 41, Prasat Pra Dak, pp. 165-166.

[100] Emile Senart, "Une Inscription bouddhique du Cambodge," *Revue Archéologique*, 1883, 182-192; Aymonier, II, 308-318.

Vishṇuism, they were loyal Śivaites, devoted to the cults of the *devarāja* and ancestor-worship. This was shown by the many important shrines erected by them and consecrated to these cults—Bakrei Chamkrong, Mebon, Pre Rup, Phimeankas.

(d) *The Religio-Administrative Reforms of Sūryavarman I*

Sūryavarman I was the first Buddhist king of the Angkor period and, although the principal foundations and inscriptions of his reign were Śivaite, the author believes there are reasons to think the revolution of his reign was more significant than has generally been realized, although its aims and results were more administrative than religious. The ground had been prepared for this movement, even perhaps for the seating of Sūryavarman I personally, during the two previous reigns. Sūryavarman was the son of the king of Tāmbralinga (present Ligor), which was so famous a center of Buddhism that a little later it was given the name of *Śrī Dharmarāja nagara*, "City of the King of the Law." The Mahāyānist teachings (and probably some teachers) brought into Cambodia from foreign countries by Kīrtipaṇḍita, probably came, in part at least, from Tāmbralinga; for Louvo, the only other famous Buddhic center on the east side of the peninsula of Indo-China, was Hīnayānist. It may also be recalled that Sūryavarman's mother belonged to a prominent Cambodian family, one of whose members—Prāṇā—had been a wife of Rājendravarman II and chief secretary of Jayavarman V. No doubt the nucleus of Buddhism established under these two predecessors, especially by Kīrtipaṇḍita, was of great assistance to Sūryavarman in gaining the throne and, through the teachers from foreign countries, there may have been a direct connection with Sūryavarman in Tāmbralinga before he came to the throne.

Whether there were definite parties or not, it may be conceived that the functionnaires of Cambodia consisted of two groups. One group centered in the great privileged hereditary families—represented in the inscriptions of Sdok Kak Thom, Vat Thipdei B, and Takeo B—who furnished *purohitas, hotars,* and certain hereditary priests and judges. They had doubtless waxed powerful, and the long minorities of Rājendravarman II and Jayavarman V had given them an opportunity to consolidate their power. Naturally they were jealous of their power and looked with disfavor on new families and anything which disturbed the *status quo*. At this time, the most important functions of these three families were united in the celebrated pandit, Śivācārya.[101] The most powerful of the new families was that of Saptadevakula, represented in the inscriptions of Lovek[102] to which family Sūryavarman's mother belonged. Śivācārya served under Jayavarman V and there is no sufficient reason to think that he did not continue under Udayādityavarman I (1001-2) and Jayavīravarman (1002-11) until Sūryavarman conquered the capital in 1006. The chief representative of the Saptadevakula family at this time was the pandit Śaṅkara. He apparently joined the Buddhist group in favor of Sūryavarman at the start.

The war is said to have lasted nine years.[103] Sūryavarman, apparently ascended the Mekong, landed in the east and moved slowly toward the capital. Gradually, as new territory was conquered, new factions came over to his side. He seems to have got possession of the capital in 1006.[104] The pacification of the country was completed by 1011. During this period of conquest, several significant events seems to have taken place: (1) the exclusive hereditary privilege of furnishing purohitas to the *devarāja* was taken away from the house of Śivakaivalya after the death of Śivācārya; (2) Sūryavarman divided the house of Śivakaivalya by taking a member of that house out of the religious life, marrying him to a sister of the queen and giving him important public (but not sacerdotal) functions, under the title of Jayendrapaṇḍita; (3) as *purohita*, he named Śaṅkarapaṇḍita[105] of the house of Saptadevakula, who continued to serve in that capacity under several later kings;[106] (4) he strengthened his own claim to the throne by

[101] This Śivācāryapaṇḍita is not to be confused with the Śivācārya who was *hotar* of Jayavarman IV. See also Briggs, "The Genealogy and Successors of Śivācārya."

[102] Barth, *IC*, No. 17, Lovek.

[103] Coedès, "Le Serment des fonctionnaires de Suryavarman I," *BEFEO*, 1913, 6, 11-17.

[104] Dupont thinks Sūryavarman approached Yaśodharapura via Korat, after his father had taken the Menam valley, in 1002-4, and that Śivācārya went over to him at that time (*BEFEO* 43 [1943-6], 21-23). The argument is given in the author's *The Ancient Khmer Empire* (Trans. Amer. Philosophical Soc., XLI, 1), p. 146.

[105] This Śaṅkarapaṇḍita is not to be confused with the celebrated Indian philosopher Śaṅkarācārya.

[106] Barth, "Lovek," B. st 32.

marrying Vīralakshmī, who claimed descent from Yaśovarman I and who Coedès suggests may have been the widow of Jayavīravarman;[107] (5) he seems to have ended the hereditary privileges of the great Śivaite theocratic families, for one by one of these families carved their genealogies and disappeared from history; (6) finally, in 1011, he called together all his functionaries, of every grade and class, and made them take an ironclad oath of allegiance to him personally.

Thus, Sūryavarman I seems to have broken down the hereditary exclusive privileges of the powerful sacerdotal oligarchy, divided the most powerful family against itself by the marriage of its most promising member into the royal family, and bound all the functionaires, sacerdotal and political, great and small, to him by a powerful oath of allegiance. The celebration of the rites in connection with the *devarāja* continued as a state-cult, but the office of *purohita* and others who could administer these rites was no longer the exclusive prerogative of the family of Śivakaivalya, but was exercised by a member of the family of Saptadevakula, to which the king belonged.

There is nothing to indicate that Sūryavarman I ever accepted the worship of the *devarāja* to the extent of identifying himself with Śiva in a linga, as his predecessors had done. No inscription mentions a *Sūryeśvara*. But he seems to have established a new capital with a Buddhic central temple on the site of the later Bayon.[108] We know little of the architecture of this temple and nothing of its central idol; but the people by that time were accustomed to the idea of a king-god and, although we have nothing tangible to support such an hypothesis, in the light of new discoveries, we may at least be permitted to think that the new central idol was a sort of Buddharāja and that the new central temple became Sūryavarman I's mausoleum after his death. With the new spirit of toleration, Śaṅkarapaṇḍita could also have served this central idol. The syncretism of Śivaism and Buddhism, which had been going on in Southeast Asia for some time makes this quite possible.

[107] Coedès, *États hindouisés*, p. 229; Coedès, *Inscriptions*, II, 196; Aymonier, II, 209.

[108] Victor Goloubew, "Mission Goloubew: Recherches dans Aṅkor Thoṃ," *BEFEO*, 1936, 619-623; Goloubew, "La double enceinte et les avenues d'Aṅkor Thoṃ, leur étude et leur dégagement systematique," *Cahiers de l'EFEO* (*CEFEO*), 14 (1938), 33-39.

(e) *Buddhism Dormant during the Śivaite and Vishṇuite Periods (1050-1150)*

Udayādityavarman II (1050-66) restored Śivaism; but it seems to have been a more pliant Śivaism—the Śivaism of the family of Saptadevakula instead of that of the family of Śivakaivalya. Jayendrapaṇḍita whom Sūryavarman I had won to his cause by honors and marriage to a royal princess, continued as *guru* of the king, taught that monarch all the *śāstras*, built many public works, and probably indited the famous inscription of Sdok Kak Thom—which seems to have been the swan-song of the family of Śivakaivalya—in 1052 or shortly afterward. But when that king erected his new Central Temple, the Baphuon, and established therein his golden linga, Udayādityeśvara, it was the sage Śaṅkarapaṇḍita who was the *purohita* of this new *devarāja*.[109] This pandit continued to serve Harshavarman III (1066-90) in this capacity, as he had served the two previous kings, and indited the inscription of Lovek, which gives the genealogy of his family. Harshavarman II's reign, like that of his brother and predecessor, seems to have been mildly Śivaite. It was in 1067, the first year of his reign, that an unusual *caturmūrti* was erected, composed of Brahma, Vishṇu, and the Buddha—the latter substituted for Śiva—, the whole consecrated to Śiva.[110]

With the advent of the Mahīdharapura dynasty, about the beginning of the twelfth century, Vishṇuism seems to have crept in unobtrusively and to have increased in power until it became the dominant religion.[111] Buddhism continued to occupy a subordinate position. The principal Buddhic development was the appearance in Cambodia of a new type of Buddhic statue, influenced by the new "School of Lophburi."[112] After the conquest of the Menam valley by Sūryavarman I and/or his father, a new Mon-Khmer school of art had been formed there, which was now returning to influence the art of Cambodia. Dupont has called to our attention that the Buddha on Nāga

[109] Barth, "Lovek," B, st 32; Briggs, "Śivācārya."

[110] Barth, *ISC*, No. 19, Prasat Prah Khset, pp. 173-177.

[111] This was the period when Rāmānuja was preaching the doctrines of the Vaiṣṇava sect in India. It would be surprising if it did not have a repercussion in Cambodia.

[112] Coedès, *Les collections archéologiques du Musée National de Bangkok* (Paris, 1912), pp. 23-28; Dupont, "Art Siamois: Les écoles," *Bulletin de la Commission Archéologique Indochinoise* (*BCAI*), 1931-4, 45-58.

came into Cambodia during a Vishṇuite period, when representations of Vishṇu on Śesha were common.[113] It is to be noted that this statuary consisted chiefly of images of the Buddha. Lokeśvara does not seem to have played a prominent part in Mahāyānist Buddhism in Cambodia until well into the reign of Jayavarman VII.

The Vishṇuite zenith under Sūryavarman II, which marked the peak of Angkorean art, was followed by a period of dissension during which Prince Jayavarman, who seems to have had the best claim to the throne, renounced his claim temporarily and went on a long pilgrimage to Champa. Then followed chaos, during which an ambitious functionary assassinated the king and usurped the throne and was finally killed by a Cham invasion, which conquered the country and sacked the capital. Jayavarman returned and, after a long fight, drove out the Chams, restored order and was crowned as Jayavarman VII.[114]

Jayavarman VII was a Mahāyānist and a moody visionary, probably of the Yogācāra (mystic) school. His long exile and sufferings, his sight of the destruction of the capital, which he was unable to prevent, and his long struggle to restore order, produced an intense feeling of melancholy in his naturally impressive mind, which feeling was intensified by his marriage to a very intelligent woman, even more mystical and dreamy than he. This experience seems to have made of this exceedingly able and naturally susceptible man an almost irresponsible megalomaniac, whose desire to achieve merit for himself and his family knew no bounds. Coming to the throne at an advanced age, he conquered Champa, held it in subjection for several years, pushed the limits of his Empire on all sides to their widest boundaries and entered into an orgy of building, which resulted in the construction of the present walls and towers of Angkor Thom, its central sanctuary, the Bayon, and more than half of the great structures of the Angkor region—the greatest conglomeration of architectural splendor that ever proceeded from the mind of one individual, a building program which probably impoverished and embittered the country and was the beginning of the downfall of Angkor civilization.[115]

[113] *BEFEO*, 1936, 632.

[114] Briggs, "A Sketch," pp. 352-353.

[115] Coedès, *Un grand roi du Cambodge: Jayavarman VII* (Phnom Penh, 1935).

(f) *Lokeśvara before Jayavarman VII*

As already observed, Lokeśvara does not figure prominently in the epigraphy or iconography of Cambodia until well into the second of the four periods into which Stern and Madame de Coral Rémusat divide the style of the Bayon,[116] in the middle of Jayavarman VII's reign, at the very end of the twelfth century. Before that time, Lokeśvara was mentioned only incidentally, if at all, in the Buddhist inscriptions of Cambodia and his images were few and generally of uncertain origin.

The inscription of Tep Pranam near Angkor, dated 893, records the creation of a Buddhist monastery, but does not mention Lokeśvara. The three inscriptions of Bat Chum, dated 960, record the foundation at that place of three sanctuaries, consecrated to the Buddha, Vajrapāṇi, and Prajñāpāramitā. One of the inscriptions mentions Lokeśvara in the invocation.[117] The inscription of Srei Santhor (Sithor), giving rules for the practice of Buddhism in general, mentions Lokeśvara only incidentally in connection with Prajñāpāramitā. The inscription of Banteay Neang celebrates the erection of a Lokeśvara.

The most notable iconographic specimen in this field before Jayavarman VII, which would pass as belonging to an early period of the reign of that monarch, if it were not dated 989 by an inscription on its base, is a four-faced stele—called a *cetiya* by Finot—about 1.30 meters high, in beautiful red sandstone, found at Thma Pouk, a few kilometers south of Banteay Chmar. Each face is a reduction in edifice of a sanctuary with four superposed, retreating storeys. Under the arcature of each storey (including the lower one) is the figure of a deity—twenty in all—representing, according to the inscription, the Buddha, Indra, Lokeśvara, Prajñāpāramitā, Maitreya, and Vajrapāṇi. Aymonier thought this monument was Buddhic. Lunet de Lajonquière called it Vishṇuite. Finot thought the monument was dedicated to Prajñāpāramitā. He described the Lokeśvara on one of its faces as follows: "It is standing, in short sampot; the torso and legs bare. It wears a high coiffure, in five stages, without the figure of Amitabha. It has a single head and four arms,

[116] Madame Gilberte de Coral Rémusat, *L'Art khmèr*, p. 130.

[117] Coedès, "Bat Chum," 257, A, st 30.

holding the lotus, the rosary, the flacon and the book." [118]

(g) *Lokeśvara under Jayavarman VII*

Lokeśvara did not figure prominently in the early part of the reign of Jayavarman VII. Preah Khan of Angkor was dedicated to that deity and Ta Prohm to Prajñāpāramitā and Coedès points out that they form the Buddhic Trinity, with the Bayon dedicated to the Buddha in its proper place in the center. Smiling bodhisattvas with cylindrical chignon began to appear in the earliest face-towers of the second period of the Style of the Bayon. But in the third period, images of Lokeśvara came in an avalanche. This was the era of sculptured images. Like the monuments, most of the sculptured figures of ancient Cambodia belong to the reign of Jayavarman VII. According to the inscription of Ta Prohm, 260 small statues were deposited in that temple, while those of Preah Khan numbered 515.[119] They seem to have been destined to be carried in parades. These idols were almost all, if not all, funerary images, i. e., statues of princes, princesses, or dignitaries, raised to the honors of apotheosis and represented under the traits of a Buddhic divinity, principally Lokeśvara for the men and Tārā or Prajñāpāramitā for the women.[120] Queen Jayarājadevī had a perfect mania for erecting these "portrait statues." According to the inscription of the Phimeanakas, she "erected everywhere her father, her brothers, friends, relatives and members of her family, known to her or of whom she had heard." [121]

Lokeśvara was the leading deity of the period and many images of him appeared, some of which were unique at that time and have never since appeared, in Cambodia or elsewhere. The smiling bodhisattva, with diadem and necklace, which appeared in the face-towers of the second period "of the Style of the Bayon," was perfected in the third period. The jewelled Lokeśvara of the basreliefs of Banteay Chmar; [122] the strange bodhisattvas, in stone or bronze, in which figurines in emanation occur as a coat of mail or otherwise, found at Prasat Preah Thkol, Ta Prohm of Bati near No. 486 and elsewhere; [123] the giant figures of Lokeśvara at Don Tai, with figurines on the chest, waist, and feet; [124] and the storeyed stele of Thma Puok, described above, in which twenty deities appear in arcatures on a four-faced upright stone,[125] are some of the unusual manifestations of bodhisattvas during this period.

(h) *The Syncretism of Lokeśvara and Maheśvara*

In the latter part of the second period of the Style of the Bayon, a new type of Lokeśvara appeared—a Lokeśvara which shows the amalgamation with Maheśvara. This syncretization had been slowly taking place in Cambodia, as shown by the bodhisattvas of the preceding period. But its progress was undoubtedly stepped up at this period by an influx of Mahāyānist monks from North India. Mahāyānism was already being absorbed there by Śivaism—both impregnated with Tantrism, mysticism and other magic practices—(or perhaps it would be more true to say, Mahāyānism was becoming amalgamated with Śivaism), when a new foe arrived. About the middle of the twelfth century, the Senas, a Śivaite dynasty with a strong tendency to Tantrism overthrew the Pāla dynasty in Bengal.[126] Their triumph was short-lived. In 1191, the Turkish house of Ghor overcame their overlords of Ghazni. In 1193, they were in Delhi. The next year they plundered Benares. In 1202 they defeated the Senas and drove them into the eastern part of Bengal.[127] Some of the Mahāyānists, less affected by Tantrism, fled to Southeast Asia. Others found the transition to Śivaism so slight, it offered little difficulty, proving the truth of the dictum that Mahāyānism, in its turn, was not driven out of India until the Śivaites had absorbed all the good

---

[118] Aymonier, II, 333; E. Lunet de Lajonquière, *Inventaire archéologique de l'Indochine* (Paris, 1912), III, 383; Finot, "Lokesvara," pp. 251-252.

[119] Coedès, "La stèle de Ta Prohm," *BEFEO*, 1906, st. 37.

[120] Coedès, "Nouvelles découvertes à Angkor," *CEFEO*, Nos. 20-21 (1939), 19.

[121] Finot, "Inscriptions d'Angkor: 10, Phimanakas," *BEFEO*, 1925, st. 93.

[122] Finot, "Lokeçvara," pp. 240-243.

[123] Finot, "Lokeçvara," pp. 243-244 and pl. 19; Coedès, "Catalogues des pièces originales de sculpture khmèr conservés au Musée Indochinois du Trocadero et au Musée Guimet," fig. 42 and p. 30.

[124] Finot, "Lokeçvara," pp. 250-251; Lunet de Lajonquière, III, 295-297.

[125] Finot, "Lokeçvara," 251-252; Aymonier, II, 233; Lunet de Lajonquière, III, 387.

[126] Grousset, I, 101; V. A. Smith, *Early History of India* (Oxford, 1914), p. 403.

[127] W. H. Moreland and A. C. Chatterjee, *A Short History of India* (London, 1936), p. 152.

it contained.[128] Hinduism, based on caste and family, was able to survive the Muslim deluge; but Mahāyānism, centered in its monasteries, could not outlive their destruction.[129]

The syncretism of Lokeśvara and Śiva reached its culmination in Cambodia during the third period of the Style of the Bayon. Śivaism had its counterpart to the doctrine of the compassionate Lokeśvara in the cult of Maheśvara, which was associated with the linga in Indo-China. These two cults became so similar that they flourished side by side without friction, almost without distinction in some cases. The similarity even extended to the personality and attributes of the two deities. Lokeśvara was pictured at Angkor with the four arms, four faces, the frontal eye, and sometimes even with the trident and twining serpents of Śiva.[130] The smiling four-faced Bodhisattva, with cylindrical coiffure which appears during the previous period, was further developed, with a diadem replacing the chignon. This period completed the development of the Bodhisattva with diadem and necklace, different from any other Bodhisattva of Khmer Art, seen at its best in the towers of the Bayon. "No specimen of the Bodhisattva now known." says Dupont, "and the repertoire of the epoch of the Bayon carries many of them, corresponds exactly with the aspect of the head sculptured on the towers of Jayavarman VII. . . . The Khmer Lokeśvara as far as known, wears a cylindrical chignon and sometimes jewelry, but diadem and necklace . . . are never [elsewhere?] found on them."[131]

This syncretization had other implications at this time. We have seen how, in the reign of Jayavarman V, Buddhism had been brought to a level with Śivaism by adopting Śivaic forms (see III c); it is now almost certain that this syncretism of Mahāyānism with state Śivaism (Maheśvara associated with the linga) resulted in the development of a Buddharāja and its substitution for the *devarāja*. We have seen how, in the reign of Sūryavarman II, the syncretism of Śivaism and Vishṇuism probably resulted in the substitution of a Vishṇurāja for the *devarāja* and the adoption of the pyramid form for the Vishṇuite temple of Angkor Wat (see II f). More certain is the substitution of a Buddharāja during the reign of Jayavarman VII and the transformation of the Bayon into a pyramid-temple, even during the course of its construction.[132]

There is no doubt that the Bayon was originally dedicated to Lokeśvara. The figure found in the fronton and in other prominent places—concealed by later constructions until brought to light by Parmentier in 1923—is the figure of Lokeśvara,[133] and the four faces of the towers of the Bayon and its walls are the faces of Lokeśvara in the image of Jayavarman VII, with whom he is conceived to have been united. But it is just as certain that the Bayon was finally dedicated to the Buddharāja—the Buddha under the lineaments of Jayavarman VII. The Buddha unearthed by George Trouvé in 1933, at the bottom of the pit under the central socle of the Bayon is the Buddharāja, not a Lokeśvara.[134] This may account in part for the concealing of the Lokeśvara of the fronton by the workmen who attempted to make a tower-temple of the Bayon in the third period of Jayavarman VII's reign. The face-towers are believed to be of the late second and early third period, when the Bayon was built on a flat surface and dedicated to Lokeśvara. But as the idea that he was the living Buddha began to grow on Jayavarman VII,[135] he conceived the idea of a Buddharāja — himself apotheosized as the Buddha — in place of the temple on the flat plan which he was building. The result was the Bayon and the enormous statue of the Buddha found there. These changes are attributed to the third period of the Style of the Bayon.

Tantrism, however, which formed such an important part in the Mahāyānism of the North, and even in Java and Bali, did not strike a deep root in Cambodia. Perhaps that was because the extreme Mahāyānists of Bengal found their escape in Śivaism or in the countries to the north. Finot thinks it was because the excesses of the Bodhi-

[128] Eliot, I, X.

[129] Eliot, II. 112-113, 120.

[130] Finot, "Lokeçvara," pp. 230-231.

[131] Dupont, "A propos de l'evolution de la statuaire angkorienne," *BEFEO*, 1926, 630; Coral Rémusat, p. 125 and pl. XXXVI (1928).

[132] *BEFEO*, 1933, 1196-7.

[133] Finot, "Lokeçvara," p. 216; Briggs, "*A Pilgrimage*," p. 88 and pl. X.

[134] Coedès, "Le mystère de Bayon d'Angkor Thom," *CEFEO*, No. 10 (1937), 28; Coedès, *Pour mieux comprendre Angkor* (Paris, 1947), p. 144; Briggs, "*A Pilgrimage*," pp. 87-88 and pl. IX.

[135] Coedès, "La stèle de Praḥ Khan d'Angkor," *BEFEO*, 1941, 296, st. 171.

sattva and his *sakti*, depicted in the iconography of Tibet and Mongolia, shocked the deep moral sense of the Cambodians.[136] The only Tantric form which appears in the iconography of Cambodia is Hevajra, of whom several bronze images have been found, but who, according to Finot, is not once mentioned in the inscriptions of that country.[137]

(i) *Cambodian Religions at the End of the Thirteenth Century*

After the death of Jayavarman VII, a Śivaite reaction seems to have set in, which occupied most of the thirteenth century and continued into the fourteenth. In its early stages, it was accompanied by acts of vandalism, of which the Buddhic monuments of the Bayon period and earlier show many traces.[138] Lokeśvara's analogies with Śiva probably saved his images from destruction or complete mutilation. The linga seems to have been restored, for an inscription of the fourteenth century tells of the erection of a golden linga and the appointment of a *hotar* for it.[139] It is sometimes said that Śivaism conquered Buddhism in Indo-China, but the evidence does not seem to support that contention. The last great Śivaite effort was the Baphuon. The last great Hindu effort was the Vishṇuite temple of Angkor Wat. After both these efforts, Mahāyānism completely dominated the kingdom and built the Bayon and more than half of the great temples of Cambodia; and, although a Śivaite reaction seems to have occupied much of the thirteenth century, at the end of that century Chou Ta-Kuan seems to consider Buddhism as the leading popular religion of the capital. "All," he says, "adore the Buddha."[140]

Chou Ta-kuan describes in some detail the religions of Angkor and,[141] although he admits that he does not understand them thoroughly, his opinions are of great interest, for he was a Buddhist and a close observer and spent nearly a year at Angkor. He speaks of three sects, or creeds. (1) Buddhism he seems to think is the leading popular creed. By Buddhism he seems to think chiefly of the new Singhalese Hīnayānist creed, which had come in via Louvo, about the middle of the thirteenth century; for he called their priests *chu-ku*, which is said to be a Thai term still applied to Hīnayānist bonzes. But he had Mahāyānists also in mind, as far as he was able to distinguish them, for he called the four faces of Lokeśvara faces of the Buddha.[142] (2) The *pan-ki* (pandits), who wear the brahmanic cord, were the leaders of the Hindu-sects—Śivaite, Vishṇuite, and probably to some degree Mahāyānists. (3) The *Pa-sseu-wei* were apparently worshippers of the linga (not the *devarāja*). Finot suggested that these were the Pāśupata, (an ancient sect), worshippers of Śiva, but distinct from the Śaiva sect,[143] which (the Pāśupata) had been in Cambodia since the Chenla period. Eliot suggests that they may have absorbed some ideas from the Lingayats, a Hindu sect, worshippers of the linga, which originated in southern India about the middle of the twelfth century.[144] He refers to the stele of Ta Prohm (A. D. 1186), where mention is made of the Jaṅgama, the priestly class of the Lingayats.[145]

IV. The Śiva-Buddha Cult in Java

Mahāyānism seems to have been introduced into Southeast Asia from Bengal by the Śailendra dynasty at the beginning of the eighth century. At least, they both arrived about that time, both seem to have come from that region, and the Śailendra monarchs were the propagators of that creed in the peninsula and the islands. This form of Buddhism was impregnated in Bengal with the Tantric form known as Vajrayāna, Mantrayāna, or Tantrayāna. Dr. H. B. Sarkar, who has made a special study of this subject, thinks there is reason to believe the Buddhism of the Borobudur was of this type. It had a tendency to amalgamate with the native Hindu religions, particularly Śivaism.[146] Perhaps because of the strife between the Khmers

[136] Coedès, *Bronzes khmèrs* (Ars Asiatica, 5, Paris, 1922), pp. 44-45.
[137] Ibid., pl. 30-31.
[138] Coedès, "Le mystère du Bayon d'Angkor Thom," p. 30; Coedès, *Pour mieux comprendre Angkor*, p. 150.
[139] Bergaigne, *ISC*, No. 65, Angkor Wat, st. 57-58.
[140] Pelliot, "Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge, sous Tchou Ta-kouan." *BEFEO*, 1902, 152.
[141] Pelliot, "Mémoires," pp. 148-151.
[142] Pelliot, "Mémoires," p. 142.
[143] Pelliot, "Mémoires," 145-150, note 2.
[144] Eliot, III, 114.
[145] Coedès, "Ta Prohm," st. 4.
[146] Himansu Bhusan Sarkar, "The Cultural Contact between Java and Bengal," *Indian Historical Quarterly* (*I. H. Q.*), 13 (1937), 593-594; N. J. Krom, *Barabudur, Archaelological Description* (The Hague, 1927), pp. 281-332.

and the Śailendra in the eighth-ninth century, this creed did not develop so rapidly among the Khmers as in the islands. In Java, according to Kern, at all the great solemnities, both religions, the Śaivas and the Saugatas, were represented by their priesthood.[147] Ultimately, a definite Śiva-Buddha cult developed.

There is evidence of this cult in Java early in the eleventh century, about the time Sūryavarman I, the first Buddhist Khmer Emperor, came up from Tāmbralinga to rule at Angkor, although there seems to be no connection between the two events and the Mahāyānism of Sūryavarman I shows little evidence of Tantrism or even of bodhisattva-worship. In the Simpang stone-inscription of 1034, during the reign of Erlangga of Java, the term "Saiva-sogata" occurs; while the Calcutta stone-inscription of 1041, during the same reign, uses the term "Sogata-mahesvara." Dr. Sarkar, who edited both inscriptions, translated both expressions as Śiva-Buddha.[148]

About a century and a half later, the name Śiva-Buddha seems to have been applied to Kritanagara, last king of Tumapel (1272-92), according to the testimony of two later documents. The *Nagarakritagama* (see later) says he died in the Śiva-buddhaloka, which is equivalent to saying he was absorbed into Śiva. Eliot believes that the Chandi Singarara, built by this king in 1278, was the temple known as Śivabuddhālaya, "abode of Śiva," in which he was commemorated under the name of Śiva-Buddha.[149] This seems to have been the building of which Kern says the lower part was devoted to the cult of Śiva, while the upper part was a Buddhist shrine, with the statue of the Dhyāni-Buddha Akṣobhya (probably later).[150]

Some sources, whose exact dates are not known but which are quoted by the great works of a later period, make clear the belief at this time in the identity of Śiva and the Buddha. According to the *Bauddhakavya*, quoted by the *Purusasanta* (see below), Śiva and the Buddha are identified with each other. "The god Buddha differs not from Śiva, the king of gods." "The nature of Jina and the nature of Śiva are one: they are distinguishable and yet are the same being." The *Kunjarakarna* (possibly as early as the twelfth century) is the story of a *raksha* of that name who sought wisdom of Vairocana, first of the Dhyāni-Buddhas. This writer also identifies Śiva with the Buddha: Buddhapada is the name of the dwelling of the god Mahadeva (an epithet usually applied to Śiva). When Vairocana put the five Dhyāni-Buddhas (which he called Sugatas) each in line with one of the Śivaite Kusikus, he announced: "We are Śiva; we are Buddha."[151]

The reign of Rajasanagara, or Hayam Wuruk (1350-89), was one of great literary activity in Java and many great works were written during this period which throw light on the syncretism of religions there. The *Purusadasanta*, or *Sutasoma*, describes the adventures of the bodhisattva Sutasoma. It was written by Tantula during this reign but uses earlier document as stated above. Buddha is declared to be the equivalent of the Hindu Trimūrti. Sutasoma was an embodiment of the Buddha. He is also equivalent to Vairocana, the first of the Dhyāni-Buddhas. The *Nagarakritagama*, written in 1365 by the poet Prapancha, who was the head of the Buddhist clergy, gives an account of the Majapahit kingdom at its height. The *Pararaton*, written near the end of the fifteenth century, gives a chronicle of that period. Both speak of a Śiva-Buddha, with whom they identify King Kritanagara (see above).[152]

The Śākyamuni Buddha no longer played any part at all in the religion of Java and the bodhisattva Lokeśvara played only a very small one. Vairocana, as chief of the Dhyāni-Buddhas and Ādi-Buddha, was now the principal deity.[153]

[147] H. Kern, "Buddhism in Java, Bali and Sumatra," in *Encyclopedia of Ethics and Religion*, ed. James Hastings (New York, 1914), pp. 495-497.

[148] Sarkar, "Siva-Buddha and the Old Javanese Records," *Indian Culture*, I (1934), 284.

[149] Eliot, III, 169.

[150] Kern, p. 496.

[151] Sarkar, *Indian Influence on the Literature of Java and Bali* (Calcutta, 1934), p. 386; Krom, II, 298-304.

[152] Krom, II, 303; George Coedès, *Les États hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonesie* (Paris, 1948), pp. 333, 400; Sarkar, "Indian Influences," 230, 319-322, 385; Sarkar, "Siva-Buddha," p. 285.

[153] Krom, p. 303. In Tantric Northern Buddhism, which Java imported from Bengal, there were five "celestial" or "meditative" Buddhas, known as Dhyāni-Buddhas. Each had a corresponding Dhyāni-Bodhisattva and a corresponding Mānushi-Buddha ("earthly" Buddha). The present (fourth) Mānushi-Buddha is the Śākyamuni. The corresponding Dhyāni-Buddha of which Śākyamuni is an emanation, is Amitābha. The corresponding Dhyāni-Bodhisattva is Avalokiteśvara, or Lokeśvara. The coming (fifth) Mānushi-Buddha is Maitreya. In Java, the first Dhyāni-Buddha was Vairocana, who is generally considered the Ādi-Buddha, or "primordial"

This syncretism of Śivaism and Buddhism in the Archipelago seems also to have absorbed the leading Indonesian deities. Przyluski has advanced the idea that, when the Bataks of Sumatra were converted to Hinduism and gave Indian names to their gods, their chief god, Bataraguru, who resided on the mountain, became identified with Śiva-Rudra and after the syncretism became Bhaṭṭāra-Buddha. In the Tantric treatise, *Sang hyang Kamahayanikan*, written partly in Old Javanese, various entities are interspersed between Bhaṭṭāra-Buddha and the Dhyāni-Buddhas, and the former appears as a sort of Ādi-Buddha. Thus in Java we have the syncretism of Śiva, Buddha, and the chief Indonesian deity.[154]

Buddha.—Alice Getty, *The Gods of Northern Buddhism* (Oxford, 1928), pp. 1-78; Alfred Foucher, *Étude sur l'iconographie bouddhique de l'Inde* (Paris, 1900-5), I, 76-128; II, 15-49.

[154] Jean Przyluski, "The Śailendravaṃsa," *JGIS*, VI (1935), 31-32. This forms the basis of Przyluski's belief in the Javanese origin of the Śailendra dynasty. Briggs, "The Origin of the Śailendra Dynasty: Present Status of the Question," *JAOS*, LXX (1950), 84.

P'ÍNG-HUÀ AND THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE SĀN-KUÓ CHÌH

J. I. CRUMP, JR.
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

1. INTRODUCTION.

The history of the *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* (*Sān-kuó Chìh Yĕn-ì*) from the earliest known edition—that attributed to Ló Kuàn-chūng, published during the *hūng-chìh* reign period of the Míng (1488-1506)[1]—is a very complex muddle. Anyone who attempts a definitive treatment of this period in the life of the *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* is lacking the better part of valor. Hú Shìh's excellent critical work[2] is of considerable help, but even so the number of variant versions in existence today, and the successive liberties taken with the text each time it is republished, would benight the most diligent sinolog. We shall have reason to return to this subject later.

If, however, one starts with the 1494 edition and works backward in time, the task is not nearly so difficult and is much more rewarding. The logical place to begin, then, is with the preface of the 1494 edition. Here, right at the outset, we have a clue. ". . . in times gone by, historical romances were written as *p'íng-huà* (平話)," [3] says the preface. The question then arises, what is meant by *p'íng-huà*. It is the answer to this and its implications which unfolds the whole early history of the *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*.

2. THE HUÀ-PĔN.

In tracing back the history of the *Sān-kuó Chìh*, there is every reason to believe it is closely involved with the story-teller's prompt-books, or *huà-pĕn* (話本), which date from the Sung-Yuan period. There is also reason to hope that some light can be thrown on the meaning of the term *p'íng-huà* by referring to the few studies[4] by Western scholars on the *huà-pĕn*. Jaroslav Prušek attempts the following definition of the term *p'íng-huà*:

> Opposed to *tz'ú-huà* (詞話 [? narrations with *tz'ú*]) or *shīh-huà* (詩話 [? narrations with poems]) was the *p'íng-hùa* or 'plain narration' without, or with very few poems.[5]

A brief check on the statistics would have shown Prušek his error. There are *no* works bearing the

[1] This is referred to hereafter as the 1494 edition.

[2] q.v. in the *Chūng-kuó Chāng-huí Hsiăo-shuō K'ăo-chèng* (中國章回小說考證).

[3] Reference to *Tz'ú-hăi* will yield—among other things—the equation 平話 = 評話. This quoted statement is to be found in the Hán-fēn Lóu (涵芬樓) photolith edition of the Míng *hūng-chìh* edition, p. 4b in the preface by Chiăng Tà-ch'ì (蔣大器).

[4] Jaroslav Prušek, "Popular Novels in the Collection of Ch'ien Tseng," *Archiv Orientální* X (1938), 181-94; "The Narrators of Buddhist Scriptures and Religious Tales in the Sung Period," *ibid.*, 375-89; "Researches into the Beginnings of the Chinese Popular Novel," *ibid.*, XI (1939), 91-132. See also Jan Jaworski, "Notes sur l'ancienne litterature populaire en Chine," *Rocznik Orjientalistyczny*, XII (1936), 181-91.

[5] Prušek, "Researches," p. 102, n. 1.