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spill, C E ꝑ.column, En ꝑ.column, Gt ꝑ.column, Ed ꝑ.column, H akə’a; Gz Tna ꝑ.column ‘spill,’ Te ꝑ.column.
stone, C E En ꝑ.column, Gt ꝑ.column, Ed ꝑ.column, M Ms ꝑ.column, G ꝑ.column, A ꝑ.column, W ꝑ.column, H ꝑ.column, Z ꝑ.column; Gz ꝑ.column, Tna ꝑ.column, Te ꝑ.column; Semitic; Hebrew ꝑ.column.
sun, A ꝑ.column, Gf ꝑ.column, with weakening of ꝑ.column in S W ꝑ.column, Z ꝑ.column; Gz ꝑ.column and ꝑ.column (Brauner-Plazikowski, Ein aethiopisch-amharisches Glossar 110). Cerulli, Studi etiopicì 2.190, under ꝑ.column, considers the SE words borrowings from Cushitic, but in view of the attested Ethiopic root ꝑ.column it might be possible to consider the Cushitic words taken from Ethiopic-Semitic.
sweep, E M ꝑ.column, Ms ꝑ.column; ꝑ.column ‘dung,’ H ꝑ.column; Gz ꝑ.column ‘sweep,’ ꝑ.column ‘dirt, dung’ (Polotsky, JAOS 69.39).

threshing-field, C E ꝑ.column, En ꝑ.column Ed Ms S W ꝑ.column, A ꝑ.column, H ꝑ.column; Gz ꝑ.column, Tna ꝑ.column; Cerulli, Studi etiopicì 1.230 connects this root with Galla ꝑ.column, ꝑ.column.

throw away, see ꝑ.column.
today, S W ꝑ.column, Z ꝑ.column, H ꝑ.column; Tna ꝑ.column, ꝑ.column, and probably also Gz ꝑ.column ꝑ.column ‘now,’ Te ꝑ.column.
together, H ꝑ.column (from the root ꝑ.column); Gz ꝑ.column ‘with,’ Te Tna ꝑ.column.
tomorrow, S W ꝑ.column, H ꝑ.column; Gz ꝑ.column, ꝑ.column ‘get up in the morning, come in the morning,’ Te ꝑ.column ‘travel (in general, at any time of the day).’ In view of Tna ꝑ.column ‘leave in the morning, fast and in a hurry’ (re-
duplication of the root ꝑ.column), the Amharic ꝑ.column ꝑ.column ‘travel fast’ is to be connected with the same root.

tooth, C E Gt M Ms H Arg G A Z ꝑ.column, Ed ꝑ.column, S ꝑ.column, W ꝑ.column, Gf ꝑ.column; Gz ꝑ.column, Tna ꝑ.column; Semitic.
toward, see ꝑ.column ‘go toward.’
tree, C Gt ꝑ.column, E M Ms ꝑ.column, En ꝑ.column, S W ꝑ.column, Z ꝑ.column, Gf ꝑ.column; Gz ꝑ.column ‘wood, tree,’ Te ꝑ.column; Amh ꝑ.column ‘wood’ (‘tree’ is ꝑ.column); Semitic; Hebr. ꝑ.column.
wash, S W ꝑ.column, Z ꝑ.column, Gf ꝑ.column; Gz ꝑ.column ꝑ.column ‘sweat,’ Tna ꝑ.column; Semitic; Hebr. ꝑ.column ‘wash.’
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THE SYNCRETISM OF RELIGIONS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA, ESPECIALLY IN THE KHMER EMPIRE

I. NATURE OF THE MOVEMENT

One of the most engaging movements of the history of Southeast Asia during the first millennium 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 Vishnuism and (2) the syncretism of Hinduism and Buddhism, particularly that of the Śivaic Maheśvara and the Mahāyānīst Lokeshvara. 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 Vishnuism, 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 Viṣṇu, 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 Viṣṇu, a whole multitude of aboriginal gods were absorbed. Thus Neo-Hinduism was an attempt to combine the monotheism of Śiva and Viṣṇu 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, Viṣṇu 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 Viṣṇu. To the Viṣṇuites, the Trimūrti consisted of Viṣṇu, Śiva as Viṣṇu, and Brahmā as Viṣṇu, 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 Viṣṇuism (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 Śrīyavarman II, in the first part of the twelfth century, when a Viṣṇušūraja seems to have replaced the Śivaites devarāja as the central deity of the royal worship and the great Viṣṇuit temple of Angkor Wat adopted the form of a pyramid-temple, a form hitherto found in Cambodia only in Śivaites 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 Mahēśvara 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, Śrīyavarman 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 VIŚNUISM
(a) Viṣṇuism in Funan and Chenla—Harihara

The close relationship between Śivaism and Viṣṇuism 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 Viṣṇu and Śiva in a single body, Viṣṇu on the right, Śiva on the left (Hari—Viṣṇu; 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 Viṣṇu side, hair dressed in a high cylindrical cone, cloth falling from waist to knees, with a fold in front, attributes of Viṣṇu on the two right hands.³

This curious deity, said to be mentioned in the Harivamśa, seems to have made its first appearance in sculpture in the rock-temple of Bādami in the Pallava country of Southeast India, which is dated 578.⁴ Eliot thinks it may have reached

---

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.
Funan in the sixth century. Paul Mus thinks it was mentioned by the Chinese in their description of the customs of Funan in 503, and Parmentier believes the earliest statues of Harihara found in Cambodia belong to the Funan period. It did not appear in an inscription until the reign of Iśānavarman 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—are 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—Harirahalaya, “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 Vishnuism does not occupy a prominent place) and then under the name of Śaṅkara-Nārāyaṇa. It appeared only once—very doubtfully—in Java, at the end of the thirteenth century, when Harihara was all but forgotten in Cambodia and Vishnuism and Svāism 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 Viṣṇu,

which have led Dutch archeologists to classify it as Harihara. 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 Viṣṇu 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 Viṣṇu in Chenla and Java

There is evidence that the legend of Viṣṇu, 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. But not too many inferences should be drawn from these facts. While the great Indian epics portray a part of the Viṣṇu 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 Viṣṇuism in any great degree. In Java, the earliest inscriptions compare the king with Viṣṇu, and scenes from the legends of Rāma and Krishṇa, avatars of Viṣṇu, decorate the panels of the temple of Prambanan, an early shrine dedicated to Śiva; but no shrine of this early period seems to have been dedicated to Viṣṇu. Java does not seem to have had close commercial connections with India during the ante-Sailendra 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

---

8 Auguste Barth, “Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge” (ISC), Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres: Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits (Paris, 1885), No. 8, Vat Chakret; No. 8, Ang Fou.
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.”

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) Vishnuism 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 Hiranyadāma. This brahman used four Tantric texts to make a ritual so that Kambujadesa should have a chakravartin 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. 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). 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. Hiranyadāma 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.

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.

Although the worship of the devarāja was established as a state-cult, Vishnuism 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 Vishnu 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 Vishnu seem to have succeeded those of Harihara as the chief objects of Khmer iconography. 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. Coëdès and Pierre Dupont, “L’Inscription de Sdok Kak Thom” (BEFEQ, vol. XLIII, 1943-46), stanzas 70-77, hereafter SKT; G. Coëdès, “Les états hindouisés d’Indochine et d’Indonésie” (Paris, 1948), pp. 171-173, hereafter, “États hindouisés”.
15 Thus the devarāja of Indravarman I was called Indrāśvara. It is not known that this system came into use before Indravarman I. No Jayēśvara for the first two kings has been found in the inscriptions. Coëdès, États hindouisés, pp. 188-189.
17 Not to be confounded with certain sects, like Pāṇḍāta and Lingayata, which were worshippers of the linga.
perhaps two, of Jayavarman II’s queens seems to have been Vishṇuṣïte. An inscription of a later reign says his wife, Bhāṣ-svāmīṇī, was a daughter of a Vishṇu brahman. Another inscription says his wife, Kambujalakṣmī, had a brother named Vishṇuvāla, who received the name of Lakshmīndra and became administrator of the private treasury. These feminine names may denote the same wife and she seems to have been Vishṇuṣïte. At any rate, Jayavarman III was Vishṇuṣïte—the only Vishṇuṣïte 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 Kesavabhaṭṭa, received the name of Arimathana and became purohitā of the king.”

Now, we know that the post of purohitā of the devarāja was hereditary with the family of Śiva-kaivalya. The Vishṇuṣïte names of this “purohitā” 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 purohitā. The guru of this king, named Nivasakavi, was given the name of Prithivindrapaṇḍita and founded the central sanctuary of Kok Po, in what was probably the region of the old Amarendra pura, one of Jayavarman II’s early capitals. This group of temples seems to have been an important Vishṇuṣïte center for several generations. On Jayavarman III’s death, he received the posthumous name of Vishṇuloka.

(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 Hinayānism at Kauṇoj 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 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. 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).

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.

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. Śivasoma seems to have been chief minister of Indravarman I (877-889) and was the tutor of Vāmaśiva, who was a nephew of Sūkhmavindu and apparently his legitimate heir as purohitā of the devarāja. Together, Śivasoma and Vāmaśiva founded an aśrama (monastery) near Angkor. Vāmaśiva was also guru of the young prince who was to reign as Yasovarman I (889-900). Śaṅkara’s enemies have charged that he defeated Buddhism in India by absorbing it and have stigmatized him as a Buddhist in disguise.

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.
24 Finot, ŠKT, p. 88; Coedès, États hindouïstes, p. 178.
from Buddhism was monastic institutions and discipline. It may not have been just a coincidence that Śivasoma and Āmaśīva 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 Vāmaśīva 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 Bakong33 says Indravarman I erected an image of Iśvara and Śrīgī in an undivided body, apparently of Harihara. During the reign of Yaśovarman I, a temple was erected on Phnom Dei to Śākara-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 Phnom35 and also erected a Vaishnavāśrama (Vishnuita 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 Yaśōdhārāśrama (Śivaites 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, Vishnū, and Brahmana, and relates the erection of an image to Mādhava (Vishnū-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 Vishnū—also under the vocable of Trailokyanātha.40 The bas-reliefs of this temple—among the earliest in Cambodia—show Vishnū and his śakti, Lakṣmī, in several legendary scenes and poses.41 It seems to have been Iśānavarman II, younger brother and successor of Harshavarman I, who, on the death of Sīkhamita, of the house of Prajakat, appointed as his successor, his disciple, Hrishikesha, “issue of a pure Vishnū family,” who was baptized and consecrated under the name of Śivācārya42 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 Vishnū and that under the unusual vocable of Śripatī.44 Under Rājendravarman II (944-968), who moved the capital back to Yaśodharapura (Angkor Thom), an inscription records the foundation of a domain to Vishnū and Lakṣmi.45 It was probably during his reign that Śivācārya erected the two lateral towers—dedicated respectively to Brahmā and Vishnū—at the linga-sanctuary of Kutiśvara and indited there the inscription, later found re-employed at the neighboring temple of Banteay Kdei.46 Indralakṣmi, sister of Jayavarman V (968-1001), seems to have been a worshipper of Vishnū. She married a distinguished bhaṭṭa from North India named Divakara and together they established images of that deity at what is now Siemreap.47 The names of the guru, Yaṭāavāraṇa and his brother Vishnukumāra, who built the temple of Banteay Srei, indicate that they may have been Vishnuites and a wing of that temple was dedicated to Vishnū.48 An inscription of Va

34 Coedès, “Études Cambodgiennes, 6, L’Inscription de Phnom Dei,” BEFEO, 1918, 9.
38 Bergaigne, 185, No. 62, “Phimeanakas,” p. 549.
Thipdei mentions a Nārāyaṇa as hotar of the family of Pranavatman under Jayavarman V and inscriptions of Kok Po of this reign speak of a donation to that temple by the mother of Nārāyaṇa. That Vishnute center seems to have been thriving under the reign of this king.

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

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

(e) The Development of Vishnusim under the House of Mahīdhapura

The triumph of Vishnusim in Cambodia seems to have had its faint beginnings with the coming of the dynasty of Mahīdhapura 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 Śivaita family of the inscriptions of Ban That and Prasat Tor, which produced the brilliant Tilakā and her son, the first of the three Bhūpen-śrāṇḍitaś who served this dynasty. But the inscription of Preah Vihear says Jayavarman VI adored Campeśvara (Vishnū) and he made a rich donation to the Vishnute temple of Kok Po.

Meanwhile, Vishnusim itself was undergoing a transformation in India. Rāmānuja, founder of the Vaiṣṇava sect and of modern Vishnusim, though himself a Vedantist, revolted against the absolute monism of Saṅkara and advocated a qualified monism. 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). Faith, not recognition of Indian tradition, was to Rāmānuja the way to Salvation. 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 Mahīdhapura 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 Vishnū.

Some of the leaders of the revolt of Jayavarman VI have been identified as later ministers of the Vishnute king, Sūryavarman II; and the brahman
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Divākarapāṇḍita, who seems to have been the guiding spirit of Jayavarman VI, became the chief adviser of Suryavarman II and has been given credit for formulating that monarch’s Vishnuite doctrine and even for the plan of the Vishnuite temple, Angkor Wat.⁶⁰ We do not know much about Jayavarman VI’s elder brother and successor, Dharaṇīdravarman 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 Suryavarman II or Dharaṇīdravarman I. The Baphuon was the Central Temple of Udayādityavarman II, where he housed his Udayādityēśvara,⁶¹ and was doubtless his funerary temple after his death.⁶² What sanctuary housed the devarāja, if any, of the early kings of the Mahīdharaṇa dynasty or their remains after their death, is not known.

(f) The Triumph of Vishnuism under Suryavarman II—The Vishnu-rāja

The reign of Suryavarman II (1112-50) was the golden age of Vishnuism in Cambodia. Buddhism, which had had a brief day under Suryavarman 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 Bhūpenderapāṇḍita—apparently fervent Śivaites and identified with the dynasty of Mahīdharaṇa 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 Divākarapāṇḍita,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 Vishnu-rāja and the erection of its great temple, Angkor Wat.⁶⁴

It seems that Suryavarman II did not, any more than his Buddhist 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 Sūryēśvara. Apparently under the aegis of Divākarapāṇḍita, the idea of a Vishnu-rāja began to replace that of a devarāja. This spirit seems to have developed slowly under Śivaic forms. Beng Melea, Chauay Tevoda, Thommanon, Banteay Samré, Angkor Wat, were the architectural manifestations of it. It was a Vishnuism strangely interwoven with the old state Śivaism. Like Buddhism during the reign of Jayavarman V, Vishnuism 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 Vishnuism, and Angkor Wat—the sumnum bonum of Śivaic architectural aspiration—became the abode of a Vishnu-rāja. The syncretism of Śivaism and Vishnuism seems from this time to have been complete—in a larger Hinduism. It seems incorrect to say that Śivaism triumphed over Vishnuism 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 Vishnu and its decorations were Vishnuite; 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
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under Jayavarman VII (1181-1219), when both Śivaism and Vishnuism were relegated to the background and the devarāja and Vishṇurāja were superseded by, or at least subordinated to, a Buddhārāja—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 Hindu 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 Hinayānism) and seems to group Śivaism and Vishnuism—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 śvara '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 Buddhist 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 Mahāsāṃghikas (who dissented on points of discipline and on the question of the position of the laics). After the
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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. 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 Kaṇḍinya 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.”

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; 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, and the Buddhist 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. The Buddhism of Southeast Asia of this period was Mahāyānist.

During the early Chenla period, Buddhism played an even smaller part, and Lokeśvara appeared scarcely at all. Iśānvarman 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. Under later kings, there were Buddhist 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 Maitreyā, and another, in the West Baray region near Angkor, dated 791, mentions Lokeśvara under that name. The only Lokeśvara images attributed to this period are that found at Rachgía, of uncertain date and origin, and the bronze figures at Ak Yom, in the West Baray region. 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. 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
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the reforms of the Mahāyānitists did. Whereas the Hīnayānīst hope of deliverance lay in the attainment of Nirvāṇa, the Mahāyānists offered the more attractive prospect of universal attainment of buddahood through bodhisattvaship.\footnote{Coedès, Les états hindouises, pp. 165-166.}

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 (750-1060), 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.\footnote{Majumdar, “Bakul Stele Inscription, dated śāka 751,” Champa (Lahore, 1927), book 3, 66-67.} The Sailendra 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 Sailendra dynasty.\footnote{Pinot, “Lokeśvara,” pp. 233-235.} 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 Sailendra was reigning in West and Central Java and Southeast Sumatra about the middle of the ninth century, the date of the Nālandā grant.\footnote{Majumdar, “Dong Duong Stele Inscription of Indraravarman II, dated śāka 797,” Champa, book 3, 74-88.} 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. Coedès points out\footnote{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.} 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.\footnote{Sūrī, “The Origin of the Sailendra Dynasty: Present Status of the Question,” JAOS, LXXX (1950), 85.} Finot lists several statues of Lokeśvara, in Champa.\footnote{Sūrī, “Un nouveau document sur le bouddhisme birman,” J.A., ser. 10, 20 (1912), 121-136; Charles Duroiselle, “The Art of Burma and Tantric Buddhism.” Annual Report of the Archeological Survey of India (ARASI), 1913-16, 79-93.} The dates, however, are uncertain. In 875, Lakshmīndra Bhumīśvara Grāmasvāmin came to the throne of Champa and ruled as Indravarman II, the first Buddhist king of Champa, and founded the new dynasty of Chán-Ch'êng, 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 Mahāyānīst Buddhism in Champa. The same inscription speaks of receiving from Śiva, via Brīhgu and Uroja, a Śivalinga called Bhadrēśvara, apparently the talisman of the new dynasty.\footnote{Hirananda Sastri, “The Nalanda Copper Plate of Devapāladeva,” Epigraphia Indica, 1923-24, 17, 310-327; Sūrī, “The Origin of the Sailendra Dynasty: Present Status of the Question,” JAOS, LXXX (1950), 85.} Relations between Champa and Java seem to have been close at this time,\footnote{Hirananda Sastri, “The Nalanda Copper Plate of Devapāladeva,” Epigraphia Indica, 1923-24, 17, 310-327; Briggs, “The Origin of the Sailendra Dynasty: Present Status of the Question,” JAOS, LXXX (1950), 85.} 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
fell into the background and played a very minor role in Cambodia until the reign of Râjendravarman 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 (Saṅgatāśrama), near the capital but not a Yaśodharāśrama, as these were dedicated only to Śiva and (one) to Viṣṇu. Buddhism seems to have been wholly absent from Chok Gargyar.

With Râjendravarman II came a new era of tolerance, probably partly related to the circumstances of his succession. Râjendravarman, 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). Râjendravarman seems to have won after a hard struggle. 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 Râjendravarman II made a study of the Buddhic doctrine; and, although he rejected it, as his many lingas and other foundations and his posthumous name testify, still he appointed as his great minister, Kavindrārimathana—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. Kavindrārimathana, erected a sanctuary at Bat Chum, apparently the first Buddhist sanctuary of the Angkor period, dedicated to the Buddha and to the bodhisattvas Lokesvara, Vajrapāṇi, and Prajñāpāramitā, and made Buddhist foundations at other sanctuaries. 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.

The inscription of Srei Santhor, whose last date is 968, the first year of the reign of Jayavarman V (968-1001), son and successor of Râjendravarman II, shows that the latter had another Buddhist minister, Kirtiṣaṅgita, who had served also under Râjendravarman II. This minister is said by an inscription to belong to the school of Yogacāra (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 Lokesvara. With the support, or at least the acquiescence, of Jayavarman V, Kirtiṣaṅgita 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 Buddhās,” and Lokesvara. An undated inscription of Prasat Pra Dak, Angkor, begins with an invocation to the three Buddhist ratnas—śrīgaṇa, dhārma, and saṃgha. 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. Brahmins could bathe in the tīrtha at Bat Chum. The inscription of Srei Santhor provided that a pūrāhitiva should be versed in Buddhist doctrine and on festival days should bathe the image of the Buddha and recite Buddhist prayers. Thus Buddhism was raised by having its rites performed in the same forms as Śivaism and through Śivaite agencies.

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

---

92 Pinot, “Inscriptions d’Angkor: 4, Mebon,” BEFEO, 1925, st. 57; Coedès, “La Stèle de fondation de Pre Rup,” Inscriptions du Cambodge, I, st. 76.
95 Aymonier, I, 261-270; II, 308-318.
96 In a previous article (BEFQ, 1947, 351), this author erroneously stated that Jayavarman V was a brother of Râjendravarman II.
97 Coedès, États hindouïstes, p. 201.
98 Bergaigne, ISC, No. 52, Phum Bantei Neang, p. 178.
99 Bergaigne, ISC, No. 41, Prasat Pra Dak, pp. 165-166.
Vishnuism, they were loyal Sīvaites, devoted to the cults of the devarāja and ancestor-worship. This was achieved by the many important shrines erected by them and consecrated to these cults—Bakrei Chambroyong, Memon, Pre Rup, Phimeanakas.

(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 Sīvite, 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 Kṛtipāṇḍita, probably came, in part at least, from Tāmbralinga; for Louvo, the only other famous Buddhist center on the east side of the peninsula of Indo-China, was Hīnayaṇist. 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 Kṛtipāṇḍita, 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 Kram Lom, Vat Thippei 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, Sīvācārya. The most powerful of the new families was that of Saptadevakula, represented in the inscriptions of Lovek to which family Sūryavarman’s mother belonged. Sīvācārya served under Jayavarman V and there is no sufficient reason to think that he did not continue under Udayadityavarman I (1001-2) and Jayaviravarman (1002-11) until Sūryavarman conquered the capital in 1006. The chief representative of the Saptadevakula family at this time was the pandit Saṅkara. He apparently joined the Buddhist group in favor of Sūryavarman at the start.

The war is said to have lasted nine years. 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 gotten possession of the capital in 1006. The pacification of the country was completed by 1011. During this period of conquest, several significant events seem to have taken place: (1) the exclusive hereditary privilege of furnishing purohitas to the devarāja was taken away from the house of Śiva-kaivalya after the death of Śivācārya; (2) Sūryavarman divided the house of Śiva-kaivalya 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 sacredotal) functions, under the title of Jayendrapāṇḍita; (3) as purohita, he named Śaṅkara-pāṇḍita of the house of Saptadevakula, who continued to serve in that capacity under several later kings; (4) he strengthened his own claim to the throne by
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marrying Viralakshmi, who claimed descent from Yasovarman I and who Coedès suggests may have been the widow of Jayavarman; he seems to have ended the hereditary privileges of the great Sivaite theocratic families, for one by one of these families carved their genealogies and disappeared from history; 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, Suryavarman 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 functionaries, 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 Sivakaivalya, but was exercised by a member of the family of Saptadevaka, to which the king belonged.

There is nothing to indicate that Suryavarman I ever accepted the worship of the devarāja to the extent of identifying himself with Siva in a linga, as his predecessors had done. No inscription mentions a Suryēśvara. But he seems to have established a new capital with a Buddhist central temple on the site of the later Bayon. 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 Buddhaśrāja and that the new central temple became Suryavarman I's mausoleum after his death. With the new spirit of toleration, Śaṅkarapāñḍita could also have served this central idol. The syncretism of Sivaism and Buddhism, which had been going on in Southeast Asia for some time makes this quite possible.

(e) Buddhism Dormant during the Śivaite and Vīšnuite 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 Saptadevaka instead of that of the family of Sivakaivalya. Jayendrapāñḍita whom Suryavarman 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 instilled the famous inscription of Sdok Kak Thom—which seems to have been the swan-song of the family of Sivakaivalya—in 1052 or shortly afterward. But when that king erected his new Central Temple, the Baphuon, and established therein his golden linga, Udayādityēśvara, it was the sage Śaṅkarapāñḍita who was the purohita of this new devarāja. This pandit continued to serve Harshavarman III (1066-90) in this capacity, as he had served the two previous kings, and instilled 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 caturmārti was erected, composed of Brahma, Vīśṇu, and the Buddha—the latter substituted for Śiva—, the whole consecrated to Śiva.

With the advent of the Mahādhārapura dynasty, about the beginning of the twelfth century, Vīśnuitism seems to have crept in unobtrusively and to have increased in power until it became the dominant religion. Buddhism continued to occupy a subordinate position. The principal Buddhist development was the appearance in Cambodia of a new type of Buddhist statue, influenced by the new “School of Lopburi.” After the conquest of the Menam valley by Suryavarman 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
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came into Cambodia during a Vishnuite period, when representations of Vishnu on Šesha were common.\textsuperscript{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 Mahāyānīst Buddhism in Cambodia until well into the reign of Jayavarman VII.

The Vishnuite zenith under Suryavarman II, which marked the peak of Angkorean art, was followed by a period of dissolution 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.\textsuperscript{114}

Jayavarman VII was a Mahāyānīst 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.\textsuperscript{115}

\textbf{(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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 arcade 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 Buddhist. Lunet de Lajonquière called it Vishnuite. 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,

\textsuperscript{113} REFEI, 1936, 632.
\textsuperscript{115} Coedès, \textit{Un grand roi du Cambodge: Jayavarman VII} (Phnom Penh, 1935).
\textsuperscript{116} Madame Gilberte de Coral Rémusat, \textit{L’Art khmèr}, p. 130.
\textsuperscript{117} Coedès, "Bat Chum," 257, A, st 30.
holding the lotus, the rosary, the flacon and the book.”  

(g) Lokeshvara under Jayavarman VII

Lokesvara 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 Buddhist 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 Lokesvara 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. 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 Buddhist divinity, principally Lokesvara for the men and Tarā or Prajñāpāramitā for the women. Queen Jayarāṣādevī 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.”

Lokesvara 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 Lokesvara of the bas-reliefs of Banteay Chmar; 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; the giant figures of Lokesvara at Don Tai, with figurines on the chest, waist, and feet; and the storeyed stele of Thma Puok, described above, in which twenty deities appear in arcatures on a four-faced upright stone, are some of the unusual manifestations of bodhisattvas during this period.

(h) The Syncretism of Lokesvara and Mahāeshvara

In the latter part of the second period of the Style of the Bayon, a new type of Lokesvara appeared—a Lokesvara which shows the amalgamation with Mahāeshvara. 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 Śvātē dynasty with a strong tendency to Tantrism overthrew the Pāla dynasty in Bengal. 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. 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 Śvātēs had absorbed all the good
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it contained.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{129}

The syncretism of Lokesvara 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 Lokesvara in the cult of Mahēśvara, 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. Lokesvara was pictured at Angkor with the four arms, four faces, the frontal eye, and sometimes even with the trident and twining serpents of Śiva.\textsuperscript{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 Lokesvara as far as known, wears a cylindrical chignon and sometimes jewelry, but diadem and necklace... are never [elsewhere?] found on them.”\textsuperscript{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 (Mahēśvara associated with the linga) resulted in the development of a Buddhārāja and its substitution for the devarāja. We have seen how, in the reign of Suryavarman II, the syncretism of Śivaism and Vishnuism probably resulted in the substitution of a Vishnuājī for the devarāja and the adoption of the pyramid form for the Vishnuite temple of Angkor Wat (see II f). More certain is the substitution of a Buddhārāja during the reign of Jayavarman VII and the transformation of the Bayon into a pyramid-temple, even during the course of its construction.\textsuperscript{132}

There is no doubt that the Bayon was originally dedicated to Lokesvara. 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 Lokesvara,\textsuperscript{133} and the four faces of the towers of the Bayon and its walls are the faces of Lokesvara 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 Buddhārāja—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 Buddhārāja, not a Lokesvara.\textsuperscript{134} This may account in part for the concealing of the Lokesvara 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 Lokesvara. But as the idea that he was the living Buddha began to grow on Jayavarman VII,\textsuperscript{135} he conceived the idea of a Buddhārāja—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-
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sattva and his sakti, depicted in the iconography of Tibet and Mongolia, shocked the deep moral sense of the Cambodians. 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.

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

After the death of Jayavarman VII, a Śivaitic 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 Buddhist monuments of the Bayon period and earlier show many traces. Lokesvara’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. It is sometimes said that Śvaitism conquered Buddhism in Indo-China, but the evidence does not seem to support that contention. The last great Śivaitic effort was the Baphuon. The last great Hindu effort was the Vishnuite 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 Śivaitic 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.”

Chou Ta-kuan describes in some detail the religions of Angkor and, 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 Hīnayānīst 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 Hīnayānīst bonzes. But he had Mahāyānists also in mind, as far as he was able to distinguish them, for he called the four faces of Lokesvara faces of the Buddha. (2) The pan-ki (pandits), who wear the brahmanic cord, were the leaders of the Hindu-sects—Śivait, Vīshnuite, and probably to some degree Mahāyānīsts. (3) The Pa-sser-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, 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. He refers to the steele of Ta Prohm (A.D. 1186), where mention is made of the Jaṅgama, the priestly class of the Lingayats.

IV. THE ŚIVA-BUDDHA CULT IN JAVA

Mahāyānism seems to have been introduced into Southeast Asia from Bengal by the Sailendrā 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 Sailendrā 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 Sivaitism. Perhaps because of the strife between the Khmers
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and the Sailendra 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 Saṅgatas, were represented by their priesthood. Ultimately, a definite Śiva-Buddha cult developed.

There is evidence of this cult in Java early in the eleventh century, about the time Śuryavarman 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 Śuryavarman I shows little evidence of Tantrism or even of bodhisattva-worship. In the Simpang stone-inscription of 1034, during the reign of Erilangga 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. About a century and a half later, the name Śiva-Buddha seems to have been applied to Kṛitanaṅga, last king of Tumapal (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. Elliot believes that the Chandi Singarara, built by this king in 1278, was the temple known as Ṣivabuddhālaya, “abode of Śiva,” in which he was commemorated under the name of Śiva-Buddha. 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).

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 Baudhāvavya, quoted by the Purusasantaka (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 Kauṇjarakarnā (possibly as early as the twelfth century) is the story of a rākṣa 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 Saṅgatas) each in line with one of the Śivaite Kusikus, he announced: “We are Śiva; we are Buddha.”

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 Purusasantaka, or Śutasoma, 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 Trīṃḍrti. 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 Pararoton, 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).

The Śākyamuni Buddha no longer played any part at all in the religion of Java and the bodhisattva Lokesvara played only a very small one. Vairocana, as chief of the Dhyāni-Buddhas and Adi-Buddha, was now the principal deity.
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1. INTRODUCTION.

The history of the Romance of the Three Kingdoms (Sân-kuó Chih Yêng-i) from the earliest known edition—that attributed to Lô Khuân-ch’êng, published during the hùng-chih reign period of the Ming (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 Shih’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-PÉN.

In tracing back the history of the Sân-kuó Chih, there is every reason to believe it is closely involved with the story-teller’s prompt-books, or huà-pén (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-pén. Jaroslav Prušek attempts the following definition of the term p’íng-huà:

Opposed to ts’ú-huà (詞話 [† narrations with ts’ú]) or shih-huà (詩話 [† narrations with poems]) was the p’íng-huà 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 Chîng-kuô Ch’ang-hu Hsiâo-shu K’ao-ch’êng (中図章回小說考證).
³ Reference to Te’á-hài will yield—among other things—the equation 平話 = 詩話. This quoted statement is to be found in the Hân-fên Lâu (高芬樓) photolith edition of the Ming hùng-chih edition, p. 4b in the preface by Ch’îngh Tâ-ch’êl (蔣大器).

⁵ Prušek, “Researches,” p. 102, n. 1.