

The Śaiva Religion among the Khmers

Part I

Alexis SANDERSON *

The primary religion of the Khmers is now Theravāda Buddhism, as it is throughout mainland Southeast Asia with the exception of sinicized Vietnam; but the rise of that religion occurred only with the decline and fragmentation of the Khmer kingdom of Angkor and the concomitant growth of the power and influence of the Tai, who had adopted the Theravāda from the Mon of Dvāravatī and lower Burma. Our records of the Khmer principalities of the fifth to eighth centuries and of the unified kingdom of Angkor that emerged thereafter and endured into the fourteenth, show that religion throughout that time comprised three other faiths of Indian origin: Śaivism, the Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism of the Bhāgavatas, and Mahāyāna Buddhism in the developed form that includes the system of ritual and meditation known as the Mantranaya, Mantrayāna or Vajrayāna. The three coexisted harmoniously for the most part but with Śaivism predominant. This was so throughout ancient Kambujadeśa, the area of Khmer settlement that extended southeast through modern Kampuchea from the Angkor region north of the Great Lake into the delta of the Mekong river in southern Vietnam, and to the north, through north-eastern Thailand¹ and the Champasak province of southern Laos.²

* Spalding Professor of Eastern Religions and Ethics, All Souls College, University of Oxford.

1. The remains of nearly two hundred Khmer temples of the Angkorean period survive in modern Thailand in the provinces of Chanthaburi, Sa Kaeo, Prachin Buri, Nakhon Ratchasima, Buri Ram, Surin, Si Sa Ket, Ubon Ratchathani, Yasothon, Roi Et, Maha Sarakham, Khon Kaen, Chaiyaphum, and Sakon Nakhon, with the greatest concentrations in Nakhon Ratchasima, Buri Ram and Surin.

2. I have chosen to use the term Kambujadeśa to avoid confusion with the modern state of Kampuchea or Cambodia. Kambujadeśa or Kambuja is the name given to their territory by the Khmers in their Sanskrit and Old Khmer inscriptions of the Angkorean period: K. 14, v. 3; K. 235, Khmer, C l. 72; K. 258 C, v. 2; K. 278, v. 2; K. 282 D, v. 23; K. 549, l. 12–13; K. 956, l. 16. They also show the form Kambudeśa (*kamvudeśa*) and synonyms: K. 300, v. 9; K. 400 B, v. 2; K. 923, v. 14; K. 806, v. 270a (*kambuviśvambharā*). These names were understood through a tradition that the Khmer kings are the descendants of a mythical progenitor Svāyambhuva Kambu (K. 286, v. 11 sqq.), i.e. as ‘the land of the sons of Kambu’ or ‘the land of Kambu’. In Middle Khmer we find *kāmbūj*, *kambūjdes*, *kāmbūjdes* (K. 465 of A.D. 1583 [NIC I: 22]), in Modern Khmer *kambujā*/Kampuchea/, and in Old Javanese *kamboja* (*Deśawarṇana* 15.1). The earliest occurrence of the word of which I am aware is in A.D. 817. It occurs in Campā, the rival kingdom to the east of Kambujadeśa, in a Sanskrit inscription of king Harivarman I at the Po-Nagar temple (C. 2 = M. 26): *ākambujārdham ajitabhujaujasā* ‘one the might of whose arm was unconquered right up to the middle of Kambuja[deśa]’.

Perhaps there was no sense of any such comprehensive entity in the pre-Angkorean period. Running through the kingdoms of mainland Southeast Asia, the *Da Tang Xiyu ji* of Xuanzang (= Taishō 2087), completed during that period, in A.D. 646, calls the kingdom between Dvāravatī (*dolobodi*) to the West and Mahācampā (*mohojenbo*) to the East not Kambujadeśa or similar, as we might expect, but Īśānapura (*yishangnabulo*) (BEAL 1884, 2:200). This is the name of the capital (= Sambor Prei Kuk) of the

The same configuration of religions held sway elsewhere in Southeast Asia. We find it to the east of the Khmers in Champa (*campā*), the confederated principalities of the Chams that occupied the coastal region and highlands of Cochin-China from the fifth century until the seventeenth.³ It was much diminished by progressive Islamicization after the retreat of the capital to the Phan-rang (Pāṇḍuraṅga) area in the South in the wake of the capture and destruction of Vijaya (Binh-Dinh) by the Vietnamese in 1471.⁴ But the king remained a follower of the old tradition until at least 1607⁵ and elements of it survived into modern times among the ‘Brahmanist’ Chams.⁶ There are signs of its presence in the Minangkabau region of Sumatra in the fourteenth century,⁷ and in the kingdom of

dominant principality of the period, named after its founder Īśānavarman I (r. 616/7, 627–c. 635). The Chinese referred to the early southern coastal kingdom as Funan. Thereafter, from the seventh century onwards they referred to the land of the Khmers (*gemie*) as Zhenla (**Ts'ien-lâp*). The origin of neither term is known. I have seen no reference to the region or its people in any pre-modern Indian source.

I write here by invitation, and do so aware that my competence is limited. As a Sanskritist working on the history of Śaivism I have come eventually to look beyond the Indian subcontinent to other regions in which this religion took hold, and this has led me to the inscriptions of the Khmers. But I have relied entirely on published transcriptions. I have not worked directly from the inscriptions themselves or from rubbings, squeezes, or photographs. Furthermore, I have very unequal competence in the two languages of the inscriptions, Sanskrit and Old Khmer, my knowledge of the latter being a superficial acquaintance that relies heavily on the translations of George CÉDÈS, Claude JACQUES and Saveros POU, and on the *Dictionnaire vieux khmer-français-anglais* of the last. I offer my own translations throughout, but where I have ventured to disagree with these scholars, I have not done so out of a superior sensitivity to the nuances of Old Khmer, but rather because I have felt that the subject and context demand an alternative within what I have thought with less than authoritative judgement to be the range of possible meanings. I am greatly indebted to my colleague Professor Gerdi Gerschheimer of Paris for encouraging me to undertake this work in spite of these deficiencies, for helping me to do so by providing a number of copies and photocopies of important epigraphical sources and studies and for saving me from many errors through his meticulous reading of my manuscript. I am grateful also to Dr. Arlo Griffiths of the University of Groningen for reading my manuscript and detecting a good number of misprints and other errors.

3. These principalities were centred in the string of coastal plains facing the South China Sea located, from north to south, in (1) the Binh-Tri-Thien area, (2) Quang-Nam and Quang-Ngai provinces (My-Son; capital Indrapura [Tra-kieu]); (3) Binh-Dinh province (capital Vijaya [Do-Ban or Cha-Ban]), (4) Khanh-Hoa province (Kauṭhāra; capital Kauṭhāra [Po Nagar, Nha-Trang]), and (5) Phan Rang and Phan Ri provinces (Pāṇḍuraṅga; capital Pāṇḍuraṅgapura). In the Sanskrit inscriptions of this region and that of the Khmers the land of the Chams and the various peoples of the highlands is called Campā or Campādeśa. In the inscriptions of the Khmers the Chams themselves are known as the Cāmpas: K. 273, v. 67 (Skt.); K. 1036 (*NIC* II–III, 149–155) (Khmer).

4. See PO DHARMA 2001 (14–27) for an excellent up-to-date summary of knowledge of the history of Champa up to its demise in the first half of the nineteenth century.

5. See the report of Cornelis MATELIEF in 1608 cited by REID (1993, 187). The mass of the Chams were Muslim by the 1670s, including the king (MANGUIN 1979, 269–71).

6. See AYMONIER 1891, CABATON 1901, MUS 1933.

7. Chinese, epigraphical and material evidence indicates that the powerful thalassocracy of Śrīvijaya ruling from Palembang from the seventh century to the thirteenth was Mahāyāna-Buddhist. It was followed by the kingdom of Malāyu, first centred in Jambi and then, by the beginning of the fourteenth century, on the west coast. Malāyu, unlike Śrīvijaya, was in close contact with Java, which achieved ascendancy of this region from the late thirteenth century. This led to the introduction of Majapahit's Śaiva-Buddhist religious culture. In 1284 the king of Malāyu received a composite statue consisting of copies of deity-statues from the Buddhist temple Caṇḍi Jago in East Java sent to him by king Kṛtanagara of Majapahit, an event recorded on the back of the statue in an Old Malay inscription (DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, 321). King Ādityavarman of Malāyu (r. c. 1347–79), who had spent his early years in Majapahit, is described in his Surasao inscription as a follower of the esoteric Buddhist

Kutai in the central region of the east coast of Kalimantan (Borneo).⁸ It prevailed in East Java from the eighth century until the Muslim forces of Demak crushed Majapahit in about 1527, eliminating the last remaining major Śaiva-Buddhist court of the region, and in West Java until those of Banten conquered the Sundanese court of Pajajaran in 1579.⁹ It clung on into the eighteenth century in the kingdom of Blambangan on Java's Eastern Salient, and perhaps even within the Islamic kingdom of Mataram in the Central Javanese heartland.¹⁰ It is still intact among the Balinese of the neighbouring islands of Bali and Lombok; and some of its Śaiva practices and liturgies survive in Java itself, among the priesthood of a cluster of isolated communities in the Tengger highlands to the east of Malang,¹¹ a survival that suggests that when Islam began to make its inroads Śaivism was not merely the religion of the courts but had put down deep roots in rural society, at least in some parts of Java.¹²

cult of Hevajra (Satyawati SULEIMAN 1977 cited in DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, 321). But there is also an impressive fourteenth-century statue, 4.41 m in height, of a two-armed Bhairava standing on a corpse, said to have been found at Sungei Langsat (SCHNITGER 1937, plates 13–16; CÈDÈS 1968, 243, claiming that it is an image representing Ādityavarman), and there is a set of fourteenth-century sculptures from Palembang in which Śiva is flanked by Brahmā and Viṣṇu reproduced in SOEBADIO 1992, 120–121.

8. Śaivite and Buddhist statues have been found in a cave at Gunung Kambeng; see FONTEIN 1990, 25, citing BOSCH 1925. The stone statue of Śiva, which conforms to the Javanese iconographical type (samapāda, holding a trident, a rosary, a fly-whisk, and showing the gesture of boons) has been reproduced in SOEBADIO 1992. Kutai is the site of the earliest Sanskrit inscriptions of maritime Southeast Asia, those of Mūlavarman in the late fourth or early fifth century associated with a shrine of a [Śiva] Vaprakeśvara (CÈDÈS 1968, 52). Its rulers probably maintained their Śaiva-Buddhist religious culture until they were converted to Islam in 1568.

9. REID 1993, 2:212–213.

10. See RICKLEFS 1993, 366–367, n. 74 and REID 1993, 2:149, 173–186 on the slow progress of Islam in Java, especially among the Javanist (*kejawen*) ruling elites, and the superficiality of its adoption by the lower orders of society. The Kartasura *Babad ing Sangkala* (Chronicle of the Chronograms) composed before about 1670 (RICKLEFS 1993, 2) first mentions Muslims only in 1577–78, recording their defeat of Śaiva-Buddhist Kaḍiri; and we have a Dutch report of 1598 that Javanese Muslims were found only on the north coast and that the people of the interior were all heathen (REID 1993, 2:173–174). Blambangan was under the control of the Śaiva-Buddhist kingdoms of Bali, first Buleleng and then, from 1711, Mengwi (RICKLEFS 1993, 161). As evidence of Śaiva-Buddhist survivals in Mataram RICKLEFS (1993, 366–367) notes that the Dutch East India Company reported superstitious heathen (*supertitieuze heydenen*) in Mataram in 1743. For the survival of some isolated Śaiva-Buddhist religious communities see also PIGEAUD 1967, 54.

11. On the religion of the Tengger communities see HEFNER 1985. He reports (1985, 8) that at the time of his research there were some twenty-eight priests in a like number of village units comprising some 40,000 people living at altitudes between 1400 and 2000 metres, somewhat shielded from Islamicization by the fact that the massive expansion of the population of Java during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (from around 5 million in 1800 to around 100 million at present) and the consequent migration into less populous areas largely passed them by, since these villages are above the altitude at which sugar and coffee can be cultivated (HEFNER 1985, 31–33). Tengger communities in the lower villages and in the nearby towns (Malang, Pasuruan, Probolinggo and Lumajang) have been converted to Islam (*ibid.*).

12. HEFNER 1985, 9.

The Sources

Our evidence for these three religions in Kambujadeśa up to the fall of Angkor, as for all other aspects of its history, consists primarily of inscriptions. More than a thousand have been discovered and published, engraved on stone stelae, image-pedestals, and the jambs of temples, written in Sanskrit verse, in Khmer prose, or commonly in both. The great majority belongs to the period from the last quarter of the ninth century, some seventy-five years after the beginning of the Angkorean kingdom, down to its end. For the first part of the Angkorean period we depend mostly on dubious information in later inscriptions, and before that only the seventh century is well represented, by some two hundred contemporary records.

In all periods these epigraphs record the establishing or restoration of temple-deities, temples, hermitages and other pious foundations by royalty, high dignitaries and local leaders, their endowments consisting of land, slaves (*khñum*, Skt. *dāsaḥ*) to work that land and to serve as cooks, musicians and the like, livestock, ritual implements and other valuables, or the settlement of title disputes concerning these, and the allocation of revenues (*kalpanā*) for purposes such as the funding of specific recurrent ceremonies and the subsistence of religious officiants and other staff. They commonly introduce these practicalities with eulogies of the monarch and his ancestors, and also of the donor himself if other than the king, eulogies which sometimes contain information on matters of interest to the historian of religion, such as accounts of other pious works of the donor, the history of priestly lineages and their relations with their patrons through appointment to religious, administrative and other offices, rituals performed or sponsored, and in rare instances, the names of the textual authorities followed in these performances.

In addition we have the evidence of a great wealth of material culture in the form of the remains of religious edifices, images of their deities, ritual objects, and bas-reliefs showing scenes from the Indian epics and the life of the population. The sheer number of the Khmer's temples, the vast scale of the greatest of them, and the inscriptions that detail their endowments, reveal that the creation and support of such foundations was central to the economic, cultural and political life of the whole society. They channelled and promoted agricultural production, engaging a very substantial proportion of the region's human and material resources, they integrated the realm, and they legitimated the tenure of land and power.¹³

No non-epigraphical texts remain from the pre-Angkorean and Angkorean periods, other than a few short Chinese reports redacted in later compendia and a Chinese memoir of 1296–97 written by Zhou Daguan, who spent eleven months in Angkor with an embassy sent by Temür Öljeitü, the second Mongol emperor of China. None of these throws much light on the Khmers' religions. For the literature that sustained and expressed them, in the form of sacred texts, commentaries, handbooks of ritual, and temple archives, was transmitted in palm-leaf manuscripts, which cannot survive long in the hot and humid climate of Southeast Asia.¹⁴ Once the information they contain had lost its relevance with the decline of Angkor and the rise of Theravāda Buddhism there would have been no reason to preserve it by making new copies.

13. HALL 1985, 136–138, 160–161.

14. The region of Angkor has a monsoon climate. It rains on average on more than half the days of the five months from May to October, with annual rainfall in recent years averaging 1,410 mm. Temperatures climb above 35°C in April and May and fall to a little over 30°C at the end of the year. Relative humidity fluctuates between 60 percent and 80 percent (ACKER 1998, 7; NESBITT 1997, 32). Documents on palm-leaf are unlikely to survive long in such conditions.

Though all local manuscripts of pre-Theravādin times have perished, manuscripts of some of the Sanskrit texts that the Khmers' inscriptions identify as guiding their ceremonies in the Angkorean period do survive in the Indian subcontinent. In the case of Śaivism these works were primary authorities in India only in the early period during which the form of the religion they teach was introduced among the Khmers. Not long after that they were followed in the subcontinent by a second wave of texts propagating a simplified system of Śaiva observance that rendered them largely irrelevant. This early obsolescence would no doubt have led to their complete disappearance, were it not that the Kathmandu valley has a temperate climate that has enabled a few manuscripts to survive there from the ninth and tenth centuries, when these changes had not yet occurred or, at least, had not yet affected this rather isolated region. By studying these and related sources we have a means of adding to our knowledge of Khmer religion.

Scripture and Paddhati

However, common sense and the character of the Indian Śaiva literature must alert us to the naïvety of assuming that these works can reveal more than the general parameters within which some elements of local practice would have operated. They are texts of scripture (*āgamaḥ*, *tantram*, *saṃhitā*) and as such were designed to be accepted as authorities by the widest possible constituency. To that end they tend to prescribe only the bare framework of practice, thereby allowing for the great variety on the level of detail and ancillary elaboration that can be observed in the practical manuals (Paddhatis) that guided the procedures followed by religious officiants in specific regions and lineages.

The Khmers too had their manuals setting out the procedures to be followed in the worship of their deities. A Khmer inscription of A.D. 1306 from Banteay Srei (Īśvarapura) refers to such a text:

qnak varṇna khnar grān nā vraḥ kamrateñ añ pre paṃre ta vraḥ kamrateñ añ ru devatākṣetra sap anle nusāra śloka praśasta vraḥ pāñjīy kṣetropacāra
khnar grān corr. : *khnar grañ* POU + *nusāra* corr. : *nu sāra* Pou
 K. 569 (ed. POU 2001, 166–171), ll. 17–19

The personnel of the corporation of Khnar Grān at [the temple] of the goddess are commanded to serve the goddess as [is done] in all [other] deity-sites, following (*nusāra*) the verses of the ordinances (*śloka praśasta*) of the Sacred Manual (*vraḥ pāñjīy*) on the Procedure for Worship at Sacred Sites (*kṣetropacāra*).¹⁵

15. POU translates the last phrase as follows: “suivant en cela les stances du saint registre relatif au domaine”. For Khmer Skt. *upacāraḥ* in the meaning ‘[ritual] service’ see K. 254, v. 8: *devadvijopacārārtham* ‘to serve the gods and brahmins’; K. 258 C, v. 10: *agryopacārair* ‘with fine offerings’.

The Sanskrit term *pañjī*, *pañjikā* from which the Khmer form *pāñjīy* is derived is used in Indian sources to denote both written records or registers, such as those that priests keep of their clients, and guides to ritual (Paddhati). An example of the latter is the *Pañjikā* of Brahmaśambhu, a Paddhati on the Śaiva rituals composed in A.D. 938. Thus in the *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna*, f. 54r3: *prakāśito yam arthātmā pañjikopāyato mayā*. ‘I have clarified this topic by means of the *Pañjikā*’; f. 31r3–4: *prapañcaḥ sakalo py asya nityakarmasamuccaye / nirddiṣṭaḥ pañjikāyāñ ca teneha na pratanyate* ‘I have taught the full elaboration of this in the *Nityakarmasamuccaya* and the *Pañjikā*’. Similarly in *Jayadrathayāmala*, Ṣaṭka 1, f. 197v8–9: *kriyā vā deśikendrena vyākhyeyā pañjikāgatā* ‘or else the Guru should explain the ritual [as set out] in the *Pañjikā*’. I am very grateful to Mr. Guy Leavitt of the University of Chicago, who went to the trouble of obtaining a microfilm of the *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna* manuscript for me in Calcutta.

and an inscription of the reign of Udayādityavarman II (1055–1066) reveals in a eulogy of his predecessor, the devout Śaiva king Sūryavarman I (r. c. 1002–1050), that the latter had composed one or more such works:

śivapūjāviśeṣo pi śāstroktāś śrutamātrakaḥ
dhiyā viracito yasya śivāṅśasyākhilocitaḥ
 K. 661, v. 61

And being a born devotee of Śiva (*śivāṅśasya*) he was able by virtue of his intelligence to compose a fully appropriate [manual for] an excellent ritual of Śiva worship taught in [Śaiva] scripture as soon as he had heard it [expounded in that source].¹⁶

16. CÉDÈS misunderstood the verse as follows (*IC* 1:213; my trans. and parentheses): “The least particulars of the worship of Śiva (*śivapūjāviśeṣo 'pi*), prescribed by the treatises (*śāstroktāḥ*) or only transmitted orally, were entirely understood (*akhilocitaḥ*) only when they had been redacted (*viracito*) by the wisdom (*dhiyā*) of this (king) (*yasya*) who was a portion of Śiva (*śivāṅśasya*)”. His rendering of *śivapūjāviśeṣo 'pi* is contradicted by the singular number. There is nothing in the verse that justifies his “or”. The compound *śrutamātrakaḥ* (= *śrutamātraḥ* with the stem-extending suffix *-ka-* for the sake of the metre) has been wrenched from its common idiomatic sense, that is to say “merely heard” in the meaning “as soon as heard”. For the use of Bahuvrīhis in *-mātra-* after a past participle passive in this sense see, e.g., RENOUE 1984, 117. The Śāstra(s) of *śāstroktāḥ* are more naturally understood as the Śivaśāstra(s), i.e. the Śaiva scriptures. This is the normal sense in Śaiva works, where it is not, as in Buddhist usage, used to refer to works of scholarship as opposed to scripture. “Entirely understood” cannot be the meaning of *akhilocitaḥ*, which must mean either “entirely appropriate” or, less probably, “appropriate to all”.

As for *śivāṅśasya*, which CÉDÈS understood as a Tatpuruṣa compound meaning “a portion of Śiva”, it is rather to be understood as a Bahuvrīhi meaning “whose *aṃśaḥ* is towards Śiva”. In Śaiva terminology a compound formed of the name of a deity followed by the word *-aṃśaḥ* means a devotee of that deity, more precisely a person with a natural inclination (*aṃśaḥ*) towards that deity rather than another. This can be seen in a passage of the *Kiraṇa* in which it teaches three versions of the postmortuary Śrāddha ritual, calling them the Śivaśrāddha, the Rudraśrāddha and the mundane (*laukikaṃ*) Śrāddha. The first is for the benefit of Śaiva initiates (*dīkṣitāḥ*), the second for that of *rudrāṃśāḥ*, and the third for that of brahmins who are neither (f. 95r2–4 [61.6–10b]): *īśas sadāśivaḥ śānto deśikatritayam bhavet / sādḥaka*dvitayam* (em. : *ṛtayaś* Cod.) *cānyad rudrānantam iti sthitam / ṛptaiḥ tair nikhilan ṛptam śivāntam abhavat khaga / dīkṣitānām śivaśrāddhaṃ rudrāṃśānān tadāmakam / tatra caṇḍamahākālau dvau gaṇau dvitaye sthitau rudraḥ skando *gaṇeśo 'nyas* (em. : *gaṇeśānyat* Cod.) *tritaye saṃsthitāś tv ime / tapasvibhiḥ dvijaiś cātra rudraśrāddham prakalpayet / kurvanti ye narā bhaktyā rudralokam vrajanti te / laukikaṃ brahmaviṣṇvīśa*sūryāntakavikalpitam* (em. : *sūryāntikavikalpitam* Cod.) and (f. 96r5–v1 [61.34–36]): *śrāddham evaṃvidham śaivaṃ śivasāyōjyadam param / rudraśrāddham svanāmāṅkaṃ praṇavādi namontikam / rudrasāyōjyadañ caiva devatānām svasamjñayā / kṛte smin laukike śrāddhe *narakam na sa* (conj. : *navamāsyam sa* Cod.) *paśyati / viprāṇām vihitam śrāddham vedoktam smṛtikalpitam / brahmalokam avāpnoti tatkartā dvijasattamaḥ*. That *rudrāṃśāḥ* means ‘devotee of Rudra/Śiva’ (*rudrabhaktāḥ*, *śivabhaktāḥ*) here is evident from its occurrence elsewhere in the same passage. Three balls of rice (*piṇḍāḥ*) are to be put out in a line in the course of the Śrāddha. If the wife of the person commissioning the ceremony (the *kartā*) desires a son she should eat the one in the middle. She will then, we are told, give birth to one who will grow up to be a *rudrāṃśaḥ* (f. 96r4 [61.31]): *putrārtham vanitā śuddhā madhyamaṃ piṇḍam āpnuyāt / tadā tasya naro dhīro rudrāṃśaḥ strīyuto bhavet*. That this was understood to mean “devotee of Rudra/Śiva” is apparent from the parallels of this passage seen in the *Bṛhatkālottara* (f. 196v1: v. 57c) and the *Kriyāsamgrahapaddhati* of Vāladhārin (f. 111v2–3). For there the son is described respectively as *śāṅkaraḥ* ‘a devotee of Śaṅkara’ (*janayec chāṅkaram putram*) and *śivabhaktāḥ* ‘a devotee of Śiva’ (*jāyate dhanavān putraḥ śivabhaktāḥ suśīlavān*). Furthermore, the triad initiate (*dīkṣitāḥ*), *rudrāṃśāḥ* and ordinary brahmin identified as the beneficiaries of the three kinds of Śrāddha is paralleled in this same passage by the triad initiate, *rudrabhaktāḥ* and ordinary brahmin, where these are those who may, in order of

*śivārccanāgnihotrāditapasyāsādhanāni yaḥ
mantratantrāṇi samśodhya vidhaye rañjayad dhiyā*
K. 661, v. 74

Intelligently redacting the Mantras and rites that accomplish the worship of Śiva, the fire-sacrifice, other [rituals], and ascetic practice, he clarified them for ritual application.

and:

*yuktam ukto maheśo yas tapasyāsādhanaṃ vidhim
sādhūkṛtya kṛtodyogair yogibhir yvad akārayat*
K. 661, v. 76

He was aptly called the Great Lord (Śiva) since he removed errors from the procedure for the practice of asceticism and then saw to it that it was followed by determined meditators.

Similarly, early in the reign of Jayavarman II (r. 802–c. 835), in connection with the foundation of the united Khmer kingdom of Angkor and the inauguration of the royal cult of the Devarāja (Kamraten Jagat ta Rāja), a brahmin called Hiraṇyadāma is said to have extracted the essence of the four primary sources of the Vāma division of the Śaiva scriptural canon (*vāmasrotah*), works concerned with the special rites and observances of Tumburu and his sisters:

*jayavarmmamahābhṛto mahendrā-
vanibhṛnmūrdhahakṛtāspadasya śāstā
kavir āryavarāṅgavanditāṅghriś
śivakaivalya iti pratītir āsīt
hiraṇyadāmadvijapuṅgavo gryadhīr
ivāvjayoniḥ karuṇārādra āgataḥ
ananyalavdhāṃ khalu siddhim ādarāt
prakāśayām āsa mahābhṛtaṃ prati
sa bhūdhareṇānumato grajanmā
sasādhanāṃ siddhim adikṣad asmai
hotre hitaikāntamanahprasattiṃ
saṃvibhrate dhāmavivṛṇhaṇāya
śāstraṃ śiraśchedavināśikhākhyam
saṃmohanāmāpi nayottarākhyam
tat tumvuror vaktracatuṣkam asya
siddhyeva vipras samadarśayat saḥ*

diminishing preference, be invited to receive the offerings in the Śivaśrāddha (f. 95r6 [61.11cd]): *sādhakaputrakābhāvād rudrabhaktā *dvijāthavā* (Aīśa for *dvijā athavā*) ‘In the absence of Sādhakas or Putrakas [the recipients] may be [lay] devotees of Rudra or [ordinary] brahmins’. Finally, see *Niśvāsaguhya*, f. 42v1–2 (1.8 ff.), defining the *brahmāṃśaḥ*, the *viṣṇvaṃśaḥ*, and the *rudrāṃśaḥ*. The section on the last is mostly lost through damage to the codex but the other two are defined in a manner that supports my interpretation. The first is said to be one who is ever eager to study the Vedas, who accepts the Upaniṣadic doctrine of the Self, and who aims to reach the paradise of Brahmā (*brahmalokaṃ sadākāṅkṣan*), while the second is said to be ever eager to meditate on Viṣṇu (*viṣṇudhyānarataḥ sadā*) and to aspire to enter his paradise (*viṣṇusāyōjyakāṅkṣiṇaḥ*). Of the first line of the two-line definition of the *rudrāṃśaḥ* we have only the last four syllables, in which he too is said to be ever devoted (*rataḥ sadā*), presumably to the meditation or worship of Rudra (*rudradhyānarataḥ sadā / rudrapūjārataḥ sadā* or similar). The first half will probably have referred to his desire to reach the paradise of Rudra, perhaps *rudralokaṃ sadākāṅkṣan*.

*dvijas samuddhṛtya sa śāstrasāraṃ
rahasyakauśalyadhiyā sayatnaḥ
siddhīr vvaḥantīḥ kila devarājā-
bhikhyāṃ vidadhre bhuvanarddhivṛddhyai*
K. 235, vv. 25–29

King Jayavarman, who had made his residence on the summit of Mount Mahendra [Phnom Kulen], had as his teacher a poet called Śivakaivalya, whose feet had been honoured by [contact with] the heads of [prostrating] Āryas.¹⁷ Hiraṇyadāma, an excellent brahmin, like Brahmā himself in his great wisdom, being moved by compassion came and with due respect revealed to the king a Siddhi which no other had attained. To increase [the king's] splendour this brahmin, with the king's permission, taught the Siddhi and the means of achieving it (*sasāadhanām*) to that offerer of the [king's] sacrifices, [knowing that he was one] whose tranquil mind was devoted entirely to [his monarch's] welfare. The Brahman revealed to him as though by means of [this] Siddhi the four faces of Tumburu that are the scriptures *Śiraścheda*, *Vināśikha*, *Sam̐moha* and *Nayottara*, and in order to increase the prosperity of the realm he carefully extracted the essence of [those] texts through his mastery of the esoteric [teachings] and [with it] established the Siddhis that bear the name Devarāja.¹⁸

This 'essence' (*sārah*) that Hiraṇyadāma extracted is evidently a manual for practical application, a Paddhati or Pañjikā, since we are told that after extracting it he proceeded to install the powers known as the Devarāja. The point must be that he redacted a Paddhati for this purpose on the basis of those scriptures.

It might be objected that if the 'essence' were a manual of ritual procedure then learned Indian tradition dictates that it should be claimed that it is based not on four texts but on one, a Paddhati, literally 'a pathway', being a practical manual that guides the performer of a ritual by co-ordinating the Mantras and actions taught explicitly or implicitly in the various parts of a single scripture, setting them out explicitly in the order of their performance and utterance, supplementing them from related scriptures only where the silence of the primary source requires it.¹⁹ However, the account of the events

17. The meaning of the term *ārya-* is uncertain. It could mean a person of North India, an inhabitant of Āryadeśa, a sense that is found in Old Javanese inscriptions; see ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *ārya*, *karnataka*, *kēliṅ*, and *draviḍa*, and the inscription of Kaladi, 7b1–2 (BARRETT JONES 1984, 186), where they are distinguished from the people of Kaliṅga, Śrīlankā, Karṇāṭas, Draviḍas etc. However, it may have been used here, as also in Old Javanese, to refer to powerful persons of noble birth; see ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *ārya* and ROBSON 1995, 139 ad *Deśawarṇana* 81.3–4.

18. Tumburu is indeed four-faced; see, e.g., *Vināśikha* 96b–97b: *tumburuṃ karṇikopari / padmāsanopaviṣṭam tu varadānodyatakaram // caturvaktram aṣṭabhujam*. The four texts are these four faces in the sense that they are thought to have been uttered by them, by analogy with the well-known tradition that Sadāśiva's five faces are the sources of the five streams of the Śaiva revelation: the Siddhānta from the upper, the Vāma from the left-facing, the Dakṣiṇa from the right-facing, the Gāruḍa from the front-facing, and the Bhautika from the rear-facing.

19. *Sārdhatrisatikālottaravṛtti* p. 45, ll. 6–7: *paddhatiḥ pratiśāstram vikṣiptasya śrutasya *tatsāmarthyākṣiptasya* (em. : *tatsāmarthyāt kṣiptasya* BHATT) *ca mantratantrānuṣṭhānāya *sam̐kṣepāt* (em. : *sam̐kṣepa* BHATT) **kramenābhidhānaṃ* (em. : *kramenābhidhānād* BHATT) *yajurvedādaḥ yajñasūtrādivat* 'For any scripture a Paddhati is a text which enables the performance of the rituals [of that scripture] along with the Mantras [that accompany them] by succinctly arranging in the order [of performance] (i) the [instructions] explicitly stated [in that scripture but] dispersed in various places

connected with the installation of the Devarāja in the Khmer portion of the same inscription, removes this anomaly:

man vrāhmaṇa jmaḥ hiranyadāma prājña siddhividyā mok amvi janapada. pi vraḥ pāda parameśvara aṅjeñ thve vidhi leha leñ kam pi kamvujadeśa neḥ āyatta ta javā ley. leñ āc ti kamrateñ phdai karom mvāy guḥ ta jā cakravartti. vrāhmaṇa noḥ thve vidhi toy vraḥ vināsikha pratiṣṭhā kamrateñ jagat ta rāja vrāhmaṇa noḥ paryyan vraḥ vināsikha. nayottara. saṃmoha. śiraścheda. syaṅ man svat ta mukha cuñ pi sarsir pi paryann steñ aṅ śivakaivalya nu gi.

K. 235, Khmer, C II. 71–75

Then a brahmin called Hiranyadāma, who was learned in the Mantras that bestow Siddhi, came from Janapada. The Venerable Parameśvara [the late Jayavarman II] requested him to perform a ritual in order that this land of Kambuja (Kambujadeśa) should not continue to be a dependency of Javā and so that only one king should be universal ruler [in this region]. That brahmin performed the ritual [for those ends] following the venerable *Vināsikha* and established the Kamrateñ Jagat ta Rāja (= Devarāja). The brahmin [then] taught the *Vināsikha*, the *Nayottara*, the *Sam̐moha* and the *Śiraścheda*. He recited them from beginning to end so that they could be written down, and taught them to Steñ aṅ Śivakaivalya.

It is clear from this that the ‘essence’ of those four Vāma scriptures was not a hybrid but a Paddhati based on one of them. This text, called the *Vināsikha* here, is evidently the *Vīṇāsikha/Vīṇāsikhātantra* that survives in a single Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript. It is widely attested in Indian sources as one of the principal Vāma scriptures²⁰ and presents itself in its opening verses as the culmination or essence of the Vāma revelation already given in the other three texts.²¹

It does not teach a ritual specifically for the purposes of independence and political unity indicated in the inscription, but then nor does any Śaiva text known to me. One would expect that Hiranyadāma simply wrote these aims into the prose formula of intention (*saṃkalpah*) that any text of worship must contain when enacted for the benefit of the worshipper or his client,²² perhaps choosing the ninth day of the lunar fortnight

[throughout its length], and (ii) whatever [else] those explicit statements imply. An example is the *Yajñāsūtra* in the case of the [Kāṭhaka] Yajurveda’.

20. The error in the Khmer report of the title is certainly that of the composer of the inscription rather than the engraver or editors, since it also appears in the Sanskrit, where the metre requires the short syllable provided by the erroneous *vi-*. It should be remembered that the inscription was composed in A.D. 1053, some two hundred and fifty years after the installation it reports. It is only too likely that by then the Paddhati based on the *Vīṇāsikha* was all that had survived of the Vāma literature and that the original title had become distorted.

21. *Vīṇāsikha* 4–10. Note that in v. 12 it refers to its configuration of mantras/deities (Yāga) as the essence of the Tantras, by which it means those of the Vāma division: *yāgam ādau pravakṣyāmi tantrasāraṃ sudurlabham / *yenaiva* (em. : *tenaiva* Cod. and GOUDRIAAN) *varadā devyo nityaṃ devi bhavanti hi* ‘I shall first teach you the Yāga, the essence of the Tantras, so hard to find, by means of which, O goddess, the [four] goddesses will constantly grant one’s desires’.

22. The formula is to express the intention in an adverbial compound ending in *-artham* ‘for the purpose of’. For example, in the *Svacchandabhairavakramamahāsarvaśāntividhānam*, f. 3v9, we see *amukaśāntyarthaṃ baliṃ gr̥hna* ‘Accept the bali for the averting [of ills] from N’ and in the *Rudraśānti* section of the same manuscript we see in f. 19r6: *dvīpamārimahotpātaśāntyarthaṃ mṛtyuñjayāya sarvapūjītāya namaḥ* ‘Obeisance to Mṛtyuñjaya worshipped by all for the averting of the great disaster of disease throughout the land’; and in f. 19r9–v1: *mahāmṛtyuñjaya mahājanakṣayapraśāntyarthaṃ deśotpātamahāmāribhayaśāntyarthaṃ baliṃ gr̥hna* ‘Great Mṛtyuñjaya accept the bali for the averting of

(*navamī*) for the ceremony on the authority of the *Vīṇāśikha*, which rules that a king who seeks victory over his enemies should have the worship of the deities of this text performed on that day.²³

The *Vīṇāśikha* also lacks instructions on the procedures for the installation of images (*pratiṣṭhā*). But that too would not prevent the *Vīṇāśikha* from being taken as the basis of a Paddhati composed for that purpose, since to select a scripture for a Paddhati is only to select its system of Mantras, its configuration of deities (*yāgaḥ*) and other basic constants. With these in place it is a simple matter to add any rituals such as those of installation that it happens not to cover but that are essential components of any Śaiva system. We see exactly this in the surviving mainstream Paddhatis of the Indian Saiddhāntika Śaivas, nearly all of which are Paddhatis of the *Kālottara* in its two-hundred verse redaction, a text which says nothing of installation.²⁴

We cannot assume, then, that references in Khmer inscriptions to rituals as following certain scriptural sources enable us to access the nature of those rituals in any detail where those sources happen to have survived. The Paddhatis that guide and reflect actual practice though claiming to be based on such texts draw only their framework from them. They are obliged to fill this in and extend its application by drawing extensively on other sources if they are to contain comprehensive prescriptions capable of governing the whole range of rituals that the faithful require.

Nor should we assume that the inevitable supplementation would have been limited to closely related sources. Śaiva theoreticians require this and argue against eclectic syncretism. But their argument is a conservative attack on an established practice. Thus the Kashmirian Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha (*fl. c.* 950–1000)²⁵ decries a tradition of incorporating the procedures of the *Svacchanda* into worship based on the *Mataṅga* on the grounds that the two texts belong to separate streams of the Śaiva revelation, the former being a text of the Dakṣiṇa or Bhairava division and the latter one of the Saiddhāntika division:

yena tv atra etacchāstrakramam vihāya svatantrapaddhatikrama ullikhitah sa svacchandam upekṣaṇīya eva. yato yatretikartavyatā na śrīyate tatrākāṅkṣābalāt saṃhitāntaratas tadapekṣā yuktā na sarvatra anavasthiteḥ. ity uktam: kriyādi-bhedabhedena tantrabhedo yataḥ smṛtaḥ. tasmāt tatra yathaivoktaṃ kartavyaṃ nānyatantrataḥ iti. tatrāpi svasrotasa evaikasrotopadeśarūpatvena saṃnikarṣāt na

destruction from the whole community, for the averting of national disaster, of the peril of fatal epidemic disease'. Similarly, in the text of the Śaiva postfunerary *Gopradānavidhi* of Kashmir the worshipper is made to say that he is about to worship the gods listed in the formula *ātmanah puṇyavṛddhyartham vānmanahkāyopārjitaḥpanivāraṇārtham pituḥ rudrasya paralokapuṇyavṛddhyartham śivapadavī-prāptiyartham* (f. 7v) 'for the increase of my own merit, for the removal of the sins that I have acquired through word, mind and body, for the increase of merit of the Rudra who is [my deceased] father in the next world and for [his] reaching the path of Śiva'.

23. *Vīṇāśikha* 17: *saṃgrāme vijayārthī vā pararāṣṭra*vimardane* (conj.: *vimardanam* Ed.)/*navamyām *pārthivo* (em.: *pārthivaṃ* Ed.) *yāgaṃ kurvīta bhaginīpriyam* 'Alternatively if a king desires victory in battle, [or] intends an assault on the kingdom of an enemy, he should perform the ceremony of worship dear to the Sisters on the ninth day [of the month]'.

24. All the major early Saiddhāntika Paddhatis that have survived are based on the *Dviśatika-Kālottara*: the *Paddhati* of Brahmaśambhu (*Brahmaśambhupaddhati*) (938 A.D.), the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* of Bhojarāja (r. 1018 to 1060), the *Kriyākāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu (*Somaśambhupaddhati*) (1095/6), the *Kriyākramadyotikā* of Aghoraśiva (1157/8) and the *Jñānaratnāvalī* of Jñānaśiva (second half of the twelfth century). Only one Saiddhāntika Paddhati survives that is based on another scripture. That is Aghoraśiva's *Mṛgendrapaddhati*, which, as its name reveals, is a Paddhati of the *Mṛgendratāntra*. But his purpose in this work is evidently not to promote an alternative model for the Saiddhāntika ceremonies.

25. For my grounds for this dating see GOODALL 1998, xiii–xviii.

srotontarataḥ ata eva viprakaṣād viruddhānuṣṭhānaprasaṅgāc cety uktam asmābhir anyatra: na ca śāstrāntare kartuṃ yuktaṃ śāstrāntaraśrutam.

1-2 *sa svacchandam* em. : *svacchandam* BHATT

Mataṅgavṛtti ad KP 5.11

One may freely disregard the [teacher] who has introduced the procedure of the Paddhati of the *Svacchandatantra* at this point. This is because it is proper to supplement a scripture by drawing on another only where a procedure is not explicitly stated [but evidently required]. In such cases one may draw on another scripture, because one is forced to do so by the incompleteness [of the base-text]. But one may not do so in all cases, because that would remove all consistency. This is why we have the text ‘Tantras are distinguished from each other through their differences in the domains of ritual (*kriyā*) [, meditation practice (*yogaḥ*)] and [observance (*caryā*)]. So one must follow the instructions of that [scripture which one has adopted] and not those of any other system.’ Moreover, even then (*tatrāpi*) [, when one is obliged to supplement its information from another source, one should do so] from [a scripture of] one’s own division of the Śaiva canon, that being the closest since it has the nature of instruction within one and the same stream of revelation. One may not do so from any other division [such as that of the *Svacchandatantra*], because it is too remote from that and because this would lead to the undesirable consequence of the presence of practice of a contrary nature [within Saiddhāntika Śaivism]. That is why I have taught: ‘It is not proper in [the practice of] one scripture to do what has been taught in another.’²⁶

But the Paddhati *Siddhāntasāra* composed by Mahārājādhirāja Bhojadeva, probably the Paramāra king of that name who ruled from Dhārā in modern Gujarat from A.D. 1018 to 1060, shows that the influence of the *Svacchanda* was too great to be withstood. For though his Paddhati is based on the two-hundred-verse redaction of the *Kālottara*, a Saiddhāntika scripture, it has drawn extensively on the three and a half thousand verse Dakṣiṇa *Svacchanda*, though without acknowledging the fact, especially in its treatment of the rituals of initiation. Indeed large parts of his Paddhati are little more than a prose redaction of passages of that scripture.²⁷ The influential Saiddhāntika Paddhati of

26. See also Aghoraśiva, *Mṛgendrapaddhati*, p. 1, and Vaktraśambhu, *Mṛgendrapaddhativyākhyā* ad loc.

27. Compare, for example, *Svacchanda*, f. 254-v4 (3.163-174) with *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* f. 20v3-21r2. After each verse section of the first I have placed the corresponding prose section of the second in square brackets. The prose passages form a continuous text. 163 *pāśakarmam ato vakṣye kanyākartitasūtrakam / triṅṇaṃ triṅṇīkṛtvā pāśabandhanasūtrakam / 164 śivāmbhasāstra saṃprokṣya kavacenāvaguṇṭhanam / pūjayitvā tu vidhinā gandhapuṣpādihūpakaiḥ* [→ *tad anu kanyānirmitaṃ sūtraṃ triṅṇaṃ triṅṇīkṛtyāstraprokṣitaṃ kavacāvaguṇṭhitaṃ saṃpūjya*] / 165 *gṛhya prasārayet sūtraṃ mūrdhnādyaṅguṣṭhayāvadhī / śiṣyasya stabdhadehasya nāḍībhūtaṃ vicintayet* [→ *śiṣyasyordhvakāyasya śikhāyāṃ baddhvā pādānguṣṭhāgrāt tam avalambya suṣumnānāḍīrūpaṃ vicintya*] / 166 *suṣumnā madhyamā nāḍī sarvanāḍīsamavitā / omkāradisvarūpeṇa namaskārāvasānikam* [→ OM SUṢUMNĀYAI NAMAḤ] / 167 *śiṣyadehe sthitā nāḍī saṃgṛhya viniveśayet / gandhapuṣpādibhiḥ pūjya kavacenāvaguṇṭhayet* [→ *ity anena śiṣyadehāt suṣumnāṃ saṃgṛhya sūtre saṃ(29v)yojya saṃpūjya kavacenāvaguṇṭhya*] / 168 *saṃnidhāne trīr āhutyas svanāmapadajātīnā / śivāmbhāstreṇa saṃprokṣya śiṣyasya hṛdaye punaḥ / 169 puṣpeṇa tāḍaye ’streṇa hṛdi cit saṃhṛtā bhavet* [→ *sannidhānāhutiṭrayaṃ dadyāt. tataḥ śiṣyahṛtpradeśe saṃyojya puṣpāstreṇa hṛdi saṃtāḍya*] / *humkāroccārayogena recakena viśed dhṛdi / 170 nāḍīrandhreṇa gatvā tu* [→ *recakaprayogena humkāraṃ samuccaran nāḍīmārgēna hṛdi tasya sampraviśya*] *caitanyaṃ bhāvayec chiśoḥ / kadambagolakākāraṃ sphurattāraḥsaprabham / 171 hṛtsthaṃ chidyāstrakhaḍgena humphaṭkārastrajātīnā / dhāmenāṅkuśabhūtena karṣayed yāva chaktitaḥ* [→ *śiśoś caitanyaṃ sphurattāraḥkāraṃ hṛdy astreṇa saṃcchidya mūlamantreṇa samākṣya*] / 172 *dvādaśānte ca saṃgṛhya saṃpuṭitvā hṛdā tu tam / saṃhāramudrayā yojya sūtre nāḍīprakalpite* [→ *dvādaśānte hṛdayasaṃpuṭitaṃ kṛtvā OM HĀM HAM HĀM saṃhāramudrayā saṃgṛhya sūtre saṃyojya*] /

Somaśambhu completed in central India in A.D. 1095/6 perpetuates this tacit fusion since it is in large part a verse redaction of Bhojadeva's prose;²⁸ and it is taken forward into the Saiddhāntika Paddhatis of the Tamils Jñānaśiva and Aghoraśiva, the first composed in Benares and the second in the far South in the second half of the twelfth century, both authors who would have been abashed had they realized that their 'pure' Saiddhāntika tradition had been hybridized in this way.

Our understanding of Indic ceremonial traditions has tended to be dominated by the model of the archaic Vedic (Śrauta) sacrifice, which has come down through the centuries in a remarkably stable and uncontaminated form. The Śaivas too wished their traditions to be seen in this light and at every stage have denied, or would have denied, that they were innovating, insisting that they were faithfully preserving the tradition of a specific ancient scripture, supplementing its instructions from ancillary sources only where absolutely necessary and with the understanding that they were doing so in accordance with an intention implicitly conveyed by that scripture, thus avoiding all syncretism. We have now seen that this model fails to stand up to analysis even in the domain of the private worship required of individual initiates for their own benefit, where we might expect that reasons for innovation would have been less compelling since such worship was comparatively free of market forces. But in the domain of worship performed by professional priests for others, such as we encounter in the Khmers' inscriptions, the pressures to depart from the

173 *vyāpakam bhāvayitvā tu kavacenāvaguṇṭhayet / trir āhutiṃ bhairaveṇaiva saṃnidhānārthahetave* [→ *vyāpakam sambhāvya kavacenāvaguṇṭhya saṃnidhānārtham mūlamantrenāhutiprayam juhuyāt*] / 174 *dviṭīyasūtradeham tu pāsā yatra sthītās tv ime / badhyās chedyās tathā dāhyāḥ sūtrasthā na tu vigrāhe* [→ *tādanādīni ca pāsānām sūtre kuryāt, na śarīra iti*].

28. Compare, for example, the section of the *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* cited above with *Somaśambhupaddhati* 3:169–183 (vv. 5–13). See also *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* ff. 23r–v (B) with the corresponding continuous passages of *Somaśambhupaddhati* 3:3–13 (vv. 1–13) in square brackets: *atha dīkṣāsvārūpanirūpaṇam* [→ 1 *athāto bhogamoḥsārtham dīkṣārūpanirūpaṇam / yathāgamaṃ yathābodham saṃkṣepād abhidhīyate*], *tatra bandhahetumalakarmamāyādīpāsāviśleṣo jñānam cānugrhyasya yayā kriyayā janyate sā dīkṣā* [→ 2 *malamāyādīpāsānām viśleṣaḥ kriyate yayā / jñānam ca janyate śiṣye sā dīkṣety abhidhīyate*], *tatrānugrāhyas trividhaḥ vijñānākalaḥ pralayākalaḥ sakalās ceti* [→ 3 *vijñānālanāmaiko dviṭīyaḥ pralayākalaḥ / trīṭīyaḥ sakalaḥ śāstre 'nugrāhyas trividho mataḥ*], *tatra malamātrayukto vijñānākalaḥ, malakarmayuktaḥ pralayākalaḥ, kalādīpṛthivyantatatvayuktaḥ sakalaḥ* [→ 4 *tatrādyo malamātreṇa yukto 'nyo malakarmabhiḥ / kalādībhūmiparyantatatvats tu sakalo yutaḥ*], *dīkṣāpi dvividhā niradhikaraṇā sādihikaraṇā ca* [→ 5 *nirādhārā ca sādihārā dīkṣā tu dvividhā matā*], *tatrācārya-nirapekṣeṇa bhagavatā svaśaktyānugraharūpayā tivratarasaktinipātena yā kriyate sā niradhikaraṇā, vijñānākalapralayākalanām* [→ 6 *ācāryanirapekṣeṇa kriyate śambhunaiva yā / tivrāsaktinipātena nirādhāreti sā smṛtā*], *yā tv ācāryamūrtisthena bhagavatā mandamandataratīvratīvratatūpā-śaktinipātena yā kriyate sā sādihikaraṇā, sakalātmanām* [→ 7 *ācāryamūrtim āsthāya manda-tīvrādībhedayā / śaktyā yāṃ kurute śambhuḥ sā sādihikaraṇocyate*], *sā punaḥ sabijā nirbījā sādihikārā niradhikārā ceti* [→ 8 *īyaṃ caturvidhā proktā sabijā bījavarjitā / sādihikārā niradhikārā yathāvad abhidhīyate*], *tatra samayasamayācāravatī sabijā. sā ca viduṣāṃ kriyāsamarthānām eva bhavati* [→ 9ab *samayācārasamyuktā sabijā jāyate nṛṇām*], *samayasamayācārapāśasuddhipūrvikā samayasamayācāradīrahitā nirbījā. sā ca bālabālīśavṛddhavyādhitātmanām strīṇām bhogabhujām ca* [→ 9cd *nirbījā tv asamarthānām samayācārarjitā*], *ācāryasādhakayor nityanaimittikāmyakarmasv adhikaraṇāt sādihikārā* [→ 10 *nītye naimittike kāmye yasya syād adhikāritā / sādihikārā bhaved dīkṣā sādihikācāryayor ataḥ*], *samayiputrayayor nirbījādīkṣitānām ca nītyakarmamātrādhikāritvān niradhikāraiva* [→ 11 *nirbījādīkṣitānām tu tathā samayiputrayoḥ / nīyamātrādhikāritvād dīkṣā niradhikārikā*], *sā punar ubhayarūpāpi dvividhā kriyāvati jñānavatī ca. tatra rajaḥkuṇḍamaṇḍalapūrvikā kriyāvati. tad vinā kevalamanovyāpārajanitā jñānavatī* [→ 12 *dvividheyam dvirūpāpi prayekam upajāyate / ekā kriyāvati tatra kuṇḍamaṇḍalapūrvikā*] / 13ab *manovyāpāramātreṇa yā sā jñānavatī matā*], *itthambhūta dīkṣā labdhādhikāreṇācāryeṇa kriyate* [→ 13cd *ittham labdhādhikāreṇa dīkṣācāryeṇa sādhyate*].

purists' model would surely have been much greater. We should consider it very probable that the Paddhatis that guided their ceremonies among the Khmers were freely modified over time to appeal to or satisfy the expectations of new clients, such as immigrant brahmins patronized by the court or an incoming dynasty with its own traditions of worship for the protection of the king and the state.

Anyone who doubts this need only examine the relationship between scripture and Paddhati throughout the Indic world. I shall consider three examples, from Kashmir, Nepal and Bali. These are cultural zones which received their Śaivism independently. Features that they share are therefore very unlikely not to have been found in their common source and, moreover, in other zones that received the religion, such as Kambujadeśa. Readers whose interest is purely Khmerological may wish to skip the rest of this subsection, moving directly to the next section (p. 380).

Kashmir

The Paddhatis used by the Śaiva officiants of Kashmir until recent times, notably the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati* and the *Agnikāryapaddhati*, are based on the scriptures *Svacchandatantra* and *Netratantra*. Study of those scriptures and their learned commentaries written by the Kashmirian Kṣemarāja (fl. c. 1000–1050 A.D.) leads one to assume that their ritual systems, being distinct in their Mantras, deities and other defining particulars, would be kept distinct. But we find that they are fused in these manuals within single ceremonies, and that this hybrid is further elaborated through the insertion of the worship of numerous subsidiary deities drawn from various sources, some of them local goddesses such as Śārikā, Rājñī and Jvālāmukhī, and others drawn from mainstream traditions, such as Mālinī, Kubjikā, Tripurasundarī, and, from the Kalpas of the *Jayadrathayāmala*: Nityākālī, Pāpāntakārīṇī, Bhāgyādhirohiṇī, Bhuvanamālinī (Dīkṣādevī), Mantraḍāmarikā, Mantramātrkā, Vāgīśvarī, Vāgbhaveśvarī, Vidyāvidyeśvarī, Saptakoṭīśvarī and Siddhalakṣmī.²⁹

Further, there are distinct redactions of these texts which differ from each other in the presence or absence of the worship of certain deities or in following different sources for their worship. Thus the version of the *Agnikāryapaddhati* in a Paris manuscript adds the East-Indian Śākta deities Tārā, Bhuvaneśvarī, Bhadrakālī, Dakṣiṇā Kālī, Bagalāmukhī and Vajrayoginī to the goddesses who receive oblations in the Śaiva fire-sacrifice,³⁰ deities that are no part of early Kashmirian tradition and are lacking both in a Göttingen manuscript's version of this Paddhati and in the corresponding section of the fire-worship that ends the ceremony of Śaiva initiation in the Kashmirian *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*.³¹

29. See SANDERSON 2002, 2 and 22–23 (endnote 19) for a full list of the goddesses who receive offerings in the fire-sacrifice that is a regular constituent of the Paddhatis of the Kashmirian Śaiva officiant (*gōryun*). The seats (Pīṭhas) of the local Kashmirian goddesses listed are as follows: (1) Śārikā: in Śrīnagar on the NW side of the hill Hāraparbutth (Skt. Śārikāparvata, also called Pradyumnaśikhara); (2) Rājñī (/Khīrbhavānī): at Tulamul (Skt. Tūlamūlya); and (3) Jvālā/Jvālāmukhī: on a spur at Uyen (Skt. Ovanā) / Khruv (Skt. Khaḍūvī). They and Bālā, whose seat is under a Deodar tree at Bālahōm (Skt. Bālāśrama) to the NE of Pāmpar (Padmapura), are the family goddesses (*kuladevī*) of the Kashmirian brahmins (*Devīrahasya*, introd., p. 2). For the presence of these goddesses at these sites see STEIN 1961, 2:459 (Bālā), note on 1.22 (Jvālāmukhī), note on 4.638, and 2:446–447 (Śārikā), and 488 (Rājñī). For their fairs (*utsavaḥ*) see KOUL 1991, 85–97. The antiquity of these local goddesses is uncertain. Śārikā at least was already venerated in the eleventh century since she is mentioned in the Kashmirian *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva (reign of Kalaśa, 1063 and 1081/2); see 73.107–118. Paddhatis for the worship of these four goddesses have been published as supplements (*pariśiṣṭāni*) to the *Devīrahasya*.

30. These goddesses are covered in ff. 80r5–84v8 of the Paris manuscript.

31. *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*, A, ff. 220r1–227r12.

Dakṣiṇā Kālī, who is the foremost of these East-Indian goddesses, has also been added in the Paris version, together with Bhadrakālī, among the deities summoned to protect the Yāga;³² and the same two have been included among the goddesses in one version of the Paddhati of the *Annapūrapūjā* of the Śaiva Śrāddha ceremony (*śivaśrāddham*).³³ Similarly, in the *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*, first composed in A.D. 1335/6 by one Manoda but expanded and modified until at least the end of the seventeenth century,³⁴ we find two redactions that differ in their sub-Paddhatis, one incorporating East-Indian tradition, the other not, for the preliminary worship of Gaṇeśa and the goddess Pustakavāgīśvarī.³⁵

I propose that these intrusive East-Indian elements were the result of the incorporation into Kashmirian brahmin society of the family stocks (*krām*) that share the name Kaul. They claim to be Kashmirians who moved from the Kashmir valley to Darbhanga in the eastern state of Bihar (Mithilā) in order to escape Islamic persecution during the reign of Sikandar (1389–1413) and then returned when conditions had improved during the reign of Zain-ul-abidin (1419, 1420–70). But there are compelling reasons to conclude that they

32. F. 27r–v. Dakṣiṇā Kālī (/Dakṣiṇakālī) is the principal Kālī venerated in Bengal (BANERJI 1992, 180). Her dark lolling-tongued form, four-armed, her left hands brandishing a sword and holding a severed head, and her right hands showing the gestures of protection and the bestowing of boons, standing on the prostrate body of Śiva and surrounded by jackals, is held by tradition to have been revealed to the famous Bengali Śākta Kṛṣṇānanda Āgamavāgīśa Bhaṭṭācārya of Navadvīpa (BANERJI 1992, 91), author of the *Tantrasāra*, composed c. 1580 (ibid.). She appears in such East-Indian Śākta scriptures as the *Kulacūḍāmanītantra* (4.39–47); *Toḍalatantra* (1.3–4, 18), *Phetkārīṇītantra*, Paṭala 10, *Guptasādhanatantra*, Paṭala 6, *Niruttaratantra* cited in *Karpūrādistotraṭīkā* p. 2, 3–11, *Viśvasāratāntra* cited ibid., p. 4, 13–16; and *Mahākālasamhitā*, (*Kāmakalākhaṇḍa*) 241.4.

33. *Annapūrapūjā* f. 15r4–v3 (Dakṣiṇakālī), 15v3–16v3 (Bhadrakālī). The published version of this Paddhati has only Bhadrakālī (CHANDRA 1984, 212a–218b, *śivaśrāddhe 'nnapūripūjā*). The visualization-text (*dhyānam*) of Dakṣiṇakālī in the manuscript (f. 15r5–12) is closely related to that of the East-Indian *Phetkārīṇītantra*, 10.4c–12.

34. The date of the work's original composition and its subsequent expansion are recorded at its end (MS B, f. 111v8–10): *ayaṃ svahrdayodbhavagiriśaśaktipātakramāc caturvidhaguṇānvitah pravara-dīkṣyaśiṣyocitah manodaguruṇombhitah khaśaśisamjñake vatsare prabhāv udayane maṇer nijasutasya karmoccyah | iti mahāmāheśvaramanodadattaviracito 'yaṃ dīkṣāvidhiḥ śivasvāmivistārīto bhadradāyī samāpto 'bhavat* 'This compendium of rites, which is endowed with the four good qualities and is suitable for the best of disciples worthy of initiation, has been composed for his son Maṇi by the Guru Manoda during the reign of Udayana, in the year 10, inspired by the descent of Śiva's power that has arisen in his heart. Here ends this beneficent Ceremony of Initiation, composed by Mahāmāheśvara Manodadatta and expanded by Śivasvāmin.' Udayanadeva ruled Kashmir from 11 Pauṣa Laukika [43]99 (A.D. 1320) to 13 badi Phālguna (Śivarātri) Laukika [44]14 (A.D. 1339). In support of these dates see PARMU 1969, 84, n. 44. The year 10, then, can only be 4410 of the Laukika (Saptarṣi) era, since that was A.D. 1335/6. In the other era used by Kashmirian brahmins, that of the beginning of the Kaliyuga, the year 10 fell too early, [44]10 being A.D. 1308/9. We have no information that enables us to date the expander Śivasvāmin or to determine whether he is one of the Śivasvāmins known from other sources or another. The latest addition to the text that I can recognize is in MS A. This gives the *Bhairavastotra* of Rājāna[ka] Śaṅkaraṅṭha (f. 200r5) and the *Śambhukṛpāmanoharastotra* of his son Rājānaka Ratnakaṅṭha (f. 201v13–15) among hymns to be chanted after the consecration ceremony (*abhiṣekaḥ*) that follows the *dīkṣā*. Ratnakaṅṭha's *Stutikusumāñjalilaghupañcikā* is dated Vikrama 1738, = A.D. 1681/2 (p. 256).

35. Redaction 1 = MS A, ff. 2r6–5r12; Redaction 2 = MS B, ff. 1v3–2v3 and MS C, ff. 1v4–2v16. For its worship of Gaṇeśa B follows East-Indian tradition (= *Āgamarahasya*, *Uttarārḍha* 855–860) and for the worship of Pustakavāgīśvarī it combines that tradition (= ibid. 865–867b) with a Kashmirian tradition incorporating *Jayadrathayāmala*, Ṣaṭka 4, *pustakādhikārapaṭalaḥ*, ff. 209r4, 209r5–7 (= vv. 21c–22b, 24–26).

were Maithila brahmin immigrants from that region and that they conceived this story of return to support their assimilation.

An anonymous Kashmirian Sanskrit tract of the Islamic period reports that the brahmins of Kashmir, who have often claimed to be all Sārasvatas, are actually Sārasvatas, Maithilas, Kānyakubjas, Drāviḍas, Gauḍas, Autkalas and Gurjaras. Now it says that those Kashmirians who are Maithilas are distinguished from all others by the fact that their Gotra division is the Dattātreyā.³⁶ Since this is the Gotra of the Kauls and of the Kauls alone, at least in Kashmir,³⁷ we are being told that the Kauls are Maithilas and therefore that they are of East-Indian origin, since the term could never be applied to brahmins who had merely spent some years in Mithilā, the region from which the Maithilas derive their name.

This conclusion is confirmed from within the Kaul community itself. For we have verses in two nineteenth-century Kashmirian manuscripts of collectanea of devotional works and liturgical texts of their tradition, in which an anonymous Kaul reveals not only that he belongs to the Dattātreyā lineage but also that he is a Maithila and a Yajurvedin of the Mādhyandinaśākhā and the Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra—the Maithila brahmins of Bihar are indeed either Mādhyandina Yajurvedins or Kauthumaśākhīya Chandogas³⁸—and that his original home (*pūrvabhūmiḥ*) was in the land of Janaka, where Sītā was born, on the banks of the Kolā river, that is to say, in northern Bihar at or near Sītāmarhi, about fifteen miles south of the modern Nepalese border.³⁹ The Kauls' presence there may explain the names of two villages in the vicinity: Madhkaul and Dhankaul.⁴⁰

36. *Brāhmaṇādijītyakavarṇana* p. 1[11], ll. 13–16: *sārasvatā bharadvājā dattātreyāś ca maithilāḥ / *gārgyavātsyāḥ* (em. : *gārgyavātsya* Cod.) *kānyakubjā drāviḍā āngirahkuśāḥ / mūlatuṣṭā vasiṣṭhās ca mudgalā maudgalās tathā / *gauḍajās te* (conj. : *gauḍajā ete* Cod.) *samākhyātā gautamā aupamanyavāḥ / mudgalidrāviḍās caiva *kiṣkindhādeśa* (corr. : *kiṣkindā* Cod.) *āgatāḥ / kaśyapā *gurjarāḥ* (corr. : *gūrjarāḥ* Cod.) *khyātāḥ parāśarās tathaiva ca* 'The Bharadvājas are Sārasvatas, the Dattātreyas are Maithilas, the Gārgyas and Vātsyas are Kānyakubjas, the Āngirases and Kuśas are Drāviḍas, the Mūlatuṣṭas, Vasiṣṭhas, Mudgalas and Maudgalas are said to be Gauḍas. The Gautamas, Aupamanyavas and Mudgalidrāviḍas are Autkalas; and the Kaśyapas and Parāśaras are said to be Gurjaras.' For the view that all the brahmins of Kashmir (Kashmiri Pandits) are Sārasvatas see MADAN 1989, 13; cf. BÜHLER 1877, 19. For the claim that the Kauls merely returned from Mithilā see KOUL 1991, 49.

37. For the Gotras of the Kashmirians and the fact that the Kaul stocks (Krāms) (Bamzai, Chowdhri, Daftari, Jalali Kothdar, Miskin, Muhtasib, Pahalwan, Rafiz, Sahib, Salman, Sultan, Zamindar etc.), and they alone, are of the Dattātreyā Gotra, see the Census of Kashmir of 1891, para. 191 and KOUL 1991, 99.

38. MISHRA 1984.

39. "Ānandanātha", f. 277r4–278r1 (A), Ms. Stein Or. g. 1 of the Bodleian Library, Oxford (B) (I am very grateful to my former pupil Dr. Jürgen HANNERER of the University of Halle for bringing the second witness to my attention): 1 *dattātreyā *kulotpannaḥ* (A : *kuletpannaḥ* B) *yajurvedy asmi maithilāḥ / tatra mādhyandinī śākhā sūtram kātyāyanaḥ smṛtam / 2 atrir gaviṣṭharākhyāś ca ṛcanānāśasamjñakāḥ / *dāmodaro* (em. : *dāmodhare* AB) *vaṁśadevaḥ sthitiḥ *kolāpagātaḥ* (em. : *kaulāpagātaḥ* A : *kaulāpage taḥ* B) / 3 *jātā sā yatra sītā, saratī navajalā vāgvatī yatra *pūjyā* (A : *pūjya* B) *yasyāḥ sānnidhyakartrī suranagaranādī, bhairavo yatra liṅgam / mīmāṃsānyāyavedādhyanaapatutaraiḥ paṇḍitair maṇḍitā yā *bhūdevo* (em. : *bhodevo* AB) *yatra bhūpo janakavasumatī sāstī naḥ pūrvabhūmiḥ* 'I am a Maithila Yajurvedin of the Dattātreyā clan. My branch of the [Yajurveda] is the Mādhyandina and my Sūtra is that of Kātyāyana. Born in the Gotra of Atri I have three Pravaras: Ātreya, Gāviṣṭhara and Ṛcanānāśa. My lineage god is Dāmodara [Kṛṣṇa] and my [ancestral] home is on the banks of the Kolā river. My former country is the land of Janaka ruled by a brahmin king, adorned by scholars adept in the study of Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya and the Vedas, where Sītā was born, where the venerable river Vāgvatī flows with its fresh waters, where the Suranagara river grants its presence, the site of the Bhairava Liṅga.'

The traditional birthplace of Sītā is in Tirhut, in modern Sītāmarhi (26°35 N, 85°29 E) in the administrative division of that name (formerly the Sītāmarhi subdivision of the Muzaffarpur district). Sītā

Once established in Kashmir, perhaps in the wake of the incorporation of the country into the Mughal empire by the emperor Akbar in 1586,⁴¹ they adopted the local goddesses as their lineage deities, the doctrines of Kashmirian Śaiva non-dualism, and the Kashmiri

is believed to have sprung to life here from an earthen pot into which King Janaka had driven his ploughshare (O'MALLEY 1907, 156–158). That our anonymous author means this place and not some other possible claimant is confirmed by his mentioning the Vāgvatī and the Kolā. The former is the Bāgmatī river, which rises in Nepal near Kathmandu and descends south through northern Bihar, passing about 12 miles to the west of Sītāmarhi, or about 5 miles, if it is the old course of the river that is intended. The river Kolā (*kolāpagā*) flows south from the Bāgmatī at a point about 4 miles south of Dheng, passes about 8 miles to the west of Sītāmarhi and ends in the Bāgmatī about 16 miles SSW of Sītāmarhi and about 4 miles SW of Belsand.

From the thirteenth century onwards Mithilā was indeed famous for its great experts on Mīmāṃsā, Nyāya and Vaidika observance; and from the fourteenth it was indeed ruled by brahmins, having been made over as a fief to Kāmeśvara Ṭhakkura, the head of the Śrotriyas of Mithilā, by Tughlak Shah after his defeat of Harisimha, the last of the kings of the Kaṃṇāṭa (Simrāongarh) dynasty (c. 1097–1323), and the destruction of Simrāon, his capital. The Sugāon or Ṭhākur dynasty founded by this brahmin ruled over Tirhut up to the early sixteenth century, until Tirhut was conquered by Nasrat Shah of Bengal (r. 1518–32) and put under the governorship of his son-in-law Ala-ud-din, to pass shortly afterwards with the fall of the independent kingdom of Bengal into the Mughal empire.

For the three Pravaras of the Atri Gotra (its Gāviṣṭhara division) mentioned in the verses see BROUGH 1953, 34; and for the Dattātreya subdivision of this Gotra see *ibid.*, 139.

40. Survey of India, Sheet No. 72F. Madhkaul lies between the Kolā and the Bāgmatī, about two miles W of Belsand. Dhankaul lies between the same rivers on the west bank of the old course of the Bāgmatī about two miles W of Parsauni, which lies about 5 miles N of Belsand. The two place-names are perhaps named after Kauls who received these villages as fiefs (*jaḡir*): Mādḥ (= Mādḥava) Kaul and Dhan (= Dhaneśa?) Kaul. The origin of the name Kaul is not clear. It is unlikely, I believe, to be a reference to their religion: as Śāktas they are indeed Kaulas. For that is not an identity that would be so publicly advertized. Perhaps it is rather from the Kolā river, by which they had settled.

41. The Kauls' claim that they entered Kashmir from Mithilā during the reign of Zain-ul-abidin (1419, 1420–70) is supported by Munshi Muhammad-ud-din Fauq (A.D. 1877–1945), who states in his *Shabab-i-Kashmir* that a Mādho (Mādḥava) Kaul, a Ganesh Kaul and a Gopāl Kaul were in charge of the land settlement and grand irrigation schemes that marked this reign (KILAM [1955], 9). Such projects were indeed put into effect by Zain-ul-abidin (PARMU 1969, 148–154). But the contemporary histories (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī*) written by Jonarāja and Śrīvara, covering the periods 1149–1459 and 1459–1486 respectively, make no mention of them nor, more tellingly, of any other Kaul. Kauls are also absent both from the history of the years 1486–1537 provided by Śuka (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī*) and from the anonymous supplement which takes the chronicle of the kings of Kashmir up to 1597. In fact, the earliest sure evidence known to me of Kauls in Kashmir dates from the first half of the seventeenth century. Sāhib Kaul tells us in his *Devīnāmavilāsa* (17.18) that he completed that work in Vikrama 1723 at the age of 24, which places his birth in 1636 A.D.; and the author of the *Dabistan-ul-Mazahab* refers to Kauls whom he had met in Kashmir (trans. SHEA and TROYER 1937, 229): Sudarshan Kal (= Sudarśan Kaul); Kopāl Kul (= Gopāl Kaul). From the text it appears that he was in Kashmir at dates from 1627, when he was a boy, to 1639 or 1640 A.D. Fauq reports a Paṇḍit Sada Kaul favoured by the emperors Jahangir (r. 1605–28) and Shah Jehan (r. 1628–1658) (KILAM [1955], 101). Perhaps the Kauls came in not during the reign of Zain-ul-abidin but in or after 1586, when Kashmir was annexed by Akbar, attached to the province of Kābul, and placed under the administration of imperial officers (SMITH 1917, 240), this piece of family history having been pushed back to the time during which they claimed to have returned from Bihar. Perhaps the source of Fauq's report that Kauls were engaged in land settlement and irrigation schemes has also been dated to fit this claim. As a newly acquired territory of the Mughal empire Kashmir was immediately subjected to the rigorous system of land and revenue assessment introduced under Akbar. Five imperial officials were sent for this purpose. We know their names from the *Akbarnāma* of Abu-l Fazl (PARMU 1969, 289–290), and they are not Kauls. But perhaps Kauls were brought in among their staff. They have certainly been prominent among the Kārkun sub-division of the brahmins of Kashmir, those who learned Persian and served in the administration of the Muslim rulers of the country.

language, all of which can be seen in the works of Sāhib Kaul, composed in Kashmir in the seventeenth century.⁴² But they also maintained their East-Indian Śākta traditions, as is shown by the same author's Paddhatis. I am aware of manuscripts of three works of this kind: his *Śyāmāpaddhati* for the worship of Dakṣiṇā Kālī, his *Śrīvidyāpūjāpaddhati* for the worship of Tripurasundarī, and his *Hṛllekhāpaddhati* for the worship of Bhuvaneśvarī. They show no connection with the Śākta Śaivism long-established in Kashmir. They do not inherit its ritual forms, draw on its sources, or share its theology. They also contain elements entirely foreign to it, such as the consumption of the intoxicating drink known as *saṃvit/saṃvidā* or *vijayā* that is prepared from the powdered green *Cannabis indica* plant.⁴³

42. Among these works by Sāhib Kaul (b. 1636) is a hymn to the local goddess Śārikā as the goddess of his patriline; *Śārikāstava* v. 17, f. 532r: *stotraṃ mantrōddhāry adah śārikāyāḥ sāhibkaulo vaṃśadevyās cakāra* 'Sāhib Kaul is the author of this hymn to [his] lineage goddess Śārikā, a hymn which contains the [means of] the extracting of her Mantra [element by element from the initial syllable of each verse]'. He also wrote numerous works in which he expresses his devotion to the goddess in the language of Kashmirian Śaiva non-dualism, such as *Saccidānandakandalī*, *Sahajārcanaśaṣṭikā*, *Śvātmabodha*, *Citsphārasārāḍvaya*, *Śivaśaktivilāsa*, and *Devīnāmavilāsa*, a tour de force of devotional poetry in the most refined and complex style based on the *Bhavānīśahasranāmastotra*. In the Kashmiri language we have his *Janmacarita* (BL, MS. Stein Or. f. 3 (v); SOAS MS no. 44390, ff. 69–140).

43. *Śyāmāpaddhati* f. 16v–17v: *tatra padmāsanenopaviśya kāmēśvaraṃ saṃvidam vā svīkuryāt. tad yathā* OM SAṂVIDE BRAHMASAMBHŪTE BRAHMAPUTRI SADĀNAGHE BRĀHMAṆĀNĀM CA TRṢTYARTHAM PAVITRĀ BHAVA [etc.] SVĀHĀ *iti mantreṇa juhuyāt. tata ānandamayo bhūtvā raktavaśanādyalamkṛtaḥ śivo 'ham iti bhāvayan* 'Then he should seat himself in the lotus posture and take *wine (*kāmēśvaraṃ* [?]) or *saṃvidā*. He should pour an oblation of it [into his mouth] with the following Mantra: OM SAṂVIDĀ, born of Brahmā, daughter of Brahmā, become pure for the delight of brahmins [etc.] SVĀHĀ. Then when he has become full of bliss [from it], he should adorn himself with a red garment etc. and contemplating that he is Śiva ...'. See also *Hṛllekhāpaddhati*, ff. 21[119]r8–22[121]v5: *...ity anena mukhe saṃvidam tattvamudrayā juhuyāt. iti saṃvidvidhiḥ. tata ānandamayo bhūtvā ...*; and the published sources *Jvālāmukhīpūjāpaddhati* p. 361, 12–18 and *Bālāpūjāpaddhati* pp. 488, l. 30–489, l. 13. That the drink is prepared from cannabis is stated in *Sarvollāsa* 30.21b, in a passage extracted from the *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi: bhaṅgarūpā*; and in a version of the Mantra to be recited when taking it, in which the substance is explicitly addressed by its mundane name *bhaṅgā*: OM BHAṅGE BHAṅGE MAHĀBHAṅGE It is mixed with milk, water, Mādhvika juice, molasses and other ingredients (*Ānandapaṭala* in *Sarvollāsa* 30.47–54). It is to be drunk before the *pūjā* proper after the worship of the deities around the door to the shrine. The long Mantra for the taking of this drink is exactly as in East-Indian sources, except that where the Kashmirian Paddhatis have *brāhmaṇānām* they have *bhairavānām*; see, e.g., *Sarvollāsa* p. 117; cf. *Samayācāraṇtra* f. 30v (*bhairavānandatattvārtham*). In other Śākta Śaiva systems, such as those inherited by the Kashmirians, the only intoxicant consumed in ritual is alcoholic liquor. In the relatively late tradition seen in East-Indian Śākta texts the cannabis-drink has been added; and the Mantra given for its empowerment (*abhimantraṇam*) is a variant of that already current for alcoholic drinks; see *Śyāmāpaddhati*, ff. 17r6–7: OM AMṚTE AMṚTODBHAVE AMṚTAVARṢIṆI AMṚTAM ĀKARṢAYA 2 SIDDHIM DEHI ...SVĀHĀ and cf. *Kulārṇavatāntra* 6.55, which gives ...AMṚTE AMṚTODBHAVE AMṚTEŚVARI AMṚTAVARṢIṆI AMṚTAM SRĀVAYA SVĀHĀ for wine. The quantity of cannabis to be consumed is not nominal. The *Ānandapaṭala* cited in *Sarvollāsa* 30.61 requires the worshipper to use from one to three tolakas in weight, no less, no more. As can be seen from the citation above from the *Śyāmāpaddhati* of Sāhib Kaul, the worshipper could use either substance. But the East-Indian tradition is in no doubt that cannabis is superior. This is stated in a verse-line frequently encountered in its texts: *saṃvidāsavayor madhye saṃvid eva garīyasī* 'Of cannabis and wine it is cannabis that is greater'; see, e.g., *Sarvollāsa* 30.26cd and 60ab (*Mātrkābhēdatāntra* and *Ānandapaṭala*) and *Samayācāraṇtra* f. 30r9 (*saṃvidānandayor madhye saṃvid eva garīyasī*). The Kashmirian Bhaṭṭāarakasvāmin, author of the *Spandapradīpikā*, an unpublished commentary on the *Spandakārikā* of the ninth-century Kashmirian non-dualist Śaiva Kallaṭa, speaks for the old tradition against this new Śāktism, dismissing its claim that cannabis enhances spiritual awareness. In f. 3v11–13 we read: *tasmāt sarvatra vyāptēḥ spanda eva*

It is this Maithila tradition that is the probable source of the East-Indian elements that have intruded into some redactions of the Kashmirians' Śaiva Paddhatis. I have mentioned only the addition of East-Indian goddesses; but there are other features that support this conclusion. The Paris *Agnikāryapaddhati* includes a sub-Paddhati for an animal sacrifice to the Goddess which is a variant of those seen in Sāhib Kaul's manuals;⁴⁴ and there are visualization-texts (*dhyānam*) recited in the worship of the same redaction that are identical with those used in these Paddhatis. That for Gaṇeśa, for example, is found in the *Śyāmāpaddhati*, and it is also found in the principal Bengali Śākta treatise of the sixteenth century, the *Tantrasāra* of Kṛṣṇānanda Bhaṭṭācārya.⁴⁵

The Newars

Syncretistic elaboration also characterizes the anonymous manuals for the worship of the royal temple deities written and followed by the Newar Śaiva priests of the Kathmandu valley. We see this in the many surviving Nepalese manuscripts of Paddhatis that give the recitation-texts in Sanskrit and the ritual instructions in Newari for ceremonies of installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) by named royal patrons, or set out the same for the *thā pūjā*, *puchā*, and *dhavamchā*, the periodic rituals that must be performed by these priests in the palace temples.⁴⁶ In these the principal deities are Kubjikā with her consort Navātmanātha,

kāraṇaṃ maheśvaro nāma. yac cātikruddho prahr̥ṣṭo vā kiṃ karomīti vāmṛśan / dhāvan vā yat padaṃ gacchet tatra spandaḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ ityādinā śrīspandavyaktir atraiva darśitā tat prāmādikam. vijayāpānaratānām bodhanimajjanād iyam itham uktiḥ 'So the dynamism [of consciousness] alone is the cause, namely Śiva, because it pervades all [states]. As for the view that the manifesting of this sacred dynamism can occur only in the states mentioned in such verses as "The dynamism is present in the state one enters when one is in great anger or delight, wondering desperately what to do or running" [*Spandakārikā* 1.22], that is erroneous. This is what those who are given to drinking *vijayā* say, because [by consuming it] they diminish their awareness'. For the contrary belief, that cannabis promotes understanding, see passages such as *Sarvollāsa* 30.32–33, 55. It is probable that the use of cannabis for spiritual intoxication was adopted following the example of Muslim ascetics in India such as those of the Madāriyya order, founded by Badī' ad-dīn Shāh Madārī, an immigrant who settled in Jaunpur, where he died c. 1440 (TRIMINGHAM 1973, 97), an order notorious for its use of hashish.

44. *Agnikāryapaddhati* A, ff. 41v–44v. Cf. *Śrīvidyānityapūjāpaddhati*, ff. 122v–124r; *Śyāmāpaddhati*, ff. 37r8–38r5; *Hṛllekhāpaddhati*, ff. 70v4–74v8.

45. *Agnikāryapaddhati* A, f. 45r8; = *Śyāmāpaddhati*, f. 6v4–6; = Kṛṣṇānanda, *Tantrasāra* f. 97r2–5. The *Tantrasāra* of Kṛṣṇānanda was certainly studied in some circles in Kashmir, since several Kashmirian manuscripts of it have survived, such as BHU Mss. c. 1028 and c. 3657; Research Department, Srinagar, MSS 1479 and 1637. A number of the visualization verses of the Paris *Agnikāryapaddhati* (A) are found in the published *Uddhāraakośa* associated with the *Devīrahasya*. That of Tārā (f. 80r5-v4) = 7.11–12; that of Bhuvaneśvarī (f. 80v5-81r3) = 7.14–15; that of Vajrayoginī (f. 84v3) = 7.49; that of Kulavāgīśvarī (f. 65r) = 7. 62; that of Mṛtyuñjaya (f. 47r) = 7. 71–72. The *Devīrahasya* is East-Indian in character but it has assimilated the local Kashmirian goddesses. In 2.2–6b it lists the Mantras of Śārikā, Mahārājñī, Jvālāmukhī, Śāradā and Bheḍā. The locations of the first three have been stated above. Śāradā, a goddess of transregional fame, was worshipped to the north of the valley at Shardi by the Kishenganga river (STEIN 1961, 2:279–289). Bheḍā/Bhīḍā was worshipped on a mountain in the Śukru Pargaṇa. See the *Kāsmīratīrthasamgraha* of Sāhib Rām, f. 21r1–2: *śukroṣarāṣṭre parvatamastake bhīḍādevī*. Cf. STEIN 1961, 2:472–3.

46. The Newari term *thāpūjā*/*thāpūjā* denotes a special ceremony of worship (*pūjā*) that is to be performed on one or more calendrically fixed days of every year in accordance with the requirements of an endowment for this purpose. See, e.g., G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976 no. 79 (a copper-plate inscription of 1799/1800 A.D. concerning a land-grant to the Taleju temple in Hanumān Dhokā), ll. 4–6: *prativarṣa-bhādrakṛṣṇāṣṭamyām mārgakṛṣṇāṣṭamyām phālguṇakṛṣṇāṣṭamyām ca dānapatrasya yathālipi sāmagribhiḥ thāpūjām kārayitum kāntipuramahānagarabhūbhāgāntargataṣaṭṭriṃṣottaraṣaṭ 536*

Siddhilakṣmī,⁴⁷ Guhyakālī, and Tripurasundarī. Each of these four is an independent pan-Indian Śaiva deity with her own ritual system;⁴⁸ and for each there survive Paddhatis for personal worship. But here their cults are combined to form a larger structure. This in turn subsumes certain other deities of special significance to the palace, such as the Durgās Tumbēśvarī, Ugracaṇḍā and Māneśvarī, and, in certain contexts, the aniconic goddess Duyinimāju/Dumāju. It is also the basis of Paddhatis for the worship of yet other deities.⁴⁹

I propose that this came about in response to the accumulation of the goddesses of successive dynasties, that when a new dynasty came to power the palace priests integrated its goddess with those already in worship in the royal temples, creating a composite Paddhati for this purpose.

The evidence for this falls far short of enabling a chronology but it does support the hypothesis of the historical process. The worship of the four goddesses is divided in the Paddhatis into two segments called the *paścimadegulipūjā* and the *uttaradegulipūjā*. The meaning of these Newari terms is ‘worship of the western tutelary deities’ and ‘worship of the northern tutelary deities’. Now Kubjikā is worshipped in the first and Siddhilakṣmī, Guhyakālī and Tripurasundarī in the second. The sense of the reference to the cardinal points is that in the classification of Śākta systems that was current among the Newars and elsewhere in the subcontinent Kubjikā is the goddess of the Western Transmission (*paścimāmnāyaḥ*, *paścimānvayaḥ*), while Siddhilakṣmī and Guhyakālī are the goddesses of the Northern Transmission (*uttarāmnāyaḥ*, *uttarānvayaḥ*). When the worship of Tripurasundarī is classified within this schema it is generally in late texts of its own tradition that seek to present it as the culmination of all the others and so classify it as the Transmission of the Zenith (*ūrdhvāmnāyaḥ*), though an earlier tradition seen in the *Ciñciñimatasārasamuccaya*, a secondary, syncretistic scripture of the Western Transmission, had classified the cult of the Nityās, a system that prefigures the classical, as that of the Southern Transmission.⁵⁰ Here it is tagged on, as it were, without a separate

mūriparimitakṣetram sakuśodakam saṃkalpya samarpitam asti ‘Land within the capital Kāntipura [= Kathmandu] measuring 536 Mūris has been given with the formula of intent and with kuśa grass and water to enable a *thāpūjā* to be performed with all necessary materials, as specified in the document that records the donation, every year on the 8th days of the dark fortnights of the months Bhādrapada, Māgha and Phālguna’; and no. 80, concerning the same temple, recording a land-grant to fund two annual *thāpūjā*, on the 8th of the bright fortnight of Bhādrapada and the 5th of the same of Āśvina. This provides textual confirmation of the account of this kind of *pūjā* given by VERGATI (1995, 115–116) on the basis of anthropological enquiry in Bhaktapur as periodic acts of *pūjā* established by the Malla kings with donations of land to pay for them.

The *puchā* (Skt. *pavitṛārohaṇam*) is the annual expiatory offering of threads to the deities, and the *dhavaṃchā* (Skt. *damanārohaṇam*) is the annual expiatory offering of the parts of the fragrant-leafed *Artemisia Indica* plant (*damaṇaḥ*, *damanakaḥ*), though it appears from our lexicographers of Classical and Modern Newari that the plant offered by the Newars is camomile; see TAMOT 2000, s.v. *dhavaṃchā*, *dhavanasvāna* and MANANDHAR 1986, s.v. *dhavaḥ*, *dhavaḥsvāṇā*.

47. Siddhilakṣmī is identical in Mantra and iconography with the Siddhalakṣmī of the Kashmirian tradition.

48. See SANDERSON 1988: 682–690 (1990 repr.: 150–158).

49. See, e.g., *Talejusake thāpūjā yāya vidhiḥ*; *Tulajāḍīpadānapūjāvidhi* (*Talejusake matāpūjāvidhi*); *Uttarāmnāyapavitṛārohaṇavidhi*; *Pratyāṅgirāpaddhati*; *Tumbēśvarīpūjāpaddhati*; *Navarātrapūjā*; *Tulajāthāpūjāvidhi* (in text: *śrī 2 jayabhūpatīndramalladevanatayā thāpūjā*); *Tulajācūlikāsthāpanavidhi*; *Revantamahābhairavapūjāvidhi*. The last three of these are the texts of installation ceremonies in which the client/sponsor (*vajamānaḥ*) is King Jayabhūpatīndramalla (r. 1696–1722) of the kingdom of Bhaktapur.

50. *Ciñciñimatasārasamuccaya*, ff. 17v9–20r8. The goddess here is called Kāmeśvarī and Tripurā and she has a retinue consisting of eleven [Nityā] goddesses (Hṛllekhā, Kledinī, Nandā, Kṣobhiṇī, Madanātūrā, Nirañjanā, Rāgavatī, Madanāvatī, Khakalā, Drāviṇī and Vegavatī) and Kāmadeva. The same

identity, as an annex of the ‘worship of the northern tutelary deity’ (*uttaradegulipūjā*), so as not to disrupt the balance of the established structure of the complementary co-existence of the western and northern traditions.⁵¹

The proposal that these western and northern goddesses are worshipped side by side because those of one dynasty have been added to those of another is encouraged by remarks in the *Parātantra*, a short scripture of 582 verses which gives every appearance of being a product of the Kathmandu valley. There are many manuscripts of it in that region and no evidence that it was known outside it. Furthermore, the system of goddess worship that it teaches is seen only in the Paddhatis of the Newars.

It is primarily concerned with the deities of the Northern Transmission, their Mantras and worship, but it embeds this matter in a treatment of a larger artificial schema of six Transmissions, those of the four cardinal points, the zenith and the nadir. The deities assigned to the east and south are Pūrṇeśvarī and Niśeśvarī, goddesses that have no place in the Śaiva tradition outside this context, appearing to my knowledge only here and in the Newars’ Paddhatis.⁵² It may well be that they were created artificially to fill these two positions in the schema and it is perhaps an indication of this that their cults are said by the *Parātantra* to be current in the concentric continents (*dvīpaḥ*) beyond the oceans that surround the known world, Pūrṇeśvarī in Plakṣadvīpa and Kuśadvīpa, and Niśeśvarī in Śākadvīpa and Puṣkaradvīpa.⁵³ No such imagined geography is invoked in the treatments of the other goddesses of the transmissions, who are all deities of mainstream traditions that were well-established in Nepal and beyond.

To the zenith (*ūrdhvāmnāyaḥ*) is assigned Tripurasundarī, and to the nadir (*adhāmnāyaḥ*) the Buddhist Tantric goddess Vajrayoginī, a deity that was of major importance in the Śaiva-Buddhist culture of the Kathmandu valley, as the antiquity and popularity of her temple at Sankhu attest.⁵⁴ The text is explicit about her Buddhist identity and this is what justifies her position at the nadir. She is included because she was a major goddess

system of deities is that of the scripture *Nityākaula*; see f. 2r7–2v1. The *Ciñciñimatasārasamuccaya* refers to the systems assigned to the cardinal points as *āmnāyaḥ*, as in other sources; but it also calls them houses (*gharam*) and *gharāmnāyaḥ*. Thus, f. 15r7: *punar anyam pravakṣyāmi ...caturṇām ghara-m-āmnāyām avatāraṃ pṛthak pṛthak* ‘I shall teach you another matter ...the descent among men of the four Gharāmnāyas, each separately.’ *ghara-m-āmnāyām* is for correct Sanskrit *gharāmnāyānām*.

51. *Talejusake thāpūjā yāya vidhiḥ*, f. 4v3: *tato uttara siddhilakṣmīguhyakāṭṭripurasundarīpūjanam*.

52. *Parātantra* 1.55ab: *pūrṇeśvarī mahogrā sā *pūrvāmnāyā* (Cod. [f. 5r5–6] : *pūrvāmnāyā* Ed.) *prakīrtitā*; 2.1a, 1d, 2d: *dakṣiṇāmnāyā vakṣyāmi ...*niśeśī* (corr. : *niśeśī* Cod. and Ed.) *ca *nirargalā* (conj. : *nirargalā* Cod. and Ed.) *...niśeśī raktacarcikā*. In the Paddhatis see, e.g., *Tulajāḍīpadāna-pūjāvidhi* f. 185r: *ekā mūrtir anekadhā trijagatī pūrṇeśvarī vāsave / bhūteśī gaganopamā bhagavatī niśeśvarī dakṣiṇe*.

53. *Parātantra* 1.71cd (on Pūrṇeśvarī): *plakṣadvīpe kuśadvīpe bahudhā ca tadanvagāḥ* ‘She has many followers in Plakṣadvīpa and Kuśadvīpa’; 2.25bc (on Niśeśvarī): *sarvasādhakasiddhidā / śākapuṣkaradvīpeṣu* ‘bestowing Siddhi on all her Sādhakas in Śākadvīpa and Puṣkaradvīpa’. I take the reading *tadanvagāḥ* to be meant as equivalent to *tadanugāḥ*, a barbarism that could easily be removed by emending to *tadanvagāḥ*. However, cf. 1.61ab: *iṣṭatvena ca sampūjyā sarve tasyānugāḥ smṛtāḥ*.

54. On her cult in Nepal and its role in linking exoteric deities both Buddhist (Prajñāpāramitā) and Śaiva (Durgā) with the deities of esoteric Buddhism see ZANEN 1986 and GELLNER 1992, 256. The local *Nepālamāhātmya* gives the Śaiva angle on the ambiguity of Vajrayoginī by making her a form of Pārvatī, having Pārvatī favour the Buddha by appearing to him in that form (1.59): *tapasyām kurvatas tasya buddhasya girijā tadā / tuṣṭā babhūva prakatā nāmnā sā vajrayoginī* ‘When the Buddha was engaged in asceticism Pārvatī was delighted and appeared to him under the name Vajrayoginī’. The *Parātantra* calls her Śābarī Prajñāpāramitā (6.1b: **śābarī* [em. : *sāvarī* Cod. f. 15v6 : *sāvali* Ed.] *jinamātrkā*), which may mean ‘the Prajñāpāramitā of [the Siddha] Śābara[pāda]’, since Śābara was associated with the Sādhana of this goddess; see ENGLISH 2002, 8, 360, 367–368.

among the Newars both Buddhist and Śaiva, but in the point of view of the latter her Buddhist background means that she can be acknowledged only in an inferior position, as able to bestow quick rewards in this life but not liberation.⁵⁵ The deities assigned to the west are Kubjikā and Navātmanātha and to the north Siddhilakṣmī and Guhyakālī, the first under her name Pratyāṅgirā.⁵⁶ This is exactly as in the Paddhatis' arrangement of the complementary tutelaries, and while the assigning of Kubjikā and her consort to the west is not distinctively Newar, that of the combination of Siddhilakṣmī and Guhyakālī is. Moreover, the iconography of the deities of both transmissions given in the *Parātantra* agrees with that seen both in the Newars' Paddhatis and in their religious art.⁵⁷

The *Parātantra*, then, is almost certainly a product of the Newar community of the Kathmandu valley. It is therefore of great significance to the analysis of the Newars' bicentric Paddhatis that it associates the Western and Northern Transmissions that constitute those two centres with distinct royal lineages and that it does so in their case alone. It tells us that Kubjikā is the lineage goddess (*kuladevī*) of the kings that are descended from the Moon (Somavaṃśin) and that Siddhilakṣmī (Pratyāṅgirā) is the tutelary goddess (*iṣṭadevī*) of those who are descended from the Sun (Sūryavaṃśin).⁵⁸

55. *Parātantra* 6.1d–2a: *kalau śīghraphalaprādā / bauddhamārge* 'bestowing quick results in the Buddhist religion during the Kaliyuga'; 6.6c–7b: *saugatānugamā sāksāt kalau śīghraphalaprādā / ihaiva phaladā nityam* (corr. : *nityā* Ed.) *nāpavargaphalaprādā* 'Followed by the devotees of the Buddha, quickly bestowing manifest results in the Kaliyuga, always bestowing results in this life but not granting the reward of liberation'.

56. In the sequence of Paṭalas 1 to 6, in which one Paṭala is devoted to each of the six goddesses of the transmissions, the goddess of the northern, the subject of Paṭala 4, is Guhyakālī. But in the long seventh Paṭala, in which this transmission is singled out for further treatment, this identity expands to the pair Siddhilakṣmī (Pratyāṅgirā) and Guhyakālī.

57. One of the rooms in the Art Museum in Bhaktapur contains scroll paintings on cloth (Skt. *paṭaḥ* [→ Tib. *than ka*], Newari *paubāhā*) of all these deities. On the left wall is a painting of a form of the white dancing Navātmanātha embracing the red Kubjikā and another which shows the three goddesses of the *uttaradegulipūjā* in a row: the red four-armed, one-faced Tripurasundarī seated in the lotus-posture on a prostrate Sadāśiva, the black nine-faced, fifty-four-armed Guhyakālī dancing on a prostrate Bhairava, and the ten-armed, five-faced white Siddhilakṣmī seated on Rudra. On the far wall as one enters is a large and very finely executed painting of the white Siddhilakṣmī in her cosmic form (*viśvarūpā*), with eighteen fully depicted arms in the foreground and countless others in circuits behind and thirteen faces in the lowest of eight diminishing tiers. I claim no skill in such matters, but in style all three paintings appear to me to belong to a time before the eighteenth century. Elsewhere in the museum is a painting of Guhyakālī with the goddess Siddhilakṣmī in the upper left corner and Tripurasundarī in the upper right. None of these images is correctly identified in the legends attached to their frames, a fact that underlines the esoteric nature of such knowledge: the educated public of Bhaktapur is generally unable to identify such deities.

58. *Parātantra* 3.23d–25b: *kubjikā cakranāyikā / aṅgiraḥsādhitā vidyā dakṣāya pratipādītā / nahuṣāya tato *dattā* (corr. : *dattvā* Ed. and Cod.) *tataś candrānvayāya ca / pārthivānām ca saumyānām kuladevīti kīrtitā* '...Kubjikā, Leader of the Wheel. [Her] Mantra, which had been mastered by Aṅgiras, was taught [by him] to Dakṣa. It was then given to Nahuṣa and thence to the [kings of the] lineage of the moon. It is declared to be the family goddess of the lunar kings'; 7.58c–61b (Cod. f. 22v5–23r1): **pratyāṅgirā* (Cod. : *tyāṅgirā* Ed.) *mahākālī mokṣasaubhāgyadāyini / 59 nānayā sadṛśī vidyā vidyate bhuvanodare / rājyadā dhanadā mokṣadātrī kaivalyadāyini / 60 *tenāstreṇa* (Cod. : *tenāstave* Ed.) *ca rāmeṇa rāvaṇo vinipātitaḥ / tadāprabhṛti sā devī *sūryavaṃśanṛpeśvaraiḥ* (em. : *sūryavaṃśā nṛpeśvarāḥ* Cod.) 61 *iṣṭatvena ca sampūjyā *sarve* (corr. : *sarvva* Cod.) **tasyānugāḥ smṛtāḥ* (conj. : *tasyānugāśrītā*) 'The Great Kālī Pratyāṅgirā bestows the bliss of liberation. There is no Vidyā in the worlds equal to this. She bestows sovereignty, wealth, liberation and transcendence. It was with this as his weapon that Rāma slew Rāvaṇa. From that time forward she has been worshipped by the kings of the solar dynasty[, who

Two dynasties claiming descent from the Sun ruled in the Kathmandu valley. The first is that of the Licchavis, known to us from dated inscriptions from A.D. 456/7 (Mānadeva) to 733 (Jayadeva). The second is that of the Mallas, who ruled from 1200 until they were conquered in the second half of the seventeenth century by Pṛthivīnārāyaṇ Śāh, the first king of the non-Newar dynasty that has occupied the throne of Nepal down to the present.⁵⁹ The solar kings in the mind of the redactor of the *Parātantra* were no doubt these Mallas, since the text contains several indications that it is unlikely to have been written before the fifteenth century.⁶⁰ That Siddhilakṣmī was their tutelary goddess is supported by other evidence. King Jitāmitramalla (r. 1673–1696) of Bhaktapur composed an esoteric hymn to her, the *Siddhilakṣmīmantrayantroddhārādistotra*,⁶¹ in which he presents the goddess in terms that accord well with this hypothesis. When he explains how to form her Mantra for the purpose of repeated recitation (*japaḥ*) he identifies the reciter as the king,⁶² a restriction I have seen in no other Paddhati. He also intends his hymn to be used by his descendants. For he tells us that by reciting it kings will achieve success (Siddhi), bringing about contentment among their ministers and destroying the lineages of

are Rāma's descendants,] as their personal goddess. It is tradition that all of them are her devotees'. The last two lines (60c–61b), containing her association with the solar kings, are lacking in the edition.

59. The Licchavis' claim to be kings of the lineage of the sun is made in Jayadeva's Paśupati inscription of Saṃvat 157 (A.D. 733), vv. 3–14 (Dh. VAJRACĀRYA 1973, 548–550): 3 *sūryād brahma-pautrān manur atha bhagavān janma lebhe tato bhūd iṣvākuś cakravartī nṛpatir api tataḥ śrīvikukṣir babhūva* ...5cd *śrīmattuṅgarathas tato daśarathaḥ putrais ca pautrais samaṃ rājño ṣṭāv aparān vihāya parataḥ śrīmān abhūl licchaviḥ* ...7cd *sārdhaṃ bhūpatibhis tribhiḥ kṣitibhṛtām tyaktvāntare viṅsatim khyātāḥ śrījayadevanāmanṛpatih prādurbabhūvāparaḥ* It is made for the Mallas in the epithets that precede their names in all their inscriptions and in many manuscript colophons that mention a Malla as the reigning king.

60. It names the East-Indian Mahāvidyā goddesses Dakṣiṇakālī, Ugratārā, Chinnamastā, Bagalāmukhī and Nīlasarasvatī in its coverage of the Southern Transmission (1.18d–20a). It also speaks of the cult of Tripurasundarī as having two forms, one following the counter-brahmanical practice (*vāmācārah*) and the other the brahmanical (*dakṣiṇācārah*), and identifies the latter as that of the Sannyāsins (*bhikṣūṅām*) (5.43ab: *vāmadakṣiṇayāgena sundarī dvividhā matā* and 5.44cd: *dakṣiṇācārayāgena bhikṣūṅām paramā smṛtā*). This expurgated form of the worship of Tripurasundarī is the hallmark of the tradition of the Sannyāsīn Śaṅkarācāryas. The earliest evidence that the Sannyāsins of that tradition were receiving patronage in the Kathmandu valley is in the reign of Ratnamalla (c. 1484–1530); see MICHAELS 1994, 116 ff. See also the copper-plate inscription of 1635/6 from the Jagannātha temple in the Hanumān Dhokā palace square in Kathmandu (G. VAJRACĀRYA 1976, no. 10), which names a number of Daśanāmasannyāsins of this order.

61. Comprising 42 verses in the Vasantatilaka and Sragdharā metres it gives the visualization, the Mantra (the *navākṣarī vidyā*: OM HRĪM HŪM HĀM PHREM KṢOM KROM NAMAḤ), the design of the Yantra, and the deities and their positions within it. It may have been transmitted independently. The colophon (f. 44r6–7): *iti śrīmanmahārājādhirājatarāṅkulakīrtigaṅgābhagīrathāyamānanṛpativṛndavandītacaraṇa-kamalaśrīśrīsumatijayajitāmitramalladevaviracitam śrīsiddhilakṣmīmantrayantroddhārādistotraṃ samāptam* '[This] Hymn in which inter alia the Mantra and Yantra of Siddhilakṣmī have been brought forth, which has been composed by Mahārājādhirāja Śrī 2 Sumatijayajitāmitramalladeva, who is a Bhagīratha to the Ganges that is the fame of the Solar Dynasty, whose lotus-feet have been venerated by a multitude of kings, has come to its end'.

62. F. 43r1: *mantrasya mūrdhni ruciraṃ praṇavaṃ nidhāya cainaṃ jape nṛpavaro namasā hi yuktam / lakṣmīḥ sthīrā bhavati tasya gr̥heṣu nityaṃ vāgdevatā vasati tadvadanāravinde* 'Having placed a glowing OM at the head of the Mantra the foremost among kings should repeatedly recite it with NAMAḤ [at its end]. Prosperity will endure in his palaces and the goddess of [eloquent and learned] speech will be constantly present in the lotus of his mouth'.

their enemies.⁶³ It was probably intended to be incorporated into the Paddhati of Siddhilakṣmī's worship, and it is indeed in this context that it has been transmitted.

Confirmation of her role as the personal deity of the Malla kings appears in the Paddhati for Navarātrapūjā in the autumnal royal festival of Dasain. For there Siddhilakṣmī is identified unambiguously as Rājamantrabhāṭṭārikā-Siddhilakṣmī 'Siddhilakṣmī, the Goddess of the King's Mantra'.⁶⁴

The importance of this goddess to the kings of Nepal is underlined by evidence of her having been linked with Paśupatinātha, the premier Śiva of Nepal, venerated far beyond its borders and acknowledged as their patron by the kings of the realm from the time of Aṃśuvarman in the sixth century down to the present.⁶⁵ For she is or has become the esoteric identity of Vatsalādevī, a goddess on the bank of the Bāgmatī river below the entrance to the temple of Paśupatinātha. The benedictory verse of a stele inscription of 1412/3 in the courtyard of that temple describes her as his consort,⁶⁶ and this relationship is also enacted in her annual festival.⁶⁷ The Nepalese chronicles (*Vaṃśāvalī*) of the post-Malla period record a tradition that the eighth-century Licchavi king Śivadeva acknowledged this goddess as the principal deity of the realm, establishing an annual human sacrifice and a public car-procession in her honour, adding that when five generations later the king attempted to suppress these sacrifices he was prevented from doing so by divine intervention.⁶⁸

That Siddhilakṣmī is or became the liturgical identity of this goddess is certain. Her processional image has not been observed in detail, but it has been seen to conform to the

63. F. 44r2: *ādau guruṃ kalaya rāvam amuṃ nṛpānāṃ siddhipradaṃ vividhamantrisukhākaram ca*; f. 44r4–5: *stotraṃ caitan nṛpānāṃ ripukulaśamanam*.

64. The context is the rites of the eighth day (Mahāṣṭamī). After setting up and worshipping first the royal sword (*khaḍgasthāpanam*) and then two vessels for the *kalasapūjā* of Amṛteśabhairava and the *kumbhapūjā* of Vāruṇī, the priest is to do the worship of the *pāścimadeguli* followed by that of the *uttaradeguli*. The Paddhati for the latter begins (*Navarātrapūjā*, f. 5r6): *śrī 3 rājamantrabhāṭṭārikāśrīsiddhilakṣmīdevārcanam kārayet. siddhilakṣmīdeguli yāya* 'He should [now] perform the worship of Siddhilakṣmī, the most sacred Goddess of the King's Mantra. He should do [the rite of] the tutelary Siddhilakṣmī'; it ends (f. 5v5): *thvate siddhilakṣmīdeguli samāpta* 'This [rite of] the tutelary Siddhilakṣmī has been completed'. It is followed by those of Guhyakālī (with the Mantras taught in the *Parātantra*) and Tripurasundarī, with the addition of a *pūjā* to the goddess Kaumārī, associated with the worship of nine female children (*kumārī*) and two young boys that will take place the next morning (Mahānavamī). For a detailed account of the worship of these children (as personifications of Ugracandā, her eight subordinate goddesses, Gaṇeśa and Bhairava) performed by the king, or rather the brahmin priest who nowadays must take his place, the other priests of the Taleju temple, and the descendants of the Malla kings see LEVY 1990, 540 ff. This addition of the *pūjā* of the goddess Kaumārī is an example of how while personal Śaiva worship is relatively free of syncretistic pressures, the liturgies of such royal priests must be adaptable in order to accomplish their engagement with the civic religion and its calendrical variety.

65. As soon as Aṃśuvarman began to publish edicts in his own name, after doing so in the name of his father-in-law Śivadeva, he assumed the epithet *bhagavatpaśupatibhāṭṭārapādānuḡrhitāḥ* or *bhagavatpaśupatibhāṭṭārapādānudhyātāḥ* 'favoured by the feet of the Revered Lord Paśupati'. The earliest of these edicts (Dh. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1973, no. 71) is dated in Saṃvat 29 of his era (= A.D. 595).

66. Inscription of Jyotirmalla, v. 1 (TANDAN 1999, 122): *śrīśrīnepālakhaṇḍe sakalamalahare vyāpinam* (conj.: *vyāpitam* Ed.) *puṇyabhūmau śambhuṃ* (em.: *śambhu* Ed.) *śrīvatsaleśaṃ paramapaśupatim pañcavaktraṃ surūpam* (conj.: *svarūpam* Ed.) ...*naumi* 'I praise the beautiful five-faced Śambhu, supreme Paśupati, the lord of holy Vatsalā, who pervades the sacred land of Nepal that removes all impurity ...'.

67. MICHAELS 1984.

68. LÉVI 1905–8, 2:124–125; WRIGHT 1877, 126.

iconography of Siddhilakṣmī in being five-faced and ten-armed. This identification has been confirmed by the priests of her temple⁶⁹ and is placed beyond reasonable doubt by a visualization-text given for her worship in the Newari Paddhati literature.⁷⁰ That she should have two names, one esoteric and the other exoteric, is in no way surprising for a goddess such as this whose cult extends into the domain of the civic religion. The same is the case in Patan (Lalitapaṭṭana), which has the temple of a Siddhilakṣmī known as Pūrṇacaṇḍī⁷¹ who is worshipped there as their tutelary deity by a section of the Limbus and Rais calling themselves Kirantis, the name which the chronicles gave to the earliest rulers of the Kathmandu valley.⁷²

The kings of the lunar dynasty said by the *Parātantra* to have had Kubjikā as their lineage goddess (*kuladevī*) cannot be identified. But they were no doubt understood by the composer or redactor of this scripture to be the immediate predecessors of the Mallas ruling during the tenth to twelfth centuries, an earlier date being less likely in the light of what we know of the time during which the cult of Kubjikā was constituted and disseminated. Epigraphical evidence for Nepal during those centuries is extremely sparse and the accounts of the late local chronicles are unreliable. But although those sources are of limited value as sober history they at least reveal a model of dynastic alternation that is relevant to the present issue. For in their account a dynasty of five lunar kings was followed by the solar Licchavis; those were followed by a series of lunar kings that they call the Ṭhākūrīs; and these gave way in their turn to the solar Mallas.⁷³ Nepalese manuscripts of texts pertaining to the worship of Kubjikā, unlike those pertaining to the cults of Siddhilakṣmī or Guhyakālī, do survive from the period before the Mallas. We have a *Laghvikāmnāya* manuscript of 1037/8 and at least four manuscripts of the *Kubjikāmata* extending from some time during the reign of the Pāla king Rāmapāla (c. 1072–1126) to 1179.⁷⁴

69. MICHAELS 1984, 112–114 and 1994, 98.

70. *Gajaśāntimahābalividhi*, f. 58r: *sūryakoṭinibhā devī *rudrārūḍhā* (corr.: *rudrārūḍhām* Cod.) **vaśaṃkarī* (conj.: *kaśaṃkarau*) / *daśa*hasṭā maheśānī pañcavaktrā* (corr.: *hasṭa maheśānī pañcavaktra* Cod.) *kirīṭinī* / *khaḍgatriśūlavarada vajrakādyakhaṭvāṅgapa* / *abhayākālada + śm† *trinetreyam virājate* (conj.: *trinetrayamtirācatā* Cod.). This passage is too corrupt to yield all ten of the hand-attributes. But the sword, trident, two gestures, vajra, skull-cup, and Khaṭvāṅga are all held or shown by Siddhilakṣmī. If the crux in the penultimate Pāda conceals a vase (*kalaśa-*) or goad (*aṅkuśa*), both are among her hand-attributes.

71. An inscription of 1636 A.D. refers to the goddess under both names: *māi jagadambā siddhilakṣmī pūrṇacaṇḍī* (GAIL 1988, 2:48). Another, in the wall of the temple, begins with a Sanskrit hymn to Siddhilakṣmī (**Siddhilakṣmīstava*) and refers to the temple as that of the donors' tutelary goddess (*sveṣṭadevī*) Pūrṇacaṇḍī (ll. 13–14: *śrīmatsveṣṭasureśvarīti viditā yā pūrṇacaṇḍī parā* / *...tatprāsādasya parā tu kṛtā jīrṇmodhṛtir mudā*).

72. VERGATI 1995, 154.

73. See LÉVI 1905, 2:83; REGMI 1965–66, 1:106.

74. These manuscripts are described in GOUDRIAAN and SCHOTERMAN 1988, 4–5, 6–7, 9–10 and 14. The dates given here for Rāmapāla's reign are those cogently argued by D.C. SIRCAR (1976). For the alternatives that have been proposed, from 1057 for its commencement to 1132 for its end, see HUNTINGTON 1984, 29–37, where these are conveniently tabulated.

Who, then, is the mysterious goddess Taleju who has repeatedly been identified in the ethnographic literature and in the inscriptions as the tutelary deity (*sveṣṭadevatā*) of the Malla kings—see, e.g., G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976, no. 28 recording a *tulādānam* by Cakravartīndramalla in 1664 A.D. 'for the pleasure of his *iṣṭadevatā*, the Mother Taleju': *śrīśrīśrīsveṣṭadevatā-tarejumāju-prītina*—and whose image, Mantra, and other esoteric aspects were concealed, we are told (e.g. LEVY 1990, 239–240), from all but the royal priests, the king and his male relatives? The Paddhatis for the worship of Taleju, in which one would expect to find a simple answer to this question, are puzzling at first sight, because they

Bali

Nor was eclectic syncretism limited to the Paddhatis of the subcontinent. It is also apparent in those of the Śaiva brahmin priests (*pēdanda śiwa*) of Bali and Lombok, inheritors of the traditions of pre-Islamic East Java. The Śaivism of those texts is a form of the Saiddhāntika division of the Śaiva Mantramārga,⁷⁵ but it contains elements of other traditions. Thus in the *Ādityahrdayastava* the deity, Śiva as the Sun (*śivādityah*), is equated with Tumburu, the presiding deity of the Vāmasrotas of the Śaiva Mantramārga, accompanied “by Jayā and the others”, that is to say, by his four sisters Jayā, Vijayā, Jayantī/Ajitā and Aparājītā.⁷⁶ Similarly, Khaḍgarāvaṇa appears in the Balinese Śaiva

do not mention her outside their titles, consisting of the worship of the sequence of the deities of the *paścimadegulipūjā* and the *uttaradegulipūjā*. I propose, therefore, that there is no Taleju over and above these deities and that she is either Kubjikā or Siddhilakṣmī, or both. If she is one of them to the exclusion of the other then Kubjikā is the most likely candidate. She and Navātmanātha stand at the head of the liturgies. Moreover, there is a shrine of Wanelāykū Taleju in the Tachapāl ward of Bhaktapur (SLUSSER 1982, 320a) which is surely the Paścimamūlasthānabhaṭṭārikā (‘the western goddess of the primary/original site’) of Vanerājakule mentioned among the deities of this ward in the liturgy of the *Pratyāngirāpaddhati*, f. 29r–v: *gaṇeśa tavacapāla. mantra pūrvavat. balim. vanerājakule. mantra. AIM 5 HSKŠMLVRYŪM SHKŠMLVRYŪM ŚRĪPAŚCIMAMŪLASTHĀNABHAṬṬĀRIKĀ*YAI (corr. : ya Cod.) pādukām. 3. balim. bhīma tavacapāl For Newari lāykū (←Skt. rājakulam) means ‘royal palace’; there is no other goddess included for worship in that ward; and the names Paścimamūlasthānabhaṭṭāraka and Paścimamūlasthānabhaṭṭārikā are those under which Navātmanātha and Kubjikā/Samayā are addressed in the Mantras of the *paścimadeguli*; see, e.g., *Pratyāngirāpaddhati*, f. 13r. The term *mūlasthānam* in these Mantras is used elsewhere in Śaiva texts to mean the site of the primary or original installation of the deity of a temple. This fits the theory that Kubjikā is the earliest of the two principal royal goddesses and/or the main deity of the Taleju temples. For the latter sense one may compare such terms as *mūlacārya* for the chief priest of the temple.*

On the other hand we have seen that Siddhilakṣmī is known as the Goddess of the King’s Mantra and this strongly suggests that the name Taleju was also applied to her, because the secret Tantric knowledge of the king is identified as that of Taleju in the narrative literature. Furthermore, the *Parātantra* speaks of the 290-syllable Vidyā of Pratyāngirā (Siddhilakṣmī) as having come down through a line of transmission in an account (7.48–59) that strongly resembles the legend of the transmission of Taleju’s Yantra written by a brahmin of Bhaktapur who works as a public storyteller summarized by LEVY (1990: 234–241). As with the Yantra of Taleju, the Pratyāngirā is acquired by Rāvaṇa, the demon king of Lankā (7.50). Later it is given to Rāma on the banks of the Sarayū river so that he can use it to defeat Rāvaṇa (7.53c–54 reading *daśonā trīśatākṣarī* with the manuscript in 54d) but the Mantra so far revealed is defective, having 300 syllables in its perfect state. In the modern storyteller’s narrative Rāma acquires Taleju’s Yantra by defeating Rāvaṇa and takes it to Ayodhyā. The goddess instructs him in a dream to throw it into the river Sarayū, which flows past Ayodhyā, because its worship would be defective after his death. Here the narratives part company, the Newari legend introducing the solar king Nānyadeva, who is said to have rescued it from the river, and his descendant Harisimhadeva who is said to have brought it to Bhaktapur, whose Taleju temple is believed to be the first in the valley. But this ‘history’ from the time of Nānyadeva and Harisimhadeva, both Maithila kings known from inscriptions, could not have been included in the *Parātantra*, because its presence would have contradicted its claim to scriptural status by showing that its composer postdated figures of relatively recent times. Further, the same text distinguishes, as we have seen, between Kubjikā as a lineage goddess (*kuladevī*) and Siddhilakṣmī as a tutelary or chosen goddess (*iṣṭadevī*); and Taleju is referred to in the inscriptions as the *iṣṭadevī* of the Malla kings. It is probable, then, that the name Taleju was applied to both goddesses and either, according to context. But further research into the Paddhatis may shed clearer light on this issue.

75. Old Javanese *siddhānta*, *śaiwasiddhānta*, *śivapakṣa*, *śaiwapakṣa*, *śiwaśāsana*. See ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v.

76. HOOPYKAAS 1966, 118: *ḲṢAṆ ḲṢIṆ ḲṢEṆ ḲṢUṆ jayādibhir anugatatanuṃ tumburuṭryakṣarāṅgam*. This would make better sense if we read *tumburuṃ tryakṣarāṅgam*: ‘Tumburu, embodied in the tri-

ritual for the preparation of consecrated water.⁷⁷ This is a Rudra of the Śaiva Bhūtatantras of the exorcistic Paścimasrotas division of the Mantramārga.⁷⁸

We also find an element of the more ancient Śaivism of the Pāsupata Atimārga in the *pañcakusika* or *pañca ṛṣi*, the five sages Kuśika/Mahākusika, Gārga/Garga, Metri/Maitri, Kuruṣya, and Pātañjala/Prtañjala/Pratañjala, who were venerated by the ascetics of the Javanese Ṛṣi sect, distinguished in Old Javanese sources from both the Śaivas and the Buddhists. These are put into correspondence with the constituents of the human body in a Balinese priest's detailed comment on the Śaiva Paddhati presented by Hooykaas.⁷⁹ That they are the hallmark of the Ṛṣi denomination is clear from the Old Javanese *Kuñjarakarṇa*, since that teaches that the *pañcakusika* are to the Ṛṣi sect what the five Tathāgatas are to the Mahāyāna Buddhists and the five deities to the Śaivas⁸⁰ setting out the correspondences between sets of five in the three denominations (*tripakṣa*) as follows: (1) Mahākusika/Kusika = Akṣobhya = Rudra; (2) Gārga/Garga = Ratnasambhava = Brahmā; (3) Maitri/Metri = Amitābha = Maheśvara; (4) Kuruṣya = Amoghasiddhi = Viṣṇu; and (5) Pātañjala/Pratañjala = Vairocana = Śiva.⁸¹

The first four are known from Indian sources as the disciples of Śiva in his Lakulīśa incarnation, and are remembered as the originators of the four teaching lineages (Gotras)

syllable, his form accompanied by Jayā and the others [in the syllables] KṢAṆ KṢIṆ KṢEṆ and KṢUṆ'. In Javanese usage the "trisyllable" (*tryakṣaram*) is the syllable OM (*praṇavaḥ*), seen as comprising A, U and MA; see in the Sanskrit and Old Javanese *Jñānasiddhānta* 26.11cd: *a-u-ma tryakṣaram samkhyam tryakṣaram praṇavam smrtam*; also 8.9b: *omkāram tryakṣaram tyajet*; 16.6ab; 18.8cd; 26.10d. See also *ibid.*, p. 74 in the chapter *sañ hyaṇ praṇavajñāna kamokṣan* 'Liberation through the knowledge of the holy Praṇava': *nāma sañ hyaṇ omkāra praṇava viśva ghoṣa ekākṣara tumburu tryakṣarāṅga* 'The names of the holy sound OM are Praṇava, Viśva, Ghoṣa, the Monosyllable, Tumburu embodied as the Trisyllable'. Not understanding the reference to these deities HOOPYKAAS (1966, 119) took KṢAṆ KṢIṆ KṢEṆ KṢUṆ *jayādibhir anugatanam* to mean "[whose body is followed by [the syllables] kṣam kṣim kṣem kṣuṃ and [the exclamation] Victory and so forth", missing the reference to the goddesses, and *tumburutryakṣarāṅgam* to mean "whose body consists of the three syllables tum-bu-ru". For these deities, whose worship was also current among the Khmers, since it was the basis of the state-cult of the *Kaṃrateñ Jagat ta Rāja/Rājya* (Devarāja) founded c. 800, see, e.g., *Viñāsikha* 94–118; *Devyamata*, f. 40r1–2: **tumburuḥ* (corr. : *.um.uru* Cod.) *sa sadāśivaḥ / divyavastraparīdhāno nānābharaṇabhūṣitaḥ / jayā ca vijayā caiva jayanī cāparājita / dūtibhiḥ kiṃkaraiḥ sārddham samvrytas *tumburuḥ* (corr. : *tumburum* Cod.) *sthitāḥ / *divyarūpāḥ* (corr. : *divyarūpā* Cod.) *sulāvanyā bhuktimuktiphalaḥ / saumyarūpo *mahādevaḥ* (em. : *mahāde* Cod.) *krīdate sa jayādibhiḥ*; f. 40r3–3: **jayādyāḥ* (corr. : *jayādyā* Cod.) *kiṃkarā dūtyās tumburuḥ ca mahādyutiḥ / vāmasrotākhyataś caiva vānavaktrād *viniḥṣṭāḥ* (corr. : *vinisṭā* Cod.); *Netratantra*, Paṭala 11. For the evidence of this cult in Java see GOUDRIAAN 1973.

77. See HOOPYKAAS 1974, 54.

78. His Mantra and rites (*mantravidhānam*) are taught in the *Khaḍgarāvaṇakalpa* of the scripture *Kriyākālaguṇottara*, ff. 42v4–47v1. In the non-scriptural literature of the Paddhatis of Kerala we find Khaḍgarāvaṇa and his Mantra in the 13th chapter (*grahadhvaṃsapāṭalaḥ*) of the *Tantrasārasaṃgraha*, alias *Viṣṇanārāyaṇīya*, of Nārāyaṇa of Śivapuram (15th century) and in the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (the *Siddhāntasāra* of Īśānaśivagurudeva), *Mantrapāda, Pūrvārdha, Paṭala* 41.

79. HOOPYKAAS 1966, 135 (pañca-ṛṣi: Kusika, Garga, Metri, Kuruṣya, Prtañjala).

80. *Kuñjarakarṇa* 23, 1/2 (cited in SOEBADIO 1971, 55, n. 182): *sogata pañcabuddha ṛṣi pañca kusika wiku śaiwa pañcaka* 'the five Tathāgatas of the Buddhists, the *pañcakusika* of the Ṛṣis, and the pentad of the Śaivas'; *Kuñjarakarṇa* 23, 1/3–4/3. Cf. *Tantu Panggëlaran* 76.3 cited in ZOETMULDER 1982 s.v. *pañcakusika* (Kusika, Garga, Metri, Kuruṣya, Pratañjala); *Nawaruci* 64.5 cited *ibid.* (*pañcarṣi*: Kusika, Garga, Metri, Kuruṣya, Prtañjala).

81. *Kuñjarakarṇa* cited in SOEBADIO 1971, 55–56, notes 182 and 186.

of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupatas⁸² and commonly seated around him in sculptural representations.⁸³ The fifth in the Javanese pentad might be thought to be Patañjali, the founder of the Yoga system, though Pātañjala, if that is the original form, would rather denote a follower or descendant of that sage. But it seems hardly convincing as a name, which is what we require in this context; and we can have little faith in it when we see that the variant Pṛtañjala or Pratañjala is widely attested.⁸⁴ It is more probable that Pātañjala is an attempt to substitute sense for a corrupt reading Pṛtañjala than that the latter is a corruption of the former. Perhaps what is concealed here is an ancient corruption of a name of Agastya. For the sage Agastya was widely worshipped in Java⁸⁵ and he is famous in brahmanical mythology for having drunk all the waters of the ocean. Possibly, then, the original name was *Pītañjala ‘He who drank the waters’.⁸⁶

It might be urged against this hypothesis that the correspondences in the *Kuñjarakarna* show that this figure, whoever he was, was seen by the author of that text as the highest of the five, since he is equated there with Vairocana, the highest of the five Tathāgatas, and with Śiva, the highest of the five deities of the Śaivas, and that therefore we should expect rather a name for Lakuliśa himself, since no-one else could reasonably be seen as their senior. But there is the alternative that the poet’s correspondences are superficial and that Agastya or some other sage concealed behind the transmitted name has merely been added at the end of the established Pāśupata list to enhance his status in a Pāśupata environment. That this is so is strongly suggested by the position of the name and by the fact that the four that precede it are ordered with the seniormost in first position, since Kuśika was venerated by the Pāśupatas as the first of Lakuliśa’s disciples.⁸⁷

But whatever the origin of the fifth name the tradition is old. For the five sages are found in this form among the powers invoked as divine witnesses in the imprecation formulas of Old Javanese charters from 860 onwards.⁸⁸ They also appear in the cosmogony of the *pūrwabhūmi* prayer in the Śaiva liturgy of the priests of the Tengger in

82. In the original *Skandapurāṇa*, ed. Bhaṭṭarāi, 167.127–143 these four are Kauśika, Gārgya, Mitra and Kauruṣya. In *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.131 they are Kuśika, Garga, Mitra and Kauruṣya. In the Cintra Praśasti of A.D. 1287 from Somnāthpattan/Prabhāsa (*El* 1:32, v. 16–17b) they are Kuśika, Gārgya, Maitreya and Kauruṣa.

83. For illustrations of Lakuliśa surrounded by his four disciples see, e.g., MEISTER 1984, plates 83–84, 88–92, 108–110, 117, 124–125, 127, 129–130.

84. See, here, notes 79–80 and 89; also the text of the Balinese *pemangku* temple-priest’s prayer in STUART-FOX 2002, 170: *kurusya maka-pulacek, pratanjala maka-padma, sang hyang kaki maka-puspa*.

85. DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, 312–313, following POERBATJARAKA 1926.

86. This tentative hypothesis supposes an irregular compound without reduction of the first member to its stem form (an *aluk samāsaḥ*) (= *pītaṃ jalam yena sa *pītañjalaḥ*). For the myth of his drinking up the waters see, e.g., verses in the Kumbhakoṇam edition after *Mahābhārata* 12.202.11: *agastyo ’sau mahātejāḥ pātu taj jalam añjasā / tatheti coktvā te devā munim ūcur mudānvitāḥ / trāyasva lokān viprarṣe jalam etat kṣayaṃ naya / tatheti coktvā bhagavān kālānalasamadyutiḥ / dhyāyañ jalādanivahaṃ sa kṣaṇena papau jalam* ‘“Let that radiant [sage] Agastya quickly drink that water”. Having agreed those gods were delighted and said to the sage: “Save the people, O brahmin sage; get rid of this water”. The Venerable [Agastya], who was as radiant as the fire of the aeon, agreed, and meditating on the mass of the water-devouring [*Vāḍava fire?] drank the water in an instant.’ This hypothesis would be less tentative if this epithet were found in place of the name Agastya in some Sanskrit source. I do not know of an instance. However, we do see the nearly synonymous Pītābdhi ‘He who drank the ocean’.

87. *Pañcārthabhāṣya* pp. 3–4.

88. ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *pañcakauśika*; see, e.g., the Poh Dulur copperplate inscription of A.D. 890 (BARRETT JONES 1984, 197–198), side B, l. 4: *kusika gargga metrī *nurusya (sic Ed.) patañjala*. They are also mentioned as witnesses in the Old Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* of the eleventh century (24.155).

East Java. There it is said that there first arose the goddess Umā (Umo Betari, = Skt. Umābhāṭṭārikā) and then these five ‘gods’ (*dewoto*, Skt. *devatā*).⁸⁹

Now in this prayer the officiant is identified as a *resi pujangga*, which if we may judge by the use of this Old Javanese term (*ṛṣi bhujangga*) in Balinese religion, denotes members of a class of non-brahmin, commoner priests with lower status and function than the brahmin priests of Śiva (*pēdanda śiwa*) but serving 93 per cent of the population. In Bali the *ṛṣi bhujangga* are members of the title-group *sengguhu*, which the brahmins rank as elevated Śūdra.⁹⁰ The element *rēsi/ṛṣi* and the special position assigned to the five sages in this *pūrwabhūmi* text, which has its close parallel in the liturgies of the Balinese *rēsi bujangga*,⁹¹ suggests that these priests too have their origin in the Ṛṣi sect. Its establishments appear from Old Javanese sources to have been located in isolated areas, of which the Tengger highlands above the court centres of Singhasari and Kaḍiri, are an outstanding example; and it appears that their beliefs and practice became closely entwined with popular religion,⁹² as is the case with the *rēsi bujangga* of the Tengger and Balinese.

Considering the centrality of the founders of the Pāñcārthika Pāśupata lineages in their cosmogony text and the role of these sages in the imprecations of Old Javanese charters from the earliest period onwards, I offer the hypothesis that these non-brahmin priests inherit what remains of the earliest Śaivism in Java, that this derives from the Atimārgic (Pāśupata) phase of the religion, that the Mantramārgic Siddhānta was introduced into Java at a later date, as it was, as we shall see, in Kambujadeśa, and that once this new tradition had been adopted by the courts and their brahmin officiants, the older system subsisted in a subordinate position among non-brahmin officiants, who survived in two roles. In the first, perhaps restricted to the courts and the core areas around them, they would have co-operated with brahmin priests as assistants and in that context been restricted to such functions as the invocation of lesser powers, as is the case among the Balinese *rēsi bujangga* in the *nyepi*, the annual day of silence, in which the brahmin *pēdanda śiwa* make offerings to the high gods while at their side the *rēsi bujangga* make offerings to the demons, so protecting the island from their assaults during the coming year.⁹³ In the second they served in their own right as the priests of the majority of the population, as in Bali, or in remote rural areas such as the Tengger highlands as the only priests, where their survival reveals that though Śaivism may have flourished among the social elites in and around the court centres it had also established itself among the rural population, where it survived, as we can see in the *pūrwabhūmi* liturgy with a core element of an older Pāśupata or Pāśupata-influenced tradition, one that was influential enough in Java to survive also in the exegesis of the high-status liturgy of the *pēdanda śiwa*, albeit in an abstract schema in which it no longer has the exalted position originally assigned to it.⁹⁴

89. HEFNER 1985, 178, text and tr.: *sira muah mijil kang ponco dewoto / kongsi gargo mentri kuruso / kang kalilan wong pritonjolo* ‘Together they emerged the five gods / Kongsi, Gargo, Mentri, Kuruso, / along with the Pritonjolo person(s)’. The *pañcakuśika* are called gods, as here, in the Old Javanese *Pārthayajña* (40.10) (ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *pañcakuśika*).

90. HOOYKAAS 1974, 243; HOBART et al. 2001, 80–81 and 233, n. 30.

91. HEFNER 1985, 271–272.

92. SANTIKO 1995, 65.

93. HOOYKAAS 1974, 53; HEFNER 1985, 271.

94. ZOETMULDER reports that in Old Javanese (1982, s.v.) the Sanskrit term *bhujāṅga* is used for a brahmin or other person of clerical rank and notes that in the older texts “it often appears to be a younger brahman (student or disciple)”. Perhaps, then, it refers in the case of the term *ṛṣi bhujangga* to the subordinate status of these priests. For the distinction between Atimārgic and Mantramārgic forms of Śaivism see SANDERSON 1988.

Thus while the liturgy of the Balinese is predominantly Saiddhāntika Śaiva it shows elements of the non-Saiddhāntika Mantramārgic traditions of the Vāmasrotas and Paścimasrotas and also of the archaic Atimārga. But the religious culture of the Javanese court of Majapahit, whose traditions the Balinese have inherited, was a Śaiva-Buddhist coalition; and so we find that Buddhism too has been drawn into the redaction of the liturgy. For the last two of the eight goddesses of the eight fingers in the preliminary ritual of the cleansing of the hands (*karaśuddhi*) are Prajñādevī and Parimitādevī.⁹⁵ These are surely created out of the Buddhists' goddess Prajñāpāramitā as Prajñāpāramitā is known in later Old Javanese sources.⁹⁶ The other six are personifications of the four unlimited virtues or Brahmavihāras of Buddhism (*upekṣā, karuṇā, muditā, maitrī*) but with Śāntā taking the place of the fourth, together with the two brahmanical goddesses Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī.

We see, then, that Śaiva priests paid scant attention to the rule that a Paddhati must adhere closely to a single scriptural source. Pure Paddhatis of this kind were believed to exist for the personal worship of initiates, but when we look closely even they show admixture from disparate ritual systems. In the case of worship conducted by professional priests—and it is this class of ritualist that figures in the Khmer inscriptions—we find that the needs and expectations of their clients have led to thoroughly syncretistic developments in three independent cultural contexts. It would be unreasonable, therefore, to assume that Kambujadeśa was exceptional in this regard.

Indigenous Religion

A further limitation is imposed by the character of our evidence. Unlike Christianity and Islam, which would claim half the population of Southeast Asia during the age of commercial expansion in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries, the religions of India that flourished in the region before this period demanded no radical rejection of existing cults. As the new religions were assimilated by the Khmers they were no doubt added to traditions of the kind we see today in the propitiation and mediation of the local Khmer spirits known as the *neak ta*, accommodating them through subordination in a manner similar to that seen with the *nat* and *phi* cults of Theravādin Burma and Thailand.⁹⁷ But the sources at our disposal do not allow us to see this substrate, reflecting as they do only the Indic high culture patronized by the ruling elite.

There are a few deities mentioned that may be pre-Indic. We have, for example, deities identified only by the pre-Angkorean title *Kpoñ Kamratāñ Añ* 'My Venerable Lord/Lady' and no name;⁹⁸ and there are a few more that are identified only by association, such as *vraḥ kaṃmrātāñ añ tnal* 'the god of the road' (K. 910), *vraḥ kaṃmrātāñ añ kaṃmrātāñ teṃ krom* (K. 137, K. 600) 'the god of the Krom tree',⁹⁹ *vraḥ kamratāñ tñaiy luc* 'the god of the west' (K. 22), and *vraḥ kaṃmrātāñ ai travañ ver* 'the god of the double pond' (K. 22). Another, *kpoñ kaṃmrātāñ añ bha nāriyya* (K. 107), has a non-Sanskrit name, and yet another, *kpoñ kaṃmrātāñ añ śrī Senāmukhavijayā* (K. 904 of

95. See HOOYKAAS 1966, 50.

96. See, e.g., *Deśawarṇana* 67.2, 69.1, 74.1 and ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *prajñāpāramitā*.

97. On the *neak ta* see MABBETT and CHANDLER 1996, 107–124.

98. K. 600 of 612 A.D. from Angkor Borei; K. 790 (undated, seventh century); K. 910 of 651; Ka. 10 (*NIC* II–III, 186) (late pre-Angkorean).

99. CÉDÈS (K. 600, *IC* 2:23, n. 8) rejects the possibility that pre-Angkorean Khmer *krom* = mod. Khmer *krom* 'below', on the grounds that the latter was *karom* in Angkorean Khmer. He therefore proposes that it is probably the name of a kind of tree.

713), has a name that is Sanskrit but unparalleled, so that one might suspect this of being the Sanskritization of an originally Khmer designation.

Such names have been thought to be firm evidence of pre-Indic cults.¹⁰⁰ But there are reasons to be cautious, over and above the obvious consideration that the argument rests on negative evidence, namely that certain deities are not identified in a way that enables us to say that they are certainly Indic. For another nameless Kpoñ Kammrātān Añ appears in the Khmer portion of K. 79 of 644; but in the Sanskrit portion she is identified as ‘the goddess Caturbhujā (the four-armed)’, which is very probably a reference to an Indic image. The probability that this is a Khmer deity is further diminished by the context in which she is mentioned. The inscription, which records its installation, states that it was commissioned by a Śaiva ascetic (*yamī*), that is to say by one of those least likely to be involved in the cult of a pre-Indic deity. Furthermore we are told that he was motivated to undertake this meritorious action by his devotion to Śiva and that the procedures adopted were those appropriate to the Goddess. All this suggests that the image was that of Śiva’s consort.¹⁰¹

Caution is also prompted by the case of the *kaṃmrateñ jagat piñ thmo* ‘the god of the stone pond’ of K. 653 of 956, who is surely identical with the deity who appears synonymously in Sanskrit as Aśmasaronātha and Śilāsaronātha in K. 56, an undated inscription of the reign of Rājendravarman (944–c. 968). This and the cases cited above have been considered “perfect examples of Sanskrit names devised as translations of Khmer cult terminology”;¹⁰² but the evidence is far from compelling. While recording the many pious acts of a Vaiṣṇava dignitary related to the chief queen of Rājendravarman, the inscription tells us that he reinstalled the Viṣṇu in the temple of the Lord of the Stone Pond (Aśmasaronātha):

*yaḥ kulapāvanīḥ
catasraś śrīpater arccā janmabhūmāv atiṣṭhipat
vaiṣṇavīm pratimām aśmasaronāthasya sadmani
bhūyo bhūrivibhām bhīmapure kātyāyanītanum*
K. 56 B, v. 17b–18

...who installed four images of Viṣṇu in the place of his birth to purify his family, reinstalled the image of Viṣṇu in the temple of the Lord of the Stone Pond brightly shining, and installed an image of Durgā in Bhīmapura, ...

If the Lord of the Stone Pond were a pre-Indic deity this would mean that a Viṣṇu was present as a subsidiary in his temple, a striking result, since the character of the inscriptions and the material evidence would lead us to expect that if a pre-Indic deity persisted it would have been an ancillary rather than the principal deity of a temple. But I see nothing that compels this interpretation against the alternative that the Lord of the Stone Pond was actually a Viṣṇu and that it was his own image that was being reinstalled. The use of names in -nātha for Viṣṇus is seen elsewhere in the corpus;¹⁰³ and later in the

100. VICKERY 1998, 140–149.

101. K. 79, v. 2a ...2d–3: *mukhartuvānai gaṇite śākāpde ...pratiṣṭhitam devicaturbhujākhyam / bhaktyā bhagavataś *śambhor* (corr.: *śambhur* Ep.) *pitāmātror vimuktaye / devīyathārthacaritais sthāpitaṃ yaminā bhuvi* ‘In Śaka 565 ...an image has been installed called Goddess Caturbhujā. An ascetic has installed it in the world following the ceremonies appropriate to [the installation of] the Devī, out of his devotion to Lord Śiva [and] for the salvation of his parents.’

102. VICKERY 1998, 142. He gives the Old Khmer form of the name as *kaṃsteñ jagat piñ thmo*. This is how it appears in K. 56.

103. K. 35 of the reign of Jayavarman IV (928–c. 940), K. 99 of A.D. 922/3, and K. 270 of A.D. 921.

same inscription we learn that this Vaiṣṇava dignitary built a brick temple for a Devāriṅjayaviṣṇu to the north of the temple of the Viṣṇu of the Stone Pond (Śilāsaroviṣṇu):

*yo kāṛṣīd iṣṭakāharmmyan devāriṅjayaśārṅgiṇaḥ
dhāmnaś śilāsaroviṣṇor uttarāśākṛtasthiteḥ*

K. 56 D, v. 33

Who built a temple of bricks for the Devāriṅjayaviṣṇu installed to the north of the temple of Śilāsaroviṣṇu, ...

It is highly probable, then, that the Lord of the Stone Pond and the Viṣṇu of the Stone Pond are one and the same. To defend the hypothesis that the Lord is a distinct, pre-Indic deity we have to accept three entities in place of one with metrically variant names: a pre-Indic Lord of the Stone Pond with his own temple, a Viṣṇu within that temple, and a separate temple of a Viṣṇu of the Stone Pond; and we would have to be constrained to do so by firmer evidence than the claim that the Khmer version of the name in K. 653 looks like pre-Indic cult terminology. The fact is that we have no clear evidence of such terminology but only the probability that when the Khmers started to give Indic deities Khmer titles they would have drawn on pre-Indic conventions.

Even if the inscriptions do refer to non-Indic deities, they tell us nothing about them other than their names. Nor is it certain that this lack of information prevents us from seeing the religious life of the rural masses alone, those on whose observances it is likely that the imported Indian religions had the least impact. For we cannot be sure that the old practices did not continue even among the Indianized elite, since absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. Conversely we cannot know how far the Indic religions had penetrated beyond the culture of the court, though the evidence of Java and that of the very large numbers of Khmers involved in various capacities in the support of these traditions strongly suggest that they must have put down roots in the minds and practices of the wider population.

It is even more unlikely that the reticence of our sources concerning the pre-Indic traditions merely deprives us of knowledge of those traditions themselves. It is almost certain that it also diminishes and distorts our understanding of the imported religions. For if our sources allowed us to see Khmer religion and society in the round we would no doubt recognize that Indian forms clothed Khmer beliefs and practices or embedded them as subsidiaries, as we see wherever Indian religions have been assimilated, both in India itself and beyond it from Burma to Bali, and from Tibet to Japan.¹⁰⁴

It is in any case implausible that even purely Indian rituals would not have taken on a Khmer character when performed by Khmers for Khmers, just as their images of Indian deities have a distinctive style and aesthetic quality while remaining within the parameters of an imported iconography.

104. VICKERY argues (1998, 142) that the popularity of Durgā Mahiṣāsūramardīnī in 7th-century Khmer art should not be seen simply as a borrowing of a cult popular in southern India but “must be explained, if possible, in terms of a local socio-religious setting.” Rightly insisting that comparative Southeast-Asian ethnography may be more important than Indian prototypes, he adds in a footnote that buffalo sacrifices presided over by female shamans are still known in northern Thailand, citing a report in the *Bangkok Post* of 2 July, 1986, thereby suggesting that the cult of Durgā Slayer of the Buffalo Titan (Mahiṣāsūramardīnī) was an Indic veneer over an indigenous tradition. Perhaps it was. But he cites no evidence that the Khmers sacrificed buffaloes to Durgā, and, more crucially, no evidence that they did so in a manner that was Khmer rather than Indian.

Khmer Subsidiary Brahmanism

Also present among the Khmers was the Brahmanism of Śruti and Smṛti. Brahmin dignitaries who officiated for the Khmer monarchs are commended for their knowledge of the Vedas, their ancillaries (*vedāṅgāḥ*), the Upaniṣads, the Epics and the Purāṇas;¹⁰⁵ and Rājendrarvarman (r. 944–c. 968) is credited with repeatedly causing the gods to drink Soma, which is a claim that he had Soma sacrifices performed. If this is not empty praise, it entails the existence of a community of orthodox brahmins versed in the Vedas and Śrauta ritual, since no Soma sacrifice can be performed with less than sixteen such persons as officiants (*rtvik*).¹⁰⁶ This king is also said to have studied the exegesis (*mīmāṃsā*) of the Vedas from a brahmin Someśvarabhaṭṭa and then to have taught it to

105. K. 5 (5th century), v. 9: brahmin officiants learned in the Vedas, Vedāṅgas and Upavedas (Āyurveda etc.); K. 180 of A.D. 948: king Rājendrarvarman's ācārya Rudrācārya, pupil of Śivasoma, the Guru of king Indrarvarman, describes himself as learned in the Vedas (*hotrā vedavidā*); K. 263 C, v. 22: Jayavarman V is said to have been praised by brahmins who knew the essence of the Upaniṣads, adhered to the path of Smṛti, and were learned in the Vedas and their ancillaries (*viprair ...vedāntajñānasāraḥ smṛtipathaniratair ...abhinuto vedavedāṅgavidbhīḥ*); K. 300, v. 22 (14th century; concerning Siddharṣi, Guru of the Rājaguru Vidyeśa): *cakāra deśan nāmnemaṃ madhyadeśaṃ jan(ākulam) / *vedavedāṅgavid vipras* (em. : *vedavedāṅgav(i)dv(i)pra(m)* BERGAIGNE) *s(tr)īya(m) prāpya pr(i)yyān t(u) saḥ* 'That brahmin, learned in the Vedas and their ancillaries married his dear wife and then founded this populous place called Madhyadeśa'; K. 725 (Jayavarman I), v. 5: *atrāsīd vrāhmaṇo vidvān vedavedā[ṅga]pāragāḥ dharmmasvāmīti v[i]khyātas* 'Here there was a learned brahmin called Dharmasvāmin, who had mastered the Vedas and their ancillaries'; K. 809, between A.D. 878 and 888, v. 40ab (re Rudra, teacher of Śivasoma): *vedavid* 'learned in the Vedas'; K. 692, v. 47 (A.D. 1189/90 or 1195/6) concerning Bhūpendrapaṇḍita I (Mūrdhaśiva): *siddhāntatarakkamunisammataśavdaśāstravedārthapañcajaladhīn pivati sma* '[who] had drunk the five oceans that are the Śaiva scriptures, Nyāya, the grammar approved by the [three] sages [Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali], the Vedas and Artha[śāstra]; K. 809, v. 42, concerning Śivasoma, honoured by Indrarvarman: *purāṇabhārataśeṣaśaivavyākaraṇādīṣu śāstreṣu kuśalo yo bhūt tatkārika iva svayam* 'who was as adept in the Purāṇas, the *Mahābhārata*, the Śaiva scriptures, grammar and other śāstras as if he had composed them himself'; K. 1002 (JACQUES 1968), v. 53, concerning Nilakaṇṭha, father of Śaṅkarapaṇḍita (priest of Harṣavarman III): *śaive vyākaraṇe kāvyē purāṇe bhārate khīle / adhīty adhyāpayām āsa yo gurūṇām anugrahāt* 'who studied the Śaiva scriptures, grammar, Kāvya, Purāṇa and the *Mahābhārata*, and, through the favour bestowed by his teachers, taught them'; K. 359 (pre-Angkorean), v. 3–4: a brahmin donated copies of the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa* and a Purāṇa to the temple of Tribhuvaneśvara that he had founded, and made a provision that they should be recited continuously every day (v. 4: *rāmāyanapurāṇābhyām aśeṣam bhāratam dadat / akṛtāvaham acchedyām sa ca tadvacanāsthitim*); Sūryavarman I's attachment to the stories of the Purāṇas and the two epics (K. 218, v. 11: *purāṇarāmāyanabhāratādīkathā*; K. 661, v. 56b: *bhāratādīkathārataḥ*); K. 661, v. 94: *sārāṇi bhāratādīnām *śrutvoktāni* (conj. : *śrotoktāni* Cœdès) *mudam yayau* (concerning Jayendrapaṇḍita). The *Mahābhārata* is cited (*vyāsagītā*) in K. 279 C1, v. 2. The verse quoted is 12.65.28 of the Pune critical edition.

106. K. 958, v. 6 (A.D. 947/8): *yo *dhanāmvunidhir* (conj. : *dhanāmvunidhiṃ* conj. Cœdès : *dhanāmvunidhiṃ* Ep.) *viprān divya ṁṁyaśomṛtam / surān somaṃ samam yajñe asakṛt kṛty apīpyata* '*wise and an ocean of riches (?), who in his sacrifices repeatedly caused both the brahmins [whom he engaged as officiants] to drink the nectar of celestial ...fame and the gods to drink Soma'. K. 692, v. 55 (A.D. 1189/90 or 1195/6) says that Bhūpendrapaṇḍita gave his deceased parents all the merit he had accumulated from life to life through such actions as repeated recitation of Mantras, Homa, and the Soma sacrifice (*dideśa ...japahomasomayāgādīkarmaphalam ācaritaṃ ca pitroḥ*). But this does not mean necessarily that he was claiming to have performed Soma sacrifices in his current existence. For the sixteen officiants necessary for a Soma sacrifice (Agniṣṭoma) see, e.g., *Āpastambaśrautasūtra* 10.1.19.

others;¹⁰⁷ and Yaśovarman I (r. 889–910) and Jayavarman II (r. 802–c. 835), the inaugurator of the unified kingdom of Angkor, are both praised for their commitment to those sacred texts.¹⁰⁸ Persons are commended for their knowledge of and adherence to the Dharmaśāstra and kings for promoting this adherence.¹⁰⁹ We hear of its presence in the curriculum of royal education,¹¹⁰ of certain dignitaries who were official reciters or readers of the Dharmaśāstra (*svat vraḥ dharmmaśāstra*),¹¹¹ of judicial decisions being reached following its authority,¹¹² and of king Rājendravarman's being versed in its legal system.¹¹³

In the domain of ritual, we hear of the brahmanical rites of passage (*saṃskārāḥ*) being performed by one royal brahmin for another,¹¹⁴ and of the principal ceremonies that Indian brahmanical authorities required to be performed for the monarch by his personal

107. K. 806, v. 239: *śrīsomeśvarabhāṭṭād yo mīmāṃsāṃ śrutavān dvijāt / vudhān vyākhyātavedārthāṃ vrahmaṇyān adhyaḥgamat* 'Having studied from the brahmin Someśvarabhāṭṭa the Mīmāṃsā in which the meaning of the Vedas has been explained he taught it to pious scholars'.

108. K. 323, v. 34ab: *homayogādīnirato vedasaktaḥ* 'devoted to Homa, Yoga and the rest, attached to the Vedas' (Yaśovarman I); K. 534 (reign of Yaśovarman I), v. 22: *[veda]priyaṃ mahībhṛtam* 'the king, devoted to the Vedas' (Jayavarman II).

109. K. 53, v. 6: *tasya tau mantriṇāv āstām sanmatau kṛtavedinau / dharmmaśāstrārthaśāstrajñau dharmmārthāv iva rūpinau*; 'Those two ministers of that [king Bhavavarman], valued by the virtuous and appreciative of his favour, were so expert in the Dharmaśāstra and the Arthaśāstra respectively that it was as if they were themselves the very embodiments of Dharma and Artha'; K. 263 C v. 22: *viprair ...smṛtipathaniratair* 'by brahmins ...who delighted in the path of Smṛti'; K. 111, v. 13: *vyavahāre satām mārgge manvādīnām mate same / kāladhvāntaniruddhe yo *madhyāhnārka* (corr. : *madyāhnārka* CÆDÈS) *ivābhavat* 'In law he [Jayavarman V] illuminated the unequalled path of the virtuous taught by Manu and the other [sages], a path that had been obscured by the darkness of time, as the midday sun [illuminates an uneven road obscured by the darkness of night]'; K. 208, v. 11: *manumārggānugāminah* 'following the path of Manu'; K. 235, v. 20cd: *apālayiṣyat ...mānavān mānavanītisāraiḥ* 'he would have protected men with the essences of the Way of Manu'; K. 528, v. 174ab, concerning Rājendravarman: *śubhaṃyūnā yūnā manuvartmānuvartinā* 'a handsome youth following the path of Manu'; K. 834, v. 51, concerning Śūryavarman I: *kāntārāgāśrayo bhūtibhūṣito viṣayārijit / manumārggāśrito gādi yo mahāyatir ity api* 'Although he was the object (*-āśrayo*) of his lover's (*kāntā-*) desire (*-rāga-*), adorned (*-bhūṣito*) with wealth (*bhūti-*), a conqueror (*-jit*) of the enemies (*-ari-*) of the realm (*viṣaya-*), and a follower (*-āśrito*) of the path of Manu (*manumārga-*), he was also (*api*) called (*agādi*) a Great Ascetic (*mahāyatir*) [(since) adopting (*-āśrito*) the [Śaiva] Mantramārga (*manumārga-*) he had resorted to (*-āśrayo*) the wilderness (*kāntāra-*) and mountains (*-aga-*), adorned (*-bhūṣito*) with ashes (*bhūti-*), and had conquered (*-jit*) the enemies (*-ari-*) that are the objects of the senses (*viṣaya-*)].'

110. K. 235, D, ll. 65–66: *vraḥ pāda kamrateṇ aṅ ryyān vidyā phoṅ daṃnepra siddhānta vyākaraṇa dharmmaśāstra śāstra phoṅ tadai ti* 'Our Revered Lord [king Udayādityavarman II] studied the sciences [with his Guru Jayendrapañḍita]: the Śaiva scriptures, grammar, Dharmaśāstra, and other Śāstras'.

111. K. 374 of 1042 A.D.; K. 814 of 979/80–1004/5 A.D., 5, ll. 52–54: *mratañ śrī pṛthivīndropakalpa svat vraḥ dharmmaśāstra mratañ śrī rājopakalpa svat vraḥ dharmmaśāstra*.

112. K. 569 of A.D. 1306 (ed. POU 2001, 166–171), ll. 14–17 and ll. 24–26. In the latter, the closing words of the inscription, the ruling king Śrīndravarman and his chief queen Śrīndrabhūpeśvaracūḍā are described as 'protecting their subjects and the pious endowments of others in accordance with the sacred Dharmaśāstra': *prajāpālana parapuṇyānupālana nu vraḥ dharmmaśāstra*.

113. K. 806, v. 143 refers to Rājendravarman as expert in the eighteen topics of legal business (*vyavahārah*) (*aṣṭādaśapadajñena*). For these eighteen, which begin with non-payment of debts see *Manusmṛti* 8.3–7 (7cd: *padāny aṣṭādaśaitāni vyavahārasthitāv iha*); *Nāradaśmṛti* 1.16–19 (19d: *ity aṣṭādaśapadaḥ smṛtaḥ*). CÆDÈS misunderstood *aṣṭādaśapadajñena* here to mean 'qui connaissait le vers de dix-huit pieds'.

114. K. 1002 (JACQUES 1968), v. 52: *garbhādhānādividhinā saṃskṛtaḥ kṛtyavedinā / bhagavad-vyāsapādena guruṇā tena yaḥ kṛtī* 'that learned man who was purified by that dutiful Guru Bhagavadvyāsapāda with the rites beginning with conception'.

officiants. We are told of the consecration of the king that inaugurates his reign (*rājyābhiṣekaḥ*),¹¹⁵ the consecration of the chief queen (*mahiṣī, agradevī*),¹¹⁶ and that of the crown prince (*yuvarājah*),¹¹⁷ and of the *puṣyābhiṣekaḥ*, by which a king is to be reconsecrated to his office annually by the royal chaplain and the royal astrologer. In a clear allusion to this brahmanical ceremony Rājendravarman is described as being “consecrated every Puṣya by a stream of nectar poured from one hundred golden vases”.¹¹⁸ Our Indian sources reveal that the stream of nectar to which the inscription refers was melted butter. The king is to be covered with a blanket and then this butter is to be poured over him from eight, twenty-eight or one hundred and eight vases. The blanket (*ghṛtakambalam*) is then removed and he is bathed with the waters of the ‘Puṣya bath’ (*puṣyasnānāmbubhiḥ*).¹¹⁹

Then there are the recurrent royal fire-sacrifices of one hundred thousand oblations (Lakṣahoma) and ten million oblations (Koṭihoma):¹²⁰

115. K. 14, v. 5 (= K. 310, v. 6); K. 136 B, v. 28; K. 194, Khmer, A l. 14 (*rājābhiṣeka*); K. 254, v. 9; K. 273, v. 29; K. 377, v. 1; K. 661, v. 16; K. 806, v. 18 and 136; K. 989 A, v. 14. For this brahmanical ceremony see *Raghuvamśa* 17.8–20; *Viṣṇudharmottara*, Khaṇḍa 2, chapters 21–23 (→ *Agnipurāna*, chapters 218–219).

116. K. 485, v. 95c (the consecration of Indradevī as the chief queen of Jayavarman VII after the death of her younger sister Jayarājadevī): *tatpūrvajā nṛpatinā vihitābhiṣekā*. The consecration of the chief queen is required by *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.7.7c–8b, to be received by her either together with the king at the time of his initial consecration, performed by the royal chaplain and astrologer or, if later, by the king himself, as in the case of Indradevī: *evamguṇagaṇopetā narendreṇa sahānagha / abhiṣecyā bhaved rājye rājyasthena nṛpeṇa vā*.

117. K. 569 (*NIC* II–III, 166–171) of 1306 from Banteay Srei (Īśvarapura) records that Śrīndravarman (r. c. 1295–1307) was consecrated as Yuvarāja during the reign of Jayavarman VIII (1243–c. 1295). For this consecration in Indian sources see, e.g., a verse on occasions for the release of prisoners quoted without attribution by Vallabhadeva ad *Raghuvamśa* 17.19–20: *yuvarājābhiṣeke vā pararāṣṭrābhīmadane / putrajanmani vā mokṣo bandhanasya vidhīyate* ‘The release of prisoners is ordained when the crown prince is consecrated, when one invades another country, or when a son is born’; *Bhaṭṭikāvya* 12.501a: *kṛtābhiṣeko yuvarājarājye; Avadānāsataka* p. 209: *rājānam vijñāpayām āsa anujānīhi mām tāta bhagavacchāsane pravrajīṣyāmīti. rājovāca na śakyam etan mayā kartuṃ yasmāt te yuvarājābhiṣeko na cireṇa bhaviṣyātīti*; and *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna* f. 84r5: *anenaiva vidhānena yuvarājābhiṣecanam*.

118. K. 806, v. 66: *āmṛtyā dhārayā ...kalaśaśatāt kāladhautāt patantyā / puṣye puṣye bhiṣikto*. For evidence of this regular consecration (*puṣyābhiṣekaḥ, puṣyasnānam*) among the Khmers see also K. 686, v. 19 (reign of Rājendravarman, 943/4–968).

119. For the procedure of this ceremony see Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* 47 (*puṣyasnānādhyāyaḥ*) following the elder Garga; *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.152.2 and *Nilamata* 810 (monthly); *Ādipurāna* ll. 2744–2745; *Atharvavedaparīṣiṣṭa* 5; *Satkarmaratnāvalī*, part 2, p. 518: *ayaṃ cābhiṣekaḥ prativarṣam mahānavamyāṃ kartavyaḥ. puṣyābhiṣeko mahānavamyāṃ indrotsavo janmadine prativarṣam ity ātharvaṇasūtrāt. iti puṣyābhiṣekaḥ* ‘And this abhiṣeka should be done every year on Mahānavamī, because of the *Ātharvaṇasūtra*’s statement: “The Puṣyābhiṣeka every year on Mahānavamī and the Indra festival on [the king’s] birthday.” Thus the Puṣyābhiṣeka’. The “hundred” vases of the inscription were probably to be understood as ‘shorthand’ for the one hundred and eight of Garga’s rule. That ‘shorthand’ is not uncommon in Sanskrit Śaiva sources.

120. See *Atharvavedaparīṣiṣṭa* (on the rituals to be performed for the king by his Atharvavedic priest [*rājapurohitaḥ*]) 30a (*laghulakṣahomaḥ*), 30b (*bṛhallakṣahomaḥ*), and 31 (*koṭihomaḥ*); *Viṣṇudharmottara* 2.152.6: *saṃvatsarāt koṭihomaṃ kuryāc ca ghṛtakambalam* ‘after a year he should do the Koṭihoma and the Ghṛtakambala [= Puṣyābhiṣeka]’; 2.153.10: *asminn eva tathā kāle koṭihomaṃ samācaret / kṛtikyāṃ tatsamāptis tu yathā bhavati bhārgava* ‘O Bhārgava, he should do the Koṭihoma at this very time in such a way that it ends on the full-moon day of Kṛtika’; *Ādipurāna* ll. 2801–2803 (= *Brahmapurāna* as quoted in the *Rājadharmakāṇḍa* of the *Kṛtyakalpataru* of Lakṣmīdhara, p. 109): *dvau lakṣahomau kurvīta tathā saṃvatsaram prati / ekaṃ tu [ko]ṭihomaṃ tu yatnāt sarvābhayapradam / atharvavedavidhinā *sammantrya*

*bhagavat pāda kamrateñ añ gi ti añjeñ thve vraḥ koṭihoma vraḥ lakṣahoma vraḥ + + +
homa vraḥ pitryajña vraḥ + +yajña sap saṃvatsara gi*

K. 383, Khmer, ll. 33–35

Our Majesty [Sūryavarman I] invited [Our Lord the Venerable Guru Śrī Divākarapaṇḍita] to perform the annual Koṭihoma, Lakṣahoma, ...homa, Pitryajña, and ...yajña.¹²¹

Some idea of these fire-sacrifices may be formed from the many records in inscriptions and manuscripts of their performance for the Malla kings of the Kathmandu valley. A Newari document listing various rituals and the dates of their performance records two Koṭihomas for king Bhūpālendramalla of the independent kingdom of Kathmandu in 1693/4 and 1703/4 and tells us that the first lasted from the 6th of the dark half of Pauṣa to the 7th of the light half of Phālguna and the other from the 10th of the light half of Māgha to the 10th of the dark half of Phālguna, which is to say for forty-six and forty-five days respectively.¹²² This means that the Homas must have proceeded at a rate of over 200,000 oblations (*āhutiḥ*) a day with numerous priests working simultaneously, each at his own fire. According to another Nepalese source, the *Lakṣakoṭihomaprayeroga*, one should engage 4, 8 or 10 priests (*ṛtvik*) for a Lakṣahoma and 16, 20, 24, 64 or 100 for a Koṭihoma. This makes the frequent references in the Khmer Sanskrit inscriptions to their kings blocking out the light of the sun with the smoke of their countless sacrifices seem less like poetic exaggeration.¹²³

Of the two annual Yajña ceremonies mentioned after the great Homas in the passage just cited, that whose name survives intact, the Pitryajña, is the annual Śrāddha ceremony,

(em. : *sammantryam* Ed.) *ca [pu]rohitaiḥ* ‘After consulting his domestic priests he should take care to do two Lakṣahomas and one Koṭihoma that bestows freedom from all dangers every year following the procedures of the Atharvaveda’; *Nīlamata* 813: *saṃvatsarasyātha kāryau lakṣahomau* (conj. : *kāryo lakṣahomo* Ed.) *mahīkṣitā / koṭihomas tathā kārya eka eva divijottama / tayor vidhānaṃ vijñeyam kalpeṣv ātharvaṇeṣu ca* ‘The king, O best of brahmins, should do two Lakṣahomas and one Koṭihoma in the course of the year. Know that their procedure is [that taught] in the Kalpas of the Atharvaveda’.

121. Other references to the Koṭihoma and Lakṣahoma: K. 95, v. 28; K. 136 B, v. 6; K. 300, v. 20; K. 418 B; K. 528, v. 92; K. 692, v. 54; K. 806, v. 236, concerning Rājendravarman: *lakṣaṣo lakṣahomāgnau hutam yasyāpi hotrbhiḥ*; K. 872, v. 13.

122. See the *thyā saphū* (‘folded manuscript’) ‘A’ transcribed in REGMI 1965–66, 3:37 and 44.

123. K. 95, v. 22 (Yaśovarman I); K. 136 B, v. 4 (Sūryavarman I); K. 235, v. 18 (Udayādityavarman II); K. 263 C, v. 20 (Jayavarman V); K. 279 B1, v. 4 (Yaśovarman I); K. 286, v. 21 (Jayavarman II); K. 323, v. 40 (Yaśovarman I); K. 432, v. 5 (Yaśovarman I); K. 528, v. 92 (Rājendravarman): *lakṣādhvarotthaiḥ sthagayadbhir āsā dhūmair niruddhārkakarākarair yaḥ / divaṃ ca śātakratavīm ca kīrtim malīmasatvam yugapan nināya* ‘who simultaneously obscured the sky and the reputation of Indra with the clouds of smoke from his Lakṣahomas that filling the directions blocked out all the rays of the sun’; K. 528, v. 125 (Rājendravarman); K. 528, v. 154 (Rājendravarman); K. 677, v. 16 (Jayavarman IV); K. 806, v. 200 (Rājendravarman); K. 832, v. 5 (Yaśovarman I); K. 872, v. 13 (Rājendravarman): *yadyajñānala*dhūm*(corr. : *dhūm* Ed.) *yaughā lakṣahomādisambhavāḥ / meghāyante pade viṣṇos satatañ kāmavarṣiṇāḥ* ‘the masses of smoke in the domain of Viṣṇu produced by his offering fires in the Lakṣa- and other Homas are like clouds constantly raining down the fulfilment of his desires’. The ‘domain of Viṣṇu’ here is the sky. Cf. K. 235, v. 18.

Nepalese materials show that Śaiva and Śākta forms of these homas were developed, the brahmanical rituals being performed with non-Vedic mantras. One may ask, therefore, whether this may not also have been so among the Khmers. I think it was not. K. 806, v. 104, while not referring specifically to these two Homas speaks of the Homas of Rājendravarman as accomplished with the Mantras of the Vedas: *dhūmo ...yajñeṣu yasya ...jagāma ...divaṃ saha vedamantraiḥ* ‘in his sacrifices the smoke rose to heaven along with [the sound of] the Mantras of the Veda’.

in which offerings were presented through brahmins to the ancestors (*pitṛ-*), namely the three male ascendants of the patriline together with their spouses.

As for the other annual Yajña, whose name has been lost through damage, I propose that it was the Brahmayajña ‘the offering to Brahmā’. It has long been assumed that this Yajña, which is mentioned several times in the inscriptions,¹²⁴ is that which is taught under this name as one of the five basic daily obligations (*pañca yajñāḥ*) of the twice-born in mainstream brahmanical texts: that is to say the figurative sacrifice (*yajñah*) that is the daily recitation of a portion of the Vedas and other religious texts, otherwise called *svādhyāyah*. This practice was certainly followed by Khmer brahmins. For example, we are told in an inscription of the reign of Sūryavarman I (1002–1050), that the ceremonial capital (*puram*) was loud with the sound of brahmins engaged in this daily chanting;¹²⁵ and one of the contexts in which the Brahmayajña is mentioned in the Khmer inscriptions does associate it with sacred knowledge, since we find it there as an event that marks the beginning or end of the period of study with a Guru. But I propose that it is a proper sacrificial ceremony that is intended, a *yajñah* in the literal sense.

This conclusion is suggested by its occurrence in another context, in which it is paired with the *māṭṛyajña* ‘the sacrifice to the Mothers’ as a preliminary rite performed on the site on which a Liṅga is about to be installed:

vrah kaṃsteñ añ śrī lakṣmīpativarmma thve vrahmayajña māṭṛyajña ta gi bhūmi noḥ nu pan-lyañ suvarṇnaliṅga ta vrah sureñ pi vrah kaṃsteñ añ kanlaḥ vnaṃ mok samayajña sanme ni pi jaṃnuṃ mahāpanḍitta phon ta daṃnepra vrah kamrateñ añ śrī vidyādhipanḍita gi ta guru ni ta vrahmayajña vrah kamrateñ añ bhimapura ta thve māṭṛyajña vrah kamrateñ añ vlok ta panlyañ suvarṇnaliṅga.

Ka. 18 (NIC II-III:243, A ll. 18–20)

V.Ka.A. Lakṣmīpativarma [caused to be] performed a Brahmayajña and a Māṭṛyajña on this ground and then the golden Liṅga to be installed in the temple of Sureñ. V.Ka.A. Kanlaḥ Vnaṃ came [there]. Men learned in the proper times [for rites] (*samayajña*) agreed (*sanme*) to make the offerings together (*ni pi jaṃnuṃ*), great scholars beginning with V.K.A. Śrī Vidyādhipanḍita, the Guru for the Brahmayajña. V.K.A. Bhimapura celebrated the Māṭṛyajña. V.K.A. Vlok [was the guru for] the installation of the golden Liṅga.¹²⁶

124. K. 216 S, v. 5; K. 235, Khmer, D l. 66; K. 352 Khmer, N l. 22; K. 353 S, Khmer, ll. 20–23; K. 444, Khmer, A ll. 5–9; K. 523, Khmer, D, ll. 14–17; K. 702, v. 23; Ka. 18, Khmer, A l. 3 and 18.

125. K. 1002 (JACQUES 1968), v. 33: [*śa*]vdaśāstrādiniṣṇātaśavditānām mahat puram / yasya svādhyāśavdena śavdabrahmamayaṃ yathā ‘whose great *puram* seemed to embody the Veda through the sound of the private daily recitations of scholars well-versed in grammar and the other Śāstras’.

126. Pou takes *mok* and *samayajña sanme ni pi jaṃnuṃ mahāpanḍitta phon ta daṃnepra* ... together and translates as follows (with my interpretation of her parsing in parentheses): ‘vint (*mok*) se joindre à ses sacrifices (*samayajña*) où furent assemblés (*sanme*) de grands savants, en premier ... (*mahāpanḍitta phon ta daṃnepra*)’. I have rejected this interpretation because her translation of *samayajña* ‘to join in a sacrifice’ creates an implausible hapax and renders *sanme ni pi jaṃnuṃ* ‘agreed to make the offerings together’ pleonastic. She avoids that problem by translating only *sanme* (‘où furent assemblés’). I have preferred to take *samayajña* as Sanskrit *samaya-jña-*. This occurs frequently in religious contexts in the meaning ‘one who knows the proper occasion’. See, e.g., *Mahābhārata* 4.27.6ab: *samayaṃ samayajñās te pālayantaḥ śucivratāḥ*. It also occurs in both Śaiva and Bhāgavata texts meaning ‘one who knows the rules of the initiated’, in the special sense of one who has received the first grade of initiation. This is probably not what is intended here, since these officiants would have had to have been fully initiated and consecrated, though one cannot exclude the possibility that the term was also applied to initiates in general.

and it is confirmed, I propose, in a Sanskrit verse cited immediately after the lacunose Old Khmer text that lists these ritual duties. For we learn that the royal preceptor (Vraḥ Guru) was invited to perform them “every year in accordance with [the following] Śloka [composed] by Our Lord Sūryavarmadeva [himself]” (*sap saṃvatsara gi roḥ vraḥ śloka vraḥ pāda kamrateñ añ śrīsūryavarmadeva*):

– – *d guror hutavahe havir āhutir yat
samyag vidher vividhāvṛṣṭibhavaṃ praśasyaṃ
sasyāya tad vidhividhāv iha koṭihoma
koṭir hutis suvidhivat kurute grasiddhyai*
K. 383, v. 2 (A II. 35–36)

The verse is problematic. It is not just that its first two syllables have been lost. It is also that its meaning is obscured by grammatical incoherence and syntactic ambiguity. It is clear, however, that the verse refers to the benefits of three kinds of fire-sacrifice, which the context requires to be among those listed as the Vraḥ Guru’s duties. The third is the Koṭihoma. The first is conveyed in the relative clause and the second in the correlative clause that follows it, ending *sasyāya tad vidhividhau*. The crucial word there is *vidhividhau*. CÉDÈS and DUPONT took it to mean ‘in a ritual (*vidhau*) [performed] in accordance with injunction (*vidhi-*)’. But that is implausibly stilted Sanskrit for this sense and the passage so interpreted fails to provide the name of a sacrifice. There is a simple solution, which provides natural Sanskrit and satisfies the requirement of the context. That is to take *vidhividhau* in the meaning ‘in the ceremony (*-vidhau*) of Brahmā’, *vidhiḥ* being a commonly used name of that deity.¹²⁷ The second sacrifice, then, is the Brahmajajña. This supports the restoration *vraḥ pitṛyajña vraḥ brahmajajña* in the Khmer prose (K. 383: *vraḥ pitṛyajña vraḥ + + yajña*), but it also demonstrates that the Brahmajajña was a literal rather than a figurative sacrifice. For though the Sanskrit is incorrect in composition or transcription, it is clear that the meaning intended is that the same offerings that are made into the fire in the first sacrifice bring about the various timely rains (*vividhāvṛṣṭibhavaṃ*)¹²⁸ and so promote the grain harvest (*sasyāya*) in the second, that is to say, in the Brahmajajña.

There is also Old Javanese evidence for such a Brahmajajña. The *Deśawarṇana*, alias *Nāgarakṛtāgama*, completed in A.D. 1365 by Mpu Prapañca, Superintendent of Buddhist Affairs (*dharmādhyakṣa kasogatan*) at the court of Hayam Wuruk of Majapahit in East Java, refers to a *brahmajajña* in contexts that indicate that a ritual of worship rather than text recitation is intended. He tells us that the royal priest Śrījñānawidhi in performing the preliminaries to the postmortuary rites of the chief queen (*rājapatnī*) consecrated the ground for installation and in that context ‘performed a *brahmajajña* as his offering (*pūjā*)’;¹²⁹ and in an account of annual ceremonies for the welfare of the king he tells us that ‘the Śaivas and Bauddhas performed the *homa* and *brahmajajña* as their offering (*pūjā*)’.¹³⁰ One could not refer to the *brahmajajñaḥ* in the figurative sense of text-recitation as a *pūjā*.

127. See, e.g., K. 692, v. 43d: *caturānana vidhir*; *Amarakośa* 1.1.17d (among synonyms of *brahmā*).

128. CÉDÈS and DUPONT give *vividhāvṛṣṭibhavaṃ*. I have corrected this because the metre requires the third syllable to be short. As for the solecisms in the rest of the verse, I have understood *havir āhutir* as *havir āhutaṃ* and *koṭir hutis* as *koṭir hutā*.

129. *Deśawarṇana* 67.3: *sañ śrī jñānawidhi n lumakwani tēhēr mabrahmajajña n pamūjā*.

130. *Deśawarṇana* 83.6: *homa mwañ brahmajajñenulahakēn ira sañ śewa boddha n pamūjā*. It may be relevant that the centre-point of any ritual ground (*yāgabhūmiḥ*) is known as the ‘place of Brahmā’ (*brahmasthānam*); see, e.g., Bhojadeva, *Siddhāntasārapaddhati*, f. 6r (on entering the shrine for worship): *brahmasthāne om vāstoṣpataye brahmaṇe nama iti puṣpaṃ dattvā* ... One of the principal rites in the preparation of a site is the *Vāstupūjā*, the presentation of offerings to the deities of the 64 or 81

No details of the ritual are recorded. But among the supplements (*pariśiṣṭam*) of the *Atharvaveda*, short tracts which set out the ritual duties of the king's personal priest, there is one (19b) that gives the procedure of a *brahmayāgaḥ*. Since *yāgaḥ* and *yajñāḥ* are synonymous and since no other applicable *brahmayajñāḥ/brahmayāgaḥ* is taught in the brahmanical literature known to me, it seems at least probable that the Khmer and Javanese ceremonies were derived from it. In this Brahmā is worshipped in a Maṇḍala in a pavilion (*maṇḍapaḥ*) constructed for this purpose, a platform (*vediḥ*) is made to its south or west, a fire-sacrifice is celebrated and an *abhiṣekaḥ* given [to the king on that platform]. This is followed by the feeding of learned brahmins and the needy, the offering of a nocturnal *gaṇabaliḥ*, worship of the domestic deities, festivities in the palace, the feeding of Yogins and householders in their homes, and the usual markers of royal ceremonies in the civic domain: the temporary banning of the cutting down of trees and the butchering of animals, and the proclamation of a general amnesty throughout the kingdom. Finally the king should venerate his Guru. The benefits are said to be long life and the extension of the king's realm.¹³¹

Other brahmanical rituals are encountered in the inscriptions. We have seen that a Mātṛyajña is said to have been performed as a preliminary ritual on the site on which a Liṅga was to be installed. I propose that this was the worship of the Mother-goddesses (*mātrkāpūjā*) that is prescribed in Indian brahmanical sources as a preliminary rite in such ceremonies as rites of passage (*saṃskāraḥ*) and the consecration of homes or temples (*pratiṣṭhā*).¹³²

There is also the first of the three annual sacrifices mentioned in the Sanskrit verse attributed to Sūryavarman I. Though the Sanskrit is lacunose and somewhat incoherent (– *d guror hutavahe havir āhutir yat*) it is very probable that this was a *guruhomaḥ*, a sacrifice [in honour] of the Guru. Against this conjecture is the absence of any reference to a sacrifice with this name in brahmanical literature. But in its support is the fact that elsewhere in these inscriptions a royal Guru is described as *gurukoṭihomahotā*.¹³³ CÉDÈS took this to mean 'who performed the Koṭihoma for his Guru'. But this is highly implausible, since the Koṭihoma is a sacrifice performed for kings. The alternative is to take the compound to mean 'who performed the Guruhoma and the Koṭihoma'. In that case this ceremony too should be among those listed in the Khmer prose as the annual duties of the royal Guru. If so, it can only have been the third Homa of the list. Against this conclusion is the fact that CÉDÈS and DUPONT judge there to be a lacuna of three syllables in the text where its name is given (*vraḥ + + + homa*) while the restoration *vraḥ guruhoma* supplies only two (*guru-*). However, this objection is not decisive. For *guru* has the trisyllabic *ācārya* as a frequently used synonym. I propose, therefore, the restoration *vraḥ ācāryahoma*.

We also hear of the brahmanical practice of the daily pouring of libations of water to the ancestors (*pitṛtarpaṇam*). For in an inscription of 667 A.D. Siṃhadatta, the devout Śaiva physician of Jayavarman I, is praised as follows:

śivayajñena yo devān munīn addhyayanena ca

compartments of the square Maṇḍala of the Site (*vāstumaṇḍalam*) drawn upon it. Brahmā is worshipped with the presentation of various foods in the central four or nine compartments; see, e.g. *Somaśambhupaddhati* 4:55 and 57, vv. 83ab and 89c–91b.

131. *Atharvavedapariśiṣṭa* 19.1.1–19.5.9. I propose the following emendations to the published text: *pūrayed varṇakaiḥ* for *pūjayed varṇakaiḥ* in 19.2.1; and *madhyepadmaṃ tu saṃsthāpya brahmāṇaṃ* for *madhye padmaṃ tu saṃsthāpya brahmāṇaṃ* in 19.2.5.

132. On the *mātrkāpūjā* in this context see SANDERSON 1990, 62.

133. K. 692 of 1189/90 or 1195/6, v. 54.

pitṛmś cātarppayat toyais satputrakaranissṛtaiḥ
K. 53, v. 23

He satisfied the gods through his worship of Śiva, the sages through his recitation of sacred texts, and the ancestors through libations of water poured from the hands of a virtuous son.

That this refers to the daily libations that brahmanical tradition requires is not stated explicitly; but it is implied by the context, since the other two obligations, those of worship and reciting the scriptures, are daily duties. By speaking of these libations as poured from the hands of his son the author conveys that he has fulfilled his duty to the ascendants of his patriline, not merely by pouring the libations himself, which goes without saying since this is among the daily duties of any brahmin male, but also by fathering a son, since without a son to follow on the offerings to the ancestors would be interrupted.¹³⁴

Postfunerary rituals other than the annual Pitṛyajña are mentioned. We are told of Śrāddhas performed for the benefit of persons who have died leaving no-one to make these offerings to them. An inscription reports that a Śaiva hermitage abandoned in A.D. 949/50 had been restored by four men without heirs on the condition that their Śrāddhas would be performed by the head (*pādamūla*) of the hermitage,¹³⁵ and the foundation stele of one of the hermitages founded by Yaśovarman I rules that balls of rice (*piṇḍam*) must be offered [by the officiant] to persons who have died leaving no-one to make their postfunerary offerings (*apiṇḍāḥ*).

ye bhaktyā patitā yuddhe ye ca bhaktāḥ parāsavaḥ
apiṇḍāḥ kṛpaṇānāthavālavṛddhāś ca ye mṛtāḥ
eteṣāṃ eva sarvveṣāñ caturāḍhakatandulaiḥ
māsāvāsāne sarvvatra piṇḍaiḥ kurvvīta tarppaṇam
etasminn āśrame piṇḍaṅ kṛtvānīya ca sarvvaśaḥ
yaśodharataṭākānte tasminn eva tu nirvvaṇet
K. 279 C1, vv. 13–15

At the end of every month he should use four āḍhaka measures of rice to satisfy with rice-balls all the following: those who have fallen in battle out of loyalty [to the king], deceased loyal [servants of the crown], and the wretched, the unprotected, children and the elderly, who have died without anyone to offer them the postfunerary rice-balls. He should prepare the rice-balls in this hermitage, and then take them and offer them at the edge of the Yaśodhara reservoir.¹³⁶

134. The verse invokes the brahmanical doctrine of the three debts from which a twice-born male must free himself before he is entitled to retire from the world. There are two views expressed as to how he is to clear his debt to his ancestors: (1) by making the postfunerary offerings to them, and (2) by fathering offspring. The first is seen in *Mahābhārata* 12.281.9c–10c: *ṛṇavāñ jāyate martyas tasmād anṛṇatāṃ vrajet / svādhyāyena maharṣibhyo devebhyo yajñakarmanā / pitṛbhyāḥ śrāddhadānena* ‘Mortals are born with debts [to the great sages, the gods and their ancestors]. Therefore they should free themselves of them, through the daily recitation of the sacred texts, the rituals of sacrifice and the giving of postfunerary offerings’. The second is seen in *Baudhāyanadharmasūtra* 2.6.11.33: *jāyamāno vai brāhmaṇas tribhir ṛṇavā jāyate brahmacaryeṇa ṛṣibhyo yajñena devebhyāḥ prajayā pitṛbhyā iti* ‘The brahmin is born with three debts: to the sages, to the gods, and to his ancestors [, which he clears] by studying the scriptures, by offering sacrifices, and by fathering offspring’ and in *Manusmṛti* 6.35–37. Our inscription combines these two views.

135. K. 215, ll. 16–17: *āyāta ta pādamūla leṅ nirvvaṇeṇ dharmma yeṅ* ‘It is the responsibility of the officiant to perform the Śrāddha offerings of this foundation’.

136. This is the vast Yaśodharataṭāka (approx. 7 km. by 1.8 km [JACQUES 1999, 55]), now known as the Eastern Baray, excavated by Yaśovarman I at his newly founded capital Yaśodharapura (Angkor).

In discussing the group of stelae of which this is one Barth states that there is nothing in Indian Smṛti texts corresponding to this provision by the king for Śrāddha offerings for such persons, holding that the Indian rule is that only a relative of the deceased may perform the rite.¹³⁷ But that he was mistaken is clear from *Brahmapurāṇa* 220.78c–79b:

*sarvābhāve striyaḥ kuryuḥ svabhartṛṇām amantrakam
tadabhāve ca nṛpatiḥ kārayet tv akutumbinām*

If there is no-one else, women should do [the Śrāddha] for their husbands if they have no family, [but] without the Mantras; and if there is no wife then the king should have it done for them.

The principal here is that the heir and the person with the duty to make the postfunerary offerings are one and the same. In the absence of all others the king inherits the property of the deceased except, says Manu, in the case of a brahmin, whose property may never be taken by the king but must be given to a brahmin, preferably one learned in the Vedas. That these rules are relevant to the question of who has the responsibility to make the offerings is apparent from the fact that Vijñāneśvara quotes the passage of the *Manusmṛti* that states them (9.188–189) in this context ad *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 2.135–136.

Moreover, the case of the heirless individuals who had restored a foundation on the condition that its head should make their Śrāddha offerings (K. 215, ll. 16–17) may be understood as an application of the rule that in the absence of a son or close relative the Ācārya of the deceased may make the offerings.¹³⁸

We hear also of a Homa performed by the royal preceptor Divākarabhaṭṭa for the deceased queen Mahendradevī on the twelfth day after her death, an office for which her husband Rājendravarman rewarded him with the gift of two villages.

*894 śaka pūrṇamī phālguṇa nu vrah kamrateṅ aṅ divākarabhaṭṭa nivedana ta dhūli
vrah pāda dhūli jeṅ vrah kamrateṅ [aṅ śrī] jayavarmadeva kāla samrāc homa
dvādaśarātrī vrah pāda [vrah ā]jñā kanloṅ kamrateṅ aṅ ° riy sruk kandin nu sruk
supurāya pramān pūrvadiśa ° ta gi dhūli vrah pāda dhūli jeṅ vrah kamrateṅ aṅ stāc
dau śivaloka oy vrah karuṇā prasāda ta vrah kamrateṅ aṅ [divāka]rabhaṭṭa neḥ sruk
ta anle 2 gi pi vrah kamrateṅ aṅ + + + + vrah dakṣiṇā phley srāc dvādaśarātrī
K. 668 B, ll. 1–8*

In Śaka 894, on the full-moon day of Phālguṇa V.K.A. Divākarabhaṭṭa informs D.V.P.D.J.V.K.A. Śrī Jayavarmadeva that on the occasion of his completing the Homa of the twelfth day for V.P.V.A. the deceased queen [Mahendradevī] K.A., Sruk Kandin and Sruk Supurāya in the Pūrvadiśa District were given to V.K.A. Divākarabhaṭṭa by the favour of D.V.P.D.J.V.K.A. the king who has gone to Śivaloka [Rājendravarman]. These two Sruks V.K.A. [Divākarabhaṭṭa received as (?)] his sacred dakṣiṇā as the result of the completion of [the rites of] the twelfth day.

This was no doubt a Homa in connection with the offering of the first Ekoddiṣṭa Śrāddha after the period of eleven days of postmortuary impurity (*āśaucam*) had ended,¹³⁹ though

137. See BARTH in BERGAIGNE 1893, 414.

138. *Mitākṣarā* p. 223 ad *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 2.135–136: *bandhūnām abhāve ācāryaḥ. tadabhāve śiṣyaḥ. putrābhāve yaḥ pratyāsannaḥ sapinḍaḥ. tadabhāve ācāryaḥ. ācāryasyābhāve 'ntevāsīty āpastambasmarānāt* ‘In the absence of kin the Ācārya. In his absence a pupil [of the Ācārya], in accordance with the teaching of Āpastamba: “in the absence of a son a close Sapiṇḍa relative, in his absence the Ācārya, and in the absence of the Ācārya a pupil”.’

139. After the period of impurity (*āśaucakālah*) ends the deceased receives his or her first Ekoddiṣṭa Śrāddha on the twelfth day after death and others after a month and a month and a half and every month

in the absence of further information we cannot know whether the ritual was conducted in its purely brahmanical form. Given the prevalence of Śaiva initiation it is possible that the queen's postmortuary rites were performed in the parallel form that the Śaivas elaborated for their own initiates.¹⁴⁰

Brahmanism, then, was certainly present among the Khmers, at least within the élite of society. But I see no evidence that it amounted to a fourth religion. The Indian Śaivas claimed to go beyond Brahmanism through practice authorized by their own, higher bodies of scripture; but they underwent Brahmanism's rites of passage, performed many of its regular ceremonies in addition to their own, and adhered to its regulations concerning such matters as caste-endogamy, inheritance, and the administration of law under royal authority. Only their path to salvation was peculiarly theirs. The Brahmanism that we find among the Khmers was of this subsidiary kind. There is no trace of the exclusive variety that many in India considered to be the sole means of access to salvation, denying the validity of the Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava scriptures.

What is more, the subsidiary Brahmanism of the Khmers was less substantial than that of their Indian co-religionists. Its influence did not penetrate to those levels that provided the primary criteria of brahmanical orthopraxy in India. The Khmers eagerly adopted the etiquette and ceremonial of the Indian courts; they cremated their dead; and they allowed India to influence their personal habits, avoiding the left hand in eating, and cleaning their teeth with toothsticks;¹⁴¹ but they did not adopt Brahmanism's dietary preferences and taboos, except in the case of special restrictions adopted by Śaiva ascetics.¹⁴² Thus we have two inscriptions in meditation caves that speak of such ascetics living on a diet of milk, a practice attested in Indian Śaiva sources;¹⁴³ but reliefs on the wall of the Bayon

after that until a full year has elapsed. Then the deceased (*pretah*) becomes an ancestor (*pitā*) through the Sapiṇḍikaraṇa ritual and from then on receives annual Pārvaṇa Śrāddhas, unless the deceased is a woman without a son. In that case she does not join the ancestors through the Sapiṇḍikaraṇa and receives an annual Ekoddiṣṭa rather than Pārvaṇa Śrāddha. See, e.g., *Brahmapurāṇa* 220.64–75.

140. On the Śaiva rites for the dead and their relation with their brahmanical prototypes see SANDERSON 1995, 31–36.

141. See MABBETT and CHANDLER 1996, 128, 129 and 133. Information on Khmer funerary practice is meagre. According to a passage in the official history of the Sui Dynasty (*Suishu*), covering the years 581–617 and compiled during the years 629–636, that is included in Ma Duanlin's *Wenxian tongkao*, an encyclopaedic history of institutions published in A.D. 1317, cremation was the norm though there were some who simply exposed their dead (translation in CÉDÈS 1968, 76). In Zhou Daguan's memoir, based on his visit in A.D. 1296–7 and published at some time before 1312 (PELLIOT 1951, 37–38) it is exposure that is reported as the norm. He notes that cremation was gradually increasing, but mostly among the descendants of Chinese (PELLIOT 1951, 24). The difference between the two reports is probably the result of the different perspectives of the two divisions of Khmer society, that of the common people, who exposed their dead, and that of the élite, who cremated theirs following Indian rites. The *Suishu* says that the dead were attended either by Buddhist monks and nuns or by Taoist priests. The latter term is probably a reference to Śaiva ascetics. Excavations at Nen Chua and Go Thap in the Mekong Delta have uncovered brick-lined chambers containing cremated human remains with gold leaves showing brahmanical symbols and other mortuary offerings. Radiocarbon dates suggest occupation during the periods A.D. 450–650 for the former and A.D. 400–600 for the latter (HIGHAM 2001, 29–31).

142. Similarly REID (1988, 34–35) points to the fact that brahmanical dietary rules “had little practical effect in restricting sources of protein” among the Javanese.

143. K. 156 (10th century), v. 10cd, concerning the ascetic Kambu: *gurudevāgnisadbhaktir ācāryyaḥ kṣīrabhug yamī* ‘an ascetic [Śaiva] Ācārya living on milk, truly devoted to his Guru, his deity, and the sacred fire’; v. 16ab: *kṣīrāṣī yo *mahātejāḥ* (corr. : *mahātejā* Ep.) *pūjyaś śrīkamvubhūbhṛtām* ‘an illustrious eater of milk, venerated by the kings of Kambu’. K. 431 (9th century), v. 4, tells us of another such Śaiva ascetic inhabiting the cave Indraguhā ‘who adhered to the ascetic observance of Sadāśiva [=

temple of Jayavarman VII (r. 1181–c. 1210) depict fishing with nets and a kitchen in which two cooks are about to plunge a whole pig into a boiling cauldron; and Chinese sources report that the Khmers' diet included cakes soaked in meat gravy and that they reared chicken, ducks, sheep and geese.¹⁴⁴ The *Manusmṛti*, the foremost brahmanical authority on such matters, enjoins the avoidance of fish and strictly prohibits the eating of the meat of the domestic pig or hen, saying that any twice-born person who eats these loses his caste.¹⁴⁵

Indeed inscriptions show that pork, goat and fish were eaten by the Khmers even in religious feasts. Thus on the occasion of the erecting of boundary-stones in 1089 an inscription records a donation of food that includes two pigs and four goats;¹⁴⁶ and an inscription of the reign of Sūryavarman I (1002–c. 1050) speaks of a feast that required two-thousand bowls, two pigs, eight hundred large fish, and an unstated quantity of beer (*surā*).¹⁴⁷

This too was a feast in a religious context. The purpose of the inscription is to record a royal decree requiring [the head of] a hermitage and the dignitaries (*pradhāna*) of two localities to pay with land for the equipment and materials (*kriyā*) of a *vraḥ rudraśānti*. The foods and utensils are part of what was received for that purpose. In his edition of this

Suśiva], [sustaining himself by] drinking [only] milk' (*kṣīraṃ piban ...suśivavratasṭhaḥ*). For this voluntary dietary restriction in Indian Śaivism see *Niśvāsaguhya* f. 82r1: *devaṃ pūjyāgnau juhuyād auḍumbarasamidhānāṃ tryaktānāṃ sahasraṃ trisandhyaṃ kṣīrāśī sapta dināni juhuyāt. cīrṇavidyāvratato bhavati* 'At each of three junctures of the day after he has worshipped Śiva he should make offerings into the fire of a thousand sticks of Uḍumbara wood smeared with the three [sweet substances: milk, butter and sugar]. He should do this fire-sacrifice for seven days living on milk. He will then have completed the observance of his Mantra'; *Niśvāsakārikā* 60.35 concerning the *vāgīśvarīvratam*: *śālipiṣṭalabhuñjānaḥ kṣīrabhuk sādhaśevaraḥ / māsam ekaṃ vratam kuryāt sarvakāmaprasiddhaye* 'Eating rice-flour [or] consuming [only] milk the excellent master of Mantras should practice the observance for one month in order to achieve his every desire'; *Picumata* 21.95: *careḍ devyāvratam hy etan nirācāro jitendriyaḥ / atha vā kṣīrabhojī syād gḥṛtapraśanam ārabhet* 'Free of orthopraxy, with his senses under control, he should practice this observance of the Goddess. Either he should live on milk; or he should eat clarified butter'; *Goraḥśasataka* 53c–54: *kaṭvamlalavanatyāgī kṣīrabhojanam ācaret / brahmacārī mitāhārī tyāgī yogaparāyaṇaḥ / abdād ūrdhvaṃ bhavet siddho nātra kāryā vicāraṇā* 'Giving up salt and pungent and astringent foods he should live on milk. Celibate, eating little, abandoning all attachments and intent on meditation he will achieve his goal after a year. Of this there should be no doubt'. Similarly K. 91 (no earlier than the reign of Jayavarman VI [1080–1107]) tells us that the Kavīśvaraṇḍita, the Guru and counsellor of Sūryavarman I, followed the religious discipline of the Pañcarātra and lived on clarified butter: *vraḥ kamrateñ añ srī kavīśvaraṇḍita qji māṭṭpākṣa [ye]ñ mān śīla pañcarātra *gḥṛtāhāra* (corr. : *gḥṛnāhāra* CÆDÈS).

144. See GITEAU 1976, 35b–38a; and *ibid.* fig. 28 and fig. 92 for the scenes of fishing and of the kitchen with the whole pig. The rearing of chickens on temple land is forbidden in K. 367, l. 10.

145. *Manusmṛti* 5.12ab; 5.14cd; 5.15cd; 5.19: *chatrākaṃ viḍvarāhaṃ ca laśunaṃ grāmakuḥṭam / palāṇḍum grñjanaṃ caiva matyā jagdhvā pated dvijaḥ* 'a twice-born person who knowingly eats mushrooms, the domestic pig, garlic, the domestic hen, onion or *the red onion (?) will certainly lose his caste'. This is considered equal to the major sin (*mahāpātakam*) of drinking alcoholic liquor (*surāpānam*); see *Manusmṛti* 11.56.

146. K. 258 A, l. 23: *kriyā jrvak 2 vave 4 rañko thlvañ 5 marīca qvar 2* 'food [that I gave]: 2 pigs, 4 goats, 5 thlvañ of husked rice, 2 qvar of pepper'.

147. K. 353 N, ll. 31–33: *jrvak 2 (32) ti saṃlāp pi oy pāy rañko thlvañ 5 ti taṃtām tr aruñ slik 2 khāl slik 5 ceḥ 5 dlah 6 (33) vāñ dik surā saṃlo sthāli ...* '2 pigs to be slaughtered for food; 800 big fish; 2000 bowls; five jars; 6 metal cooking-pots; water-jars (?); beer; meat gravy (*saṃlo*); *śīli* pots; ...'. Zhou Dagan reports four types of fermented drinks consumed by the Khmers, made from mixing water and an agent of fermentation with (1) honey, (2) certain leaves, (3) rice, and (4) sugar; see PELLIOU 1951, 29.

inscription CÆDÈS is not sure whether the words *vraḥ rudraśānti* name a dignitary or a temple.¹⁴⁸ But what is referred to here is neither a person nor a temple. It is a Śaiva ceremony. The purpose of a Rudraśānti ritual is to counter ills of all kinds but above all national disasters, epidemics and famines. Its procedure (*kalpaḥ*) and myth of origin (*itihāsaḥ*) are the subject of a chapter of the Śaiva scripture *Bṛhatkālottara*;¹⁴⁹ and an abbreviated redaction of the section on the procedure has been incorporated in the *Agnipurāṇa* (*Adhyāya* 324). The foodstuffs and beer were evidently required for a feast held at the conclusion of a performance of this ritual, probably at some time of widespread distress. Such feeding, of brahmins and others, is, as is well known, a required subsidiary of all major Indic rituals, and in apotropaic rituals of whatever scale. This too, then, would have been a religious rather than a secular feast.¹⁵⁰

Khmer patterns of kinship, inheritance and property-rights also remained largely unaffected. The passing of office from a man to his sister's son seems to have been the norm among Khmer brahmins, and it remained widespread even in royal lineages, where patrilineal succession did make inroads.¹⁵¹

Women, moreover, appear as owners and disposers of property in their own right, a role from which Indian brahmanical tradition excluded them.¹⁵² Thus K. 216 S of A.D. 1006/7 reports that Madhyadeśā, a woman in service at the court, donated land and other property to her Guru after a Brahmayañña, and yet other lands to the Śiva installed at Śivapāda; and the Khmer portion of this inscription lists slaves given by two men to Teñ Umā, the granddaughter of Madhyadeśā; K. 165 N of A.D. 953 records that Me Indrānī, Me Devakī and Me Neṃ, three female members of the family of Tāñ Kaṃrateñ Añ Mahendradevī joined with Vāp Pañ, the chief (*mūla*) of the corps of Bhāgavata servants,

148. IC 5:134, n. 2. Names in -śānti are not uncommon in the inscriptions, e.g. Kumāraśānti (K. 1), Jñānaśānti (K. 21), Bhavaśānti (K. 657), Bhāśānti (K. 561) and Śikhāśānti (K. 382).

149. *Bṛhatkālottara*, ff. 85v3–90v6: *rudraśāntiṇīpaṭalaḥ*. On the purpose of the ceremony see f. 87r2–v3: *rudraśāntiṇī pravakṣyāmi śivāṃ sarvārthasādhanīm / mānuṣānāṃ hitārthāya samam rudreṇa bhāṣitām / sarvvavighnāḥ praṇaśyanti śrutvainām pāpanāśanīm / duḥsvapnā vyādhayaś caiva grahāś caiva diśo daśa /rudraśāntiṇī namasyāmi vetālānāṃ vināśanīm / narānāṃ upasṛṣṭānāṃ devāyatana-veśmasu / yeśāṃ na garbhamaṃbhūtiḥ kulahāniś ca jāyate / yatra jātā vinaśyanti bhavanti ca napuṃsakāḥ / mārī cotpādyate yatra satataṃ ca grṛhe grahāḥ / garbhaḥ pataty akāle ca rudraṃ vā yatra jāyate / durbhikṣeṇaiva pīḍyante rāṣṭrotpātaiś ca dāruṇaiḥ / gaṇā yatra virudhyante bhrātaraś cāpy anekāśaḥ / pitā *mātā (corr. : mātās Cod.) tathā caiva kandalopahate grṛhe / paśyanti ca kapim svapne bījaṃ kṣetre na rohati / gāvo tha paśavaś caiva dāsāḥ karmakarā api / grṛhe sthitā virudhyante tatra śāntiṇī prayojayet / kūpo vā garjate yatra pṛṣṭhavaṃśaś ca bhidyate / taravo nāhatāś caiva sravanti rudhiraṃ bahu / devatāś caiva vṛkṣāś ca nṛtyanti ca hasanti ca / akāle puṣpītā vṛkṣāḥ phalitāś cāpy anekāśaḥ / ulkāpātāś ca jāyante bhūmikampāś ca dāruṇāḥ / nimittair aśubhair ebhir anyaiś cāpi sudāruṇaiḥ / ekāgrāḥ (corr. : ekāgram Cod.) prayato bhūtvā tatra śāntiṇī prayojayet. However, the Newar *Rudraśānti* mentions only national calamities, epidemics and famines, f. 19r5: *dvīpamārī-mahotpātaśāntiyartham*; f. 19r9–v1: *mahājanakṣayaprasāntiyartham deśotpātamahāmārībhayaśāntiyartham*; and f. 26v8: *iti śrīrudraśānti mahāmāridurbhikṣaprasāntividhiṃ samāptā*.*

150. See, e.g., *Śāṅkhāyanagrhyasūtra* 1.2.1: *karmāpavarge brāhmaṇabhojanam* 'at the close of the ritual the feeding of brahmins [should take place]'. For the case of apotropaic rites (*śāntividhiḥ*) see the *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* 1.295–308 (*grahaśāntiprakaraṇam*). The Newar *Rudraśānti* Paddhati likewise rules a meal (*samayabhojya*) as the last act of the proceedings, after the dismissing of the deity from the fire and the presentation of offerings to virgin girls (f. 23v7–8): (*agnivisarjana yāya. kaumāriyāga. samayabhojya. iti śrīrudraśānti* ...). For the meaning of *samayabhojya* see MANANDHAR 1986 s.v. *samay/samae*/, TAMOT 2000 s.v. *smaya, samaya dyāhā*, ISWARANAND 1995, s.v. *samae*, and LEVY 1990, 326, 642 (*samhae*).

151. See Adhir CHAKRAVARTI 1982; VICKERY 1998, 258–270.

152. *Manusmṛti* 8.416a: *bhāryā putraś ca dāsāś ca traya evādhanāḥ smṛtāḥ* 'Three are held to be without property: a wife, a son [before partition] and a slave'.

to install a [Viṣṇu] Cāmpesvara in Dvāravatī and to unite its personnel with that of another deity of this name; and K. 692 of A.D. 1189/90 or 1195/6 tells us that when Sūryapaṇḍitasabhāpati (Bhūpendrapaṇḍita II) installed images of both his parents he did so in conjunction with his wife.¹⁵³

We also find evidence that women could officiate as priests. We learn that when there was no available male in a lineage of Bhāgavatas designated to supply the presiding officiant of the Viṣṇu temple at Kadeñ, a woman of the family was to be ordained for that purpose.¹⁵⁴ Nor is it probable that this arrangement was exceptional among the Khmers, for we find it also in the royal Śaiva cult of the Devarāja. In the Sdok Kak Thom inscription of A.D. 1053, to which we owe most of our knowledge of this cult, we are told that after its inauguration by king Jayavarman II around the turn of the eight and ninth centuries he and the brahmin Hiranyadāma agreed that the right to conduct the worship of the god should pass from Śivakaivalya to men or women in his maternal line:

*tanmātrvaṃśe yatayas striyo vā
jātā ॐ – tra niyuktabhāvāḥ
tadyājakās syur na kathañcid anya
iti kṣitīndradvijakalpanāsīt*

K. 235, v. 31

The king and the foremost of brahmins provided that ascetics or women born in his [Śivakaivalya's] maternal lineage, and no others under any circumstances, should be appointed to this ...and perform its worship.

CÆDÈS and DUPONT chose to translate this passage in a manner that eliminates reference to the right of women by taking *striyo* not as a nominative plural ('ascetics or women born in his maternal lineage') but as an ablative singular ('ascetics born from a woman in his maternal lineage'). But this asks us to accept an unnaturally stilted use of Sanskrit in an inscription whose Sanskrit is otherwise of a high standard of correctness

153. K. 692, v. 57: *asthāpayad bhagavatīm jananīm satīm śrībhūpendrapaṇḍitapituḥ padapānsulavdhyai / śrīsūryapaṇḍitasabhāpatir ātmarūpaṃ bhaktyaitayos sahakalatram atiṣṭh[i]pad yaḥ.*

154. K. 989 B, ll. 10–11 (of A.D. 1007) referring to an edict of Jayavarman II (r. c. A.D. 770–c. 834) concerning the Vaiṣṇava temple of the God of Kadeñ (*kamrateñ jagat kadeñ*): *vraḥ śāsana pre santāna steñ rau ta phjuḥ purohita kamrateñ jagat kadeñ ° daha qyat santāna ta puruṣa (11) ley strijana ta qvyah mān ṛtusnāta lah ta vvaṃ ṛtusnāta ley lah pvās bhāgavatī pre phjuḥ kamrateñ jagat kadeñ* 'A royal edict [of Jayavarman II] ordered that the descendants of Steñ Rau should serve as the officiants (*purohita*) of the God of Kadeñ, and if there is no male descendant that a woman who is *qvyah*, who has bathed after menstruation or who has not, should be ordained as a Bhāgavatī (a female Bhāgavata) and serve the God of Kadeñ'. CÆDÈS (tr., *IC* 7, 183) understood *ṛtusnāta lah ta vvaṃ ṛtusnāta ley lah* to mean 'nubiles ou non nubiles'. VICKERY rightly finds fault with this rendering and proposes instead 'women who no longer menstruate or who have not begun to menstruate' (1998, 220, 419–420), taking *qvyah* to mean 'finished with' and apparently having it govern *ṛtusnāta*. However, that too is unsatisfactory, however well it accords with anthropological expectations about menstruation taboos, since it is implausible that prepubertal girls were ordained as temple priests. The Sanskrit term *ṛtusnāta*- adopted by Old Khmer refers to a woman who has bathed at the end of the five days of impurity caused by her menstruation and is thereby considered ready to conceive, it being obligatory for the husband to attempt to procreate a son at this time; see, e.g., *Parāśarasamṛti* quoted by Kullūka ad *Manusmṛti* 3.45: *ṛtusnātām tu yo bhāryām sannidhau nopagacchati / ghorāyām bhrūnahatyāyām patate nātra saṃśayah*; Trilocanaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 52: *ṛtusnātā yadā patnī tadā pañcadināvadhi / sevyā vipreṇa putrārtham anyathā bhrūnahā bhavet*. I tentatively propose, therefore, that *ṛtusnāta* here is extended to mean 'of child-bearing age' and that accordingly *vvaṃ ṛtusnāta* means 'no longer of child-bearing age'.

and lucidity; and, more conclusively, it overlooks the crucial word *vā* ('or'). Women, then, had the right to serve as priests, if only in the absence of a qualified male.¹⁵⁵

It seems, moreover, that high-born women were not barred by their gender from access to all positions in the administration. We learn that after the death of king Rājendravarman (r. 944–c. 968) Prāṇā, the daughter of his sister, was put in charge of the private secretaries of his successor Jayavarman V (r. c. 968–c. 1000/1).¹⁵⁶

As for caste, adherence to which is so central an element of brahmanical orthopraxy in India, our sources use its language to distinguish between brahmins and the 'kṣatriya' rulers they served; but marriage between brahmin men and women of the Khmer royal families was common, as it was in the neighbouring principalities of the Chams, kings of both peoples boasting of brahmin-kṣatriya descent;¹⁵⁷ and most of the rest of society is referred to without caste-differentiation as 'the common people' (*sāmānyajanaḥ*, *sāmānyāḥ*):¹⁵⁸

*rājakūṭyantare rājadvijātīnṛpasūnavah
viśeyur atra nirddoṣan ta evābharaṇānvitāḥ
tadanyas tu sasāmānyajano noddhataveṣaṇaḥ*
K. 95 A, v. 39–41b

Only the king, brahmins and the prince(s) may enter this royal house of retreat wearing their ornaments without fault. Others than they, and the common people, should not be dressed in finery.

and, in the Lolei inscription of Yaśovarman I (r. 889–910) prescribing the punishments that should be meted out to those who infringe the rules of conduct in a hermitage:

*78 ye śāsanam idan darppāl laṅghayeyur yyadi dvijāḥ
vadhadaṇḍādyanarhatvān nirvvāsyās ta ito ṅganāt
79 rājaputrās tu dāpyās te hemaviṅśatpalair mmitam
tadarddhavinayah kāryyo nṛpatijñātimantriṅām*

155. CÉDÈS and DUPONT 1943–46, 96: '« Que les yatis nés d'une femme de ce mātrvaṃṣa et préposés... ici, soient prêtres de ce culte et jamais d'autres ! » Telle fut la règle des brahmanes royaux'. I also reject their translation of *kṣitīndradvija-* as 'brahmanes royaux' (literally 'king-brahmins'). This too is implausible. The preferable alternative ('the king and the foremost of brahmins') fits the context perfectly and is supported by the Old Khmer parallel in ll. 76–77 of side 3: *vraḥ pāda parameśvara nu vrāhmaṇa hiraṇyadāma oy vara śāpa pre santāna steṅ añ śivakaivalya gi ta siṅ nā kamrateṅ jagat ta rāja vvaṃ āc ti mān qnak ta dai ti ta siṅ ta noḥh* 'V.P. Parameśvara [Jayavarman II] and the brahmin Hiraṇyadāma made a solemn oath requiring the lineage of Śivakaivalya to officiate before the Kamrateṅ Jagat ta Rāja and forbidding any other persons to do so'. On women with cult responsibilities, sometimes called *kloṅ mratāñ*, mentioned in pre-Angkorean inscriptions, see VICKERY 1998, 163.

156. K. 136 A, v. 24: *śiṣṭānvayācāraguṇā mrte rājendravarmanī sāpy abhyantaralekhinām adhipā jayavarmmaṇaḥ* 'Possessing the religious observances and virtues of her cultured lineage she became the chief of the private secretaries of Jayavarman after Rājendravarman's death'.

157. K. 134 of A.D. 781/2, v. 1 re Jayavarman (probably Jayavarman II): *śrījayavarmanī nṛpatau ... brahmakṣatrāñśabhava*; K. 287 (undated) re Jayavarman VII: *dvijarājavamśyah*; K. 528 of 952, v. 10, re Sarasvatī, wife of the brahmin Viśvarūpa, mother of Mahendradevī, the mother of Rājendravarman: *vrahmakṣatraparamparodayakarī*; C. 73a = M. 7, l. 3, re Rudravarma I (6th century), son of a brahmin (C. 96 = M. 12, v. 3: *dvijātipravarātmaḥ*): *brahmakṣatriyakulatilake*; C. 25 = M. 23 of 799, v. 2 re Indravarma I: *brahmakṣatrapradhāno*.

158. This terminology is also found in Old Javanese; see ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v. *sāmānyajana* and *caturśāmānya* (*sic*). Similar is the distinction in Balinese society between the gentry (*trivangsa* [*trivamaśa*]) comprising title-groups classified as brahmin, kṣatriya and vaiśya, and commoners comprising title-groups classified as śūdra, the latter comprising about ninety per cent of the population; see HOBART et al. 2001, 75–82; GEERTZ 1980, 26–27 and 148.

80 *tadarddhakan tu dāpyās te hemadaṇḍātapatrināḥ*
tasyāpy arddhan tu mukhyānām śreṣṭhinām vinayo mataḥ
 81 *dāpyās tadarddhavinayaṃ śaivavaiṣṇavakādayaḥ*
tasyāpy arddhan tu vinayas sāmānyesu samīritaḥ
 82 *dhanan dātum aśaktās syus sāmānyā yadi mānuṣāḥ*
prṣṭhe vetreṇa tān hanyāc chatam ity anuśāsanam
 K. 323, v. 78–82

It is ruled that if out of arrogance brahmins should transgress this order they should be expelled from these precincts, since it is not fitting to chastise them with corporal punishments, and the like. Princes should be fined twenty Palas of gold. [Other] relatives of the king, and ministers, should be fined half that. [Other dignitaries] with golden-handled parasols should pay a fine of half that amount. Leading merchants should be fined half as much [2.5]. Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava and other [ascetics] should be fined half that. The fine for common people is set at half that. If a common person cannot pay his fine he should receive one hundred blows of the cane upon his back.¹⁵⁹

The superficiality of the concept of caste among the Khmers is also evident in the fact that *varṇaḥ*, the Indian Sanskrit term for the [four] caste-classes from brahmin to Śūdra, was put to other use in Cambodian Sanskrit and Old Khmer. There it denotes title-groups or corporations associated with various kinds of royal service. A person could be honoured by enrolment into such a Varṇa, and new Varṇas could be created by royal decree.¹⁶⁰

159. See also K. 279 C1, v. 10: *sāmānyamānavān sarvvān vālavṛddharujāvitān / dīnānāthāṃś ca yatnena bhared bhaktauśadhādibhiḥ*; K. 904 B, l. 28: *ājñā vraḥ kaṃmrātān añ ta vrāhmaṇa tel nirvvāsyā sāmānya śarīradaṇḍa*.

160. See, e.g., K. 157, v. 12: *kontyākhyāṃ bhāgineyīm svām nṛpatau tām nivedya yaḥ / rājñōpaskarageṣu sevivarṇṇe py atiṣṭhipat* ‘who offered Kontī, the daughter of his sister, to the king and had him place her in the Varṇa of the servants in the houses of the utensils’; K. 205, v. 12: *tadguṇacoditamanasā narapatinā sādareṇa sa prathite / varṇṇe hemakarāṅke sakulapuro lekhitō + +* ‘persuaded by his virtues the king eagerly enrolled him with [all the members of his] family’s settlement in the celebrated Gold Cup Varṇa’; K. 228, v. 17: *sa cā ∪ varṇṇottamatām prapede* (CÉDÈS conjectures *cāravarṇṇottamatām*) ‘he become the leader of the ...Varṇa’; K. 278, v. 8: *śrīsūryavarmmaṇo rājye varṇṇabhāge kṛte pi yaḥ / saṃpadam prāpya sadbhaktiā varṇṇaśreṣṭhatvasamsthitaḥ* ‘who, when the Varṇas were distinguished during the reign of Sūryavarman, obtained wealth as the reward of his outstanding loyalty and became the leader of the Varṇa(s)’; K. 444 (ed. POU 2001, 130–138), A ll. 11–18: *man srā[c] vidhi mān vraḥ śāsana dhūli vraḥ pāda dhūli je[n] vraḥ kamrateñ añ ta kamrateñ añ ta vraḥ guru pre res paṃnvās āy [ta neh] saptavarṇṇa [nu kule] nai ācāryyapradhāna pra[dvān] mok duk mūla khmuk vraḥ kralā arccana 20 mūla karmmāntara [20 o]y cralo phle sruk sre bhūmyākara leñ [s]iddhi jā varṇṇa neh ta vyar* ‘When the ritual had been completed there was an order from Our Lord the King to Our Lord the Venerable Guru instructing [him] to choose men in holy orders from the existing seven Varṇas and [from] the families of the Principal Ācāryas up till now in order to establish 20 Chiefs of Khmuks for the hall of worship and 20 Chiefs of Karmmāntaras [and] to give them exclusive title to the revenues of these two Varṇas: villages, rice-fields and whatever wealth may be in the ground’; *ibid.* B, ll. 16–18: *vraḥ karuṇā [duk jā] varṇṇa [khmuk] vraḥ [kralā arccana] jā varṇṇa karmmāntara* ‘The royal compassion established the Varṇa of the Khmuks of the hall of worship and that of the Karmmāntaras’; K. 194, l. 8: *varṇa karmmāntara* (concerning Divākarapaṇḍita, the Guru of Jayavarman VI, Dharaṇḍravarman and Sūryavarman II and a member of this Varṇa); K. 534, v. 12cd: *prāpa paṃcām varṇṇeṣy adhīsatām* ‘he was appointed chief of the Varṇas of the guards’; K. 569 (ed. POU 2001, 166–171), l. 17: *qnak varṇṇa khnar grāñ* ‘the men of the title group of Khnar Grāñ’; K. 717, v. 16: *rājādhiraḥ naganetrarandhre devīpurasthā janatās tadānim / cakāra cāmīkarakāravarṇṇe nivedanāt tasya suśilpavuddhīm* ‘Then as a result of the information received from him the Overlord of Kings enrolled the people then in Devīpura [knowing them to be] highly skilled in their art, in the Varṇa of the goldsmiths, in 927’; K. 989 B, ll. 8–9: *ta gi vraḥ rājya parameśvara gi nu res qji yeñ ta*

The society of the Khmers also included persons called *khñuṃ* (pre-Angkorean *kñuṃ*) or *dāsa* (m.) / *dāsī* (f.) in the Khmer texts, and *dāsaḥ/dāsī* in the Sanskrit.¹⁶¹ The Sanskrit terms mean slave (male/female); and though that term in the sense of an absolutely unfree and property-less person is not applicable to all categories among the Khmers' *khñuṃ*,¹⁶² it is certainly applicable in general. For our inscriptions speak of their being bought, stating their purchase prices,¹⁶³ of their being donated together with their offspring to persons, or to temples as 'slaves of a god' (*khñuṃ vraḥ*, *devadāsa*),¹⁶⁴ along with land, livestock and other valuables, exchanged (K. 222), given to an officiant as payment for a sacrifice (*dakṣiṇā*) (K. 89, K. 523 D), and inherited as 'family slaves' (*khñuṃ santāna*) (K. 523 D). We also learn of a runaway slave who had been born in the sacred territory of a temple being recaptured and punished by having his nose and ears cut off (*karṇnanāsikaccheda*) (K. 231). The same inscription tells us that he and his family were offered to the temple with full rights of ownership (*siddhi*). A pre-Angkorean inscription records the manumission of a female slave, her sons and grandsons by royal favour.¹⁶⁵

jmaḥ steñ rauv āy vraī svāy pramān śatagrāma varṇa qninditapura teṃ kāla jyak vraḥ travān nagara śrīndrapura pi abhiṣeka saptavarṇa pi cek dau jā paṃcām kanmyañ paṃre 'During his reign Paramesvara [Jayavarman II] chose [our] ancestor named Steñ Rauv, in Vrai Svāy of the Śatagrāma district, of the Varṇa of Aninditapura, when the excavation of the Sacred Pond of the capital Indrapura had been begun, in order to consecrate (*abhiṣeka*) the seven Varṇas, in order to divide them [and] make them Guards and Pages'; K. 92, v. 11: *so ninditapuraśreṣṭhavarṇasantānasantatiḥ*; K. 221B, ll. 7–8: *varṇa qnak pūrva* 'the Varṇa of the people of the East'; K. 254 B, ll. 2–3: *añ aṃcas varṣa chnām tap pra[m]piy gi nu gāl ta varṇa nā vraḥ canmāt* 'I, having reached the age of 18, served in the Varṇa of the Sacred Bulls'; K. 1036 (NIC II-III, 149–155), A l. 27: *varṇa smin* 'the Varṇa of the officiants'.

161. They are distinguished from 'the common people' in K. 71 (mid-tenth century), ll. 7–8: *sāmānyajana nu khñuṃ vraḥ kamrateñ añ* 'the common people and (nu) the slaves of the god'.

162. JACQUES 1976a, citing instances of (1) a *va* ('male slave') donating another to a god; see K. 54, I, l. 13 (IC 3:159): *aṃnoy va jleñ ta vraḥ kamratāñ añ va et* (= NIC II–III, 21, reading *va cat* rather than *va et*) 'Va Jleñ donated Va Et/Cat to the god'; and (2) a *gho* purchasing a paddy-field for a price that included two slaves'. In the second case, however, the *gho* is described as a superintendent of temple personnel; see K. 958, North, ll. 21–25: *sre cāmka ti gho kumāra khloñ qnak khnet duñ ta vāp ṛṣi vāp dhap teñ so teñ vit vāp vrau paṃcām dravya nu duñ khñuṃ vyar sru bhay vyar ti samakṣa nu vraḥ sabhā sañ gol jvan ta vraḥ kaṃmrateñ añ śrībhadreśvara qnau rudramahālaya* 'The paddy field [called] Cāmka that Gho Kumāra, superintendent (*khloñ*) of the personnel of the light fortnight, purchased from Vāp Ṛṣi, Vāp Dhap, Teñ So, Teñ Vit, Vāp Vrau paṃcām for [the following] goods: two slaves (*khñuṃ*) and forty measures of rice, after the fixing of its boundaries had been witnessed by [representatives of] the Venerable Council (*vraḥ sabhā*), was donated to V.K.A. Śrī Bhadreśvara at Rudramahālaya'. See also VICKERY 1998, 225–250, 271–274.

163. See, e.g., K. 33 of A.D. 1017; K. 105 of A.D. 987; K. 493 of A.D. 657; K. 933 of A.D. 1013.

164. For the expression *khñuṃ vraḥ* see K. 254 B, l. 13 and K. 523 B, l. 27. For Khmer *devadāsa* see K. 415, l. 8. For Sanskrit *devadāsaḥ* see K. 717, v. 15.

165. K. 666, v. 2: *rājaprasādēna hi somatistrī tasyās [ca] p[u]trās tv atha pautrakās ca / adāsabhāvaṃ prajagāma tasmai prabhāsasomā yamachidra*bāñaiḥ* (corr. : *vāñaiḥ* Ep.) 'By the favour of the king Prabhāsasomā, the wife of Somati, together with her children and grandchildren, ceased to be slaves, in [Śaka] 592.' The term *adāsabhāvaṃ prajagāma*, literally 'became 'non-slaves' (*adāsaḥ*) alludes to the formula of manumission "adāsaḥ!" as seen in *Nāradaśmṛti* 5.40–41: *svadāsam icched yaḥ kartum adāsaṃ pṛitamānasaḥ / skandhād ādāya tasyāpi bhindyāt kumbhaṃ sahāmbhasā / akṣatābhīḥ sapuṣpābhīḥ mūrdhany enam avākiret / adāsa iti coktvā triḥ prāñmukhaṃ tam athotsṛjet* 'One who being delighted wishes to make his slave a non-slave should lift a pot full of water from that slave's shoulder and smash it. He should then scatter rice grains and flowers over his head, pronounce the [formula] "adāsaḥ" three times and then release him, turning away'. In the brahmanical Dharmasāstra the only slaves that the king is said to have a duty to liberate are those who have been enslaved by force, having been kidnapped by criminals and sold (*Nāradaśmṛti* 5.36: *caurāpahṛtavikṛtā ye ca dāsikṛtā balāt / rājñā mokṣayitavyās te dāsavaṃ teṣu neṣyate; Kātyāyanasṛti* 726).

Now, it might be thought that these persons formed a class in Khmer society so degraded that we could claim that while much of the detail of the Indian system of caste is lacking, the Khmers had at least its essential structure, namely the distinction between pure groups, of whom the purest were the brahmins, and a mass of persons excluded as pollutant. But this would be an error. There would be a *prima facie* reason to see the *khñuṃ* in this light, if it were the case that slaves in India were considered pollutant.¹⁶⁶ But I find no evidence that this was so and much that it was not.

For slaves working in Indian Śaiva temples we have the testimony of the *Śivadharmottara*, in which ‘Śiva’s slaves’ (*śivadāsāḥ*) are distinguished from temple servants hired for wages in a passage that promises both categories of worker that they will attain the world of Rudra when they die:

ye cāpi vṛttibhṛtakāḥ śivāyatanakarmināḥ
yānti te ’pi mṛtāḥ svarge śivakarmānubhāvataḥ
śivadāsatvam āpannā naranārīnapuṃsakāḥ
te ’pi tannāmasaṃyogād yānti rudrapuram mahat
 f. 12[75]v5–6 (2.166–167)

Those wage-earners who work in the temple of Śiva will also go to heaven when they die by virtue of their work for Śiva (*śivakarma*). As for men, women and the neuter who have become Śiva’s slaves (*Śivadāsas*), they too, because of their connection with the name of that [god], will go to the great paradise of Rudra.¹⁶⁷

The Śaiva Paddhati *Naimittikakarmānusandhāna* composed by Brahmaśambhu of the Karkaroṇī branch of the Mattamayūra lineage in 938/9 A.D. also distinguishes these two categories of worker. We are told that after the cremation of an ascetic of a hermitage (Maṭha) the Ācārya should announce the event to the initiated ascetics, lay Māheśvaras, slaves and workers [of the Maṭha]:

deśikādisamayantān vyāhṛtya tu tapodhanān
māheśvarajanāms cāpi dāsān karmakarāms tathā
dr̥ṣṭapūrvāparān brūyād iti sarvvān sadharmmiṇaḥ.
 ff. 92v5–93r1

Similarly, when an outgoing Ācārya passing on his duties to his successor tells him all the details of the foundation over which he will preside, these should include the slaves he must support:

105 *idaṃ sthānam iyaṃ vṛttir eṣā pustakasamhatih*
amī vai bharaṇīyās tu dāsāḥ karmakarās ca naḥ
 106 *etat sarvaṃ mayā tubhyaṃ dattam adya tvayāpi ca*

166. This has been taken for granted by JACQUES 1976a, 73–74. He argues that those *khñuṃ* who were working within the temple, for example in the preparation of food, cannot have been slaves in the Indian sense, since this would have contravened brahmanical dietary taboos, and that this would surely have been unacceptable in Cambodia, even though the system was probably less rigid there.

167. The role of neuter slaves (*napuṃsakaḥ*, *klībaḥ*), that is to say, of men congenitally incapable of sexual intercourse and fatherhood rather than ‘eunuchs’, as these terms are commonly mistranslated, is unclear. I suppose that it was in the quarters reserved for the large numbers of women dedicated to the god as Rudraṅgikā dancers or in humbler capacities (*Devadāsīs*). The reference to connection with the name of the god mentioned in this passage shows that the term *śivadāsāḥ* is a title as well as a description. Cf. such terms as *śivagānavit* “a singer in a Śiva temple”, *śivadīkṣitaḥ* “a Śaiva initiate”, *śivabrāhmaṇaḥ* “a Śaiva brahman”, *śivavratī* “a Śaiva ascetic”, and *śivārāmaḥ* “the garden of a Śaiva temple or hermitage”.

pālanīyaṃ tathā samyag yathāsmābhiḥ prapālitaṃ

f. 73v1–3, = 4.105–106

105d *dāsāḥ* em. : *dāsya* Cod.

Such is the foundation; such is the revenue; such is the library; and these are the slaves and workers that it is my duty to support. All this I have given to you this day, and you should properly maintain it as I have done.¹⁶⁸

The Śaiva scripture *Bṛhatkālottara* defines the property of a temple-god (*devasvam*) as whatever has been donated to that god, including humans (*dvipadāḥ*):

yad dattaṃ devadevāya tac caṇḍāya prakalpayet

lohaṃ bhū †vājayed yatnād† dvipadās ca catuspadāḥ

maṇayo ratnanicayaṃ devasvaṃ parikīrtitaṃ

f. 44v5–6, = 22.8c–10b

He should assign to [the charge of the deity] Caṇḍa whatever has been donated to Śiva. The property of a deity (*devasvam*) is defined as ‘metals, lands, † ... †, human beings (*dvipadāḥ*), livestock, jewels and precious stones.¹⁶⁹

and inscriptions confirm that such slaves were a common feature of temples.¹⁷⁰

As for the relative purity or impurity of slaves in ancient India, it was a matter of their caste or that of their owner (*svāmī*), not of their degraded civil status. Thus when considering the proper duration of the periods of impurity (*āśaucakālah*) for the various castes caused by the death or birth of a relative both brahmanical and Śaiva authorities rule that the period for a domestic slave should be that prescribed for his master, or if his master has died, that prescribed for his own caste, which would normally but not always be Śūdra.¹⁷¹

I see no reference to the period of impurity for temple slaves in brahmanical sources. But the Śaiva Trilocanaśiva rules that a female temple slave (*devadāsī*) and any Śūdra that works in the temple (which would include and is probably intended to mean male temple slaves of that caste) is subject to impurity for twenty days.¹⁷² During this period they are not excluded

168. A related passage in the Keralan *Siddhāntasāra* of Īśānaśivagurudeva adds female slaves; see *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati, Kriyāpāda*, p. 196: *idaṃ sthānam ime dharmās caite pustakasañcayāḥ / dāsīdāsādayas caite paripālyā yathā purā*.

169. Cf. K. 81 A, v. 33ab: *dāsaḥgokṣetrahemādi devadravyam aśeṣataḥ* ‘the property of the god in its entirety comprising the slaves, cows, fields, gold etc.’

170. On evidence of male and female domestic slaves (*aḍiyār*) and ‘slaves of the god’ (*dēvarāḍiyār*) in South Indian inscriptions see APPADORAI 1990, 23–24, 256–258, 313–322; KARASHIMA 2001, 2: 124–129.

171. For this see *Bṛhaspatismṛti, Āśaucakāla*, v. 35: *svāmitulyena śaucena śuddhyante* ‘they become pure after a period of purification equal to that of their owner’; Bhavadēvabhāṭṭa, *Śavasūtakāśaucakāla-prakaraṇa*, p. 13: *dāsādāsīnām tu na pṛthag āśaucam. kiṃ tu svāmiśaucakāla eva teṣām śuddhiḥ. svāmyabhāve tv ātmīyam evāśaucam*; ‘Male and female slaves do not have a period of impurity specific to them [as slaves]. On the contrary, their purification is in the period of time that is required for the purification of their owner. However, if their master has died, then the period of impurity is that which applies to them in their own right [as determined by their caste and any other relevant factors]’; Trilocanaśiva, *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 65: *bhṛtyānām svāmijātyuktam anyeṣām svoktam iṣyate* ‘[the period of impurity] for slaves is that prescribed for the caste of their owners. For others it is held to be that prescribed for their own [caste]’.

172. *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 65: *dinair viṃśatibhiḥ śuddhir devadāsīyām prakīrtitā / tathā devālaye karmaratāḥ śūdrāḥ prakīrtitāḥ*.

from the temple but like anyone else in this state, regardless of their caste, may not come closer to the god than the outside of the entry hall that leads to the inner sanctum.¹⁷³

Moreover, Trilocana follows Manu in prescribing thirty days for the purification of an ordinary Śūdra.¹⁷⁴ By prescribing only twenty days for Devadāsīs and Śūdra temple workers he conveys that they are of greater purity because of their connection with Śiva. For this is an adaptation of a ruling which has a similar sense in the brahmanical Dharmaśāstra. There we find that Śātātapa and Bṛhadvyāsa declare that Śūdras require only twenty days to be returned to full purity, and that this discrepancy is resolved by taking these authorities to mean this to apply only to devout, observant Śūdras, the rule of thirty days laid down by Manu applying to the rest.¹⁷⁵

Moreover, just as not all Indian slaves were Śūdras, so the slaves of god in the Khmers' temples included some at least who are likely to have been of high birth. The evidence of this is in the names of the slaves listed in our inscriptions in records of donations. While nearly all the donors have Sanskrit names, the names of most of these slaves are Khmer, and some of them are derogatory.¹⁷⁶ Among the Sanskrit names too are some that are consonant with low status. For example, some male slaves mentioned in pre-Angkorean inscriptions were named after a day of the lunar month, probably because they were born or acquired on those days.¹⁷⁷ But we also find such names as Jyeṣṭhavarma, Īśānaśiva, Brahmaśiva, Mūrdhaśiva, Vaktraśiva, Varmaśiva, Śikhāśiva and Hṛdayaśiva.¹⁷⁸ The first of these is indicative of 'kṣatriya' status, names in -varma being held among the Khmers by royalty, generals and other high non-religious dignitaries. The rest are Śaiva initiation names (*dīkṣānāma*) and of a kind given only to brahmins according to most Indian authorities and to members of all castes above the Śūdras according to the rest,¹⁷⁹

173. *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 65, continuing: *āśaucinām tu sarveṣāṃ prāsādasya praveśanam / agramaṇḍapabāhye tu na doṣāya prakalpitaṃ*.

174. *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* p. 61, = *Manusmṛti* 5.83d: *śūdro māsenā śuddhyati* 'a Śūdra is pure after one month'.

175. See *Śavasūtakaśaucakālaprakaraṇa*, 12–13.

176. See VICKERY 1998, 247, citing as examples the names *vā cke* 'Dog'; *va kdit* 'Arse'; *svā kmāu* 'Black Monkey'; *va sa-uy* 'Stinker'.

177. See, e.g., K. 66 (7th century): *vā caturthī*, *vā pañcamī*, *vā dvādaśī*; K. 140 of 676: *vā pañcamī*, *vā tray...* (probably *vā trayodaśī*), *vā daśamī* and *vā pūrṇamī*; K. 600 of 612: *va daśamī*; K. 560 (7th century): *vā ekādaśī*, *vā pañcamī*; K. 424 (7th century): *vā daśamī*; K. 562 (7th century).

178. K. 600: *va jyeṣṭhavarmma*; K. 232: *gho īśānaśiva*; K. 232: *gho murddhaśiva* (= Mūrdhaśiva); K. 824: *sī vaktraśiva*; K. 232: *gho varmmaśiva*; K. 232: *gho vrahmaśiva*; K. 420: *si śikhāśiva*; K. 420: *si hṛdayaśiva*.

179. The view that initiation-names in -śiva (originally also -jyotis, -śikha and -sāvitra [the four Gocara names]) are the prerogative of brahmin males is taught in *Vidyāpurāṇa* cited by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta in *Nityādisaṃgrahapaddhati* f. 63v11, 64r12–13: *śivo jyotiḥ śikhā caiva sāvitraś ceti gocarāḥ ...yena ye dīkṣitās te pi tadgocarasaṃkhyayā / khyātās tv āśramadharmāś ca svechchāsankalpato bhavet / etās sañjñā dvijāgryānām rājādīnām gaṇānkitāḥ / śaktisaṃjñās tathā strīnām sarvāsāṃ parikīrtitāḥ* '-śiva, -jyotis, -śikha and -sāvitra are the lineage[-name]s. A person is given the lineage-name of his initiator. Duties according to stage of life are a matter of personal choice. These names are those of brahmins. The names of kings (kṣatriyas) and others are distinguished by [ending in] -gaṇa. It is ruled that all women should have names [ending in] -śakti'; *Mrgendra*, *Kriyāpāda* 8.60c–61b: *srajaṃ vimocayen nāma dīkṣitānām tadādikam / śivāntakaṃ dvijendrānām itareṣāṃ gaṇāntakam*; 'He should cast forward the flower. The names of initiates must begin with that [of the deity on to which it falls]. In the case of brahmins it should end in -śiva and for other [male initiates] in -gaṇa'; and *Bṛhatkālotara*, f. 91v3–4: *śivasamjñā dvijasyaiva kavacākhyā nṛpasya ca / vaiśyānām devasamjñā ca śūdrānām ca *gaṇāntakam* (em. : *gaṇāntikam* Cod.) 'Only the brahmin may have a name in -śiva. The king's name should be in -kavaca. Vaiśyas' names should end in -deva, and Śūdras' names in -gaṇa'. The minority view is seen in Kashmir: Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha ad *Mrgendra*,

names found elsewhere in our inscriptions as those of gentry and high-ranking religious dignitaries.¹⁸⁰

That even persons of the highest rank could fall into slavery is apparent from K. 158 of the reign of Jayavīravarmān (1002–c. 1010). This records that of three persons found guilty of misappropriating lands two were punished by the mutilation of their lips and the amputation of their hands and the third given to the litigant at his request along with his entire family and domain in what is surely a case of the punitive enslavement (*daṇḍa-dāsatvam*) recognized by brahmanical authorities.¹⁸¹ The reason for the difference in

Kriyāpāda 8.60c–61, taking *dvijendrāḥ* ‘the foremost of the twice-born’ to refer implausibly to the best in all three caste-classes of the twice-born, i.e. outstanding brahmins, kṣatriyas or vaiśyas; *Tantrālokaviveka* ad 4.265ab; and Manodaguru, *Kalādīkṣāpaddhati*, BORI MS. 157 of 1886–92, ff. 96v16–97r: *tatpātāvasare śivanāmānkitam śiṣyam vidhāya striyam ca śaktināmānkitam vidhāya bhagavan sakaleśvara tvatpādapadmapūjanarasikamanāḥ ayam amukaśiva āgata iti puṃviśaye. strīviśaye tu bhagavan sakaleśvara tvatpādapadmapūjanarasikamanāḥ iyam amukadevī āgatā iti puṣpāñjalipātāvasare guruḥ kathayēd ity arthaḥ. Śūdraviśaye tu ayam amukaḡaṇa āgata iti prayojyam. ayaṃ viśayo bhuktiparaḥ. mumukṣau tu gurur evēcchayā nāma kuryāt* [‘The words] “When, at the time that it has fallen, the Guru has given a male candidate a name in -śiva and a female a name in -śakti” mean that as soon as the handful of flowers has fallen he should say in the case of a man “Lord Sakaleśvara [= Sakalavacchanda], this [man] N-śiva has arrived, eager to worship the lotuses that are your feet” and in the case of a woman “Lord Sakaleśvara, this [woman] N-devī has arrived, eager to worship the lotuses that are your feet.” But in the case of a Śūdra [male] he should use “this [man] N-ḡaṇa has arrived”. This matter concerns [the attainment of] rewards. As for one who seeks liberation, the Guru may give him any name he pleases’.

180. K. 352, N II. 18-19: Loṅ Astraśiva; K. 343: Vāp Īśānaśiva; K. 950: Ācārya Caitanyaśiva, Sabhādhipati; K. 373: Loṅ Vrahmaśiva; K. 723: Vaktraśiva; K. 1050 (POU 2001, 99): Mrateṅ Vaktraśiva; K. 265 A: Steṅ Varmaśiva, Khloṅ Vnam (Skt. *śailādhipaḥ*) of the royal Indreśvara temple; K. 220: Vāp Varmaśiva (Karmmāntara of Thkvāl Loṅ) and Steṅ Varmaśiva the younger; K. 933: a hermitage founded at Hariharālaya in 978 A.D. by Loṅ Varmaśiva, grandson in the maternal line of Nandikācārya, the Ācāryapradhāna and Vrah Guru of Indravarmān (r. 877–889 A.D.); K. 235: Vāmaśiva, Guru of Yaśovarman, priest of the Devarāja; K. 253: Śikhāśiva, Hotar of Yaśovarman; K. 834: Śikhāśiva, Purohita of Jayavarman V; K. 1074 / K. 1090: Mratāṅ Śikhāśiva; K. 1152 (POU 2001, 126–128): land given to Vāp Sarvaśiva and transferred to Mrateṅ Somaśiva, his nephew; Ban That inscription, *BEFEO* XII, 2 ff.: Mūrdaśiva (= Bhūpendrapaṇḍita I), Sabhāpati of Jayavarman VI (1080–c. 1107), Dharaṅindravarman I (1107–1113) and Sūryavarman II (1113–c. 1150). The giving of names in -varma to kṣatriyas follows *Manusmṛti* 2.32b. If these slaves with names in -śiva were brahmins then this was in contravention of the rule of *Kātyāyanasmṛti* 715cd: *triṣu varneṣu vijñeyaṃ dāsyam viprasya na kvacit* ‘Know that the three caste-classes [kṣatriya, vaiśya and śūdra] may be slaves, but never a brahmin’; *ibid.* 717: *samavarṇo ‘pi vipraṃ tu dāsatvam naiva kārayet / brāhmaṇasya hi dāsatvān nṛpatejo vihanyate* ‘Even a person of the same caste-class may not make a brahmin his slave. For the enslavement of a brahmin destroys the king’s power’.

181. See *Manusmṛti* 8.415cd, in which the *daṇḍadāsaḥ* ‘the slave by punishment’ is listed as the last of seven types of legally permitted slave. Judicial enslavement is also recognized in the Śaiva context. The *Śivadharmottara* reports that free women could be forced as punishment for unspecified offences to become Rudraḡaṇikās (also called Rudrakanyās or Rudranārīs), female temple slaves of a superior class whose duty was to gratify the deity with dancing (f. 12[75]v7–8, = 12.168): *dattāḥ kṛtāḥ praviṣṭās ca *daṇḍotpannā* (em. : *daṇḍōtpannāḥ* Cod.) *balāḥṛtāḥ / vijñeyā rudraḡaṇikāḥ śivāyatanayōṣitāḥ* ‘Know that Rudraḡaṇikās, the women of the temple of Śiva, are [of five kinds:] those given, those purchased, those who have entered [of their own free will], those who have become [Rudraḡaṇikās] as a punishment [for a crime] (*daṇḍōtpannāḥ*), and those acquired by force’. They are superior to other persons who are the god’s property because Trilocanaśiva gives the rule that the period of impurity caused by the death or birth of a relative is only fifteen days in their case, whereas he gives it as twenty days for a Devadāsī; see *Prāyascittasamuccaya* p. 65: *ye ca māheśvarāḥ śūdrā bhasmarudrākṣadhāriṇāḥ / teṣāṃ pañcadaśāhena śuddhiḥ sūtau mṛtāv api / tathaiva *rudrakanyāyām* (em. : *śūdrakanyāyām* Cod.) *pañcācārye ‘pi *sammatam* (em. : *sammatau* Cod.) ‘Śūdras who are devotees of Śiva and wear ashes and Rudrākṣa seeds are purified in fifteen days if there is a

treatment seems to be that the third culprit was the brother of the litigant's mother. This means that he was the son of Virendravīra, the general of king Harṣavarman II.¹⁸²

Indian slaves, then, were not impure by reason of their civil status and there is no evidence that Khmer slaves, domestic or belonging to deities, were considered more impure than their Indian counterparts. The Chinese Zhou Daguan, observing the Khmers at the end of the thirteenth century, reported that their numerous domestic slaves were made to sit and sleep beneath the raised floors of the Khmers' houses, and that any visiting Chinese who had sexual intercourse with a slave girl even once was shunned by her Khmer master. But he also reports that slaves were allowed to enter the house, as in India, to carry out domestic duties.¹⁸³ This is far from untouchability in the brahmanical sense, and there is no sign of a more degraded group in Khmer society. For an Indian untouchable (*caṇḍālah*) was required by the brahmanical tradition to live with others of his caste far outside the limits of the settlement (*grāmah*) of the four caste-classes. He might enter it only in the forenoon to remove ordure and to perform any executions that may be required; he was to be executed himself if he were found within the settlement after midday; and he was ruled to be without right of access to the benefits of religion (*sarvadharmabahiṣkṛtaḥ, sarvakarmabahiṣkāryaḥ*).¹⁸⁴

Premodern Indian sources reveal no knowledge even of the existence of the Khmers. But how, one wonders, would Indian brahmanical authorities have looked upon this region? Would they have recognized it as part of the territory of their religion, that is to say, as a land fit for the performance of its sacrifices (*yajñīyo deśaḥ*)?

The answer must be no, if one applies the standard of the authoritative brahmanical jurist Medhātithi, writing in the ninth or tenth century,¹⁸⁵ since he rules the following in his commentary on *Manusmṛti* 2.23:

yadi kathaṃcid brahmāvartādideśam api mlecchā ākrameyuh tatraivāvasthānaṃ kuryur bhaved evāsau mlecchadeśaḥ. tathā yadi kaścit kṣatriyādijātīyo rājā sādhvācaraṇo mlecchān parājayet cāturvarṇyaṃ vāsayet mlecchāṃś cāryāvarta iva caṇḍālān vyavasthāpayet so 'pi syād yajñīyaḥ

If somehow foreigners (*mlecchāḥ*) were to invade a region such as Brahmāvarta and establish themselves there it would certainly become foreign [and so unfit for brahmanical sacrifices]. Equally if some king of orthodox observance belonging to the

birth or death. The same is accepted for the Rudrakanyā and the [musicians and dancing-instructor known as] the Five Ācāryas'. Evidently this rule applies to them on the assumption that they are Sūdras, that is to say, as a further reduction of the thirty days ruled for castes so classified.

182. K. 158, 25–26: *oṣṭhacchedaṃ karacchedaṃ heṃnāmnāḥ pvāhvāyasya ca / yathā taddoṣataḥ kuryād iti tadrājaśāsanam / svamātāmahasūnus tu kenāmā sakulas tadā / yācitas sahadevena rājñā dattas sabhūmikaḥ* 'That king commanded that because of their crime Heṃ and Pū should have their lips mutilated and their hands amputated. But at Sahadeva's request, Ke, [being] the son of the father of his mother, was given to him along with his family and lands'. That the father of his mother was Virendravīra and the general of Harṣavarman (II) is stated in K. 158, v. 11.

183. PELLIOU 1951, 19. Zhou Daguan gives the going rate for a slave as one hundred lengths of cloth for one that is young and strong, and about thirty or forty for one that is old and weak. This corresponds quite well with the prices indicated in our inscriptions. For example, K. 933 of A.D. 1013 records the purchase of a woman and four children for sixty garments, of a woman for one buffalo, of a woman for twenty measures of paddy, of a woman for one frying-pan weighing six *jyaṇ*, and of a man for ten *yo* of garments and twenty measures of paddy. These reports reveal, incidentally, that the Khmers' economy was not monetarized.

184. See *Manusmṛti* 10.12b, 10.51–56; *Vaikhānasadharmasūtra* 144.3–8.

185. DERRETT 1975, 6. KANE, 1930–1962, vol. 1, section 63, 275, = 1/i (2nd ed.), 583, places him between 800 and 900 A.D.

kṣatriya or other [appropriate] caste were to conquer the foreigners [of some country], settle a community of the four castes [there], and reduce the foreigners to the status of untouchables (*caṇḍālāh*), as in Āryāvarta, then that too would become fit for brahmanical sacrifice.¹⁸⁶

As we have seen, there is no evidence that any part of the indigenous Khmer population was reduced to untouchability, let alone the whole of it, as Medhātithi requires.¹⁸⁷ But the absence of a fully formed caste system is unlikely to have been problematic for many, since the fundamental distinction, that between brahmins and their patrons was present. This may have been all the more so for the Śaivas, since their religion was essentially that of a brahmin-kṣatriya culture centred on the court, the royal temple and the hermitage. As for the other non-brahmanical aspects of Khmer society there are large parts of India itself in which traditions such as matrilineal succession and cross-cousin marriage have survived within otherwise fully brahmanical communities,¹⁸⁸ traditions that were so integral to those communities that the theorists of Brahmanism conceded them as *deśadharmah*, as institutions prescribed and therefore meritorious for persons within the regions (*deśa-*) in which they are practised.¹⁸⁹ So those who had reason to do so could have accommodated Khmer traditions of inheritance and property in the same way.

In any case we have clear evidence in the Khmers' inscriptions that there were Indian brahmins prepared to migrate to the region and to accept the daughters of Khmer royalty in marriage. Durgasvāmin, a Taittirīya brahmin, is said to have been born in the Deccan (Dakṣiṇāpatha) and to have married the daughter of Īśānavarman I (r. 616/7, 627–c. 635) (K. 438). Another Taittirīya, the Śaiva Śakrasvāmin, is said to have been born in Madhyadeśa (K. 904) and to have married a daughter of Jayavarman I (r. 657, –690+). K. 95, v. 5 (= K. 323, v. 6) tells us that a brahmin Agastya of Āryadeśa, expert in the Veda and its ancillary sciences, married the princess Yaśomatī, the great-great-grandmother of the wife of Indravarman I (r. 877–before 889); and K. 263, v. 30 reports that the brahmin Divākaraḥṭṭa, husband of the younger sister of Rājendravarman (r. 944–968), had been born where Kṛṣṇa sported beside the river Yamunā, which is to say in the region of Mathurā in northern India. K. 910 of A.D. 651 mentions the benefactions of a brahmin Anantasvāmin from Mālava in western India; and K. 923, v. 14 describes Śrīnivāsakavi, who served as a royal priest under Indravarman and his predecessor Jayavarman III (r. c. 835–before 877), as supremely learned in the Veda and as an immigrant who came from the excellent land of his birth to purify that of the Khmers.¹⁹⁰ It is very probable that this 'excellent land' was some region of the Indian subcontinent. Finally, K. 300, v. 7–10

186. For Medhātithi the relevant criteria in the present case must have been that the barbarians should be made to live apart as untouchables outside the religion. Only then could a conquered and colonized territory be fit for Brahmanical rites.

187. The same was and is the case among the Balinese of Bali and Lombok. They classify society within the four brahmanical caste-classes (*catuwangsa*): *brahmana*, *satria*, *wesia* (*triwangsa* [gentry]) and *sudra* (commoners); and they recognize no untouchable group outside them. On the Balinese caste-system see HOBART *et al.* 2001, 76–82.

188. Matriliney is practised by the Nayars of Kerala (see FULLER 1976; GOUGH 1993) and there is cross-cousin marriage (marriage between the children of a brother and sister) throughout the communities in which Dravidian languages are spoken (see TRAUTMANN 1993a and 1993b).

189. See TRAUTMANN 1993a, 87–88. There he renders *deśadharmah* as 'regional custom'. But as *dharmah* it is more than custom. It is religiously valid activity that generates merit, but only, in this case, for those in the region in which the custom is established.

190. K. 923, v. 14: *yaḥ praśaste svadeśe pi sambhūto vedavittamaḥ / praśasyakamvudeśānām pāvanārtham ihāgataḥ*.

reports the tradition that the preceptorial lineage of the fourteenth-century Śaivācārya and royal Guru Vidyeśa descended from an Indian Sarvajñamuni, who was believed to have transported himself to the land of the Khmers by means of Yoga in order to worship the pre-eminent Śiva of this region.¹⁹¹

Moreover, there is Chinese testimony that there were Indian brahmins elsewhere in mainland Southeast Asia. The *Wenxian tongkao*, Ma Duanlin's encyclopaedic history of institutions published in A.D. 1317, draws on an early Chinese report that Indian brahmins had been greatly favoured by the king of the nearby kingdom of Panpan on the Malay peninsula and that many had come to his court to profit from his patronage;¹⁹² and a source of the fifth century cited in the *Taiping yulan*, the general encyclopedia (*leishu*) published by Li Fang and others in A.D. 984, reports that there were more than a thousand Indian brahmins in Dunsun, a principality in the same area and a dependency of the early kingdom of southern Kambujadeśa that the Chinese called Funan. The people of Dunsun, we are told, followed the religion of these brahmins, many of whom had settled there permanently since they had been given local women as wives.¹⁹³

The Pre-eminence of Śaivism

Of the three Indian faiths of the Khmers Śaivism appears to have been the most widespread and the most deeply rooted. Already in the sixth century a Chinese source, the *Nan Qishu*, the Standard History of the Southern Qi dynasty (A.D. 479–501), cites the report of an Indian Buddhist monk Nāgasena sent by the king of Funan to the Chinese court in 484 that though Buddhism was present in the region the dominant religion was the worship of Maheśvara (= Śiva).¹⁹⁴ In later times it was so central to the ceremonial life of the monarchy that it may be called the state religion. Śaiva temples and associated hermitages far outnumber others in the epigraphic and material records; and it was Śaiva ascetics that were the pre-eminent preceptors and priests of the élite. The pyramid-based state-temples built by the major Khmer rulers of the Angkorean period at the centre of the ceremonial capitals (*puram*) whose foundation marked their reigns were mostly temples of Śivas incorporating the ruler's name installed by Śaiva officiants;¹⁹⁵ and during this same period Śaiva initiation (*dīkṣā*) became a regular addition to the conventional brahmanical rite of royal consecration (*rājyābhīṣekah*), being received even when a king's personal religious loyalty (*bhaktiḥ*) was to Viṣṇu or the Buddha rather than to Śiva.¹⁹⁶ For their services these officiants were rewarded with lands, slaves, and other valuables, and they were granted the golden palanquins (*dolā*, *dolāyānam*, *śibikā*), golden-handled fly-whisks (*cāmaram*), fans (*vyajanam*), white parasols (*sitātapatram*), peacock feather parasols

191. It is possible, though not probable, that the Madhyadeśa and Dakṣiṇāpatha mentioned in the first two of these cases were Khmer localities named after those in India; for these see K. 300, v. 22, Ka. 18 (Madhyadeśa) and K. 289 B, v. 10 (Dakṣiṇāpatha); and cf. VICKERY 1998, 124, 194, 205.

192. See CÉDÈS 1968, 52.

193. PELLIOU 1903, 279.

194. The relevant passage of this work, composed by Xiao Zixian (A.D. 489–537), has been translated in PELLIOU 1903, 260.

195. For the Indian practice of establishing a deity under the name N-iśvara, N-iśvarī etc. where N is the name of the founder (*vajamānah*) or a person designated by him or him, commonly a parent, see below, p. CHECK. It does not imply any degree of apotheosis.

196. These matters of the Śaiva state-temples and royal Śaiva initiation will be taken up in the sequel of this study.

(*māyūrātapatram*), and other regal insignia that marked elevation to the ranks of the highest dignitaries of the state;¹⁹⁷ and they were not infrequently related to the royal families by marriage.

The Śaivization of the land

Furthermore, neither Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism nor Mahāyāna Buddhism became so intimately connected with the land itself. In the pre-Angkorean period most of the Śivas whose installation in Liṅgas is recorded in our inscriptions, at least two thirds, were given the names of the Śivas of venerable Śaiva sites of pilgrimage in India. They have a name in -īśvara preceded by the name of one of those sites, meaning, therefore, ‘the Śiva of X’, or the name (in -īśvara) of the deity that presides there. The effect of the practice is to transfigure the Khmer realm by creating a Śaiva landscape whose sacred enclaves could be seen as doubles of those of the religion’s Indian homeland.

Nineteen such names, some given to more than one Khmer Śiva, are those of Indian Śivas of such fame and sanctity that they are included in the following four lists in Indian sources:

1. The “five Liṅgas” of v. 50 of the *Śivastuti* of Halāyudha in an inscription of A.D. 1063 on the Ardhamāṇḍapa of the Amareśvara temple at Māndhātā (A).¹⁹⁸
2. The forty Śiva sites, in five sets of eight, taught in the *Śivadharmā*¹⁹⁹ and

197. K. 156: the ascetic Kambu, the king’s emissary; K. 194, ll. 13–33: Divākarapaṇḍita, the Rājaguru [Vrah̄ Guru] of Jayavarman VI (r. 1080–1107), Dharaṇīndravarmān I (1107–1113) and Sūryavarman II (r. 1113–c. 1150); K. 218, v. 23, reign of Sūryavarman I (1002–1050): Mādhava, father of Deva-Vāgīśvarapaṇḍita; K. 235, vv. 75–76: Deva-Jayendrapaṇḍita (formerly Sadāśiva as a religious), purohita of the Devarāja under Sūryavarman I (r. 1002–c. 1050); K. 235, vv. 97–117: *dakṣiṇā* to the same after the *dīkṣā* of Udayādityavarman II (r. 1050–1066); K. 381, v. 2: Deva-Tapasvīndrapaṇḍita, from Sūryavarman I; K. 532, v. 39: the Śaivācārya Hṛṣīkeśa, from Rājendravarmān (r. 944–968); K. 706 A v. 8: an unnamed Rājaguru; K. 834, v. 94: Śivācārya, Purohita of Jayavarman V (r. 968–1000), Hotar of Sūryavarman I; K. 842, v. 18: Ācārya Yajñavarāha, Guru of **Harsavarman II (r. 940–944)**; K. 842, v. 31: Ācārya Viṣṇukumāra, younger brother of Yajñavarāha; K. 692, v. 53: Bhūpendrapaṇḍita II, Sausnātika of Sūryavarman II.

These royal insignia are pan-Indic. Indian sources for the chowry (*cāmarah̄*) and the parasol (*chattram*, *ātapatram*) and their distinctions according to the status of those for whom they are carried are Varāhamihira, *Bṛhatsamhitā*, Adhyāyas 71–72 and *Viṣṇudharmottara Khaṇḍa* 2, chs. 12–13. For the giving of a palanquin and other royal insignia (*rājāṅgāni*) to the Śaiva officiant at the time of his consecration to office (*ācāryābhiṣekah̄*) see *Svacchanda* 4.470; → Bhojarāja, *Siddhāntasārapaddhati* A, f. 41v2: *uṣṇīsamakuṭacchatrapādūkācāmarahastyaśvaśibikādirājāṅgāni*; → *Somaśambhupaddhati* 3:483 (*Ācāryābhiṣekavidhi* v. 17abc). Cf. the list of the king’s insignia (*rājacihnāni*) to be empowered before battle in *Liṅgapurāṇa*, *Uttarabhāga* 27.259c–260b: his white parasol, conch, chowry, ‘drum etc.’ (*bheryādyam*), palanquin (*śibikā*) and war banner (*vaijayantī*).

198. *EI* 25, 185: *avimuktas ca kedāra omkāras cāmaras tathā / paṃcamaṃ tu mahākālah̄ pañca liṅgāḥ *prakīrtitāḥ* (em. Ed.: *prakīrtitaye* Ep.) ‘Avimukt[eśvar]a, Kedār[eśvar]a, Omkār[eśvar]a, Amar[eśvar]a and, fifth, Mahākāla, are called the Five Liṅgas’.

199. *Śivadharmā* (H), A, f. 40v6–41r5; B, f. 37v3–38r1 (12.110c–122b): *bhastrāpadam̄ rudrakoṭir avimuktam̄ mahālayam / 111 gokarṇṇam̄ bhadrakarṇṇam̄ ca suvarṇākṣo 'itha dīptimān / sthāṇvīśvaras̄ ca vikhyātas̄ triṣu lokeṣu viśrutah̄ / 112 sthānāṣṭakam̄ idam̄ jñeyam̄ rudrakṣetraṃ mahodayam / bhastrāpadādī sthāṇvantaṃ rudrasāyoyakāraṇam / 113 chagalaṇḍo duraṇḍas̄ ca mākoṭam̄ maṇḍaleśvaram / kālañjaram̄ śaṅkukarṇṇam̄ *sthūleśvaraḥ̄ sthaleśvaraḥ̄* (B : *sthaleśvaraḥ̄ sthūleśvaraḥ̄* A) 114 *pavitṛāṣṭakam̄ ity etat mahāpuṇyābhivaraddhanam̄ / mṛtāḥ̄ prayānti tatraiva śivasya paramam̄ padam / 115 gayā caiva kurukṣetraṃ nakhalāṅ kanakhalāṅ tathā / vimaleśvaroṭṭahāsam̄ mahendram̄ bhīmam̄ *aṣṭamam̄* (conj. *aṣṭakam̄* AB) / 116 *etat guhyāṣṭakan nāma sarvvaṇapāvimocanam / gatvā tu puruṣaḥ̄ śrīmān prāpnoti śivamandiram / 117*

throughout the literature of the Śaiva Mantramārga, where they are listed in accounts of the hierarchy of worlds (*bhuvanādhyā*) in the five ascending reality-levels of Water, Fire, Wind, Ether and the I-maker (*ahānkārah*), as paradises to which the uninitiated laity who die in the eponymous sites are translated.²⁰⁰

*śrīparvataṃ hariścandraṃ jalpam amrāṭikeśvaram / madhyamaṃ ca mahākālaṃ kedāram bhairavan tathā / 118 etad guhyāṭiguhyāṃ ca aṣṭakam parikīrtitam / santārya tu pīṭṇ sarvān śivaṃ *yānti (B : śānti A) paraṃ padam / 119 amreśvaram prabhāsaṃ ca naimiṣam puṣkaran tathā / āśādhī diṅḍimuṅḍiś ca bhārabhūtim bhavāntakam / 120 nakulīśvaro tha vikhyātas tathā pratyātmiko mahān / pratyātmikāṣṭakāṃ kṣetraṃ rudrasya hitakāmikam / 121 tatra yānti mṛtās sarve rudrasya paramaṃ padam / dānāny āvasatham kūpam udyānan devatālayam / 122 tīrtheṣv etāni yaḥ kuryāt so 'kṣayaṃ phalam āpnuyāt. The reading amreśvaram in 119a is for the sake of the metre, standing for amareśvaram.*

200. See, e.g. Niśvāsaguhya f. 64r5–v3 (A): *pratyātmikāṣṭakād ūrdhvaṃ guhyāṣṭakam ataḥ param / atigu[hyā]ṣṭakam caiva pavitrāṣṭakam eva ca / *sthānvaṣṭakam (em. : sthānāṣṭakam Cod.) ca pañcaite pravakṣyāmy anupūrvaśaḥ / amareśam *prabhāsam (em. : prahāsam Cod.) ca naimiṣam puṣkaram tathā / āśādhīr diṅḍimuṅḍiṃ ca bhārabhūtim *salākulim (em. : samākulim Cod.) / *pratyātmike (em. : pratyātmikā Cod.) mṛtā ye tu te vrajanty eva tat padam / hariścandraṃ puram guhyam guhyam madhyamakeśvaram / śrīparvatam samākhyātam jalpeśvaram ataḥ param / ambratike[śvaram] caiva mahākālam tathaiva ca / kedāram uttamaṃ guhyam mahābhairavam eva ca / guhyāṣṭake mṛtā ye tu te vrajantiḥa tat padam / gayā caiva kurukṣetraṃ nakhalam kanakhalam tathā / vimalam cāṭṭahāśas ca māhendram bhūmam aṣṭamam / *atiguhye (em. : atiguhyā Cod.) mṛtā ye tu atiguhyam vrajanti te / *bhastrāpadam (em. : bhadrāpadam Cod.) rudrakotiṃ avimukta *mahālayam (em. : mahābalam Cod.) / gokarṇa bhadrakarṇas ca svarṇ[ākṣaḥ] sthānu[r] aṣṭamam / eteṣv api mṛtāḥ samyag bhittvā lokam aśeṣataḥ / dīpyamānās tu gacchanti atra sthāneṣu ye mṛtā / chagaranḍam dviranḍam ca mākoṭam maṇḍaleśvaram / kālaiṅgarāṃ samākhyātam devadāruvanam tathā / śaṅkukarṇan tathaveha sthaleśvaram ataḥ param / eteṣv api mṛtā ye tu bhittvā lokam aśeṣataḥ / dīpyamānās tu gacchanti sthānya[aṣṭaka]m idam priye; Svāyambhuvasūtrasamgraha 4.45–54 (B); Matariga, Vidyāpāda 18.109–112, 19.34–38, 20.51c–55, 21.17–19; 22.13–15 (C); Sarvajñānottara, Advhaprakaraṇa 62–85b (B, pp. 62–4) (D), giving the names of the presiding Śivas rather than the sites themselves: 62 eṣāṃ ūrdhvaṃ bhaved āpo daśadhāvṛtya saṃsthitāḥ / †kharāravamukharan† āvartormi *samākulāḥ (corr. : samākulāḥ Cod.) / 63 tatrāste bhagavān devo varuṇo mṛtasambhavaḥ / śuddhasphaṭika *saṃkāśa (corr. : saṃkāśi Cod.) ādiguhyāṣṭakāvṛtaḥ / 64 omkāras tasya pūrveṇa āgneyyāṃ śaśibhūṣaṇaḥ / devadevas tu yāmyāyā *m ajāgandhis (em. : m bhojagandhas Cod.) tu nairṛte / 65 *āśādhīś caiva (em. : āśādhīś ca Cod.) *vāruṇyāṃ (corr. : vāruṇyāḥ Cod.) vāyavyāṃ diṅḍir eva ca / *bhārabhūtiś (corr. : bhārabhūtiś Cod.) tu saumyāyāṃ aiśānyāṃ lākūlam viduḥ / 66 ata ūrdhvaṃ bhaved anyad *āgneyāvarāṇam (conj. : āgneyāvarāṇam Cod.) viduḥ / *sudhmātāyasaṃkāśo (em. : sudhmātāyasaṃkāśa Cod.) meghastanitanisvanaḥ / 67 tatrāste bhagavān agniḥ *atiguhyāṣṭakāvṛtaḥ (em. : iti mahyāṣṭakā pratiḥ Cod.) / padmarāgapratikāśo jvalantas tena tejasā / 68 haraś ca tripuraghnas ca *triśūli (corr. : triśūliḥ Cod.) sūkṣma eva ca / mahākālaś ca *śarvaś (corr. : sarvaś Cod.) ca iśāno *bhairavas (corr. : bhairavas Cod.) tathā / 69 ata ūrdhvaṃ bhaved anyad vāyavyāvarāṇam punaḥ / nīlajīmūtasamkāśo bhinnāñjana-samaprabhaḥ / 70 tatrāste bhagavān vāyuh *kṛṣṇavarṇo 'ñjanopamaḥ (corr. : kṛṣṇavarṇāñjanopamaḥ Cod.) / subhagaḥ kāmarūpī ca guhyāḍguhyāṣṭakāvṛtaḥ / 71 *pitāmahapituh (corr. : pitāmahaṃ pituh Cod.) sthānam svayambhūr ugra eva ca / viśveśas ca *mahānādo (em. : mahābādo Cod.) mahad bhīmas tathāṣṭamaḥ / 72 ataś cordhvaṃ bhaved vyoma bhūtaṣṭveṣṭ *saṃpratiṣṭhitāḥ (conj. : pradaṣṭitāḥ Cod.) / aprameyam anirdeśyam mokṣasthānam *ivāparam (corr. : ivāparaḥ Cod.) / 73 tatrāste bhagavān devo vyomarūpī maheśvaraḥ / sūkṣma *mūrtir (corr. : mūrti Cod.) *mahāmś (corr. : mahāś Cod.) cāsau pavitrāir aṣṭabhir *vṛtaḥ (corr. : vitaḥ Cod.) / 74 *bhavaś (corr. : bhavaś Cod.) caiva mahāyogī trimūrti rudra eva ca / mahābalaśivaś caiva sahasrākṣaḥ sthānur eva ca / 75 ato hy ūrdhvaṃ bhavet *tattvam ahamkārasya (corr. : tattvamhamkārasya Cod.) ṣaṅmukha / dīptapāvavakarṇabhaṃ bhīmanādam durāsadam / 76 trividhas *sa ca (conj. : tasya Cod.) vijñeyo hamkāro ghorarūpadhṛk / *pralayāmbudhanirghoṣaḥ (corr. : pralayāmbudhanirghoṣa Cod.) sthānvaṣṭakasamāvṛtaḥ / 77 kaparda ūrdhva *retāś ca (em. : rebhāś ca Cod.) mahān utkaṭa eva ca / śrīkaṅṭho nīlakaṅṭhaś ca mahātejās tathaiva ca / 78 *mahāliṅgaś (em. : mahāliṅgiś Cod.) ca sthūleśaḥ kārañjñānuvartināḥ / ādiguhyāṣṭakāś rudrā atiguhyāṣṭakās tathā / 79 guhyāḍguhyāṣṭakāś caiva pavitrāṣṭaka eva ca / sthānvaṣṭakāś ca *pañcaite (em. : pañcaite Cod.) niyogād *bhūmivāsinaḥ (em. : bhūmivāsinaḥ Cod.) / 80 anugrahāya *lokānām (em. : mokānām Cod.) liṅgabhūtaḥ *pratiṣṭhitāḥ (em. :*

Since this set of forty sites is found both in the *Śivadharmā* and throughout the scriptural authorities of the Mantramārga, and since there is nothing specifically Mantramārgic about the list itself—indeed the first eight are clearly Pāśupata²⁰¹—it is probable that it was already current when the first scriptures of the Mantramārga came

pradaṣṭitāḥ Cod.) / *teṣāṃ eva samīpa*sthāṃ* (corr. : *sthāḥ* Cod.) *yad yat toyam ṣaḍānana / 81 tat tīrtham *paramam* (em. : *punaram* Cod.) *puṇyam tatra snātvā śivam vrajet*; *Kiraṇa* VP 8.108c–118c (E); *Svacchanda* 10.853–854, 871–873b, 883–884, 886c–890b (F); *Mālinīvijayottara* 5.15c–22b (G). The five sets are also mentioned in the *Rauravasūtrasaṃgraha* (4.12cd: *pañcāṣṭakam caiva pratyātmakam athāditāḥ / guhyam tathātiguhyam ca pavitraṃ sthāṇusaṃjñitam*) and the *Paṣkarapārameśvara/Pārameśvara* (as quoted by Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha ad *Mrgendra, Kriyāpāda* 8.78–79: *uktaṃ hi śrīmatpaṣkare: kālāgnirudrāt prabhṛti kramāt pañcāṣṭakāvadhī / laukikānugrahaḥ kāryaḥ*), though the forty sites are not listed in what we have of either. In most of these sources only the site is named, but in the *Sarvajñānottara* and, in a few instances, in the *Mataṅga* the names of the Śivas of the sites are given, though in some cases the name given is simply that of the site followed by -īśa/īśvara. In some of these cases it appears that the deity may be referred to either in that way or under his proper name. In other cases the presiding deity is identified only in the first style. This is the case with Lākula/Lākulin/Lakulīśvara, Bhārabhūtiśvara, Āṣādhīśvara, Diṇḍīśvara, Mahākāla, Bhairava, Vimalaśvara, Bhīmeśvara and Sthāṇvīśvara. The forty, then, are as follows with the names of the presiding Śivas, where these differ, in parentheses. (1) Lākula (BCDF) / Lākulin (AEG) / Nakulīśvara (H), (2) Bhārabhūti, (3) Diṇḍimuṇḍi (AFH) / Diṇḍi/Diṇḍīśa (BCDEG), (4) Āṣādhī/Āṣādhīśa, (5) Puṣkara (Ajāgandhi), (6) Naimiṣa/Naimiśa (Devadeva), (7) Prabhāsa (Śaśibhūṣaṇa [= Someśvara]), (8) Amareśvara (Omkāra) ; (9) Bhairava/Mahābhairava, (10) Kedāra (Īśāna), (11) Mahākāla, (12) Madhyama/Madhyameśa/Madhyamakeśvara, (13) Āmrāṭikeśvara/Āmrātakeśvara (Śarva), (14) Jalpa/Jalpeśvara (Sūkṣma), (15) Hariścandra (Hara), (16) Śrīparvata/Śrīśaila (Tripuraghna [= Tripurāntaka]), (17) Bhīma/Bhīmeśvara/Bhīmakeśvara (C), (18) Mahendra (CEG)/Māhendra (ABF) (Mahant [D] / Vrateśa [C] [Mahāvrate]), (19) Aṭṭahāsa (Mahānāda) [CD]), (20) Vimala/Vimalaśvara, (21) Kanakhala (AFHG) / Nakhala (BCDE) (Īśa [D], Nakhaleśa [C]), (22) Nakhala/Nākhala (Ugra [D] Nākhaleśa [C]), (23) Kurukṣetra (Svayambhū [D], Rudra [C]), (24) Gayā (Pitāmahapitr [D] Prapitāmaha [C]), (25) Sthūleśvara / Devadāruvana (A) (Sthūleśvara), (26) Sthaleśvara (Mahāliṅga), (27) Śaṅkukarṇa (Mahātejas), (28) Kālañjara (Nīlakaṇṭha), (29) Maṇḍaleśvara (Śrīkaṇṭha), (30) Mākoṭa (Mahotkṣa [mahān utkṣaḥ]), (31) Dvirāṇḍa (ACE) / Duraṇḍa (BFHG) (Ūrdhvaretas), (32) Chagalaṇḍa (A [Chagaraṇḍa] BCEH) / Chagalaṇḍa (FG) (Kaparda), (33) Sthāṇu/Sthāṇvīśvara (H), (34) Suvarṇākṣa/ Svarṇākṣa (Sahasrākṣa), (35) Bhadrakarṇa (Śiva), (36) Gokarṇa (Mahābala), (37) Mahālaya (Rudra), (38) Avimukta (Trimūrti), (39) Rudrakoṭi (Mahāyogin), (40) Vastrāpada (FBCE, G [Ambarāpada]) / Bhastrāpada (AH) (Bhava). Of these the following would seem to be of particular antiquity, since they are already mentioned as sacred places associated with Śiva/Maheśvara in the pilgrimage text of the *Āraṇyakaparva* of the *Mahābhārata*: Mahākāla, Sthāṇutīrtha, Śaṅkukarṇeśvara, Vastrāpada, Rudrakoṭi, Suvarṇākṣa, Bhadrakarṇeśvara, Śrīparvata, and Gokarṇa. Vārāṇasī is associated with Maheśvara there; but there is no mention of Avimukta.

201. The original *Skandapurāṇa* (167.118–149) says that Śiva incarnated himself at Kārohaṇa near the Narmadā as Bhārabhūti in the Kṛtāyuga, as Diṇḍimuṇḍa (*sic*) in the Tretāyuga, as Āṣādhī in the Dvāparayuga, and as the Guru of Kauśika, Gārgya, Mitra and [Kuruṣya], that is to say as Lakulīśvara/Nakulīśvara, in the Kaliyuga. Kārohaṇa, the supposed site of the revelation of the Pāśupata system, is modern Kārvān, a large village in the Dabhoi Taluk of the old Baroda State in Central Gujerat about 18 miles south of Baroda, not far from the Narmadā, probably once a station on the road from ancient Ujjayinī to ancient Bhṛgukaccha (mod. Broach). According to *Matsyapurāṇa, Adhyāya* 194 (in the *Narmadāmāhātmya*) Bhārabhūti is a Śivakṣetra on the Narmadā below Broach. It is no doubt the Bhārbhut (*sic*) on the north bank of the Narmadā about 8 miles from Broach reported to be the site of a Śiva in whose honour there is or was a pilgrimage every nineteen or twenty years in *The Gazetteer of the Bombay Presidency. Gujerat: Surat and Broach* (Bombay: Government Central Press, 1877), 550–551. In the Gazetteer of the Ordnance Survey the village is written more correctly as Bharbhut. Āṣādhī is mentioned in passing by the *Matsyapurāṇa*'s version of the *Narmadāmāhātmya* after Bhārabhūti and before Strīrīrtha. I have no information on the location of Diṇḍimuṇḍi/Diṇḍi, but it too was doubtless in this area. These four then, which head the lists, are Pāśupata sites. Of the other four, Amareśvara and Prabhāsa too were Pāśupata strongholds, to judge from inscriptions surviving at these sites.

into existence, which is not likely to be later than the sixth century. In any case it is earlier than the ninth. The Nepalese “Licchavi” script of an undated and fragmentary palm-leaf manuscript of the *Śivadharmottara* suggests that it was penned in that century,²⁰² and that text is certainly not earlier and very probably later than the *Śivadharma*. That is also the probable date of a fragmentary Nepalese manuscript of the *Sarvajñānottara*, whose script closely resembles that of this *Śivadharmottara* manuscript.²⁰³ We have early Nepalese manuscripts of two other of the Mantramārgic sources that retail this list, one of the *Niśvāsaguhya* from c. 900 and one of the *Kiraṇa* from A.D. :924. (B).

3. The forty-eight Śiva sites in the Ur-*Skandapurāṇa*, *Paṭala* 167 (*Śivāyatanavarnanapaṭala*),²⁰⁴ which has come down to us in a Nepalese manuscript of A.D. 810.²⁰⁵ It is unlikely that this text was composed later than the end of the seventh century or earlier than the sixth.²⁰⁶ Its background is the pre-Tantric Atimārga (C).

202. This manuscript is NAK 5-892, NGMPP Reel No. A 12/3.

203. The *Sarvajñānottara* manuscript is NAK MS 1-1692, NGMPP Reel No. A 43/12.

204. First (167.1–28) come nine sites that humans cannot reach: (1) Ādityabandhana, a peak in the Vindhya mountains; (2) Hemasomodbhava, a peak in the Himālaya; (3) Lake Satya on the Mountain of the Sunrise (Udayagiri); (4) the Mahānīla Liṅga in the hermitage on Mt. Uśīrabhīja; (5) the golden Liṅga on a peak on the unilluminated northern side of Mt. Meru; (6) the vast Liṅga installed by Jaigīṣavya on the Mountain of the Sunset (Astaparvata); (7) the Liṅga installed by Indra in the Nandana park; (8) the Liṅga of rock crystal installed by the Bālakhilyas in the ocean of milk; (9) and the golden Liṅga Kubereśvara installed by Kubera on Mt. Gandhamādana. Then (167.29–204) the text teaches the holy temples of Rudra (167.205: *puṇyāni rudrasyāyatanāni*) that are accessible to humans (167.29b: *gamyāni puruṣaiḥ*). They are as follows. (1) Mahālaya, (2) Kedāra, (3) Madhyameśvara, (4) Gaurīśikhara (the site of Umā’s asceticism), (5) Mt. Rṣabha (the site of Nandin’s asceticism), (6) the Himalayan peak that is the site of Rudra Bhastreśvara, (7) Kanakhala at Gaṅgādvāra, the site of Bahurūpeśvara, (8) Japyeśvara, (9) Mahābhairava, (10) Kumbhakāreśvara, (11) Utkuṭakeśvara, (12) Chagalaṇḍeśvara (10–12 are within the domain of Mahābhairava), (13) Rudrakoṭi, (14) the Devadāruvana, (15) Sthāneśvara installed by Dadhīca, (16) Takṣakeśvara on the bank of the Ganges, (17) Āmrāteśvara installed by Agastya, (18) the Liṅga on Mt. Kālañjara, (19) Puṣpabhadra in the Vindhya mountains installed by the Rākṣasa Meghanāda, (20) Citraratha in Andhra, (21) Śrīparvata in Andhra, where Śīlāda installed a thousand Liṅgas, (22) Uttaragokarṇa, (23) [Dakṣiṇa-]Gokarṇa, (24) Mt. Hariścandra, (25) Kārohaṇa to the north of the river Narmadā: Śiva was incarnated here as Bhārabhūti (in the Kṛta age), Diṇḍimuṇḍa (in the Tretā), Āṣāḍhi (in the Dvāpara) and Lakulīśvara (in the Kali); all have their temples; (26) Avimukteśvara in Benares, (27) Prayāga, (28) Naimiśa, (29) Kurukṣetra, (30) Gṛdhrakūteśvara at Gayā, (31) Prahāsīteśvara in Magadha at Pāṭalīputra (eight sites in Magadha sanctified by the sojourn of Lakulīśvara and his disciples mentioned but not named), (32) a site among the Yavanas, (33) Hemacūḍeśvara in Aṅga, (34) the Liṅga *Brahmeśvara (*brahmaṇā sthāpitam liṅgam*) installed where the Ganges meets the sea, (35) Prabhāsa, (36) Puṣkara, (37) the temple of Rudra on Mt. Mahendra, (38) Mahākāleśvara in Ujjayinī, (39) Drimicaṇḍeśvara, (40) Śaṅkukarṇeśvara, (41) Diṅgeśvara in the Himālaya, (42) Suvarṇākṣa, (43) the temple of Rudra at Saptagodāvara, (44) Bhadreśvara, (45) Ekāmra in Orissa, (46) Virajā in Orissa, (47) Nepāla (Paśupati), (48) Naikatungādhipreśvara in the Himālaya. The total of forty-eight sites is as I have counted them. It has not been stated in the text itself. One might more accurately count forty-five, since Kumbhakāreśvara, Utkuṭakeśvara and Chagalaṇḍeśvara are properly subsumed under Mahābhairava; see BISSCHOP 2004: 3, n. 1. Drimicaṇḍeśvara is probably the tīrtha Drimi associated with the worship of Maheśvara in the pilgrimage text of the *Mahābhārata* (3.80.87).

205. NAK 2-229. For this date see ADRIAENSEN, BAKKER and ISAACSON 1998, 32.

206. Yuko YOKOCHI has observed (1999a: 81–82) that the icon of the goddess Mahiṣāsūramardīnī seen in texts of the sixth and seventh centuries gives way to a new iconic type around the beginning of the eighth century and that the original *Skandapurāṇa* belongs with the earlier sources in this regard. The same scholar has argued (1999b: 68–75) that the “Gupta” type of this icon seen in the *Skandapurāṇa* corresponds closely to the subtype seen in a sixth-century image in the Siddhi-kī-Guphā at Deogarh and concludes that there is a distinct possibility that the text was composed in that century.

4. The sixty-eight Śiva sites of the *Tīrthamāhātmya* of the *Nāgarakhaṇḍa* of the Venkatesvara Press *Skandapurāṇa* (Adhyāyas 108–109).²⁰⁷ This list, though appearing in a composite text of uncertain date, is ancient enough to have provided the sixty-eight Rudras of the nine cremation grounds of the initiation Maṇḍala of the *Picumata* (*Brahmayāmala*), a work whose earliest surviving manuscript is from A.D. 1052,²⁰⁸ and

207. The source gives the sites and the names of the presiding Śivas, as follows: (1) Vārāṇasī: Mahādeva; (2) Prayāga: Maheśvara; (3) Naimiṣa: Devadeva; (4) Gayāśiras: Prapitāmaha; (5) Kurukṣetra: Sthāṇu; (6) Prabhāsa: Śaśisekhara; (7) Puṣkara: Ajāgandhi; (8) Viśveśvara: Viśva; (9) Aṭṭahāsa: Mahānāda; (10) Mahendra: Mahāvraṭa; (11) Ujjayinī: Mahākāla; (12) Marukoṭi/Marukoṭa [= the Āgamic Mākota]: Mahotkaṭa; (13) Śāṅkukarṇa: Mahāteja; (14) Gokarṇa: Mahābala; (15) Rudrakoti: Mahāyoga; (16) Sthaleśvara: Mahāliṅga; (17) Harṣita: Harṣa; (18) Vṛṣabhadhvaja: Vṛṣabha; (19) Kedāra: Īśāna; (20) Madhyamakeśvara: Śarva; (21) Suvarṇākṣa: Sahasrākṣa; (22) Kārttikeśvara: Susūkṣma; (23) Vastramārga/Vastrāpatha: Bhava; (24) Kanakhala: Ugra (sic also *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.7.32; according to *Ur-Skandapurāṇa* 167.64 the Śiva is Bahurūpeśvara [Ugra=Aghora=Bahurūpa]); (25) Bhadrakarṇa: Śiva; (26) Daṇḍaka: Daṇḍin; (27) Tridaṇḍā (= Āgamic Dvirāṇḍa/Duraṇḍa): Ūrdhvareta; (28) Kṛmijāṅgala: Caṇḍiśvara; (29) Ekāmra: Kṛttivāsa; (30) Chāgalaka/Chāgaleya (= Āgamic Chagalāṇḍa/Chagalāṇḍa): Kapardin; (31) Kālīnjara: Nilakaṇṭha; (32) Maṇḍaleśvara: Śrikaṇṭha; (33) Kāsmīra: Vijaya; (34) Marukeśvara: Jayanta; (35) Hariścandra: Hara; (36) Puraścandra: Śankara; (37) Vāmeśvara: Jaṭin; (38) Kukkuṭeśvara: Saumya; (39) Bhasmagātra: Bhūteśvara; (40) Omkāra: Amarakaṇṭaka; (41) Trisandhyā: Tryambaka; (42) Virajā: Trilocana; (43) Arkeśvara: Dīpta; (44) Nepāla: Paśupati (*paśupālakah*); (45) Duṣkarṇa: Yamaliṅga; (46) Karavīra: Kapālin; (47) Jāgeśvara: Trisūlin; (48) Śrīśaila: Tripurāntaka; (49) Ayodhyā: Rohaṇa; (50) Pātāla: Hātakeśvara; (51) Kārohaṇa: Nakulīśa; (52) Devikā river: Umāpati; (53) Bhairava: Bhairavākāra; (54) Pūrvasāgara: Amara; (55) Saptagodāvaritīrtha/Saptagodāvara: Bhīma; (56) Nirmaleśa: Svayambhū; (57) Karnikāra: Gaṇādhyakṣa; (58) Kailāsa: Gaṇādhipa; (59) Jāhnavitīra/Gaṅgādvāra: Himasthāna; (60) Jalaliṅga: Jalapriya; (61) Vāḍavāgni: Anala; (62) Badarītīrtha/Badarikāśrama: Bhīma; (63) Koṭītīrtha/Śreṣṭha: Koṭiśvara; (64) Vindhya: Vārāha; (65) Hemakūṭa: Virūpākṣa; (66) Gandhamādāna: Bhūrbhūva; (67) Liṅgeśvara: Varada; and (68) Lanḱā/Lanḱādvāra: Narāntaka.

208. There are eight Rudras in each of the eight peripheral cremation grounds and four at the centre of the Maṇḍala. They are identical, with only a few discrepancies, with those of *Skandapurāṇa*'s sixty-eight sites. The source is *Picumata*, f. 8r5–9r3 (3.132–156): 132 *pūrve *mahāśmaśāne* (corr. : *mahāśmaśānes* Cod.) *tu mahādevaṃ tu vinyaset / karṇṇikāyāṃ likhen mantrī pūrvapatre tathaiva ca /* 133 **maheśvaraṃ* (em. : *māheśvaraṃ* Cod.) *tathāgneye devadevan tu dakṣiṇe / ālikhet tu dale mantrī nairitye prapitāmahaṃ /* 134 *paścime tu vidu sthānam *ajāgandhiṃ* (em. : *ajogandham* Cod.) *ca vāyave / viśveśvaraṃ tathaiva ca ālikhett uttare dale /* 135 *īśāne tu mahānādaṃ vinyasen mantravit kramāt / mahāvānaṃ tathāgneye mahāghaṇṭeśvaraṃ likhet /* 136 *mahāvraṭaṃ tathā caiva tathā caiva mahotkaṭaṃ / tathā likhen mahātejaṃ tathā caiva mahābalaṃ /* 137 *mahāyogaṃ tathā caiva tathā sthūleśvaraṃ punaḥ / harikeśvaraṃ tathā cānyaṃ sarvatra navamaṃ smṛtam /* 138 *dakṣiṇe tu dale devi aṭṭahāsaṃ samālikhet / punaś caivāṭṭahāsan tu tasya pūrve tu patrake /* 139 *īśānān ca tathā rudraṃ sahasrākṣaṃ tathaiva ca / bhairavaṃ ca tathā ugraṃ ūrdhvareta kapardinam /* 140 *nairite navake ramye ālikhec *chaśibhūṣaṇam* (corr. : *chaśibhūṣaṇam* Cod.) */ śaśibhūṣaṇaṃ punaś caiva kirttivāsaṃ tathaiva ca /* 141 *punaḥ pūrvadale caiva vinyasec chaśibhūṣaṇam / āmrāteśvaraṃ caiva nīlakaṇṭhaṃ tathaiva ca /* 142 *śrikaṇṭhaṃ ca mahāyogī tathā ca hātakeśvaraṃ / tathaiva vijayan devi navamaṃ parikṛttitam /* 143 *paścime tu mahākālaṃ karṇṇikāyāṃ samālikhet / pūrvapatre tathā caiva mahākālaṃ samālikhet /* 144 *śankaraṃ ca haraṃ caiva jaṭi saumyan tathāparam / tryambakaṃ ca tathā cānyaṃ tathā cānyaṃ trilocanaṃ /* 145 *trisūlinaṃ tathā cānyaṃ navamaṃ parikṛttitam / vāyave tu gaṇādhyakṣaṃ tathā ca tripurāntakam /* 146 *lakulīśaṃ tathā caiva tathā caiva umāpatim / paśupatiṃ ca tathā devaṃ tathā kāmeśvaraṃ likhet /* 147 *amareśvaraṃ tathā caiva omkāraṃ ca tathāparam / navamaṃ ca tathā bhīmaṃ vinyasen mantravit kramāt /* 148 *uttare bhuvane devi ekapādan tu bhairavam / svayambhūṃ ca tathā caiva tathā caiva gaṇāpatim /* 149 *virūpākṣan tathā caiva bhūrbhuvan tu samālikhet / tathā caiva himasthānam analeśvaraṃ eva ca /* 150 *bhasmagātraṃ tathā caiva kirāteśvaraṃ eva ca / navamaṃ tu samākhyātam *uttare nātra* (corr. : *uttareṇātra* Cod.) *saṃśayaḥ /* 151 *īśāne tu mahādevi hetukeśvaraṃ ālikhet / vārāhaṃ ca tathā śreṣṭhaṃ raviṣṭa jambukeśvaraṃ /* 152 *prahasitaṃ ca tathā devi tathā caiva jaleśvaraṃ / aśubhaṃ ca tathā caiva varadaṃ navamaṃ smṛtam /* 153 *mūlāsānasya deveśi brahmasthānābjake tathā / karṇṇikāyāṃ catuṣkan tu rudrāṇaṃ viniveśayet /* 154 *sinharūpā mahādevi*

to have been mentioned by the Kashmirian scholar Kṣemarāja (*fl.* c. A.D. 1000–1050) (D).²⁰⁹

The nineteen Khmer doubles of the Śivas of these lists, five of them appearing more than once, are the following: (1) an Amareśvara (ABD),²¹⁰ (2) an Avimuktakeśvara (ABC), (3) six Āmrātakesvaras (BCD) along the length of the Mekong river from Kratie down to the Delta,²¹¹ (4) a Kanakaleśvara, which is no doubt an orthographical error for Kanakhaleśvara (BC), (5) Kālañjaleśvara,²¹² which is probably the same for Kālañjareśvara (BCD), (6) a Kedāreśvara (ABCD), (7) a Tripurāntakeśvara (BD), (8) a Naimiśeśvara (BCD), (9) three Puṣkareśvaras (BCD), (10) two Prabhāsomeśvaras (BCD),²¹³ (11) a Prahasiteśvara (CD),²¹⁴ (12) a + karṇeśvara (K. 719), probably for Gokarṇeśvara (BCD), Bhadrakarṇeśvara (BD) or Śaṅkukarṇeśvara (BCD), (13) several Bhadreśvaras (C [= Bhadrakarṇeśvara]), (14) a +++ trāpadeśvara (K. 46), which is probably Vastrāpadeśvara/ Bhastrāpadeśvara (BCD), (15) a Bhīmeśvara (BD), (16) a Maṇḍaleśvara (BD), (17) two Rudramahālayas (BC),²¹⁵ (18) a Vijayeśvara (D), and (19) a Vimaleśvara (B).

We should probably add (20) Siddheśvara, of which several installations are recorded in pre-Angkorean inscriptions. I find the name in our lists only in a variant of B found in the *Matsyapurāṇa*, in which it is compounded with the familiar Mahālaya.²¹⁶ But there is evidence of numerous Indian Siddheśvaras, many with Pāśupata associations: at the Nalamba capital Hemavatī (Pāśupata);²¹⁷ at Eḍedore;²¹⁸ at Palārī, about 20 km north of Sirpur, in ancient Dakṣiṇa Kosala (Pāśupata);²¹⁹ at Barākar in the Burdwan District of Bengal (Pāśupata);²²⁰ at Māndhātā on the Narmadā (Pāśupata);²²¹ at Somnāthpattan/-Prabhāsa in Kāthiāwād;²²² and at Loharī in Rajasthan.²²³

*ṭṭatvasyāpi *copari* (conj. : *kopari* Cod.) / *amareśvaraṅ ca *āgneye* (corr. : *agneye* Cod.) *karṇṇikāyān tu vinyaset* / 155 *omkāra nairite bhāge diṅḍi vai vāyugocare / īśāne ca tathā *diṅḍim* (conj. : *caṅḍi* Cod.) *sinharūpās tu vinyaset*. The hypermetrical Harikeśvara of v. 137 is for Harṣeśvara, probably through Harikheśvara.

209. *Svacchandoddyota* vol. 5a, p. 103: *vārāṇasyādīgataśrīmahā*devādyastaṣṭeś* (em. : *devāṣṭa-ṣṭeś* Ed.) ‘the sixty-eight beginning with Mahādeva in Vārāṇasī etc.’.

210. I have given references to the Khmer inscriptions that record these foundations only in those cases that cannot be found through the index of names in *IC* vol. 8. I cannot assert with the incomplete materials at my disposal that this list is exhaustive, but am confident that at worst it is nearly so.

211. VICKERY 1998, 379.

212. Ka. 39, *NIC* II–III, 211–213.

213. The Śiva of Prabhāsa is called Śaśibhūṣaṇa or Śaśisekhara in the Indian lists used here. But the name Someśvara or Somanātha is elsewhere standard for this deity.

214. According to the original *Skandapurāṇa* (167.181) this is the Śiva of Pāṭalīputra in Magadha: *anyad āyatanam puṇyam magadhāsu pinākinah / nagare pāṭalīputre nāmnā prahasiteśvaram*.

215. In the Indian lists cited here the place is Mahālaya and the presiding Śiva is Rudra. But the name Rudramahālaya is seen in a context that suggests that the same place is intended in Devala as quoted by Lakṣmīdhara in his *Kṛtyakalpataru*, *Tīrthavivecanakāṇḍa* p. 250: *kṣetrāṇi vārāṇasī mahābhairavam devadāruvanam kedāram *madhyamam rudramahālayam*.

216. *Matsyapurāṇa* 181.25–26c: *vastrāpadam* (em. : *vastrapadam* Ed.) *rudrakoṭim siddheśvara-mahālayam / gokarṇam rudrakarṇam ca suvarṇākṣam tathaiiva ca / amaram ca mahākālam tathā kāyāvarohaṇam / etāni hi pavitrāṇi*.

217. *EC* 12: Si 28.

218. *EC* 7: Sh. 40.

219. *EITA* 2i:245, plates 490–491.

220. *EITA* 2ii:406, plate 881.

221. *Kūrmapurāṇa* 2.39.58.

222. See OZHA 1889.

There are at least six more pre-Angkorean Śivas that are likely to have been named after Indian prototypes that are not listed in A, B, C or D. These are (21) Acaleśvara, (22) Kadambakeśvara/Kadambeśvara, (23) Piṅgaleśvara, (24) Vīreśvara, (25) Vṛddheśvara, and (26) Tuṅgiśa (= Tuṅgeśvara). There are Acaleśvaras on Mt. Abu, within the bounds of Achalgarh on that mountain,²²⁴ Śrīśailam²²⁵ and Tiruvārūr;²²⁶ Kadambakeśvara/Kadambeśvaras at Śrīśailam²²⁷ and in Kashmir;²²⁸ Piṅgaleśvaras on the Narmadā river²²⁹ and in Kashmir;²³⁰ a Vīreśvara in Vārāṇasī, venerated by those seeking male offspring,²³¹ a Vṛddheśvara in Kārohaṇa (Karvan), the supposed place of Rudra's incarnation as Lakuliśa, the origin of the Pāśupata teaching,²³² and a Tuṅgeśvara in Kashmir and another listed in the *Liṅgapurāṇa* as one of six Śaiva sites propitious for the practice of the text's Pāśupata Yoga.²³³

Bhadreśvara

Of these Khmer doubles Bhadreśvara appears to have been especially revered. Its Indian eponym, at Kanakhala in Brahmāvarta, the area within North India venerated as Brahmanism's purest territory, that most fit for the performance of its sacrifices, was believed to have been installed by the deity Brahmā to mark the site of what is arguably the pivotal episode in the devotional mythology (*śivakathāḥ*) of the Śaiva religion, that in which Dakṣa's Vedic Aśvamedha sacrifice was destroyed as punishment for his failure to include Śiva among the gods invited to receive a share of the offerings.²³⁴

There were several Bhadreśvaras in Kambujadeśa, a fact that attests the special status of this Śiva among the Khmers,²³⁵ but the most important, and perhaps the original, was at a temple-complex whose architectural remains date from the 7th to the 12th centuries A.D. located at Vat Phu near the ancient town of Liṅgapura, near the foot of Phu Kao massif

223. Dasharatha SHARMA 1959, 231 ('Pāśupata').

224. See the inscription of 1331 edited in *EI* 30:10 and *Śivapurāṇa* 4.2.26.

225. *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.92.165.

226. For the ancient Acaleśvara at Tiruvārūr mentioned by Appar, now in the second prakāra of the Tyaḡarāja temple, rebuilt in stone by Sembian Mahādevī, see BALASUBRAHMANYAM 1971, 195–197.

227. *Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.92.161.

228. *Nīlamata* 120.

229. *Kūrmapurāṇa* 2.39.21–22.

230. *Nīlamata* 1031; *Haracaritacintāmaṇi* 11.29.

231. *Śivapurāṇa*, *Śatarudrasaṃhitā*, Adhyāyas 13–14.

232. *Kāraṇamāhātmya* p. 53. D.R. BHANDARKAR (1909: 182, 184) reports that there is still a Vṛddheśvara at Karvan and that the image in the sanctum of the Nakleśvar temple is pointed out as the conjoint figure of Brahmeśvara and Lakuliśa.

233. *Nīlamata* 1368c: *tuṅgeśatīrthakṣetraṃ tu; Liṅgapurāṇa* 1.92.7: *vārāṇasīkurukṣetraśrīparvata-mahālaye / tuṅgeśvare ca kedāre tatsthāne yo yatir bhavet*.

234. The installation of the Indian Bhadreśvara by Brahmā at Kanakhala just south of modern Hardwar and the tradition that it was the site of the overthrow of Dakṣa's Aśvamedha by Bhadrakālī and the Gaṇeśvara Hari/Haribhadra/Vīrabhadra are the subject of the thirty-second chapter of the original *Skandapurāṇa*. This Rudrakṣetra, whose sanctity is declared to extend in all directions for a distance of one yojana around the Liṅga (32.164), is said there to contain the Bhadrakarṇa lake (32.166) and to be situated near Kubjāmra (32.171–176). Evidently, then, Bhadreśvara is none other than the Bhadrakarṇeśvara already reported to be situated near Kubjāmra by the *Mahābhārata* (*Āraṇyakaparvan* 82.35–36) in its account of the pilgrimage route from Kurukṣetra to Prayāga.

235. See, e.g., K. 81; K. 136 A, v. 10; K. 162; K. 190 A, v. 24; K. 258; K. 728; K. 809; K. 818; K. 940; K. 958, v. 16.

(1,416 m.) in the Champasak District of southern Laos close to the modern Lao-Cambodian border.

Mt. Phu Kao, known in our inscriptions as the Mountain of the Liṅga (*liṅgaparvataḥ*, *liṅgādriḥ*), owed its ancient name to an impressive Liṅga-like outcrop on the summit at the centre of the massif. A deity personifying the mountain (*bhagavān śrīliṅgaparvataḥ*), probably a Śiva, is mentioned in a fragmentary inscription assigned on palaeographic grounds to the second half of the fifth century found close to the mountain in the remains of an as yet unidentified city.²³⁶ A royal decree from the reign of Jayavarman I (657, – 690+) expresses the wish that the endowments of this god be used to good effect and underlines the sanctity of the area by prohibiting persons (1) from taking the life of any creatures that dwell on the mountain, even if they are criminals deserving punishment, (2) from moving about in its hermitage without restraint, riding in carriages, with raised umbrellas and chowries, and (3) from feeding or raising dogs and chickens on the god's lands.²³⁷ The God Liṅgaparvata is also mentioned as the recipient of a silver bowl donated by Śaṅkarapaṇḍita, the priest (Purohita) of Harṣavarman III (r. 1066/7–1080) and his two predecessors,²³⁸ and as the recipient of a platter offered by king Tribhuvanādityavarman (r. c. 1165–1177 A.D.) to mark the occasion of the second annual Koṭihoma after his accession.²³⁹

As for the outcrop after which the mountain was named, it was not perceived as merely Liṅga-like. It was venerated as a Liṅga, under the name Niṣkala;²⁴⁰ and the remnants of the brick foundations of a temple have been discovered on its top, with a carved sandstone Linga lying at its foot.²⁴¹ In the Indian Śaiva tradition natural Liṅgas of this kind are termed self-created (*svayambhu*) or self-manifest (*svayamvyaktam*) and they

236. K. 365 (fragmentary; found at Wat Luong Kau, 6.5 kilometres east of Vat Phu), A, v. 2: *bhagavatā śrīliṅgaparvvatenāsmīn* The city, on the alluvial plain on the west bank of the Mekong River, with an archaeological area of about 400 hectares, has tentatively been identified as Śreṣṭhapura; see UNESCO 1999, 70 (1.3.23). But this appears to rest on no firmer foundation than the long established assumption that Śreṣṭhapura was near Vat Phu. VICKERY (1998, 346, 410–413) has shown the weakness of this assumption and has argued convincingly that the evidence points, though not conclusively, to a site in the central Angkor region between Siem Reap and Kompong Thom.

237. K. 367, ed. SALOMON 1998 (281–284), v. 4b–5: *atra śrīmati liṅgaparvva[tava]re ye sthāyinaḥ prāṇi[nah] (8) vaddhyantān na janena kenacid api prāptāparādhāḥ kadā devāya pratipāditam yad iha taddhemādikaṃ siddhyatu || (9) devasyāsyā yathābhilāṣagamanā gacchantu naivāsra[me] yānārohadhṛtāpatraracanaḥbyutkṣiptasaccāmaraiḥ / (10) poṣyāḥ kukkurakukkuṭā na ca janair ddevasya bhūmaṇḍalesv ity ājñāvanipasya tasya bhavatu kṣmāyām alaṅghyā nṛṇām.*

238. K. 136, Khmer II. 29–30: *kamrateṅ jagat liṅgaparvvata khāl prāk 1.*

239. K. 418 B (undated): *+++ kamrateṅ aṅ śrītribhuvanādityavarmmadeva ta kamrateṅ jagat liṅgaparvvata nā thve dvitiya vraḥ koṭihoma* '[Offered by] K.A. Śrī Tribhuvanādityavarmmadeva to K.J. Liṅgaparvvata when the second Koṭihoma was celebrated.' See CÉDÈS 1929, 305–6, arguing that this would have been one year after his accession, since the first Koṭihoma was at the time of his accession. But K. 194, which he cites as evidence that the Koṭihoma was performed at the time of accession, says only that it is performed every year after accession, as do our Indian authorities on royal ceremonies. These do not require it among the ceremonies of accession itself.

240. K. 583, v. 6 (as edited in JACQUES 1976b). That Niṣkala is its name rather than a description of a type of Liṅga, i.e. 'subtle', 'interior' (BHATTACHARYA 1967) or 'simple', that is to say a Liṅga proper without faces (BRUNNER-LACHAUX 1968, 445–447), follows from the accompanying Khmer text, in which it is called *vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ śrī niṣkala* (II. 3–4). This was pointed out by DAGENS in a private communication reported by JACQUES in his edition of the inscription (1976b, 368). The sense of *niṣkala*-that justifies its technical use to denote the simple kind of Liṅga is 'undifferentiated'. This would be even more appropriate as a name for a Liṅga that has not been formed in any way by man.

241. See UNESCO 1999, 54 (1.3.2).

differ from other Liṅgas in that they may be of any shape, size and colour, may be found anywhere in nature, and are permanently and unconditionally imbued with Śiva's presence. They need no base (*pīṭhaḥ*) or shrine to support and house them, but may be provided with these and in this sense 'installed'. Furthermore they lack the differentiation into lower, middle and upper sections that characterizes ordinary, man-made Liṅgas.²⁴² So

242. For these features of the *svayambhuliṅgam* see *Īśanaśivagurudevapaddhati, Kriyāpāda* 38.4–10b: *atha svayambhuliṅgāni *jarjarāṇi* (corr. : *jarjharāṇi* Ed.) *kṛṣāni ca / hrasvāni cātīdīrghāni phalakāsadrśāni ca / 5 anekāgrāṇi gokarṇamātuluṅganibhāny api / śaṭpañcatridaśāgrāni mānonmānādibhir vinā / 6 śrīṅāgrāny api vakrāṇi nānāvārṇākṛtīni ca / sapīṭhāny apy apīṭhāni sālayāny aghāṇi vā / 7 vanaparvatanadyabdhītīrthakṣetragatāny api / darśanasparśanārcābhir eṣāṃ siddhir anuttamā / 8 vidyāt svayambhuliṅgāni yeṣu nityaṃ sthītaḥ śivaḥ / mūlaṃ na śodhayet teṣāṃ śodhanaṃ sarvanāśakṛt / 9 amīmāṃsyāni tāny āhuḥ pūjyāny eva yathāsthīti / naiṣāṃ mūrtivibhāgo 'sti na ca syān mantrasaṅkaraḥ / 10 mānuṣeṣv eva liṅgeṣu mantramūrtyādīsankaraḥ* 'As for self-born Liṅgas they may be split, narrow, short, extremely long, slab-like, with more than one summit, with the shape of a cow's ear or a Mātuluṅga fruit, with six, five or thirty protuberances at the top, without conformity to any of the rules of height, width and the rest, crooked, of various colours and shapes, with or without a pedestal, with or without a shrine to house them, located in the wilderness, on mountains, in rivers, the ocean or at holy bathing places and sacred sites. By seeing them, touching them or worshipping them the highest Siddhi [is attained]. One should know that it is in self-born Liṅgas [alone] that Śiva is permanently [and unconditionally] present. One should not purify the original [Liṅga]. To do so would cause universal destruction. [The learned] declare that these [Liṅgas] should not be examined [to determine whether they are in a state fit for worship]. They should be worshipped as they are. They do not have [the usual] division into the [three] segments; nor is it possible to be guilty of mixing Mantras [of different classes]. [The danger of] mixing Mantras and icons applies only in the case of Liṅgas installed by human beings.' In ordinary Liṅgas one may not install Mantras of one sort where Mantras of another have already been installed. This restriction does not apply in self-born and other natural Liṅgas such as Bāṅaliṅgas. This is another aspect of their immunity to contamination.

In Śaiva scripture see *Kirāna*, f. 74v3: *svayambhūṭaliṅgasya sthāpitasya maharṣibhiḥ / devair *vā* (em. : *vya* Cod.) *sthāpitasyāpi rūpamānaṃ na gṛhyate* 'Form and dimension are irrelevant in the case of a self-arisen Liṅga or of one that has been installed by a great sage or god'. Differentiation into sections (*mūrtivibhāgaḥ*) is that into the square *brahmabhāgaḥ*, which is the lower third of the Liṅga, the octagonal *viṣṇubhāgaḥ*, which is the central, and the rounded cylindrical *rudrabhāgaḥ*, which is the upper and the only one that is visible once the Liṅga has been installed.

This category of Liṅga is mentioned in K. 762. It records the installation of a natural (*svāyambhuvam*) Liṅga with the name Kedāreśvara in A.D. 673. It is probable that another instance is recorded in K. 400B, v. 4–5: *liṅgaṃ suvarṇṇasaṃghātaṃ surāsuragaṇais tu ◡ / + rggajanitaṃ pu – ◡◡* *āmrātasya kalpitam / [vi]yadratnasvarāṅke smin kāle tat sthāpayat tadā / ◡◡ sadravīnāny eva so smai prādāc ca bhaktītaḥ*. I propose that the second Pāda read *surāsuragaṇais stutam* 'hymned by all the gods and Asuras'. Cf. the Pāda formula *surāsuranamaskṛtaḥ* that appears frequently in the *Mahābhārata* (1.94.34b etc.) and *Purāṇas*. For the beginning of the third Pāda CÉDÈS conjectured *svarggajanitaṃ*. But this is implausible because the three syllables after the first may never be ◡◡◡, and because the cadence of the Pāda would be a *ma-vipulā* without the required word-break before the closing – ◡. It is more probable, therefore, that there were two syllables in the initial lacuna and only one syllable after *pu*, probably *nyam*. I propose *nisarggajanitaṃ punyam*, understanding the first word to mean 'born by nature, natural'. For the synonym *nisargaja-* in this sense see, e.g., *Manusmṛti* 8.414cd and 9.16ab. As the object of the reverence of both the gods and the Asuras it is appropriate that the Liṅga should be of this kind. That it is a 'natural' Liṅga is also suggested by the expression *suvarṇṇasaṃghātaṃ* 'a conglomeration of gold'. This would be an odd way to refer to a Liṅga cast in gold, but makes good sense if it was rather a naturally Liṅga-shaped nugget. As restored the passage means 'In 790 [Śaka, = 868/9 A.D.] he installed the nugget of gold, an auspicious natural Liṅga that had been hymned by Gods and Asuras'. I leave unsolved the crux ◡◡ *āmrātasya kalpitam*, though I suspect a reference to the name of the Liṅga and therefore to Āmrāteśa/Āmrāteśvara/Āmrātakeśvara.

it follows that even if they are broken into pieces the deity will remain equally present in each of the fragments. That this view was held by the Khmers may be inferred from the fact that the purpose of the inscription that names this Liṅga is to report that a fragment of it, perhaps detached through erosion, was installed for worship in another place. Dating from the reign of Rājendravarman (944–c. 968) the inscription tells us the following about Indrāyudha, a son of king Jayavarman II (r. 802–c. 834):

*prāg eva campā[dhipa]tigrahaṇe labdhavikramaḥ
tīrttvā kālam va(yo)[vr]ddhau śivabhaktiparāyaṇaḥ
gantā liṅgapu(ra)ñ citran tapaḥ kaṣṭaṇ cakāra saḥ
tataś śivājñāyā liṅgam aiśan niṣkalaliṅgataḥ
lavan tat sthāpi[ta]n t[e]na santūnāmni [p]jure mudā*

K. 583, v. 4c–6 (ed. JACQUES 1976b)

JACQUES proposes plausibly that *gantā* in 7c is an error for *gantvā*

After many years, having earlier achieved an act of great valour in capturing the king of Campā, he turned in his old age to devotion to Śiva. He went to Liṅgapura and performed various harsh austerities. Then at Śiva's command he took a Liṅga of Śiva that was a fragment [fallen] from the Liṅga [called] Niṣkala [on the summit of the mountain] and joyfully installed it in Santūpura.

Two other Liṅga fragments (*liṅgaikāṃśau*), probably from the same source, are reported to have been installed for worship in Aninditapura by Śivācārya, a Śaiva officiant in the service of the four Khmer kings from Īśānavarman II (r. c. 922–c. 928) to Rājendravarman (r. 944–968).²⁴³ That this Śaiva dignitary should have chosen to install these fragments where he did is in keeping with his special connection with the Śivaliṅga already established there. Generally the opening verses of the Khmers' Sanskrit inscriptions offer praise or obeisance to one or more deities in their unlocated universality, with the principal deity at the head. In this case after venerating Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Umā and Sarasvatī in that manner he adds, most unusually, a verse of devotion addressed to the Śivaliṅga of Aninditapura.²⁴⁴

Now the Bhadreśvara enshrined on a terrace near the foot of Mt. Phu Kao and aligned with the natural Liṅga on its summit appears to have been seen as the national deity, in a

In K. 806, v. 27 we read of Rājendravarman that 'he increased the endowments of both the natural and the installed deities in Kambujadeśa': *kamvuvīśvambharāyāṃ yas tridaśānām svayambhuvām / sthāpitānāñ ca yajvaiko bhūtvā pūjān avarddhayat*. CÈDÈS missed the meaning of *svayambhuvām* 'natural' and *tridaśānām* here 'gods'. He took the former to mean 'gods' and the latter to indicate their number ('thirty'): 'il accrut le culte des trente dieux érigés sur la terre de Kambu'. The price of this reading was to overlook the conjunction *ca*.

243. K. 532, v. 27: *liṅgaṃ bhīmapure moghapure liṅge ca sa vyadhāt / liṅgaikāṃśau sabhīmāreccāv aninditapure punaḥ* 'he installed one Liṅga in Bhīmapura, two in Amoghapura, and two fragments of the Liṅga and an image of Bhīma in Aninditapura'. I suppose that these may be fragments of the Niṣkalaliṅga because I know of no other natural Liṅga that could be intended.

244. K. 532, v. 6: *vande śrīśivaliṅgākhyam śaṅkaraṃ viśvaśaṅkaram / aṇimādiguṇānindyam aninditapurāspadam* 'I venerate the Śaṅkara (Śiva) at Aninditapura, holy Śivaliṅga by name, who bestows joy (*-śaṅkaram*) upon the whole world who is [indeed] irreproachable (*anindya-*) because of [his possession of] the [eight supernatural] attributes [of godly power], minuteness (*aṇimā*) and the rest.' Aninditapura is important in royal genealogies as one of three kingdoms, the other two being Śambhupura and Vyādhapura, from which the early kings of Angkor had descended. But it is not mentioned before the reign of Yaśovarman I (889–910) and its location is uncertain. VICKERY (1998:384) considers it the *puram* of a lineage whose estate was somewhere between Kompong Thom and Kompong Cham, in the central part of modern Kampuchea.

role analogous to that of such South Asian Śivas as Naṭarāja of Cidambaram for the Tamils of the Far South and Paśupati of Deopatan for the inhabitants of the Kathmandu Valley. Thus we learn that the lineage of Vidyēśa (*vidyēśavit*, *vidyēśadhīmān*),²⁴⁵ a Śaiva Rājaguru of the fourteenth century, had emanated from an Indian Śaiva called Sarvajñamuni who, we are told, had employed Yoga to transport himself from India (*āryadeśaḥ*) to Kambujadeśa to worship Bhadreśvara, mostly that of this site:²⁴⁶

7 śa[r]vvaḥpriyo bhavad vipras sarvvāgamaviśārada[h]
 sarvvalokārthakṛt nāmnā sarvvajñamunir īri[taḥ]
 8 caturvve[da]nidher yyasya caturānanam āvabhau
 caturmmukhasyeva bhr̥ṣaṅ caturvvedasa – ∪ –
 9 āryya[de]śe samutpannaś śivārādhanaatparah
 yo yogenāgataḥ kamvudeśe smin[n] i ∪ – ∪ –
 10 śrībha[dreśvaraśa]mbhor yyo yajanārthaṃ samāgataḥ
 cirakālan tam abhyarcya prayayau parama[m] pa[dam]

K. 300, vv. 7–10

7a śa[r]vvaḥpriyo conj. Bergaigne : śa[r]vva + + Ep. + 10d parama[m] pa[dam] CÆDÈS : *padam aiśvaraṃ* conj. BERGAIGNE

There was a brahmin devoted to Śiva, skilled in all the [Śaiva] Āgamas, acting for the good of all, called Sarvajñamuni. He had memorized the four Vedas and his skillful mouth loudly [reciting them] seemed like that of the four-faced [Brahmā] himself. He was born in Āryadeśa and devoted himself to the propitiation of Śiva. Having reached this land of Kambu by means of meditation [...] he came to worship Bhadreśvaraśiva and having done so for a long time proceeded [in death] to the ultimate goal.

Moreover, an inscription composed during the reign of Dharaṅīndravarman I (A.D. 1107–1113) by Yogīśvarapañḍita, grandson in the maternal line of Vīralakṣmī, daughter of Sūryavarman I (r. 1002–c. 1050), in which he records his career as a Śaiva officiant and his lavish donations to Bhadreśvara, refers to the latter in terms that reveal that it was venerated as the source and guarantor of the supremacy of the Khmer emperors.

In the first benedictory verse of that inscription Śiva is revered in abstract, metaphysical terms as that from which all creation flows and as that into which all creation returns:

yasmāt kramena sakala . i ∪ –dbhavanti
 bhūtāni tantuvisarā iva †pūlikāyāḥ†
 yatraiva tāni nidha – ∪ ∪ – †nidīha†
 vyomnīva ta śiva

K. 258 C, v. 1

Emending the first quarter verse, restoring diagnostically the sense of the corrupt and lacunose second and third, and providing the last, whose engraving was not completed, with a makeshift ending of the kind required by the context, I propose:

yasmāt kramena sakalāni samudbhavanti
 bhūtāni tantuvisarā iva lūtikāyāḥ
 yatraiva tāni nidhanaṃ punar eva yānti
 vyomnīva taṃ śiva[*m ahaṃ praṇamāmi bhaktyā (?)]

245. I propose that the Sanskrit expressions *vidyēśavit* and *vidyēśadhīmān* that refer to him (K. 300, v. 40; K. 300, v. 103) are to be understood as metrical substitutes for the name-title Vidyēśapañḍita/Vidyēśvarapañḍita, designations in -pañḍita being standard for Khmer royal officiants.

246. No later Sanskrit inscription from the Khmer realm has been published.

[*With devotion I offer my obeisance (?)] to Śiva, from whom all creatures emerge in due order like threads from a spider, [and] into whom they disappear again as though into space.²⁴⁷

In the second verse he is invoked simultaneously in his transcendent nature and in his perceptible manifestation as the deity on the mountain of Bhadreśvara, this double juxtaposition, both between the verses and within the second, heightening the sense of the latter's sanctity:

*sarvveśām api kāraṇan tri[*jagatām (?)] -- ∪ -- yo vibhuś
śrīmatkamvujadeśabhūpatigaṇāms tadbhaktibhūmādarāt
karttuṃ sarvvamahābhṛtām api [patīn] -- ∪ -- [*ā(?)]gataś
śaśvad vo vatu śaktibhiḥ paśupatiḥ bhadreśvarādrau sphutaḥ*

K. 258 C, v. 2

2b *ganāms* corr : *ganāms* CÆDÈS

[I pray] that Paśupati, the Lord of Bound Souls, may protect you at all times with his Powers, he, who though omnipresent (*vibhuḥ*) and the source of the three [*worlds (?)], is visible to us (*sphutaḥ*) on the Bhadreśvara mountain, having [*come down to earth (?)] to make the rulers (*bhūpatigaṇāms*) of holy Kambujadeśa [lords] over all [other] kings, [moved] by the great fervour of their devotion.

That the Bhadreśvara mountain of this verse is the mountain of the Liṅga (Phu Kao) with Niṣkalaliṅga as its summit and the temple of Bhadreśvara at its foot is evident from K. 723, an undated pre-Angkorean inscription from the largest of three caves 1500 metres north of Vat Phu, which refers to the consecration of that cave as a place for meditation and locates it “on the side of the Bhadreśvara mountain”.²⁴⁸

247. Cædès's reading *pūlikāyāḥ*, which he translated ‘d'un écheveau’ (‘from a skein’) is suspect. The word is not found to my knowledge in Sanskrit. At best one may postulate it on the basis of *pūlah*, *pūlakaḥ* ‘bunch, bundle’. But even so the sense is not apposite, because the term is used of grass or straw. I see two possibilities. The first is that *pūlikāyāḥ* is an error for *pūnikāyāḥ* ‘from a roll of cotton’ or ‘from a spindle’. But this too invokes an unrecorded form, one for which we must rely on the Prakrit words *pūniā* and *poṇiā*, which are attested in these two meanings respectively, though the analogy is somewhat less inapposite, and the syllables *ni* and *li* could easily be confused. However, I have preferred to propose that the author intended *lūtīkāyāḥ* ‘from a spider’. Though it is a step further away from the reading attested by Cædès it provides an entirely appropriate sense. For the spider's emanating threads from within its body is well-attested in key Indian theological texts as a metaphor to illustrate how it is that the world can come forth from within its divine source, so that its efficient cause and its material cause (its *nimittakāraṇam* and its *upādānakāraṇam*) are one and the same, whereas the alternatives before us are not found to my knowledge. We see it in the *Bṛhadāraṇyakopaniṣad* 2.1.20, in the Vaidika-Pāśupata *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad* 6.10 and *Muṇḍakopaniṣad* 1.1.7; and it was standard among those emanationist (*pariṇāmavādin*-) Vedāntists who preceded or survived the illusionist reformation of Śaṅkara and Maṇḍanamiśra. Thus it is invoked by Bhāskara *Brahmasūtrabhāṣya* ad 2.1.14 (concerning *Chāndogyopaniṣad* 6.1.4: *mṛttikety eva satyam: apracyutasvabhāvasya śaktivikṣepalakṣaṇaḥ / pariṇāmo yathā tantunābhāsyā paṭatantuvat*); and it is challenged by the Mīmāṃsaka Kumāṛila in *Ślokaṅkārtika*, *Sambandhākṣepaparihāra* 50c–51, tacitly treating it as a standard argument by analogy. That such emanationism is rejected by the dominant tradition of learned theology within the Siddhānta, the mainstream Śaivism whose rituals and observances were followed among the Khmers is not an argument against this reading. All three readings are equal in that regard, and the fact that those who propagated the Śaiva dualism that strictly separated God as the efficient cause of the universe from *māyā* as its inanimate material cause were followers of this ritual system does not require us to conclude that all its followers adhered to the same view.

248. K. 723: *samādhaye sarvvatapodhanānām iyaṃ guhā vaktraguheti nāmnā / sā niṣṭhitā vaktraśivena śaktyā vibhāti bhadreśvaraśailapārśve* ‘This cave shines forth on the side of Mt.

Though the exact words that occupied the lacuna in the third line cannot be inferred with certainty, there is little room for doubt concerning the meaning intended, namely that Śiva came to earth as the Bhadreśvara of Vat Phu in order to reward the Khmer kings' devotion to him with power over their neighbours. I propose, tentatively, that the noun in the accusative plural required in the lacuna by the context was *patīn* (*karṭtuṃ sarvvamahībhṛtām api patīn* 'to make [the rulers ...] lords over all [other] kings') because it provides the required sense and fits both the metre and style. As for the last criterion, we see the same expression for the Khmer king as paramount ruler later in this same composition (K. 258 C, v. 6c) in the compounded form *mahībhṛtpatiḥ* and in the uncompounded form in another inscription.²⁴⁹ It is also alliterative (*api patīn*) and echoed by *paśupatiḥ* in the next Pāda.

There is other evidence of the role of the Śiva Bhadreśvara of Vat Phu as the patron of the Khmer monarchs and thence as the protector of the Khmer realm. After re-occupying the temporarily abandoned city of Angkor (Yaśodharapura) and constructing his new capital on the south bank of the Yaśodharataṭāka or 'Eastern Baray', the vast water reservoir excavated by Angkor's founder Yaśovarman I (r. 889–910), Rājendravarman (r. 944–968) established two eponymous Śivaliṅgas, the first in 953 in the 'Eastern Mebon', a temple-complex on an island constructed for this purpose at the centre of that reservoir, and the second in 961/2 in the central tower at the summit of his pyramid-temple now known as Pre Rup, built at what was probably the centre of his capital. The name of the first of these Śivaliṅgas was formed in accordance with the common practice observed in the Indic world for images of deities enshrined by individuals, that is to say, as a compound consisting of the distinctive part of the individual's name, or of that of a person designated for the honour, followed by a term indicating the universal deity invoked into the image for worship: -īśvara for a Śiva, -svāmin, -mādhava or -nārāyaṇa for a Viṣṇu, -svāmin or -āditya for a Sūrya, and -īśvarī for a goddess.²⁵⁰

Bhadreśvara, established to the extent of his ability by Vaktraśiva under the name Vaktraguhā for the meditation practice of all ascetics'.

249. K. 81 A, v. 2 (7th c.): *rājā śrībhavavarmmeti patir āsīn mahībhṛtām*.

250. For these naming conventions see, e.g., *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 34v9–35r1: *yajamānasya yan nāma yojayed īsvareṇa tu* 'he should compound the name of the patron with -īśvara'; Bhojarāja, *Siddhānta-sārapaddhati*, f. 76r4: *yajamānādyam īsvarāntaṃ bhagavate nāma datvā* 'after giving the deity a name that begins with [that of] the patron and ends in -īśvara'; *Somaśambhupaddhati* 4:227 (N-īśvara for a Śiva), 275 (N-īśvarī for a Goddess), 291 (N-svāmin or N-āditya for a Sun), 311 (N-svāmin or N-mādhava for a Viṣṇu); *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati Kriyāpāda*, p. 446: *yajamānābhīdhānādyam *nāmeśvara* (em. : *nāmaiśvarya* Ed.) *padāntakam* 'the name, beginning with the name of the patron and ending with the word -īśvara'; *Pratiṣṭhāmayūkha*, p. 30b7: *atha karṭṛnāmayutaṃ devanāma kuryāt sarvadā vyavahārātham* 'For the sake of mundane transactions one should always give the deity a name compounded with that of the patron'. I interpret the last of these passages as pointing to the fact that the apparent individualization of the deity through the giving of this composite name is understood as a device that enables the deity in the principal image of the temple to be treated in law as the owner of the lands and other goods gifted by the founder and any subsequent benefactors. It has no further reality. The Śiva in an image is never worshipped under this name but only as Śiva pure and simple. That the legal fiction of ownership is the function of the name is implicit in *Somaśambhupaddhati* 4:227 (v. 46): *hiraṇyapaśubhūmyādi gītavādyādīhetave / amukeśāya tad bhaktyā śaktyā sarvaṃ nivedayet* 'With devotion he should make over all that he can, such as gold, domestic animals and lands "to N-īśvara" to [fund] the singing, instrumental music and other [expenses of the cult]'. The naming convention is mentioned only in this context. The *Śivāgamaśekhara* cited by BRUNNER-LACHAUX ad loc. elaborates this as follows: *tato rājāntikaṃ kartā gatvā hiraṇyagrāmādi dāsādāśīparyantaṃ nṛtagītādīhetave amukeśvarāyeti svaśaktitas tāmraśilāśānaṃ kṛtvā nivedayet*. 'Then the patron should go to the king and having prepared a copper-

In this case, since the image was a Śivaliṅga it was named Rājendreśvara (‘Rājendra[varman]’s Śiva’).²⁵¹ But the name given to the second was Rājendrabhadreśvara (‘Rājendra[varman]’s Bhadreśvara’):

*sa śrīrājendrabhadreśvara iti viditam liṅgam atredam agryam
gaurīśaurīśvarāṇām catasṛbhir abhirāmābhir arccābhir ābhiḥ
kīrtim vaktum prasannaṃ mukham iva muditasyarddhvam āsyaiś caturbhiś
śambhor bhāsvadbhir iddhe śikhitanuvasubhis sthāpayām āsa śāke*

K. 806, v. 277

277a atredam corr. : atraidam CÆDÈS + 277d vasubhis corr. : vasubhi CÆDÈS

In Śaka 883 [= A.D. 961/2] to proclaim his fame he installed here this excellent Liṅga called Śrī-Rājendrabhadreśvara together with these four lovely images of Gaurī, Viṣṇu and Śiva, resembling the calm upper face of joyful Śiva with his [other] four radiant faces.²⁵²

This is an altogether exceptional title that expresses both Bhadreśvara’s exalted status among the Khmers and his special role as patron of the monarch, a role that was also that of certain

plate or stone edict he should donate gold, villages and the rest down to male and female slaves for the sake of the dancing, singing and other [expenses], saying [that he does so] “to N-īśvara”.

251. K. 286, v. 44cd; K. 872, v. 15; K. 528, v. 218.

252. The complex of the Liṅga surrounded by the four images is compared to that of the five faces of Sadāśiva, the form of Śiva venerated in the Siddhānta, which was then the Śaivism of the state. Just as Sadāśiva has a superior upper face (Īśāna) and four lesser faces below it (Tatpuruṣa, Aghora, Sadyojāta and Vāmadeva) looking in the four directions, so this Liṅga shrine has four somewhat lower shrines around it forming the corners (SE, SW, NW, and NE) of a square of which it occupies the centre. For the quincunx layout of the uppermost level of the Rājabhadreśvara temple (Pre Rup) see JACQUES 1999, 76–78. The secondary images, installed in the corner-shrines, were (1) a Rājendravarmeśvara (SE) for the king’s own benefit, (2) a Viṣṇu Rājendravisvarūpa whose purpose is not stated, (3) a Gaurī, probably called Rājendreśvarī, for the salvation of his consort Jayadevī, and (4) a Rājendravarmadeveśvara for the welfare of his younger brother Harṣavarman (K. 806, vv. 278–281).

CÆDÈS translates *liṅgam ...agryam* ‘ce liṅga principal’ as though it were related to others; but see the following close parallel in a Nepalese inscription of 468/9 A.D. in which another solitary liṅga is so described: *aiśānaṃ liṅgam agryam vidhivad anupamaṃ sthāpayām āsa bhaktyā* (Dh. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1973, No. 6).

CÆDÈS reads *kīrtim vaktum ...muditasya ...āsyaiś caturbhiś* ‘joyeux de proclamer sa renommée par quatre bouches brillantes’, but this abandons the syntactic parallel and makes no sense: gods do not proclaim their fame and that is certainly not the function of Sadāśiva’s four lateral faces. On the other hand it is in keeping with Indic convention to say that the purpose of a religious installation is to enhance the founder’s reputation (*kīrtiḥ, yaśaḥ*), that and the increase of merit (*puṇyam, dharmāḥ*) being everywhere identified as the goals of such activity, for the founder, others, usually his parents, or both. See K. 53, v. 12: *yo tiṣṭhipad imau devau śraddhayā bhūridakṣiṇau kīrtistambhāv ivodagrau* ‘who installed these two gods with faith like two loft pillars of [his] fame, giving abundant fees’; K. 528, v. 202cd: *sthāpayām āsa pitṛṇām dharmavṛddhaye* ‘he established [it] to augment the merit of his ancestors’; K. 323, v. 59ab: *imās svaśilparacitā gurūṇām puṇyavṛddhaye* ‘these [images] fashioned by his own craft to increase the merit of his elders’; K. 339, v. 39: *khātam idaṃ mātuḥ taṭākam puṇyavṛddhaye* ‘this tank was excavated to increase the merit of his mother’; Lājimpāṭ inscription of Mānadeva (467/8 A.D.) (Dh. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1973, No. 4): *mātuḥ ...sarvadā puṇyavṛddhyai* ‘for ever to increase the merit of his mother’; Varāhamihira (6th century), *Brhatsaṃhitā* 55.1cd: *devatāyatanam kuryād yaśodharmābhivṛddhaye* ‘he should construct a temple to increase his fame and merit’; Bānskherā copper-plate inscription of Harṣa (628 A.D.), *EI* 4, pp. 210 ff., line 11 and the Sunak grant of Karṇa I (1091), *EI* I, 36, line 8 (prose): *puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye* ‘to increase his fame and merit’; Ujjain copper-plate of Bhojadeva (*Indian Antiquary* 6, pp. 53 ff.): *mātāpitror ātmanāś ca puṇyayaśobhivṛddhaye* ‘to increase the merit and fame of his parents and himself’.

‘national’ Śivas in the Indian subcontinent. In the Tamil country Naṭarāja of Cidambaram became the family deity of the Cola emperors;²⁵³ Paśupati in the Kathmandu valley is regularly invoked as the patron of the kings of that region from the seventh century to the present;²⁵⁴ and the Gaṅgas who conquered Orissa claimed the same relationship with Śiva Gokarṇasvāmin on Mt. Mahendra in the Ganjam district, as did the Solānkis with Umāpatiśiva, the Hoysala Yādavas with Vajreśvaraśiva,²⁵⁵ and the Guhilot kings of Mewār with Ekaliṅgaśiva.²⁵⁶ The Rājendrabhadreśvara of the Pre Rup pyramid-temple was evidently intended as a local double of the national deity, permanently accessible to the monarch at the heart of the new capital and no doubt visible from his palace (*rājamandiram*). No remains of this palace have yet been identified, perhaps because they have not been searched for with sufficient diligence. But JACQUES has proposed that in accordance with normal practice it would have been located directly to the north of the Rājendrabhadreśvara temple, between it and the Yaśodharataṭāka and in alignment with both the Rājendrabhadreśvara and Rājendreśvara on the island at its centre.²⁵⁷

The role of Bhadreśvara as the sustainer of the king and his realm is confirmed by another passage of the same inscription:

*kamvuvīśvambharāyāṃ yas tridaśānāṃ svayambhuvām
sthāpitānāñ ca yajvaiko bhūtvā pūjām avarddhayat
rājendunā yena yathā yathā śrī-
bhadreśvare dīyata maṇḍalaśrīḥ
tathā tathāvarddhata niṣkalaṅkā
candraśriyaṃ hrepayitum mudeva
K. 806, vv. 270–271*

Having become [as king] the unique worshipper of [all] the gods of Kambujadeśa, both the self-manifested and those installed, [Rājendravarman] increased their endowments.

253. *SII* 5:458: *taṅ kulanāyakam*; HALL 2001, 87–95.

254. The constant epithet of the kings of the Kathmandu valley in their inscriptions of the seventh and eighth centuries, beginning in the time of Aṃśuvarman (d. 639/40), is *bhagavatpaśupatibhaṭṭāraka-pādānugrhitāḥ* / *-pādānudhyātaḥ* ‘favoured by the feet of Lord Paśupatibhaṭṭāraka’ (see Dh. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1973, Nos. 71 and 72). Similarly in the epigraphy of Malla times the standard epithet of the kings of the region begins *paśupaticaraṅakamaladhūlidhūsaritaśiroruha-* ‘with their hair made grey with the pollen of the lotuses that are the feet of Glorious Paśupati’ (e.g., G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976, No. 12 of 761, = 1640/1 A.D.); and later, under the Shah dynasty, Nepalese inscriptions pray that this lineage may endure by the favour of the dust of the feet of Guhyakālī and Paśupati (e.g. G. VAJRĀCĀRYA 1976, No. 74, ll. 18–19: *yāvan nakṣatramālā vilasati gagane tāvad eva sthiraḥ syāt / pṛthvinārāyaṇasya kṣitipatimukūṭaprotahīrasya vaṃśo nepāle guhyakālīpaśupaticaraṅadvandvadhūliprasādāt. śubham astu. śrīśrīśrīpaśupataye namaḥ*).

255. See, e.g., SIRCAR 1983, 170 (Gaṅga): *gokarṇasvāminas samārādhana-labdhanikhilamanorathānām* ‘who have obtained all their desires by propitiating the Lord Gokarṇa’; *EI* 27 (1956): 41, concerning Gaṅga Samantavarman: *mmahendrācalaśikharavarānīvāsino gokarṇasvāminah satata-praṇāmaparicaryādibhiḥ rñni[rdhau]takāleyadoṣo* (lines 1–5) ‘who has eliminated the sins of the Kali age by his constant obeisance, worship and [donations?] to the lord Gokarṇa who dwells on the summit of Mt. Mahendra’; SIRCAR 1983, p. 404 (Solānkī): *śrī-umāpativaralabdhaprauḍhapratāpa-* ‘whose great might was obtained as a boon from Umāpatiśvara’; p. 544 (Hoysala Yādava): *vajreśvarārādhana-labdharājyaḥ* ‘who obtained his realm by propitiating Vajreśvara’.

256. See James TOD (1829 and 1832) 1920, 1:222–225, 516. He reports that the Guhilot kings were seen as the regents of this Śiva (*ekliṅ kā dīwān*), Ekaliṅgaśiva himself being seen not only as their tutelary deity but also as the true ruler of the realm.

257. JACQUES 1999, 71 (map of Angkor), 72.

[And] the more this moon among kings gifted the untainted wealth of his realm to Bhadreśvara the greater it grew, as though it sought through joy to shame the splendour of the moon itself.

The special status of this Śiva is also indicated by the fact that he was believed to have manifested a double of himself (*punarbhāva*) at Śikhareśvara/Śikhariśvara (Preah Vihear):

*man [kamra]teñ jagat śrībhadreśvara liṅgapura mok punarbhāva āy śrīśikharīśvara
piy gi vraḥ tejaḥ ta yal pratyakṣa prādurbhāva*

K. 380 E, ll. 3–5

Then the Lord of the World Bhadreśvara of Liṅgapura came to be born a second time in Śikhariśvara, so that the divine radiance (*vraḥ tejaḥ*) should be made manifest [there].

and to have been induced to do so by king Sūryavarman I (r. 1002–c. 1050) as the reward of his ascetic practice (*tapovīrya*):

*man kamrateñ jagat śrībhadreśvara liṅgapura ti vraḥ pāda kamrateñ kamtvan añ
śrīsūryavarmmadeva sādhyā nu tapovīrya gi pi mok rājya āy śrīśikharīśvara piy gi
vraḥ tejaḥ prādurbhāva pratyakṣa pi loka mel*

K. 380 E, ll. 58–60

Then the Lord of the World Śrībhadreśvara of Liṅgapura, by the power of asceticism achieved by His Majesty Sūryavarman [I], came to rule in Śikhariśvara, to make his divine radiance (*vraḥ tejaḥ*) visible, so that all the world could see it.

This public manifestation of Śiva's radiance was the installation of a Liṅga, as is revealed by parallel expressions.²⁵⁸ The meaning, then, is that Sūryavarman I engaged in ascetic practices, probably in the vicinity of Bhadreśvara, and was rewarded with a vision in which that god had instructed him to install a double (*punarbhāva*) in the form of a Liṅga bearing this name at Preah Vihear. It is at least probable that this event was intended to be understood as a divine authorization of the king's rule, which we know to have been won by force of arms and after a long struggle. The theme of ascetic retreat from the world as enabling the seizing of power through conquest and as the support of its exercise is well-documented in Southeast Asian sources, among the Khmers, the Chams, and the Javanese;²⁵⁹ and Preah Vihear was a site of special significance to this king's rule. It was

258. K. 769 (12th/13th century): *tejaś saivam atiṣṭhipat* 'he installed the radiance of Śiva'; K. 232, v. 2cd: *jyotis tad uccaiś śaśīsekharasya liṅgābhavad *bhātu* (conj. : *bhāti* Ed.) *vibhūtikṛd vaḥ* 'May that intense light of Śiva taking the form of the Liṅga shine forth to bring you glory'; K. 834, v. 5: *namo stu śivaliṅgāya yadādijyotir aiśvaram niśreyasābhyudayayos siddhyai dhātrādisādhitam* 'Let there be obeisance to the Liṅga of Śiva, *whose primal divine radiance (or: 'which, being the primal radiance of God' [*yad ādijyotir aiśvaram*]) was propitiated by Brahmā and the other [gods] as the means of accomplishing both salvation and prosperity'; K. 380 W, Khmer A, ll. 14–15: *nu man udyoga cām pāñjīy kāla vraḥ śivatejaḥ kamrateñ jagat śrīśikharīśvara ta yal pratyakṣa prādurbhāva* 'He carefully preserves the inventory [of goods received] since the time that the divine Śiva radiance of the Lord of the World Śikhariśvara was directly manifested to our senses'.

259. K. 323, v. 26 (eulogy of Yaśovarman I): *saminā yena guptāpi kṛtye śaktiḥ prakāśitā / tāpasābhena hariṇā nakhālīva guhaukasā* 'Practising withdrawal in the guise of an ascetic living in a cave he manifested the power to act **that been** concealed [within him], just as Hari [Narasimha] manifested his claws [when he appeared from the pillar to rend the impious Titan Hiranyakaśipu]'; K. 79, v. 1 (eulogy of Bhavavarman II): *rājā śrībhavavarmmeti tapasā dhāraṇād iti* (conj. : *dhāraṇādditiḥ* Ep. : *dhāraṇāditiḥ* corr. C.ÉDÈS) 'called Bhavavarman ['Protector of the World'] because he supported [it] through his ascetic practice'; K. 806, v. 289 (Rājendravarman addressing all the future kings of the Khmers): *labdhā dharitrī tapasā bhavadbhir* 'you have obtained the earth [to rule] by virtue of your

the northern of four sites around the limits of his kingdom at which he chose to establish Liṅgas incorporating his name (Sūryavarmēśvaras) in A.D. 1018;²⁶⁰ it may well have been where he was first consecrated;²⁶¹ and it was the principal of three sites at which the written records of the reigns of his royal ancestors and the various departments of their governments were preserved during his reign.²⁶²

asceticism'. This theme is seen among the Chams in C. 66 = M. 31, the Duong Duong stele of Indravarman II (A.D. 875), A, vv. 18–21. There we are told the following. Bhadravarman's son Śrī-Indravarman now rules (*nṛpo bhavati*) in the royal city of Campā (*campānagare*), through the might of Śiva (*māheśvaraprabhāvāt*) (18). The perfect sovereignty that the king has acquired is not simply an inheritance from his ancestors (19ab), the gift of his grandfather to his father and of his father to him (19cd). He has won it from Bhadreśvara as the exceptional award of his religious austerities (*tapahphalaviśeṣāt*) [in many former lives (cf. prose after v. 37)], his pious actions, his wisdom and his valour (*puṇyabuddhiparākramāt*) (20–21). In Java we find the theme that the ideal king's career comprises ascetic preparation, victory through war and eventual retirement into life as a hermit. This pattern is ascribed to Pikatan, the Śaiva king of the Sañjaya dynasty in Central Java who expelled the Sailendras from Java in the mid-ninth century, and to the East Javanese conqueror Airlangga (r. 1019–1049) (TAYLOR 1992, 177–178). The latter is said to have spent four years in a hermitage on the mountain Vanagiri before he acceded to the pleas of the brahmins and other dignitaries that he should accept royal power (CÉDÈS 1968, 144–145). It is very probable that it was the latter's career that motivated his court poet Mpu Kaṇva to compose his *Arjunawiwāha* (A.D. 1053), since that retells the myth derived from the *Mahābhārata* of the asceticism undertaken by Arjuna on the Indrakīla mountain to obtain from Śiva the weapon that would bestow victory on the humiliated Pāṇḍavas (HENRY 1986, 14, following BERG). The theme persisted after the arrival of Islam, being found in the Javanese chronicles (*babad*). SUPOMO (1997, I:67), writes: "we often read in various *babad*, that a would-be rebel against a Javanese king, Dutch authority, or both, would invariably practice asceticism before embarking on his dangerous undertaking".

260. The others were at Jayakṣetra (= Vat Baset in Battambang) in the west, Sūryādri (= Phnom Chisor) in the south, and Īśānāfirṭha, presumably in the east. JACQUES proposes (1999, 96–99) that it may have been by the Mekong river. Perhaps it was within the territory of the old kingdom of Īśānapura in the Sen river valley to the east of the Tonlé Sap. The installation of these four Sūryavarmēśvaras is recorded in K. 380 E, v. 12: *ekaṃ śrīśikhareśvarādriśikhare śrīśānāfirṭhe para[m] śrīsūryādriśiloccaye nyad asame śrīsūryavarmmeśvaram / liṅgaṃ samyag asau śrīyādhikajayakṣetre purātiṣṭhipat paścāt tīrṇaviyatpayodhivivaraiś śrīsūryavarmmā triṣu* 'Sūryavarman first installed a Sūryavarmēśvaraliṅga in Śrījayakṣetra and then, in 940 elapsed, in three [other sites], one on the summit of the hill of Śikhareśvara, another at Īśānāfirṭha, and yet another on the summit of the hill of the Sun (Sūryādri)'.

261. This hypothesis has been proposed by JACQUES (1976b, 364).

262. K. 380 W of 1037/8 A.D., ll. 14–19: **K. 380 W, Khmer A: K. 380 W, Khmer A, ll. 11–26: 958 śaka amāvasyā māgha ta jā puṣya dhaniṣṭhanakṣatra madhyāha nu vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ śrīrājapativarmma cau vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ śrīrājapativarmma ta qcas sruk avadhyapura paṅgaṃ thpvaṅ nivedana ta vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan aṅ śrīsūryavarmmadeva ruv gi bhaktiy śrīsukarmmā kaṃsteṅ nā man jā tem ta gi karmma durggama phoṅ nā kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara nu kamrateṅ jagat śrīvṛddheśvara nu man udyoga cāṃ pāñjīyā kāla vraḥ śivatejaḥ kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara ta yal pratyakṣa prādurbhāva ta nu jā vraḥ yaśasthirāvasāna nu man gi ta mān santāna ta cāṃ likhita kamvuvāṅśa nu aṅga vraḥ rājakāryya likhita kīrtti kamrateṅ phdai karom damnepra gi vraḥ pāda śrutavarmmadeva lvoḥ ta vraḥ kīrtti vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan aṅ śrīsūryavarmmadeva ta rājakula vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ aṅ śrīndravarmmadeva ta stac dau īśvaraloka nu kaṃmrateṅ aṅ śrīvīralakṣmī mahādevī āy vrac vraḥ sruk rājakula vraḥ pāda śrīharṣavarmmadeva ta stac dau rudraloka nu vraḥ pāda śrīśānavarmmadeva ta stac dau paramarudraloka nu man gi ta laṃtāp vraḥ likhita pi duk ta vraḥ rikta pi duk nā kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara nu kamrateṅ jagat śrīvṛddheśvara nu ta ti duk āy kanloṅ nu man śapata teṃ bhaktiy mvāy vaddha nu vraḥ kamrateṅ aṅ śrīrājapativarmma gi pi vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan aṅ śrīsūryavarmmadeva karuṅā pandval vraḥ vara ta śrīsukarmmā kaṃsteṅ oṃ prasāda rājadravya nu sruk vibheda mṛtakadhana mratāṅ śrīpṛthivīnarendra kaṃnuṅ (kaṃn[u]ṅ) kaṃsteṅ śrīmahādhavararmma vraḥ sruk ta śrīsukarmmā kaṃsteṅ pandval pre cā ta vraḥ śilāstambha nā kamrateṅ jagat śrīśikharīśvara pre cār ta śilāprasasta pi duk ta sruk vibheda mna vraḥ pāda kamrateṅ kaṃtvan aṅ śrīsūrya[varmma]deva oṃ vraḥ karuṅā prasāda ta śrīsukarmmā kaṃsteṅ nu**

The pre-eminence of Bhadreśvara as the principal Śiva of the realm is also seen in references to a practice in which the king's Guru, after consecrating him as the monarch, would receive lavish gifts from him and then go on a pilgrimage to sacred sites (*kṣetrādhigama*) to pass on those gifts as his own donations to the deities of those sites, to perform sacrifices there, install images, found hermitages, excavate reservoirs and establish endowments. Divākarapaṇḍita, after serving in lesser capacities under Udayādityavarman II (r. 1050–1066) and Harṣavarman III (r. 1066–1080), is said to have followed this practice as Vraḥ Guru under Jayavarman VI (r. 1080–1107), Dharaṇīndravarmā I (r. 1107–1112) and Sūryavarman II (r. 1113–c. 1150). We are told that after he had performed the royal consecration of Sūryavarman II, given him Śaiva initiation, taught him the Śaiva scriptures and other branches of learning, and been invited to perform the Koṭihoma and other annual brahmanical sacrifices for him, he was given golden palanquins and many other valuables so that he could visit various sacred sites around the kingdom and give these to the deities installed there, each engraved with a verse composed by the king himself to the effect that it was a gift to Śiva made by his revered Guru. The sites chosen for this purpose were five, of which the first three are clearly the most important: Bhadreśvara, Śikhariśvara (Preah Vihear), and Śivapura Danden (Phnom Sandak). At each of these he had a water-reservoir excavated, founded a hermitage, gave it slaves and villages and made an endowment to provide for worship. Similarly, Sadāśiva Jayendrapaṇḍita, high priest of the royal Śaiva cult of the Kamrateñ Jagat ta Rāja (Devarāja) and Guru of Udayādityavarman II, is praised for his constant lavish donations to 'Bhadreśvara and other gods'.²⁶³

kulasantāna śrīsukarmā kaṁsteṇi ta ti duk ta sruk vibheda ta jmaḥ kurukṣetra ilū 'In 958 Śaka, on the new moon day of Māgha in Puṣya, under the asterism Dhaniṣṭhā, at midday. V.K.A. Śrī Rājapativarman, grandson of V.K.A. Śrī Rājapativarman the elder, of Sruk Avadhyapura, respectfully informs H.H. Sūryavarman [I] of the works of devotion of Śrī Sukarmā Kaṁsteṇ on the occasion of the beginning of the works of fortification for the gods Śikhariśvara and Vṛddheśvara. He preserves with great effort the inventory [of goods received] since the time that the Śiva splendour of Śikhariśvara was directly manifested to our senses ...There is a family that preserves the records of the Kambu lineage and the departments of the royal service, records of the splendid deeds of the kings from [those of] Śrutavarman down to those of Sūryavarman I in the royal family of Indravarmā who went to Īśvaraloka and [down to those of] the queen Vīralakṣmī Mahādevī of Vrac of the Vraḥ Sruk, relative of Harṣavarman who went to Rudraloka and of Īśānavarmā who went to Paramarudraloka. The collection of the sacred records is kept on leaves stored in Śikhariśvara, Vṛddheśvara and Kanloñ. He took the same oath of loyalty *following the same formula as Rājapativarman (?). So Sūryavarman I favoured Sukarmā and gave him royal goods and the Sruk Vibheda, inheritance of Pṛthivīnarendra being part of the goods of Mahīdharavarman of Vraḥ Sruk. He ordered that [this decision] be engraved on a stone pillar in Śikhariśvara and ordered it to be engraved on [another] stone pillar to be placed in the Sruk Vibheda given by him to Sukarmā in Sruk Vibheda, formerly called Kurukṣetra'.

263. The account of Divākarapaṇḍita's offices and donations is given in K. 194, A9–B17. The gifts of Sadāśiva Jayendrapaṇḍita are mentioned in K. 235, v. 119ab: *maṇikanakamayādi dyumnajātam vadanyas satatam adita deve bhūri bhadreśvarādau* 'A liberal donor, he constantly gave valuables made of jewels, gold and other [precious substances] in great abundance to Bhadreśvara and the other deities'. CÆDÈS and DUPONT (1943–46: 137–139) discuss this practice of redistributing royal gifts to the gods of the kingdom in the introduction to their edition of this inscription, considering both these passages. They also cite the case of the general Saṁgrāma. K. 289 D recounts his campaign against a chieftain called Sivat, who had attacked him in Pṛthuśaila. He defeated him at Praśānvraimmyat and founded two hermitages dedicated to Śiva Bhadreśvara at the site in this same year, giving one thousand cows and a hundred and twenty cows. The inscription records a further encounter near a temple of Viṣṇu. Once again victorious he made donations to this god and having returned handed over the booty (*dhanāni hṛtāni*) to the king, Udayādityavarman II. The king gave these riches back to the general as the reward of his loyal

Neither Buddhism nor Vaiṣṇavism offered the Khmers any deity so central to their collective identity and only Śaivism had inscribed itself so deeply into the Khmers' sense of place, by establishing this and other doubles of the Śivas of ancient temple-sites of the Indian subcontinent and by locating natural, autochthonous Śivas in their landscape.

Śaivism and Khmer Vaiṣṇavism

Moreover, while Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism and Mahāyāna Buddhism flourished alongside Śaivism, there are indications they were unable to escape its shadow. Thus Nārāyaṇa, a Bhāgavata courtier of Jayavarman V (r. c. 970–1000), could found a Vaiṣṇava hermitage and build a Viṣṇu temple within it, but then install images of Nandin and Mahākāla to guard its entrance, although these two are the door-guardians prescribed in the Śaiva systems for shrines of Śiva.²⁶⁴

*cakāra cakrisaubhakyāt saṃkrāntapadam āśramam
dāsīdāsahiranyādidhanair āpūrayac ca saḥ
dviprasthañ cātra śucyannaṃ dātavyaṃ prativāsaram
triprasthadevayajñañ ca cakriṇe so py akalpayat
nandinam śrīmahākālam dvāssthaṃ viṣṇor vvidhāya saḥ
dviprastham anvahan tābhyāṃ yajñan deyam akalpayat*

K. 256 C, v. 9–11 (= K. 814, v. 9–11)

saubhakyāt conj. : *saubhakyā* (*saubhākyā* K. 814) CÆDÈS and DUPONT²⁶⁵ + *dviprasthañ cātra śucyannaṃ* conj. : *dviprastham tadā śucyannaṃ* CÆDÈS and DUPONT²⁶⁶

Out of his great devotion to Viṣṇu he founded the Saṃkrāntapada hermitage and filled it with male and female slaves, gold and other valuables. He provided for two prastha measures of pure food to be given here daily [for the residents] and for [daily] offerings of three prasthas to Viṣṇu. He also established a Nandin and a Mahākāla at the door of [this] Viṣṇu [temple] and provided for a daily offering of two prasthas to be given to them.²⁶⁷

service. The general declined to accept them and asked that they be given to the king's subtle inner self, the Śiva in the golden Liṅga (v. 27bc: *suvarṇnamayaliṅgateśvare te sūkṣmāntarātmani*), which was probably that which Udayādityavarman II had established c. 1060 on the Tribhuvanacūḍāmaṅgiri (the Baphuon temple-mountain) (see K. 136 B, v. 24).

264. See *Pañcārthabhāṣya* ad *Pāśupatasūtra* 1.9; *Somaśambhupaddhati* 1:95; *Sūryasevana* p. 135; *Svacchanda* 2.25 and *Netratantra* 3.9; Kṣemarāja ad *Svacchanda* 2.25 and *Netratantra* 3.9; and *Tantrāloka* 15.183–188b.

265. The emendation *saubhakyāt* cannot be supported by any citation of this word; but it is well-formed as an abstract from *subhakta*- 'very devoted, very loyal' (cf. such words as *saugandhyam* and *saubhāgyam*), whereas *saubhakyā*, which could only be understood to mean *subhakyā*, is an implausible solecism.

266. The version of K. 814 is given by CÆDÈS and DUPONT as *catuḥprastha – śucyannaṃ*, reporting that the syllable after *stha* is *cā* or *cchā* with *tra* written beneath. The reading *dviprastham tadā śucyannaṃ* accepted by CÆDÈS and DUPONT in K. 256 C is unmetrical.

267. The word *śucyannaṃ* 'pure food' is a Vaiṣṇava usage. In our Old Khmer inscriptions *śucyanna* and *saṃvibhāga* are in the worship of Viṣṇu what *caru* and *naivedya* are in that of Śiva and the Goddess. See K. 989 B, l. 47–C, l. 1. For this usage among Indian Vaiṣṇavas see *Rahasyāmnāya* cited and discussed by Vedāntadeśika in his *Saccaritarakṣā*, p. 90, ll. 7–10, also Alaśiṅgabhṭṭa ad *Sātvatasamhitā* 6.181c–182: ...*odanapacane śucyannaṃ śrapayitvā vedyāṃ bhagavate nayati*

The deities required at the entrance to a Vaiṣṇava shrine are Caṇḍa and Pracāṇḍa.²⁶⁸

There is further evidence of the intrusion of Śaivism into the Vaiṣṇavism of the Khmers if the great temple established by Sūryavarman II (r. 1113–c. 1150) and now known as Angkor Vat was originally dedicated to Viṣṇu, as is probable and generally accepted. In the bas-relief on the wall of the eastern section of its southern gallery thirty-two hells are depicted, each with an accompanying Khmer legend that names it and identifies the kinds of sinners being punished in it.²⁶⁹ Now the schema of thirty-two hells is distinctively Śaiva. It is taught in the Śaiva scriptures *Niśvāsamukha*, *Mataṅga* (VP 23.74–81b), *Parākhyā* (5.11–32b), and *Kiraṇa* (*Vidyāpāda* 8.7–11c). There is some small variation among these sources in the names or identities of the hells, and no scriptural list known to me agrees exactly with that of the Angkor Vat bas-relief. But there is a particularly close agreement, both in names and in their order, with that of the *Niśvāsamukha*.²⁷⁰ In any case all the Śaiva lists are closer to that of Angkor Vat than are those seen in brahmanical and Vaiṣṇava sources.²⁷¹

But more telling than this is the fact that the inscriptions identifying the categories of sinners who are punished in these hells disclose an unambiguously Śaiva perspective. For they include persons who have committed offences against Śiva or his devotees but none who have committed sins against Viṣṇu or Vaiṣṇavas.²⁷² Thus:

krimīnicaya. anak ta nindā devatā vraḥ vleñ. guru. vrāhmaṇa. mahājñāna. anak ta pradau dharmma. anak ta śivabhakti. ame. vapā. suhṛt.

K. 299, no. 6²⁷³

Krimīnicaya: [Here are] those who denigrate the gods, the sacred fire, a Guru, a brahmin of great knowledge, a teacher of religious duty, devotees of Śiva, their mother, father or friends.

268. These, and, in subordinate roles, Jaya and Vijaya, Śaṅkhanidhi and Cakranidhi are prescribed in *Jayākhyasamhitā* 13.79–81; *Lakṣmītantra* 33.49–60; *Pādmāsāṃhitā* 2.48; 4.17; 10.63–66.

269. K. 299 (*NIC* II–III, 156–163). The hells are the following: 1 Avīci, 2 Krimīnicaya, 3 the river Vaitaraṇī, 4 Kūṭasālmālī, 5 Yugmaparvata, 6 Nirucchvāsa, 7 Ucchvāsa, 8 Dravattrapu, 9 Taptalākṣāmaya, 10 Asthibhaṅga, 11 *Kraśaccheda (corr. : *krakaccheda* Ed.), 12 Pūyapūrṇahrada, 13 Aśṛkpūrṇahrada, 14 Medohrada, 15 Tikṣṇāyastunda, 16 Aṅgāranicaya, 17 Ambarīṣa, 18 Kumbhīpāka, 19 Tālavṛkṣavana, 20 Kṣuradhāraparvata, 21 S - - - - - , 22 Sūcimukha, 23 Kālasūtra, 24 Mahāpadma, 25 Padma, 26 Sañjivana, 27 [Sujivana], 28 [Uṣṇa], 29 Śīta, 30 Sāndratamas, 31 Mahāraurava, and 32 Raurava.

270. *Niśvāsamukha*, f. 17v6–18r1: *avīcī krimīnicayo vaitaraṇī kūṭasālmālī / girīyamala ucchvāso nirucchvāso hy athāparaḥ / pūtimānsa dravaś caiva trapus taptajatus tathā / paṅkālayo 'sthibhaṅgaś ca krakacchedam eva ca / medosṛkpūyahradaś ca tikṣṇāyastuṅdam eva ca / aṅgārarāśibhuvanah śakuniḥ khañjarīṭakaḥ / ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ ॐ -- ॐ hy asitālavanas tathā / sūcimukhaḥ kṣuradhārah kālasūtro 'siparvataḥ / padmaś caiva samākhyato mahāpadmas tathaiva ca / †ayoko+ra† uṣṇaś ca sañjivanasujivanau / śītatamondhatamasau mahārauravarauravau / dvātrīṃśad ete narakā mayā devi prakṛttitāḥ.*

271. See, e.g., *Manusmṛti* 4.88–90, *Viṣṇudharma* 45.9–12, *Brahmapurāṇa* 215.84–135, *Agnipurāṇa* 203.6–23.

272. This incongruity was considered in a study of these bas-reliefs by CÉDÈS (1911, 210). He considered that it did not contradict the exclusively Vaiṣṇava character of the bas-reliefs of Angkor Vat, on the ground that the inscriptions might be a little later than the bas-reliefs and that they may therefore have been executed after the fashion for Vaiṣṇavism had receded in favour of Śaivism, the persistent primary religion. This hypothesis is weakened by the fact that, as we have seen, the bas-reliefs of the hells are themselves Śaiva in inspiration. CÉDÈS wrongly thought the inspiration to be Buddhist (1911, 207–8).

273. These inscriptions were published by AYMONTIER (1883), then, with some corrections of Aymontier's readings by CÉDÈS (1911). They have now been re-edited by POU (2001, 156–163) with notes and some unremarked deviations from the text of CÉDÈS. The text given here and the following citation is that of CÉDÈS and POU.

and:

padma. anak ta lvac vñya. peḥ vñya ta śivārāma. duk jey sin.

K. 299, no. 29

Padma: [Here are] those who steal flowers, who pluck flowers from the garden of a Śiva [temple] (*śivārāma*), *and enjoy keeping them (*duk*) in their huts (*jey*) (?).

Indeed both these passages have striking Sanskrit parallels in the treatment of the candidates for infernal punishment given in the *Śivadharmottara*, one of the two principal Śaiva scriptures concerned with the duties of the uninitiated Śaiva laity. These are:

*ye nindanti mahātmānam ācāryaṃ dharmadeśakam
śivabhaktāṃś ca saṃmūdhāḥ śivadharmāṃ ca śāsvatam*

f. 38r7–8, = 7.192c–193b

Those fools who denigrate a man of great wisdom, a Guru, a teacher of religious duty, devotees of Śiva and the eternal Śivadharmā ...²⁷⁴

and:

*ye śivārāmapuṣpāṇi lobhāt saṃgrhya pāṇinā
jighranti mūḍhamanasaḥ śirasā dhārayanti ca*

f. 38r6, = 7.190c–191b

Those of deluded mind who out of greed pluck flowers from the garden of a Śiva [temple], enjoy their fragrance, and wear them on their heads

In my translation of the last phrase of the second Khmer passage (*duk jey sin*) I have reproduced that given by the Khmerologist Saveros POU with her edition of the inscription. But I have queried it, because *jey* is not found in any other Old Khmer inscription, and the meaning ‘hut’ that POU attributes to it is both hypothetical and less than compelling in the context.²⁷⁵ I propose that *jey* is an error for *thep* ‘smell’. The characters *th-* and *j-* are similar enough in the Khmer script, as are *p-* and *y-*, to be easily confused; and the emendation replaces the puzzling reference to those who keep Śiva’s flowers in their huts with exactly what we find in the Sanskrit parallel: ‘those who wear them [on their heads] (*duk*) and those who smell [them] (*thep*)’. Only the order of the two is different.²⁷⁶

274. The Khmer text suggests that it might be based on a variant of this verse with the reading *mahājñānam* rather than *mahātmānam*. The meaning is any case the same.

275. See POU 1992, 191ab and 545b (s.v. *hajaya*). Her evidence for this meaning is the hapax legomenon *hajaya* K. 324a (*NIC* II–III, 62–64), l. 36 (9th century): *cmām hajaya tai kanlak* ‘Guard of the *hajaya*: the female servant Kanlak’, and Middle and Modern Khmer *jai*. See also POU 2001, 163 (ad loc.). But only the meaning of *jai* would seem to be certain. CÆDÈS (1911, 207) saw no meaning in *duk jey sin* and so attempted no translation.

276. The point of the rule against smelling the flowers for worship, that is to say, deliberately inhaling their fragrance, is that having been enjoyed by another they become impure and therefore unfit to be offered to the deity. See, e.g., *Paramasaṃhitā* 5.29cd: *anyair anupayogas tu sarveṣāṃ śuddhir uttamā* ‘the highest purity is not to have been used by others’; 5.46c–47b: *bhuktaśeṣaṃ parimlānam aspr̥ṣyaspr̥ṣtam eva ca // puṣpaṃ vihitam apy etam āpatkāle ’pi varjayet* ‘He should avoid these flowers though enjoined [for offering] if they have been already enjoyed, if they are faded and if they have been touched by an untouchable, even in times of dire distress’.

Śaivism and Khmer Buddhism

As for Mahāyāna Buddhism, whose presence among the Khmers is apparent from the seventh century onwards in images of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara, that too received extensive patronage from the Khmer élite,²⁷⁷ particularly during the reigns of Jayavarman V (c. 970–1000) and Jayavarman VII (1181–c. 1210), both of whom, but especially the latter, were active supporters and adherents of this form of Buddhism. Indeed Jayavarman VII's vast and grandiose program of Buddhist temple and monastery building was evidently part of a conscious attempt to supplant Śaivism as the dominant religion, empowering it to take over the roles of protecting the state, validating its hierarchies and sanctioning the authority of the emperor.

The Mahāyāna was already well placed to do this, especially since it had provided itself through the Way of Mantras (*mantranayaḥ*, *mantrayānam*) with an elaborate and impressive system of rituals designed along Śaiva lines to offer its royal patrons exactly the protective and apotropaic benefits promised by their rivals. However, the Mahāyānist versatility of method (*upāyakaūśalam*) that enabled this development went a step further among the Khmers. For they adopted the Śaiva practice of installing deities under names that incorporate that of the founder. Moreover, in the case of Lokeśvara, these names end in -īśvara, as do those of Śiva-images. Indeed in one case such a Lokeśvara is even referred to as a Liṅga, a surprising inroad from Śaiva terminology, in which *liṅgam* denotes all three varieties of Śiva image, namely the Liṅga proper (*avyaktaṃ liṅgam*,

277. For seventh- and eighth-century images of two-armed Avalokiteśvara see JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos. 7–10. Images of the four-armed and eight-armed Avalokiteśvara generally called Lokeśvara in the inscriptions abound in the Angkorean period; see *ibid.*, nos. 59, 95–98. The earliest epigraphic reference to Lokeśvara is K. 244 of A.D. 791/2: *samaguṇaśaśinagaśāke prathito yas supratīṣṭhito bhagavān / jagadīśvara iti nāmnā sa jayati lokeśvarapratīmaḥ* ‘Victorious is the renowned Lord well installed in Śāka 713 under the name Jagadīśvara in the likeness of Lokeśvara’. Inscriptions record many installations of Lokeśvara, the Buddha, and the goddess Prajñāpāramitā, the Perfection of Wisdom who is the Mother of the Buddhas (*jinamātā* K. 273, v. 36; *jinānām janani* K. 273, v. 5); and there is material and epigraphic evidence of the currency of the worship of those three as a triad on a single base, a meditating Buddha seated on the coils of the Nāga Mucilinda being flanked by attendant standing figures of the other two; see, e.g., JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, no. 95. We also find a tetrad comprising these and Vajrin (= Vajrapāṇi, the wrathful defender of the faith); see *ibid.*, no. 59, where they appear on the four sides of a small Caitya. The cult of Ekādaśamukha, the eleven-faced Avalokiteśvara, was also present. K. 168 of A.D. 973 records gifts of slaves and other valuables to Ekādaśamukha, Lokeśvara and Bhagavati (Prajñāpāramitā). The popularity of this cult in the early phase of the development of the Mantranaya within Mahāyāna is shown not only by the survival of its principal scriptural authority, the *Ekādaśamukhadhāraṇī*, among the sixth-to seventh century manuscripts of the Gilgit horde (ed. DUTT 1939, 35–40), but also by the existence of three Chinese versions (Taishō 1070, translated by Yaśogupta around the middle of the sixth century, Taishō 1071, translated by Xuanzang in 656, and Taishō 1069, translated by Amoghavajra at some time between 720 and 774) and by its conspicuous role in the religious rituals of Japan during the eighth century (ABÉ 1999, 159–176). By the time of Jayavarman V, if not earlier, the more esoteric, Vairocana-centred Mantranaya of the Yogatantra that reached China in the eighth century and Japan in the ninth, was in vogue among the Khmers (K. 111, see below n. 284; K. 240–241, which refers to a donation to the deity Trailokyavijaya (I. 2), for whose position in the Buddhist Yogatantra tradition see LINROTHE 1999, 26, 178–211, 214–215); and by the late twelfth century the cult of Hevajra, a major deity of the Buddhist Yoginītantras that followed the phase of the Yogatantras in India, was flourishing there, as can be seen by many surviving images (LOBO 1997; JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos. 99–102), though by no epigraphic reports.

niṣkalam liṅgam), the anthropomorphic image (*sakalam liṅgam*), and the hybrid Liṅga with Śiva's faces (*vyaktavyaktaṃ liṅgam, sakalaniṣkalam liṅgam*).²⁷⁸

Jayavarman VII adopted this practice of installing deities incorporating his name, evidently for the glorification of himself and his lineage, in his two vast foundations at Angkor, the Rājavihāra (Ta Prohm) and the Jayaśrīnagarī (Preah Khan). In 1186/7 he had an image of Prajñāpāramitā with the likeness and name of his devout Buddhist mother Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi installed as the presiding deity of the former,²⁷⁹ and in 1191/2 he had a Lokeśvara embodying his father installed with his own name (Jayavarmeśvara) as the presiding deity of the latter.²⁸⁰

He also installed Jayabuddhamahānāthas, images of the Buddha incorporating his name, in many sites throughout his realm²⁸¹ and ordained that every year during the month of Phālguna these should be invited to the temple of the Lokeśvara Jayavarmeśvara, together with the “Eastern Buddha”, the Buddha Vīraśakti (*vīrasaktisugataḥ*),²⁸² the Buddha of Phimai (*vimāyasugataḥ*), the Prajñāpāramitā Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi of the Rājavihāra, and Bhadreśvara, Cāmpesvara, Pṛthuśaileśvara and the other major deities of the realm, in all one hundred and twenty-two.²⁸³ This must have

278. The Sanskrit portion of K. 239 records the installation in A.D. 961/2 of a — — ◡ — *keśvaraliṅgam ...prāsādam* (S, l. 13, v. 7) by Bhadrātīśaya, a servant of King Rājendravarman. The text begins with obeisance to the Three Jewels and the donor prays that the merit of the act should go to his mother, father, the king, [his] guru, his kinsman and his friend, and that by means of this good deed he may be a Bodhisattva in life after life in order to save people drowning in the ocean of incarnation. The Khmer portion of the inscription records the consecration in A.D. 966 of bricks offered to V.K.A. śrī Jagannāthakeśvara (l. 23) and donations to him of various paddy-fields. This deity is surely the same as that of the — — ◡ — *keśvaraliṅgam ...prāsādam* of the Sanskrit text, though the metre precludes exactly that name. Given the context and the name in -īśvara it is highly probable that this deity was a Lokeśvara. We may compare the Lokeśvara Jagadīśvara of K. 244.

279. K. 273, v. 36–37: *prātiṣṭhipac chrījayarāja*cūḍāmaṇiṃ* (corr. : *cūddāmaṇiṃ* Ep.) *maṇidyotita-puṇyadehām / tasyāñ jananyā jinamātrmūrtim mūrtim samūrttidyaśāñkarūpaiḥ / so tiṣṭhipac chrījayamaṅgalār[tha]devaṃ tathā śrījayakīrtidevam / mūrtim guror dakṣiṇavāma – yaś ṣaṣṭiṃ śate dvau parivāradevān* ‘In [Śāka] 1108 he installed Jayarājacūḍāmaṇi, an image of the Mother of the Buddhas. Its body was illuminated by its jewels and it incorporated his mother. He installed a Jayamaṅgalārthadeva and a Jayakīrtideva, embodying his Guru, to its left and right, and two hundred and sixty deities as its retinue’.

280. K. 908, v. 34–35: *sa śrījayavarmmanṛpaś śrījayavarmmeśvarākhyalokeśam / vedenducandrārūpair udamīlayad atra piṭmūrtim / āryāvalokiteśasya madhyamasya samantataḥ / śatadvayan trayoṣṭis tena devāḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ* ‘In [Śāka] 1113 that king Jayavarman [VII] installed here a Lokeśa called Jayavarmeśvara embodying his father. Two hundred and eighty-three deities were installed around this central Avalokiteśvara’.

281. K. 908, v. 115–121b. This says that Jayavarman installed a Jayabuddhamahānātha at each of twenty-three listed locations (120c–121b: *trayoviṃśati*deśeṣv* [em. : *deveṣv* CÆDÈS] *eṣv ekaikasminn atiṣṭhipat / jayavuddhamahānāthaṃ śrīmantaṃ so vanīpatiḥ*). But in v. 159 it speaks of the Jayabuddhamahānāthas of the twenty-five locations (*jayavuddhamahānāthāḥ pañcaviṃśatideśakāḥ*).

282. This Buddha is probably the “god Vīraśakti” mentioned in Jayavarman’s Rājavihāra foundation stele, K. 273, v. 85: *bhagavān bhagavatyaśau *caturddaśyāṃ* (corr. CÆDÈS : *caturddaśyāṃ* Ep.) *pradakṣiṇam / triḥ kuryyāt *paurṇamāsyāñ* (corr. : *paurṇamāsyāñ* CÆDÈS) *ca vīraśaktyādibhis suraiḥ* ‘On the fourteenth [of Caitra] and on the full moon day the [Buddha] and the goddess [Prajñāpāramitā] should circumambulate [the temple] three times, keeping it on their right side, together with Vīraśakti and the other gods’. K. 240 N comprises the words *kamrateṇ jagat śrī jayavīraśaktimahādeva*. This, given that it is found on a Buddhist temple, is no doubt the same deity rather than a Śiva (Mahādeva).

283. K. 908, v. 158–160: *atrādhyeṣyā ime devāḥ phālguṇe prativatsaram / prācyo munīndraś śrījayarājacūḍāmaṇis tathā / jayavuddhamahānāthāḥ pañcaviṃśatideśakāḥ / śrīvīraśaktisugato vimāya-sugato pi ca / bhadreśvaracāmpesvaraprthuśaileśvarādayaḥ / śatadvāviṃśatis caite piṇḍitāḥ*

entailed processions (*yātrā*) in which their festival images—we may presume that their primary images remained in place—were transported in palanquins (*śibikā*) over considerable distances into the presence of the king's personal Lokeśvara in the capital in a ceremony that mirrored that in which subordinate rulers would come before their overlord to demonstrate their dependence and loyalty.

The inscription that records these arrangements listed twenty-three sites throughout the kingdom in which Jayavarman VII established a Jayabuddhamahānātha. But when it speaks of the annual visit of these Buddhas to the temple of Lokeśvara Jayavarmēśvara it gives their number as twenty-five. Perhaps this is a lapse. But that would be surprising in an inscription that contains a great deal of precise numerical information on the funding of the foundation, the various classes of personnel engaged to serve in it, and its deities. I propose that the number has risen because the author's list was of provincial Jayabuddhamahānāthas and that there were two others in the capital or its vicinity that were to be included in the total in the context of the annual visit. It is probable that one of the additional two was the image presiding in the Bayon, the great temple constructed by Jayavarman VII at the centre of his ceremonial capital Angkor Thom. The broken fragments of a Buddha were found at the bottom of a deep shaft under the tower in which the image would have been housed, perhaps, as has often been suggested, having been thrown there during the anti-Buddhist Śaiva backlash after the end of this reign. That Jayavarman VII installed a Buddha here is in any case highly probable. The Bayon, the Jayaśrīnagarī and the Rājavihāra, his three principal Buddhist foundations, would thus have been dedicated to the Buddha, Lokeśvara, and Prajñāpāramitā respectively, completing the triad whose worship as a set, on a single base with the Buddha in the centre, is a well attested feature of Buddhist devotion during this period. That it should have been a personal Buddha is intrinsically probable in the light of his policy in his other foundations, and that it should have a personal Buddha in his own name is also probable, since that would have accomplished a further symmetry: his personal Buddha in the Bayon at the centre of Angkor Thom with a Lokeśvara and Prajñāpāramitā embodying his father and mother in Jayaśrīnagarī and the Rājavihāra outside its walls.

That this cult of the personal deity-image was adopted from Śaivism, and in Kambujadeśa itself, cannot be demonstrated conclusively. But it is very probable. It is less than certain because it rests on an inference from an absence of evidence that this practice was ever adopted by Buddhists in India together with the assumption that though the installation of deities incorporating the name of the founder was also practised in Pāñcarātrika Vaiṣṇavism, the preponderance of Śaivism in the religion of the Khmer state makes that an improbable source. My assertion that Buddhist images were not personalized in India through the incorporation of their founder's name is, of course, a claim that further research or the greater knowledge of others may easily refute, since even a single example of the practice would suffice for this purpose. But in this case the inference of absence from the absence of evidence is somewhat strengthened by the fact we find no evidence of the practice in a context in which we would expect to see evidence if it existed. This is the record of the religious foundations of pre-Islamic Kashmir in

*parivāra*kaiḥ. K. 254 (Sanskrit, vv. 28–29; Khmer, B I. 44–d, l. 42) details benefactions in 1127 for the Śiva Liṅgapureśvara / Kaṃmraten Jagat Liṅgapura, the Śiva of Pṛthuśaila (Phnom Rong, north of the Dang Raek range) / Kaṃmraten Jagat Vnaṃ Ruṅ, the Viṣṇu of Cāmpēśvara / Vraḥ Kānti Kaṃmraten Añ Śrīcāmpēśvara, and the Buddha of Vaṃśārāma / Kaṃmraten Jagat Chpā Ransi. In K. 289, C, v. 32 the military commander Saṃgrāma makes donations to Pṛthuśailaśiva and requests him to grant him success in his campaign to seize the rebel Kaṃvau during the reign of Udayādityavarman II (1050–1066): *pṛthuśailaśivaṃ prāpya samyag ārādhya so dhiyā / datvā rairūpyanāgendrān arīndrāptim ayācata.*

Kalhaṇa's chronicle of the dynasties of that kingdom (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī*), completed in A.D. 1149/50. In Kashmir, as in Kambujadeśa, Buddhism, Śaivism and the Pāñcarātra were able to flourish side by side. In nearly all the cases of Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava foundations established by the kingdom's rulers and high dignitaries the deity installed or the Maṭha constructed has a name that incorporates that of the donor at its beginning, or that of a person that he or she has designated. But not one of the Buddhas whose installation he records—and they appear together with those of Śivas, Viṣṇus and other gods—has a personal name of any kind. The only Buddhist foundations in Kalhaṇa's history with names incorporating the donor's are monasteries (*vihāraḥ*).

What is more, even when royal support for Buddhism was at its most fervent, it seems to have been unwilling or unable to oust Śaivism completely from the circle of royal and state ritual. Nor did Buddhist fervor divert the monarchy from its traditional obligation to uphold the brahmanical Dharmaśāstra that the Śaivas had always accepted as binding in the sphere of law and other mundane transactions.

An undated inscription of the reign of Jayavarman V (K. 111) records his ordinances for the conduct of religion in the Buddhist monasteries of his realm. It also reports that one Kīrtipaṇḍita, a learned follower of the Mahāyāna and an expert in the esoteric Mantra rites of the Yogatantra,²⁸⁴ was adopted by the royal family as their Guru, giving them many sermons on the Buddhist religion while seated on the Dharma throne (*dharmāsanaṃ*),²⁸⁵ and that he was engaged within the royal palace to perform frequent

284. The evidence that he was a follower of the Yogatantra form of the Buddhist Way of Mantras is as follows. In K. 111, v. 23 he is said to have been devoted to the four Mudrās: *catussandhyāsu yogātmā caturddānāvito nvaḥ[m] caturmudrātmako dharmmañ catusparṣatsu *yo diśat* (conj. : *yo* ∪ ∪ CĒDÈS) 'Devoted to meditation at the four junctures of the day, a giver of the four gifts, one with the four Mudrās, he taught the Dharma to the four congregations'. The four Mudrās are a distinguishing mark of this system; see, e.g., Mkhars grub rje, *Rgyud sde spy'i rnam par gzag pa rgyas par brjod* (LESSING and WAYMAN 1980), pp. 226, l. 28–248, l. 7. He is said in vv. 28–29 to have resuscitated the long neglected study of the *Madhyavibhāgaśāstra* (= the *Madhyāntavibhāgaśāstra* of Maitreya) (v. 28: *śāstram madhyavibhāgādyam dīpaṃ saddharmmapaddhateḥ / kāladosāniladhvastaṃ bhūyo jvālayati sma yaḥ*) and to have sought from abroad and taught the *Lakṣaṅgrantha Prajñāpāramitāsūtra* and the *tattvasaṅgrahaḥkāditantram* (v. 29: **lakṣaṅgrantham* (corr. : *lakṣaṅgrantham* Ep.) *abhiprajñam yo nveṣya pararāṣṭrataḥ / tattvasaṅgrahaḥkāditantrañ cādhyāpayad yamī*). CĒDÈS took the *Tattvasaṅgrahaḥkā* mentioned here to be Kamalaśīla's commentary on Śāntarakṣita's *Tattvasaṅgraha*. It appears more probable that having mentioned sources of the two major branches of the Sūtra tradition of the Mahāyāna he now speaks of the complementary Way of Mantras, saying that Kīrtipaṇḍita "taught the Tantra teachings (*tantram*) of such texts as the *Tattvasaṅgraha* and its commentary", that title being an abbreviation, as commonly in Indian sources, for the *Sarvatathāgatattattvasaṅgraha*, the principal scripture of the Yogatantras. This combination of the exoteric and esoteric divisions of the mature Mahāyāna is also referred to in v. 42: *vāhyam guhyañ ca saddharmmaṃ sthāpayitvā cakāra yaḥ / pūjārthan tasya saṃghasyātithes ca prthag āśramān* 'Having propagated the Buddhist religion in both its exoteric and esoteric forms he founded separate hermitages to honour the monastic community and [lay] guests'. That the Way of Mantrayāna was also established in Jayavarman's monasteries is clear from the fact that this inscription requires each such institution to engage an officiant (*purohitaḥ*) who must be "adept in the heart[-syllable]s, Mudrās, Mantras and Vidyās, and in the ritual of the fire-sacrifice, and who must understand the secret doctrines of the Vajra and the Bell" (v. 69: **hṛnmudrāmantravidyāsu* (corr. : *hṛnmūdramantravidyāsu* Ep.) *homakarmmaṇi kovidaḥ / bajra-ghanṭārahasyajñō dakṣiṇīyaḥ purohitaḥ*).

285. K. 111, v. 32: *sāntahpuraiḥ pramudītai rājabhir yyo gurūkrtaḥ / dideśa vahuśo dharmmaṃ vauddham dharmmasane sthitaḥ* 'Appointed as their preceptor by the delighted king and his female household he taught the Buddha's Dharma [to them] on many occasions, seated on the Dharma Throne.' The plural *rājabhiḥ* I take to be a plural of respect (*ādare bahuvacanam*). On the Dharma throne see, e.g., *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra*, Parivarta 6, p. 77–78. According to that account when the king wishes to hear

rituals for the averting of dangers (*śāntih*), the promoting of welfare (*puṣṭih*) and similar ends, for the protection of the kingdom.²⁸⁶ But the same inscription, in spite of its purely Buddhist focus, praises Jayavarman V for guiding his subjects in strict accordance with the precepts of brahmanical Smṛti and Śruti.²⁸⁷ Moreover, the royal high-priest Divākaraḥṭṭa praises him as a devotee of the Śaiva Path of Mantras, that is to say, of the Tantric Śaivism of the Siddhānta, which implies that like other major Khmer monarchs he had received Śaiva initiation at the time of his elevation to the throne in 970 or shortly thereafter.²⁸⁸

Since the Buddhist inscription is undated we are not able to assume that his involvement in Śaivism and Buddhism were contemporaneous. He may have been committed to Śaivism around the time of his accession and then turned to Buddhism later. Nor may we assume from Divākaraḥṭṭa's claim that Jayavarman "delighted" (*rarāma*) in the Śaivism of the initiate that his commitments to Śaivism and Buddhism were of a similar kind. It is all too possible that his Śaiva initiation and subsequent involvement in the Path of Mantras were matters of social convention dictated by his position in the state, and that his personal faith in Buddhism was already present at that time. That his Buddhism was indeed a matter of personal conviction is clear enough from his relationship with Kīrtipaṇḍita and his drawing up of regulations to govern the [royal] monasteries. It is confirmed by the name Paramavīraloka he was given after his death. For it was the custom among the Khmers, as it was among their neighbours the Chams, to give their kings posthumous name that expressed the belief that the bearer had ascended to the paradise (-loka, -pura) of a certain god or to some other goal (-pada) of [their] religious endeavour.²⁸⁹ In the great majority of cases this world or goal is Śaiva. But there are a few

the *Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra* he should sprinkle the palace with scented water, scatter it with flowers, set up a high, richly adorned Dharma throne for the preacher (*dharmabhāṇakaḥ*), decorating the place with chowries, parasols, banners and pennants, and a lower throne for himself on which he is to sit and listen without any thoughts of his royal power.

286. K. 111, v. 36: *rāṣṭramāṇḍalarakṣārtham satkṛtyāyuṅkta yan nṛpaḥ mandirābhyantare* (corr. : *mandirābhyantare* Ep.) *bhikṣnam śāntipuṣṭyādikarmmasu* 'whom the king bestowed honours on and then engaged repeatedly within the palace in rituals of pacification, invigoration and the like'.

287. K. 111, v. 12–13 and 16: 12 *svarggāpavarggamārgeṇa yaḥ piteva vahan prajāḥ / smṛtiraśmir vimārggebhyaḥ svendriyāśvān nyavārayat / 13 vyavahāre satām mārgge manvādīnām mate same kāladhvāntaniruddhe yo *madhyāhnārka* (corr. : *madyāhnārka* Ep.) *ivābhavat / ... 16 tyaktām dharmmasutenāpi kalidoṣamahodadhau / yaś śrutismṛtistābhyām uddharet satyatāṅganām* 'Holding the reins of Smṛti, conveying his subjects like a father along the road to heaven and liberation, he restrained the horses of his senses from wandering into the false paths [of forbidden objects]. In law he [Jayavarman V] illuminated the unequalled path of the virtuous taught by Manu and the other [sages], a path that had been obscured by the darkness of [advancing] time, just as the midday sun [illuminates an uneven road that has been obscured by the darkness of night]. ... With the Śruti and Smṛti as his two hands he rescued Lady Truth from the ocean of the defects of the Kali age when she had been abandoned even by the son of Dharma [Yudhiṣṭhira]'.

288. K. 669, v. 21 (A) / K. 263 C, v. 2 (B): *mahīpates tasya babhūva putro digrājavandyo ∪ ∪ – ∪ – yaḥ / dhāteva varṇṇāśramasadyavasthām kṛtvā rarāmeśvara*mantramārgge* (em. : *mantramārggāiḥ* A: *ma ∪ – ∪*) 'That king had a son [Jayavarman V] who was revered by kings in every direction, who after effecting like Brahmā himself an orthodox settlement of the "order of castes and life-stages" delighted in Śiva's Path of Mantras'.

289. That the Sanskrit compound names in -loka or -pada, literally 'one who has the world or domain [of N]', were understood to mean 'one who has gone to that' or 'who is in that' is revealed by Old Khmer renderings and Sanskrit periphrases. Thus, in the case of Jayavarman III (Viṣṇuloka) we see *vraḥ kamrateṇ aṅ ta stac dau viṣṇuloka* 'My Sacred Lord, the King who has gone to Viṣṇuloka' (K 256A, ll. 12–13); in the Sanskrit portion of the same inscription we see *mānanīyo guruś śāstā viṣṇulokasthitasya yaḥ / parameśvaraputrasya rājñāś śrījayavarmmaṇaḥ* 'the venerable Guru who was

exceptions. Among these are this posthumous name of Jayavarman V and that of Jayavarman VII: Mahāparamasaugatapada. The latter is obviously Buddhist, since it means that the bearer has attained the domain (*padam*) reached by those who are supremely devoted to the Buddha (*paramasaugataḥ*). The former is less obviously so, but it too must be Buddhist, since *vīraḥ* is a common epithet of the Buddha and is not found in Saiddhāntika Śaiva, Pāñcarātrika or brahmanical usage in any appropriate sense that would allow an alternative interpretation. I propose, therefore, that it is equivalent to Paramabuddhaloka and so testifies to the king's personal devotion as opposed to what may have been no more than religious obligations imposed by his position.²⁹⁰

As for Jayavarman VII, the intense commitment to Buddhism manifest in his vast architectural undertakings might have been expected to entail that those who sang his praises in the inscriptions would have presented him in purely Buddhist terms, so that we would find no evidence of involvement in the earlier tradition of royal devotion to Śiva. But on the stele in front of the chapel of Lokeśvara in the south-western corner of Angkor Thom a eulogy of this king speaks of him as having Śiva permanently in his heart:

*sraṣṭur manobhūr gatavān mano pi
krodhādibhis svair anugair nu dūram
nirasya nityasthitaśūlibhītyā
tān yasya citte vahiraṅgalīnaḥ*

K. 288, v. 24

[When] Love, deprived of his material form entered the mind of the creator [Brahmā], [he did so] with Anger and his other attendants. [But when] he entered the heart of [Jayavarman] [he] surely [did so only] after banishing them afar, because he feared Śiva (-*śūli-*), who was ever present [there].²⁹¹

With this we may compare the following in a eulogy of Indravarman I (r. 877–before 889):

the teacher of the son of Parameśvara [Jayavarman II], King Jayavarman [III] who is in Viṣṇuloka' (K. 256A, v. 6); and in K. 826, v. 30 we see *sa viṣṇusvāmināmānaṃ murārātīm atiṣṭhipat / viṣṇulokaprayātasya bhūtyai śrījayavarmmaṇaḥ* 'He established a Viṣṇu with the name Viṣṇusvāmin for the welfare of Jayavarman [III] who had gone to Viṣṇuloka'. Similarly, for an early ruler, perhaps Jayavarman I, we find *vraḥ kamratañ aṅ ta dau śivapura* 'My Lord who has gone (*dau*) to the world of Śiva' (K. 451 of 680); *vraḥ kamratañ aṅ ta dau svarga śivapura* 'My Lord who has gone to the heaven that is the world of Śiva' (K. 726); for Jayavarman II (Parameśvara) *vraḥ pāda stac dau parameśvara* 'The Venerable King who has gone to Parameśvara' (K. 956); for Yaśovarman I (Paramaśivaloka) *dhūli vraḥ pāda ta stāc dau paramaśivaloka* (K. 238); for Harṣavarman I (Rudraloka) *vraḥ pāda stac dau rudraloka* (K. 72); for Īśānavarman II (Paramarudraloka) *vraḥ rājya stac dau paramarudraloka* (K. 72).

290. The posthumous name Paramabuddhaloka is seen among the Chams as that of the ninth-century king Indravarman II (C. 67 = M. 36, p. 101). For *vīraḥ* as a name of the Buddha see, e.g., the vocatives *vīra* addressed to the Buddha in the devotional *Śatapañcāśatka* of Mātṛceṭa, vv. 19c, 45c, and 87d.

291. When Love had tried to distract Śiva from his meditation with feelings of desire for Umā, Śiva had punished him by reducing his body to ashes with the fire from his third eye. Love thus disembodied was able to enter the mind of the Creator (Brahmā, Prajāpati), and did so along with anger and the other moral taints that accompany love in lower beings. But Śiva was permanently present in the heart of the King. So Love dared to enter there only after dismissing this company, lest Śiva, who had already destroyed his outer form, be angered by this contamination of his presence and destroy him altogether. The poet thus proclaims the king's moral perfection. If he allowed himself to feel carnal desire it was because he could not otherwise fulfill his duty to his subjects by fathering a son. This is a variant of an ancient theme in the brahmanical portrayal of the ideal king. See, e.g., *Raghuvamśa* 1.7d: *prajāyai gṛhamedhinām* 'marrying [only] for offspring'.

*adhyāste yasya hṛdayam naiva kāmo nirantaram
tatsannihitacandrārdhacūdāmaṇibhayād iva*
K. 713, v. 12

Carnal love never entered his heart, as though out of fear of [the god] who wears the digit of the moon on his crest, [since he was] ever (*nirantaram*) present there.²⁹²

It seems, then, that this reference to Jayavarman VII's devotion to Śiva is conventional praise, part of the stock in trade of royal eulogy. But the fact that it was not considered inappropriate to use it in his case is significant. It is hard to believe that it could have been used if Jayavarman VII would have found that it misrepresented his religious sensibilities.

Similarly, in the same inscription the king is claimed to have been an offerer of sacrifices to Śiva:

*dakṣo maheśapratipāditeṣṭir
maheśvaro dhvaṃsitakālakūṭaḥ
jīṣṇus svadārair niyatas sudhīr yo
dakṣeśvarendrāl laghayāñ cakāra*
K. 288, v. 91

That wise [king] surpassed Dakṣa, for he was *dakṣaḥ* (a skilled [ruler]) and offered sacrifices to Śiva [unlike Dakṣa who refused to do so]. He surpassed Maheśvara (Śiva) for he was a great lord (*maheśvaraḥ*) and eliminated the dishonesty of the [Kali] Age (*dhvaṃsitakālakūṭaḥ*) [unlike Maheśvara, who did not destroy the Kālakūṭa poison (*dhvaṃsitakālakūṭaḥ*) since though he saved the world from its effects by imbibing it, it remains forever visible in the dark colour of his throat]; and he surpassed Jīṣṇu (Indra), for he was *jīṣṇuḥ* (victorious in battle) and faithful to his wife [unlike Jīṣṇu (Indra), who took many consorts].

Finally, a verse of this inscription compares him to a Śaiva Guru through terms with double meanings, one pertaining to the role of that Guru as the saver of souls through initiation and the other to the king's skill in governance:

*gurur ninīṣur bhuvanāni mantraiś
śivan dhruvam mantravidām variṣṭhaḥ
vidhūya dṛṣṭiprativandhabhūtan
tamo nvagād yas samayān aśeṣān*
K. 288, v. 79

Wishing to bring mankind to *eternal Śiva / lasting welfare* by means of *the Mantras / his policies* [this] Guru who was the foremost among *the Masters of Mantras / experts in politics* banished the darkness that was the obstacle to knowledge and honoured his pledges.

This might be thought to mean that he too had received Śaiva initiation, because the function of that ritual is believed to be to remove the substance Impurity (*malaḥ*) that prevents the soul from experiencing the deployment of its innate Śiva-ness and because

292. A variant of this verse is v. 19 of K. 826 of A.D. 881/2, also in praise of this king: *na sthātum aśakad yasya hṛdaye kusumāyudhaḥ / tatsannihitacandrārdhacūdāmaṇibhayād iva* 'The Flower-Bowed [Love God] could not dwell in his heart, as though it was afraid of [the god] who wears the sliver of the moon on his crest, [since he was] present there'.

“darkness” (*tamaḥ*) is one of the terms used by the Śaivas to denote this Impurity.²⁹³ Moreover, the term *samayān* that I have translated ‘pledges’ is that used by the Śaivas to refer to the special rules that bind the conduct of persons once they have been initiated. But to compare his governance to the giving of initiation in the first half of the verse and then to report the king’s having received initiation in the second seems excessively lame and muddled. If the whole verse is about the king’s governance of his subjects compared in all four quarters with the benefit bestowed by a Śaiva Guru on his disciples, then the effect, though not compelling, is at least coherent. It would in any case be improper to say that the person who receives initiation dispells his own darkness. That is the function of the officiant or rather of Śiva acting through him; and the alternative, that we are being told that Jayavarman was himself a Śaiva officiant, is very improbable. That the political sense of the last two quarters lacks attack is a lesser defect than overall incoherence. Perhaps he was referring in the third quarter to the king’s exercise of his duty to promote knowledge, certainly evident in his generous provision for education in the Rājavihāra (Ta Prohm), and in the fourth to his loyalty to his followers. Even so, the very fact that the king’s conduct towards his subjects is compared to that of a Śaiva Guru towards his disciples shows clearly that the Buddhism of Jayavarman VII was not defined by any radical and intolerant exclusion of Śaivism either by the king himself or by those who like the author of this eulogy wished to win or maintain his favour.

The same conclusion follows from the plan of the Jayaśrīnagarī. Two hundred and eighty-three deities are said to have been enshrined around Lokeśvara Jayavarmēśvara, the king’s personal deity at its centre. In addition to various Buddhist deities installed to the south and east of it thirty gods lead by [Viṣṇu] Cāmpēśvara were installed to its west and forty lead by [the Śiva of] Śivapāda to its north.²⁹⁴ The complex is likewise said to be especially holy because of its association with sacred bathing sites dedicated to the Buddha, Śiva and Viṣṇu. In this regard, we are told, it surpasses even the famous Prayāga of northern India. That is visited by pilgrims seeking purification because the two sacred rivers Yamunā and Gaṅgā come together there. But here three sacred waters combine to empower the site.²⁹⁵ The same holds with the arrangements for the annual ‘durbar’ in

293. *Kiraṇa*, ed. Goodall 1988, 2.19c–20b: *malo ’jñānaṃ paśutvaṃ ca tiraskāraḥ tamaḥ / avidyā hy āvṛtīr mūrechā paryāyās tasya coditāḥ*. Cf. also v. 49 of the Bilhari inscription of the Kalacuri Yauvarājadeva II (*EI* 1, 251–270) referring to the initiation of Avantivarman in about 825: *mattamayūra-nāthaḥ / niḥśeṣakalmaṣamaśim apahrīya yena saṅkrāmitam paramaho nṛpater avanteḥ* ‘[Purandara,] the abbot of Mattamayūra, who entirely removed from the king Avanti the black stain of all his Impurity and transmitted to him the supreme radiance [of Śivahood]’.

294. K. 908, vv. 35–38: *āryāvalokiteśasya madhyamasya samantataḥ / śatadvayan trayoṣītis tena devāḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ / 36 vivudhās śrītribhuvanavarmmeśvarapurassarāḥ / trayāḥ pratiṣṭhitās tena pūrvasyān diśi bhūbhṛtā / 37 kāṣṭhāyān dakṣiṇasyām śrīyaśovarmmeśvarādayaḥ / tena pratiṣṭhitā devā viṃśatir dvādaśottarā / 38 śrīcāmpēśvaravimvādyas triṃśat paścimatas surāḥ / kauveryām śivapādādyās catvāriṃśat pratiṣṭhitāḥ* ‘He installed 283 gods around the central Avalokiteśvara, three gods beginning with Tribhuvanavarmēśvara to the east [of it], thirty-two gods beginning with Yaśovarmēśvara to the south, thirty gods beginning with an image of [Viṣṇu] Cāmpēśvara to the west, and forty [gods] beginning with [that of] Śivapāda to the north ...’.

295. K. 908, v. 33: *satkrīya tīrthadvayasannidhānāt sādhyo viśuddhyai jagatām prayāgaḥ / kin kathyate vuddhaśivāmvujāksatīrthaprakṛṣṭā nagarī jayaśrīḥ*. In his annotation of his edition of this inscription CÉDES identified these three bodies of sacred water (*tīrtham*) as the Western Baray, the Eastern Baray (Yaśodharataṭāka) and Preah Khan Baray (Jayataṭāka) or Srah Khan. These would be associated with Viṣṇu, Śiva and the Buddha respectively. The Eastern Baray is referred to as a *tīrtha* in K. 258, A l. 82: *vraḥ tīrtha śrīyaśodharataṭāka*.

which, as we have seen, the gods of the Khmers, Śivas and Viṣṇus as well as Buddhas, were to be brought before Lokeśvara Jayavarmēśvara in this complex.

That the strongly Buddhist royal family of this reign was unwilling or unable to sever its links with the non-Buddhist deities of the realm is also apparent from a record of the pious works of Jayarājadevī (/Jayarājacūdāmaṇi), the devoutly Buddhist chief queen (*agradevī*) of Jayavarman VII. She founded a Buddhist nunnery for abandoned girls, and made gifts to the Eastern Buddha (Pūrvatathāgata), the Jayarājacūdāmaṇi of the Rājavihāra, the Buddha of the Jayaśrīnagarī (*jayaśrīsugataḥ*),²⁹⁶ to [Śiva] Bhadreśvara,²⁹⁷ [Viṣṇu] Cāmpēśvara, the Buddha of Phimai, and the Śiva of Pṛthuśaila,²⁹⁸ installed and endowed with lands a Śiva and his consort in the temple of Śiva at Baset in Battambang (Jayakṣetraśiva), giving both the name of her husband: a Jayarājeśvara and a Jayarājeśvarī,²⁹⁹ gave one hundred decorated multi-coloured silk war banners to the god on the Central Mountain (*madhyādrisuraḥ*) for her husband's welfare in the world to come,³⁰⁰ gilded the Vasudhātilaka temple in Śivapura that had been made in stone by a previous king, and installed golden statues of her three Gurus there.³⁰¹ She also set up images of her mother, father, brother(s), friends and family, both those she knew and those of whom she was informed.³⁰²

It will have been noticed that the deities to whom she made gifts agree closely with those whose images are identified as having to be brought each year to the temple of Lokeśvara Jayavarmēśvara along with the twenty-five Jayabuddhamahānāthas, namely the Eastern Buddha, the Buddha Vīraśakti, the Buddha of Phimai, the Prajñāpāramitā Jayarājacūdāmaṇi of the Rājavihāra, Bhadreśvara, Cāmpēśvara, and Pṛthuśaileśvara. Nor

296. K. 485, v. 80–86.

297. K. 485, v. 87: *bhadreśvare rūpyamayaṃ suvarṇair ālepitan dundabhim apy adāt sā / devaiṃ ca bhadreśvaraputrabhūtam asthāpayat dundabhisamjñam arthāt* ‘To Bhadreśvara she gave a gilded silver drum and installed a god called Dundabhi [i.e. Dundabhiśvara] as Bhadreśvara's son’. The drum (*dundabhiḥ* [for *dundubhiḥ*]) has given its name to the deity, a usage of which I know no parallel.

298. K. 485, v. 88: *cāmpēśvarākhye ca sure vimāye vuddhe ca pṛthvadryabhidhānake ca / śive diśad dundabhim ekam ekam sā svarṇalīptam kṛtarūpyapūrvvam* ‘She gave one gilded silver drum each to the god called Cāmpēśvara, the Buddha at Phimai, and the Śiva called Pṛthuśaila’.

299. K. 485, v. 89: *sā śrījayakṣetraśive ca devaṃ maheśvaraṃ śrījayarājapūrvvam / nāmneśvarīṃ ca tathāsapūrvvām asthāpayat kalpitadeśabhūmām* ‘She installed a god Maheśvara in [the temple of] Jayakṣetraśiva preceded by Śrījayarāja- [i.e. Śrījayarājeśvara] and an -īśvarī with the same prefix [i.e. Śrījayarājeśvarī], on whom she settled land revenues’.

300. K. 485, v. 90.

301. K. 485, v. 91-92: *vasudhātilakaṃ pūrvakṣitīśena śilākṛtam svarṇaiḥ prāvṛtya sā dharmād dyobhūmyos tilakaṃ vyadhāt / sā sādhu tatra trigurūn sauvarṇān ratnabhūṣaṇān asthāpayat chivapur[e] prataptān iva bhāsvarān*. ‘She made the Vasudhātilaka [‘The forehead ornament of the Earth’] that had been built in stone by a former king the forehead ornament of both the earth and the heavens by covering it with gold. She piously installed in that [temple] in Śivapura golden bejewelled [statues of her] three Gurus, that shone as if on fire’.

CÆDÈS proposes (*IC* 2:180, n. 2) that the Vasudhātilaka may be the Phimeanakas, the small pyramid-based single-towered laterite state-temple of Sūryavarman I. But this is blocked by the next verse, which says not, as CÆDÈS translated it, that she installed statues in Śivapura (‘A Çivapura, elle érigea ...’) but that she did so “there in Śivapura” (*tatra ...asthāpayat chivapure*). I do not see any alternative to concluding that the Vasudhātilaka too was in Śivapura, namely Phnom Bayang or Phnom Sandak. CÆDÈS's translation treats the crucial *tatra* as though it were redundant. There is certainly no clue that he recognizes the presence of the word.

302. K. 485, v. 93: *māraṃ pitaraṃ bhrātrṣuhṛdvandhukulāni ca / jñātāni jñāpitāny eṣā sarvvatrāsthāpayat sudhīḥ*.

are the non-Buddhist deities treated less generously. The Buddha of Phimai, the Śiva Bhadreśvara and Prthuśaileśvara and the Viṣṇu of Cāmpēśvara each receive the same gift: a gilded silver drum. As for the “Central Mountain” to whose god she dedicated banners for the welfare of her husband after his death, CÉDÈS suggested that this might be the Bayon at the centre of Jayavarman’s capital. But the text speaks of a god rather than a Buddha, the Bayon has not been called the Central Mountain (*madhyādriḥ*) in any other inscription, and there is an obvious alternative in Phnom Bakheng, the Śaiva state-temple of Yaśovarman I, constructed *c.* 900, since that is known in Old Khmer as *Vnaṃ Kantāl*, “the central mountain”.³⁰³

Relations between the Religions

Relations between the three faiths were generally tolerant. The inscriptions speak of Vaiṣṇava, Śaiva and Buddhist family lineages among the nobility,³⁰⁴ but they record cases of marriage between persons of these different faiths,³⁰⁵ and show that the palace, though predominantly Śaiva, was not exclusively so.

Among the Khmer kings of Angkor Jayavarman V and Jayavarman VII were fervent promoters of Buddhism, as we have seen, and at least two were devotees of Viṣṇu: Jayavarman III (*r. c.* 835–before 877) and Sūryavarman II (*r.* 1113–*c.* 1150). This is apparent from their posthumous names, Viṣṇuloka and Paramaviṣṇuloka, which assert that these kings ascended after death to the paradise of Viṣṇu.³⁰⁶ Moreover, the preceptor of Jayavarman III was the Bhāgavata Śrīnivāsakavi;³⁰⁷ and a bas-relief in Angkor Vat depicts Sūryavarman II going forth to war mounted on an elephant preceded by a small statue of Viṣṇu on Garuḍa.³⁰⁸

303. K. 265, S ll. 4–5: *vrah kamrateñ añ [vnaṃ ka]ntāl*; K. 235, D ll. 12–13: *man vrah pāda paramaśivaloka sthāpanā vnāṃ kantāl* ‘Then the Venerable Paramaśivaloka [Yaśovarman I] established the Central Mountain’; K. 774.

304. K. 180, v. 24: *svesām māheśvarāṇām yaḥ kulānām patih*; K. 444, B ll. 28–30: *dhūli vrah pāda dhūli je[ñ vrah] kamrateñ añ śrī jayavarmmadeva phle māheśva[rānva]ya* ‘My Venerable Majesty Jayavarman [V], born of a Śaiva lineage’; K. 532, v. 35: *[śu]ddhavaiṣṇavavaṃśo* ‘of a pure Vaiṣṇava lineage’; K. 687, v. 19: *yo ninditapurodbhūtavaiṣṇa* 𑀓𑀓𑀓𑀓𑀓𑀓𑀓 (perhaps *vaiṣṇavānvayasambhavaḥ*); K. 86, v. 8: *jinānvayām* ‘of the lineage of the Buddha’.

305. K. 86, v. 8: *adiśat kṣitīndraḥ tāṃ bhāgīneyām prakṛtiṣṭhagoṭrāñ jinānvayām viṣṇumayāya bhartre* ‘the king [Jayavarman VII] gave that daughter of his sister, who possessed an inborn seed of Buddhahood [and] was in a family [who were devotees] of the Buddha, to [Tribhuvanabrahmendra], a devotee of Viṣṇu, as her husband’. CÉDÈS has misunderstood the terms *prakṛtiṣṭhagoṭrām*, *jinānvayām* and *viṣṇumayāya bhartre*: ‘appartenant à un clan très pur, et descendant du Jina, à un époux participant de la nature de Viṣṇu’. For the technical Mahāyānist meaning of *gotram* and its *prakṛtiṣṭham* variety see RUEGG 1969 *passim*. For the suffix *-mayah*, literally ‘one with’ in the meaning ‘devoted to’ in *viṣṇumayāya* see, e.g., *Mahābhārata* 6.26.10ab (*Bhagavadgītā* 4.10ab): *vītarāgabhayakrodhā manmayā mām upāśritāḥ*, and also *śivātmā* in the meaning ‘devoted to Śiva’ in K. 534, v. 13 (= K. 382A, v. 13).

306. For Viṣṇuloka see above, n. 289. For Paramaviṣṇuloka (Sūryavarman II) see K. 298 (CÉDÈS 1911, 201) in the western gallery of the bas-reliefs of Angkor Vat: *saṃtac vrah pāda kamrateñ añ paramaviṣṇuloka nā stac nau vnaṃ śivapāda pi pañcuḥ vala* ‘Our Venerable Majesty King Paramaviṣṇuloka on the hill of Śivapāda about to lead forth his army’.

307. K. 256 A, v. 5–10.

308. The scene is depicted in the bas-relief of Sūryavarman II’s march to war (*yātrā*, *prayānam*) in the west half of the southern gallery of the third enclosure. This scene is described in FREEMAN and JACQUES 1999, 59–60. The practice of going into battle with an image of one’s personal deity and the belief that this will protect one’s troops and confound those of the enemy, is well attested in Indian

Jayavīravarma (r. 1002–c. 1010) too may have been a devotee of this god. His posthumous name, if he was given one, has not been recorded, but he is described as having taken up his rule by Viṣṇu's favour.³⁰⁹

Moreover, there were high-born Vaiṣṇavas in the royal staff. We hear, for example, of members of a corps of Bhāgavata royal servants (*bhāgavata paṃre*) and their chief (*mūla bhāgavata paṃre*) going back to the time of Jayavarman II,³¹⁰ and of the Vaiṣṇava endowments of a Pāñcarātrika noble Kṣetrajña, given the title Mahendropakalpa 'Assistant to the King', who was the barber of Rājendravarman and had served in some capacity under all four preceding rulers. His ancestors too are traced back to the reign of Jayavarman II.³¹¹ Other Bhāgavatas who served the palace received -upakalpa titles with the same meaning. Nṛpatīndropakalpa, the daughter of whose sister became the chief queen of Rājendravarman, has been encountered above in connection with his extensive Vaiṣṇava endowments; and he was a matrilineal descendant of a certain Narendropakalpa, the both of his maternal grandmother (*māṭṛmatulaḥ*). We also have a record of the Vaiṣṇava endowment of a dignitary who had received the title Rājopakalpa from Jayavīravarma (1002–1006).³¹²

K. 91, an Old Khmer inscription from the reign of Jayavarman VI (1080–1107) at the earliest records a matrilineal line of Guru mandarins beginning with Kavīśvarapaṇḍita, described as an observer of the rule of the Pañcarātra (*śīla pañcarātra*), who became the Guru and counsellor of [the Śaiva] King Sūryavarman I. Of his two brothers, Jātibindu,

Buddhist sources and in Far-Eastern sources derived from them; see *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* 54.32–41: an image of Mañjuśrī to be taken into battle on the back of an elephant or on a standard; *Mahābalasūtra*, Tibetan translation, para. 19: 'Mahābala attaché à l'étendard, quoi qu'il arrive dans la bataille, l'adversaire ne saura faire aucun mal'; Taishō 1248, a ritual of Vaiśravaṇa attributed to Amoghavajra, but not found in the Korean Tripiṭaka, teaches that one should attach an image of Vaiśravaṇa to a staff and enter battle with this standard carried fifteen paces in front of the army (DEMIÉVILLE 1929–30, 81b, ll. 41–44). The eulogy of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Govinda III in his Nesarikā grant of 805 A.D. boasts that he has seized the standards (*cihnāni*) of thirteen kings: the Fish from the kings of the Pāṇḍyas, the Bull from the Pallava king and the kings of Kosala and Avanti, the Tiger from the Cola king, the Elephant from the Gaṅga king, the Bow-stock from the king of Kerala, the Boar from the king of Andhra, the Cālukya, Maurya, and Siṃhala, and the goddess Tārā from Dharmapāla, the king of Bengal. He then brought the whole world under his Garuḍa standard (*EI* 34, 19).

309. K. 989 A, v. 7: *āsīd aśeṣāvanipālamaulimāṅikyakoṭīdyutirañjītāṅghriḥ / caturbhujadvārādḥṛtādhirājyaḥ prājyodayaś śrījayavīravarmā* 'There was Jayavīravarma, [a king] of great success, whose feet were illuminated by the radiance from the tips of the emeralds on the crown of every king, who took on the position of supreme ruler through [the intervention of] the four-armed [god]'. For the convention that *caturbhujah* 'the four-armed' means Viṣṇu see, e.g., K. 165 S, v. 4; K. 256 C, v. 1; K. 275, v. 8; K. 323, v. 1; K. 528, v. 208; K. 532, v. 43; K. 534, v. 10 (= K. 382 A, v. 4); K. 814, v. 1; K. 814, v. 29 (= K. 256 C, v. 22). The expression *caturbhujadvārādḥṛtādhirājyaḥ*, which I have translated 'who took on the position of supreme ruler through [the intervention of] the four-armed [god]' may also refer to the date of his accession: 'who took on the position of supreme ruler in 924 [śaka]'. CEDÈS proposes only the second interpretation (*IC* VII, 179).

310. K. 165, K. 989 B, and K. 1036.

311. K. 522 of the reign of Rājendravarman (A.D. 944–968), after 28 January 953, since it refers to the temples in the Yaśodharataṭāka, whose deities were installed on that date.

312. K. 856, v. 23, K. 814, E, v. 54. Other holders of variants of this title were Dharaṇīndropakalpa during the reign of Rājendravarman (K. 262), a Kṣitīndropakalpa, whose title was given after his death to his matrilineal descendant Śivavindu (K. 278, v. 18), and Pṛthivīndropakalpa (the courtier Paramārthaśiva) (K. 382 C, v. 5). See also K. 208, v. 53 (Rājendropakalpa). The Sanskrit term *upakalpaḥ*, literally "one who prepares or provides", i.e. "an assistant" (Old Khmer *upakalpa*) is not used to my knowledge in this sense in Indian sources. In Old Javanese *upakalpa* denotes a religious officiant of some kind; see ZOETMULDER 1982, s.v.

and Śrīkaṅṭhapāṇḍita, the latter is said to have taught at the Śaiva site of Śivapāda. His son, unnamed, had a son Vāgīśvarapāṇḍita, who became the principal fire-sacrificer (*hotā*) of Harṣavarman III and the Guru of the queen. This record shows conclusively that families were not strictly Śaiva or Vaiṣṇava, that members of the same family could be of different religions, and that a Pāñcarātrika could preside in Śaiva centres, for Kavīśvarapāṇḍita is said to have been in control of the hermitages of Īśvarapura, Śivapura, Sūryaparvata and Jalāṅgeśvara and to have installed a Liṅga and a Bhagavatī on vacant land acquired by royal favour and a Caṇḍī in the temple of K.J. Govinda, evidently a Vaiṣṇava establishment.

There is evidence that the state did limit the freedom of individuals to change their religion, but only in the special case of persons from certain title-groups (*varṇa*) who had been selected for training as Śaiva officiants in the service of the king. A decree of Jayavarman V (r. c. 970–1000) forbids these from becoming Vaiṣṇavas (*bhāgavata*). K. 444B, ll. 9-13:

nau rū kule ta qnak si [man ta] āc ti paryann hoñ nām mok oy ācāryya [caturācāryya] pre paryān sikṣā āy nagara pi pre nā vraḥ rājakāryya nā pamnvās vvaṃ āc ti bhāgavata

As for males of these families, those competent to be taught should be brought to the Ācāryas among the Caturācāryas. It is ordered that they should be trained by them in the royal capital and that they should then work in the service of the king (/in royal ceremonies) as religious officiants and should not be able to become Bhāgavatas [Vaiṣṇavas].

and insists that the women of the families from which they were selected should be given in marriage to none but persons who are of the highest status (*uttama*) and devotees of Śiva. K. 444B, ll. 2–4:

nau ampall kule ta strījana oy ta qnak ta uttama pi śivabhakti. vvaṃ āc ti qnak ta hīnajāti yo[k d]au pi pañjā qnak khloñ

As for the women of these families, they are to be given to those who are [of] superior [status] and devoted to Śiva. Men of low birth (*hīnajāti*) may not take them to make them their wives.

The Unchanging Śaiva Temple Cult

Indian Śaivism was not static. During the course of several centuries new systems evolved and co-existed with their antecedents as beneficiaries of state-patronage. This history also affected the Khmers, who received the religion in at least two waves. The first is seen in inscriptions of the principalities of the pre-Angkorean period from the seventh to the early eighth century, the second in those of the kingdom of Angkor from the ninth to the fourteenth. These two forms of the religion fall within what Indian Śaiva sources call respectively (1) the Atimārga ('The Supra[-mundane] Path'), intending thereby the various divisions of the Pāśupatas, principally the Pāñcārthikas, Lākulas/Kālamukhas and Somasiddhāntins, and (2) the Mantramārga ('The Path of Mantras'), corresponding to what modern scholars have called Āgamic or Tantric Śaivism, principally that of the Saiddhāntikas, the followers of the Siddhānta. But it should be understood that the differences between these two traditions, the Khmer evidence for which will be the principal subject of the second part of this study, bear for the most part on the private practice of initiates. Śiva temples in which Śiva was worshipped in the form of the Liṅga

and associated hermitages for the support of Śaiva ascetics were institutions that appear to have remained unchanged in their fundamentals whatever the initiatory affiliation of the religious attached to them, and it is these common externals that are all that are usually apparent to us and recorded in the inscriptions.

This relatively unchanging aspect of the religion, which was already in place when the Atimārga held sway and which was inherited by the Saiddhāntikas when they came to the fore, was that of lay devotion (*śivabhaktiḥ*). Though the worship of initiates was focused on Śiva alone and on Śiva in one iconic form, the temples of Śiva in which they officiated for the benefit of the laity accommodated a broader range of deities. There was a single Śiva at the heart of each foundation, generally embodied in a Liṅga,³¹³ who received a version of the regular worship that initiates were required to perform for themselves. But the sites also enshrined (1) ancillary Śiva forms that had no role in the higher worship of the initiated, but evoked the mythological dimensions of the deity that are so central a feature of lay devotion, and (2) images of various other deities besides. As elsewhere in the Indic world distinctions between the religions were less relevant in the lay domain, where piety tended to be inclusive.

Thus during the reign of the pre-Angkorean ruler Īśānavarman I (c. 610–628) the temple of the Śiva Prahāsīśvara in his capital Īśānapura (Sambor Prei Kuk), named after the Indian Śiva Prahāsīśvara of Pāṭaliputra in Magadha, received installations not only of a golden Liṅga, but also of a silver image of Vṛṣabha (Śiva's bull), a Brahmā and a Sarasvatī (his consort) and four anthropomorphic ancillary Śiva forms: (1) that in which the left of his body is that of Viṣṇu, called Harihara or Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa, (2) that in which this half is his consort Umā, called Ardhanārīśvara or Gaurīśvara, (3) dancing Rudra, called variously Nṛtyarudra, Nṛtīśvara, Nṛtyeśvara, Nāteśvara, Nātakeśvara and Nātyeśvara, and (4) a Śiva pure and simple, probably single-faced and two-armed:

hariśambhor umārdhāṅgasamhatasya pinākinah
vṛṣabhānkasya – – ◡ catasraḥ pra[ti]mā imāḥ]
 32 *kārttasvaramayaṃ liṅgam idaṅ ca sacaturmmukham*
śarvvasya †śarvvarīdhvāntanīvṛtāṅgaṃ ◡ – ◡ – †
 33 *pratimeyaṃ sarasvatyā iyan nṛtīśvarasya ca*
vidhinā sthāpitaṃ sarvvaṃ idan tena mahībhuja
 34 *sthāpiteyaṃ pratikṛtīr vṛṣabhasya ca rājatī*
yā mūrttir iva dharmmasya paripūrṇnā kṛte yuge
 K. 440, vv. 31–34

31a *hariśambhor umārdhāṅga* em. : *hari* ◡ ◡ ◡ – *recāṅga* Ed. **31c** *vṛṣabhānkasya* corr. : *vṛṣabhānkasyā* Ed. **32a** *kārttasvaramayaṃ liṅgam* em. : *kārttasvaramayaliṅgam* Ed.

These four images of Harihara, Ardhanārīśvara, Śiva [and ...], this golden Liṅga together with [an image of] the Four-faced [Brahmā], this image of Śiva; this image of Sarasvatī, and this of Nṛtīśvara: all this has been installed by that king. He has further installed this silver image of [Śiva's] Bull, which seems to be the body of Dharma in the Kṛta Age, [when it was still] undiminished.³¹⁴

313. A notable exception is the golden image of Parameśvara (Śiva) consecrated by Rājendravarman in A.D. 948 in the central shrine at Baksei Chamkrong, as recorded in K. 286, v. 45: *sa divyadrśvā parameśvarasya hiraṇmayīm apratimāṃ vidhānaiḥ / upāskṛtemāṃ pratimāṃ pravīṇaḥ prāsādaśobhāṅ ca sudhāvicitrām* 'With celestial vision this gifted king provided with all due rites this matchless golden image of Parameśvara and adorned the temple-towers with beautiful stucco-work'.

314. In his edition and translation of K. 440 (*JC* 4, 5–11) CÉDÈS expressed the view that *hari* ◡ ◡ ◡ – *recāṅgasamhatasya pinākinah* (31ab) ('Hari ... de l'Archer (Çiva) uni au corps de ...') referred to Viṣṇu and Harihara, i.e. the Śiva form which is half Śiva (Hara) and half Viṣṇu (Hari). But the fact that we have

Śaiva sites during the Angkorean period show the same openness. In addition to the primary Liṅga, the image of the five-faced, ten-armed Sadāśiva, the icon that Saiddhāntika Śaiva initiates are to visualize when they worship Śiva in the Liṅga,³¹⁵ the guardians Nandin and Mahākāla who stand at the right and left of the doorway into Śiva's shrine,³¹⁶ and the wrathful Caṇḍeśvara, who receives the offerings that remain after Śiva's worship (*yajñāśeṣaḥ*),³¹⁷ in addition, that is, to the deities that are found in the private cult of Śaiva

hari rather than *hareḥ* and the Śaiva context render this interpretation less probable. The syllables *rccāṅga* that CŒDÈS read after the lacuna are surely an error (his or the engraver's) for *rddhāṅga*. Cf. K. 228, v. 5b: *harārdhāṅgadharā*; K. 583, v. 1 (= K. 70, v. 2): *namo 'stu ta[s](mai) [ru](drā)ya yadarddhāṅgaṃ ha(ri)r ddadhau*; *Kathāsaritśāgara* quoted in *Śrīvidyāmantravivṛti*, f. 35r: *tathā ca brhatkathāsaritśāgare devīm prati / mahādevavacanam: "madīyārdhāṅgabhūto 'sau tato viṣṇus tvadātmanā / yo hi nārāyaṇaḥ sā tvam śaktiḥ śaktimato mama / tataḥ prabhṛti vikhyātaṃ rūpadvayam idaṃ mama / ardhanaṛīśvaraṃ rūpam ardhahāriharaṃ vapuḥ / ato dadāmi nityatvaṃ svabhakteṣu harer gatim" iti.*

Vṛṣa (Śiva's bull) is seen as the embodiment or symbol of pious religious observance (Dharma). See, e.g., *Śivadharmottara* D, f. 71r4: *īśvarāyatanaśyādhaḥ śrīmān dharmavṛṣaḥ sthitaḥ*. In the Kṛtayuga, the first and best in the cycle of the four ages, Dharma is believed to have been complete and to have diminished by one quarter with each age until now, in the fourth age, the Kaliyuga, only one quarter (*pādah*) remains. Vṛṣa, being four-footed (*catuspādah*), symbolizes the Dharma complete with all four of its quarters (*catuspādah*).

315. See CŒDÈS 1923, 25–27, plates XI, 2, XII, 1-3, LI, 3. XI, 2. There is a relief sculpture in which a standing Sadāśiva is flanked by reverentially kneeling figures of Viṣṇu (viewer's right) and Brahmā (viewer's left) on the rock face a few metres to the north of the Vat Phu sanctuary, illustrated in UNESCO 1999, 89. For an eight-armed variant see the 12th/13th century bronze in SOTHEBY'S 1995, pl. 99.

316. K. 191, v. 45; K. 275, v. 7; K. 278, v. 26; K. 300, v. 64. For the role of Nandin and Mahākāla as Śiva's door-guardians see, e.g., Trilocanaśiva, *Somaśambhupaddhativvyākhyā*, IFI T. 170, 27–28; Jñānaśivācārya, *Jñānaratnāvalī*, IFI T. 231, p. 39; *Tantrāloka* 15.183c–187.

317. *Kiraṇa* f. 49v3: *tarpayed yajñāśeṣa caṇḍeśaṃ taṅkadhāriṇam* 'With the remnants of the sacrifice he should make an offering to the hatchet-wielding Caṇḍeśvara'. Caṇḍeśvara/Caṇḍa/Caṇḍarudra has his shrine in the NE corner of the Indian Śaiva temple compound. This is surely the deity given as Candīśvara in K. 593, v. 1 and K. 278 B, v. 26. The former records the installation of a Candīśvara, a Gaṇeśa, a Liṅga and the Grahas (*candīśvaraṃ vighnapatiṅ ca liṅgaṃ / grahais saha sthāpitavān*), the latter that of a Liṅga and the re-installation of a Gaṇeśa, a Candīśvara, a Nandin and a Mahākāla: *padmāsane sphāṭikam īśaliṅgaṃ / yas sthāpayām āsa yathāvidhānam / vighneśacandīśvaranandikālān / punar yathāsthānam atīṣṭhipac* (em. BARTH : *adhiṣṭhipac* Ep.) *ca*. I am unaware of any surviving Khmer image of this deity. However, the fact that he is in the company of Gaṇeśa, Nandin and Mahākāla make it unlikely that it is not Caṇḍeśvara that is intended. For these are all deities of the same class, being among the eight leaders of Śiva's attendant demigods (*gaṇeśvarāḥ, pramathanāyakāḥ*) that are worshipped in the systems of some of the Śaiva Tantras as the deity-circuit outside the Vidyēśvaras, between the latter and the Lokapālas. The other four are Skanda, the skeletal devotee Bhṛṅgin/Bhṛṅgiriti, Śiva's Bull, and Ambikā/Umā (*gaṇamātā* 'the Mother of the Gaṇas'). See, e.g., *Kiraṇa* ff. 40v6–41r1: *evam *syād* (corr. : *syā* Cod.) *dvāravinyāsaḥ padmaiḥ *pūjyāḥ* (corr. : *pūjyā* Cod.) *khageśvarāḥ* (i.e. *khaga* (voc.) *īśvarāḥ* [= *vidyēśvarāḥ*]) / **tikṣṇāgrotpalasaṃsthānāḥ* (corr. : *tikṣṇāgrotpalasaṃsthānā* Cod.) **pūjyāḥ* (corr. : *pūjyā* Cod.) *pramathanāyakāḥ / lokaśāḥ svastikaiḥ pūjyāś caturbhāgavivartitaiḥ; Mṛgendra* 3.20–26b; *Sarvajñānottara* B, p. 37 (*Śivārcanaprakaraṇa* 35ab, 37c–39a, 39c): *vidyēśvarāṃs tṛtīye tu pūrvād ārabhya vinyaset / ...gaṇeśvarāṃs caturthe tu kauberyāśādiśaḥ kramāt / *devīm* (conj. : *divam* Cod.) *caiva tu caṇḍeśaṃ mahākālaṃ ca nandinam / gaṇādhyakṣaṃ ca bhṛṅgīśaṃ vṛṣabhaṃ skandam eva ca / dhyāyet ...pañcame lokapālāṃs tu kramād āvaraṇe budhaḥ / vinyased agramārgena dharmācāmīkaraprabhān; Brhatkālottara* f. 19r5 (13.102c–103): *anantādyān dalāgreṣu vidyēśāṃs tatra pūjayet / pīṭhakaṅthe gaṇeśāṃs tu lokaśān pīṭhāpādātaḥ*. Cf. also the opening sequence of deities invoked in the *sāntyādhyāyah* of the laity's *Śivadharmā*: Śiva, Umā, Skanda, Nandin, Gaṇeśa, Mahākāla, Ambikā (Gaṇamātr), Mahiṣāsūramardini (Durgā), Bhṛṅgin/Bhṛṅgiriti, and Caṇḍeśvara, followed by Brahmā, Viṣṇu and the Mothers. See also the pre-Angkorean inscription K. 22, which records the

initiates, we find installations of Śiva's vehicle (*vāhanam*), the Bull (*vr̥ṣaḥ*, *vr̥ṣabhah*) who sits facing the Liṅga of the central shrine,³¹⁸ the four ancillary Śiva forms already mentioned (Harihara,³¹⁹ Ardhanārīśvara/Gaurīśvara,³²⁰ the dancing Rudra,³²¹ and the simple Śiva³²²) and Umāmaheśvara, also called Umeśa, in which Umā, Śiva's consort, sits on his right thigh with his right arm around her.³²³

installation of a Harihara, and *viṣṇucandēśvareśānalingam*, which most probably means 'a Viṣṇu, a Caṇḍeśvara, and a Śivaliṅga' (cf. K. 834, v. 84: *liṅgam aiśānam*), as thought by CœDÈS (*IC* III, 145).

318. K. 300, v. 64. The Bull has been generally called Nandin or Nandi in secondary sources both Indological and Khmerological. But this usage is extremely rare in Indian sources before modern times (see G. BHATTACHARYA 1956) and is never seen in the Khmer inscriptions. In the classical and learned Sanskrit sources Śiva's mount is always simply "the Bull" (*vr̥ṣaḥ*, *vr̥ṣabhah*). The current usage is particularly unfortunate since Nandin (/Nandi/Nandiśa/Nandikeśa) is the name of the entirely different, anthropomorphic figure that stands guard at the right door-post of the entrance to the Śiva shrine, as Mahākāla guards the left.

Śiva's Bull is understood as the embodiment of religious observance, *dharmah*; and in consequence the word *vr̥ṣaḥ* is found as a synonym of *dharmah* in Khmer and Indian inscriptions (K. 282 D, v. 9; K. 286, v. 20; K. 834, v. 44; Gwalior Museum Stone Inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu (MIRASHI 1962), l. 15 (re the ascetic Vyomaśambhu): *vr̥ṣaikaniṣṭho 'pi jitasmaro 'pi yaḥ śaikaro 'bhūd bhuvi ko 'py apūrvvaḥ* 'He was a new and extraordinary *Śaikara/bestower of happiness* in this world, [since he was] *completely devoted to piety/rode only on the Bull* and had *conquered lust/conquered the God of Love*'; *ibid.* ll. 24-25 (re Pataṅgaśambhu): *acalasthitivṛṣanirataḥ prakāṭikṛtaviśamadarśanaḥ satatam / yo vijitamakaraketur ddhūrjjatilām alaṃ vahati* 'He fully imitated Śiva, being *content with unchanging piety/dwelling the Himālaya and fond of the Bull*, *always clarifying abstruse doctrines/with his three eyes ever manifest*, *having conquered lust/having defeated the Love God*'.³¹⁹

319. K. 583, v. 1 (= K. 70, v. 2); K. 366, l. 16; K. 904 B, ll. 14 and 17; K. 926, Khmer, l. 3. For [standing four-armed] images see e.g., JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos 16 and 17 (7th century), 40 (10th century; head only).

320. K. 324 B i, v. 1; K. 528, v. 7 and 135.

321. K. 908, v. 30 (*nātyeśvarau svarnamayau*); K. 276 (Pra Keo), ll. 6-13: [Yogīśvarapaṇḍita] gave a palanquin on which he installed a fully adorned, ten-armed V.K.A. Śrī Nātakeśvara (= Nātakeśvara) (*vraḥ kamrateñ añ śrīnātakeśvara daśabhujā*), along with the necessary vessels for his cult in gold and silver, a peacock-feather parasol, and the inhabitants of Ampeṇa to serve him. I have not noted the name Nātakeśvara in any Indian source; but it is very improbable that this is other than the form called Nātyeśvara, Nṛteśvara etc., especially in the light of its description here as ten-armed. The same applies to the Nartakeśvara whose installation is recorded in Ka. 18 B, ll. 2 and 36-37. Khmer examples of ten-armed dancing Rudras have survived. He is found as the deity on temple tympana at Banteay Srei, Sikhoraphum and Phnom Rung. From the Prasat Thom at Koh Ker there survive exquisite fragments of a five-faced, ten-armed dancing Rudra in stone, of about twice human size (JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, no. 42). BOISSELIER (1955, 198) wrongly identified the image as a Sadāśiva.

322. K. 95 A, v. 32: *catasraś śivayor arcā yaś śrutīr iva pāvānīḥ / dvīpe śrīndrataṭākasya pitṛbhūtyai samam vyadhāt* 'He installed together four images of Śiva and his consort, like the four purifying Vedas, on the island in the Indrataṭāka for the welfare of his parents'; K. 323, v. 59 (the same installation); K. 191, v. 46 (a golden anthropomorphic image of Śiva); K. 528, v. 207: *saṃprāptayoḥ prāptayaśās svapitrōr bhuvah patih so 'pi bhavodbhavena / *sasthānatām* (em. : *sa[m]sthānatām* FINOT) *sthāpitavān sthūtiṅṅo nime ime dve śivayoḥ śivāya* 'Having acquired fame that lord of the earth, knowing the sacred order, installed two images, one of Śiva and the other of his consort for the welfare of his two parents now that they had gone to dwell with Śiva in his world'. For surviving [two-armed mild standing] Śivas of the Angkorean period see, e.g. JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos 33, 38 (head only), and 57.

323. K. 300, v. 64: *+++ +m umayā sahitaṃ punaḥ / nandinaṃ kālasamyuktaṃ haimaśṅgagirau vr̥ṣam* '[a Śiva] together with Umā, [the two door-guardians] Nandin and Mahākāla, and the Bull, on the Mt. of the Golden Peak (= Ta Keo)'. See the Umāmaheśvara from Banteay Srei, c. A.D. 967 (Phnom Penh, National Museum, Ka 1797) illustrated in JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, no. 56. For the bull see *ibid.*, no. 24.

We also find images of the following deities of the wider pantheon at Śaiva sites: Durgā Maḥiṣāsūramardīnī, Umā, Gaṇeśa, Skanda, Viṣṇu (including the forms Trivikrama and Hayagrīva), Brahmā, Sūrya, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, the Lokapālas, the Grahas (the Sun, the Moon, the five visible planets, and Rāhu and Ketu, the ascending and descending nodes of the moon personified as the causes of eclipses), the river Gaṅgā and Bhīma.³²⁴

Similarly, Śaiva temples in which a central shrine of Śiva was flanked by shrines of Brahmā and Viṣṇu were not uncommon in the region. Examples of such complexes are those built by, or in the reign of Yaśovarman I (889–910) on the hills Phnom Krom and Phnom Bok roughly equidistant from the pyramid-based temple of Yaśodhareśvara, the Liṅga incorporating his name on the summit of Phnom Bakheng at the centre of his new capital Yaśodharapura (Angkor).³²⁵ Others, all tenth-century, are recorded in K. 94 (on Phnom Trâp), K. 352–354 (at Rudrapada [Prasat Kantop]), and K. 532 (at Banteay Kdei). During the reign of Rājendravarman Hṛṣīkeśa, Śaivācārya and tutor of the royal family, had a Brahmā and a Viṣṇu installed to the right and left of a Liṅga established by his Guru in Yaśodharapura (Angkor),³²⁶ and these two gods are portrayed kneeling on either side of a standing Sadāśiva in a bas-relief on the rock-face behind the Vat Phu Śiva temple.³²⁷

324. K. 176, a cave inscription on Phnom Kulen below one of the images that adorn the walls, records the installation by a Śivasoma, the Śaiva ascetic occupying the cave, in A.D. 1074/5, of the gods Śiva etc., their consorts Umā etc., the Gaṇas; Śiva with Viṣṇu, the Gaṇas and Umā; Brahmā [?: *prathamamakhabhuk*]; K. 191, v. 41: a Liṅga, a Viṣṇu and a Sarasvatī; K. 218, reign of Sūryavarman I (A.D. 1002–1050): a Liṅga, an Umā, a Trivikrama Viṣṇu, a Hayagrīva, and a Trailokyasāra (Viṣṇu); K. 254 B, ll. 17–23: a Liṅga, a Viṣṇu, and a Devī; K. 258 C, v. 26: two Liṅgas with a Viṣṇu; K. 286, v. 32: Śiva, the Goddess (Umā), Viṣṇu, and the two Goddesses (Lakṣmī and Sarasvatī?) in the Baksei Chamkrong; K. 366, ll. 16–17: a Liṅga, a Maḥiṣāsūramardīnī and a Viṣṇu; K. 528, v. 218: Rājendresvara on the Eastern Mebon together with a Viṣṇu, a Brahmā, a Śiva and a Gaurī; K. 528, v. 205: a Liṅga, a Viṣṇu, a Gaurī and a Śiva on the south bank of the Yaśodharataṭāka; K. 532, vv. 1–6: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Umā, Sarasvatī, the Śivaliṅga of Aninditapura; K. 702, v. 22: Śiva and Sarasvatī; K. 56 B (Vaiṣṇava): Lakṣmī, five Viṣṇus, Kātyāyanī (Durgā), Gaṅgā, a Viṣṇu sleeping on the ocean (Jalāyāyin); Maḥiṣāsūramardīnī: K. 56 B, v. 18cd (Kātyāyini); K. 257, ll. 31–32; K. 534, v. 21. Skanda: K. 57, v. 36; Gaṇeśa: K. 346, v. 36 (= K. 95 A, v. 36); K. 358 (an image); the Grahas: K. 593 (A.D. 930); K. 726 (8th century), listing their names; Gaṅgā: K. 56 B, v. 19 (emending *tripathagām tanum* to *tripathagātānum*; K. 826, v. 29 (with Śiva and Umā: *umāgaṅgābhujalātāsamśliṣṭajaghanasthālam / sa tśvaraṃ sthāpitavān umāgaṅgāpatīśvaram*; see CĒDÈS 1939). Cf. K. 300, v. 26 (= K. 95 A, v. 36), which refers to a Yogin's vision of Śiva accompanied by Umā and Gaṅgā. The identity of Bhīma is problematic. It is mentioned to my knowledge only in K. 532, v. 27: *liṅgaṃ bhīmapure moghapure liṅge ca sa vyadhāt / liṅgaikāṃsau sabhīmārccāv aninditapure punaḥ* 'He established a Liṅga at Bhīmapura, two Liṅgas at Amoghapura, two parts of a Liṅga together with an image of Bhīma in Aninditapura'. Perhaps it was an image of the Epic Hero Bhīma. A cult of this Bhīma in association with the Liṅga cult was practised in East Java at Sukuh on the slopes of Mt. Lawu. Several Bhīma statues survive from this area. He appears in Old Javanese literature as a compassionate saviour of souls, a tradition that has survived in the Balinese shadow play. See DE CASPARIS and MABBETT 1992, 317. For surviving images of these deities see, e.g., JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos 18 (Durgā Maḥiṣāsūramardīnī); 19, 29 (Umā); 43 (Umā as Gaṇa dancing before the dancing Rudra); 26 (Gaṇeśa); 25 (Skanda); 15, 30, 31, 34, 39 (head only), 67, 69, 70 (four-armed standing Viṣṇu holding the disc of the earth on his lower right palm); 68 (Viṣṇu reclining on the waters); 14, 46 (Hayagrīva, both pre-Angkorean), 45 (Brahmā); 47 (the Lokapāla Varuṇa); 66 (Lakṣmī?); MIKSIC and SOEKATNO 1995, 128, no. 9 (Bhīma). For Khmer sculptures of the nine Grahas, from all periods see K. BHATTACHARYA 1956, 1957 and 1958; MALLERET 1960; and BÉNISTI 1976; JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, nos 58 and 62.

325. CĒDÈS 1968, 113; JACQUES 1999, 42 (map), 62.

326. K. 532, v. 43: [*te*]nemaṃ sthāpitau devau caturāsyacaturbhujau / [*da*]kṣiṇottarayor atra guru-śāśanavartīnā.

327. Illustrated in UNESCO 1999, 89.

In Central Java we see the same arrangement in the great Śaiva temple-complex built in the late ninth or early tenth century at Prambanan near modern Yogyakarta, where the Śiva temple (the Candi Loro Jonggrang) (47m in height; 34m x 34m at the base) is flanked by two somewhat smaller temples housing Viṣṇu and Brahmā (33m in height; 20m x 20m at the base). We see it also in Pura Meru, the state-temple established in 1720 in Cakranegara on Lombok. There too there are three pagodas in an inner courtyard. That of Śiva is in the centre with eleven roofs, that of Viṣṇu on the north with nine, and that of Brahmā on the south with seven.³²⁸ The same triad is conceptualized in the eleven-roofed pagodas that dominate the three shrine-complexes of Pura Besakih on Mount Agung, Bali's principal state temple. The main pagoda of the central complex (Pura Penatarang Agung) is dedicated to Śiva, while those of the complexes to the left and right of it (Pura Batu Madeg and Pura Dangin Kreteg) are dedicated to Viṣṇu and Brahmā respectively.³²⁹ The ninth-century Candi Srikandi on the Dieng Plateau in Central Java has the same three deities in relief: Śiva on the east wall, flanked by Viṣṇu on the north and Brahmā on the south.³³⁰ In the fourteenth century the East Javanese poet Mpu Tantular of Majapahit depicts an imaginary landscape that includes a ruined Śaiva temple complex on a mountainside comprising shrines of Śiva and Viṣṇu with one of Gaṇapati under the gate.³³¹

This laity-orientated Śaiva inclusivism is also evident in the benedictory verses that open the Khmers' Sanskrit inscriptions. Those that record benefactions creating or supporting Vaiṣṇava and Buddhist establishments open with strictly Vaiṣṇava (Pāñcārātrika) or Buddhist benedictions. This convention is also seen with some of the Śaiva benefactions. But many of the inscriptions recording these, while giving precedence to Śiva or to Śiva and his consort (Umā/Gaurī), go on to venerate other gods, typically Brahmā and/or Viṣṇu (commonly both), sometimes with Lakṣmī and/or Sarasvatī.³³²

In this openness the Khmers were following the long-established practice of India. There too Śaiva temple sites housed a wider range of deities, bridging the gap between the exclusive worship of the initiates and that of the laity on whose support they were dependent. But the Khmers were following more than the principle here. For the Śiva-forms and ancillary deities of their Śiva temples are precisely those which are prescribed for this purpose in the surviving Indian Śaiva scriptural sources, or rather in the earliest of them available to us, which comprise most of the works of this kind that were known to Indian Śaiva scholars between the tenth century and the thirteenth.

The most important of these are unpublished Pratiṣṭhāntaras, works concerned specifically with the installation (*pratiṣṭhā*) of Liṅgas and images, the consecration of temples, other religious edifices and the royal palace, and the ancillary topics of iconometry, iconography and architecture. They are the *Devyāmata*, the *Piṅgalāmata* alias

328. For these numbers of roofs for pagodas of Śiva, Viṣṇu and Brahmā in Balinese temples see VAN EERDE 1910.

329. STUART-FOX 2002, 95–97.

330. SOEKMONO 1990, 68.

331. Mpu Tantular, *Arjunawijaya* 32.2 (*śiwawimba, harirūpa, gaṇa*); also Mpu Tantular's *Sutasoma* 13.1–2, locating the Viṣṇu to the north and the Gaṇa (Gaṇapati) under the gate. See S. SUPOMO 1977, 2:312–313 (ad *Arjunawijaya* 32.2).

332. See, e.g., K. 70: Śiva, Harihara, Viṣṇu; K. 34, K. 235, K. 436, K. 661: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā; K. 92: Śiva, Devī, Viṣṇu, Brahmā; K. 136: Śiva, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Sarasvatī; K. 190 B: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Gaurī, Sarasvatī; K. 218: Śiva, his Śakti, Viṣṇu, Brahmā; K. 228: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Umā; K. 323: Śiva (as taking form as Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Rudra), Viṣṇu, Brahmā; K. 532: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Gaurī, Sarasvatī; K. 702: Śiva, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Umā, Sarasvatī, Lakṣmī; K. 834: Śiva, Narasiṃha, Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Sūrya, Sarasvatī; K. 989: Liṅga, Śiva (Parameśvara), Umā, Nārāyaṇa and Lakṣmī; K. 1002 (JACQUES 1968): Śiva, Umā, Sarasvatī, Viṣṇu, Brahmā.

Jayadrathādhikāra, the *Mayasaṃgraha* and the *Mohacūrottara*. All have come down to us in early Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts.³³³

Kashmirian Śaiva scholars of the mid-tenth to early eleventh century, whose works are our earliest body of detailed, citation-rich Śaiva exegesis, were familiar with at least the first three. One of these scholars, Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, appears to have written a commentary on the *Piṅgalāmata*, since it is mentioned and attributed to him by the twelfth-century South-Indian Śaiva authority Trilocanaśiva in his commentary on the *Somaśambhupaddhati*;³³⁴ and another, Vidyākaṇṭha, a pupil of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha's famous son Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II, wrote a commentary on the *Mayasaṃgraha*, which has survived complete in a single Kashmirian manuscript under the title *Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*,³³⁵ a work of importance not only in its own right but also because it is our only evidence of the contents of substantial parts of the text it explains, the *Mayasaṃgraha* itself having come down to us in a single incomplete manuscript.³³⁶ The commentary cites the *Devyāmata*³³⁷ and, very frequently, the *Piṅgalāmata*.³³⁸ The fourth work, the *Mohacūrottara*, also referred to as *Mohaśūrottara* and *Mohacūḍottara*,³³⁹ is not cited or named by any of the

333. The relevant sections of these sources are as follows: *Devyāmata*, ff. 66v4–73r4 (Paṭala 61: *surāṇām vividhapratimālakṣaṇapaṭalah*); *Piṅgalāmata*, ff. 13r2–27v3 (Prakaraṇa 4: *pratimādhikārah*); *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 4v2–9v1 (Paṭala 2: *vyaktaliṅgaprakhyānam*). The relevant section of the *Mayasaṃgraha* is one of those missing in the incomplete *codex unicus*, but its contents can be determined from the commentary on this text (*Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*) composed by the Kashmirian Saiddhāntika Vidyākaṇṭha II, pupil of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II.

334. *Somaśambhupaddhativyākhyā*, p. 99: *tad uktam piṅgalāmataṭīkāyām nārāyaṇakaṇṭhena pīthāntam pīthavyāpīti*.

335. For my evidence that the author of the commentary was a pupil of Rāmakaṇṭha II rather than the Vidyākaṇṭha who was a pupil of Rāmakaṇṭha I, and for my identification of the *Mayasaṃgraha* of the Nepalese ms. as the work known to the early Kashmirian commentators, see Dominic GOODALL 1998, x–xiii. I am very grateful to him for providing me with a photocopy of his photocopy of the Jammu manuscript, which he had acquired seeing that it might be a previously unknown work of Kashmirian Saiddhāntika literature, and to another of my former pupils John NEMEC, who kindly acquired a direct photocopy of the manuscript for me in Jammu, a copy which proved, unlike the first, to be completely legible. This *Mayasaṃgraha* is not to be confused with the published, South-Indian *Mayamata*. They have in common only that they are Śaiva works on Pratiṣṭhā attributed to Maya, the architect of the Asuras.

336. Prakaraṇa 2 of the *Mayasaṃgraha*, the section on iconometry and iconography (*pratimālakṣaṇaprakaraṇam*), is covered in the commentary on ff. 12r7–21v9.

337. Ff. 56v and 58v, on both occasions with the erroneous spelling *Divyāmata*, which no doubt reflects the tendency of the speakers of Kashmiri who transmitted this text not to distinguish Sanskrit *ī* and *e*; see GRIERSON 1915, 3b–4a.

338. E.g. ff. 4v, 8v, 21r, 24r, 25r, 25v, 35v, 37v, 40r, 43r, 43v, 44v, 50v, 53r, 53v, 55r, 57v, 61r, 61v, 62v, and 66r. The other works of this class that are cited as authorities by Vidyākaṇṭha are the *Nandikeśvaramata* (ff. 17v, 18r, 53r, 54r, 67r), the *Pratiṣṭhāpārameśvara* (ff. 7r, 8r, 12r, 13v, 17v, 23r, 24v, 57v, 67r), the *Paitāmaha* and the *Pratiṣṭhāsamuccaya* (ff. 17r, 22r, 58r, 58v, 59r, 60r, 66r). I know of no surviving manuscript of any of these.

339. The name of this text is a puzzle. In the opening section Indra, the pupil here, says that he has already been taught the *Mohacūḍa* (1.2ab: *tvatprasādāt pariññātam mohacūḍam mayā prabho*), and asks Skanda to teach him the *Mohacūrottara* (1.3cd: *mohacūrottaram śāstram tadarthaṃ vaktum arhasi*) to provide detailed instruction on the Liṅga and temples mentioned there. We therefore expect *mohacūḍottaram* 'The Sequel of the *Mohacūḍa*', but the unmeaning *-cūrottara-* is repeated in all the colophons. The original source of the text, a mythical work in 70 million verses, is also *Mohacūra* in the closing verses of the work (f. 46v5–6: *saptakoṭīpravistūrñān mohacūrān mayā tava / vyākhyātam sāram ādāya lakṣaṅgrathena svrata / punaḥ prṣṭaḥ samāsenā tvayāham suranāyaka / tad ākhyātam tadarddhena mohacūram mayā hare / siddhisārasahasrais tu yugmacandrais tad antataḥ / yogajñānādisamyuktaṃ vyākhyātam śāstram uttamam / susaṃkṣepam sugambhīram pratiṣṭhāntaram*

tenth-century commentators of Kashmir. But it was known to Somaśambhu, who cites it in his *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* (*Somaśambhupaddhati* 4:85, v. 42), which he completed in A.D. 1095/6 while he was abbot of the Central-Indian Golakīmaṭha. It is excerpted by Hṛdayaśiva, probably of Mālava, in his unpublished *Prāyaścittasamuccaya*,³⁴⁰ which may prove to have been earlier. But the evidence now available to me indicates that it may have been composed at any time from the late ninth century to 1157/8, the date of the earliest manuscript.³⁴¹

We also have the *Kiraṇa* and the *Netratantra*, both major scriptural sources for the Kashmirians of the tenth century, the former surviving in a Nepalese manuscript completed in A.D. 924/5, the latter in one of 1200.³⁴² Neither of these Śaiva scriptures is a work devoted exclusively to Pratiṣṭhā, but both include important relevant information on the range and iconography of deities. Chapter 52 (*vyaktaliṅgalakṣaṇam*) of the *Kiraṇa* sets out the iconography of the wider Śaiva pantheon, that is to say, of the images of the various deities that a Śaiva officiant may be expected to install. The *Netratantra* teaches the specialized cult of the Mantra-deity known as Mrtyuñjaya, Amṛteśa[bhairava] or Netranātha, but it is a peculiarity of its system that the Mantra is absolutely universal in that the officiant initiated into its cult is empowered to use it in the worship of any deity. The Mantra is constant; only the visualization changes. In this context the text sets out in its thirteenth chapter the principal forms of the deities whose worship may be assimilated. The range is wider than that of the other texts, since the *Netratantra* is not narrowly concerned with the programme of images in the Śaiva temple-complex but envisages the whole range of deities, including the Buddha, whose worship was part of the religious calendar of the court, in which this Śaiva specialist was to serve in a role that encompasses and exceeds that of the brahmanical royal chaplain (*rājapurohitah*). Though its iconographical information is less detailed than that of the other five works mentioned it is of use in that it agrees closely with the range of Śiva-forms envisaged in those sources.

These, minor discrepancies apart, are just those seen in the surviving inscriptions and statuary of the Khmers: the mild one-faced and two-armed Śiva, the ten-armed, five-faced Sadāśiva, the ten-armed dancing Rudra, Ardhanārīśvara, Harihara/Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa, and Umāmaheśvara.³⁴³ The same applies to the wider Śaiva pantheon taught for installation in

uttamam. We also see it with the citation of the text in the manuscripts of the *Prāyaścittasamuccaya* of Hṛdayaśiva. South-Indian citations always give the title as *Mohaśūrottara*, which removes the problem but is certainly a misguided attempt to correct what was probably seen as a Tamilism, for Sanskrit -ś- is rendered by -c- in Tamil transcription. The puzzling spelling is also supported by the Kashmirian manuscripts of the *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu. The Kashmirian edition has *mahādūrāntare* for the locative singular of this title in v. 1361b, but records the obviously less corrupt variant *mohadūrāntare*. This *dū* is more probably a corruption of *cū* than of *śū*, because *cū* and *dū* resemble each other in the Kashmirian Śāradā script to a degree that makes confusion easy, whereas *śū* and *dū* do not. Moreover, *cū* and *dū* have one style of postconsonantal *ū*, whereas *śū* shows the other. I find the title in the expected form *Mohacūḍottara* in two Maharashtrian sources: a manuscript of Kamalākarabhaṭṭa's *Śūdradharmatattva* (AUFRECHT 1864, 279a) and the published edition of the *Caturvargacintāmaṇi* (1:134, 135) composed by Hemādri while he was a minister of the Yādava king Mahādeva of Devagiri (r. 1260–1271). I have retained the prevalent spelling in preference to this plausible correction.

340. Ff. 103v1–111r1, = *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 42v4–47r2 (the end).

341. For these termini see SANDERSON 2001, 3.

342. *Amṛteśatantra*, NAK MS 1-285, NGMPP Reel No. B 25/5; palm-leaf; Nepalese 'Pāla' script.

343. *Devyāmata*, ff. 66v4–69r2: Naṭeśvara surrounded by the dancing Gaṇas (Nandin, Mahākāla, Umā, Skanda, Caṇḍeśvara and Bhṛṅgīśa/Bhṛṅgiriṭi), Ardhanārīśvara, Umāmaheśvara/Umeśa, mild Maheśvara forms (two-armed in the capital, four- or eight-armed in a Pattana), and various many-armed Bhairava-like fierce (*raudra*-) forms (for the wilds and villages); *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 7r5–8r3: Sadeśāna

these texts, which comprises Gaurī, Durgā Mahiṣāsūramardīnī, Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Skanda, Gaṇeśa, Nandin, Mahākāla, Sarasvatī, the Sun, or the Sun and the other eight heavenly bodies (Grahas), the Lokapālas, the seven Mothers with Vireśa, and, in some cases, also Lakṣmī and Bhairava.³⁴⁴ The only major discrepancy between the Indian Śaiva and Khmer Śaiva evidence is that the latter reveals no instance of the installation of images of Bhairava or of the Seven Mothers (Brahmāṇī to Cāmuṇḍā) and Vireśa. This might suggest the possibility that the Khmers received their Śaivism before these elements had been integrated into its programme of temple images. But this is unlikely, since Śaivism's engagement with these deities goes back at least to the fourth century of the Christian era. The Vākātaka king Rudrasena I (r. A.D. c. 335–c. 360) is described as a loyal devotee of

(Sadāśiva), Ardhanārīśvara, Umeśa, Haranārāyaṇa (Harihara), and Nṛtyeśa/Nṛtyarudra; *Mayasaṃgraha* (*Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, f. 19r14–v3): ten-armed Śiva, Śiva on his bull, Ardhanārīśvara, naked and ithyphallic in the Devadāruvana, Nātyastha and Saṅkaranārāyaṇa (Harihara); *Kiraṇa*, Paṭala 52: ten-armed dancing Rudra, Umāmaheśvara, Ardhanārīśvara, Rudra-and-Kṛṣṇa (Harihara); *Netratantra* 13.29–32b: ten-armed Rudra on his bull, four-armed Śiva with trident, gesture of protection, citron and rosary, Nātyastha, Ardhanārīśvara, Harihara, Vivāhastha, Samīpastha (= Umāmaheśvara?); and *Piṅgalāmata* f. 19v2 ff.: Nāteśvara, Sadāśiva (four-faced and eight-armed), Umāmaheśvara, Ardhanārīśvara, and Harirudra (Harihara).

344. *Devyāmata*, ff. 69r2–73r3: Viṣṇu forms (four-armed, seated on a lotus or on Garuḍa, Viśvarūpa, Narasiṃha, Trivikrama, Vārāha), Brahmā, 10-armed Mahiṣāsūramardīnī, fierce eight-armed Kauśikī, Skanda, Gaṇeśa, the Lokapālas, Vireśa and Gaṇeśa with the seven Mothers Brahmāṇī to Cāmuṇḍā, Śrīdevī (Lakṣmī), and the Sun; *Mohacūrottara*, ff. 8r3–9v2: Viṣṇu, Brahmā, the Sun, the Moon, the other Grahas, Gaṇeśa, Skanda, Nandin, Mahākāla, the ascetic Pārvatī (Aparṇā/Tapogaurī), Durgā Mahiṣāsūramardīnī and Sarasvatī; *Mayasaṃgraha* (*Bhāvacūḍāmaṇi*, f. 18v10–19r13): the eight Vidyēśvaras (ten-armed), the Gaṇas (Bhṛṅgin etc.), Gaurī mounted on a lion, Gaṇeśa, the hundred Rudras, the Lokapālas (with Yama + Kāla, the Piṭṛs and Vyādhis), Rudra and the Gaṇas, Brahmā; 19v4–21v3: various forms of Viṣṇu (one-faced, three-faced and four-faced, on Garuḍa, lying on the ocean [*jalaśāyī*], on Śeṣa with Lakṣmī), the ten Avatāras of Viṣṇu, the seven Mothers, the Grahas, Durgā, Gaurī, Sarasvatī, the seven ṛṣis, Revanta, Dhanvantari and the two Aśvins, the Rivers, and the Kṣetrapālas; *Kiraṇa*, Paṭala 52: Brahmā, Skanda, Gaṇeśa, Caṇḍikā/Mahiṣāsūramardīnī, the Lokapālas, Īśa (= Vireśa) as the lute-playing (*vīṇāhastah*) leader of the seven Mothers (*mātṛṇām agrāṇīh*), the seven Mothers, Āmardaka (ferocious, two- or four-armed carrying a knife and skull or severed head), the Sun, Sarasvatī, and Gajalakṣmī; *Netratantra* 13.2–16: Viṣṇu: one-faced, four-armed Nārāyaṇa; three-faced, six-armed on Garuḍa with lateral Narasiṃha and Varāha faces and Lakṣmī as consort; eight-armed on a ram [= Bālasaṃkarṣaṇa]; Viśvarūpa; on the ocean (*śayanastah*), in marriage with Lakṣmī (*vivāhastah*); with Lakṣmī as half his body (Lakṣmīvāsudeva); Narasiṃha, Varāha, Vāmana, Kapila, and Avyakta; 13.17–28: various images of the Sun; 13.32c–43: Brahmā with the four Vedas, the Buddha, Skanda, Kāmadeva, Sūrya, Soma, Gaṇeśa, the Lokapālas etc.; and *Piṅgalāmata* ff. 17v3–27v3: Bhairava and the Mothers, Gaṇeśa, Skanda and the other Gaṇas, Lakṣmī, Sarasvatī, Durgā, the ascetic Pārvatī (*pañcāgñīh*), Mahādeva and the hundred and eight Rudras, the eight Vidyēśvaras, the Lokapālas, Viṣṇu, the ten Avatāras of Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Gāyatrī, Sāvitrī, the Grahas, the Nāgas and Nāginīs, Yakṣiṇīs etc. Among these sources the *Netratantra* and the *Piṅgalāmata* stand apart from the mainstream tradition seen in the *Devyāmata*, *Mohacūrottara*, *Mayasaṃgraha* and *Kiraṇa*. The subtypes detailed in the *Netratantra* belong, I shall argue elsewhere, to a Kashmirian tradition with strong local features. The *Piṅgalāmata* is not a text of the Siddhānta but rather of the Yāmala tradition of the Śākta Śaivism of the Vidyāpīṭha. It affiliates itself to the *Brahmayāmala* (*Picumata*) and in accordance with this stance, though it covers Saiddhāntika territory, it teaches the iconography of the deities of the Vāma, the Dakṣiṇa (*Picumata*) and the Trika, and builds up the role of Bhairava and the Mother Goddesses in its general Śaiva iconography. In the absence of the relevant portion of the text of the *Mayasaṃgraha* it is impossible to be sure that all the deity-forms in Vidyākaṇṭha's commentary were in that text. His reference to three- and four-faced Viṣṇus seems likely to have been added on the basis of what he knew of the distinctive Kashmirian Pāncarātrika tradition.

“Great Bhairava”;³⁴⁵ and a copperplate decree issued by Mahārāja Bhuluṇḍa in A.D. 376 from Bagh (Valkhā) in Madhya Pradesh records a grant made to support the worship of the Mothers in a temple of those deities established by a Pāśupatācārya Bhagavat Lokodadhi.³⁴⁶ But in all other respects we find a strikingly close correlation between the Khmer evidence of the range of deities installed in Śiva temples and that prescribed in these early sources of Indian Śaivism. And this correlation demonstrates that the Śaivism of the temples underwent little change when patronage shifted from the Atimārga to the Mantramārga. For although the extant Indian textual sources that record this iconography belong to the Mantramārga, the same iconography, with the exception of the Mantramārga’s Sadāśiva, is in evidence among the Khmers in the seventh century, well before the Mantramārga reached their shores.

The Problem of Provenance

What we do not find among the Khmers or their neighbours in mainland and maritime Southeast Asia is any trace of that range of ancillary Śiva-forms that has seemed so central to students of Śaiva India because they are found throughout the Śiva temples of the Tamil-speaking South, where Śaivism has been best preserved down to modern times, and because they are those prescribed in Śaiva scriptures transmitted under ancient titles in that region.³⁴⁷ I refer to forms such as Bhikṣāṭana, Somāskanda, Kaṅkālārūpa, Candraśekhara, Dakṣiṇāmūrti, Gaṅgādhara, Tripurāntaka, Liṅgodbhava, Kāmāri, Kālāri, Caṇḍeśvaraprasāda, and Naṭarāja.³⁴⁸

345. EI 22, 171 (Tirodi plates of Pravarasena II, r. c. 400–c. 450, 1, ll. 3–6): *atyantasvāmimahābhairavabhaktasya ...vākāṭakānām mahārājaśrirudrasenasya*. For these approximate regnal dates of Rudrasena and Pravarasena see BAKKER 1997, 169.

346. RAMESH and TEWARI 1990, 21–22 (no. 10), ll. 2–: *bhagavallokodadhīpāśupatācāryya-pratiṣṭhāpitakapīṅchikānakagrāmamātrsthānadevakulasya piṅchikānakam eva grāmaṃ saha bhadrattavāṭakagrāmavāṭakachena devāgrāhāramāṭīṅ[m] balicarusatradhūpagandhapuṣpamālyopayojyabhogāya*

347. I refer to the *Kāmika*, *Kāraṇa*, *Ajita*, *Raurava*, *Suprabheda*, *Dīpta*, *Vātulaśuddhākhyā*, *Aṃśumatkāśyapa*, and related Āgamas. See *Ajitāgama*, *Kriyāpāda* 36.207–288b; *Rauravāgama*, *Kriyāpāda* 35.114–292.

348. A tradition of sixteen ancillary forms is taught in the *Dīpta*, pp. 684–5: 17.119 *ṣoḍaśapratimākāraṃ vīkṣyate vidhinādhunā / prathamam sukhāsanam proktaṃ vaivāhikam dvitīyakam / 17.120 tritīyam umayā yuktaṃ vṛṣārūḍham caturthakam / pañcamam tripuraghaṇam ca ṅṛttarūpaṃ ca ṣaṣṭhakam / 17.121 candraśekharam evoktaṃ saptamaṃ tu vidhīyate / aṣṭamaṃ ardhanaṛī ca navamaṃ hari-rarddhakam / 17.122 caṇḍeśvaraprasādan tu daśamaṃ parikīrtitam / *kāmāry (em. : kaumāry Cod.) ekādaśam proktaṃ dvādaśam kālanāśanam / 17.123 trayodaśam dakṣiṇāmūrtiṃ bhikṣāṭanam ataḥ param / sadāśivaṃ pañcadaśam vidyāl liṅgodbhavaṃ ca ṣoḍaśa*. This list is followed by the *Sūkṣma* and the *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (*Kriyāpāda* 43.1–84b). The *Rauravāgama* teaches fourteen forms (*Kriyāpāda* 35.1–292): Someśvara, Somāskanda, Vṛṣārūḍha, Tripurāntaka, Candraśekhara, Kālāri, Kalyāṇamūrti, Naṭarāja (Bhujaṅgatrāsanṛtta), Uddaṇḍanṛtta, Atyuddaṇḍanṛtta, Bhikṣāṭana, Kaṅkāla, Ardhanaṛīśvara, and Dakṣiṇāmūrti. The *Ajitāgama* teaches the following twenty ancillary Śiva forms and other deities for installation in Śiva temples (*Kriyāpāda* 36.207–375a): Liṅgodbhava, Sukhāsina, with Gaurī, Bhikṣāṭana, Kaṅkālārūpa, ṅṛttarūpa, Trimūrti, Cakrada, Candraśekhara, Devyardha, Dakṣiṇāmūrti, Kāmāri, Kālāri, Vaivāhya, Somāskanda, Jalandhara, Harihara, Vṛṣārūḍha, Tripurāntaka, and Viṣaṣaṃharaṇa; Viṣṇu, Brahmā, Śakti, Vināyaka, Skanda, Sūrya, Durgā, Kṣetrapāla, Caṇḍeśa, Moṭī, Jyesthā, Śāstrī, the Dikpālas, the Mātr̥s and Gaṇas, Virabhadra and Gaṇeśa, the Rudras, Ādityas, and Vasus, the Vidyeśvaras, the eight Mūrtis, Nandin and Mahākāla, Śailādi, Śrī, Sarasvatī, Agastya, Nārada, the Gaṇas, Bhr̥ṅgi, Gaṇeśvaras, Rudrakiṅkaras, Bhaktas, and Vṛṣa.

But this should not be read as evidence that the temple Śaivism of the Khmers cannot have reached them from the Tamil-speaking region of South India. It may have been introduced from another source, but the mere absence of the Śaiva iconography distinctive of that vigorous cultural zone does not settle the matter, since our evidence of Khmer Śaiva images goes back to the seventh century and so long predates the emergence of that iconography.

Against influence from this region one might also point to the Indian Śivas that proliferated in the Khmer realm during the pre-Angkorean period. We find no Śiva from the Tamil cultural zone among them and so might wish to conclude that the Khmers must have received their Śaivism from another direction. But this too carries no weight, since the names chosen are those of Śivas sanctified by inclusion in the lists of the early Śaiva tradition. That tradition is North-Indian in origin, as can be seen from the fact the Śiva temples of its lists are overwhelming concentrated in that region. There are only three sites that approach the South and they are outposts: Śrīśaila (Tripurāntaka) and Saptagodāvara (Bhīma) in Andhra, and Gokarṇa (Mahābala) just below Goa in northern Karṇāṭaka. But the tradition, with its religious topography, spread throughout India and indeed beyond it and therefore could have been brought to the Khmers from any part of the subcontinent.

Thus while it is entirely possible that the Khmers received their Śaivism from sources other than the Tamil South, there is as yet no evidence that definitely excludes that region. On the contrary there is evidence of South-Indian influence in other spheres that should make us hesitate to do so in this. There are the scripts of the Khmers and Chams, which are based on South-Indian models, and there is evidence that both peoples knew the *Mahābhārata* Epic in its South-Indian recension. The evidence is slight in the case of the Khmers. A single verse cited in an inscription shows a reading that appears in all but one of the South-Indian manuscripts that have been collated and in only one other.³⁴⁹ But the evidence is firmer for the neighbouring Chams, since one of their Sanskrit inscriptions relates the myth of Śiva's destruction of the celestial palaces of the three Asuras in a variant that appears only in that recension.³⁵⁰

349. K. 279, C1, v. 1–2: *sa hi viśvambharādhiśas sarvvalokagurus smṛtaḥ / yad iṣṭan tasya tat kuryyād vyāsaḡitam idam yathā / sarvvalokaguruḥ caiva rājānaḡ *yo vamaṇyate* (em. : *yo timanyate* Ep.) / *na tasya dattan na kṛtan na śrāddhaḡ phalati kva cit*. The expression *vyāsaḡitam* in 1d evidently means 'taught by Vyāsa [in the *Mahābhārata*]' for the verse that follows is from that source. In the Poona critical edition it is given as follows (12.65.28): *paralokaguruḡ caiva rājānaḡ yo 'vamaṇyate / na tasya dattaḡ na hutāḡ na śrāddhaḡ phalati kva cit*. According to the editors' apparatus criticus all the manuscripts collated read *sarvalokaguruḡ* as in this citation, except for two from Kashmir and a single Devanāgarī witness (Ś1, K1.4 and D1), whose reading they have adopted. The reading *kṛtaḡ* is found in D7 and in all the South-Indian witnesses except G2.

350. C. 99 = M. 17, the My-son stele inscription of Vikrāntavarman (7th-8th century), v. 4: *sāvitrī-jyāsanāthapraṇavadr̥hadhanur muktavāṇārīvāṇaḡ kṛtvā somorupuṇkhaḡ sphuradanalamukhaḡ sārathīḡdiviriṇcam / aṣṭārddhabrahmadhuryaḡ sakalasuramayasyandanaḡ viṣṭapānāḡ śāntyarthaḡ yena dāho yugapad api purā traipurāṇāḡ purāṇāḡ* 'Who of old simultaneously burned for the peace of the worlds the palaces of the Traipura [Asuras], having made the Praṇava (OM) his strong bow, the Gāyatrīmantra its bow-string, Viṣṇu the arrow, Candra its broad flight-feather, blazing Agni its barb, and all the gods his chariot with the four Vedas as its horses and Iḡāviriṇca as his charioteer'. Commenting on this MAJUMDAR (1985, 34) reports that the story to which this verse alludes is given in the *Anuśāsanaparvan* (= *Mahābhārata* 13.145.24–29b). But this is not the poet's source, since several of the details differ. This version makes Yama rather than Soma the flight-feather and the Vedas rather than Praṇava the bow, while the inscription makes the four Brahmas (the Vedas) the horses. The true source is the *Dronaparvan* in the Southern Recension. This version begins as in *Mahābhārata* 7.173.52–56a: *asurāṇāḡ purāṇy āsams trīṇi vīryavatāḡ divi / āyasaḡ rājataḡ caiva sauvarṇaḡ aparāḡ mahat / āyasaḡ tārakākṣasya kamalākṣasya rājataḡ / sauvarṇaḡ paramaḡ hy āsīd vidyunmālīna eva ca / na*

In the first part of this study I have considered evidence for Khmer Śaivism in general in its relations to other religions, society and the state. In the second I shall turn to that for specific Śaiva traditions, beginning with the Atimārga and proceeding to the Mantramārga.

Abbreviations

- ASB = Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta
 BEFEO = *Bulletin de l'EFEO*
 BL = Bodleian Library, Oxford University
 BORI = Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute (Pune)
 C = Cham inscription, numbered as in SCHWEYER 1999
 CSS = Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series
 EFEO = École française d'Extrême-Orient
 EC = *Epigraphia Carnatica*
 EI = *Epigraphia Indica*
 EITA = MEISTER 1983–91
 IC = *Inscriptions du Cambodge* (CÈDÈS 1937–1966)
 IFI = Institut français d'Indologie, Pondicherry
 ISC = *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge* (BARTH 1885)
 ISCC = *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā et du Cambodge* (BERGAIGNE 1993)
 GOS = Gaekwad's Oriental Series, Baroda
 K = Khmer inscription, numbered as in CÈDÈS 1966
 Ka = Khmer inscription as published in *NIC*
 KSTS = Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies
 M = Inscriptions of the Chams as numbered in MAJUMDAR 1985
 NAK = National Archives, Kathmandu
 NGMPP = Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project
 NIC = *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge* (I, II–III) (POU 1989, 2001)
 SII = *South Indian Inscriptions*
 SOAS = School of Oriental and African Studies, London
 T = Devanāgarī transcript prepared for the IFI
 Taishō = TAKAKUSU and WATANABE 1924–1929
 ULC = University Library, Cambridge, U.K.

śaktas tāni maghavān bhettuṃ sarvāyudhair api / atha sarve 'marā rudraṃ jagmuḥ śaraṇam arditāḥ / te tam ūcur mahātmānaṃ sarve devāḥ savāsavāḥ / rudra raudrā bhaviṣyanti paśavaḥ sarvakarmasu / nipātaiṣyase cainān asurān bhuvaneśvara / sa tathoktas tathety uktvā devānāṃ hitakāmyayā. Then it has the following passage not found in any other recension according to the editors of the Poona critical edition: *śalyam agniṃ ca vai kṛtvā puṅkhe somam apāṃ patim / sa kṛtvā dhanur oṃkāraṃ sāvitriṃ jyāṃ maheśvaraḥ / hayāṃś ca caturo vedān sarvavedamayaṃ ratham / prajāpatiṃ rathāśreṣṭhe viniyujya sa sārathim* before continuing as in *Mahābhārata* 7.173.56c–58: *atiṣṭhat sthāṇubhūtaḥ sa sahasraṃ parivatsarān / yadā trīṇi sametāni antarikṣe purāṇi vai / triparvaṇā trīśalyena tena tāni bibheda saḥ / purāṇi na ca taṃ śekur dānavāḥ prativīkṣitum / śaraṃ kālāgnisamyuktaṃ viṣṇusomasamāyutam.* The unique passage has all the details of the Cham version if we accept that the inscription's Iḍāviriṇca is the Epic's Prajāpati.

Bibliography

Manuscripts³⁵¹

AGNIKĀRYAPADDHATI. A = Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS Sanscrit 505 C; paper; Śāradā; B = Göttingen, Cod. Ms. Mu. 1, 134; paper; Śāradā. Paddhati of the fire-sacrifice as performed by the Śaiva Gurus of Kashmir.

ANNAPŪRAPŪJĀ. BORI MS 252 of 1883–84, Pt. 3. Paper; Śāradā. See also CHANDRA 1984. The Kashmirian Śaiva Paddhati for the *annapūrapūjā/annapūripūjā* that precedes the Aṣṭakā fire-sacrifice (*śivāṣṭakā*) in the annual Śrāddha (*śivaśrāddham*).

‘ĀNANDANĀTHA’. SOAS MS 44389. Paper; Śāradā. Kashmirian Maithila Śākta collectanea.

UTTARĀMNĀYAPAVITRĀROHAṆAVIDHI. NAK MS 1-70, NGMPP Reel No. B 177/30. Paper; Newari script. Newari and Sanskrit. Paddhati for the periodic ritual of offering Pavitras to Siddhilakṣmī and the other deities of the Northern Transmission.

UMĀTILAKA. Locus of attribution of *SIDDHILAKṢMĪSTAVA, q.v.

KALĀDIKṢĀPADDHATI of Manodaguru/Manodadatta, expanded by Śivasvāmin. A = BORI Ms 157 of 1886–92; B = BORI Ms. 440 of 1875–76; C = BORI Ms. 1147 of 1886–92. Paddhati of the rituals of initiation and consecration as performed by the Śaiva Gurus of Kashmir.

KĀSMĪRĀTĪRTHASAMGRAHA, BL MS Stein. Or. d. 2. Paper; Śāradā. Abstracts of information gathered by Paṇḍit Sāhib Rām (d. 1872) while preparing a never-completed descriptive survey of the ancient Tirthas of Kashmir commissioned by Mahārāja Raṅbīr Singh (r. 1868–1885). See STEIN 1961, 2:283–385.

KIRAṆA. NAK MS 5-893, NGMPP Reel No. A 40/23 (= *Kiraṇatantra*, *Kiraṇāgama*). Nepalese “Licchavi” script; an incomplete palm-leaf MS of A.D. 924 of the Saiddhāntika scripture of this name. Contains text from 7.5c of VIVANTI 1975 to the end.

KRIYĀKĀLAGUṆOTTARA. NAK MS 3-392, NGMPP Reel No. B 25/3. Palm-leaf; Nepalese “Pāla” script; A.D. 1184/5. A Śaiva Tantra covering the subject-matter of the Gāruḍatantras and the Bhūtatantras.

KRIYĀSAMGRAHAPADDHATI of Vāldhārīn. Kathmandu, Kaiser Library MS. 63, NGMPP C 5/3. Palm-leaf; Nepalese Bhujimol script; Saṃvat 211 A.D. 1090/1. A Saiddhāntika Paddhati covering the daily duties, initiation, consecration to office (*abhiṣekah*), cremation and the postmortuary rituals.

GAJAŚĀNTIMAHĀBALIVIDHI. NAK MS 1-1322, NGMPP Reel no. A 235/29. Paper; Newari script. Paddhati of a ritual sponsored by Jayabhūpatīndramalla, king of the independent kingdom of Bhaktapur, A.D. 1696–1722.

GOPRADĀNAVIDHI: *Gopradānavidhiḥ (śaivānām rītyā)*. BL MS Stein Or. f. 2. Kashmirian Śaiva Paddhati for the postmortuary gift of a cow.

CIŅCIŅĪMATASĀRASAMUCCAYA. NAK MS 1-767, NGMPP Reel No. B 157/19. Paper; Newari script; A.D. 1754. A syncretistic Kaula scripture of the Western Tradition (*paścimāmnāyah*).

JAYADRATHAYĀMĀLA, Ṣaṭka 4. NAK MS 1-1468, NGMPP Reel No. B 122/4. Paper; Newari script; A.D. 1671/2. A scripture of the Krama-based Kālikula.

JĀNĀRATNĀVALI of Jñānaśivācārya. IFI MS T. 231. A 12th-century Saiddhāntika Paddhati written by a South-India Śaiva in Benares.

TANTRASĀRA of Kṛṣṇānanda. Banaras Hindu University Library MS Acc. No. C. 1028, wrongly catalogued (TRIPĀTHĪ 1971) as the *Tantrasāra* of Abhinavagupta.

TALEJUSAKE THĀPŪJĀ YĀYA VIDHIḤ. NAK MS 4-220, NGMPP Reel No. 1230/9. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the *thāpūjā* of Taleju.

TUMBEŚVARĪPŪJĀPADDHATI. NAK MS 1-1696. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the worship of the Durgā Tumbeśvarī.

351. All sources are in Sanskrit unless otherwise stated.

TULAJĀCŪLIKĀSTHĀPANAVIDHI. NAK MS 1-168, NGMPP Reel No. 238/1. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for a ceremony of installing a finial on a temple of Taleju.

TULAJĀTHĀPŪJĀVIDHI (in the text: *śrī 2 jayabhūpaṅḍramalladevanatayā thāpūjā*). NGMPP Reel No. E 1948/4. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the *thāpūjā* of Taleju.

TULAJĀDĪPADĀNAPŪJĀVIDHI (TALEJUSAKE MATĀPŪJĀVIDHI). NGMPP Reel No. E 1930/31. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the ritual of worshipping Taleju by presenting lamps.

DĪPTA. IFI MS T. 507, pp. 533–1051. A South-Indian Pratiṣṭhāntara under the title of a lost ancient Saiddhāntika scripture of that name. It is identified in its chapter colophons as the *Dīptaśāstra-Pratiṣṭhāntara*.

DEVYĀMATA. NAK MS 1-279, NGMPP Reel No. A 41/15 (*‘Niśvāsākhya mahāntara’*). Palm-leaf; Nepalese “Licchavi” script. An early Saiddhāntika Śaiva Pratiṣṭhāntara, claiming to be a text of the *Bījabheda* of the *Niśvāsa*.

NAVARĀTRAPŪJĀ. NAK MS 1-220, NGMPP Reel No. A 240/17. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the rituals of the autumnal Navarātra festival.

NITYĀKAULA. NAK MS 2-226, NGMPP Reel No. B 26/21. Palm-leaf; Newari script; comprising ff. 2–3 and 6–13, breaking off in the course of the sixth Paṭala. Codex unicus. A Kaula scripture of the Nityā cult.

NITYĀDISAMGRAHAPADDHATI compiled by Rājānaka Takṣakavarta. BORI MS No. 76 of 1875–76. Paper; Śāradā (*‘Bhr̥ṅgeśasamhitā’*: that is the locus of attribution of the last folio of a manuscript of the *Mṛtītatvānusmarana* that has been placed at the end of this codex); codex unicus. This is evidently the exemplar of BL MS Stein Or. d. 43 (*‘Nityādisamgrahābhīdhānapaddhati’*). A Kashmirian digest of passages of Śaiva scriptures, Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika, pertaining to the regular and other Śaiva rituals.

NIŚVĀSAKĀRIKĀ. IFI MS T. 17. A later addition to the *Niśvāsa* group of Saiddhāntika scriptures. It includes the *Dīkṣottara* as its latter half.

NIŚVĀSAGUHYA. NAK MS 1-227, NGMPP Reel No. A 41/14 (*‘Niśvāsātattvasamhitā’*), ff. 42r5–114v. Palm-leaf; Nepalese “Licchavi” script; c. A.D. 900. A very early Saiddhāntika scripture.

NIŚVĀSAMUKHA. NAK MS 1-227, NGMPP Reel No. A 41/14 (*‘Niśvāsātattvasamhitā’*), ff. 1v–18v6. Details as for NIŚVĀSAGUHYA.

NAIMITTIKAKARMĀNUSAMDHĀNA of Brahmaśambhu. ASB, MS G 4767. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; incomplete. The earliest surviving Saiddhāntika Paddhati, part of the *Brahmaśambhupaddhati*, covering initiation, consecration (of Sādhakas, Ācāryas and the king and queen), the last rites (*antyeṣṭiḥ*) and Śrāddha.

PARĀTANTRA. Calcutta, ASB MS 4775 (G). Paper; Newari script. A Nepalese scripture of the Malla period concerning the worship of the goddesses of the Āmnāyas, principally Siddhilakṣmī (Pratyāṅgirā), Guhyakālī and Kubjikā.

PIṄGALĀMATA. NAK MS 3–376, NGMPP Reel No. A 42/2. Palm-leaf; Newari script; A.D. 1173/4. Also called *Jayadrathādhikāra*. An early Śaiva Pratiṣṭhāntara covering both Saiddhāntika and non-Saiddhāntika domains, which assigns itself to [the tradition of] the *Brahmayāmala*.

PICUMATA (/BRAHMAYĀMALA). NAK MS 3-370, NGMPP Reel No. A 42/6. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; 12 January A.D. 1052 (PETECH 1984, p. 44). The principal scripture of the Yāmala division of the Vidyāpīṭha.

PRATYAṄGIRĀPADDHATI. NAK MS 3-796, NGMPP Reel No. A 253/18. Paper; Newari script; Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the worship of Siddhilakṣmī, the fifty Kṣetrapālas, and the local deities of the wards of Bhaktapur.

PRĀYAŚCITTASAMUCCAYA of Trilocanaśiva. IFI MS T. 1060. A summary of the rules concerning penance and purification, drawing on various undeclared Saiddhāntika scriptural sources.

PRĀYAŚCITTASAMUCCAYA of Hṛdayaśiva. Cambridge, University Library, MS Add. 2833. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; A.D. 1157/8. A digest of Śaiva scriptural treatments of penance.

BRHATKĀLOTTARA. NAK MS 1-89, NGMPP Reel No. B 24/59 ('*Kālottarantram*'). Palm-leaf; early Newari script; undated. A late eclectic Saiddhāntika scripture, probably of the tenth century.

BRĀHMAṆĀDIJĀTIYAKAVARNANA. BL, MS Stein. Or. c. 4. Paper; Śāradā. A short anonymous tract on the divisions of the Kashmirian brahmins.

BHĀVACŪDAMAṆI. Jammu, Raghunath Temple Library, ms. 5291, now in the collection of the Ranbir Research Institute, Jammu. Paper; Kashmirian Devanāgarī; codex unicus. A commentary on the *Mayasaṃgraha* by Vidyākaṇṭha, pupil of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha II.

MAYASAṂGRAHA. NAK MS 1-1537, NGMPP Reel No. A 31/18. Palm-leaf; Newari script; incomplete; codex unicus. An early Saiddhāntika Śaiva Pratiṣṭhāntara.

MṚGENDRAPADDHATI of Aghoraśiva with the commentary (MṚGENDRAPADDHATIVYĀKHYĀ) of Vaktraśambhu. IFI MS T. 1021. A Saiddhāntika Paddhati based on the scripture *Mṛgendra*.

MOHACŪROTTARA. NAK MS 5-1977, NGMPP Reel No. A 182/2. Paper; Devanāgarī; copied from an old Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript. A Saiddhāntika Pratiṣṭhāntara.

RUDRAŚANTI. NGMPP Reel No. A 256/44, ff. 8v6–23v8. Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for the Rudraśānti ritual.

REVANTAMAHĀBHAIKAVAPŪJĀVIDHI. NAK MS 1-625. Paper (*thyā saphū*); Newari script. Sanskrit and Newari. A Paddhati for a ritual on the occasion of the installation by King Bhūpatīndramalla of Bhaktapur of a gateway (*torāṣṭhāpanam*) for the pleasure of Revanta (Revantamahābhairava), son of the Sun and protector of horses.

LAKṢAKOṬIHOmaprayoga. Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, Hs or 9484. Paper; Nepalese; Devanāgarī. Detailed instructions for the fire-sacrifices of 100,000 and 10,000,000 oblations, composed during the reign of Tribhuvan Bir Bikram Shah (r. A.D. 1911–1955).

VIṆŚIKHA. NAK MS 1-1076; NGMPP Reel No. A 43/33. Palm-leaf; Nepalese 'Pāla' script; codex unicus. A Tantra of the Śaiva Vāmasrotas.

ŚĀRIKĀSTAVA of Sāhib Kaul. SOAS MS 44389 ('*Ānandanātha*'). Paper; Śāradā. ff. 1-5. A mystical hymn to the Kashmirian goddess Śārikā as the author's lineage-deity (*vaṃśadevī*).

ŚIVADHARMA. A = ULC MS Add. 1694 ('*Śivadharma etc.*'). Palm-leaf; earlier Newari script; undated; complete. Contains *Śivadharma*, *Śivadharmottara*, *Śivadharmasaṃgraha*, *Śivopaniṣad*, *Umāmaheśvarasaṃvāda*, *Uttarottara*, *Vṛṣasārasaṃgraha* and *Dharmaputrikā*; B = ULC MS Add. 1645 ('*Śivadharma Tantra*'). Palm-leaf; earlier Newari script; A.D. 1139/40). Same contents.

ŚIVADHARMOTTARA. Part 2 of Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine (London), South Asian Manuscript Collection, MS δ 16 ('*Śivadharmaśāstra*'); paper; Devanāgarī transcript of a Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript. Folios numbered from 63 to 143 in the right margin of each verso and from 1 to 80 in the left.

ŚYĀMĀPADDHATI of Sāhib Kaul. Photocopy of a manuscript from Jaipur, prepared when it was the property of Sam Fogg Rare Books and Manuscripts, 35 St. George Street, London. Paper; Devanāgarī. A Kashmirian Maithila Paddhati for the regular worship of Dakṣiṇā Kālī (Śyāmā).

ŚRIVIDYĀNITYAPŪJĀPADDHATI of Sāhib Kaul. BL, MS Chandra Shum Shere e. 264 ('*Tantric Collectanea*'), ff. 1[=227]v1–156[=382]v. Paper; Śāradā. A Kashmirian Maithila Paddhati for the regular worship of Tripurasundarī (Śrividya).

ŚRIVIDYĀMANTRAVIVṚTI of Upādhyāya Śivarāmasvāmin. Staats-Bibliothek zu Berlin, Ms. 166 (Janert MS Ka 663), ff. 1[37]r–47[74]r; paper; Śāradā script. A late Kashmirian tract in about 700 granthas showing that the Śivādvaita is supported by the Upaniṣads and that both Tantric and Vedic Mantras (the Saubhāgyavidyā and the Gāyatrī) share the same Śaiva meaning and reality.

SAMAYĀCĀRATANTRA. BL, MS Chandra Shum Shere d. 363 (vi). Paper; Devanāgarī. A scripture on the Kaula rites and observances.

SARVAJÑĀNOTTARA. A = NAK MS 1-1692, NGMPP Reel No. A 43/12. Palm-leaf; early Nepalese "Licchavi" script; undated but probably tenth century. B = IFI MS T. 334. An early Saiddhāntika Śaiva scripture.

SIDDHĀNTASĀRAPADDHATI of Mahārājādhīrāja Bhojadeva. NAK MS 1-1363, NGMPP Reel No. B 28/29. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; A.D. 1077/8. A Saiddhāntika Śaiva Paddhati covering the rituals of regular worship, initiation, installation and renovation.

SIDDHILAKṢMĪMANTRAYANTRODDHĀRĀDISTOTRA of King Jitāmitramalla (r. 1673–1696) of Bhaktapur. In *Uttarāmnāyapavitrārohaṇavidhi*, NAK MS 1-70, NGMPP Reel No. A 253/18, ff. 42v7–44r7. Paper; Newari script.

*SIDDHILAKṢMĪSTAVA. A hymn to Siddhilakṣmī in twelve Śārdūlavikrīḍita verses at the beginning of an inscription in Sanskrit and Newari in the wall of the temple of Pūrṇacaṇḍī in Patan, Nepal, recording a restoration (*jīrṇoddhārah*) of the temple in 1854. The inscription attributes the hymn to the *Umātilaka* (l. 12: *ity umātilake siddhilakṣmyāḥ stavah*). Photograph.

SOMĀŚAMBHUPADDHATIVYĀKHYĀ of Trilocanaśiva. IFP MS T. 170. A commentary on the *Karmakāṇḍakramāvalī* of Somaśambhu (*Somaśambhupaddhati*).

SPANDAPRADĪPIKĀ of Bhaṭṭārakasvāmin. BORI Ms. No. 513 of 1875–76 (*Spandapradīpa*). Paper; Śāradā. A commentary on the *Spandakārikā*.

SVACCHANDA: *Svacchandalalitabhairavatantra*. NAK MS 1-224, NGMPP Reel No. B 28/18. Palm-leaf; early Newari script; A.D. 1068/9. The principal scripture of the Śaiva Dakṣiṇasrotas.

SVACCHANDABHAIRAVAKRAMAMAHĀSARVAŚĀNTIVIDHĀNA. NGMPP Reel No. A 256/44, ff. 1v–8v5. Newari and Sanskrit. A Paddhati for a Śānti ritual addressed to Svacchandabhairava.

HR̥LLEKHĀPADDHATI of Sāhib Kaul. BL, MS Chandra Shum Shere g. 27. Paper; Śāradā. A Kashmirian Maithila Paddhati for the regular worship of Bhuvaneśvarī.

Published Sources

AGNIPURĀṆA, ed. Āchārya Baladeva Upādhyāya. Kashi Sanskrit Series, 174. Varanasi: CSS Office, 1966.

AJITĀGAMA, ed. N.R. Bhatt. 2 vols. Publications de l'IFI, No. 24. Pondicherry: IFI, 1964 and 1967.

ATHARVAVEDAPARIŚIṢṬA: *The Pariśiṣṭas of the Atharvaveda*, ed. George Melville Bolling and Julius von Negelein. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1909–1912.

AMARAKOŚA, ed. A.A. Ramanathan with the commentaries of Liṅgayasūri (AMARAPADAVIVṚTI) and Mallinātha (AMARAPADAPĀRIJĀTA). The Adyar Library Series, vol. 101. Madras: The Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1989. Reprint of first edition of 1971.

ARJUNAWIJAYA of Mpu Tantular. See SUPOMO 1977. Old Javanese.

AVADĀNAŚATAKA, ed. P.L. Vaidya. Bauddha-Saṃskṛta-Granthāvalī, no. 19. Darbhanga: Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1958.

ĀGAMARAHASYA (UTTARĀRDHA) of Paṇḍita Sarayūprasāda Dvivedī, ed. Gaṅgādhara Dvivedī. Rājasthāna-Purātana-Granthamālā, No. 110. Jodhpur: Rājasthāna-Prācyavidyā-Pratiṣṭhāna, 1969.

ĀDIPURĀṆA, ed. Yasuke IKARI and Takao HAYASHI in IKARI 1994, 83–136.

ĀPASTAMBAŚRAUTASŪTRA with the commentary of Rudradatta, ed. Richard Garbe. 2nd ed. with new appendix containing corrections and emendations to the text by C.G. Kashikar. Bibliotheca Indica, No. 92. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal, 1983.

ĪŚĀNAŚIVAGURUDEVAPADDHATI: the *Siddhāntasāra* of Īśānaśivagurudeva, ed. T. Gaṇapati Sastri. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, 69 (*Sāmānyapādaḥ*), 72 (*Mantrapādaḥ* = *Tantrasārah*); 77 (*Kriyāpādaḥ* pt. 1) and 83 (*Kriyāpādaḥ* pt. 2, and *Yogapādaḥ*). Trivandrum, 1920, 1921, 1922, 1925.

UDDHĀRAKOŚA: Raghu Vira and Shodo Taki (ed.), *Dakṣiṇāmūrti's Uddhāra-kośa. A dictionary of the secret Tantric syllabic code*. 2nd edition. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal: 1978. Reprinted from the edition of 1938.

KATHĀSARITSĀGARA of Somadeva, ed. Paṇḍit Jagadīś Lāl Śāstrī. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

KARPÜRĀDISTOTRĀṬĪKĀ of Vimalānandasvāmin: Karpūrādistotram with Introduction and Commentary by Vimalānanda Svāmī translated by Arthur Avalon. Tantrik Texts, vol. IX. London: Luzac, 1922.

KARMAKĀṆḌAKRAMĀVALI of Somaśambhu, ed. Pandit Jagaddhar Zadou. KSTS, No. 58. Srinagar, 1947. = *Somaśambhupaddhati*.

KĀTYĀYANASMṚTI, text reconstructed and trans. with notes and introd. by P.V. Kane. Bombay: P.V. Kane, 1933.

KATHĀSARITSĀGARA of Somadeva, ed. Paṇḍit Jagadīś Lāl Śāstrī. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1970.

MAHĀKĀLASAṂHITĀ (KĀMAKĀLĀKHAṆḌA), ed. Umesh Mishra and Gopinatha Kaviraja. Rashtriya Sanskrit Samsthan Series, No. I. Allahabad: Gaṅgānātha Jhā Kendriya Saṁskṛta Vidyāpīṭha, 1971.

KIRAṆA. See GOODALL 1998 and VIVANTI 1975.

KULACŪḌĀMAṆITANTRA, ed. Girīsha Chandra Vedāntatīrtha. Tantrik Texts, vol. 4. London: Luzac, 1915.

KULĀRṆAVATANTRA, ed. Tārānātha Vidyāratna. Tantrik Texts, vol. 5. London: Luzac, 1917.

KŪRMAPURĀṆA, ed. Ananda Swarup Gupta. Varanasi: All-India Kashiraj Trust, 1971.

KṚTYAKALPATARU of Lakṣmīdhara, ed. K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. GOS, No. 106. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1948.

GAṆAKĀRIKĀ with the commentary RATNĀṬĪKĀ, ed. C.D. Dalal. GOS, No. 15. Baroda: Central Library, 1920.

GUPTASĀDHANATANTRA, ed. Puṇyaśīla Śarmā. Guptāvatāradurlabhatantramālā, Caturtha-varṣa-maṇi 5. Prayāga: Kalyāṇamandira, [VS] 2027 (= A.D. 1970).

GORAKṢAŚATAKA, ed. Fausta Nowotny. Dokumente der Geistesgeschichte, 3. Köln: K.A. Nowotny, 1976.

CATURVARGACINTĀMAṆI: *Caturvargacintāmaṇi of Hemādri*, ed. Paṇḍita Bharatacandra Śiromaṇi. 7 volumes. Kashi Sanskrit Series, No. 235. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Sansthan, 1985. Reprinted from the 1911 edition of the ASB.

JAYĀKHYASAMHITĀ, ed. Embar Krishnamacharya. GOS, No. 54. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1967.

JĀNASIDDHĀNTA. See SOEBADIO 1971. Old Javanese and Sanskrit. A compendium of Śaiva materials edited from Balinese manuscripts.

JVĀLĀMUKHĪPŪJĀPADDHATI. Among the Parīśiṣṭas of the DEVĪRAHASYA.

TANTRASĀRASAMGRAHA of Nārāyaṇa of Śivapura, also called *Viṣanārāyaṇīya*, ed. Duraiswami Aiyangar. Vrajajivan Prachyabharati Granthamala 62. Delhi: Chowkhamba, 1992.

TANTRĀLOKA of Abhinavagupta with the commentary (TANTRĀLOKAVIVEKA) of Rājānaka Jayaratha, ed. Mukund Rām Śāstrī. KSTS 23, 28–30, 35–36, 41, 47, 52, 57–59. Bombay and Srinagar, 1918–38.

TOḌĀLATANTRA, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja. In *Tantrasaṅgraha*, Part II, pp. 53–94. Yogatantra-granthamālā, no. 4. Vārāṇasī: Vārāṇaseyasamskṛtavividyālaya, 1970.

DEVĪNĀMAVILĀSA of Sāhib Kaul, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Shāstrī. KSTS 63 [Srinagar], 1942.

DEVĪRAHASYA with Parīśiṣṭas, ed. Ram Chandra Kak and Harabhaṭṭa Shastri. Delhi: Chaukhamba Sanskrit Pratishthan, 1993. Reprint of KSTS edition, Srinagar. 1941.

DEŚAWARṆANA of Mpu Prapañca. See PIGEAUD 1960–63; and ROBSON 1995. Old Javanese.

NĀRADASMṚTI, ed. Richard W. Lariviere: *The Nāradasmṛti critically edited with an introduction, annotated translation, and appendices*. University of Pennsylvania Studies on South Asia, Vols 4–5. Philadelphia: Dept. of South Asia Regional Studies, University of Pennsylvania, 1989.

NĪLAMATA, ed. K. de Vreese. Leiden: Brill, 1936.

NETRATANTRA with the commentary (NETRODDYOTA) by Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 46, 59. Bombay, 1926, 1939.

NEPĀLAMĀHĀTMYA, ed. Kedāranātha Sharmā. Chaukhamba Amarabharati Granthamala, 10. Varanasi: Chaukhamba Amarabharati Prakashan, 1977.

PAÑCĀRTHABHĀSYA: *Pāsupatasūtra* (= *Pañcārtha*) with the commentary (*-bhāṣya*) of Kauṇḍinya, ed. R. Ananthakrishna Sastri. Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, No. 118. Trivandrum: The Oriental Manuscript Library of the University of Travancore, 1940.

PARAMASAṂHITĀ, ed. and trans. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar. GOS, No. 86. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1940.

PARĀKHYA. See GOODALL 2001.

PARĀTANTRA, ed. Lt.-Col. Śrī Dhan Shum Shere Jung Bahādur Rāṇā. Prayāg: Caṇḍī Kāryālaya, VS 2016.

PĀDMASAṂHITĀ, ed. Seetha Padmanabhan and R. N. Sampath. Pañcarātra Pariśodhanā Pariśad Series, Nos 3–4. Madras: Pañcarātra Pariśodhana Pariśad, 1974 and 1982.

PRATIṢṬHĀMAYŪKHA of Nīlakaṇṭhabhaṭṭa. Lithograph. Bombay, 1862. Part of the *Bhagavantabhāskara*.

PHETKĀRIṆĪTANTRA, ed. Gopinatha Kaviraja. In *Tantrasaṅgraha*, Part II, pp. 161–306. Yogatantra-granthamālā, no. 4. Vārāṇasī: Vārāṇaseyasamskṛtavividyālaya, 1970.

BĀLĀPŪJĀPADDHATI. Among the Pariśiṣṭas of the DEVĪRAHASYA.

BRĤATSAMHITĀ of Varāhamihira with the commentary (*-vivr̥ti*) of Bhaṭṭotpala, ed. A.V. Tripāṭhī. Sarasvatībhavangranthamālā, 97. Varanasi, 1988.

BRĤASPATISMṚTI (reconstructed), ed. K.V. Rangaswami Aiyangar. GOS, No. 85. Baroda: Oriental Institute, 1941.

BAUDHĀYANADHARMASŪTRA, ed. Cinnasvāmīśāstrī. Kashi Sanskrit Series, Karmakāṇḍa Section, No. 11. Benares: CSS Office, 1991.

BRAHMAPURĀṆA, ed. Peter Schreiner and Renate Söhnen. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1987.

BRAHMASŪTRABHĀSYA of Bhāskara, ed. Pandit Vindhyaesvarī Prasāda Dvivedin. CSS, Nos 70, 185 and 209. Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Book Depot, 1915.

BHAṬṬIKĀVYA, ed. and trans. Maheshwar Anant Karandikar and Shailaja Karandikar. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1982.

MAÑJUŚRĪMŪLAKALPA: *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, ed. T. Gaṇapati Śāstrī, Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, nos 70, 76 and 84. Trivandrum: The Oriental Manuscript Library of the University of Travancore, 1920, 1922 and 1925. Reprinted by P.L. Vaidya as Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 18 (one volume), Darbhanga: Mithila Institute, 1964.

MATAṆGA: *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama, Vidyāpāda*, with the commentary (MATAṆGAVṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI, Pondicherry, No. 66. Pondicherry: IFI, 1977; *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama, Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda* and *Caryāpāda*, with the commentary (MATAṆGAVṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha up to *Kriyāpāda* 11.12b, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI, Pondicherry, No. 65. Pondicherry: IFI, 1982.

MATSYAPURĀṆA. Ānandāśramagranthāvali, No. 54. Poona: Ānandāśrama Press, 1907.

MANUSMṚTI with the commentary (MANVARTHAMUKTĀVALI) of Kullūkabhaṭṭa, ed. J.L. Shastri. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1996. Second reprint of the 1983 edition.

— with the commentary (*Manubhāṣya*) of Medhātithi. Ed. Gaṅgānātha Jhā. 3 vols. Bibliotheca Indica, 256. Calcutta: ASB, 1932 (vol. 1), 1939 (vols 2–3).

MAHĀBALASŪTRA, ed. and trans. F.A. Bischoff. *Contribution à l'étude des divinités mineures du bouddhisme tantrique: Ārya Mahābalanāma-Mahāyānasūtra, tibétain (mss. de Touen-Houang) et chinois*. Series Buddhica, Première série, Mémoires, 10. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1956.

MAHĀBHĀRATA, ed. V. Sukthankar et al. and (since 1943) S. Belvalkar. 19 volumes. Poona: BORI, 1933–1966.

MĀLINĪVIJAYOTTARA: *Mālinīvijayottaratantra*, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul. KSTS 37. Srinagar, 1922.

MITĀKṢARĀ. See YĀJÑAVALKYASMRITI.

MRGENDRA: *Mṛgendratāntra*, *Vidyāpāda* and *Yogapāda*, with the commentary (-VṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 50. Srinagar, 1930; MRGENDRA: *Mṛgendrāgama* (= *Mṛgendratāntra*), *Kriyāpāda* and incomplete *Caryāpāda*, with the commentary (-VṚTTI) of Bhaṭṭa Nārāyaṇakaṇṭha, ed. N.R. Bhatt. Publications de l'IFI, No. 23. Pondicherry: IFI, 1962.

YĀJÑAVALKYASMRITI with the commentary (MITĀKṢARĀ) of Vijñāneśvara, ed. Wasudev Laxman Sastri Pansikar. Bombay, 1926.

RAGHUVAMŚA of Kālidāsa with the commentary (SAMJIVANĪ) of Mallinātha, ed. Narayan Ram Acharya. Bombay: Satyabhamabai Pandurang, 1948. Reprint: Chaukhamba Rajmata Series, No. 4. Varanasi/Delhi: Chaukhamba Orientalia, 1987.

RĀMĀYAṆA. See KERN 1900. Old Javanese.

RAURAVASŪTRASAMGRAHA, ed. N.R. Bhatt in *Rauravāgama*, vol. 1. Publications de l'IFI, No. 18. Pondicherry: IFI, 1985. Parts of this scripture are published here as the whole work, as *Rauravāgama*, *Vidyāpāda*, Paṭalas 1–10 (pp. 1–16, 173–194).

RAURAVĀGAMA, ed. N.R. Bhatt. 3 vols. Publications de l'IFI, No. 18. Pondicherry: IFI, 1961, 1972 and 1985.

LAKṢMĪTANTRA, ed. Pandit V. Krishnamacharya. The Adyar Library Series, Vol. 87. Madras: Adyar Library and Research Centre, 1959.

LINGAPURĀṆA with the commentary (ŚIVATOṢINĪ) of Gaṇeśas Nātu, ed. Gaṅgāviṣṇu. Bombay: Venkatesvara Press, 1924. Reprinted, Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1989 and 1996.

VIṢṆUDHARMOTTARA, ed. Kṣemarāja Kṛṣṇadāsa. Delhi: Nag Publishers, 1985. Reprint of 1912 edition (Bombay: Venkatesvara Steam Press).

VIṆĀŚIKHA. See GOUDRIAAN 1985.

VAIKHĀNASADHARMASŪTRA, ed. K. Rangachari. Ramanujachari Oriental Institute Publication, vol. 3. Madras: Diocesan Press, 1930.

ŚATAPAÑCĀSATKA of Mātṛceṭa: The Śatapañcāsatka of Mātṛceṭa. Sanskrit text, Tibetan translation & commentary and Chinese translation, ed. and trans. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.

ŚAVASŪTAKĀŚAUCAKĀLAPRAKARAṆA of Bhavadeva, ed. and trans. Rājendracandra Hajāra. Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series, Nos. 4 and 6. Calcutta: Sanskrit College, 1959.

ŚĀNKHĀYANAGRHYASŪTRA, ed. Sitarama Sahagal. Sri Garib Das Oriental Series, No. 42. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1987.

ŚIVAPURĀṆA, ed. Khemarāja (son of Kṛṣṇadāsa). Bombay: Venkatesvara Press, V.S. 2011 [= A.D. 1954].

ŚLOKAVĀRTIKA: Kumārila Bhaṭṭa's versified clarification of the *Tarkapāda* of the *Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya* of Śabaravāmin with the commentary (NYĀYARATNĀKARA) of Pārthasārathimīśra, ed. Dvārikādāsa Śāstrī. Prāchyabhāratī Series, No. 10. Varanasi: Tara Publications, 1978.

SACCARITRARAṢĀ of Vedāntadeśika, ed. Aṅṅamgarācārya. Kāñcī: Granthamālākāryālaya, 1947. Published with the *Tattvaṭīkā*, *Nikṣeparakṣā*, *Pañcarātrarakṣā*, *Bhūgolanirṇaya* and other works as volume 3 of the section of commentaries in the *Śrīmadvedāntadeśikagranthamālā*.

SATKARMARATNĀVALĪ of Mahārājādhirāja Gīrvāṇayuddhavīravikramaśāhadeva, ed. Rāmanātha Ācārya and Dāmodara Koīrālā. 2 parts. Kathmandu: Śrī 5 Ko Sarakārako Chāpākhānā, VS 2026, 2029.

SARVOLLĀSA: *Sarvollāsatantra* of Sarvānandanātha, ed. Rāsamohana Cakravartī, Calcutta: Herambachandra Bhaṭṭācārya, 1953. Forward by Gopinatha Kaviraj and introduction by Dineshchandra Bhattacharyya, both in English.

SĀTVATASAMHITĀ with the commentary (-BHĀṢYA) of Alaśīngabhāṭṭa, ed. Vraja Vallabha Dwivedi. Library Rare Texts Publication Series, No. 6. Varanasi, 1982.

SĀRDHATRIŚĀTIKĀLOTTARAVṚTTI of Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, ed. N.R. Bhatt: *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha: édition critique*. Publications de l'IFI, No. 61. Pondicherry: IFI, 1979.

SUVARṆABHĀSOTTAMASŪTRA, ed. Johannes Nobel (*Suvarṇabhāsottamasūtra: Das Goldglanz-Sūtra; ein Sanskrittext des Mahāyāna-Buddhismus nach den Handschriften und mit Hilfe der tibetischen und chinesischen Übertragungen*). Leipzig: Harrassowitz, 1937.

SŪRYASEVANA. See HOOYKAAS 1966. Balinese.

SOMĀŚAMBHUPADDHATI. See BRUNNER-LACHAUX 1963–1998.

SKANDAPURĀNA: *Skandapurānasya Ambikākhaṇḍaḥ*, ed. Kṛṣṇaprasāda Bhaṭṭarāi. Mahendraratnagranthamālā 2. Kathmandu: Mahendrasamskṛtaviśvavidyālayaḥ, 1988. The original *Skandapurāna* surviving in Nepalese MSS, of which the earliest (NAK MS 2-229, NGMPP Reel No. B 11/4) was completed in A.D. 810.

SKANDAPURĀNA, ed. Kṣemarāja Śrīkṛṣṇadāsa. Bombay: Venkatesvara Steam Press, V.S. 1967.

STUTIKUSUMĀÑJALILAGHUPAÑCIKĀ of Rājānaka Ratnakaṇṭha. Published with separate pagination after p. 526 of *Stutikusumāñjali*, ed. Premavallabha Tripāṭhi (Banaras: Acyutagranthamālā, V.S. 2021).

SVACCHANDA: *Svacchandatantra* with the commentary (SVACCHANDODDYOTA) of Rājānaka Kṣemarāja, ed. Madhusūdan Kaul Śāstrī. KSTS 31, 38, 44, 48, 51, 53, 56. Bombay, 1921–35.

SVĀYAMBHUVASŪTRASAMGRAHA, ed. Venkaṭasubrahmaṇyaśāstrī. Mysore: Rājākīyaśākhāmudrālaya, 1937.

HARACARITACINTĀMAṆI of Rājānaka Jayadratha, ed. Paṇḍita Śivadatta and Kāśināth Pāṇḍurang Parab. Kāvyaṃālā, 61. Bombay, 1897.

Studies and Translations

ABÉ, Ryūichi. 1999. *The Weaving of Mantra. Kūkai and the Construction of Esoteric Buddhist Discourse*. New York: Columbia University Press.

ACKER, R. 1998. “New Geographic Tests of the Hydraulic Thesis at Angkor”. *South East Asia Research* 6, 1: 5–47.

ADRIAENSEN, R. BAKKER, H.T and ISAACSON, H. 1998. *The Skandapurāna. Volume 1. Adhyāyas 1–25. Critically Edited with Prolegomena and English Synopsis*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten, 1998.

APPADORAI, A. 1990. *Economic Conditions in Southern India (1000–1500 A.D.)*. 2 volumes. Madras: University of Madras.

AUFRECHT, Th. 1864. *Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae Pars Octava Codices Sanscriticos Complectens*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

AYMONIER, E. 1891. *Les Tchams et leur religion*. Paris: Leroux.

BAKKER, Hans. 1997. *The Vākātakas. An Essay in Hindu Iconology*. Gonda Indological Series, vol. 5. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

BALASUBRAHMANYAM, S.R. 1971. *Early Chola Temples. Parantaka I to Rajaraja I (A.D. 907–985)*. Bombay: Orient Longman.

BANERJI, S.C. 1992. *Tantra in Bengal. A Study of its Origin, Development and Influence*. New Delhi: Manohar Publications.

BARRETT JONES, Antoinette M. 1984. *Early Tenth Century Java from the Inscriptions. A Study of Economic, Social and Administrative Conditions in the First Quarter of the Century*. Dordrecht-Holland/Cinnaminson-U.S.A.: Foris.

BARTH, Auguste. 1888. *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge*. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques, vol. 27, no. 1, 1–180, Paris.

BEAL, Samuel. Trans. 1884. *Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World*. London: Trübner.

- BÉNISTI, Mireille. 1976. "Notes d'iconographie khmère". *Arts Asiatiques* 33, 25–57.
- BERGAIGNE, Abel. 1893. *Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā et du Cambodge*. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale et autres bibliothèques, vol. 27, no. 2, 181–632, Paris.
- BHANDARKAR, D.R. 1909. "Lakuliṣa". *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report: 1906–7*, 179–192.
- BHATTACHARYA G. 1956. "Nandin and Vṛṣabha". *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Suppl. III, 2, 1545–1567, 7 pls. (Vortrag, XIX. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Freiburg).
- BHATTACHARYA, K. 1956. "Notes d'iconographie khmère". *Arts Asiatiques* 3, 183–194.
- 1957. "Notes d'iconographie khmère". *Arts Asiatiques* 4, 208–298.
- 1958. "Notes d'iconographie khmère". *Arts Asiatiques* 5, 217–220.
- 1967. "À propos de niṣkalaliṅga". *Journal Asiatique* 255, 227–229.
- BISSCHOP, Peter. 2004. Early Śaivism and the *Skandapurāṇa*. Sects and Centres. Doctoral Dissertation. Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.
- BOISSELIER, Jean. 1955. *La Statuaire khmère et son évolution*. Publications de l'EFEO. Saigon: EFEO.
- BOSCH, F.D.K. 1925. "Het Liṅga-Heiligdom van Dinaja". *Tijdschrift Bataviaasch Genootschap voor Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 64, pp. 227–286.
- BROUGH, J. 1953. *The Early Brahmanical System of Gotra and Pravara. A Translation of the Gotra-Pravara-Mañjarī of Puruṣottama-Paṇḍita*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BRUNNER-LACHAUX, Hélène. Ed. and trans. 1963, 1968, 1977, 1998. *Somaśambhupaddhati*. 4 vols. *Première Partie: Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu; Deuxième Partie: Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu I: Pavitrārohaṇa, Damanapūjā et Prāyaścitta; Troisième Partie: Rituels occasionnels dans la tradition śivaïte de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu II: dīkṣā, abhiṣeka, vratoddhāra, antyeṣṭi, śrāddha; Quatrième Partie: rituels optionnels: pratiṣṭhā*. Publications de l'IFI No. 25. Pondicherry: IFI.
- 1968. "Toujours le niṣkalaliṅga". *Journal Asiatique* 256, 445–447.
- BÜHLER, Georg. 1877. *A Detailed Report of a Tour in Search of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Kaśmīr, Rajaputana, and Central India*. Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. 12; extra no. 34A. Bombay.
- CABATON, A. 1901. *Nouvelles recherches sur les Chams*. Paris: Publications de l'EFEO.
- CHAKRAVARTI, Adhir. 1982. *Royal Succession in Ancient Cambodia*. The Asiatic Society Monograph Series, 26. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.
- CHANDRA, Lokesh. Reprod. 1984. *Sanskrit Texts from Kashmir, Volume 7. Śata-piṭaka Series, Indo-Asian Literatures*, No. 333. New Delhi: Sharada Rani. This is a photographic reproduction of Kashmirian Paddhatis published in Devanāgarī. Pp. 127–247 are *Sāṅgopāṅga-viṣṇubalividhi-sāṅgaśaivikriyāmakam Karmakāṇḍam. Caturthapustakam* (Paṇḍita Keśavabhaṭṭa Jyotirvid [Keshav Bhat Zutish], ed., Bombay: 1936), which contains the Paddhati of the Śaiva funerary and postfunerary rituals.
- CEDÈS, George. 1911. "Les bas-reliefs d'Angkor-Vat". *Bulletin de la commission archéologique de l'Indochine*, 170–220.
- 1923. *Bronzes Khmers. Étude basée sur des documents recueillis par M.P. Lefèvre-Pontalis dans les collections publiques et privées de Bangkok et sur les pièces conservées au palais royal de Phnom Penh, au musée du Cambodge, et au musée de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*. *Ars Asiatica*, 5. Paris et Bruxelles: Librairie Nationale d'Art et d'Histoire.
- 1929. "Études Cambodgiennes: 23. La date du temple de Bantay Srei, 24. Nouvelles données chronologiques et généalogiques sur la dynastie de Mahīdharapura". *BEFEO* 29, 289–330.
- 1937–1966. *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. 8 vols. Paris: EFEO. 1937 (vol. 1), 1942 (vol. 2), 1951 (vol. 3), 1952 (vol. 4), 1953 (vol. 5), 1954 (vol. 6), 1964 (vol. 7), 1966 (vol. 8).

- 1939. “Une statue de Çiva récemment découverte à Bàkoñ (Cambodge)”. *BEFEO* 39, 221–222 (republished in CÆDÈS 1992, 117–118).
- 1968. *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii. Translation of CÆDÈS, *Les États hindouisés d’Indochine et de l’Indonésie*, Paris, 1964.
- 1992. *Articles sur le pays khmer*, vol. 2. Paris: EFEO.
- CÆDÈS, George and DUPONT, Pierre. 1943–46. “Les stèles de Sdok Kāk Thom, Phnom Sandak et Prāḥ Vihār.” *BEFEO* 43: 56–154. Reprinted in *George Cædès. Articles sur le pays khmer*: (Paris: EFEO, 1992), vol. 2, pp. 167–265.
- DE CASPARIS, J.G. and MABBETT, I.W. 1992. “Religion and Popular Beliefs of Southeast Asia before c. 1500”. In TARLING 1992, 276–339.
- DEMIÉVILLE, Paul. 1929–30. “Bishamon” in *Hôbôgirin. Dictionnaire encyclopédique du bouddhisme d’après les sources chinoises et japonaises*, Tokyo: Maison Franco-Japonaise, fasc. 1, pp. 79a–83b.
- DERRETT, J. Duncan M. Ed. 1975. *Bhāruci’s Commentary on the Manusmṛti: The Manu-Śāstra-Vivaraṇa, Books 6–12: text, translation, and notes*. Schriftenreihe des Südasiens-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg, Bd. 18. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.
- DUTT, Nalinaksha. 1939. *Gilgit Manuscripts. Volume 1*. Srinagar, Kashmir.
- VAN EERDE, J.C. 1910. “Hindu-Javaansche en Balinische Eredienst”. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van de Koninklijke Instituut* 65, 1–39.
- ENGLISH, Elizabeth. 2002. *Vajrayoginī, Her Visualizations, Rituals, and Forms. A Study of the Cult of Vajrayoginī in India*. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- FONTEIN, Jan with essays by R. SOEKMONO and Edi SEDYAWATI. 1990. *The Sculpture of Indonesia*. Washington: National Gallery of Art.
- FREEMAN, Michael and JACQUES, Claude. 1999. *Ancient Angkor*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- FULLER, 1976. *The Nayars Today*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GAIL, Adalbert J. 1984–8. *Tempel in Nepal*. Graz: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt. Vol. 1 (1984): *Ikonographie hinduistischer Pagoden in Patan Kathmandutal*; vol. 2 (1988): *Ikonographische Untersuchungen zur späten Pagode und zum Sikhara-Tempel*.
- GEERTZ, Clifford. 1980. *Negara: The Theatre State in Nineteenth-century Bali*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- GELLNER, David. 1992. *Monk, Householder, and Tantric Priest: Newar Buddhism and its Hierarchy of Ritual*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GITEAU, Madeleine. 1976. *The Civilization of Angkor*, New York: Rizzoli, 1976. Translated by Katherine Watson from the French: *Angkor: Un peuple – Un art*, Fribourg: Office du livre, 1976.
- GOODALL, Dominic. Ed. and trans. 1998. *Bhaṭṭarāmakaṇṭhāvīracitā kīraṇavṛttih. Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha’s Commentary on the Kīraṇatantra. Vol. 1: chapters 1–6. Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Publications du département d’Indologie, 86.1. Pondicherry: Institut Français de Pondichéry / EFEO.
- 2001. *The Parākhyantra. A Scripture of the Śaiva Siddhānta. A Critical Edition and Annotated Translation*. Habilitation thesis submitted to the University of Hamburg, 2001. Forthcoming.
- GOUDRIAAN, T. 1973. “Tumburu and His Sisters”, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 17, 49–95.
- Ed. and trans. 1985. *The Vīṇāsikhatantra: A Śaiva Tantra of the Left Current*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- GOUDRIAAN, T. and SCHOTERMAN, J.A. Ed. 1988. *Kubjikāmatatantra: Kulālikāmnāya Version. Critical Edition*. Leiden: Brill.
- GOUGH, E. Kathleen. 1993. “The Nayars and the Definition of Marriage”. In UBEROI 1993, 237–256.
- GRIERSON, Sir George, assisted by Mukundarāma Śāstrī of Śrīnagar. 1915. *A Dictionary of the Kāshmirī Language compiled partly from materials left by the late Paṇḍit Īśvara Kaula*. Bibliotheca Indica, New Series, No. 1405. Hertford: ASB, 1915. Reproduced, Delhi: Low Price Publications, 1993.

HALL, K.R. 1985. *Maritime Trade and State Development in Early Southeast Asia*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

— 2001. “Merchants, Rulers, and Priests in an Early South Indian Sacred Centre: Cidambaram in the Age of the Cōlās”. In Kenneth R. Hall (ed.), *Structure and Society in Early South India. Essays in Honour of Noboru Karashima* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press), 85–116.

HEFNER, Robert William. 1985. *Hindu Javanese: Tengger Tradition and Islam*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

HENRY, Patricia B. 1986. *The Arjuna Wiwaaha*. Gaya: Centre for South East Asian Studies. The Old Javanese *Arjunawiwāha* of Mpu Kaṇva, Sargas 1–13; text, translation and commentary.

HIGHAM, Charles. 2001. *The Civilization of Angkor*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

HOBART et al. 2001: Angela Hobart, Urs Ramseyer and Albert Leeman, *The People of Bali*, Oxford: Blackwell (paperback edition). First published in hardback in 1996.

HOYKAAS, C. 1964. *Agama Tirtha. Five studies in Hindu-Balinese religion*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.

— 1966. *Surya-sevana. The Way to God of a Balinese Siva Priest*. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij.

— 1974. *Cosmogony and Creation in Balinese Tradition*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

HUNTINGTON, Susan L. 1984. *The “Pāla-Sena” Schools of Sculpture*. Leiden: Brill.

IKARI, Yasuke. Ed. 1994. *A Study of the Nīlamata – Aspects of Hinduism in Ancient Kashmir*. Kyoto: Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University.

ISWARANAND, S. 1995. *A Concise Dictionary Newar-English*. Kathmandu: Pilgrims Book House.

JACQUES, Claude. 1968. “Études d'épigraphie cambodgienne: 1. La stèle du Phnom Srès (K. 1002)”. *BEFEO* 54, 605–622.

— 1976a. “À propos de l'esclavage dans l'ancien Cambodge”. In Pierre-Bernard Lafont (ed.), *XXIX^e Congrès International des Orientalistes, Asie du Sud-Est continental*, vol. 1, Paris: L'Asiathèque, 1976, 71–76.

— 1976b. “Études d'épigraphie cambodgienne: 9. La stèle du Baphûon, K. 583”. *BEFEO* 63, 351–365.

— with the collaboration of René DUMONT 1999. *Angkor*. Cologne: Könemann. English edition of *Angkor*, Paris: Bordas, 1990.

— 2001 “Les noms posthumes des rois dans l'ancien Cambodge”. In Marijke J. Klokke and Karel R. van Kooij (ed.), *Fruits of Inspiration. Studies in Honour of Prof. J.G. de Casparis* (Groningen: Egbert Forsten), 191–198.

JESSUP, Helen I. and ZÉPHIR, Thierry. 1997. *Angkor et dix siècles d'art khmer*, catalogue of an exhibition at the Galeries nationales du Grand Palais, Paris, 31 January to 26 May 1997 and the National Gallery of Art, Washington, 29 June to 28 September 1997, prepared under the direction of Helen I. Jessup and Thierry Zéphir. Paris: Éditions de la Réunion des musées nationaux.

KANE, P.V. 1930–1962. *History of Dharmaśāstra*. Government Oriental Series, Class B, 6. 5 volumes. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.

KARASHIMA, Noboru. 2001. *History and Society in South India. The Cholas to Vijayanagar, comprising South Indian History and Society (1984) and Towards a New Formation (1992)*. Omnibus edition. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

KERN, H. 1900. *Rāmāyaṇa kakawin, Oudjavaansch heldendicht*. The Hague: Nijhoff.

KILAM, Jia Lal. 1955. *A History of Kashmiri Pandits*. Srinagar: S.N. Dar.

KOUL Anand. 1991. *The Kashmiri Pandit*. Delhi: Utpal Publications. Reprinted from the edition of 1924 (Calcutta: Thacker Spink).

LESSING, F.D. and WAYMAN, A. Trans. 1980. *Introduction to the Buddhist Tantric Systems Translated from Mkhas grub rje's Rgyud sde spyi'i rnam par g'zag pa rgyas par brjod with Original Text*

- and Annotation*. New York: Samuel Weiser. Reprint of the second edition (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1980). First edition: The Hague, 1968.
- LÉVI, Sylvain. 1905 (vols. 1–2), 1908 (vol. 3). *Le Népal. Étude historique d'un royaume hindou*. Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'études, 17–19.
- LEVY, Robert I. 1990. *Mesocosm. Hinduism and the Organization of a Traditional Newar City in Nepal*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- LINROTHE, Rob. 1999. *Ruthless Compassion. Wrathful Deities in Early Indo-Tibetan Esoteric Buddhist Art*. London: Serindia.
- LOBO, Wibke. 1997. "L'image de Hevajra et le bouddhisme tantrique". In JESSUP and ZÉPHIR 1997, 71–78.
- MABBETT, Ian and CHANDLER, David. 1996. *The Khmers. The Peoples of South-East Asia and the Pacific*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- MADAN, T.N. 1989. *Family and Kinship: A Study of the Pandits of Rural Kashmir*. Delhi: Oxford University Press. Second, enlarged edition.
- MAJUMDAR, R.C. 1985. *The Inscriptions of Champa*, Book III in *Champā. History and Culture of an Indian Colonial Kingdom in the Far East, 2nd.–16th Century A.D.*, Delhi: Gian, a omnibus reprint of *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East, Champa*, 1927.
- MALLERET, Louis. 1960. "Contribution à l'étude du thème des Neuf Divinités dans la sculpture du Cambodge et du Champa". *Arts Asiatique* 7, 205–230.
- MANANDHAR, Thakur Lal. 1986. *Newari-English Dictionary. Modern Language of Kathmandu Valley*. Ed. Anne Vergati. Delhi: Agam Prakashan.
- MANGUIN, Pierre-Yves. 1979. "L'introduction de l'Islam au Campa." *BEFEO* 66: 255–269.
- MEISTER, Michael W. et al. Ed. 1983–91. *Encyclopaedia of Indian Temple Architecture*. Delhi: American Institute of Indian Studies, Oxford University Press. Vol. 1, Part 1: *South India, Lower Dravidadeśa 200 B.C.–A.D. 1324* (1983); Vol. 1, Part 2: *South India, Upper Dravidadeśa, Early Phase A.D. 550–1075* (1986); Vol. 2, Part 1: *North India, Foundations of North Indian Style, c. 250 B.C.–A.D. 1100* (1988); Vol. 2, Part 2: *North India, Period of Early Maturity, c. A.D. 700–900* (1991).
- Ed. 1984. *Discourses on Śiva: Proceedings of a Symposium on the Nature of Religious Imagery*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- MICHAELS, Axel. 1984. "Śiva's Wild and Wayward Calf – The Goddess Vatsalā, her Temple and Yātrā". *Kailash* XI.3–4 : 105–147.
- 1994. *Die Reisen der Götter. Der nepalische Paśupatinātha-Tempel und sein rituelles Umfeld*. Nepalica, 6. Bonn: VGM Wissenschaftsverlag. With a supplementary volume: Axel Michaels and Govinda Tandan with drawings by Harald Fritzenkötter, *Paśupatikṣetra: Maps of Deopatan*.
- MIKSIC, John N. and SOEKATNO, Sri Hardiati (ed.). 1995. *The Legacy of Majapahit*. Exhibition Catalogue. Singapore: National Museum of Singapore.
- MIRASHI, V.V. 1962. "Gwalior Museum Stone Inscription of Pataṅgaśambhu". *Journal of the Madhya Pradesh Itihasa Parishad* 64, 3–13.
- MISHRA, Abhaya Nath. 1984. *Shrotriyas of Mithila*. Bhadaini-Varanasi: Kishor Vidya Niketan.
- MUS, Paul. 1933. "L'Inde vue de l'Est : Cultes indiens et indigènes du Champa". *BEFEO* 33, 1: 367–410.
- NESBITT, H.J. 1997. "Constraints to Rice Production and Strategies for Improvement". In H.J. Nesbitt, (ed.), *Rice Production in Cambodia*, Manilla: International Rice Research Institute.
- O'MALLEY, L.S.S. 1907. *Bengal District Gazetteers: Muzaffarpur*. Calcutta: The Bengal Secretariat Book Depot.
- OZHA, Vajeshankar G. 1889. Ed. and trans. "The Somanāthpattan Praśasti of Bhāva Bṛhaspati. With an introduction by G. Bühler". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Morgenlandes* 3: 1–19.

- PARMU, R.K. 1969. *A History of Muslim Rule in Kashmir 1320–1819*. Delhi: People's Publishing House.
- PELLIOT 1903. "Le Fou-nan". *BEFEO* 3, 258–303.
- Trans. 1951. *Œuvres posthumes de P. Pelliot, Part 3: Mémoires sur les coutumes du Cambodge de Tcheou Ta-kouan: version nouvelle suivie d'un commentaire inachevé*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve. Revised and expanded edition of the original translation published in 1902 (*BEFEO* 2, 123–177).
- PETECH, Luciano. 1984. *Medieval History of Nepal (c. 750–1482)*. Second, thoroughly revised edition. Serie Orientale Roma, 54. Rome: IIMEE.
- PIGEAUD, Th. 1960–63. *Java in the fourteenth century; a study in cultural history; The Nāgarakertāgama by Rakawi Prapañca of Majapahit, 1365 A.D.* Vol 1: Javanese texts in transcription; Vol. 2: Notes on the texts and the translation; Vol. 3: Translations; Vol. 4: Commentaries and recapitulation; vol. 5: Glossary, general index. KITLV, Translation Series, 4. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- 1967. *Literature of Java*. Vol. I. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- PO DHARMA, 2001. "The History of Champa". In Emmanuel Guillon, *Cham Art. Treasures from the Đà Nang Museum, Vietnam* (Bangkok: River Books), 14–27.
- POERBATJARAKA, Raden Mas Ngabei. 1926. *Agastya in den Archipel*. Leiden: Brill.
- POU, Saveros. 1989. *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge I*. Collection de textes et documents sur l'Indochine XVII. Paris: EFEO.
- 1992. *Dictionnaire vieux khmer-français-anglais*. Bibliothèque Khmère, Série B: Travaux et Recherches, III. Paris: Cedoreck.
- Ed. and trans. 2001. *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge II & III*. Collection de textes et documents sur l'Indochine XXII–XXIII. Paris: EFEO.
- RAMESH, K.V. and TEWARI, S.P. 1990. *A Copper-plate Hoard of the Gupta Period from Bagh, Madhya Pradesh*. New Delhi: Archaeological Survey of India.
- REGMI, D.R. 1965–66. *Medieval Nepal*, 4 vols. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopādhyāya, 1965 (vol. 1), 1966 (vols. 2–4).
- REID, Anthony. 1988. *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450–1680, Volume One: The Lands below the Winds*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- 1993. *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce 1450–1680, Volume Two: Expansion and Crisis*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- RENOU, Louis. 1984. *Grammaire sanscrite*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- RICKLEFS, M.C. 1993. *War, Culture and Economy in Java 1677–1726. Asian and European Imperialism in the early Kartasura period*. Asian Studies Association of Australia, Southeast Asia Publication Series, No. 24. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- ROBSON, Stuart (tr.). 1995. *Deśawarṇana (Nāgarakṛtāgama) by Mpu Prapañca*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 169. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- RUEGG, David Seyfort. 1969. *La théorie du Tathāgatagarbha et du Gotra. Études sur la Sotériologie et la Gnoséologie du Bouddhisme*. Publications de l'EFEO, vol. 70. Paris: EFEO.
- SALOMON, Richard. 1998. *Indian Epigraphy. A Guide to the Study of Inscriptions in Sanskrit, Prakrit, and the Other Indo-Aryan Languages*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- SANDERSON, Alexis. 1988. "Śaivism and the Tantric Traditions". In S. Sutherland, L. Houlden, P. Clarke and F. Hardy (ed.), *The World's Religions*, London: Routledge, pp. 660–704. Reprinted in F. Hardy (ed.), *The World's Religions. The Religions of Asia*, London: Routledge, 1990, pp. 128–172.
- 1990. "The Visualization of the Deities of the Trika". In A. Padoux (ed.), *L'Image Divine : Culte et Méditation dans l'Hindouisme*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS, pp. 31–88.

- 1995. “Meaning in Tantric Ritual”. In A.-M. Blondeau and K. Schipper (eds), *Essais sur le Rituel III: Colloque du Centenaire de la Section des Sciences religieuses de l'École Pratique des Hautes Études*. Louvain-Paris: Peeters, pp. 15–95.
- 2001. “History Through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pañcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras”. In François Grimal (ed.), *Les Sources et le temps. Sources and Time. A Colloquium, Pondicherry, 11–13 January 1997* (Publications du Département d'Indologie, 91. Pondicherry, Institut Français de Pondichéry / EFEO), pp. 1–47.
- 2002. “Remarks on the Text of the Kubjikāmata”. *Indo-Iranian Journal* 45, 1–24.
- SANTIKO, Hariani. 1995. “Early Research on Sivaitic Hinduism during the Majapahit Era” (an abridged translation from Indonesian by J.N. Miksic). In MIKSIC and SOEKATNO 1995, 55–70.
- SCHNITGER, F.M. 1937. *The Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra*. Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie, Band 35, Supplement. Leiden: Brill.
- SCHWEYER, Anne-Valérie. 1999. “Chronologie des inscriptions publiées du Campā. Études d'épigraphie cam I”. *BEFEO* 86, 321–344.
- SHARMA, Dasharatha. 1959. *Early Chauhān Dynasties. A Study of Chauhān Political History, Chauhān Political Institutions and Life in the Chauhān Dominions from c. 800 to 1316 A.D.*. Delhi: S. Chand.
- SHEA, David and TROYER, Anthony. Trans. 1937. *Oriental Literature or the Dabistan*. New York, Tudor. A reprint, with an introduction by A.V. Williams Jackson of the edition of 1843: *The Dabistan or School of Manners translated from the original Persian with notes and illustrations*, 3 volumes, Paris: Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland. A translation of the *Kiṭab-i Dabistan-i Mazahib* attributed to Muhsin Fānī (17th century).
- SIRCAR, D.C. 1976. “Indological Notes: R.C. Majumdar's Chronology of the Pāla Kings”. *Journal of Ancient Indian History* 9 (1975–76), 209–210.
- Ed. 1983. *Select inscriptions bearing on Indian History and Civilization. From the Sixth to the Eighteenth Century A.D.* Volume 2. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- SLUSSER, M.S. 1982. *Nepal Mandala. A Cultural Study of the Kathmandu Valley*. Volume 1. Princeton: New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- SMITH, V.A. 1917. *Akbar, the Great Mogul, 1542–1605*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SOEBADIO, Haryati. Ed. and trans. 1971. *Jñānasiddhānta*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. Sanskrit and Old Javanese.
- Ed. 1992. *Pusaka. Art of Indonesia from the Collections of the National Museum*. Singapore: Archipelago Press.
- SOEKMONO, R. 1990. “Indonesian Architecture of the Classical Period: a Brief Survey”. In FONTEIN 1990, pp. 67–95. Translated from Indonesian by Jan Fontein.
- SOTHEBY'S. 1995. *Indian and Southeast Asian Art with property from the Mr. and Mrs. Klaus G. Perls Collections, Sale 6741*. Catalogue, Auction of September 21, 1995.
- STEIN, M.A. 1961. *Kalhana's Rājatarāṅginī. A Chronicle of the Kings of Kāśmīr. Translated with an Introduction, Commentary and Notes*. 2 Volumes. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Reprinted from the edition of 1900.
- STUART-FOX, David J. 2002. *Pura Besakih. Temple, Religion and Society in Bali*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- SULEIMAN Satyawati. 1977. “The Archaeology and History of West Sumatra”, *Berita Pusat Penelitian Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional* 12.
- SUPOMO, S. Ed. and trans. 1977. *Arjunawijaya. A Kakawin of Mpu Tantular*. Vol. 1: Introduction and Text; Vol. 2: Translation. Bibliotheca Indonesica, 14. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- TAKAKUSU, Junjiro and WATANABE Kaigyoku. 1924–1929. *Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai*. The Chinese Buddhist Canon.

- TAMOT, Kashinath et al. 2000. *A Dictionary of Classical Newari Compiled from Manuscript Sources*. Kathmandu: Nepal Bhasa Dictionary Committee.
- TANDAN, Govinda. 1996. *Paśupatikṣetrako Sāṅskritika Adhyayana*. Kathmandu: Jharendra Shumsher Jang Bahadur Rana and Manju Rana.
- 1999. *Paśupatikṣetrako Sāṅskritika Adhyayana (Duī Bhāga), Abhilekha Khaṇḍa*. Kathmandu: Jharendra Shumsher Jang Bahadur Rana and Manju Rana. Document volume to accompany TANDAN 1996.
- TARLING, Nicholas. Ed. 1992. *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia. Volume One. From Early Times to c. 1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- TAYLOR, Keith W. 1992. “The Early Kingdoms”. In TARLING 1992, 137–182.
- TOD, James. 1920: William Crooke (ed. with introd. and notes), *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan or the Central and Western Rajput States of India*. 3 volumes. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1920. First edition: James Tod, *Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan*. 2 vols. London: Higginbotham and Co., 1829 and 1832.
- TRIMINGHAM, J. Spencer. 1973. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*. London: Oxford University Press.
- TRIPĀṬHĪ, Ramā Śaṅkar. 1971. *Descriptive Catalogue of Samskrit Manuscripts in Gaekwada Library, Bharat Kalā Bhavana and Samskrit Mahāvidyālaya Library, Banaras Hindu University*. Banaras Hindu University Saṃskṛit Series, Vol. 6. Varanasi: Banaras Hindu University.
- TRAUTMANN, Thomas R. 1993a. “The Study of Dravidian Kinship”. In UBEROI 1993, pp. 74–90.
- 1993b. “Marriage Rules and Patterns of Marriage in the Dravidian Kinship Region”. In UBEROI 1993, pp. 273–286.
- UBEROI, Patricia. Ed. 1993. *Family, Kinship and Marriage in India*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- UNESCO. 1999. *Champasak Heritage Management Plan*. Govt. of the Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Ministry of Information and Culture. Bangkok: UNESCO.
- VAJRĀCĀRYA, Gautamavajra. 1976. *Hanumān Dhokā Rājdarbār*. Kathmandu: Nepālār Eśiyālī Adhyayan Saṃsthān, Tribhuvan Viśvavidyālaya.
- VAJRĀCĀRYA, Dhanavajra. 1973 [VS 2030]. *Licchavikālakā Abhilekha, anuvāda, aitiḥāsika vyākhyā sahita*. Kathmandu: Nepāl ra Eśiyālī Adhyayan Saṃsthān, Tribhuvan Viśvavidyālaya.
- VERGATI, Anne 1995. *Gods, Men and Territory. Society and Culture in Kathmandu Valley*. New Delhi: Manohar.
- VICKERY, Michael. 1998. *Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia. The 7th–8th Centuries*. Tokyo: The Toyo Bunko.
- VIVANTI, Pia. Ed. and trans. 1975. *Il “Kiraṅgama”: Testo e traduzione del “Vidyāpāda”*. Supplemento n. 3 agli Annali: vol. 35 (1975), fasc. 2. Napoli: Istituto Orientale di Napoli.
- WRIGHT, D. Ed. 1877. *History of Nepal* (translated from the Parbatiya by Shew Shunker Singh and Pandit Gunanand; with an introductory sketch of the country and people of Nepal by the editor, Daniel Wright). London: Cambridge University Press. A translation of the Buddhist recension of the *Vaṃśāvalī* or genealogical history of Nepal.
- YOKOCHI, Yuko. 1999a. “The Warrior Goddess in the *Devīmāhātmya*”. In Masakazu Tanaka and Musashi Tachikawa (ed.), *Living with Śakti. Gender, Sexuality and Religion in South Asia*. Senri Ethnological Studies, No. 50. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- 1999b. “Maḥiṣāsūramardīnī Myth and Icon: Studies in the *Skandapurāṇa*, II”. In *Studies in the History of Indian Thought (Indo-Shishōshi Kenkyū)* 11. Kyoto: Association for the Study of the History of Indian Thought.
- ZANEN, S.M. 1986. “The Goddess Vajrayoginī and the Kingdom of Sankhu (Nepal)”. *Puruṣārtha* 10, 125–66.
- ZHOU DAGUAN. See PELLIOU 1951.

ZOETMULDER, P.J. (with the collaboration of S.O. ROBSON). 1982. *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Editorial Conventions

When I have emended the reading of a manuscript or printed edition cited in the notes and when I have preferred the reading of one manuscript or group of manuscripts I have marked the beginning of the text-segment in question with a superscript asterisk. The end of the segment is followed by a parenthesis in which first the status of the segment is indicated, by “em.” for an emendation, “corr.” for an obvious correction, “conj.” for a conjectural emendation, or, if it is an attested reading, an upper-case letter or letters identifying the manuscript or manuscripts in which it is transmitted. The manuscripts to which these letters refer have been identified in the bibliographical entry for that text. Any testimonia relevant to the emendation or choice of reading have been indicated thereafter within square brackets. Then, after a colon, are given the readings that have been rejected. Where more than one rejected reading has been cited the later is separated from the preceding by a colon. Rejected readings are followed in every case by their source, either the letter or letters identifying the manuscript source, “Cod.” for the manuscript when only one has been available, “Codd.” when there is more than one and all give the reading, or “Ed.” when the source is a printed edition identified in the bibliography. When the reported reading of an inscription has been questioned its source has been indicated by the abbreviation “Ep.” The same conventions have been followed where text has been presented in the form of an indented citation within the main text rather than in the notes, except that emendations, variants and the rest have been given not within the citation, as in the notes, but in a register below it. The beginnings of the text-segments concerned have not been **not** marked with a superscript asterisk because they have been given in the lower register at the beginning of each entry. I have enclosed problematic text-segments between obeli. In my transcriptions the character Upadhmanīya is rendered *f*.