

BAYON: NEW PERSPECTIVES RECONSIDERED

Michael Vickery
Independent Scholar

In recent years a number of nicely illustrated coffee-table publications about Cambodia and its temples have been put on the market. Because such publications do not usually demand the critical standards of academic writing, they have been used by some writers wishing to push historico-novelistic speculations as demonstrated historical fact, or as the consensus of the specialist academic milieu. Perhaps this is harmless enough if these publications just fall into the hands of amateurs desiring pretty pictures or guides to their own tours among the monuments, but if used by students they result in misleading confusion (specialist scholars, well aware of their weaknesses, only use these books for their illustrations, and tend to ignore the texts).¹

The most recent of such publications is *Bayon: New Perspectives*, in which I wrote the Introduction.

When I was invited to participate in that book I insisted on the desirability of avoiding the fate of earlier volumes of that type, in order to produce a book which would be useful for serious historians, art historians and students. I urged that contributors should be held to standard academic discipline in the use of source references (footnotes) and specific recognition of whatever speculations they wished to make. That is, they should provide a full scholarly argument for new proposals, and if those were only hypotheses or speculations they should be clearly identified as such. If they are maintained as speculations, each such proposal must be the end of that argument. It may not thereafter be used, as though accepted fact, as a basis for further speculations.

¹ The publications about Cambodia in which this tendency has been most serious have come from River Books in Bangkok under the direction of Narisa Chakrabongse, although the same tendency is noticeable throughout the field. For example, Claude Jacques, *L'Empire khmer*, Paris, Fayard, 2004. *Bayon: New Perspectives* (edited by Joyce Clark, ed., River Books, 2007) will henceforth be cited as *Bayon*.

When this book was conceived and the first drafts of the chapters received by the editors, we hoped that through the editorial process, differences of interpretation among the contributors could be smoothed over and something like a new consensus on the Bayon could be achieved (as source references throughout the chapters show, there was in fact never an old consensus), or that editorial comment would facilitate for serious readers understanding of the controversies and disagreement among the contributors to the book. In the end, as Joyce Clark, who, following an initial suggestion by Vittorio Roveda, organized the writing of this book and financed it, said, in her Preface, this has proved impossible—even some of the basic historical facts are controversial. Moreover, the publisher refused to permit the type of editorial comment which was necessary, and surreptitiously removed editorial footnotes intended to guide serious readers through the controversies. There are thus, in some of the chapters, defects which are embarrassing for the writers, and which I shall indicate, illustrating that these are the fault of the publisher, not the writer. For example, for four of the sections, those by Hiram Woodward, Claude Jacques, Thomas Maxwell, and Peter Sharrock, the publisher did not include their final versions, but earlier ones in which errors had not yet been corrected by the editors.

As writer of the Introduction, and as *de facto* editor of the other chapters, I had intended to compose a final editorial chapter providing this information, a project which proved impossible; and the present article is intended as a substitute for that editorial chapter.²

The purpose is to indicate clearly for the reader where the controversies lie, their evidential bases, and the strengths or weaknesses of the authors' arguments.³

The very history of events of the Bayon period as written to date has always been riddled with confusion, inconsistencies, and hypotheses presented as facts; and it would have been beyond the purpose or capability of this book to resolve all of the difficulties. Even a casual reading of the historical chapters by Claude Jacques and Anne-Valérie Schweyer will show how difficult it is to achieve a reasonable synthesis of the primary sources and secondary literature on 12th-13th century Cambodia. For example, their chapters show two quite different versions of the events of the putative Champa conquest of Angkor, conventionally dated to 1177.

² This was rejected by the publisher, and by other contributors, after circulation to them by the publisher of a preliminary draft of my critical final chapter; and as a result I withdrew from the position of Editor, with freedom to publish my criticism elsewhere.

³ I shall not be concerned here with orthographical, grammatical or factual errors in the book jackets, or in the bibliography, such as (front flap), "Ecole Pratiques" (corr. 'Ecole Pratique'), concerning Claude Jacques, and "*Le Ancien Vietnam*," corr. (*L'Ancien Vietnam*), concerning Anne-Valérie Schweyer. These are due to lapses by the publisher, which neither the editor nor the contributors had the opportunity to correct. Neither were they able to intervene to insist that the text, and in particular the footnotes, should be printed in sufficiently large type to be easily readable. This reflected the publisher's rejection of the editor's desire to produce a work of scholarly value, and a preference for something of mainly touristic interest.

Concerning interpretation of the meaning of the Bayon, readers will find four different conclusions about the identity of the huge faces which give the monument its special flavor. Ang Choulean favors the popular Khmer view of the faces as Prohm (*brahma*) as understood in Khmer Buddhism, Peter Sharrock, argues for the tantric Bodhisatva Vajrasatva, Maxwell accepts a different Buddhist identity, but Jacques says they cannot be Buddhist, because some faces were not constructed until the reign of the supposedly fanatically anti-Buddhist and pro-Hindu Jayavarman VIII who would not have allowed such prominent Buddhist images in his central temple. On this, see further discussion below.

At least, the two historical chapters have advanced beyond earlier writings in their recognition of the importance of Cambodian relations with Champa for that period of Cambodian history, although as editorial comments below indicate, there is still much to be accomplished in that domain.

In spite of this advance in understanding of the period, Claude Jacques, in his “The Historical Development of Khmer Culture from the Death of Sūryavarman II to the 14th Century,” shows a number of new proposals that require more discussion than offered in the chapter, and that also show serious disagreement with other contributors which has not been clearly identified. As in some of his other recent work, Jacques has introduced a number of historical revisions, without warning readers, presenting them as though they were part of the consensus of historians, rather than merely his own hypotheses.

As he says at the very end of his paper, there is still much work for younger scholars, and “they must not be frightened to propose new hypotheses themselves, *provided that they are based on solid foundations*“ [emphasis added]. Jacques has too often not followed his own advice.

The first new detail in Jacques’ chapter concerns the year in which Jayavarman VII became king, in earlier scholarship 1181, now, according to Jacques, 1182/3. This is because the date, for example in the hospital edict inscriptions, giving the chronogram *veda-ambara-eka-indu*, Sanskrit words with numerical meanings, has hitherto been interpreted as 1103, with *veda* as 3. Now, according to Jacques and Gerdi Gerschheimer of the Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient *veda* should be understood as 4, giving a date *veda-ambara* [‘space’]-*eka* [1]-*indu* [‘moon’] = 4-0-1-1, that is, 1104 *śaka* era, plus 78/79, or CE 1182/3.⁴

Woodward, in his Foreword, has refused to accept this and still holds that the Sanskrit allusion, ‘form-[moon]-moon-vedas’ (Sanskrit, *rupa-indu-candra-veda*) should be read as “1113, that is 1191 AD,” date of consecration of the Preah Khan temple.⁵

⁴ The uncertainty in *śaka*-CE conversion, unless the month is known, is because the *śaka* year begins in March-April.

⁵ Woodward, p. 5, appears in error, with “form-moon-Vedas,” because the publisher, for some unfathomable reason, chose to publish an early version of his text, rather than the final one corrected by the editors.

There is still more inconsistency in dating, due to misunderstanding and manipulation by the publisher, in the beginning of Peter Sharrock's chapter (p. 233, nn. 5 and 7). In an earlier paper, passed around among the contributors to the book, I argued that there was only one inscription from the reign of Jayavarman VIII, then dated 1243-1295, inscription K.241 of 1267, and that it showed the same type of Buddhism as that of Jayavarman VII. This was in contradiction to the view of Claude Jacques that Jayavarman VIII must have been an anti-Buddhist Hindu and the instigator of the desecration of Buddhist images in the Bayon style temples.

Then I received from Claude Jacques and Gerdi Gershheimer correspondence concerning a new interpretation of the dates in the Maṅgalartha inscription (K.567), indicating that the reign of Jayavarman VIII did not begin until 1270. Thus inscription K.241 would be from the reign of Indravarman II (1218-1270, previously 1218-1243), who has always been accepted as following the Buddhism of Jayavarman VII, even though in fact we have almost no information about him.⁶

In Sharrock's final draft he took cognizance of this, but again the publisher, for some unfathomable reason, refused his final draft in favor of the earlier one.

Another novelty, also in the beginning of Jacques' chapter, and one based on solid evidence, says that the immediate successor to the builder of Angkor Wat, Sūryavarman II (1113-1145?), Yaśovarman II, never clearly identified in historical scholarship, although Coedès understood his existence, was overthrown on return to Angkor from Lavodaya, today Lopburi in central Thailand. This is a completely new detail in the history of Angkor, only discovered by Jacques, and based on a new reading of an inscription which Coedès apparently misunderstood. This reading of "Lavodaya" now finds favor among Sanskritists, but throws up a new historical problem which requires further research and writing—what was a king of Angkor, sometime in the 1150s-1160s, doing far to the West in central "Thailand" at a time when there is much evidence that Cambodia was, and had been since Sūryavarman II, involved politically and militarily in the East, in Champa.⁷

Other details of Jacques' new interpretation, "expedition" to Lavodaya, "ambushed as he arrived at his palace," do not come straightforwardly from the inscription, and represent historical fictionalizing, as does even Jacques' identification of the "palace" as at the site of the future Preah Khan temple.

⁶ Although this new interpretation should have been followed here, it is not absolutely secure, but is the best for the moment, and it may again be modified when a full new study of inscription K.567 is published.

⁷ The inscription is K.288, st. CVIII (see George Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* IV, pp. 219, 230-31, with a different translation by Coedès). I use here the modern name 'Thailand' strictly as a geographical referent. Certainly at the time there was no 'Thailand', nor even an entity which could be termed 'proto-Thailand'. Amusingly, Peter D. Sharrock, "The Buddhist pantheon of the Bâyon of Angkor: an historical and art historical reconstruction of the Bâyon temple and its religious and political roots" [henceforth cited as Sharrock, "Thesis"], School of African and Oriental Studies, University of London, 2006, p. 64 and n. 120 quotes Jacques' new translation, but attributes it to Coedès.

In referring this event to K.227, as well as to the specific Prasat Chrung inscription, Jacques has also, without warning, introduced here a new interpretation of K.227, the long Khmer inscription from Banteay Chmar, which in its beginning describes an attack on King Yaśovarman and defense by four officers whose images were later set up there. Since this event has defied previous explanation, it is legitimate to offer one, but it must be explicit. Jacques' explanation, however, is inadequate because inscription K.288 at Prasat Chrung says Yaśovarman was killed, whereas in K.227 his life is saved by his courageous officers.⁸

It would seem then, that the stories in the two inscriptions are unrelated, and that the events of K.227 preceded those of K.288, perhaps by many years.

Another new interpretation by Jacques, offered without documentation, is that the royal palace to which Yaśovarman II was returning, and which Tribhūvanādityavarman, who overthrew Yaśovarman, occupied subsequently, was on the site of the future Preah Khan temple, one of the later major works of Jayavarman VII, rather than the older Royal Palace.

Concerning sources on Jayavarman VII, Jacques notes, “fewer interesting inscriptions about Jayavarman VII have been found than is generally written. This is particularly true because it seems that toward the end of the thirteenth century King Jayavarman VIII (r. 1270 – 1295) sought to destroy all the documentation about Jayavarman VII and perhaps also about his successor, Indravarman II (r. ca. 1218 – ca. 1270 CE).”

The important inscriptions from the time of Jayavarman VII are, in order of presumed date, K.227 at Banteay Chmar, undated but perhaps before Jayavarman became king; the so-called ‘hospital’ inscriptions of 1182/3 and 1186/7 (K.368, etc.); the Ta Prohm temple inscription of 1186 (K.273); the Preah Khan inscription of 1192/3 (K.908)⁹; the Phimeanakas inscription (K.485), undated but inferentially still later; and the Prasat Chrung inscriptions (K.287, K.288, K.547, K.597) at the four corners of the walls around the city of Angkor Thom, undated but supposed by Coedès to have been from the end of Jayavarman’s reign. All but K.227 are in Sanskrit. Also important, but in a different way, are the dozens of short Khmer inscriptions in his temples naming various deities. They are the subject of Thomas Maxwell’s chapter in *Bayon*.¹⁰

The supposed destruction of the inscriptions of Jayavarman VII by Jayavarman VIII is one of the more fictional innovations in Jacques’ treatment. It is true that the number of extant inscriptions following the reign of Jayavarman VII precipitously declined. In the new dating discussed above there is one from the time of Indravarman, K.241 of 1267, but none from the reign of

⁸ In what follows here there are many references to Cambodian inscriptions by their K. numbers. The bibliography for these inscriptions may be found in the indexes of Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* VIII.

⁹ In earlier literature the date was 1191. Here I am following the new interpretation of *veda* as ‘4’, on which see comment above.

¹⁰ These inscriptions were catalogued by Coedès as K.293 for all but 24B(21), which is number K.539.

Jayavarman VIII, inviting the question, who then destroyed the inscriptions of Jayavarman VIII?¹¹ Following that, there are a few, but very few, from the three reigns after Jayavarman VIII.

It should also be noted that the number of inscriptions had been declining since the change of dynasty around 1080 when the so-called Mahīdharapura kings, including Sūryavarman II, builder of Angkor Wat, from north of the Dangrek mountains, moved down to reign at Angkor. There were also changes in the style and content of the inscriptions, all no doubt indicating different ideologies or power relationships.

In his treatment of this change of dynasty, Jacques (p. 30) says that the seizure of power by Jayavarman VI, the first king of the family, was probably irregular, and that the son of Sūryavarman I, Harṣavarman III, was killed by the new dynasty, for no member of this Mahīdharapura “dynasty” was ever mentioned by a king earlier than the 11th century (p. 31).

First, we know too little about political rules of the time to draw such conclusions, or to pronounce on ‘irregular’ succession. It is safe to say that these so-called Mahīdharapura kings, whose origin was north of the Dangrek mountains in what is now northeastern Thailand, did not descend directly from previous kings at Angkor, and that is why no earlier members of their dynasty were mentioned before the end of the 11th century. The lack of mention in earlier inscriptions implies nothing else.

There are, however, inscriptions showing that high-ranking officials of the previous dynasty continued in their functions under the new kings, suggesting a peaceful transition, or at least a split in the previous dynasty, with some favoring the new. Two such examples of men who served from the time of Udayādityavarman II (1050-1066) until Sūryavarman II (1113-1145?) are Namaśśivāya, full title unrecorded, and Divākaraṇḍita whose titles were nearly royal.¹² Another, Vāgindrapaṇḍita, served from Udayādityavarman to Jayavarman VI, first king of the new Mahīdharapura dynasty (K.391), as perhaps did Yogīśvaraṇḍita, although the plurality of persons with that title makes identity uncertain.

In an effort, however, to deny any link between the previous dynasty and the new, Jacques adds that “there is no mention of Sūryavarman I and his two sons in the inscriptions of the so-called ‘dynasty of Mahīdharapura’” (p. 31). This statement is incorrect. Inscriptions K.194/K.383, Phnom Sandak, dated *śaka* 1041/AD 1119, and K.254, Trapeang Don On, dated *śaka* 1048/AD 1126, both in the reign of Sūryavarman II, list the previous kings Udayādityavarman and Harṣavarman (posthumous title Sadāśivapada), sons of Sūryavarman I.

¹¹ Note again the confusion in Sharrock, notes 5, 7. This is one of the places where surreptitious censorship by the publisher removed editorial notes which would have permitted readers to understand the problem.

¹² See inscriptions K.254 (Namaśśivāya); K.38, K.194, K.383, and George Coedès and Pierre Dupont, “Les stèles de Sdok Kak Thom, Phnom Sandak et Prah Vihar,” *BEFEO* 43 (1943-46), pp. 56-154 (Divākaraṇḍita).

It seems that in support of his entirely reasonable view that the Harṣavarman, father of the mother of Jayavarman VII, was not the Harṣavarman son of Sūryavarman I, Jacques has allowed himself to neglect some of the sources.

The list of long inscriptions of Jayavarman VII is quite impressive, but Jacques argues that they were all damaged or hidden by Jayavarman VIII; and he writes (p. 41), it “can only have been on his orders that the great steles of Jayavarman VII – Phimeanakas, Ta Prohm, Preah Khan, Prasat Chrung and perhaps also some of those of Banteay Chmar – were broken, erased or concealed.”

Jacques did not explain these remarks, but the reports on the discoveries of the inscriptions do not support his statement. Aymonier, reported finding the Ta Prohm stele standing, “in a well-preserved state,” in one of the galleries of Ta Prohm, in 1882; and when Coedès published its translation in 1906, he referred to its discovery by Aymonier without remarking on any damage or perceived displacement.¹³ It is thus impossible to assume that Jayavarman VIII tried to hide or damage it. Jacques has elsewhere argued that the text of some parts of the Chrung inscriptions had been effaced (scraped away), but Coedès’ description in his publication of them seems to contradict both this and Jacques’ assertion that Coedès had not seen the stones.¹⁴ Coedès believed that those parts had never been engraved, and he even noted that some chipped places on the northwest stele had enlarged since the time Aymonier took rubbings.¹⁵ The latter certainly had a good look at them, and it was he who discovered two of them. His description shows that he, like Coedès later, considered, not that they had been effaced, as Jacques believes, by Jayavarman VIII, but that portions had never been engraved.¹⁶ The Preah Khan stele, when found in 1939, was intact, although not in its original place, which is easy to understand after neglect of the temples for 600 years. Only the Phimeanakas stele was badly broken, again not unexpected in that length of time, especially if, as Jacques says (p. 46), it was installed “at the foot of the temple” and no suggestion of deliberate damage by Jayavarman VIII is necessary.

As for “perhaps also some of those of Banteay Chmar” suffering from the action of Jayavarman VIII, this is pure speculation to fit a preconceived scenario.¹⁷ Between 1997 and 2000,

¹³ Etienne Aymonier, 1904, *Le Cambodge III Le groupe d'Angkor et l'histoire*, Paris, Ernest Leroux, Éditeur, 1904, pp. 30-31; George Coedès, “La stèle de Ta-Prohm” *BEFEO* VI (1-2), 1906, pp. 44-82.

¹⁴ Claude Jacques in an earlier draft offered to the editors of this book.

¹⁵ Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* IV, p. 207, n.8.

¹⁶ Aymonier, *Le Cambodge* III, p. 95.

¹⁷ In addition to the long inscription K.227 noted above, there are twelve short inscriptions of the type discussed in Maxwell’s chapter, and published in Coedès, “L’épigraphie des monuments,” pp. 117-119. They are numbered variously as K.226, K.592, K.696, K.827. Coedès, Index, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* VIII, p. 202, listed a one-line ‘graffito’, K.828, which he did not consider important enough to try to publish.

four steles, or the remains of four steles, were found in the ruins of Banteay Chmar, but too badly damaged to be read. Their damage, however, was like that sustained by the rest of the temple which during those years had been badly looted, and it is impossible to impute the damage suffered by the inscriptions to Jayavarman VIII, particularly because Banteay Chmar “showed a unique iconography... remarkably preserved, because it seems not to have been touched by the ‘iconoclastic reactions’ to which were subject the monuments of Jayavarman VII in the region of Angkor,” and which are conventionally blamed on Jayavarman VIII.¹⁸

An interesting point in his treatment of the forebears and genealogy of Jayavarman VII, which in other details follows the standard treatment by Coedès, Jacques says (p. 31), “we do have the name of Jayavarman VI’s paternal grandmother who might have had her fief at Banteay Chmar, where Jayavarman VII later constructed a city and a temple, according to my hypothesis, not yet published.” Jacques had earlier identified this lady as the person recorded in the Khmer-language Bayon inscription 7 (M) and in the Sanskrit stele of Preah Khan, verse CXIII, as associated with an apparent place name meaning ‘sand’, *kṣac* in Khmer, *sikaṭa* in Sanskrit, her full titles being *kanloñi kamrateñ añ* [in Khmer only, ‘defunct queen’, or ‘deceased lady’], *śrī jayamañgalārthacūḍāmañi*. Coedès considered that she was the mother of Jayavarman VII, known elsewhere as Jayarājacūḍāmañi, and that her name was here combined with that of Jayavarman’s preceptor, Jaya Mañgalārtha.¹⁹

This was no more than hypothesis, however, and one may ask whether such a combination was likely. Both this and Jacques’ hypothesis require more detailed argumentation.

In his discussion of the genealogy of the family of Jayavarman VII, Jacques says (p. 32), “the idea has occurred to me that it may have been wrong to reject the notion of matrilineal succession among kings, for this is clearly the general rule for succession in the Khmer country.” This is not quite accurate. As Jacques continues, “the practice is widely attested in priestly families, where successions pass very regularly from a priest to a nephew, the son of his sister,” but there is no case of royal succession following this pattern. A different type of matriliney is attested once during the 8th century, in K.124/AD 803, recording three reigns of queens in direct mother-daughter succession without mention of their consorts, but there are no further such examples in the

¹⁸ The extent of the damage is described in Christophe Pottier, “À propos du temple de Bantéay Chmâr,” *Aséanie* 13, juin 2004, pp. 132-149, see pp. 143-146; and the discovery of the steles is related in note 17, p. 144. Even the well-known K.227 had been cut up and stolen, but was recovered. These four steles are not registered with K. numbers in Coedès, *Inscriptions du Cambodge*. The opinion that Banteay Chmar was not touched by the iconoclastic vandalism seen in the other Jayavarman VII temples is held by all knowledgeable scholars.

¹⁹ G. Coedès, “Les inscriptions du Bayon,” *BEFEO* XXVIII, 1928, p.107, n. 2.

Angkor period.²⁰

Jacques' reference to Sūryavarman II as grandson of a sister of the two kings, brothers, Jayavarman VI and Dharaṇīndravarman I, is not apposite. In fact that family shows a still different type of succession worthy of notice in itself. Those two kings of the so-called Mahīdharapura dynasty which originated north of the Dangrek mountains in what is now northeast Thailand, followed a still older brother, designated only as *yuvārāja*, and the same woman was queen, successively, of all three. This, and the succession within that family, according to the official genealogy, of Sūryavarman II-Jayavarman VII, suggests succession from brother-to-brother or cousin-to-cousin in the same generation, of which there are other examples in early Cambodian history. Or else, as Eveline Porée-Maspero once argued, and which Jacques' current argument would imply, the royal aura was transmitted through women in all directions, which is not matrilineal succession as understood in anthropology.²¹

The discussion of Jayādityapura as the site now known as Preah Khan of Kompong Svay, that it was the domain of Jayavarman's grandfather Harṣavarman, and a center of iron production dominated by the Kuy, is interesting, and although hypothetical, not beyond reason. The only point I find too speculative, unless support is produced, is that Jayavarman VII's "maternal ancestors were Buddhists who belonged to a Tantric sect, etc." (p. 34). The hypothesis on tantrism, and that Preah Khan of Kompong Svay, a Buddhist city, was founded by the father of Jayavarman's mother, is not sufficient. At least, the quotation about Jayavarman VII from the Yay Hom inscription (K. 86), "he was like Śauddhodani {Gautama Buddha} in the city of the Śakyas" (p. 34), is hardly tantric.

Jacques should also have noted that his translation of the Yay Hom inscription to show that Jayavarman was raised as a Buddhist differs from that of Coedès. Where Jacques translates "having acquired the knowledge by himself in the city named Jayādityapura," Coedès said "having been born in the city of Jayādityapura." Whatever the translation, however, there is adequate evidence that Buddhism was important for the founders of the so-called Mahīdharapura dynasty,

²⁰ For discussion and comparison with similar situations in other Southeast Asian societies see Michael Vickery, *Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia*, Tokyo. The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for Unesco, The Toyo Bunko, 1998, pp. 267, 380-82, 399, 400.

²¹ Other examples of kingly succession in the same generation are, Jayavarman III > Indravarman, the two sons of Yaśovarman I following one after the other, Harṣavarman II > Rājendravarman, and the two sons of Sūryavarman I. On the role of females in dynastic succession see Eveline Porée-Maspero, *Etude sur les rites agraires des Cambodgiens*, Paris-La Haye, Mouton & Co, 1964. The importance of the maternal line in Jayavarman's genealogy was also emphasized by B-Ph. Groslier, "Inscriptions du Bayon," in Jacques Dumarçay and Bernard-Philippe Groslier, *Le Bayon, histoire architecturale du temple & Inscriptions du Bayon*, Mémoires archéologiques de l'EFEO No. 3, Adrien-Maisonneuve, Paris, 1973, p. 182.

and that therefore Jayavarman may have been raised as a Buddhist. Moreover Coedès provides strong evidence that the inscription refers to Jayavarman VI, not Jayavarman VII.

One detail in this discussion of Jayādityapura may leave the reader at loose ends. Jacques suggests that the city of Śreṣṭhapura, traditionally located at or near Wat Phu, was really at, or near Jayādityapura, which as a general localization, if Jayādityapura is taken as the Preah Khan of Kompong Svay, agrees with my discussion, in Vickery, *Society, Economics and Politics*, pp. 410-413.

Concerning the site of Preah Khan of Kompong Svay as a center of iron-working, Jacques should have cited the Ph.D. thesis by Bernard Dupaigne, *Les maîtres du fer et du feu: étude de la métallurgie du fer chez les Kouy du nord du Cambodge dans le contexte historique et ethnographique de l'ensemble kmer* [sic]. Paris: Thèse de l'École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 1987, where the Preah Khan is also given importance, and not just his own *L'Empire khmer* (Paris, 2005) pp 259-261, where the details obviously derive from Dupaigne.

In his sketch of the youth of Jayavarman VII, Jacques calls attention to an episode recorded in one of the Prasat Chrung inscriptions in which “still a young child... he killed a fearsome wild pig...while Giriśa and Arjuna [in killing a wild pig]... began their quarrel,” which imitates an incident in the *Mahābhārata*, “often represented in Angkorean bas-reliefs.” In fact, at the Bayon it is in the inner bas-reliefs, which Jacques elsewhere insists were carved in the time of Jayavarman VIII, but this scene might now be taken as one of the elements of the inner bas-reliefs attributable to Jayavarman VII—an incident in his biography.²²

Concerning Champa, Jacques first emphasizes what is coming to be the new consensus in which the historical chapters of this book go beyond most previous writing (see also Schweyer), that Champa was only rarely, if ever, a unified kingdom, but that it consisted of at least two, often three, or more, entities under local chiefs, often in conflict. He also insists that the same situation prevailed within Cambodia. Here he is on less solid ground, but at least in the 12th century it is certain that there were serious internal divisions and conflicts, and, in the time of Jayavarman VII, conflicts in which there were probably Khmer and Cham together on all sides. There can be no doubt that the eventual victory of Jayavarman VII was achieved with the support of Cham allies.

When Jacques writes, however (p. 35), “it seems that the future Jayavarman VII went to Champa to meet one of his allies, possibly King Jaya-Harivarman I ... of Pāṇḍuraṅga,” this goes beyond an acceptable conclusion, and may only be presented as a frank speculation. It is possible, for there are sufficient indications that Jayavarman was in Champa during the time when Jaya-

²² Jacques, p. 34. On Jacques' opinion of the bas-reliefs see, Claude Jacques, “Les derniers siècles d'Angkor,” *Comptes-rendus de janvier-mars de l'Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-Lettres*, Paris, De Boccard 1999, pp. 367-390. In *Bayon* the scene is numbered by Roveda as XXII c.

Harivarman was in power, but the inscriptions of the latter show him almost constantly at war with Cambodians, in particular against Sūryavarman II, and possibly Yaśovarman. Is Jacques implying here that the future Jayavarman was in Champa allied with a Cham faction fighting against his own dynasty? I would not find that an unreasonable hypothesis and it would be in agreement with my own conclusions about Jayavarman's own seizure of power supported by Cham allies.²³ It is a point which deserves further attention, and if that is what Jacques infers from the evidence, he should discuss it.

Unfortunately, Jacques chose for support of this hypothesis to rely on inscription 35(6) in the western sanctuary of the Bayon central tower, which he says records the installation by Jayavarman VII of the god Jaya-Harivarmeśvara, a name unknown among the Khmer gods. This is a new reading by Jacques of that inscription, which Coedès found completely illegible. Here Jacques, to make his argument convincing, must show that he has found an old rubbing taken before the inscription disappeared, and showing that royal Champa name.²⁴

Another mystery of this type is (p. 48) that in the northern tower of the Bayon there was an image of Jayabhadreśvara, a form of Śiva, and that each of the directional gods “was in his sanctuary in company with a *kanloñ*, a title which seems to have been used for goddesses similar to the Indian *mātrkā* which are in fact local deities.” In fact, the title ‘Jayabhadreśvara’ is not recorded in any publication of the inscriptions; and the term *kanloñ* is found in only two, 7 (M) and 27 (2) where the contexts suggest the more common meaning of the term, ‘defunct queen’ or ‘deceased lady’, as translated by Maxwell in this volume (pp. 130-131), and neither is in association with a god as stated by Jacques.²⁵

In his treatment of the Champa conquest of Angkor, conventionally dated to 1177, Jacques has insisted on an old interpretation which is no longer acceptable, that in the 1170s the Chams first intended to go overland, but failing to acquire horses from China, decided to go upriver, and, unfamiliar with the route, resorted to a Chinese pilot. Given this, Jacques wonders why the Phimeanakas inscription says the Cham came by chariot, since they really went upriver. As Schweyer has discussed

²³ Michael Vickery, *Champa Revised*, Asian Research Institute, National University of Singapore, August 2004, see http://www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps2005/wps05_037.htm.

²⁴ For the numbering and standard reading of the inscriptions see Maxwell in the present volume.

²⁵ This was Maxwell's treatment in his final text. In the publication there are errors, again because the publisher carelessly used an earlier version rather than Maxwell's final text. In 7(M) “The deceased Lord and Lady” is incorrect. There was only one person, a lady; and in 27(2) as well there was only a lady, not “deceased Lord or Lady. Throughout Maxwell's translations, pp. 129-135, the appellations ‘Lord and Lady’/‘Lord or Lady’ should be ignored, and all assumed to be masculine unless the name has a feminine Sanskrit ending, ‘-ī.

in her chapter on the relations between Champa and Cambodia, that scenario is unlikely.²⁶

The story goes back to the work of Georges Maspero on the history of Champa. Based on Chinese reports, Maspero wrote that a first Cham attack in 1170 failed. Then a shipwrecked Chinese officer showed them how to maneuver cavalry and shoot arrows from horseback. Thinking that this would give them an advantage over the Cambodians the Cham king tried to buy horses from Hainan but was refused, the Chinese emperor saying that it was forbidden to export horses from China.²⁷

Part of this, of course, is utter nonsense. The bas-reliefs both of Angkor Wat and of the Bayon show that the Cambodians were perfectly familiar with the use of cavalry, and if so, the Cham must have had equal familiarity. Given the divisions within Champa and the long relations between the two countries, the Cham could conceivably have obtained horses from Cambodia, if they had not already known horses as early as the Cambodians—probably the true situation. Geoff Wade's new translation of the Chinese Sung Dynasty history *Songhuiyao* shows that the Cham were very familiar with horses, and had been receiving them from China since at least the 10th century. Pictorial proof of Cham horsemanship is also seen in sculpted scenes of Cham polo players, a horseman, a horse-drawn war chariot, and general familiarity with horses in scenes on the Pedestal of the Vihāra of Đông Duong.²⁸

Then, failing to get horses, the Cham, according to Maspero, decided on a naval attack, and guided by (another?) shipwrecked Chinese, in 1177 went down the coast, then up the river (Mekong-Tonle Sap), surprised and pillaged the Cambodian capital and returned with enormous booty. Note that in this version the Cham did not remain in occupation of Angkor, as some later interpretations would have it.²⁹

This story, however, is not only expressly contradicted by the passage of the Phimeanakas inscription quoted above, that “Śrī Jaya Indravarman, king of the Cham... transporting his army

²⁶ See Jacques, p. 36 and Schweyer, p. 66.

²⁷ Georges Maspero, *Le royaume de Champa*, Réimpressions de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient, Paris [1928]1988, pp.163-64.

²⁸ Geoff Wade, “Champa in the Song Hui-yao,” paper presented at the Symposium on New Scholarship On Champa , 5-6 August 2004, Asia Research Institute, Singapore; Association Française des Amis de l'Orient (1997), *Le Musée de Sculpture Cam de Đà Nẵng*, respectively figures 124, 126, 38, 44. In the new section of the Đà Nẵng Museum, and not illustrated in the catalogue, are a small (82 cm high) sculpture (number DN 19, 10th century) of a pair of horses being ridden and guided by a single rider straddling the backs of both, just the sort of scene common among people familiar with raising and using horses; another unnumbered piece of an acrobatic dancer on a horse; and item 45-7, a horse-driven war chariot, from Binh Định, dated in the 11th-12th centuries, precisely the time of Angkor-Champa warfare,

²⁹ Maspero 1928 [1988], p.164; Jacques Népote, “Champa, propositions pour une histoire de temps long,” *Péninsule*, Nouvelle série, 26-27 (1-2), 1993, 2, p. 98.

on chariots, went to fight the country of Kambu,” but after centuries of close relations with Cambodia, both amicable and bellicose, including several invasions of their neighbor’s territory, the Cham, as Schweyer notes (p. 66), knew well all the routes into Cambodia and had no need of a shipwrecked Chinese to show them the way. Moreover, whether by land or by river, the campaign would have taken weeks, and they could not possibly have taken Angkor by surprise, a point which Jacques, p. 36, pertinently notes. This story was only credible at the time when it was believed that the Cham were remnants of an overland migration by ‘Indonesians’, and their own seafaring abilities were ignored, and when the French scholars studying Indochina considered that everything written in Chinese should be taken literally as holy writ.³⁰

Moreover, as investigations by William Southworth have shown, there seems to have been a scribal error in one of the important Chinese sources.

As Southworth wrote (personal communication), Maspero, followed by Coedès, amalgamated details from two or three Chinese texts, not all equally reliable. Their basic text seems to have been Ma Tuanlin’s *Wenxian tongkao*, translated into French by Marquis d’Hervey de Saint-Denys.³¹

Southworth notes, “The most important account however is in the Cambodia section of the *Zhu fan zhi* (2: 5), translated by Hirth and Rockhill (1911: 54). A literal translation would read: ‘[In the] 4th year [of Chunxi], 5th month, 15th day [of the lunar month, i.e. full moon – the 13th June, 1177], the ruler of Zhancheng [Champa] taking a boat army, made a surprise attack on [or ‘raided’] the capital of that country [Zhenla, Cambodia]. Requesting peace, no allowance [was made, and the people were] slaughtered.’

“The author of the *Zhu fan zhi*, Zhao Rukua, was Superintendent of merchant shipping in Fujian province, and the work is dated in the Preface to 1225 AD.

“In my opinion, the entire account in the later *Wenxian tongkao* [on which Maspero depended] is derived from this text, as whole phrases are repeated without alteration. However, neither the *Zhu fan zhi*, nor the *Song shi* or *Song huiyao*, mention anything specific about the king of Cambodia being killed, as is stated in the Zhancheng section of the *Wenxian tongkao*. In fact, the king of Cambodia is not mentioned at all in the earlier texts.

“Both Georges Maspero (1928: 164, n.5) and George Coedès (1964 & 1968: 166, n.138 – citing Maspero) state that the attack was guided by a Chinese castaway, in reference to [another Chinese text] the *Lingwai daida*. Although I have still not been able to find a copy of the Chinese text, the published translation of the *Lingwai daida* by Almut Netolitzky contains no information

³⁰ Maspero 1928 [1988], p.164, nn. 6, 8.

³¹ d’Hervey de Saint-Denys, *Ethnographie des peuples étrangers à la Chine, ouvrage composé au XIII^e siècle de notre ère par Ma-Touan-lin*, vol.II, Méridionaux, Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1883.

whatever on the attack of 1177. Indeed, in his notes to the Champa section, Netolitzky states that: ‘The naval victory which in 1177 decided the conflict between Champa and Cambodia which had lasted many years, was attributed by Coedès to this Chinese official’. As Coedès refers to the translation in Maspero of this context of the *LWTT*, it is clear that he was in error.³²

“None of the other texts mentioned above contain any information about a Chinese castaway in 1177, and in my opinion this is simply a confusion made by Maspero with the earlier account of the trade in horses in 1173, led by a Chinese castaway from Fujian, which is mentioned in detail in the *Lingwai daida*.³³ The account of Maspero in general deviates markedly from the sources, and is highly fanciful.”

It must be concluded that the Chinese texts which were the origin of the story found in Maspero and Coedès confirm that there was Champa-Cambodia warfare in 1177, in which the Cham used boats, but not the death of a Cambodian king, nor occupation by the Cham, and certainly not with a Chinese guide. It is not even certain that the 1177 attack recorded by the Chinese went as far as Angkor.

Thus the best version of the Cham attack on Angkor is that of the Phimeanakas inscription which says they came overland.

There is still uncertainty, however, about the warfare, and the supposed occupation of Angkor by the Cham. The standard modern historical synthesis has been that the Cham victory was in 1177, that it caused much destruction, and was followed by a four-year occupation. The 1177 date is based only on the uncertain Chinese sources, and the four-year occupation has been inferred from the inscriptions of Jayavarman VII which record his enthronement in *śaka* 1104 (previously 1103/1181 now reinterpreted as 1182/3—see above), assumed to have been not long after his final victory over the Cham. The assumed four-year occupation led to suppositions of looting and destruction of temples, for which, as Jacques reasonably insists, there is no evidence.

In fact, the date of the great Cham invasion is uncertain—even the nature and extent of the warfare is uncertain, as is the date, location, and results of Jayavarman’s final victory. Jacques insists, and here I am in complete agreement, that the warfare involving Champa and Cambodia in the latter half of the 12th century was not just Champa against Cambodia, but groups of Cham and Khmer struggling against other groups of Cham and Khmer. At least, it is certain from contemporary inscriptions that Jayavarman was supported by Cham allies in his final victories over presumably Khmer enemies.

³² Netolitzky, Almut. 1977. Das Ling-wai Tai-ta von Chou Ch’ü-fei, eine Landeskunde Südchinas aus dem 12. Jahrhundert. (Münchener Ostasiatische Studien, Band 21). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, p. 224, n.11.

³³ Netolitzky 1977: 37.

Where was Jayavarman's final victory over his enemies led by a king of Champa?

For Jacques the final battle between Jayavarman and the Chams was at the site of the future Preah Khan temple at Angkor, which he believes had been the location of the palace of Yaśovarman and Tribhūvanādityavarman at a time when the old royal palace at Angkor was unoccupied. This is one of the points which is purely speculative. Thus Jacques gives little importance to the naval battle scenes on the Bayon reliefs, which have previously been interpreted, for example by Groslier, as the Cham invasion and as Jayavarman's final victories over the Cham.³⁴ The inscriptions of Jayavarman VII, the source of Jacques' interpretations, however, in addition to being sometimes in obscure Sanskrit verse with more than a single possibility of interpretation, are inconsistent even when literal meanings may be inferred. In *Bayon* Jacques relies mostly on the Preah Khan and Phimeanakas inscriptions, but the Prasat Chrung inscriptions suggest different versions of Jayavarman's victory over the Cham.

Coedès once thought the final victory over the Cham was a naval battle, but that the Cham kings Jaya Indravarman 'IV', the presumed leader of the invasion, and a later Jaya Indravarman 'V' were both killed in the 1190s in Champa. However, in his interpretation of the Preah Khan inscription, Coedès, like Jacques now, felt that the final battle, where the Cham king was killed, was on the site of the future Preah Khan. In his work on the Chrung inscriptions Coedès, in different contexts, proposed both that the king of Champa was killed later in Champa by his younger brother Vidyānanda, the Cham prince loyal to Jayavarman VII, and by Jayavarman VII;³⁵ and now Jacques, in contrast to all the above, says Jayavarman VII "came to Angkor, defeated the Chams and killed their king, Jaya-Indravarman" (p. 37), apparently, between 1177 and 1182, in the final battle at the site of future Preah Khan.

There is confusion in Jacques' treatment of Jayavarman's return to Angkor after the Cham invasion and his defeat of the Cham king. Was this immediately after the Cham invasion of 1177, as implied by Jayavarman's supposed residence at Kompong Svay, about 100 km distant, or sometime later in the five-year period between the invasion and Jayavarman's enthronement in 1182?

Indeed the sources, and interpretations, concerning the Cham invasion and the death of the Cham king(s) are confusing, and Jacques has relied on only K.908 at Preah Khan. There is even uncertainty about the identity of the Cham king who was killed in Cambodia between 1177 and 1182.

As seen in Schweyer's chapter (p. 66), Coedès, following Maspero, was mistaken in amalgamating two Jaya Indravarmans of Champa (Jaya Indravarman of Grāmapura and Jaya Indravarman *oṅ vatuv*) into Jaya Indravarman IV. It would seem to be the first who led the campaign(s) against

³⁴ Groslier, "Inscriptions du Bayon."

³⁵ G. Coedès, *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et d'Indonésie*. Nouvelle édition revue et mise à jour. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1964, pp. 247, 252, 310.

Cambodia which overthrew Tribhūvanādityavarman and attacked Angkor, but his last dates in the Champa records are 1163, 1164, 1165, 1167, 1168, 1170, and possibly 1183.

Thus Jaya Indravarman of Grāmapura may have still been alive in Champa in the 1180s, and Oñ Vatuv was active in the 1190s.

When all the relevant sources are considered it is difficult to say which Cham king invaded Angkor, and where or when he was killed. The Preah Khan inscription, on which Jacques relied, has no definite statement, and Jacques' interpretation is based on hypothetical interpretations of the very convoluted Sanskrit verse.

The confusion may be a result of the political situation of the time. Jayavarman VII had been victorious in a power struggle in which he, after a long sojourn in Champa, accompanied by Cham allies, pursued his enemies into Cambodia and defeated them. But then, as new king of the Khmer, he minimized his own Champa background and presented himself as a savior of the Khmer against Cham enemies.

Given the incompatible sources, the precise circumstances of the conflicts among Khmer and Cham in the 1160s and 1170s leading to the triumph of Jayavarman VII, must remain vague.

Jacques concludes the section on Jayavarman's reconquest of Cambodia with a brief comment on his later interventions in Champa, after 1190, with the remark (p. 40) that "it is sufficient here to say that Jayavarman's projects in central Champa were not successful," contrary to the standard treatment which treats them as a conquest and occupation of Champa until ca. 1220. Here Jacques was perhaps influenced by the treatment of Schweyer who shows that the sources are not all compatible (see details in the chapter by Schweyer, pp. 68-69).

Jacques' chosen interpretation, which is not in itself unreasonable, permits an excursus into a new treatment of another area which is much less acceptable.

Focusing on Jayavarman's constructions in northeastern and western Thailand, Jacques implies they were undertaken after disappointments in Champa, that is, after 1190. This will not do for the hospitals in the Northeast whose inscriptions date them to 1186-7. Jacques also suggests that there was association with some kind of Thai or Mon principalities who were *yavana*, and that the *yavana* mentioned in the Preah Khan inscription were not Vietnamese, as Coedès thought, but Thai (p. 40).

This will certainly be incomprehensible to all but specialist students, and the following is an attempt to explain it.³⁶

³⁶ On this subject Jacques has published "Deux problèmes posés par l'inscription de la stèle de Praḥ Khan K.908," *Aséanie* 15, June 2005, pp. 11-31.

To understand the problem, the reader must know that the Cham, in their inscriptions, referred to Viet Nam as *yavana*, abbreviated to *yuan* (pron. 'yuan'), and Jacques accepts that in Champa inscriptions these terms always mean 'Viet'. The word *yuan* is also found in one Khmer inscription of the early 10th century (K.105) referring to a person, and in Cambodia studies it has also been interpreted as 'Viet'.

There is also a dialect, and its speakers, in northern Thailand called 'Thai yuan', ethno-linguistically Thai, not Vietnamese. There the derivation of the term seems to be from *yonaka*, not *yavana*. Both the names *yavana* and *yonaka* have been adapted from ancient Indian semi-mythical geography, the first in Hindu-Sanskrit literature and the second in Buddhist-Pali. In India they were paired with *kamboja* on India's distant northwestern frontier, and *yavana/yonaka* is believed derived from Ionian, referring to early contacts with Greeks from the time of Alexander the Great.³⁷

Later, as influence from India permeated Southeast Asia, elements of Indian mythical geography were displaced in local literature. 'Champa' was first an area in ancient India, not far up the Ganges, and the Cham, having in their travels become familiar with India, probably adopted it because their own ancient name for themselves, now unknown, was phonetically similar, and they then gave the name *yavana* to a region on their distant northern frontier and the people within it.³⁸ Gandhara was displaced in Thai and Burmese tradition to Yunnan; while in Buddhist Burma and in what is now central Thailand, the name *kamboja*, paired in Indian geography with *yavana*, was given to parts of their central regions, where it sometimes became confused with *kambujā* (Cambodia), a name devised at Angkor, and of quite different origin etymologically and historically from *kamboja*.³⁹ Then the northern frontier of *kamboja* became *yonaka*, and some of its Thai inhabitants *yuan*. Thus the term *yuan* in northern Thai usage has a different referent from its usage in Cham and Khmer. It must be emphasized that the term *yavana* has never been associated with the Thai Yuan.

The only Angkor inscriptions in which the term *yavana* occurs are K.908 of Preah Khan, where it appears twice, and in K.287, Prasat Chrung, and it has always been translated as 'Viet', but Jacques found that interpretation puzzling, because in both Preah Khan contexts the *yavana* appear subordinate to Angkor, which Jacques believes historically impossible, considering that the Vietnamese were always militarily stronger and the aggressors against their southern neighbors.

³⁷ Romila Thapar, *A History of India*, Vol. I, Penguin Books, 1966, p. 102, note.

³⁸ For the name 'cham' see Rolf Stein, *Le Lin-Yi, sa localisation, sa contribution à la formation du Champa et ses liens avec la Chine*. In *Han-Hiue, Bulletin du Centre d'Études Sinologiques de Peking, volume II, Peking*, 1947, p. 234, n. 223; and see maps in Thapar, pp. 61, 81.

³⁹ This is explained in detail in Michael Vickery, "Cambodia After Angkor, the Chronicular Evidence for the Fourteenth to Sixteenth Centuries," Yale University, Ph.D., December 1977. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, University Microfilms, pp. 369-377.

He accepts, however, that in the Chrung inscription Vietnamese are meant.

In his article on the subject, (note 36 above) Jacques, p. 16, seems troubled by the stanza of the Preah Khan inscription, saying that the ‘king of the Yavana’ was one of several who sent water to Angkor for a ceremonial ablution, and was thus in an inferior position to Jayavarman VII, and on his p. 25 Jacques says that Coedès, thinking of this, was reluctant to consider “the Vietnamese as vassals of the Khmer,” as though one should accept such claims in that type of source as a statement of political fact.

Jacques was taking that stanza literally, because the Sanskrit verses, “which are addressed directly to the gods [This is in fact hypothetical]... did not record counterfactual statements,” a conclusion negated by Jacques himself in his treatment (*ibid*, p. 20) of an inscription of Indravarman I (877-893), also a Sanskrit poem presumably, by Jacques’ logic, also addressed directly to the gods, as ‘exaggerated’. Yes, wildly so, and certainly a ‘counterfactual statement’ in its claim that Indravarman’s edicts “formed a crown on the proud heads of the kings of China, Champa and the island of Yava.”

Thus the passage in Preah Khan in no way permits an inference that ‘*yavana*’ there must mean other than Viet Nam. It shows rather that this inscription, like the earlier one of Indravarman, was perhaps exaggerating. And Jacques accepts that in the Champa inscriptions ‘*yavana*’ always means Viet Nam.

At the time, however, (late 12th-early 13th centuries) ‘Viet Nam’ was not the powerful aggressor against its neighbors portrayed as a constant in French colonial historiography. Champa was still contesting territory far into what is now northern Viet Nam (Nghê An); and the northern provinces of Quảng Bình and Quảng Trị were still more Cham than Vietnamese.⁴⁰ Jayavarman, during his years in Champa, might well have been involved in victorious Cham attacks northward, and probably considered, in the 1190s, that the ‘*yavana*’ there were inferior to his Cambodia. Jacques is quite mistaken (*ibid*, p. 26) to say that at the time of the Preah Khan inscription, the Khmers were “in an inferior position.” At the time Viet Nam was confined to the far North of what is now northern Viet Nam, and in no position to threaten Cambodia. Viet Nam was even, often, militarily inferior to Champa, as at the end of the 14th century (1360s-1390s) when the Cham nearly conquered all of Viet Nam. Maspero, and Coedès, who on Champa slavishly followed Maspero, simply followed the colonial paradigm of a nasty Viet Nam aggressing all its neighbors who were saved by the French.

And, whatever the relative strengths of Jayavarman’s Cambodia and the Đái Việt, Jayavarman’s long close association with some Champa faction, who were more familiar than the Cambodians with Viet Nam, meant that he would have taken the Cham usage of “*yavana*” for his own.

⁴⁰ Michael Vickery, *Champa Revised*.

Jacques' explanation (*ibid.*, pp. 26-27) of the origin in India of the term “*yavana*,” whatever its accuracy, is irrelevant. There is no way to infer that for the Cham “*yavana*” were barbarian or “illiterate,” or *mleccha*, which in one inscription are mentioned separately. Or, if Jacques is correct about that, it means that in the 12th-13th centuries, the Cham and the Khmer really did consider the Vietnamese as crude uncivilized barbarians, who were still politically inferior and in principle subject to domination.

And if in theory, “The Khmer could have used the same term “*yavana*,” become “*yuan*,” to designate the Thai”, there is absolutely no evidence that they really did, certainly not in the 12th century; and nowhere in the Thai area has *yavana* ever been used for the Thai Yuan. At that time, the kings of Angkor were fully occupied with relations with Champa, Viet Nam, and possibly Lavo (still a Khmer area), and it is difficult to imagine that they had any relations with the “Thai Yuan” at all.

In Jacques' next section, “A Glance at Angkorian history until the 14th Century,” he insists that much of the architecture hitherto attributed to Jayavarman VII was really work of his successors Indravarman II (1218?-1270), also a Buddhist, and Jayavarman VIII (1270-1295), a very anti-Buddhist Hindu.

Here I shall only discuss a few points on which there seem to be solid contributions by architects and art historians, but the reader must be warned that all of Jacques comments on architectural work by Indravarman and Jayavarman VIII are hypothetical and not yet supported by architectural research, rather the contrary where architects have committed themselves, on which see the chapter by Olivier Cunin and comment on Cunin below.

For Jacques the obvious destruction of Buddhist images in the great temples of Jayavarman VII, which must post-date his reign, may only be attributed to Jayavarman VIII, because of his supposed fervent Hinduism. A problem here is that no inscription has been preserved from the time of Jayavarman VIII, and there is no firm evidence on his religious orientation.

The inscriptions from the reigns of the successors of Jayavarman VIII, which name him, do tend to show him as a patron of Hinduism, but they were all erected by high-ranking Hindu officials who also treat the kings Śrindravarman (1295-1307) and Śrindrajayavarman (1307-1327) as patrons of Hinduism, although both of those kings set up their own inscriptions (K.144, K.217, K.754 and K.930) indicating a preference for Buddhism.

As examples of post-Jayavarman VIII inscriptions, we may take first K.300, written in the time of the last known king of Angkor Jayavarma Parameśvara (1327-?), truly a Hinduist.⁴¹ It is the genealogy of a family of brahmans going back, in the reading of Barth and Bergaigne, to the

⁴¹ This is the way he is conventionally named in modern scholarship. In the only Khmer inscription which mentions him (K.470) he is called Jayavarmadeva Parameśvara.

time of Jayavarman VII, but according to Finot and Coedès, to Jayavarman VIII.⁴² In any case there is little information about the latter. An interesting point about this inscription is that, written by and about brahmins, and entirely Hindu, it makes even Śrīndravarman and Śrīndrajayavarman appear as patrons of Hinduism, although we know of their Buddhism through their own inscriptions.

Another inscription of this type is K.567, found at the ‘Maṅgalartha’ temple which was built by Jayavarman VIII for a member of a family of Brahmins.⁴³ As in K.300, Śrīndravarman and Śrīndrajayavarman appear as patrons of Hinduism in the same way as Jayavarman VIII.

Inscription K.569 is from Banteay Srei and was set up by Śrīndravarman in honor of a favorite minister, a brahmin, who had also served Jayavarman VIII, and who was of the lineage of Yajñavarāha, another brahmin, considered as the builder of Banteay Srei in the 10th century. Thus, because of the subject, once more, everyone concerned appears brahmanical—even King Śrīndravarman who showed his preference for Buddhism in another famous inscription (K.754, partly in Pali and the first royal Theravada foundation).

All of these inscriptions, because written by or concerning highly-placed brahmins, appear Hinduist, even though two of the kings concerned left evidence of their Buddhism in other inscriptions. They are not proof of fanatic Hinduism and anti-Buddhist sentiments on the part of Jayavarman VIII; and they are the only sources on him which we have.

Other evidence which Jacques alleges as proof of the anti-Buddhism of Jayavarman VIII is the ‘cemetery’ of Buddhist images discovered in front of the temple of Banteay Kdei, also mentioned by Hiram Woodward in the Foreword to this book. Peter Sharrock, however (p. 233, n. 7), says that some of those images show 14th-century iconography, and he proposes that the anti-Buddhist vandalism may have been the work of the last king known from an inscription, Jayavarma Parameśvara, undoubtedly Hindu who, moreover, left a dated inscription (K.470) at the Bayon.⁴⁴

Thus, I think we must conclude that the date of, and impulse for, the destruction of Buddhist images after the reign of Jayavarman VII have still not been adequately explained.

Jacques continues (p. 42) with comment on the successor of Jayavarman VIII and the shift to Theravada Buddhism, “according to a Pali inscription (K.754), the official introduction of

⁴² M.A. Barth and Abel Bergaigne, *Inscriptions sanscrites du Cambodge; Inscriptions sanscrites de Campā. Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Volumes 27, pt. 1, no. LXV, 1885, p. 560; Finot, L., “Inscriptions d’Angkor ...8. Kapilapura...”, *BEFEO* 25 (1925, 3-4), pp. 297-407.

⁴³ This site is now named “Nagar Dham, monument 487” in the new Corpus des Inscriptions Khmères of the Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient.

⁴⁴ Note again that because the publisher did not reproduce Sharrock’s final version, the comments in his note 7, based on an earlier note of mine on Jayavarman VIII, attributing possible Hinayana sympathies to Jayavarman VIII, must be ignored.

Theravada Buddhism has been attributed to this king [Śrīndravarman]. This is to ignore the fact that other inscriptions [which I discussed above] celebrate him as a pious Śivaite,” because they were all set up by Hinduists. Jacques attempts to make the point that the inscription, in his view, shows Mahayanist tendencies, but he is certainly correct that “the shift from Hinduism and from Mahayana to Theravada occurred in a more complex fashion than has been generally believed.” In Coedès’ publication of the inscription, however, there is nothing about “giving food three times a day to the Buddha,” a Mahayanist tradition according to Jacques.

This inscription is interesting for itself, and since it has been evoked by Jacques in this way, it might be worthwhile to add more about the first long Theravada Pali inscription, K.754/AD1308, set up by the king who followed Jayavarman VIII.

This inscription begins with 10 verses in Pali and continues with 31 lines of Khmer, and it is thus in the same form as the older inscriptions which begin with one part in Sanskrit and a second part in Khmer.⁴⁵ The Pali part, also like the older Hinduist Sanskrit inscriptions, begins with an expression of respect for deities and religious objects, here the Buddha (Jina), the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha. The king’s name is Sirisirindavamma (Pali form of Śrī Śrīndravarman). A statue of Buddha was set up and laborers, both men and women, were given. The statements about people given to the temple to work are just like similar sections in older Hindu inscriptions. Ordinary workers are still called *si* and *tai*, and some have derogatory names. This inscription shows no change in the structure of society, in spite of the new religion. It argues against the speculations by some modern scholars that Theravada Buddhism came to Cambodia unobtrusively via lower-class ‘subversives’, “probably prisoners, laborers, merchants, and some accompanying monks,” and would have represented a sort of “superbolshevism,” or “beggars’ democracy.” There is absolutely no evidence of an “anarchic spirit of Singhalese Buddhism,” “a revolutionary faith subverting the status quo.”⁴⁶ Indeed, this inscription suggests that the ruling elite saw in the Theravada doctrine of rebirth according to accumulated merit, as it is interpreted in Southeast Asia today, a justification for the positions of king and ruling class in the status quo more effective than Mahāyāna.⁴⁷

⁴⁵ See Michael Vickery, “Cambodia and its Neighbors in the 15th Century,” Asia Research Institute Working Paper Series No. 27, Singapore, 2004; www.ari.nus.edu.sg/docs/wps/wps04_027.pdf; and www.ari.nus.edu.sg/pub/wps2004.htm.

⁴⁶ L.P. Briggs, *The Ancient Khmer Empire* 1951: 259, referring to Louis Finot, “Les Études indochinoises,” *Bulletin de L’École Française d’Extrême-Orient* VIII (1908), pp. 221-233; “Beggars’ Democracy” from Harry J. Benda, “The Structure of Southeast Asian History: Some Preliminary Observations.” *The Journal of Southeast Asian History* Vol. 3, No. 1 (March 1962), pp. 121-122.

⁴⁷ This idea was reinforced by Chris Baker’s review of Peter Jackson’s *Buddhadāsa*, whose rejection of “the whole business of acquiring merit for a future life... undermined the traditional thinking which justified the rule of the king

Returning to the Bayon period in “*Remarks on the history of some monuments at Angkor from Jayavarman VII’s reign*,” Jacques repeats that much of the work hitherto attributed to Jayavarman VII was really carried out by his successors, in particular Indravarman (1218?-1270). Most of this contradicts earlier architectural studies of the temples, and, with respect to the Bayon, is seriously put in doubt by Cunin in this book.

One of the first new proposals is that “the city of Angkor Thom centered on the Bayon apparently was one of his first creations.” Coedès, on the contrary, in his study of the Chrung inscriptions at the corners of the walls, believed that those inscriptions, and the walls, were the last constructions of the city, and more pertinently, Stern, in his study of the Bayon style, considered that the walled city was of the second period of the Bayon style, after the first period of Ta Prohm and Preah Khan.⁴⁸

Jacques denies that the Bayon could have been completed by Jayavarman VII, and proposes that much of the work was continued by the next king, Indravarman. Thus it would have been Indravarman who was responsible for the religious change seen by Stern in the second phase of the Bayon, which “he called the “great religious reform,” paying particular attention to Lokeśvara and his cult.⁴⁹

In particular (p.48) Jacques argues that it was Indravarman who had the tower faces sculpted. In doing this he distorts what was written by Stern, saying, “Philippe Stern considered that the decoration of the Bayon belonged to his third period, which was still inspired by Buddhism, and which must therefore belong to *this king* [emphasis added]. So it is possible to attribute to him the invention of towers with faces – in fact so mysterious that the divinity shown in this way is not surely identified.” The ‘third period’ in question here was Stern’s third period of the ‘Bayon style’, not the third period, or stage, of the Bayon’s construction. Stern’s ‘third period’ of the Bayon style,

and the existence of social hierarchy, in terms of unequal merit,” and which “laid him open to attack from conservatives who... especially feared the political implications” and who “branded BuddhadEsa as a Mahayanist Trojan horse who would destroy the Theravada tradition” (Chris Baker, “Rethinking Buddhism.” *Bangkok Post*, 15 March, 2003, p. E; Peter Jackson, *Buddhadāsa, Theravada Buddhism and Modernist Reform in Thailand*. Chiang Mai, Silkworm Books, 2003. This elitist view of Theravada permeates the 16th-18th-century ‘modern’ inscriptions of Angkor Wat (*IMA*), and was explicit in the political propaganda of the founders of Sihanouk’s *Sangkum* movement in 1955 (Michael Vickery, “Looking Back at Cambodia [1945-1974],” in Ben Kiernan and Chantou Boua, eds., *Peasants and Politics in Kampuchea 1942- 1981*, London, Zed Press, 1982, pp. 89-113).

⁴⁸ Coedès, (*Inscriptions du Cambodge* IV, pp. 207-209); P. Stern, *Les Monuments du Style du Bâyon et Jayavarman VII*, Publication du Musée Guimet, Recherches et Documents d’Art et d’Archéologie, Tome IX, Presse Universitaire de France, Paris 1965, p. 106.

⁴⁹ Readers must note the difference between temporal periods of the ‘Bayon style’, and temporal stages in construction of the Bayon. In the terminology established by Stern, and not always followed clearly by Jacques, ‘Bayon style’ meant

when tower faces, still, for Stern Buddhist, first appeared, included all of the now visible Bayon, and ‘this king’, for Stern, was Jayavarman VII.

Jacques’ peculiar proposal that the divinity of the tower faces is “still not identified with any certainty” (p. 48) is to prepare the reader for the further proposal that Jayavarman VIII added the towers 24, 28, 32, 36; that as a fervent anti-Buddhist he could not have had Buddhist faces sculpted; and that therefore he would not have considered that the already existing faces had any Buddhist identity. “We can therefore question the identity of the faces... if Jayavarman VIII had added faces to the new towers, or even if he had tolerated the existing faces, he certainly would not have believed that the faces represented the Buddha or Lokeśvara. Therefore these faces must have been interpreted differently, depending on whether one was Buddhist or Hinduist.”

Here Jacques opposes other modern students of the question, except Ang Choulean in this book, who all have accepted that there is some type of Buddhist identity in the faces. The architectural arguments against Jacques’ conception are in Cunin’s chapter, and noted below.

Another excursus by Jacques into architectural history concerns the 16 *vraḥ kuṭi* passageways and the corner galleries with towers 24, 28, 32, and 36 which changed the plan of the Bayon from cruciform to square. Jacques first says, following Dumarçay, that the corners with towers numbered 24, 28, 32 and 36, and galleries joining them to the existing towers were added in the third stage of the Bayon’s construction.⁵⁰ Then, because the inscriptions at the outer doorways of five of the passageways contain names of the Jayabuddhamahānātha or Buddha Ratnatraya, often followed by the name of the “Medicine” Buddha, Bhaiṣajyaguru, established by Jayavarman VII close by all the hospitals of the empire, and all of which were divinities which appear in Cambodia as creations of Jayavarman VII, dating from the first part of his reign, therefore it is likely that the *vraḥ kuṭi* belonged to the initial plan of the Bayon, implying that the *vraḥ kuṭi* passageways were built before the corner towers and had no connection with them. It is no doubt because of the importance of these deities for Jayavarman VII, that Jacques insists the removal of these passageways could not have occurred under him and must be attributed to Jayavarman VIII. Then Jacques goes on to say that “the demolition of these *kuṭi* might have been made at the same time as new towers and galleries of the second floor were built in order to change the cruciform plan into a square one,” that is in the third stage of construction as proposed by Dumarçay; “One can even imagine that the blocks of stone from these “chapels” were re-used for new constructions.”

that seen in all the monuments of Jayavarman VII, of which Stern considered that construction of Ta Prohm and Preah Khan began before the Bayon which, in his view, was begun in the second period of the ‘Bayon style’ defined by the earlier temples, and completed in the third period. The later stages in construction of the Bayon itself belong to the third period of the Bayon style.

⁵⁰ J. Dumarçay, *Le Bayon. Histoire architecturale du temple*. Paris, 1973.

Indeed Jacques imagined; and all of this is denied by Cunin (p. 199) who believes that those four towers were a second stage of the Bayon's construction, following soon after the first stage and showing sandstone with the same magnetic susceptibility; and he has shown definitely that the 16 passageways could only have been constructed after those towers and the four corners which changed the plan of the Bayon from a cross to a square. A look at the plan of the Bayon (p. 178) shows the reader that eight of the passageways, B, C, F, G, J, K, N, O, connect directly to those four towers; and, in the words of Cunin (p. 170), "Finally, the indisputable presence of vestiges of passageway BY(C) on the base of tower BY.24 definitively quashes Jacques' hypothesis that Jayavarman VIII [or earlier Jayavarman VII—MV] built the right-angle galleries of the lower level of the second floor with materials resulting from the dismantling of the 'passage galleries'. Quite clearly the Khmer architects could not possibly have constructed the base of these galleries, as well as the galleries themselves, with materials resulting from the dismantling of buildings which partly stood on these very same bases."

Jacques' remark on the importance of the passageway inscriptions to Jayavarman VII is pertinent, and because the architects are in agreement that the passageways were a late addition, in the third phase of the Bayon, Jacques proposal here tends to support my suggestion below (p. 168) that those may have been the first of the Bayon inscriptions, although not, as proposed by Jacques, in the first stage of construction of the Bayon.

Like Maxwell, Jacques states that these inscriptions "allow us to have a general idea of the organization of the temple," but as with other aspects of his treatment of the reign of Jayavarman VII, he introduces new points of view. Contrary to Maxwell, who sees these inscriptions as the work of people in the time of Jayavarman VII, Jacques says, "it remains clear that some of the texts could well have been inscribed after the reign of Jayavarman VII, and some of them later still," but he provides no evidence, and the unified palaeography of the inscriptions argues against it (quotations from p. 45).

Although not giving it emphasis here, Jacques in an earlier publication has insisted that the inner gallery bas-reliefs (see Roveda), which show many Hindu scenes, must have been the work of Jayavarman VIII, whereas Sharrock suggests that a better candidate would be Jayavarma Parameśvara (1327-?), the last known king of Angkor, and Roveda advances the opinion that they date from various periods.⁵¹

All that is certain about possible changes to the Bayon after Jayavarman VII is that most images of the Buddha in his major temples were refashioned to appear Hinduist at some time after the temples had been built as Buddhist. French scholars, who considered wars of religion,

⁵¹ Claude Jacques, *Les derniers siècles d'Angkor*, Comptes rendus de janvier-mars de l'Académie des Inscriptions & Belles-lettres, De Boccard, Paris, pp. 367-390; Sharrock, p. 233; Roveda, p. 285.

after the western experiences, as normal, assumed Jayavarman VIII responsible because they thought that he had returned to Hinduism. The entire history of Cambodia up to that time, however, shows peaceful coexistence of Hinduism and Buddhism.

Although ever since vandalism of Buddha images after Jayavarman VII was recognized, dominant opinion has been that it was the work of a later Hinduist king, a new proposal from art historian Hiram Woodward is that the first signs of Theravada are in the reign of Jayavarman VII.⁵²

I find Woodward's proposals here extremely interesting. If the turn toward Theravada Buddhism was already within the lifetime of Jayavarman VII, it would perhaps mean that some of the so-called vandalism of Mahāyāna Buddhist images in Jayavarman's temples was his own work of modification, the result of a change in his own religion, or in later reigns of Theravada kings opposed to Mahāyāna, or simple vandalism in even later centuries (it is certain that there was much activity in Angkor in the 16th century).⁵³

There are two more subjects in Jacques' chapter which merit comment here, first, the proposal that in the anti-Buddhist reaction of Jayavarman VIII the original Buddha image of the central tower was replaced by a Harihara (half Śiva, half Viṣṇu), which occasioned construction of the shrines devoted to Pārvatī and Dharaṇī; and second, the forty-two small inscriptions in the Bayon, on which Jacques has presented new ideas, and which are the subject of Maxwell's chapter.

As Jacques writes (p. 48), the central "statue of the Buddha [was] replaced by one of Harihara, identifiable by the fact that, in the chapels situated on each side of the entry to the central sanctuary there was, according to the 'small inscriptions', a statue of Pārvatī, "wife" of Śiva (inscription 29, chapel 11, to the right of the main divinity) and a statue of Dharaṇī, 'wife' of Viṣṇu (inscription 40, chapel 10, to the left of the divinity). These statues were certainly not there when the Buddha was in the main sanctuary."

It is unduly speculative to say that the central Buddha in the Bayon was replaced by a Harihara, just because the two small chapels on either side of the entry housed Pārvatī and Dharaṇī, whose images no longer exist. Given the religious tolerance seen throughout Angkor history, Maxwell insists, correctly, I think, on syncretism; and the numerous Śivaite and Viṣṇuite images and inscriptions throughout the original Bayon itself (not part of the post-Jayavarman VII anti-Buddhist reaction), show the impossibility of stating so definitely as Jacques that "These statues

⁵² Hiram W. Woodward, "Practice and Belief in Ancient Cambodia: Claude Jacques' Angkor and the Devarāja Question," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 32(2), 2001, pp. 249-261; Hiram W. Woodward, (2004:329-54) "Esoteric Buddhism in Southeast Asia in the Light of Recent Scholarship" *Journal of Southeast Asian studies* 35.2, 2004, pp. 329-54.

⁵³ Sachidanand Sahai, *The Bayon*, Bangkok, Lotus Books, p. 24, rejects this proposal of Woodward, saying, "the entire reconstruction is based on 'hard-to-interpret details'."

were certainly not there when the Buddha was in the main sanctuary.” As Jacques himself noted (p. 48), “one must admire the splendid tolerance for all religions on the part of Jayavarman VII.” Hiram W. Woodward has also argued that the nāga-protected Buddha was at that time the supreme Buddha, which, if so, given the syncretism and tolerance of Khmer religion since pre-Angkor times, could mean that Pārvaṭī and Dharaṇī were simply there as worshippers, or devotees of the Buddha, not as indicators of Harihara.⁵⁴

Maxwell, similarly, has proposed (p. 109) that those inscriptions naming Pārvaṭī and Dharaṇī indicated that the central image was in a sense ‘Harihara’, but that the concept of *harihara* was within the original nāga-protected Buddha image as superior to Śiva and Viṣṇu.

This may seem questionable, for the Khmer had been familiar with representations of Harihara since the 7th-8th centuries, with several well-preserved images, but it was not given much prominence thereafter. One late Angkor Harihara was established at Wat Phu (inscription K.366 dated 1139 in the reign of Sūryavarman II). It says, in Sanskrit, that a copper image of Harihara was installed, and in Khmer a Śaṅkara-Nārāyaṇa, another name for Harihara, in 1132.

Thus, a Harihara in the Bayon in the 12th century is not inconceivable, but the two inscriptions naming Pārvaṭī and Dharaṇī, of which the latter is still intact, given the similarity of script in all the inscriptions, and the manner in which these two were indited in reserved spaces, must have been there from the time when the Bayon was Buddhist, and when the practice of adding such inscriptions first began, as will be discussed below.⁵⁵

One might think that the question could be resolved in a palaeographic study of the small inscriptions. On this Jacques says (p. 45), “I would like to be able to say that palaeography allows me to establish a better chronological classification of these texts. Some of them have a very square calligraphy, thought to be characteristic of the epoch of Jayavarman VII, while others are more rounded. In fact, a very precise palaeographic study should be done, but it will be rather difficult, because it seems that inside the script types, square or rounded, differences are not very significant and that often the script was dependent on the engraver.” Here, however, Jacques is not confining himself to the Bayon, but is referring comparatively to the inscriptions in all of Jayavarman’s temples. Some at Ta Prohm indeed show a style, “more rounded,” different from those in the Bayon.

Coedès, who published the first, and still only, study touching on this point, said that the inscriptions of Jayavarman VII in monuments of Bayon style showed that they were of that time.

⁵⁴ Hiram W. Woodward, Jr., “Tantric Buddhism at Angkor Thom,” *Ars Orientalia* 12, 1981, pp. 57-67. See also Sahai, *The Bayon*, where the Harihara hypothesis is denied.

⁵⁵ As Sahai, *The Bayon*, p. 43, has written, they are “inscriptions for which space was reserved and a panel anticipated [and] are supposed to be the original texts dating to Jayavarman VII’s reign.” Presumably the Pārvaṭī inscription, now badly damaged and illegible, would have been of the same type as Dharaṇī.

In particular, for the Bayon itself, “the inscriptions are certainly all of the same period—one could almost say by the same hand.”⁵⁶

Other questionable comments by Jacques on some of the small inscriptions concern the religious identity of the decor on structures at the cardinal points of the temple, as in the ‘cloisters’ at Preah Khan. At least tower 20 in the North of the Bayon is certainly Śivaite, and tower 19 on the West Viṣṇuite, in both cases seen clearly in the sculpted images, whereas at Preah Khan Jacques makes the identification on the basis of a single inscription in each location, Śrī Cāmpesvara in the West and Śivapāda in the North. The South cloister of Preah Khan, according to Jacques, was for ‘dead kings’, but the single royal name, Yaśovarman is insufficient justification for that interpretation.

Developing this conception further, Jacques wishes to argue that the small inscriptions in these towers of the Bayon, must have had the same identity. In his words, “one can say, thanks to some useful small inscriptions, that to the east the divinities are apparently Buddhist, to the west Viṣṇuite, etc,” including “Jayacampeśvara [inscription 26(19)], a form of Viṣṇu for a long time venerated in Cambodia,” and “to the north, Jayabhadreśvara, a form of Śiva,” Here Jacques has allowed himself to be influenced by his imagination. There are no inscriptions with Buddhist identity in the East; if Jayacampeśvara is undoubtedly Viṣṇuite, the ten *kamrateñ jagat* in the inscription 2(63) of the western entry, to which Jacques was referring, show no particular Viṣṇuite identity, and a particularly egregious invention is “Jaya-Harivarmeśvara, a name unknown among the Khmer gods, in the western sanctuary of the Bayon central tower.”⁵⁷ This Viṣṇuite name, which Jacques says was to commemorate the Champa ally of Jayavarman VII, King Jaya-Harivarman, is Jacques’ new reading of inscription 35 (6), which Coedès found completely illegible. It is a single line engraved over and across the original decor, thus one of the late additions. Equally dubious is ‘Jayabhadreśvara’, which has never before been read by anyone, and the precise location of which Jacques did not specify.

For these previously unknown names to be accepted, according to standard academic practice, Jacques should demonstrate that he has found old rubbings, pre-1918 when Coedès found them illegible, which have enabled him to read them. Certainly he has not been able to read them directly from the stone. A few such cases of missing inscriptions legible in old rubbings, exist. As noted below (pp. 171), inscription 24B (21) is now totally effaced, but a rubbing made in 1918 has been published with eight perfectly legible lines.

⁵⁶ See discussion of these inscriptions in Maxwell.

⁵⁷ For the names in the inscriptions on the East side, and in 2 (63) see Maxwell, p. 123.

Anne-Valérie Schweyer and Champa

The importance of relations with Champa throughout the 12th century, and in particular during the years when Jayavarman VII was having his magnificent temples (Bayon, Ta Prohm, Preah Khan) constructed as symbols of a new orientation in the state religion of Angkor, was never sufficiently recognized in earlier histories of Cambodia.

Claude Jacques has advanced beyond the earlier work from the point of view of Jayavarman VII, and Anne-Valérie Schweyer retells the story as seen in the Champa records.

Schweyer, like Jacques, recognizes emphatically that there was never a 'Kingdom of Champa' as portrayed by Maspero, followed by Coedès, that Champa always consisted of at least two distinct entities, North and South, and on occasion was divided into at least three, the Thu Bồn valley (region of My So'n, Trà Kiêu, and Đông Du'o'ng), Vijaya (modern Qui Nho'n) in the center, and Pāṇḍuraṅga (modern Phan Rang, Phan Thiêt) in the South. This triple division prevailed in the period of interest here, the reign of Jayavarman VII in Angkor.

The internal and external conflicts of the 11th-early 12th centuries leading up to the time of Jayavarman VII are summarized in detail, and some of the confusion resulting from Maspero and perpetuated in later work has been cleared up. For example, the northern Cham prince Chê Cũ captured by the Vietnamese in 1069 is no longer confused with the Rudravarman of Pāṇḍuraṅga in the South who was in conflict with other Cham factions.

Schweyer recognizes that the final victory of Jayavarman VII may have been achieved with the help of Cham allies, and that this is reflected in some of the Bayon bas-reliefs. She also sees that the scenes of naval warfare in those reliefs are probably neither the main Cham invasion nor their final defeat by Jayavarman VII; and she makes the interesting suggestion (p. 68) that they might represent Jayavarman's suppression of a rebellion in Malyang, believed to be across the Tonle Sap from Angkor in what is now probably southern Battambang province. In fact, two Cham princes in their own inscriptions claimed to have been appointed by Jayavarman to lead his troops in that campaign, and some of the bas-relief scenes show Cham and Khmer fighting together in the same boat.

Then Schweyer shows clearly that in the scholarly work to date there has been confusion in the identity of the Champa king Jaya Indravarman whom Jayavarman VII claimed to have killed, and that with correct identifications we can see that some of the details in the inscriptions of Jayavarman VII are contradictory.

There were two Jaya Indravarmans involved in the conflicts with Jayavarman VII of Angkor. One was Jaya Indravarman of Grāmapura, who is recorded in Champa inscriptions as making donations to temples several times from 1163 to 1183, and in the 1190s a Jaya Indravarman Oñ Vatuv, whom Maspero, against the advice of Finot, amalgamated into a single Jaya Indravarman IV, an interpretation followed by Coedès and subsequent writers. As Schweyer

notes, the records of donations of Jaya Indravarman of Grāmapura, and their dates, suggest that they were “the results of victorious campaigns... including successful warfare against Angkor.” These Champa inscriptions also show that he could not have been killed in any battle with Jayavarman VII, which adds considerable mystery to the stories in Jayavarman’s inscriptions about his enemy, ‘Jaya Indravarman’.

Pertinently Schweyer adds (p. 66), “The Cham inscriptions make no mention of an attack on Angkor in 1177, nor of a Cham occupation of Angkor at any date. So there is little evidence for or against a Cham conquest of Angkor in 1177 – and no corroboration of the detail offered in the Chinese annals about an invasion up the Mekong and Tonle Sap rivers led by a Chinese mariner. This indeed appears inherently unlikely because the Chams were excellent sailors, and in any case they had an excellent land route to Angkor at their disposal.”

Schweyer concludes her description with the Champa inscriptions which record attempts to conquer Champa by Jayavarman VII in the 1190s, and in which success, if real, was only temporary— not pursued after 1220.

One supplementary remark is required where Schweyer refused to acknowledge the contribution of a collaborator, and the publisher removed an editorial footnote which had been inserted to make up for it. On page 59, Schweyer wrote that the Cham king Jaya Harivarman in 1154 “changed tack and approached the Đai Viêt by offering...one of his daughters” to the Vietnamese king, implying a major change in Champa-Viet relations.

The editorial footnote was: the importance of this detail, which was garbled in Maspero (p. 160 and nn. 9, 10), must not be exaggerated. Among the Vietnamese sources, *Dai Viet Su’ Ky Toan Thu’*, Tap I, p. 321, does not give it great importance, saying only, in very cursory, informal, terms, that a Cham king named Chê Bì La Bút, who may perhaps be identified with Jaya Harivarman, “gave a daughter/a girl/girls” and the [Viet] “king accepted”; and another respected chronicle, *Viet Su’ Lu’ò’c*, p. 144, says only that the Cham king offered tribute, and nothing about a daughter or girls, but in 1152, not the 1154 of the other text. Maspero, accepted both accounts as two separate events, in his note 9 took the *VSL* entry for 1152, and in note 10 the *TT* entry for 1154, but interpreted it as just “sent women” (given the uncertainty about number in the original text in Chinese characters). Coedès (*États hindouisés*, p. 320), otherwise following Maspero literally, ignored these details. The interpretation that Jaya Harivarman “sought a marriage alliance” and “offered the hand of his daughter” was first offered explicitly, in an unpublished paper first circulated among the participants in this book.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ William A. Southworth, “Fire in the East, An historical survey of Chinese and Vietnamese accounts of Cambodia during the 12th and 13th centuries AD,” citing the Vietnamese source as *TT*, Ban ky 4, 11a (1998: I, 321), and later published in German as, William Aelred Southworth, “Chinesische und vietnamesische Berichte über Kambodscha während des 12. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.,” In Karl-Heinz Golzio und Annette Heitmann, eds., “Macht und Glanz des alten Kambodscha,” *Orientierungen: Zeitschrift zur Kultur Asiens*, Themanheft 2007, München, pages 90-125 (see pp. 107-8).

Schweyer has here not taken sufficient account of her own reasonable proposal that Champa was divided into two or more 'kingdoms', and has treated this event in the manner of Maspero as relating to a unified polity for which a Vietnamese name for 'the/a king of Champa' would necessarily correspond to whatever king was recorded in a Champa inscription. In fact, there is no certain evidence that 'Chê Bì La Bút' was Jaya Harivarman, or that the latter initiated a change of policy vis-a-vis Viet Nam.

A subject which should have been given attention, especially in a book about the reign and work of Jayavarman VII, is the religious interaction between the Champa 'princedom' and Cambodia, for Mahāyāna Buddhism had been more important, and for longer, in Champa than in Cambodia; and it is impossible not to wonder if the interest of Jayavarman VII in that cult was in part awakened during his long sojourn there.⁵⁹

This subject was never given attention in older scholarship because the most important Buddhist dynasty in Champa, that of Indrapura/Đông Du'ông from mid-9th century to late 10th, which left large Mahāyāna sanctuaries from Quảng Nam to Quảng Bình now far in northern Viet Nam, was not well understood when Maspero wrote, and the pre-history of the Cham was not understood at all.⁶⁰

That is, in the time of Maspero and Coedès the maritime vocation of the Cham, whose origins in Kalimantan from where they set forth on a journey which led them to what is now Viet Nam, was not well understood, and it was assumed that they had always been a mainland people, remnants, left behind, of an 'Indonesian' migration out of China and across mainland Southeast Asia to Nusantara. It was also assumed that elements of 'Indianization' were brought directly from India by Indians.

It is now known, however, that the Cham were one of the great Austronesian seafaring peoples who voyaged around Southeast Asia and to India for hundreds of years before there is

⁵⁹ For published work on this subject see I.W. Mabbett, "Buddhism in Champa," in *Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th Centuries*, ed. David G. Marr and A.C. Milner, Singapore, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies and Canberra, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, 1986, pp. 289-313; and Nandana Chutiwongs, "Le Bouddhisme du Champa," in *Trésors d'art du Vietnam la sculpture du Champa*, Paris, Musée Guimet, pp. 65-87.

⁶⁰ Anne-Valérie Schweyer, "Le dynastie d'Indrapura (Quang Nam, Viet Nam)," *Southeast Asian Archaeology 1998*, Proceedings of the 7th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists, Berlin, 31 August – 4 September 1998, Wibke Lobo and Stefanie Reimann Editors, Centre for South-East Asian Studies, University of Hull, Special Issue & Ethnologisches Museum, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz, pp. 205-217; and Anne-Valérie Schweyer, "La vaisselle en argent de la dynastie d'Indrapura (Quảng Nam, Việt Nam), Études d'épigraphie cam - II," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* 86, 1991, pp. 345-355.

any sign of ‘Indianization’ in what is now Cambodia, Java, or Viet Nam. The Cham certainly knew India before the Khmer, the oldest known inscription in a Southeast Asian language is in Cham, what may be the oldest Southeast Asian Sanskrit inscription (*Võ-Canh*) was found near Nha Trang, one of the oldest Champa centers; and it is quite likely that the Khmer first acquired knowledge of India via Cham voyagers.⁶¹

As Southworth has written, “For most of the Angkorian era (from at least the beginning of the 9th century AD), Champa was probably the most important and most immediate source of Chinese merchandise for Cambodia, and possibly its most important trade partner. Moreover, Champa was China’s most immediate source for almost all of the goods traded from mainland Southeast Asia; in particular ivory, rhinoceros horn, tortoise shell and aromatic wood.” “In addition to Champa’s commercial importance, it is clear from the sources detailed above that Yang Bumadie [Chinese name for a Champa king in the 2nd-3rd decades of the 12th century] must also have played a significant role in the southern foreign policy of the Song court at this time, and appears to have acted as an intermediary in its reception of foreign dignitaries coming by sea from other parts of Southeast Asia, including Cambodia.”⁶²

Viet Nam, with which Cambodia was well acquainted in the 12th century, was also Mahāyāna Buddhist. As Southworth has written, “the reign of Ly Nhan Tong [1072-1127] was particularly celebrated for the consecration of Buddhist pagodas, including the construction of stone towers reaching twelve to thirteen storeys in height” [no longer standing]. “A delegation from Cambodia...is reported to have come to the Ly court at Thang Long (present-day Hanoi) in 1118... [and] at that time, a Buddhist stupa (Bào tháp) was being inaugurated. The king ordered that the sacred measuring rod...be placed in front of the Linh Quang Pagoda, for the Cambodian

⁶¹ The oldest Cham and Southeast Asian vernacular inscription is C174 from Đông Yên Châu, not far from Mỹ Sơn, published in George Coedès, “La plus ancienne inscription en langue chame,” in *Eastern and Indian -Studies in honour of F.W. Thomas, C.I.E.*, pp. 46, ff. For an accessible English rendering of the text see Graham Thurgood, *From Ancient Cham to Modern Dialects, Two Thousand Years of Language Contact and Change*, Honolulu, University of Hawaii, 1999, p.3. The literature on *Võ-Canh* (inscription number C40) is voluminous, for there was long a controversy about its ethnic identity, Cham or Khmer (Funan) or neither. See Coedès, *Les états hindouisés*, p. 81; Jean Filliozat, “L’inscription dite de ‘Võ [sic] Võ]-Canh’,” *BEFEO* 55 (1969), pp. 107-116; Claude Jacques, “Notes sur la stèle de ‘Võ [sic] Võ]-Canh’,” *BEFEO* 55 (1969), pp. 117-124; and William Aelred Southworth, “The Origins of Campā in Central Vietnam, A Preliminary Review,” Ph.D. thesis, Archaeology, SOAS, University of London, 2001, who makes a good case that it should be considered as belonging to Champa.

⁶² Southworth, “Chinesische und vietnamesische Berichte,” text with footnote 9 [pagination of published version unknown]. Text here quoted from Southworth’s English original.

envoys to go and see.”⁶³

Given the apparently long sojourn in Champa of the future Jayavarman VII, it is probable that he was aware of Mahāyāna prominence in Champa and Vietnam, and some of the inspiration for his own religious reforms may have come from that direction (see further below, comment on Sharrock).

In an amusing way, one sees confusion about Cambodia-Champa cultural interchange in the currently popular *History of Cambodia* by David Chandler. On page 58, n. 4, second edition, Chandler, referring to Mabbett’s article on the subject, noted the possibility that Jayavarman was converted to Buddhism in Champa. But then, on page 67 he evoked the possibility that the reliefs of the Bayon and Banteay Chmar show that the “Buddha has won over the Hindu gods of Champa,” and “Perhaps, as Woodward has suggested, this signifies the conversion of the Chams to Buddhism.”

This is how some popular historians try to have it both ways.

The meaning of the Bayon

T.S. Maxwell

Unlike most of his predecessors, Maxwell insists (p. 74) that the Khmer had their own beliefs before contact with India, and that Khmer Hinduism and Buddhism were not copies of what was learned from India, but synthesis or syncretism of Indian and old Khmer beliefs. His contribution here is an attempt to “understand the religion that operated in the temples of Jayavarman VII ... in terms of the cults which appear to have been practised in these Khmer structures.” This is a welcome departure from the treatments of Angkor religion to which we have become accustomed, although some of Maxwell’s proposals are inconsistent, and in disagreement with the current architectural history of the Bayon, as I shall indicate below.

Maxwell begins with an interesting discussion of packages of Indian influence in Southeast Asia seen in the Vedic *yūpa* of Kutai in Kalimantan, the Gupta-influenced Viṣṇuīte inscriptions of King Pūrṇavarman of Taruma in north Java, and another package seen in the first temples and Sanskrit inscriptions of pre-Angkor southern Cambodia [inscriptions K.5, K.40, K.875]. There should be here references to previous work in the field, one of which, given by Maxwell, was

⁶³ Southworth, “Chinesische und vietnamesische Berichte,” text with footnotes 18-19 [pagination of published version unknown]. Text here quoted from Southworth’s English original.

removed by the publisher.⁶⁴ In contrast to earlier treatments, he recognizes (p. 100, n.38) recent work which suggests that the agents in the transmission of Indian influences may have been voyaging Southeast Asians rather than Indians.

With respect to the position of Cambodia, it should also have been noted that the oldest inscription in a Southeast Asian language was in Cambodia's close neighbor, Champa, and that what has been accepted as the oldest Sanskrit inscription in Southeast Asia was also in Champa territory. Coedès, arguing from palaeography, considered that the second oldest Champa inscriptions as well, of King Bhadravarman, were older than the Mūlavarman inscription of Kutai. Thus the oldest package of Indian influence may have been in Champa, and only in the adoption of Indian script, not Indian religion, for Đông Yên Châu seems to be devoted to a Naga cult, and *Võ-Canh* is more concerned with inheritance than with religion. These characteristics are strong indications of Cham initiative in the acquisition of Indian cultural elements.⁶⁵

In contrast to other writers on the meaning of the Bayon, Maxwell has little to say about the tower faces, repeating without argument, and ignoring earlier theories of Coedès, Mus, or Boisselier, a suggestion by Dagens that the tower faces are a Tathāgata pentad – for example Ak'obhya in the east, Ratnasambhava in the south, Amitābha in the west, and Amoghasiddhi in the north, all centred on Vairocana, a change from Maxwell's earlier interpretation of them as Śiva-Lokeśvara.⁶⁶ He sees the only similar architecture in India; and Nepal, which for Sharrock in this volume is the inspiration for the Bayon faces, is not even mentioned.

He goes beyond his predecessors, however, in using information new to Cambodia scholarship, to trace a line of religious and architectural development from India to the Bayon faces, and, with his discussion of “packages” of influence, shows that cultural elements arrived so rapidly from India that only transmission by traveling Southeast Asians can explain it.

Mahāyāna Buddhist influence in Cambodia is seen already in some 7th-century inscriptions, and presumably also in images placed in the same shrines as Hindu gods, prefiguring the later syncretism; and in a famous Mahāyāna Buddhist inscription of the 10th century Maxwell sees in Kīrtipaṇḍita, the apparent leader of a Mahāyāna upsurge at that time, a predecessor of Jayavarman VII.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ The note suppressed by the publisher, concerning the Kutai inscriptions was “Jan Wisseman Christie, *Patterns of Trade in Western Indonesia* (Ph.D. thesis, SOAS 1982): 17–27; also Michael Vickery, *Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia*, Tokyo 1998:57–58.” And, concerning early *Viṣṇu* images in southern Cambodia, Dalsheimer, N. and Y. Manguin, “Viṣṇus mitrés et réseaux marchands: nouvelles données archéologiques sur le Ier millénaire de notre ère en Asie du Sud-Est,” *BEFEO* 85 (1998), which was in Maxwell's final bibliography, but omitted from his text.

⁶⁵ See above, note 61; and Coedès, “Deux inscriptions sanskrites de Fou-nan,” *BEFEO* XXXI (1931), pp. 1-8.

⁶⁶ Maxwell, *Bayon*, p. 98; T.S. Maxwell, *The Gods of Asia* OUP, Oxford, 1997, p. 36; Bruno Dagens, “Les tours à visages du Bayon et leur signification,” *Fifth Symposium on the Bayon*, Siemreap, 11& 12 December 2000, p. [6].

⁶⁷ P. 90, inscription K.111, “Stele de Vat Sithor”; and see further below on Sharrock.

Having established his argument that Khmer religion, Buddhism together with Hinduism, was a synthesis of Indian and local beliefs, Maxwell goes on to his main concern, the small Khmer-language inscriptions scattered throughout the temples of Jayavarman VII identifying deities (some with Hindu or Buddhist nomenclature), but many seemingly apotheosized human beings—princes, princesses, or high officials—a majority in the Bayon entitled *kamrateñ jagat*, literally ‘lord of the world’ or ‘lord of mankind’, probably to be interpreted as a special type of Khmer protective spirit, some of which are designated as the ‘sacred image’ (*vrah rūpa*) of the previously living person. If Jayavarman VII has long been famous for his religious reform making Mahāyāna Buddhism the state religion, these inscriptions possibly identify another religious reform—giving new prominence to the old Khmer protective deities, the *kamrateñ jagat*.⁶⁸

Maxwell has made an important point, “we are not dealing with schools of Buddhism and Hinduism in some generalized international sense, but with a specifically Khmer religion deeply anchored in the minds of a transient ruling class yet expressing itself through Buddhist and Hindu forms that effectively empowered its authority” (p. 91).

In the Bayon forty-two such inscriptions survive, naming around 120 individuals (originally more, for some inscriptions have been rendered illegible).⁶⁹ Unfortunately, once again the publisher did not include Maxwell’s final draft, in which inscription 41 was noted, and left Maxwell with the inaccurate statement that there are 40 inscriptions.

Similar inscriptions are found throughout the other major temples of Jayavarman VII, leading Stern to speak of a “frenzy of homage paid to mortals in erecting for them the statue of a divinity in which they have been or will be absorbed at the end of their terrestrial existence,” and which attained its maximum intensity, according to Stern, in the third period of the Bayon

⁶⁸ This last proposal is my own, not Maxwell’s. The title *kamrateñ jagat* first appears in Khmer inscriptions in the 10th century. (Claude Jacques, “Les *kamrateñ jagat* dans l’ancien Cambodge.” Paper presented at the Thirty-First International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa, Tokyo, 31 August-7 September, 1983, and published in Proceedings of the conference, 1983, pp. 1025-27; Claude Jacques, “The Kamrateñ Jagat in Ancient Cambodia,” in *Indus Valley to Mekong Delta Explorations in Epigraphy*, edited by Noboru Karashima, Madras: New Era Publications, 1985, pp. 269- 286; Claude Jacques, “Les kamrateñ jagat dans l’ancien Cambodge,” *Recherches nouvelles sur le Cambodge* ÉFEO, Études thématiques I, Paris 1994; Vickery, *Society*, pp. 144-146, 423-425.

⁶⁹ The standard literature on these inscriptions is George Coedès, “Les inscriptions du Bayon,” *Bulletin de la commission archéologique de l’Indochine* 1913: 81-91; Coedès, “Les inscriptions du Bayon,” *BÉFEO* XXVIII, 1928: 104-112; Coedès, “L’épigraphie des monuments de Jayavarman VII,” *BEFEO* 44 (Études cambodgiennes XXXIX) 1947–1950: 97-119; Coedès, “Inscriptions du Bayon,” *Inscriptions du Cambodge* III, pp. 193-198) where forty-one are listed, but later one more was discovered by Dumarçay (B.-Ph. Groslier, *Inscriptions du Bayon* (Mémoires archéologiques de l’ÉFEO III-2), Paris 1973, p. 93.). Note that although the inscriptions were numbered by Coedès as 1-40, they included 24A and 24B, two separate inscriptions, thus a total of 42 inscriptions.

style, when the Bayon received its final form.⁷⁰

Maxwell's close analytical attention to these inscriptions is welcome, for they were only listed, with some cursory identifications, in the publications of Coedès. An attempt at a complete study by Groslier is so confusingly organized and replete with doubtful statements that it must be set aside.⁷¹

Maxwell begins his discussion of the inscriptions (pp. 92-93) with an unnecessarily lengthy description of the way they were numbered by Coedès and fitted into a different numbering system of the architectural structures by Parmentier, with the result that now an inscription must be numbered, for example 1(E), inscription number 1 in the architectural structure (passage gallery) E, or 2(63), inscription 2 below tower 63.

Unfortunately Maxwell, p. 96, has reproduced Coedès' first attempt at numbering in 1913, which was erroneous, rather than his second of 1927 which has remained in use, and this may well lead to confusion among readers trying to use the book as a guide. The correct numbering is seen in the diagrams on pp. 94-95, but they are so overloaded with information as to be unusable. Parmentier's correct numbering of architectural structures is illustrated clearly on p. 97. The incorrect illustration of Coedès may again be the result of the publisher's use of a premature text.

At least it is clear that certain errors in his transcription and translation of some inscriptions, as described in note 25 above, are the publisher's fault. This, however, is not certain with respect to inscription 12 from Banteay Chmar, in which Maxwell (pp. 127, 134) has transcribed the name of the second image as "vraḥ bhagavatī śrī," and translated it as "the holy Goddess Śrī (=Lakṣmī)." The full name, as seen in Coedès' publication of the inscriptions, was "vraḥ bhagavatī śrī ◉ vraḥ bhagavatī Nārāyaṇī," in which 'Nārāyaṇī' is the feminine version of 'Nārāyaṇa' (=Viṣṇu), the name

⁷⁰ Stern 1965, p. 146, in part quoting Coedès. See also Coedès in Stern, p. 189; and on stages of construction, Cunin, below.

⁷¹ B.-Ph. Groslier, *Inscriptions du Bayon*, A few relevant examples are as follows. First, Groslier, introduced his own system for listing the inscriptions, different from that of Coedès which had already become, and still is, the standard. Then, p. 104, he asserted that the god *kamrateñ jagat vraḥ Maniḥ* (read by Coedès as *munih*) appeared already in the 7th century; but there were no *kamrateñ jagat* at that time, and in the inscription in question, K.493, the god was *vraḥ mañi*. Other of the *kamrateñ jagat* of the Bayon are also misidentified with pre-Angkor sites, and Groslier did not always pay attention to revisions by Coedès, for example, Coedès' re-reading the *moñ* of inscription 24B (21), in his first publications, as *phoñ* 'another', 'also', in *Inscriptions du Cambodge III*, which led Groslier, pages 222-223, into a long and meaningless discussion of *moñ*. Read as *phoñ* the text makes perfect sense. See also Claude Jacques, review of Groslier, *Inscriptions du Bayon, Artibus Asiae* 38, 2/3, pp. 250-254, 1976. It must be noted, however, that most of Jacques' severe criticisms were not concerned with the inscriptions under consideration here, but with other parts of Groslier's publication. Jacques promised there his own study of the inscriptions, *Matériaux pour l'étude des temples de Jayavarman VII: les petites inscriptions*, to appear in the collection of the *Publications du centre de recherches d'histoire et de philologie de la IVe section de l'École pratique des Hautes Études*, Paris, which, however, has not yet been published, although Jacques has informed us that its publication is still intended.

of the third image in the inscription.

Whatever the origin of the error here, its inclusion in the book is the publisher's fault, for in Maxwell's final text only the inscriptions of the Bayon were included, and those of the other temples did not come under editorial scrutiny.

According to Maxwell (p. 91), "in these short shrine inscriptions," "large numbers of people and deities are named who are not mentioned in the official stelae" (with respect only to Ta Prohm and Preah Khan—in the Bayon and other relevant temples there are no official stelae).⁷² "They relate specifically to the gods and goddesses present in each particular shrine, to the individuals who installed their images, and often also to other individuals whose spiritual forms (*vrah rūpa*) the deities or their images were stated to be"; and Maxwell says that a chief line of "enquiry into the religion of Jayavarman's time must therefore concern the real identity of the gods for whose worship his temples were built."

A major assumption is hidden here, that the temples of Jayavarman VII were built for the hundreds of disparate divinities listed in the small Khmer inscriptions, rather than for the central deities installed in the main tower, Jayavarman's father at Preah Khan, his mother at Ta Prohm, and in the Bayon a *nāga*-protected seated Buddha, whose specific identity is still a matter for discussion. There is also an assumption that it was individuals who installed the presumed images identified in the inscriptions, rather than that they were ordered installed by the king, particularly problematic at the Bayon where a large number were gods not representing apotheosized humans, and a few appear to have been direct ancestors of Jayavarman VII and other earlier kings, all of whom, it would seem, would only have been set up by the king.

Another original interpretation is that these inscriptions, by different individual authors, were inscribed over a 40-year period, rather than almost all at once, and by 'the same hand', as the palaeographic comments by Coedès implied (see Introduction to *Bayon*, p. 22), or all within the third period of construction, as Stern believed.

Maxwell, whose entire chapter is focused on the inscriptions, objects to this, saying (p. 91) that the palaeographic consistency does not have to mean that "they were all inscribed on the pillars, doorways and window frames of any particular temple in one global undertaking," that they could have been inscribed gradually over a period of forty years, which, of course, means that they were

⁷² This is only generally, but not entirely, true. In inscription number 7(M) of the Bayon the first deified person listed, not a *kamrateñ jagat*, is the "deceased Lady śrī Jayamaṅgalārtha-cūḍāmaṇi *kṣac*" [of the 'sand' (*kṣac*, perhaps a toponym)], who is also mentioned in the foundation stele of the Sanskrit Preah Khan, verse CXIII, with the epithet *sikaṭā* ('sand'), and whom Jacques considers the paternal grandmother of Jayavarman VI and the ruler of the site now called Banteay Chmar (see above, p. 108).

not 'by the same hand'. Forty years, however, seems too long a time for the maintenance of such great palaeographic consistency.

Maxwell's analysis of the distribution of the inscriptions shows that although all parts of the Bayon could be used as shrines, large areas were uninscribed, because, in his view, political change caused the work to stop, and this seems to be in some contradiction with the proposal that the inscriptions would have been done over a forty-year period by two generations of elite, under the assumption, again, that the Bayon was built for these particular divinities, and that the inscriptions would have begun at the same time as construction of the Bayon. Surely in forty years they could have filled up every space they thought necessary—if that was the way the inditing of inscriptions was carried out.

Maxwell proposes that at a certain historical moment all work on the inscriptions stopped, leaving different percentages of the different structures inscribed, the greatest number around the central tower (81%), and the least in the outer areas (25%). Thus the work of inscribing the shrines, and installing images would have begun, as might be expected, in the center, where the most important deities were installed, and proceeded outward. But, contrary to this, if the supposition of Jacques, on *pārvatī* and *dharaṇī* (pp. 48, 109) is at all correct, they would indicate that some of the central tower inscriptions may be latest (on this, however, see further below, p. 168).

As for Maxwell's 'historical moment' when work stopped, the passageways, 31% inscribed, are crucial. It is well known that they were deliberately destroyed, and according to Cunin's architectural research, only a few years after they were built in the third stage of the Bayon's construction (Cunin, p. 222), well within the reign of Jayavarman VII. Dumarçay and Royère agree that the passageways had a short life, although perhaps longer than proposed by Cunin.⁷³ Thus if their destruction, and the end of their life as inscribed shrines, coincided with the end of the practice of inditing such inscriptions everywhere, that historical moment was decided by Jayavarman VII, not the result of a reaction against him, and the lack of inscriptions in many potential shrines implies that the practice of inditing them had begun late in the construction of the Bayon. The short life of these passageways also could mean that the practice of inscribing other parts of the Bayon still continued.⁷⁴

Indeed, the five external inscriptions in what were originally the outer doorways to the

⁷³ Jacques Dumarçay and Pascal Royère, *Cambodian Architecture, Eighth to Thirteenth Centuries*, HdO, trans. and ed. Smithies, Brill 2001, p. 100.

⁷⁴ Among the students of the question, only Claude Jacques asserts that the destruction of the passageways, Maxwell's 'historical moment', was in the time of Jayavarman VIII.

passageways, and the two in the western external gallery may be crucial by their content as well. They contain the inscriptions, and presumably at one time the images, of the great territorial *kamrateñ jagat*, real divinities, not apotheosized humans, and special Buddha images of importance to Jayavarman VII. In fact, it could with equal justification be hypothesized that these inscriptions, all listing several divinities, were among the first, as proposed by Jacques, preceding at least the apotheosized humans in the interior galleries, and if so, this also points to a late inception of the practice.⁷⁵

Thus Coedès' proposal that all the inscriptions were by 'the same hand' seems more apt, and in answer to another rhetorical question by Maxwell, "[w]hy do we find that, when a certain historical moment has arrived, the Khmers have chosen to commence the work of inscribing the temple, in all its zones, with such a puzzling selection of these shrines?," I would answer that when the Bayon was conceived and the first construction begun there was no plan to include these inscriptions. They represent, as Stern saw, a religious change (or perhaps a politico-religious change) toward the end of Jayavarman's reign, and a practice which he may have renounced while still reigning.

I think that one must take issue with one of Maxwell's conclusions (p. 102), that "the existing distribution of the inscriptions can be partly explained by the hierarchy of relative importance of the deities to which they refer: the central deity had to be installed and named first [but it is not named] in order to consecrate the whole building, the shrines of deities of secondary rank surrounding the central sanctum were inscribed next, and those of lesser status were accorded inscriptions in descending sequence and frequency." As just noted, the great territorial *kamrateñ jagat* of seven of the most external inscriptions, and other deities important to Jayavarman VII, as noted by Jacques, and lowest in terms of height within the temple, surely outranked many of the apotheosized persons in the higher interior galleries.

Another contribution by Maxwell (p. 102), although dating from Coedès who did not study them in detail, is that "If all or most of the statues were of Buddhist iconography, a certain

⁷⁵ As noted above, Jacques argument on the precedence of the outer gallery and passageway inscriptions is pertinent, but it is not possible to accept that this occurred in the first stage of construction of the Bayon. Inscription 1(E) was designed for 13 images; number 2(63) lists 11; number 3(I), unfinished, lists 7; number 4(65) is destroyed, but there was space for several lines; number 5(K) lists 8; number 6(L) was designed for, and lists, 10; and number 7(M) was designed for, and lists, 11. Here we see one of the problems with Groslier's arbitrariness. In writing of 1(E) where there are only six names, in spite of the specified 13, Groslier said it was because they were worshipped in two or three places, whereas it would seem, in comparison with 6(L) and 7(M) that the discrepancy in 1(E) between specified number of places and number of named gods is because of damage in the inscription. Groslier did not comment on, nor try to justify, his apparently inconsistent reasoning.

uniformity of appearance would have prevailed.” “Yet, as we know, these statues had often to represent something as personal and individualistic as the *rūpa* of a human being, a *rūpa* which might conform neither in name nor iconographical conception to a figure of the popular pantheons. In such cases, it was essential that the statues be identified, in ritual address and also in writing, by the name of the sacred image (*vrah rūpa*) for which they stood, for there was no outward sign on the statue of this personal spiritual identity.”

In fact, very few in the Bayon fit this type. Of roughly 120 named divinities, only 5 *kamrateñ jagat* were *vrah rūpa*, five more were *rūpa* only, there were 4 more *vrah rūpa* which were not *kamrateñ jagat*, and some images, such as the ‘deceased lady’ in inscription 7 (M) were neither *kamrateñ jagat* nor *vrah rūpa*.

But no matter. If the images were identical, whatever their category, they had to be identified by inscriptions. For example, “the elongated shrine-structures in the outer courtyard of the Bayon were named *vrah kuṭi* (sacred halls/passageways) in their inscriptions, which also contained exact locational references in their opening lines.” These were required “to make sure that ...the correct set of statues reached the intended shrine” (p. 104). But if the statues were identical, there would have been no problem with correct placement.

Maxwell, here following Coedès, considers that all the images were of the Bodhisatva Lokeśvara, or, if female, Prāññāparamitā.⁷⁶ But would *pārvatī* and *dharaṇī* have been represented that way? Hardly the latter, for whom the Khmer, in their Buddhist temples, had a definite characteristic iconography, standing below the Buddha wringing a sea out of her hair to save the Buddha from the army of Mara.

Could this idea have begun in the time of the Bayon? Yes indeed. Boisselier, in his study of *Beñ Mālā* (‘Beng Mealea’), wrote, “One of the pediments of the central sanctuary ... showed the attack by Mara ... the Buddha hacked out ... and Preah Thorni [*dharaṇī*] wringing out her hair” on the left side of the original Buddha image.⁷⁷ There is also another such scene at Beng Mealea, on a two-level pediment not noted by Boisselier, which I photographed in August 2004. *Dharaṇī* is in the center of the upper level, below a hacked out Buddha, with the army of Mara on elephants approaching from both sides; and there is a very similar scene at Ta Prohm in which *dharaṇī* is in the center of the pediment, just below the destroyed Buddha image, with cavaliers brandishing

⁷⁶ George Coedès, “Les inscriptions du Bayon,” *Bulletin de la commission archéologique de l’Indochine* 1913: 90-91.

⁷⁷ Jean Boisselier, “Beñ Mālā et la chronologie des monuments du style d’Angkor Vat,” *BEFEO* 46 (1), 1952, p. 218. “Un des frontons du Sanctuaire central ... représentait un assaut de Mara ... Buddha bûché ... et la Preah Thornī tordant sa chevelure (pl. XV, 3).” See also Elizabeth Guthrie, *A Study of the History and Cult of the Buddhist Earth Deity in Mainland Southeast Asia*, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand, 2004, Figure 2.40.

weapons attacking from both sides.⁷⁸ This is very much like the scene as often portrayed in modern temples. Because of the chipped out Buddhas these scenes prove that the special iconography of *dharaṇī* was already common at the time of the Bayon. Her modern Khmer name is also ancient—*nān kanheñ/kanhyañ braḥ dharaṇī* (pron. ‘neang kanhing preah thorani’), in which ‘kanhing’ (*kanheñ, kanyhañ*) is the ancient ‘princess’, ‘queen’ seen in 7th-century inscriptions.⁷⁹

There was also special iconography for the ‘Medicine Buddha’, *Bhaiṣajyaguruvoidūryaprabharāja* (“Master-of-Remedies-With-the-Radiance-of-Beryl” [Maxwell’s translation, p. 104]), mentioned 10 times. According to Sharrock (p. 270) he was “usually seated on a *Nāga* and holding an ointment pot ... or a myrobalan fruit (*haritakī*) or simply raising one finger of his right hand while in *dhyāna* or *abhaya mudrā*”; and Maxwell acknowledges that “his specific iconography was almost certainly common to all ten images.” And what about the *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* in inscription 2, which Coedès, considering it to be the *devarāja*, always insisted was a *liṅga*. Although that form for the *devarāja* is now contested, it could hardly have been represented by a Buddha or Bodhisattva.⁸⁰

Maxwell’s insistence on the Buddhist identity of the statues is made necessary by his conclusion about the meaning of the whole Bayon. “Of what conceivable use,” he asks, “would it have been to worship over two hundred separate images of the same aspect of the same Buddha in a single temple?” Larger “numbers of Buddhas of identical iconography always appear within a specific unifying framework, such as on the body or robe of a major *Puruṣa*, Buddha or Bodhisattva,” of which the best known examples in Khmer sculpture are the so-called ‘radiating’ *Lokeśvara*;⁸¹ and “[i]n terms of the anthropomorphizing of architecture that was introduced under Jayavarman, this would mean that the temple was itself conceived of as a representation of a *Puruṣa*, a supreme Buddha principle incorporating multiple lesser manifestations of itself” (p. 109).

This still ignores the fact that not all of the images could have been identical. A considerable number were female, and others, as noted above, had well-established iconographies, which one would expect to have been followed. Moreover, Maxwell’s figure of ‘200’ seemingly represents the total of the tower faces and the images in the inscribed shrines, but Maxwell has already, in his somewhat offhand identification of the quadruple tower faces, ascribed separate identities and

⁷⁸ Guthrie 2004, Figures 2.42, 2.43.

⁷⁹ Vickery 1998, pp. 27, 177, 267, 429-30.

⁸⁰ Note that Coedès’ hypothesis of a *Buddharāja* of Jayavarman VII replacing the *devarāja* of earlier times, up to the end of the 11th century, is now rejected. See Sharrock, p. 243.

⁸¹ On which see Hiram W. Woodward, Jr., “The Jayabuddhamahānātha Images of Cambodia,” *The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery* 52/53, 1991/1995, pp.105-111, who argued that they were the Jayabuddhamahānātha images sent by Jayavarman VII to 23 cities.

even separate appearances to them (“we should expect the faces emanating from Jayavarman’s towers to represent, not repeated representations of the same face, but four different aspects of one divinity emanating from a single axis, and indeed certain differences can be observed between individual faces on the towers of the Bayon” (p. 98).

A detail which has been overlooked in the treatment of the inscriptions by both Jacques and Maxwell is that of the forty-two extant inscriptions, many, including inscriptions in all parts of the Bayon, were indited over and across pre-existing decor (roundels with floral and bird motifs and beaded edges of columns). Because, obviously, that decor could only have been carved after the temple structure was complete, the inscriptions were still later, and were carved within a very short time, ‘by the same hand’. Even where, as Coedès noted, a space seems to have been ‘reserved’ for an inscription, the space was usually reserved in the midst of previous, or at the latest contemporary, decoration, carved at the same time as the inscription. Among the rare inscriptions where there is no evidence of previous decor, or where a reserved space for the inscription seems to have been conceived along with the decor, and which therefore might have been earlier, are those in the entrances to the passageways, which Maxwell has put last. But if the passageways themselves are of the late third period of construction of the Bayon, as Cunin seems to have demonstrated, then those inscriptions, like all others, are late and of the same time.⁸²

Maxwell has not taken account of the sequence of construction of the parts of the Bayon as analyzed by archaeological architects, and in which the passageways had a short life in the late third stage of the Bayon construction under Jayavarman VII (Cunin, pp. 221-222). This means that the small number of inscriptions there does not indicate that ‘work stopped’ throughout the temple, only that it was decided to remove those passageways before more inscriptions were indited. As noted, some of those passageway inscriptions, and the place reserved for an inscription never engraved at the entrance to J, suggest that they were among the first of the inscriptions, as proposed by Jacques, although, contra Jacques, not of the first stage of construction of the Bayon.⁸³

Maxwell’s conclusions about “Religion at the time of Jayavarman VII” may be summarized as a situation in which “numerous deities were worshipped who bore both fully Indian and fully Khmer names, and whose sacredness was indicated by purely Khmer titles [and] a number of the

⁸² It seemed to me, looking at the inscriptions in October 2006, that around thirty of the forty-two had been indited over pre-existing decor. Later, however, Olivier Cunin demonstrated to me that some of those I had believed to be later were in fact within spaces planned together with the decor. A full study is required, however, of this subject which is important for dating this aspect of the Bayon, and other temples. Jacques, Cunin, and I are agreed, for example, that the inscriptions of Ta Prohm are significantly later than those of the Bayon and thus later than Ta Prohm itself.

⁸³ See further on the passageways pp. 164, 168 below.

Indian names were in reality not Indian at all, but translations into Sanskrit of original Khmer names which did not reflect Indian religious concepts or deities.” Two belief systems were integrated, and “this integration... consisted of contextualising and categorising imported and indigenous deities alike in a single coherent structure by means of a Khmer system of titles” (pp. 120-121).

I would add, for myself, that the last recorded stage of this integration in the time of Jayavarman VII, because of the vast numerical predominance of the title *kamrateñ jagat* in the small inscriptions in his temples studied by Maxwell, should be called ‘*kamrateñ jagat-ization*’, reflecting an upsurge of indigenous Khmer concepts, in particular the apotheosis of particularly qualified humans as protective deities. It should be noted that these *kamrateñ jagat* begin to appear in the 10th century at the time when the sage Kīrtipaṇḍita, whom Maxwell termed a precursor of Jayavarman VII, was setting forth on his search for *tantra* which led to a new development of tantric Mahāyāna in Cambodia at that time (see above, pp. 133-34, 144).

The presentation of the inscriptions at the end of Maxwell’s chapter merits a few more remarks because of embarrassing inaccuracies which are the result of illegitimate interference by the publisher who inserted an earlier version of Maxwell’s draft before it had been corrected by the editors.

- Note again ‘Lord and Lady’, as treated in note 25 above.

- Inscription 2(63), p. 129, “The God of Kaṃḍvat Dik (site of an important stone quarry).” The remark in parentheses should not have been included without full explanation; and it had been removed from Maxwell’s final text. Its source was Coedès’ note that the toponym “often appears on graffiti or quarry marks engraved on the stones of the Preah Khan at Angkor” (Coedès, *IC* III, p. 195).

- Inscription 5(K), p. 123, line 6, “vraḥ pāda saṃvok”; p. 129, number 7, “The God of the Holy Footprint (vraḥ pāda) of Saṃvok.” In his final text Maxwell had realized that in Khmer, both ancient and modern, ‘vraḥ pāda’, although literally ‘sacred foot/feet’, means ‘his majesty’, i.e. ‘king’. Of course we have no idea who the ‘king’ of Saṃvok was. The fault here is due to interference by the publisher.

- Inscription 6(L), More erroneous interference by the publisher. There is no reason to translate “kamrateñ jagat phler” as ‘Goddess’; nor to assume that ‘Pavitra’ refers to Viṣṇu, nor is comparison with inscription 15(42) relevant. In his own final text Maxwell omitted reference to Viṣṇu and translated “The God of Phler, the sacred image (*vraḥ rūpa*) of Pavitra, in the shrine of (*nā*) śrī Raṇa...”

- Inscription 14(41), p. 123, “vraḥ laṃvāñ”; p. 130, “The sacred image of Lady Laṃvād.” Indeed in the inscription the character ‘ñ’/‘d’ is blurred and difficult to read. In his 1918 publication Coedès opted for ‘d’, but from personal observation I think it should be ‘ñ’; and in his index, *Inscriptions du Cambodge* VIII, p. 62, under ‘vraḥ laṃvāñ’, Coedès listed it as the name in this inscription 14. Reading ‘ñ’ as in Maxwell’s transcription is also preferable because the term *laṃvāñ* and *vraḥ laṃvāñ* occur several times in other inscriptions, for example 2(63), while there is, so far, no

other occurrence of *laṃvād*. In Saveros Pou's *Dictionary*, p. 416, *laṃvāñ* is reasonably glossed as 'district', 'territory'. In either case there is no reason to interpret the person as 'Lady'. When there is no specific indication of femininity in the inscriptions, it is better to assume a masculine identity. Maxwell's text here is again mistaken in calling the following deity "Lord or Lady." In inscription 17(29) Maxwell is correct with "Lady Rājendradevī" because of the feminine ending '-ī', the masculine form being Rājendradeva', the following name in the inscription.⁸⁴ Once more, a contributor to this book has been made to appear careless by the surreptitious interference of the publisher. In his final pre-publication text, Maxwell wrote, for the English translation, "The sacred image (*vrah rūpa*) of Lord Laṃvāñ [and] the sacred image (*vrah rūpa*) of Lord Jvik," but the publisher substituted an earlier version written before correction by the editors.

- Inscription 26(19). There is no reason to translate "kamrateñ añ śrī Jayanta" as "the Lord (kamrateñ añ of [the Province] Jayanta (a region of known Buddhist connections)," unless a full explanation is provided. The structure of the name is like that of the preceding "kamrateñ añ Jaya Cāmpesvara" ("Lord Jaya Cāmpesvara") and may not be interpreted as other than "Lord Jayanta." The term Jayanta is not known from other published Khmer inscriptions, which at least means that it was very rare, and there is no indication that it was a province, or with Buddhist connections.

- Preah Khan inscription C20, pp. 125, 133

Readers conversant in Khmer might think that in the expression "rūpa anak sañjak harisoma chveñ," the last word should be translated as 'on the left', rather than as a toponym, because in modern Khmer *chveñ* means 'left'. However, in Angkorean Khmer the term for 'left' was *chvyañ*, as seen in Banteay Chmar, inscription 11, with both *stam* ('right') and *chvyañ*, a word not unexpectedly missing from Pou's Old Khmer-French-English Dictionary.

Peter D. Sharrock

Sharrock's chapter is concerned specifically with the identification and meaning of the Bayon tower faces, and through them the nature of the religion of Jayavarman VII, the subject of Maxwell's chapter.

In contrast to Maxwell, who proposes "four different aspects of one divinity," and believes that "certain differences can be observed between individual faces" Sharrock considers that they are all the same face and "their iconography is minimal and non-specific." Along with Maxwell, however, he also says (p. 234), "the massive bulk of the temple is a god with 200 faces," a description similar to that of Maxwell calling it a *puruṣa*.

⁸⁴ Saveros Pou, *Old Khmer-French-English Dictionary*, Paris, Cedorek, 1992.

Whereas Maxwell focuses on Indian sources as inspiration for the faces, Sharrock looks to Nepal for Jayavarman's inspiration, and links the Bayon tower faces to "the huge pairs of eyes of a Tantric Ādi-Buddha [which] peer out over the city from each side of the square *harmikā* of ... Kathmandu's *Svayambhū Mahācaitya*, and similar monuments in nearby Patan," "which are the only exact parallels that can be found with the Khmer face towers" (p. 255). Maxwell, as we saw, neglecting Nepal entirely, concludes that (p. 93) "the only Indian equivalent of the Khmer face-towers... in the... early 9th-century Viśveśvara Mahādeva (Śiva) temple at Bajaurā."

Sharrock hypothesizes (p. 254-55) that when the famous tantric Buddhist centers of northern India were destroyed in the 12th century Moslem conquest, and many Buddhist scholars and monks fled north to Nepal, others moved to Cambodia, an attractive refuge because of the tantric Buddhist inclinations of its king Jayavarman VII. The hypothetical nature of this proposal and the complete lack of evidence for it within Cambodia must be noted.

A problem with relating this to the Bayon is that the destruction of the Ganges valley monasteries which impelled Buddhist monks to flee to Tibet and, possibly, to Southeast Asia, is dated by Sharrock to 1197, when construction of the Bayon, and the design of the faces, at least, must have been decided. Their design cannot be imputed to influence from Indian monks fleeing the Moslem conquest; and the stupas of Nepal had not yet been constructed. Perhaps when Sharrock first wrote this he was influenced by an interpretation that the faces were created in the third stage of the Bayon's construction thus reasonably after 1200 (Jacques, as we have seen, believes they were made during Indravarman's reign in 1218-1270), but Cunin's work now shows that is impossible. And, in any case, even if the date could be reconciled, where did those monks get the idea of the faces? Was the concept of such faces already alive among the northern Indian monks before they fled? If this is the hypothesis, it must be argued.

It is noteworthy that Sharrock here ignored totally the 10th-century Cambodian monk Kīrtipaṇḍita, noted by Maxwell as leading a Mahāyāna upsurge in Cambodia at that time. The neglect of Kīrtipaṇḍita and the 10th-century florescence of Buddhism in Cambodia is doubly peculiar because that subject was a main theme of his doctoral thesis, in which, with great detail, he offered a new translation of inscription K.111 of Wat Sithor to prove that Kīrtipaṇḍita in his travels to foreign lands in search of texts returned with tantric texts which he propagated in Cambodia.⁸⁵

In his thesis Sharrock raised the interesting question of Kīrtipaṇḍita's destination. Apparently not India, and he cites an article by another scholar who proposed Java.⁸⁶ It is much

⁸⁵ Although written in the time of Jayavarman V (968- 1000), it refers to activity of Kīrtipaṇḍita in the time of Rājendravarman (944-968).

⁸⁶ Nandana Chutiwongs, "Le Bouddhisme du Champa," p. 81.

more likely that Kīrtipaṇḍita went to Champa, long an intermediary between Cambodia and other countries, where the Mahāyānist Indrapura dynasty was then enjoying its greatest development, and which may subsequently have influenced the Mahāyāna of Jayavarman VII.

Including Kīrtipaṇḍita in the story, however, with the evidence that tantrism, and an important text, were well established long before Jayavarman VII, would not help in Sharrock's preferred interpretation of the Bayon faces.

One more interesting suggestion by Sharrock concerning the short inscriptions studied by Maxwell is (p. 241) that "the short, carved Bayon inscriptions may in some cases have only marked the position reserved for each icon," assuming that a festival such as that described at Preah Khan also took place at the Bayon; and this would help explain why no image from the Bayon shrines has been found—they were always empty except on one annual occasion.

That idea negates Maxwell's interpretation—the Bayon as a *puruṣa*, which requires real images everywhere.

Sharrock (pp. 247-249) cogently criticizes the arguments of Boisselier and Woodward concerning the identification of the faces as Brahma, and in fact their proposals are simply too tortuous, requiring exactly thirty-three towers or a hypothetical original twenty-eight towers plus five more significant constructions, something which no creative numerology can produce for the Bayon.

Those arguments, in summary, are as follows.

Boisselier proposed in an authoritative treatment in 1978 that "there can be no doubt but that this temple... is an architectural adaptation of a mandala..."; "an inscription at Angkor Thom (south-east Prasat Chrung) suggests that the Bayon was intended as a terrestrial image of the gods' assembly hall in Indra's city." Moreover, the faces, although "identified in turn as images of the Buddha, of the god Śiva, of the Bodhisatva Avalokiteśvara and of Jayavarman VII himself... it would seem... on the basis of the indications contained in the inscriptions [of Prasat Chrung], as those of Brahmā appearing to the gods at their assemblies as the 'eternally young' Gandharva Pañcaśikha"; and "this interpretation is in accordance with local Buddhist tradition."⁸⁷

Boisselier continued in this vein in 1997 with, "... the inscriptions clearly state that the new capital is the city of Indra (with whom the king identifies) and of the thirty-three gods (identified with the princes and provincial governors under the king's rule), consisting of its royal palace, pleasure parks, and Assembly Hall of the Gods, which is none other than the Bayon. (This interpretation is not my assertion but one affirmed in the epigraphy, to the detriment of countless

⁸⁷ Boisselier, in David L. Snellgrove, General Editor, *The Image of the Buddha*, Paris and Tokyo, Serindia Publications/UNESCO, 1978, p. 410, captions to photographs 324 and 325, perhaps by Boisselier who collaborated in the book.

fantastic and farfetched theories).” And, “it is at the Bayon, the Assembly Hall of the Gods, that the gods gather together on certain days, while Brahmā, assuming the ‘ever young’ form of Gandharva Pañcaśikha, multiplies his image to honor each of them.”⁸⁸

In this interpretation Boisselier went beyond what “the inscriptions” [*les textes*] (really only one inscription) “clearly state.” In that inscription “the city of Indra” (*sudarśana*) and “assembly hall of the gods” (*sudharma*), as Sharrock has pointed out, are not clearly mentioned, but only interpreted from the double *entendre* of those Sanskrit terms. Neither is there mention of thirty-three gods, and certainly not of their identification with the princes and provincial governors of the realm, an idea which Boisselier apparently took over from Mus.

A similar conclusion was reached by Hiram W. Woodward, Jr., an important contributor to the interpretation of the Bayon, including the Foreword of this book, and to religion in the time of Jayavarman VII. Proceeding from the basis of Dumarçay’s architectural analysis and the proposals of Snellgrove and Boisselier, Woodward proposed that the original sixteen towers of the central cruciform edifice indicated Vajrayāna Buddhism, and that the faces of the Bayon towers therefore represented the Buddha Vajrasatva. The addition much later of twelve more towers with faces marked a change in the religious convictions of Jayavarman VII, towards Hinayāna Buddhism, after which the meaning of the faces changed to Brahma, as they have been called in local folk belief.⁸⁹

Now that closer study of the architecture of the Bayon, as detailed in Cunin’s chapter, shows that there was never a stage with sixteen towers, that interpretation must be dropped.

Moreover, Sharrock comments significantly (p. 249), “it is hard to imagine Jayavarman VII choosing as a celestial figurehead the Buddhist version of Brahma... who had long declined in his Hindu form in India. The king’s strategy after seizing power by force... was to effect a major shift to impose Buddhism as the dominant religion of state for the first time. Placing Brahma at the pinnacle of his pantheon at the ceremonial high point of the reign would just not have packed the requisite message of cosmological backing for the new vision for the state.”

Sharrock also opposes the argument of Woodward that Jayavarman VII was tending toward Hinayana Buddhism at the end of his reign, and that the change was linked with an Indrābhiṣeka ceremony and a reinterpretation of the faces from Vajrasatva to Brahma.⁹⁰ For Sharrock there is much better evidence “to suggest that the final phase of his royal Buddhist cult

⁸⁸ Jean Boisselier, “The meaning of Angkor Thom,” in Helen Ibbitson Jessup and Thierry Zephir, editors, *Sculpture of Angkor and Ancient Cambodia, Millennium of Glory*, Washington, National Gallery of Art, 1997, p. 118.

⁸⁹ Woodward, “Tantric Buddhism at Angkor Thom.” On local folk belief, see the chapter in *Bayon* by Ang Choulean.

⁹⁰ Woodward, “Tantric Buddhism at Angkor Thom.”

emphasized the presence of Hevajra, Yoginīs, Vajrapāṇī, Vajradhara, and Vajrasattva,” and “in the final years of Jayavarman’s reign an overtly Tantric pantheon led by Hevajra, Vajrasattva, Vajradhara and Vajrapāṇī moved to centre stage” (pp. 249, 255).

Thus, going back to a still earlier treatment by Boisselier, Sharrock agrees with Woodward on Vajrasattva, although not for the same reasons (he has nothing to say about the significance of the number of towers in this respect), but for him Vajrasattva was the final identity in the time of Jayavarman VII whose Indrābhiṣeka ceremony was of a Tantric type related to that identity.⁹¹

Sharrock’s treatment of Indrābhiṣeka and the ‘Churning of the sea of milk’ myth possibly associated with it is one of two very questionable subjects in his chapter.

The only indication of an Indrābhiṣeka ceremony at the Bayon is in one of four very fragmentary, and graffiti-like, inscriptions apparently identifying one scene in the eastern side of the southern outer gallery and three more in the northern panel of the western outer bas-relief gallery (Roveda, scenes 58, 64a-b). One of the latter group says that the king is proceeding to perform the Indrābhiṣeka. In that scene there is an important person, arguably the king, standing on an elephant with a sword in one hand and pointing forward with the other. He is preceded by soldiers, some of them carrying a container which may be identified with the sacred fire. The procession is moving northward toward the northwest corner of the gallery, and around the corner are circus scenes which some have claimed are associated with an Indrābhiṣeka.⁹²

Coedès took up the question of the Indrābhiṣeka ceremony in his elucidation of that sole inscription to refer to it. In an article on the Bayon and Banteay Chmar reliefs, he explained these ‘graffiti’. Concerning them in general, he wrote: “they are unfortunately very difficult to decipher, written in cursive script, they were carved on uneven surfaces which had not been previously smoothed and prepared to receive them.”

Sharrock, following Coedès, takes these inscriptions, unique in the Bayon, as instructions to masons and artists at the time the reliefs were carved. Below I advance the possibility that they are really later graffiti carved, in this case, by someone who believed that was what the scenes represented.

The first point to note, then, is that these inscriptions are not necessarily from the time of the Bayon or the time when the reliefs were carved. It is not certain whether they are ‘official’, or

⁹¹ Jean Boisselier, “Vajrapāṇī dans l’art du Bayon (Summary),” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second congress of Orientalists*, held in Istanbul September 15-22, 1951, edited by Zeki Velidi Togan, Vo. II, Communications, Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1957, pp. 324-332.

⁹² Coedès, “Quelques suggestions,” pp. 72-74. These graffiti inscriptions are now numbered collectively as K.469. They are not among the Bayon inscriptions discussed elsewhere in this book. Although intended to be shown on a plan of the Bayon with its inscriptions, they have been omitted—another oversight by the publisher—on the plan, p. 94.

added later by a casual commentator who ‘explained’ the situations according to his own ideas. The script is in such poor condition that it cannot indicate the date.

The first inscription, on the eastern side of the southern outer gallery consists of three repetitions of ‘*anak sañjak*’, a presumably military title, and referring to a combat scene above. This is an Angkor-period title, and thus, even if the inscriptions were unofficial, they probably date from that time, although not necessarily from the time of construction of the Bayon, but later.

The second, on the north side of the western gallery, beneath a scene of a large fish eating a deer, is an inscription explaining this. Since this is the only inscription explaining a scene of daily life among the hundreds of such scenes at the Bayon, it is likely to be a notation added spontaneously by a later visitor.

The third, directly following, is another combat scene involving apparently a king, entitled *vrah śakti kamrateñ añ*, which Coedès translated as “His Majesty.” There is only one other occurrence of that precise title in Cambodian inscriptions (although *śakti kamrateñ añ* is found in one of the short and badly damaged Bayon inscriptions).⁹³

In his note 4 Coedès said that *śakti kamrateñ añ* is found in the inscription on the Buddha of Grahi, in southern Thailand, in Khmer but in language and script differing from Angkor, but there it is in an expression *tapah śakti* preceding the royal title *kamrateñ añ mahārāja* and Coedès translated it (i.e., *tapah śakti*) conjecturally as ‘by order of’ or in the reign of’.⁹⁴ Thus *śakti* is dissociated from *kamrateñ añ*, and the meaning of the expression is not at all clear, nor can the date of the inscription be deduced from it.

The other occurrence of the expression within the Cambodian corpus is in one of the late, AD 1304, inscriptions of Banteay Srei, K.569, “...*vrah śakti kamrateñ an śrī tribhuvana(12)mahēśvara āy Īśvarapura*,” in reference to the principal deity, not to a living king, within the temple named *Īśvarapura*.⁹⁵ Whatever the precise meaning, this might suggest that the phrase indicates usage a century or so after Jayavarman VII, and that the Bayon inscription does not with certainty provide a correct identification of the scene.

Then, concerning Indrābhiṣeka, which is in the fourth of these inscriptions, following closely after the second and third, and below a scene of an apparent king on an elephant (Roveda, Pl OG.4, p. 314) Coedès got into the question of the ceremony in 17th-century Ayutthaya where

⁹³ See Maxwell, above, inscription no. 27(20).

⁹⁴ Coedès, G., *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam*, deuxième partie, pp. 30-31. Although the date in the inscription suggests AD 1183, it has always been in doubt. See Woodward 2003, p. 193.

⁹⁵ Bantay Srei, inscription 42, est. 420, K.569, published in Louis Finot, Victor Goloubew, Henri Parmentier, *Le temple d'Īśvarapura (Banteay Srei, Cambodge)*, Paris, Mémoires archéologiques de l'EFEO, no. 1, 1926, p. 77.

in a description of the Ayutthayan Indrābhiṣeka ceremony, one of its components was an enactment of the Churning of the Sea of Milk. Interestingly this is represented on the same section of the parallel Bayon inner gallery reliefs, suggesting, very speculatively, that the two series of reliefs may have been carved in relation to one another, or that the scene of the inner reliefs may have influenced the interpretation of the outer scene, leading some later observer to add the inscription (Roveda, panels XVIIa-c, p. 300), as recorded in Sharrock note 87.

As we shall see, Ang Choulean evokes the Churning, and sees it in the construction of the bridges at the gates of the city of Angkor where the serpent held by the giants is Vāsukī and the Bayon is to be interpreted as the pivot around which the serpent is to be understood as entwined. The interpretation of these bridges as representations of the Churning is not new, but earlier interpretations, like that of Ang Choulean, took it as the traditional Churning with the serpent *vāsukī* wrapped around the Bayon tower as pivot, as described in Cunin, p. 138.

Not all earlier scholars accepted that the bridges were the Churning. Mus considered that the two teams holding *nāga* represented rainbows between heaven and earth.⁹⁶ Coedès commented favorably on Mus's explanation, but then wished to have it both ways, saying that the bridges represented both rainbows and the Churning, with, however, the gate towers, not the Bayon, as the pivot.⁹⁷

Boisselier also, quite forcefully, treated the interpretation that the bridges “represent the Churning of the Sea of Milk” as one of the “the best known and least acceptable” of “seductive hypotheses” which had been proposed. For him, the bridges represented “The *nāga* and two families of *yakṣa*, one on either side of the causeway” who guarded the city, according to another myth which “relate[s] that the task of guarding the city was assigned to a particular class of *nāga*, two families of *yakṣa* (which must not be confused with the *asura*...), and the Four Great Kings who were the guardians of the cardinal points. The guard was completed by images of Indra himself, holding the lightning in his hand... mounted on a three-headed elephant.”⁹⁸

A careful look at the bridges, without any preconceived notion, favors either Mus or Boisselier. The two teams, whether considered as *deva* and *asura* or two types of *yakṣa* are not pulling against each other, as required in all versions of the Churning. They are pulling in tandem, each team holding an entire *nāga*, head to tail. There is no sign at all of combat or rivalry, rather cooperation.

⁹⁶ Paul Mus, “Angkor in the Time of Jayavarman VII,” *Indian Art and Letters*, nouvelle série, no. 11, pp. 65-75, 1937.

⁹⁷ G. Coedès, *Angkor An Introduction*, translated and edited by Emily Floyd Gardiner, Oxford in Asia Paperback, Singapore, Oxford University Press, 1984, pp. 46-48.

⁹⁸ Boisselier in Jessup and Zephir 1997, p. 119.

Sharrock, pp. 252-253, rejects both this and the suggestion that the same churning scene in the inner reliefs is related to the *Indrābhiṣeka*; and he proposes that the Churning of Jayavarman VII, to accompany his *Indrābhiṣeka*, was a tantric Buddhist ceremony in which “three key actors: Viṣṇu, Śiva and Indra” of the better-known Churning, as seen at Angkor Wat and in the Bayon inner gallery reliefs, are missing. Sharrock proposes that this Tantric Churning is represented in the causeway bridges at the entrances to the city of Angkor with on one side *deva* and on the other *asura* each holding a *nāga*.

Sharrock has taken the Tibetan story of a conflict over the *amṛta*, which also does not show those details, and applied it to the bridges as a Buddhist Tantric Churning perhaps known in Tibet via Sanskrit literature from northern India.⁹⁹

“Jayavarman’s Churning has only two main actors, one of whom looks godly and the other demonic. This in fact provides a closer fit with Nālandā’s Tantric Buddhist version, which features a titanic battle between two antagonists – Vajrapāṇī and the demon leader Rāhu. Vajrapāṇī eventually wins the *amṛta* produced by the churning for the Buddhas and turns blue after being made to swallow the fluid contaminated by Rāhu. Rāhu is punished by the Buddhas for defiling the *amṛta* by being turned into a nine-headed monster — and the leading causeway Asura indeed has nine heads. I propose therefore that we see the new Buddhist version of the myth as the one being staged on Jayavarman’s causeways, and go on from this to assume that the anointment and celebrations could have been led by Buddhists” (Sharrock, p. 253).

Note that here Sharrock starts with an **assumption** that the causeways represent a churning. He also **assumes** that they relate to an *indrābhiṣeka*. Both assumptions are matters which require demonstration.

⁹⁹ According to Sharrock, n. 90, p. 253, Emil Schlagintweit, *Buddhism in Tibet; Illustrated by Literary Documents and Objects of Religious Worship, Leipzig, 1863*. Reprint, Delhi: Indological Book House, 1988, pp. 114-117, cites *The legend about Chakdor (Vajrapāṇī)* for this Tibetan version of the Nālandā legend: “Once upon a time the Buddhas all met together on the top of Mount Meru (Sumeru) to deliberate upon the best means of procuring the Water of Life (*amrita*) which lies concealed at the bottom of the ocean. In their benevolence they intended, as soon as they obtained possession of the water of life, to distribute it amongst the human race as a powerful antidote against the strong poison Hala Hala, which the demons at this period had been using with such mischievous effect against mankind. The Buddhas decided to churn the ocean with Mount Meru as pivot for the *amrita* and put it in the keeping of Vajrapāṇī; but Vajrapāṇī left the elixir unguarded and the monster Rāhu stole it. A battle ensued and Rāhu was conquered, but he had urinated into the elixir so the Buddhas, to punish Vajrapāṇī, forced him to drink it and he became dark blue. Rāhu was punished by being turned into a monster with the tail of a dragon and with nine heads”. Note that Sharrock says the text originated in Nālandā, but in a subsequent personal communication he said there is no certainty about that, and it should only be ascribed to northern India.

This theme is also found in Sharrock's doctoral thesis, with, moreover a photograph of 'nine-headed Rāhu leading the Asuras'.¹⁰⁰ There Sharrock wrote, "In the Buddhist version on the Angkor causeways, Vajrapāṇī leads the row of gods pulling on a serpent and Rahu leads the demons on the other. Rāhu here bears the nine monstrous heads the Buddhas imposed after his battle with Vajrapāṇī. [Plate 86 nine-headed Rahu A.Thom] Vajrapāṇī appears with nine deva heads."

This is quite incorrect. On 21 June 2007 I visited the causeways in order to examine the figures carefully. The best preserved are on the South, now the main entrance to Angkor. Where enough remains to be certain, we can see that both the lead *asura* and lead *deva* were multi-headed, although because of damage the number of heads cannot be counted. Moreover, what Sharrock called the 'nine-headed Rāhu' leading the demons, and illustrated in Plate 86 of his thesis, is not leading, but is at the tail, and is still fairly complete, but with 12 heads, not 9, in 3 superimposed levels of 4, and there was originally something still on top, now broken off (another head?, lotus?)

It would appear that Sharrock never visited the site and worked only with photos, such as Sharrock's Plate 86, in which it is indeed difficult to count the heads. If seen from one side only, one may imagine nine. Sharrock's arguments on this point are completely negated, and these details undermine, I think, completely, the theory of a tantric Buddhist churning represented on the bridges, or indeed any churning there. This part of Sharrock's thesis should perhaps be revised; and the views of Mus and Boisselier are superior for interpreting the bridges.

In the classical Hindu churning scene of Angkor Wat the lead *asura* of humanoid form is also multi-headed, but far more than nine, and interpreted in Mannikka as 'Bali' with the monkey Sugriva at the tail end on the *deva* side. Mannikka also notes that some have interpreted the two as respectively Ravana and Hanuman (for example Claude Jacques in *Ancient Angkor*); and both Jacques and Mannikka consider that the Khmer mixed Ramayana elements with the original churning myth.

Mannikka is probably wrong in her identifications. She does not seem to realize that her 'Bali' (written in Khmer as *bālī*) is the same as *vālīn* (*vālī*), the monkey king killed by the monkey Sugrīva (*sugrīb* in Khmer—see Mannikka, Fig 5.19, p. 145). And for this identification of Bali see Saveros Pou, *Études sur le Rāmakerti*, Vol. CXI, references to Bālī in index, especially p. 80, "le singe Bālī" ('the monkey Bālī').¹⁰¹ Thus for Angkor Wat the identification Ravana and Hanuman is superior.

¹⁰⁰ Sharrock, "Thesis," pp. 163-164.

¹⁰¹ Eleanor Mannikka, *Angkor Wat Time, Space, and Kingship*, St. Leonards, Australia, 1997, p. 306, n. 20, p. 145, Fig. 5.19; Michael Freeman and Claude Jacques, *Ancient Angkor*, Bangkok, River Books, 1999, pp. 62-63.

In the Hindu churning scene in the inner gallery of the Bayon, the lead *asura*, as in Angkor Wat holding the head of the serpent, is multi-headed, although the precise number, given damage and deterioration, is difficult to determine, while at the tail end of the *nāga* it does not appear to be Hanuman as in Angkor Wat, but a *deva* figure larger than the others. Sharrock, p. 252, notes that here the directions of the scene are the opposite of Angkor Wat, if considered ‘left/right’, implying that this might have some significance for interpretation of the scenes. But for Cambodians compass directions are more important, and both at the Bayon and at Angkor Wat the *asura* are at the South end and the *deva* at the North. But there are also lintel scenes of the Hindu churning in which there are no multi-headed figures.

I wonder if there is not a danger of efforts at over-interpretation. We know now that Mus was wrong, both on the Bayon and Borobodur, in thinking that such monuments were designed according to a text, and that if we knew the text we could understand the monument. Perhaps the Khmer sometimes just engaged in fantasy, as in the Ramayana elements in the great churning scene in Angkor Wat. Note the diverse churning scenes in Ang Choulean’s chapter (p. 374), the strange one from Svay Rieng, with only one person pulling on either end of the *nāga*, shown in the catalogue of the German exhibition, and the even more peculiar one at Wat Preah Einkosei in Siemreap, in which there is only one *asura* pulling against seven *deva*. Viṣṇu, Brahma and Śiva seated on his bull observe from the left. Still another peculiar one is at Anlok Svay Cek, of which a copy stands in the departure lounge of the Phnom Penh airport.¹⁰²

Perhaps we may return to the Ayutthayan ceremony of Indrābhiṣeka, which, although not well understood, is represented on an antique screen in the royal palace in Bangkok. Sharrock referred to its description by Prince Dhani Nivat, but neglected the detail that the scene of the Churning there is the traditional one with central pivot and *nāga* pulled on either side by *deva* and *asura*. Although early Ayutthayan royalty was strongly under Khmer influence of the Bayon and post-Bayon periods, and really had some kind of Indrābhiṣeka tradition, they apparently did not pay attention to the Angkor bridges as a type of Buddhist Tantric Churning.¹⁰³

The second questionable subject in Sharrock is ‘Yoginīfication’. He offers (p. 260) an entirely new interpretation—that the third phase of the Bayon, after Stern’s Lokeśvarization in the second phase, was ‘Yoginīfication’, “reflecting a return to a broader pantheon resembling that of

¹⁰² Catalogue of the exhibition in Bonn, Berlin and Zurich, 2006-7, *Angkor Göttliches Erbe Kambodschas*, Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland GmbH, Ed., Wibke Lobo and Helen Ibbitson Jessup, p. 122, pl.40.

¹⁰³ Dhani Nivat, “The gilt lacquer screen in the audience hall of Dusit,” *Artibus Asiae* 24, 1961:275-83; For Khmer influence on early Ayutthayan royalty see Michael Vickery, “The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: A Reinterpretation,” *Journal of the Siam Society* LXI, 1 (January 1973), pp. 51-70.

Phimai Tantrism, and further indebted to the Yoginī Tantras of the northern Indian monasteries.” By *yoginī*, Sharrock means the dancing female figures carved in the hundreds on the walls and pillars of the Bayon and other Jayavarman VII temples, and who, he says, were companions of the tantric deity Hevajra (“originally, 6250 goddesses were carved on the pillars and gopuras, according to my estimate from their positioning in gopura friezes and on entrance pillars”).

Previously these images have not been given very much iconographic importance, and were just called ‘dancers’ or ‘*apsaras*’. But for Sharrock they are Hevajra’s *yoginī*, and what others have called the ‘dancers’ halls (*salles des danseuses*) in Banteay Kdei, Ta Prohm, Preah Khan, and Banteay Chmar, are for Sharrock ‘halls of yoginīs’.

He reasons in part from iconography: “the *ardhaparyāṅka* (half cross-legged) pose, with one knee bent and the other leg retracted to touch the thigh of the other, and the open-eyed, unsmiling stare of these challenging goddesses indicate kinship with [*sic!* emphasis added] the Yoginīs,” because “the goddesses found in such prominent proliferation on the temple walls do not bear the specific attributes of named Yoginīs,” but they “hold flower garlands [some do some don’t], which Yoginīs give to initiates in Hevajra consecrations.”¹⁰⁴

Sharrock’s interpretation of these figures would be more convincing if it were really true that “the emphatic use of this goddess motif in the Bayon ... is unprecedented in Khmer temple decoration.” Angkor Wat, however, is filled with the same type of dancer, in the same pose, and that temple cannot be fitted with a Tantric Buddhist interpretation. There are long rows of them on the outer wall of the western gallery, on the walls and columns of the Preah Pean chamber, and elsewhere.

Sharrock (thesis, p. 97) has attempted to get around this by treating those in Angkor Wat as real *apsaras*, mere decoration (‘heavenly wallpaper’), but in fact they are exactly like the images he calls *yoginīs* in the Bayon. Then arguing from Phimai, where there really are *yoginī*, he says “The differences in demeanour and placement between the temple dancers of Phimai [fierce *yoginī*] and Angkor Wat [gentle *apsara*] are the key to their different iconography” (thesis, p. 98). But there is no such difference between those of Angkor Wat and the Bayon. The latter are depicted with gentle smiles; and for my eyes (one good—one bad, perhaps both jaundiced), the fiercest ones are in the outer western gallery of Angkor Wat.

Returning again to iconography, Sharrock emphasizes “the *ardhaparyāṅka* pose that is the standard iconographic posture of Hevajra and of the Yoginīs” (thesis, p. 99). This, however, is the pose of the Angkor Wat dancers, it is also a standard iconic pose of modern classical dancers, and was the pose chosen for emphasis by Rodin when he painted a Cambodian dancer in 1906.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Quotations here and in next paragraph from p. 260.

¹⁰⁵ See Dagens, *Angkor Heart of an Asian Empire*, Thames and Hudson, 1995, p. 81.

In fact the Bayon female dancing figures are not at all like the genuine *yoginī* found in Banteay Chmar, Phimai, and the post-Bayon Angkor terraces.¹⁰⁶ Neither is the *ardhaparyāṅka* a sufficient attribute to identify *yoginī*. It only indicates dancing, including, as Sharrock says in his thesis, the *tandava* of Śiva.

Sharrock again goes far beyond the evidence in “when the Bayon goddesses appear with musicians in two panels in the southeast corner pavilion of the temple, instead of holding attributes, they snap their fingers in the gesture the Yoginīs ... make to symbolise cutting the ties of evil passions,” and “around their necks are draped flower garlands that Yoginīs present to Hevajra or Saṃvara initiands as they approach the maṇḍala of their deity” (thesis, pp. 104-5). This goes far beyond the evidence of the scene of the southeast corner. The figures concerned in those panels may not be called goddesses. They are just human dancers performing at some ceremony in which offerings are being taken to the temple in which there appears to be a *liṅga*. And they are not snapping fingers more than other similar figures in the Bayon and in Angkor Wat. Another such scene of dancers with musicians is in the southern chamber of the northern half of the eastern inner relief gallery.¹⁰⁷ The so-called garlands are less obvious/less defined than on the necks of some of the other Bayon ‘*yoginīs*’ who are not performing among humans.

The female dancers throughout the Bayon and in many sections of Angkor Wat are almost all identical, but because of the religious orientation of Angkor Wat (Viṣṇuite) it is impossible to there call them tantric Buddhist *yoginī*. Sharrock has really just called those in the Bayon *yoginī* because it suits his total interpretation of that temple, while acknowledging that those in Angkor Wat are *devatā* or *apsara*.

The popularity of such dancing figures in Khmer art would seem to have begun at Angkor Wat, then spread from there to Jayavarman’s temples including the Bayon; and it is very problematical to give them any special religious or iconographic significance.

If the dancing ladies of the Bayon *and* Angkor Wat are not tantric *yoginī*, what was the inspiration for their proliferation in 12th-century Angkor temples, starting with Angkor Wat, and not earlier? Again I would like to point to Cambodia’s closest neighbor and conduit to the outside world, Champa, and in particular to the beautiful dancers of Trà Kiêu which Jayavarman VII and his cohorts may have observed in a more complete state of preservation than when they were discovered by the French.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ See Pl. 7 in *Bayon* (Angkor post-Bayon), Pl. 26, Sharrock’s “Thesis” (Phimai), and Pl. 40, “Thesis” (Banteay Chmar). The post-Bayon terrace and Banteay Chmar *yoginī* figures are not in the *ardhaparyāṅka* pose—not dancing at all.

¹⁰⁷ These scenes are described in Roveda 57b, p. 323 and and XXVIIIa, p. 311, respectively.

¹⁰⁸ See *Le Musée de Sculpture Cam de Đà Nẵng*, pp. 134, 136.

Sharrock tried to take his argument further with some architectural evidence and a reference to a vague context in Stern, while ignoring more specific evidence both in Stern and in Cunin.

As support for his hypothesis of ‘yoginification’ as the end stage of tantrism at the Bayon Sharrock says (p. 260), that, “large halls, called simply ‘salles aux danseuses’ [‘dancers’ halls] by French scholars, and adorned with similar goddesses, were inserted late into the king’s other temples (the insertion was on a particularly impressive scale at Banteay Chmar) in an update package that suggests a late cultic shift,” adding that (p. 250, n. 80), “Stern attributes both the Banteay Chmar ‘salle aux danseuses’ and the royal terraces in Angkor to what he calls a ‘troisième période avancée’ [‘late third period’] — ‘either contemporary with the last work on the Bayon or immediately following it’. I am calling this style post-Bayon”; and in support Sharrock calls on “Olivier Cunin’s work on the magnetic susceptibility of the sandstone blocks of the ‘salles aux danseuses’, [which] confirms they were late additions.”¹⁰⁹

Had Sharrock been less hasty, he might have given attention to other remarks by Stern about Banteay Chmar: “Banteay Chmar appears to extend throughout the second period [of the style], having been begun, it seems, in the transition between the first and second periods and abandoned, not completely finished, at the beginning of the third”; and Banteay Chmar, “second major work of the second period of the Bayon style”; “if, almost certainly, there were modifications in its plan and additions... they were perhaps during construction... everything is of the second period of the Bayon style, from beginning to end”; except, perhaps, “the room which *corresponds to* [emphasis added] the ‘dancers’ hall’, which seems to be clearly later than the ‘dancers’ halls’ of Ta Prohm and Preah Khan,” and with friezes showing persons with raised arms (atlantes and caryatids) which seem to be much later (thus not the in the *ardhaparyatika* pose of the dancers elsewhere).¹¹⁰

Relying only on Stern’s remark about Banteay Chmar, ignoring what Stern said about the other temples more closely related to the Bayon, was risky. When Stern wrote about Banteay Chmar, its layout was not yet clear, and he only referred to “la partie correspondant à la ‘salle aux danseuses’” and “un bâtiment de type ‘salle aux danseuses’” [‘the part corresponding to the dancers’ hall’ of other temples and ‘a building of the type ‘dancers’ hall’] of the other temples, with “terrasses avec figures en atlantes” [‘terraces with atlante/caryatid figures’] like the royal terraces

¹⁰⁹ Stern 1965 p. 161, 165; Sharrock, note 138; Olivier Cunin and Etsuo Uchida, “Contribution of the magnetic susceptibility of the sandstones to the analysis of architectural history of Bayon style monuments”, in *Annual Report on the technical survey of Angkor monuments*, Japanese Government Team for Safeguarding Angkor, 2002, p. 216.

¹¹⁰ Stern 1965, pp. 56, 110-111 and Plates 164-164.

of Angkor in the “troisième période avancée” [‘late third period’]. Thus, for Stern, this part of Banteay Chmar was not like the ‘dancers’ halls’ of the other temples, and the figures sculpted there are not at all like the figures which Sharrock wishes to call ‘*yoginī*’ at the Bayon. Even if that part of Banteay Chmar is as late as Sharrock desires, it does not help his *yoginī* theory.¹¹¹

Cunin’s description of Banteay Chmar is also unhelpful for Sharrock’s theory: “the eastern complex is itself mixed up with the ‘dancers’ hall’ BC.80 situated outside the second rampart... this alignment... was the origin of the plan of the central part of Banteay Chmar which is so *atypical* [emphasis added] with respect to the plans of Ta Prohm or the Preah Khan of Angkor.”¹¹²

At least, one of the photographs which Stern attributed to “the part corresponding to the dancers’ halls” (fig. 164), showing “atlantes lions ailés” [‘winged lion atlantes’], seems to be what Cunin calls “Soubassement et vestiges de la ‘bibliothèque’ Sud” [‘substructure and remains of the south ‘library’] (structure BC.81; the ‘dancers’ hall’ is BC.80).¹¹³ And Cunin shows phase 2-2 of Banteay Chmar, with the ‘dancers hall’ already built, coeval with the “first period of the Bayon [temple],” and the third phase of Banteay Chmar coeval with the second period of the Bayon.¹¹⁴

Stern, however, although considering that the ‘dancers’ halls’ were part of the later phases of construction, still thought that they were well within the Bayon style; at Preah Khan, “second period [of the Bayon style], rather in its first phase,” at Ta Prohm, “clearly an addition,” “mostly the same features as that of Preah Khan... second period not yet developed,” Banteay Kdei, “late, it has dancers on columns.”¹¹⁵

That is, for Stern, based on stylistic comparisons, the ‘dancers’ halls’ of the two major pre-Bayon temples, Ta Prohm and Preah Khan, were in what he called the period of ‘Lokesvarization’. The studies of magnetic susceptibility seem to place them slightly later, but not at the very end where Sharrock situates his ‘yoginification’. In a special article on the use of magnetic susceptibility to date the monuments, Uchida and Cunin show that by this technique of investigation the ‘dancers’ hall’ of Ta Prohm is in the third phase of that temple’s construction, corresponding to the first stage of the Bayon as measured by magnetic susceptibility, which represents Stern’s second

¹¹¹ Stern, Figures 163-164 at Banteay Chmar and Figures 179, 181, kneeling females on the royal terrace; Sharrock, Pl. 7, p. 251.

¹¹² Olivier Cunin, “De Ta Prohm au Bayon,” Thèse de doctorat, L’Institut National Polytechnique de Lorraine, 2004, Vol 1, p. 163. Original French: “Le complexe oriental est lui-même imbriqué avec la “salle aux danseuses” BC.80 située à l’extérieur de la seconde enceinte. Cet alignement, représentant une longueur totale de près de 174 mètres pour une largeur d’environ 43 mètres est à l’origine du plan si atypique de la partie centrale de Banteay Chmar par rapport aux plans de Ta Prohm ou du Preah Khan d’Angkor.”

¹¹³ Cunin, “De Ta Prohm au Bayon,” Vol. I, p. 162, photograph 458.

¹¹⁴ Cunin, “De Ta Prohm au Bayon,” Annex I, p. 279, 281.

¹¹⁵ Stern 1965, pp. 74, 68, 61 respectively.

period (Lokeśvarization) of the style; that of Preah Khan is somewhat later, in its fourth stage, corresponding to the Bayon's second magnetic stage, perhaps still Lokeśvarization; and only the dancers' hall of Banteay Kdei, as Stern saw, is significantly later, in the third magnetic phase of the Bayon, that of the libraries and the inner constructions of the eastern entrance causeway. Study of its magnetic susceptibility shows that Banteay Kdei, contrary to Stern, who thought of it as a "*Temple-pilote*" in his study, was built stage by stage in the same periodization as the Bayon.¹¹⁶

The same relative periodization for those temples based on magnetic susceptibility is seen in Cunin's doctoral thesis.¹¹⁷

As for Banteay Chmar and the Angkor royal terraces, the female supposedly *yoginī* figures there (Pl. 7, p. 251) are not at all like those in the 'dancers' halls' of Ta Prohm or Preah Khan, or the Bayon dancers whom Sharrock wishes to call '*yoginī*. Peculiarly, in *Bayon: New Perspectives*, Sharrock avoided any illustration of the female figures at the Bayon which he wished to call *yoginī*. Cunin considers that the construction of that part of Banteay Chmar is 'atypical' within the Bayon style, and in his thesis he shows phase 2-2 of Banteay Chmar, with the 'dancers hall' already built, coeval with the "first period of the Bayon [temple]," and the third phase of Banteay Chmar coeval with the second period of the Bayon.¹¹⁸

The religious content (names of deities) of the forty-two short inscriptions, which, as I argue (above and below), must be the latest addition to the Bayon, and which Sharrock ignored entirely, does not lend support to his Vajrasatva interpretation.

Thus it seems that Sharrock's interpretations of the Bayon faces as Vajrasatva and *yoginī-fication* as the last cultic phase merit at best a Scottish verdict—not proven. Indeed the faces remain as mysterious as ever; and his supposition of a northern Indian tantric Buddhist churning in the Angkor causeways is to be entirely rejected.

Ang Choulean

Given the serious and still irreconcilable differences among Buddhologists and Indologists outlined above, with serious inconsistencies both within and among the chapters, which must make this book a confusing read for serious students, it is very difficult to dismiss the Cambodian traditional explanations as in any way inferior.

¹¹⁶ E. Uchida, O. Cunin, I. Shimoda, C. Suda, & T. Nakagawa, "The construction process of the Angkor monuments elucidated by the magnetic susceptibility of sandstone", *Archaeometry* 45/2 (2003), pp. 225, 226, 228, 229, 230; Stern 1965, p. 57.

¹¹⁷ Cunin, "De Ta Prohm au Bayon," Vol. I, pp. 303, 305, 308, 311.

¹¹⁸ Cunin, "De Ta Prohm au Bayon," Annex I, p. 279, 281.

One problem with the local traditional story, however, as recounted by Ang Choulean, is that it could not have arisen until after the Bayon was completed with the faces popularly interpreted as Brahma. For the story says that the *nāga* father-in-law of the king had warned him not to have Brahma faces sculpted on his temple, but later when coming up from the nether world to visit he saw the Brahma faces on the temple and fought with his son-in-law. Although the *nāga* was killed, his blood fell on the king's body and made him leprous.

Thus the story as now told could not have been formed before construction of the Bayon in the 12th century.

Moreover, in a comment sent to the editors, Ashley Thompson has reported that there was “an intriguing paper at the UK association for Buddhist Studies conference in 2006 about Tantric Buddhist texts and practices in which meditation practitioners are said to descend to Patala (the watery underground world of the *nāga*) to unite with resident maidens.” Thus there may be some doubt about the Khmer origin of the story.

The bas-relief scene to which Ang Choulean refers (Roveda XXVIIIa), if it was intended to represent that story, would then imply that this section, at least, of the inner bas-reliefs was carved much later when the Bayon's original meaning of the time of Jayavarman VII had been forgotten. This would not have been part of any Hindu iconoclastic campaign by Jayavarman VIII or Jayavarma-Parameśvara, and it has no significance for the question of religious orientation of the Bayon.

Ang Choulean continues with a discussion of the meaning of Angkor Thom (‘big Angkor’—Angkor Wat is ‘little Angkor’, in Khmer ‘Angkor Toch’), the colloquial designation for the Bayon with the surrounding walls of the city, as a representation of the churning of the sea of milk together with Viṣṇu asleep on the *nāga*, and with Brahma at the top of the pivot, as is seen on certain lintels.

Finally, citing late 16th-century inscriptions at Angkor Wat he demonstrates that the Khmer never forgot the origins of Angkor, that the 16th-17th century kings who made additions to the temples and left inscriptions knew very well that it had been their ancestors who built Angkor Wat and Angkor Thom.

The argument by Ang Choulean, Boisselier and Woodward that the towers may have been considered as Brahma either from the beginning, or from the end of the reign of Jayavarman VII, is weakened by the first report of a foreign visitor just one hundred years later, the Chinese Zhou Daguan, who was told that the faces were Buddha, and coming from a largely Buddhist country, he must have known what that meant.

The reader may legitimately feel that we are still in the situation bewailed by Coedès in 1943: “I can already hear our critics crying out: ‘Just look at those archaeologists of the French

School! Faced with an image as distinctive as the faces of the Bàyon, they are not even capable of telling us whether we are dealing with a Brahmā, a Śiva or a Buddha!”

Coedès sought to escape from the dilemma by a device dear to the old orientalists, that the natives did not know what they were doing, for he continued, “the point is that between Brahmā the Creator of the Universe, Śiva who spreads his blessings to all regions of space, the Buddha who multiplies himself indefinitely in the Great Miracle, and Lokeśvara ‘facing all ways’ there are not for the Indian religions those distinctions founded on individualism that the gods of Olympus have inculcated in us. What is hiding under these Indian divinities, which the architect wished to represent, is not so much a real being, an individual; it is only an abstraction... ‘royal power blessing the four quarters of the country’. Faces of Brahmā, faces of Śiva, faces of Lokeśvara equally fit with this abstraction, and if we have decided on these last, it is only because of the distinctly Buddhist character of other elements in the Bàyon.”¹¹⁹

Maxwell would not agree that the tower faces are “Indian divinities,” nor would I; and Sharrock (p. 242), arguing, against Coedès’ identification of the faces as Lokeśvara, that “it is hard to believe that such a committed message propagator as Jayavarman VII would have tolerated the omission of the instantly recognizable Amitābha figurine, attribute of the great Bodhisattva, if the latter was indeed the god he was celebrating,” obviously considers that in the beginning the faces were considered by their creator to exhibit a definite individual identity.

The answer to the long enduring ‘mystery of the Bayon’, its meaning, has not been solved by the contributors to this book, and perhaps may never be solved. And if Cambodians wish to continue in their conviction that the faces are Brahma, the arguments against this are still in the realm of theory, and often not very solid theory.

The Problem of the bas-reliefs

As noted in the book’s Introduction, the relative dating of the bas-reliefs has always been problematic, but at present there seems to be agreement that the outer reliefs are earlier than those in the inner gallery. Part of the reason for this dating is that the inner reliefs show many scenes of Hindu deities, presumably because they were carved during the anti-Buddhist reaction after the reign of Jayavarman VII, and indeed in these reliefs there are many defaced Buddha images.

A recent opinion is that of Claude Jacques, who proposes that the outer reliefs were carved “perhaps at the beginning of the 13th century,” and the inner reliefs “were carved in the

¹¹⁹ Coedès, *Pour mieux comprendre Angkor*, (1943:137-8) (translated by Peter Sharrock, p. 232).

second half of the 13th century when, under Jayavarman VIII, the Bayon was converted to Hindu worship.”¹²⁰

The outer gallery, supposedly carved during the Buddhist period of Jayavarman VII, however, does not show any particular Buddhist character, and the only scene which may show a religious orientation is in the southeast corner pavilion, possibly showing a temple with three towers and a *liṅga* in the central one, an interpretation which is not universally accepted. Thus it could be Śivaite (Roveda scene 57b).

In current discussion the problem of the southeast corner of the outer reliefs has been glossed over or pushed aside. Jacques has written that in the outer southeast corner, the “towers... remarkably similar to those of Angkor Wat. In the central sanctuary is a *liṅga*, suggesting it was carved in the second half of the 13th century,” thus a special case in the dating of the outer gallery.¹²¹

These were not the opinions of the first archaeologists and architects who studied and worked on the Bayon. Aymonier, for example, who did not try to describe the outer reliefs because they were still too heavily obscured by damage and vegetation, and who only republished the earlier description of the inner gallery by Harmand, considered that the inner reliefs “do not appear to be based mainly on mythological subjects, as was the case at Angkor Wat where... a single bas-relief gallery out of eight was given over to historical and ethnographic scenes. In these second [inner] galleries of the Bayon the sculptors rather seem to have shown scenes of real life and the country’s history.”¹²² This is the opposite of the current opinion.

Commaille, in 1912, published a nearly complete description of the reliefs and thought that the inner reliefs might have been earlier because they were artistically inferior. “Many of these sculptures give evidence of great inexperience and seem to date from a time when the decorators of Angkor were just learning their trade, if one may pardon the expression.”¹²³

That was presumably also the opinion of Coedès at the time, because in his 1932 article on the outer gallery reliefs, he wrote that in 1912 he had, with Commaille, described the inner reliefs, and in 1932 he offered no further opinions on them, beyond a prediction that they would be understood to represent themes from Indian mythology.¹²⁴

In 1912 the defacing of Buddha images, even if recognized as such, which does not seem to have been the case, might not have seemed significant, because it was believed that all the great

¹²⁰ Michael Freeman and Claude Jacques, *Ancient Angkor*, Bangkok, River Books, 1999, pp. 83-84.

¹²¹ Freeman and Jacques 1999, p. 86.

¹²² Aymonier, *Le Cambodge* III, p.169.

¹²³ J. Commaille, J., *Guide aux Ruines d'Angkor*, Paris, Hachette, 1912, p. 138.

¹²⁴ Coedès, “Quelques suggestions sur la méthode à suivre ...,” *BEFEO* XXXII (1932), p. 71.

constructions now attributed to Jayavarman VII were of the 9th century, and that the Bayon was a Śiva temple. Commaillé saw no significance in the greater number of representations of Hinduism in the inner gallery.

The reason for the current convention—that the inner reliefs are later, which can only have come about after 1927-1928 when Stern and Coedès re-dated the monuments from 9th century to Jayavarman VII, however, is clear. It is because of the iconoclastic defacing of many Buddha images in the temples of Jayavarman VII, presumably after his reign, since it seems certain that he always remained faithful to some kind of Buddhism, and imputed now to Jayavarman VIII because of his alleged preference for Hinduism. Thus, it is assumed that the more ‘Hindu’ inner gallery must have been his work, and therefore later.

The current view of the southeast outer corner and the relative dating of the inner and outer reliefs is impressionistic and ignores one of the features of the ancient Khmer temples—the mixture of both Buddhist and Hindu iconography to the extent that in some temples the original religious orientation has been very difficult to identify. Coedès noted this in 1908 in his discussion of the temple of Bat Chum, the outer appearance of which is a three-tower temple like many others, and its Buddhism could only be seen in the reading of the Sanskrit inscriptions (originally, of course, in the images within the towers), but not in its lintels. This has been true of Banteay Samre, Beng Mealea and Wat Athvea. In fact, Boisselier considered that at Beng Mealea Coedès misidentified a Buddha as Viṣṇu.¹²⁵

Thus there is no necessary temporal significance in the greater presence of Hindu motifs in the inner gallery of the Bayon, and Commaillé’s judgement, although subjective, that their inferior quality shows earlier work, must be given weight. Note also the affirmation of Claude Jacques in another context concerning “these Hindu gods whose presence is necessary to the prosperity of even a Buddhist empire.”¹²⁶ The Bayon contains so many representations of Hindu gods in its pediments and lintels, and with its northern inner gallery tower (BY.34) devoted to Śiva and the western one (BY.30) to Viṣṇu, that the proliferation of Hindu scenes in the inner gallery reliefs, or a temple sheltering a *liṅga* in the outer reliefs, cannot have any temporal significance.

The outer gallery reliefs are, as Coedès said, *actualité*, which could even include the Śivaite scene in the southeast corner of a three-tower temple, with a *liṅga* in the central tower. As G.

¹²⁵ Coedès, G., “Les inscriptions de Bat Chum (Cambodge),” *Journal Asiatique* no. 10 (12), pp. 226-252; Boisselier, J., 1952, p. 218 for Beng Mealea and Banteay Samre. On Bat Chum see also Pierre Dupont, “Les Buddha sur Naga dans l’art Khmer,” *Artibus Asiae* XIII (1950), pp. 39-61, p. 40, Bat Chum has the form of a typical Sivaite temple.

¹²⁶ Jacques, “Derniers siècles,” p. 372.

Groslier said in 1935, there would have been no lack of three-tower temples in 12th-century Cambodia. Denying that the scene necessarily represented Angkor Wat, he said it was “simply a temple with three towers, of which there were many in Cambodia.”¹²⁷

In fact, there are other similar three-towered structures in the inner reliefs which appear to be palaces, and if it were not for the apparent *linga*, that in the southeast corner could also be identified as a palace rather than a temple.

A large part of the *actualité* is warfare between Khmer and Cham, and the scenes may well represent a series of events in the life of Jayavarman VII, as B.-P. Groslier attempted to show in 1973. His interpretations are not very convincing, in part through neglect of the Champa inscriptions, but also because he proposed fictionalized reconstructions. Some of those problems have been noted in the historical chapters of this book, and Roveda calls attention to the deficiencies of Groslier’s treatment, denying that the reliefs may be read as any kind of continuous narrative.

I find Roveda’s conclusion about the inner reliefs, that they were carved at different times, some perhaps at the same time as the outer gallery and some perhaps as late as the 16th century, quite reasonable. Different panels show different styles; and some scenes are nearly identical to scenes in the outer gallery. Further study should pay attention to those scenes in the inner gallery which are of the same style as the outer gallery, or which are near duplicates of outer gallery scenes, probably due to the same inspiration. Most interesting is a scene in the southeast inner gallery which, element for element, duplicates the so-called *Indrābhiṣeka* scene in the northwest outer gallery, a detail never before noticed.¹²⁸

Cunin and the architectural history of the Bayon

The best chapter of all in this book is Olivier Cunin’s “The Bayon: an archaeological and architectural study,” beautifully illustrated with technically superb diagrams, photographs, and three-dimensional projections of the stages of the temple’s construction. Although the very technical treatment may discourage readers who lack that interest, the presentation is clear and progresses logically from one stage to the next; and, in contrast to other chapters of the book, it may be read with confidence that it represents the best and latest treatment of its subject, free from speculation.

As already noted in the book’s Introduction, Cunin’s history of the Bayon’s construction, based on more scientific objective techniques than earlier studies, has undermined some of the

¹²⁷ George Groslier, “Notes sur la chronologie des monuments khmers, Troisièmes recherches sur les Cambodgiens: 2,” *BEFEO* XXXV Fasc. 1 (1935), p. 198.

¹²⁸ The two scenes are respectively Roveda IIIb (inner) and 64a (outer).

treatments of other contributors. His more thorough detail inevitably reaches some conclusions different from those of Parmentier or Dumarçay, among architects, and is very much in disagreement with the proposals of non-specialist epigraphists and art historians.

As I wrote in the Introduction to the book (p. 27), Cunin has made use of a new technique, measuring the magnetic susceptibility of the sandstone, with which it is possible to show which parts of the structure were built with stone from the same quarry, and thus presumably at nearly the same time. This technique, it must be understood, cannot alone provide dates, either absolute or relative, but only shows which stones were worked at the same time, and makes difficult an argument that two structures of the Bayon with very different magnetic susceptibilities could have been built at the same time, or that two structures with the same magnetic susceptibility were built at very different times. When comparison of the magnetic susceptibilities of different structures agrees with earlier attempts at relative dating based on architecture or art motifs, those conclusions are strengthened. This technique cannot be applied to laterite, used in many Angkor temples and in some parts of the Bayon.¹²⁹

Among his important findings are that the Bayon was constructed on unoccupied land, not over a pre-existing temple, and that except for some of the decor, was entirely the work of Jayavarman VII. Through examination of the piles of broken stones around the Bayon known to specialists as ‘Commaille Heaps’, Cunin has attempted to discover the true number of original face towers, and has demonstrated that there were at least eleven more than those still standing.¹³⁰

There were four phases of construction, of which the first three were during the reign of Jayavarman VII, and the fourth, which affected mainly the decoration, included the ‘śivaite’ reaction, which is generally attributed to a time following Jayavarman VII, but which, as we shall see below, may have been political rather than religious, lasting only a short time immediately after his death.

The principal constructions of the three phases were, very briefly, as follows. In the first phase, which Cunin divides into two sub-phases, the central sanctuary and 24 towers (BY.22, 23, 38, 39, 40, 25, 26, 27, 41, 42, 43, 29, 30, 31, 44, 45, 46, 33, 34, 35, 47, 48, 49, 37) were erected on a cruciform terrace, but the galleries linking the towers were not yet constructed.¹³¹ This differs

¹²⁹ On this technique see E. Uchida, *et. al.*, *Archaeometry* 45/2 (2003), pp. 221-232.

¹³⁰ See pages 160-166. The expression ‘Commaille Heaps’ is a translation of the original French technical terminology *tas Commaille*, named for Jean Commaille, conservator of the Bayon from 1907 to 1916, and who arranged the broken stones cleared from the temple in piles corresponding to their apparent original locations in its structure.

¹³¹ See the master plan of the Bayon, pages 97, 145. The reason for the apparent lack of consecutive numbering is that Parmentier, who was responsible, was not concerned then with dating, and simply numbered consecutively as the towers are seen today, starting with the central tower, BY.1 and working outward.

from Dumarçay's analysis which places the eight smaller towers (BY.38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49) in the third phase at the end of the relative chronology of the Bayon. According to Cunin, measurements of the magnetic susceptibility of the relevant structures makes that untenable (see plan, p. 178).

In the second phase, corner pavilions were built to transform the cruciform plan into a square, and the four corner towers of the new square (BY.24, 28, 32, 36) were added and linked to first phase towers facing them by galleries.

Important changes in the third phase, divided into three sub-phases, were (1) extension of the floor of the third (highest) level base, which then concealed the lower pediments of the small face towers (BY.38, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49); (2) construction of the outer gallery, and in the second sub-phase construction of 16 passageways/*vrah kuti* (BY(A)-BY(P) connecting the outer and inner galleries, but which were soon demolished in the third sub-phase. Following that the 'libraries' (BY. 53 and 54) were added.

For a visual exposition of the construction sequences see diagrams on p. 177.

In addition to the differences between conclusions of Cunin and previous work by Parmentier and Dumarçay, nearly all of the hypotheses by Claude Jacques are negated: (1) the removal of the sixteen passageways between the outer and inner galleries was not part of the iconoclastic program of Jayavarman VIII, (2) nor were the square corner inner galleries built then, late in the third phase, from the remains of the passageways as part of the program of Indravarman II and Jayavarman VIII, an important part of Cunin's argument being based on the magnetic susceptibility of the stone, (3) the destruction of the passageways must have been part of a program of Jayavarman VII; (4) Cunin says categorically that the attribution of parts of the Bayon to Jayavarman VIII does not fit the archaeology or the iconography, and the contribution of Indravarman II is "nothing but supposition without any real archaeological basis."¹³²

Cunin's insistence, I would say proof, that the sixteen passageways (*vrah kuti*) were a late addition with a short life casts doubt on proposals by Jacques and Maxwell about the dating and significance of the short inscriptions; and the attribution of the tower faces to early phases of construction makes difficult acceptance of Sharrock's and Ang Choulean's interpretations of their meaning.

Although none of the writers in the book adopted it, this is a good occasion to put paid to a proposal by Paul Mus, taken up by Dumarçay, and evoked by Cunin (p. 222) with the remark that "it is not possible to either confirm or refute this hypothesis." This hypothesis was that each construction phase was a response to changes in the kingdom of Jayavarman VII. As the pantheon

¹³² Cunin, original French text, not included in translation for this book. My translation from the French.

housing the gods of all the provinces of the kingdom, the Bayon would have been an exact replica of the latter. Therefore, the divinities symbolizing newly conquered provinces were housed in the ‘passage-galleries’. Once the provinces were firmly part of the kingdom, the statues were integrated into the inner gallery of the monument, thus rendering the passageways obsolete.”¹³³

As Sharrock remarks, however (p. 241), “all attempts to formally map their random distribution to the kind of ‘mystical geography’ Mus seeks, have failed”; and there is no example of a deity named in the *vraḥ kuṭi* who appears to have been moved to an inner gallery; and too few of the gods named in the passageway inscriptions represented distant localities which might have been recently conquered—perhaps only the two *jayabuddhamahānātha* of *nagara śrī jayarājapurī*, inscription 3 (I) and *nagara śrī jayavajrapura*, inscription 6 (L), probably now Ratchaburi and Petchaburi in western Thailand.

Another attempt to place part of the Bayon, the northern library (BY.54), at a significantly later date, also now appears unacceptable.

A few years ago, after excavations carried out in the repair and reconstruction of the northern library, one of the Japanese team, Naho Shimizu, published an article on fragments of ceramics discovered at the library, suggesting that its construction might have been much later than hitherto supposed, as late as “the middle to the latter half of the 14th century.”¹³⁴

There are problems with the conclusions about the Bayon library based on ceramic fragments. I note the following points: (1) they excavated only at, and mostly outside, the northwest corner of the library (figure 2), and there is no indication of which ceramics were found outside rather than right under the northwest corner; thus I am skeptical when they write of dating the ‘platform construction’ on the basis of those ceramics; (2) they admit that the dating of Khmer and Thai ceramics which were found is insecure and that they cannot be used in dating the architecture; (3) their last paragraph, “As all of the trade ceramics associated with the structure are too fragmentary to allow for reliable identification of production loci and dates, the construction date of the platform proposed here should be regarded as tentative”; and (4) apparently based on a misunderstanding of Dumarçay, who said the library was built in the fourth phase of construction, they consider that “the library was not originally associated with the Bayon temple,” a bizarre conclusion given that the library is within the outer wall of the Bayon which all students of the question agree was built earlier.¹³⁵

¹³³ Cunin, p. 222, citing Dumarçay, 1996, pp. 39-41.

¹³⁴ Naho Shimizu, Japanese Government Team for Safeguarding Angkor, “Preliminary Report on Ceramics Recovered From the Northern ‘Library’ of the Bayon Complex, Angkor Thom,” *Udaya* 1, Apsara, April 2000, pp. 201-216; quotation from p. 207.

¹³⁵ Shimizu 2000, p. 207, citing Dumarçay and Groslier 1967 and 1973.

Although Cunin's research in the magnetic susceptibility of the stone shows the libraries later than the main structure of the Bayon and of the same date as the later structures on the eastern entrance causeway, their iconography and style, in his opinion, place them firmly within the Bayon of Jayavarman VII.

Below we shall also note Cunin's view that the so-called *śivaite* reaction against the temples of Jayavarman VII may have been very brief, and for political rather than religious reasons. One important implication of this is that there is no longer any reason to assert that the inner gallery bas-reliefs must have been the work of Jayavarman VIII.

Like other chapters of the book, Cunin's also has suffered from some carelessness in publication, in the misplacement of footnote numbers on pages 222-223. Note numbers 83 and 84 are on p. 222, but the notes themselves are missing. Then on p. 224 we find footnote numbers 85-90, but the corresponding notes, correct for the corresponding text, are numbered 83-88.

Final remarks

So what conclusions have been reached with this book? Certainly not what was imagined possible when it was conceived. And it may be that nothing like what was imagined will ever be possible.

Concerning religion, all are agreed that when the Bayon was planned and built the religious orientation was some kind of Buddhism—but that had been agreed since the work of Stern and Coedès in 1927-1928.

The faces, it seems, must remain a mystery; and the discussions of our contributors serve only to emphasize the mystery.

The work of Cunin, however, does serve to make the periodization of construction more precise—through his more careful examination of the procedures of placing one stone upon another, and through the new objective scientific study of the magnetic susceptibility of the sandstone used in construction. His conclusions are not revolutionary. In general they confirm the proposals of Stern based on study of style, and on only a few points disagree strongly with the previous architectural analysis of Dumarçay.

A few of the points which merit final emphasis are the following.

The Bayon was not built on the site of an earlier temple, but on virgin ground.

Work on it began when the construction of the temples of Ta Prohm and Preah Khan was well advanced.

Contrary to Stern, Banteay Kdei was not an early work, but a construction close in date to the Bayon.

Consistent with earlier views—going back to Parmentier, the first ground plan for the Bayon was cruciform, which was then modified to a square by the addition of corner constructions; but contrary to the earlier analyses, the change was made quickly, as is seen by the similar magnetic susceptibility of the sandstone in the two stages of construction.

Then, still consistent with earlier views, the platform of the third level was enlarged, the outer gallery was added, sixteen passageways were built between the outer and inner galleries, but not long afterward removed, and last of all the two libraries were built—all within the reign of Jayavarman VII, which did not end before 1218. I find that Cunin, in agreement here with Stern, has shown convincingly that architecturally and stylistically it is not possible to attribute any of these constructions to Indravarman or Jayavarman VIII.

We must still acknowledge, though, that the question of the relative dating of the two galleries of bas-reliefs has not been resolved. There seems to be no objection to attributing the outer reliefs to the time of Jayavarman VII. Even if there is still disagreement—which I think will remain insoluble—about some of the events of his reign, it is easy to recognize many scenes as bearing some relationship to events which may be inferred from the relevant inscriptions.

It is the inner gallery reliefs which are problematic. It is certainly obvious that Buddhist images were either destroyed or re-carved as apparent Śiva or 𑀓𑀲𑀭. There are also some scenes showing actions and motifs identical to what is seen in the outer gallery; and if the illustration of an apparent high-ranking man in combat with a snake, and then apparently falling ill, really represents the leper king legend included in the story of *Kok Thlok* (see Ang Choulean), then it must have been carved significantly later than the construction of the temple itself.

Roveda is probably correct now to propose that the inner gallery reliefs as we see them were carved at different times, some scenes perhaps as late as the 16th century when new work was carried out in several Angkor temples, the best known being the two dated (1546 and 1564) large relief panels around the northeastern corner of Angkor Wat.

It is certainly not possible to attribute the inner reliefs globally and absolutely to Jayavarman VIII, whose personal religious orientation is in fact unknown. If the obvious modifications and desecration there, and in other temples of Jayavarman VII, must be attributed to Hinduist anti-Buddhism, then the best candidate for responsibility, as Sharrock noted, is Jayavarma Parameśvara (1327-?), whose own two inscriptions show him as Hinduist, and who left one of them (K.470), which speaks of construction work and is Śivaite, at the Bayon.

Of course, as Olivier Cunin suggested elsewhere, and an explanation which I find attractive, the desecration of the temples of Jayavarman VII (except at Banteay Chmar) may not have been religious but political (throughout the previous history of Angkor and pre-Angkor history there is no sign of hostility among the religions).

A subject on which I wish to offer my own observation concerns the short inscriptions which were the subject of Maxwell's chapter, were briefly considered by Jacques, but ignored by Sharrock.

I agree with Maxwell that they are important for understanding the religion of Jayavarman VII, but Maxwell did not explain how; and their content seems to negate Sharrock's idea of 'yoginification' as the last phase of religious orientation.

Insufficient attention has been given to the possible relative dating of these inscriptions. Many of them were engraved across and over the previous decor of roundels with bird and floral patterns seen throughout the Bayon, and which can only have been added after the structure of the building was in place. That is, they are the last phase in the Bayon's construction, were probably all done within a short time period, which accounts for Coedès' remark that they appear to be all by 'the same hand'. Even where inscriptions are in a *surface réservée*, as Coedès put it, the reserved surface was in most cases imposed across pre-existing decor. This means that these inscriptions may not have been part of the original plan—at least they were not added gradually with each new phase in the construction of the building, as Maxwell proposes. It seems to me reasonable to suppose that the inscriptions within a reserved surface were the first planned, and that others were added *ad hoc* later, but of course not much later, given the identical palaeography. Some of them were in fact scratched quite crudely across pre-existing decor without even attempting to prepare an outlined space for them.¹³⁶

This would support Jacques' view that the first ones engraved were those in the doorways of five of the sixteen passageways (*vrah kūtī*) between the outer and inner galleries, and in towers By.63 and 65, for among them, those without damage are within very clear reserved spaces and are also the longest of the inscriptions.¹³⁷ This is contrary to Maxwell's interpretation in which these inscriptions were the last. Jacques' view on their relative date is also supported by their content—which includes the special deities of most importance to Jayavarman VII, *jayabuddhamahānātha* and the 'Medicine Buddha' also found in his hospitals; but Jacques' opinion that they were part of the first stage of the Bayon's construction cannot be accepted.¹³⁸

¹³⁶ A particularly clear instance of this is number 35(6) which Coedès found totally illegible, but which Jacques now wishes to read as the name of Jayavarman's Cham friend Jaya Harivarṃśvara.

¹³⁷ These are inscriptions 2 (63), 3 (I), 4 (65), 5(K), 6 (L), 7 (M). There is also a similar prepared space on the doorway of passageway J which was not inscribed.

¹³⁸ The oldest opinion about the identity of *jayabuddhamahānātha* was that of Coedès who thought they were the portrait statues of Jayavarman VII which evince some kind of Buddhist identity. Hiram Woodward 1994, followed by Sharrock here (p. 244), proposes that they were the so-called "radiating Bodhisatva." A new third interpretation is

This interpretation, however, negates Jacques' view that the inscriptions of *vraḥ bhagavatī pārvvatī*, 29 (11), and *vraḥ bhagavatī dharanī*, 40 (10), could not have been there when the central image was a Buddha, and must have been added after it was replaced by a Harihara, for the *dharanī* inscription is within a very clear reserved space, and is one of the very few where the reserved space was designed to fit between two roundels without impinging on them at all, although the space was probably prepared after the borders on the left side of the pillar had been carved and cuts into them. Thus this inscription was planned along with the roundel decor. Coedès wrote that the *pārvvatī* inscription was also within a reserved space, but that inscription and its surrounding decor have now been completely chipped out.

Stern was also of the opinion that these inscriptions were all done in the latest phase of construction, although he gave no attention to their content or meaning. As noted above, he wrote of a “frenzy of homage paid to mortals in erecting for them the statue of a divinity in which they have been or will be absorbed at the end of their terrestrial existence.”¹³⁹

Now, what is their content and meaning? Most of them are *kamrateñ jagat*, which Maxwell translates as just ‘god’. Certainly *kamrateñ jagat* were deities, or supernatural agents, of some sort, but what? A *kamrateñ jagat* is neither with certainty either Buddhist or Hindu, although some *kamrateñ jagat* bear names which are Buddhist or Hindu. For example, in the passageway inscriptions the apparently Buddha images of *jayabuddhamānātha* and the ‘Medicine Buddha’ are entitled *kamrateñ jagat*, although in another inscription, 24 (21), the Medicine Buddha is entitled *vraḥ* (‘god’) *vuddha* (‘Buddha’) *kamrateñ añ* (‘lord’, a princely title).

by Jacques (2005, p. 16) who proposes “to see in these *Jayabuddhamānātha* a sort of substitute for the protective Devarājas installed in the different provinces,” and aniconic like the Devarājas. This does not concern the Bayon, and thus I shall not give it full attention, but once again Jacques, without warning the reader, is going far beyond the evidence, which is that the Devarāja, in the single Sanskrit inscription which discusses it (K.235), was unique and followed the kings in their moves from one capital to another, not multiple and sent out from the center to the provinces (Coedès, G. , Pierre Dupont, “Les stèles de Sdok Kak Thom, Phnom Sandak et Prah Vihar,” *BEFEO* 43 [1943-46], pp. 56-134). Jacques, “Deux problèmes”, p. 16, n. 6, refers vaguely, and without indicating the location, to “the creation of a *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*, [the Khmer original for which ‘*devarāja*’ was devised in Sanskrit in K.235] in the reign of Jayavarman V,” but which he has probably confused with the *vraḥ kamrateñ añ ta rāja* of inscription K.1141 (AD 972) near Korat in northeastern Thailand (see Jacques, “Les kamrateñ jagat”, 1994, p. 223 and publication of the inscription by Saveros Pou, *Nouvelles inscriptions du Cambodge II & III*, Paris, Ecole Française d’Extrême-Orient, 2001, pp. 115-118), or the *vraḥ kamrateñ añ ta rāja* of K.175 (AD 979-987) near Phnom Kulen. It is not certain, however, that the *vraḥ kamrateñ añ ta rāja* and *kamrateñ jagat ta rāja* were the same. It is a subject requiring further study. The proposition that the *devarāja* (*kamrateñ jagat ta rāja*, the greatest of the *kamrateñ jagat*, discussed below) and *Jayabuddhamānātha* were aniconic is interesting, and relevant for the Bayon. However, the evidence of K.1141 argues against this for it speaks of *unmīlita* (‘eye-opening’) of the image of the god, implying anthropomorphism.

¹³⁹ Stern 1965, p. 146; above p. 134.

The ‘gods’ called *kamrateñ jagat* first appear, rarely, in the 10th century, their frequency increases gradually thereafter until the time of Jayavarman VII when there is, in Stern’s terminology, a real frenzy.

Previous study of the *kamrateñ jagat*, without regard to their importance for Jayavarman VII, suggests that they were a special type of native Khmer guardian spirit, neither Buddhist nor Hindu, in pre-Angkor times known as *vrah kamratāñ añ* of places or natural objects. The most famous *kamrateñ jagat* in modern scholarship was that ‘of the king’ (*ta rājā*), known from the Sdok Kak Thom inscription (K.235) and translated, probably loosely, in its Sanskrit part as *devarāja*.¹⁴⁰

This title from Sdok Kak Thom, does not appear elsewhere in the Angkor corpus, except at the Bayon, although in a few other inscriptions, first of all those of Jayavarman IV at Koh Ker (mid-10th century), there are similar deities, Coedès near the end of his life attributed the founding of that cult to Jayavarman IV.¹⁴¹ In the Bayon inscriptions it appears as one *kamrateñ jagat* among several others in 2 (63), and it is obvious from their epigraphic records that the new ‘Mahīdharapura’ dynasty in power after 1080 neglected that deity.

A new development in this ‘frenzy’ of *kamrateñ jagat*-ization, if I may, by Jayavarman VII was the apotheosization of persons as *kamrateñ jagat*. Previously the names of *kamrateñ jagat* had been names which already indicated deities, or names of places, or natural objects. Under Jayavarman VII humans, presumably elite individuals who had been of particular value or interest to him, became gods, perhaps the forerunners of the modern guardian spirits called *neak ta*, some of whom are believed to represent heroic individuals of the past.

As Stern saw, but did not explain, in the last phase of the Bayon there was what Sharrock called a ‘cultic shift’, but toward representatives of Khmer pre-Indic beliefs. Could this have accounted for an anti-Jayavarman VII reaction by the orthodox, both Buddhist and Hindu?

A final point to consider, and a discussion with which this survey may conclude, is the apparent end of the first period of the Bayon as a Buddhist temple, as seen in the desecration of Buddhist images there and in the temples of Jayavarman VII, except at Banteay Chmar.

As emphasized above, the attribution of this iconoclasm to Jayavarman VIII rests on little more than hypothesis. There is no certain evidence of his religious orientation (recall that the

¹⁴⁰ See citations in note 68, above.

¹⁴¹ G. Coedès, “Le véritable fondateur du culte de la royauté divine au Cambodge.” In *R.C. Majumdar Felicitation Volume*. Ed. by Himansu Bhusan Sarkar. Calcutta: Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyay, 1970, pp. 56-66.

1970. The titles in other inscriptions (K.125, K.175, K.186, K.187, K.188, K.189, K.356, K.682, K.1141) are variously, *vrah kamrateñ añ ta rājya*, *vrah kamrateñ jagat ta rājya*, *vrah kamrateñ añ jagat ta rājya* (here always *rājya*. ‘of the realm’). The significance of these different titles and the entire subject requires further study.

inscriptions apparently treating him as Hinduist imply the same for his two immediate Buddhist successors), and certainly no evidence of hostility toward the work and religion of Jayavarman VII. If the reaction was really religious, there is better evidence to link it to Jayavarma Parameśvara (1327-?), who gave clear indications of his Śivaism. Nevertheless, throughout the previous history of Angkor and the pre-Angkor period there is no sign of hostility among the religions. Even within the Bayon of Jayavarman VII there was a section for Śiva (BY.34 in the North) and for Viṣṇu (BY.30 in the West); and Sharrock, who favors Jayavarma Parameśvara as the culprit, notes, “installing a Śivaliṅga in the Bayon immediately upon enthronement looks like a *politico-religious act* [emphasis added] of some significance,” rather than simple religious antagonism.

As suggested by Olivier Cunin elsewhere, and an explanation which I find attractive, the iconoclasm may have been less religious than political

In his doctoral thesis (but not included in his chapter here) Cunn, whose study of the temples of Jayavarman VII has determined that the desecration was restricted to only some of the most important—Bayon, Preah Khan of Angkor, Preah Khan of Kompong Svay, Ta Prohm, and Banteay Kdei, was nowhere complete, and was not carried out at all at Banteay Chmar, which must have been equally important for Jayavarman VII. If it had been a policy of Jayavarman VIII, he could easily, even in his now shortened reign from 1270 to 1295, have completed the work. Thus, this so-called ‘Śivaite’ reaction must have been very brief, as Dagens had already proposed.¹⁴²

Cunin suggests that it was not a religious reaction, but a reaction against new state policies introduced by Jayavarman VII, unpopular in certain important milieus; and that immediately after his death around 1218 a usurper with support from old anti-Jayavarman VII officials briefly seized power and began to damage his temples. It must be emphasized that the political situation immediately following Jayavarman VII is not known at all. His supposed successor, Indravarman II, is mentioned in only one inscription, K.567, at the date 1243, and nothing is known about his origins or actions, although inscription K.241 of 1267, in the new dating presumably within his reign, indicates a religious orientation similar to that of Jayavarman VII.¹⁴³

Cunin’s proposal is further strengthened by the discovery that some doorjambs in the temples have also been effaced, usually on the East side (the main entrance). In earlier temples doorjambs were the location of important inscriptions concerning the history of the temples and

¹⁴² Olivier Cunin, “De Ta Prohm au Bayon,” Thèse de doctorat, L’Institut National Polytechnique de Lorraine, 2004, pp. 273-274, 435-436, 443, 455-457; Dagens, B., *Etude sur l’iconographie du Bayon (Frontons et Linteaux)*, *Arts Asiatiques*, XIX, 1969, p. 157.

¹⁴³ It says in Khmer that an image of *kamrateñ jagat śrīsugatamāravijita*, was set up, in Coedès words “an image of the Buddha named Sugata Māravijita” (“victor over Māra”).

their founders. Such inscriptions, giving prominence to the work of Jayavarman VII, might have been found offensive by his political enemies.

Maxwell, in his own conclusion, favors a political explanation, soon after the reign of Jayavarman VII, although focusing on the small inscriptions, which he says would have been records of the political class supporting Jayavarman VII, whose memory and influence one or more later kings wished to efface—“a coordinated campaign of posthumous assassination enacted on the stone proxies of the king and his most powerful agents in Angkor, the capital city and spiritual storehouse of their erstwhile dominance.” It seems to me, however, that Maxwell’s proposal of “a coordinated campaign of posthumous assassination” would have involved much more destruction of the inscriptions.

Although many of the inscriptions are damaged, or worn, and no longer legible, very little of this may be attributed to deliberate destruction. As Olivier Cunin pointed out to me, many of the now illegible inscriptions, and two spaces where, logically, there should have been inscriptions, are on stones facing North, more susceptible to the action of wind and rain. In some cases such natural damage has occurred since the temple was cleared by the French, removing some of the natural protection. The best such example is inscription 24B (21), which in the time of Coedes showed eight perfectly legible lines, seen in the published rubbing (*IC CCXIX*), but now completely effaced. There is no evidence in the Bayon of entire inscriptions removed in ancient times, and where, besides weathering, deliberate chipping is now visible, as in 29 (11) *pārvvatī*, it seems to have been inflicted since Coedès first studied them in 1918.

Because of the total lack of inscriptions for over 50 years after the reign of Jayavarman VII until 1267 (K.241) and no more until 1308 (K.754), these interpretations may only be hypothetical, but we may assert very strongly that Jayavarman VII did introduce radical new state policies, as had previous kings of his dynasty (beginning with Jayavarman VI around 1080), and in his case a political reaction could have been due to his relations with Champa, which might have been displeasing to certain Khmer factions.¹⁴⁴

Thus, four of the participants in this book favor an explanation involving at least some political component in the reaction, although there is not agreement among our proposals on the time or the perpetrator (immediately following Jayavarman VII by his political opponents or later by Jayavarman Paramesvara).

At least, there is increasing agreement that it was other than religious fanaticism by Jayavarman VIII; and with this conclusion about the end of the first life of the Bayon, we may also conclude this survey.

¹⁴⁴ See Schweyer’s chapter above and Michael Vickery, “Champa Revised.”

Although the purpose of this article has been to emphasize the defects of this book, resulting both from overly speculative proposals by contributors and inability to achieve a cooperative approach, as well as unjustified and often erroneous intervention by the publisher, *Bayon: New Perspectives* may nevertheless be of use to scholars and students in its bringing together, both in its own chapters, and in references to other work, the research results and opinions of most of those who have given thought to the Bayon since it first came to the attention of modern scholars.