

The purpose of this presentation is to discuss the concepts of the territory of the state, domination, kingship, and its evolution or change in the history of Cambodia in the Pre-Angkor (5th to 8th century) and the Angkor (9th to 14th century) period.

The inscriptions, which are the principal documents for research of ancient Cambodia (Kambujadeśa), have an elitist bias, and that is why we have to seek information on “social integration” in Angkor only through the ideal that was commemorated by kings and other elites in these inscriptions. In that ideal, the king was seen as the lord of the whole world and gave himself

enough authority to be comparable with the gods. We should not take such statements at face value without recognizing what sorts of power were exercised and how. However, we unfortunately do not have sufficient evidence to conclude that the king’s political power extended over the whole length and breadth of the country.

This brings us to the first subject of this presentation, which has to do with the various meanings of the word “social integration.” It is well known that the so-called Khmer style of art and architecture is found widely distributed in the mainland of Southeast Asia. Would this mean the wide-spread political domination of the “Khmer empire”? There is a great difference between the broad distribution of a similar style of architecture and the expansion of political control from the capital of Angkor. On the other hand, some Chinese documents mention the “subordinate states” of Zhen-la (真臘). When viewed from the Chinese standpoint, Zhen-la was located in the south of Champā (South Vietnam), east of Pagan (Burma), and north of the Malay Peninsula, and the eastern part of Zhen-la faced the sea. In addition, from the 12th century onwards, certain Chinese writers provided more concrete information concerning this polity, such as the name of its “subordinate states” and the items used for mutual maritime trade. Although it is difficult to identify the place of these “subordinate states,” it probably included the country placed in the middle of the Malay Peninsula and even Pagan. According to S. Fukami (1997), the author of *Ling-wai-dai-da* (嶺外代答, 1178CE) describes a number of countries such as Champā, Java, Zhen-la, and San-fo-qi (Straits of Malacca region), as “general mart,” and in *Zhu-fan-zhi* (諸蕃志, 1225CE) also, we can trace the economic relationship (not political domination) between the “general mart” and “subordinate states.” From these, it can be supposed that the territory of Angkor was a multi-layered space composed of political, religious, cultural, and economic integration, in other words, “social integration” based on self/other recognition. These concepts of state integration are comparable with pre-modern states of South and Southeast Asia, and there have been many studies under the terms “segmentary states,” “galactic polity,” or “maṇḍala,” among others. Needless to say, in order to understand the “social integration” in Angkor, synthetic examination is needed.

As time is limited, I will concentrate on the concept of kingship in Angkor for the rest of this presentation. Because of the tendency of inscriptions, as mentioned above, kingship will be considered, comparatively and in



Figure Phnom Chisor (11th Century, 50km South of Phnom Penh, Cambodia), So Called Southern Edge of Sūryavarman’s Territory.

detail, as a combination of religious and political.

In the first place, as I. W. Mabbett (1978) has said, “it is clear that Angkor cannot be treated as a static entity, unchanging from start to finish.” He goes on to say that “P. Stern discerns an interesting rhythm in the pattern of activity of certain kings who had the motive, the means, and the time to fulfil their destiny as they saw it: first the construction of major works for the public good, especially reservoirs; then the building of ancestral temples; finally, as the crowning demonstration of imperium, the erection of the symbolic temple mountains which notionally were the centre of the kingdom, the abode of divinity and royal power.” However, this pattern of aspiration of kings is no more than only one aspect of kingship or state integration of Angkor. Indeed, there were only four kings who accomplished this: Indravarman I (reigned 877–889CE), Yaśovarman I (889–910?), Rajendravarman II (944–968), and Jayavarman VII (1181–1218?). If we rely only on this viewpoint, we would have to evaluate the other kings of Angkor as inadequate; moreover, whether or not we can assume a consistent policy throughout the history of Angkor is still open to discussion.

Relevant to this point is H. Kulke (1986; 2001)’s following remark: “the process of state for-mation usually passed through three successive phases, namely, the local, regional, and imperial phases or levels...the numerous Early Kingdoms with their precarious balance of power, shared by the central authority of a *primus inter pares* and the centrifugal local polities, were certainly the dominant feature of the political map of Southeast Asia throughout the first millennium A.D. At the end of this period, however, a new development began which changed this political map considerably during the first centuries of the second millennium.” This passage is in accordance with Mabbett’s observation, which was quoted above, as “royal power depended in a sense on the personal loyalty of the king’s following; this in turn depended upon the nature and the strength of the ties between sovereign and clients... In later reigns, the descendants of these clients owe less and less to the monarch, and have their own hereditary and landed sources of authority and power. Centrifugal tendencies become stronger; factions become more violently opposed; finally a candidate for the throne appears who is able, and considers it necessary, to remove from influence all factions but his own.”

These remarks show the parallel sequences in the political history of Angkor such as centralization and the rise and challenge of regional elites. Many scholars have closely studied the important innovation in the reign of Sūryavarman I (1002–1050), in the germinal change of the divinity of king (devarāja cult), distribution of functions, and integration of the territory in the later Angkor period took place. The concept of kingship, so-called “devarāja (god-king),” although this term was often overemphasized, shows at least that the personality cult was one of the bases of Angkor authoritarianism. However, personality cults were not exclusive to kings; regional elites also claimed divinity for themselves and their families. Kingship in Angkor can be therefore traced in various efforts aimed at achieving higher divinity by kings and their entourage in the fluid social situation in Angkor.

Bibliography

- Briggs, Lawrence Palmer. 1952. “The Genealogy and Successors of Sivācārya,” *Bulletin de l’École Française d’Extrême-Orient*, 46-1, pp. 177–185.
- Coedès, George. 1937–1966. *Inscriptions du cambodge*, I–VIII, Hanoi-Paris.
- . 1964. *Les états hindouisés d’Indochine et d’Indonésie*, New ed., Paris.
- . 1970. “Le véritable fondateur du culte de la royauté divine au Cambodge,” Himansu Bhusan Sarkar (ed.), *R. C. Majumdar Felicitation Volume*, Calcutta.
- de Mestier du Bourg, Hubert. 1970. “La première moitié du XIe siècle au Cambodge,” *Journal Asiatique*, 258(3-4), pp. 281–314.

- Jacques, Claude. 1994. "Les Kamraten Jagat dans l'ancien cambodge," François Bizot (ed.), *Recherches nouvelles sur le Cambodge*, École Française d'Extrême-Orient, pp. 197–212.
- Kulke, Hermann. 1978. *The Devarāja Cult* (Data Paper No. 108), Cornell University Southeast Asia Program.
- . 1986. "The Early and Imperial Kingdom in Southeast Asian History," D. G. Marr and A. C. Milner (eds.), *Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th centuries*, Canberra: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University, pp. 1–22.
- . 2001. *Kings and Cults: State Formation and Legitimation in India and Southeast Asia*, New Delhi: Manodar.
- Mabbett, Ian W. 1969. "Devarāja," *Journal of Southeast Asian History*, 10-2, pp. 202–223.
- . 1978. "Kingship in Angkor," *Journal of the Siam Society*, 66-2, pp. 1–58.
- Majumdar, R. C. 1953. *Inscriptions of Kambuja*, Calcutta.
- Stern, Philippe. 1954. "Diversité et rythme des fondations royales khmères," *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, 44-2, pp. 649–687.
- Vickery, Michael. 1985. "The Reign of Sūryavarman I and Royal Factionalism at Angkor," *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 16-2, pp. 226–244.
- . 1998. *Society, Economics and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia, The 7th–8th Centuries*, Tokyo.
- Wolters, O. W. 1999. *History, Culture, and Region in Southeast Asian Perspectives*, Revised edition, New York: Cornell Southeast Asia Program, in cooperation with the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.

[Japanese]

- Fukami, Sumio. 1997. "The Entrepot Java: Seen from the Trade Items Indicated in Zhu-fan-zhi," *The Toyo Gakuho*, 79-3, pp. 19–37. (深見純生「流通と生産の中心としてのジャワ『諸蕃志』の輸出入品にみる」『東洋学報』79-3)
- Ishizawa, Yosiaki. 2005. *Angkor: Stories of the Kings*, Tokyo: NHK Books. (石澤良昭『アンコール・王たちの物語—碑文・発掘成果から読み解く』NTT ブックス)
- . 2013. *A Study of the Ancient Cambodian History*, New edition, Tokyo: Fukyo-sha. (石澤良昭『〈新版〉古代カンボジア史研究』風響社)
- Matsuura, Fumiaki. 2010. "Chenla and Angkor: Some Remarks Concerning Images Mutual to China and Cambodia since Primeval Times," *The Journal of Sophia Asian Studies*, 28, pp. 117–139. (松浦史明「真臘とアンコールのあいだ—古代カンボジアと中国の相互認識に関する一考察」『上智アジア学』28)

Social Integration in Majapahit as Seen in an Old Javanese Court Narrative

AOYAMA Toru

(Professor, Graduate School of Global Studies, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies)

This paper looks into some of the factors that may have contributed to the social integration of Majapahit by analyzing the Old Javanese narrative *Deśawarnāna* (DW). In particular, close attention will be paid to how the Singhasāri–Majapahit dynastic genealogy and the Phālguna–Caitra annual court festival are narrated in the text to point out their significance.

Majapahit is regarded as one of the quintessential Indianized states in the history of Southeast Asia. The kingdom was founded in 1293 by Wijaya, the son-in-law of the last king of Singhasāri Kṛtanagara, after defeating a Kadirī



Figure Panatran Temple Complex, Located in Blitar, East Java. This Hindu Sanctuary Was Visited by Majapahit's Royals as the Kingdom's State Temple.