

The Divine Rights of Kings: A Comparative Study of Medieval European Kingship and Malay World “Devaraja”

¹Puteh Noraihan Binti A Rahman and ²Zahir Bin Ahmad

¹Malay Studies Academy, University of Malaya, Taylor’s University,
Lakeside Campus, Selangor, Malaysia

²Malay Studies Academy, University of Malaya, Kula Lumpur, Malaysia

Abstract: The idea of kingship existed since the human race desired the communal leader. Leadership, politics and governance skills were essentially discussed by the political scientists and historians throughout time. The fundamental notions of serving kings vary depending on the communal interest but most of them are correlated with doctrinal and supernatural notions. This study is intended to demonstrate the analysis between medieval Europeans’ and Malays’ ideas of kingship in the sphere of divine right and authority of the kings. This study aims at identifying the difference of divine-king concept between the European and Malay communities. The secondary aim is to examine how the divine-right belief has impacted greatly on these two civilizations. The last purpose is to demonstrate a unique cult known as dewa-raja which was created by the Malays as a reflection of their divine-right doctrine. Qualitative data literary and archival works about Western and Malay political philosophy, cultural history and their social anthropology were consulted. Researcher has used “divine-right theory” and neo-historicism approach. Divine-right theory and concept between Western and Malays were different. The Malays initiated dewa-raja cult based on rituals conducted towards their king. The research is restricted to the Frankish empire and Malay kingship. The unique amalgamation process between secularism and spiritualism in both civilizations to be realized.

Key words: Divine-right, dewa-raja, king, raja, cult

INTRODUCTION

Throughout human civilizations, the king has been entrusted with the highest rank in most social hierarchy. The credence on king’s nobility has positioned the king in a special place in the heart of the people. The king has been given certain designation in the post of Christian civilization which the monarch was regarded as sacer, sacratus, divus, sanctus, sanctissimus which means divine, saint and holiest. It was a designation derived partly from Byzantium and its law-books and partly from the unbroken Roman traditions of the West-re-appeared first in the Barbarian Latin of Merovingian charters and then in the deliberate and formal theological parlance of the Carolingian court. Ancient Roman and Byzantine titles such as these were combined with ecclesiastical formulae such as “gratia Dei,” (God’s grace) or “a Deocoronatus (God-crowned),” to make up a new compound in which the diverse origins of the biblical and pagan elements are all the less apparent, because Byzantium had already anticipated this mixture of divine grace with Emperor-worship (Kern *et al.*, 1956).

The Malay royalty or royal institution has been rooted long before contact with the British colonialism.

The monarch institution officially established in very early medieval; circa 600-700 CE. According to the Malay Annals, the foundation of Malay kingship was set by a prince from the ancient line of Palembang and Srivijaya rulership; Malay kingship was grounded in the mythical genesis of mixed Hindu-Buddhist and Islamic elements (Kobkua, 2011). Before full assimilation of the Islamic belief (pre-Islamic period) of the Malays, their devotion to the ancient Hindu-Buddhist belief has put their ruler as the center of veneration. The ancient Hindus accept the idea of the king as cakravartins. In Hindu tradition, Chakravartins that contained in Vayu Purana stressed on the protective functions exercised by the Emperor in the State and by Vishnu in the Cosmos and the index of successful monarchy is found in adbhutani aisvarya, prabhusakti and the monarch is exalted above the sages, gods and men (Nilakanta, 1969).

KING AND KINGSHIP

In many cultures, the king is regarded as someone who has special power, divine legitimacy over his state and he is well respected. The king was recognized as the center of the political, social, economic infrastructure (to

ensure their land fertile and as a sustainer) and even law was made beneath the king. Their worldly secular power that combined with the spiritual influence has made the ruler as *sacrôsâncustus*. Literally, the king is defined as the male ruler of an independent state, especially one who inherits the position by right of birth, for example, King Henry 8 (4). Prior to the medieval ages, the ancient Greeks perceived their king as the true or natural superior of the citizens. They believed that monarchy is a form of political system represented by a legitimate king to rule over his territory. In the political philosophy of ancient Greece, the society believed that there were five kinds of monarchy. At first, it was the Spartan. Second, it was the Barbarian. Third, it was the elective dictatorship. Fourth was the Heroic monarchy and last was the absolute Kingship. Aristotle considered the last of these forms might appear the best polity to some; that is, if the king acts as the embodiment of law. It also might appear in Greek antiquity that monarchy arose to meet the needs of primitive society. The King is responsible as a sustainer to nourish his kingdom. As long as basic necessities of the people are satisfied, the monarchy system always is defended by his people. The history of mankind had proven this. All just kings would live in many dynasties because their people surrendered full allegiance to their king. Plausibly, the kings continuously kept their subjects contented.

The absolute kingship creates another form of political philosophy like in pre-revolutionary France; which was known as French absolutism. The "absolutism" recurs frequently in the French political literature: "The king is emperor of his realm" wrote by Jean de Blanot (1255 CE) and some forty years later, William Durandus of Mende. Also, Philip IV's apologist, John of Paris (Keen, 1968). It demonstrates that the Medieval Frankish empire emphasized the role of the king. In 800 CE, Charlemagne was crowned as emperor not only of the Franks but of the Romans. He also was associated with celestial duty. The medieval society believed that the Old Testament urged them to obey their king, so the king was not only regarded as a secular leader but also leader of the church. "Nowhere was the religious element in kingship brought out more clearly than in the sacrament of coronation, first used when Charlemagne's father became king of the Franks. Here again the guide to practice was scriptural precedent. The authority such rulers wielded was accepted as more than merely terrestrial: it had priestly connotations as well as kingly ones". In addition to that, Charlemagne was compared to biblical King David by Alquin.

In many civilizations, the idea of divine or godly essence in the king or ruler was widely disseminated. The Incas claimed to be the children of the Sun, so the notion

of divine parentage is the first germ of the theory which meets us upon the threshold of English History. The mysticism of the king's origin still remains furtive in most civilizations. The story of their supernatural origin passed down throughout generations and remarkably were accepted by many peoples. In fact, the story of king's mysticism and extraordinary power were put into writing and oral local myths and sagas. In the Malay world, literature such as Hikayat Sang Boma, Gul Bakawali, Hikayat Malim Deman, Hikayat Amir Hamzah, Hikayat Panji Semirang, Pandawa Lima, Puteri Gunung Ledang, Cik Siti Wan Kembang, Puteri Santubong and many more focused on divine attributes of royal blood. Some of these stories about kings (and queens) are connected with the heavenly kingdom such as having mandate from heaven or leadership assisted by gods.

As this idea penetrated to the folks the king and his office enjoy their sanctified privileges. According to *Sejarah Melayu* (Malay Annals), the Malay Sultanate of Melaka-the first and generally speaking, the political genesis of all other Malay sultanates-was founded at the turn of the 15th century. In *Sejarah Melayu*, the conversation particularly about the *wa'dat* (social contract) concerning the formation of Malay realms and preserving the rights of the king or ruler and the people were mentioned. As a consequence, Melaka's founder implicitly claimed his right to rule by divine authority endowed in the illustrious and mythical lineage of his forefathers within the context of both Hindu-Buddhist and Islamic traditions. This right to rule was further endorsed by the legendary social contract made between the first Ruler and the representative of the native inhabitants, Demang Lebar Daun, the one to rule without shaming his people and the other to be loyal and obedient as long as the royal obligations were kept. Actually, Islam is religion that promotes subjective democracy than objective one and promote social wellbeing through Zakat (Indrani and Sagara, 2015).

GOD-KING AND DEVARAJA

The European and the Malay perspective perceived the king as a part of their duty as a territorial ruler has possessed a sanctified spirit that positioned him in divine forms. In laying the loyalty towards their king, the spiritual activities link the king with divine power seen as essential. It has remained in the common consciousness in some sense that the king's power was of God, that obedience to him was a religious duty, taught and practiced by the Christ himself and Apostles. This has become an interesting issue whereby the physical and metaphysical elements were blended and exemplified

when the role of king in Church and states were intermingled. The king's authority demonstrated that their authority was not merely secular, nor was obedience to him merely a secular duty. For example, this kind of idea lay behind the 11th century claim of Gregory of Catino; 'Divine scripture admonishes us that we ought to understand that the king is the head of the church'. The Old Testament made it very clear that kings were more than mere secular governors.

Another issue surrounding the divine-king is the king's deification. King's deification means, the king's physical appearance was transformed to idols and to be worshipped by his people. Historically, the idea of king's deification was traced to very ancient times. The old civilizations of the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean were said to be the breeding ground of sanctification, indeed, of a deification of the monarchy which was radiated far and wide. An obvious example of the ancient Egyptian civilization was the Opet festival held each year at the temple of Amun-Re at Karnak during the fourth month of the inundation. There, the king had his union with the royal ka renewed and therefore his right to rule reconfirmed. After (almost always) thirty years, the king also celebrated his first sed-festival which served to reconfirm his relationship to the royal ka as well as to restore his vitality. When the Greeks and afterwards the Romans subjugated these lands, both gradually learned from the conquered peoples the practice of reverencing the monarch as the "son of God," the "Saviour" and so on. Although in the Western philosophical enlightenment and memories of the great civilization of the great days of the City-States strengthened resistance to such deification, one effect of the general orientalizing that underlay so much of the later culture of the ancient world, was the penetration of the new "religion" into the lands of rationalistic thought; and the emperor-cult of the West soon become hardly less unrestrained than that of the East. In addition, the deification of kings seems to be prolonged and a continuous process when the same scenario can be seen in Western and Eastern civilization. To establish a clergy power upon people in Europe, the papal authority must support the kingship like continuity of existed cult such as emperor-worship. The Christian Church was not able to eliminate all traces of this Emperor-worship. The Christianity that compromised with antiquity which according to the ecclesiastical historian Socrates submerged true Christianity after the time of Constantine gave scope to a strange survival of veneration for the monarch. The provincial priests who practiced the cult were not immediately suppressed by the Emperor after the reception of Christianity.

Some civilizations of the world had practiced certain cults and some not although they believed the essence of divinity in their ruler. A different form of cult occurred in different civilizations such as Roman, Greece, China, Ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia and Meso-America although practicing the same system, monarchy. Roman civilization for instance, has had dissimilar belief about the concept of divine king with Southeast Asian. The Romans believed that their emperor was of a semi-divine nature (demigod) like Julius Caesar but no ritual or cult took place to associate their emperor with gods or goddesses, except Caesar was depicted in Western famous play like Shakespeare. There was a difference between Southeast Asia and the West particularly about special ceremony for the Greek emperor. The Greeks did not make their kings as an object of worshipping or deification. The Greeks only have erected statues of gods and goddesses in temples to worship. Greek gods did not reveal their will in sacred writings, so priests have to perform rituals instead. Therefore, the god-king cult like what had been practiced by people in India, Indo-China and the Malay archipelago was never the same with the Greeks. The Greek belief was that the king possessed quality like gods but he was not a god. Greek mythology has several distinguishing characteristics. The Greek gods resembled humans in form and showed human feelings. Unlike ancient religions such as Hinduism or Judaism, Greek mythology did not involve special revelations or spiritual teachings. It also varied widely in practice and belief, with no formal structure such as a church government and no written code such as a sacred book.

In the Malay World, the concept of divine king was best referred as *devaraja*. To discuss this term in depth, the terminology of *devaraja* must be clearly understood. *Devaraja* is a combination of two separate words; *deva* and *raja*. *Deva* means god, *raja* means king. *Devaraja* term is best described as the king that incarnated of god or gods. The *devaraja* concept should be understood in two different spheres. Firstly, the concept of *devaraja* can be viewed through the Malay worldview perspective. This scope denotes to the king and his administration.

According to the Malay worldview, the society perceived that *devaraja* was an incarnation of god in the king and on some occasions, the king was believed to possess divine attributes. All their loyalty and obedience was surrendered to their king. Secondly, *devaraja* may also refer to king of the gods which refers to Lord Indra who settled in heaven. He is responsible for governing *Amaravati*, the heavenly city on top of Mount Mahameru. Malaysian anthropologist and sociologist, M. Rajantheran, had different opinion about the meaning of the god-king term. According to him, *devaraja*

terminology was formed from two words, namely 'god' and 'king'. M. Rajentheran believed that *devaraja* referred to god Indra but, it also can refer to other gods like god Indra, Vishnu and Shiva as some Hindus believed that one of these gods is the king of the gods. The justification of M. Rajentheran and other scholars was that the *devaraja* is best referred to god Indra who settled in Amaravati (heaven) on top of Mount Mahameru. Other evidence based on discovery of *lingga* in temples, palaces and tombstones found in ancient Hindu-Buddhist kingdoms in Southeast Asia which also refer to god Indra. This god is said to possess the attribute of immortality. God Indra was also considered the god of vengeance to evil doers (Gonda, 1969). Therefore, god Indra had become an inspiration for the Indian rulers to protect and free their people from tyranny and evil. This tradition concluded that god Indra is associated with their king who upholds righteousness and has immortality attribute. According to I. W. Mabbet, the terminology *devaraja* refers to "god-king", "kings of the gods", "kings and gods" or "he whose king is a god" as the conclusion after his finding on other scholars' works such as Aymonier, G. Coedes and P. Dupont. Besides Mabbet's observations on the concept of *devaraja*, Aymonier translated *devaraja* as "*roi des dieux*" or the king of all gods. Mabbet's "*roi des dieux*" always referred to the god Indra. But, if the *devaraja* is discussed in scope of the Ancient Khmer, it means "*dieu royal*" or royal god. Whereas G. Coedes and P. Dupont a half century later do not translate the stele cult surveyed by them as Mabbet's interpretation because they followed the initial expression of ancient Khmer, the *devaraja* as a "*dieu-roi*," or god-king. As conclusion, we may say that *devaraja* can be regarded as "god-king" or "king of gods".

Devaraja concept or idea certainly was not originated from the Malay Archipelago. This was based on findings by the Southeast Asian social scientists such as Aymonier, P. Dupont, Mabbet and G. Coedes who studied this concept and issue extensively during the 1960s to 1980s. They concluded that there is a proper name to symbolize this concept which combines both masculine difference that is *deva-raja*. As early as 1904, Aymonier in the third volume of his history described the cult of *devaraja* as "*une sorte de deification aux divinites brahmaniques, des rois et meme des personnages de distinction, hommes ou femmes, qui erigent des temples contribuent d'une facon quelconque a rehausser le culte de ces divinites.*" based on his observation on stele at Sdok Kak Thom. Whereas, L. Finot in 1915 and again by G. Coedes and P. Dupont in 1946 is particularly important in yielding fragmentary information about the history of the *devaraja* cult. G Coedes has discussed the aspects of

royal divinity in several places. The scholarly literature describing the statuary and architecture of the Angkor monuments abounds in references to the apparent deification of kings and their relatives as represented in statues and in titles attributed to them. Based on observation done by the historians and sociologists above, *devaraja* concept actually originated from Hindu culture in India. As for India, it is likely that the *lingga* similarly served the purpose of prehistoric cults, attested for example in the Harappan civilization; the *yaksas*, "demons," of later Hindu myth are likely to represent territorial gods of indigenous communities absorbed into the new composite culture. Later, when a king wanted to strengthen his political power over his territories, he introduced the *devaraja* cult with the help of Hindu or Buddha brahmin. As a result, the god-king cult had been institutionalized by the community in Southeast Asia. However, the idea remains the same, namely the application of the concept *devaraja* is intended to strengthen their position and power in their respective colonies.

Historically, this concept was institutionalized in Malay society especially under Srivijaya and Majapahit. The connection of these ancient Malay kingdoms with other Southeast Asian empires such as Khmer and Siamese during the Indianization process that took place between the 2nd-7th century. *Devaraja* cult which was popular in Cambodia under Angkorian civilization began to assimilate with the culture of the Malay Archipelago. How was this culture established? Interestingly, if the idea of *devaraja* was so abstract to be understood by the commoner, then how did it begin? Firstly, the intangible culture of the people was symbolized through the cult and rituals involving their king. This was more towards people's creed and ideology. Prior to Hindu-Buddhism belief, the pagan practices of worshipping of inanimate objects such as the sun, sky, trees and corpse or spirit was inherited from ancestral rituals known as animism which Malays practiced for so long. After Hinduism began to spread into the Malay world, their pagan belief blended with the Hindu-Buddhist and invented a new unique belief and religious cult known as "*devaraja*".

Secondly, in an effort to depict the king as a man who has supernatural powers, the Southeast Asian people have symbolized their king and his government with the essence of divinity. This is also termed as tangible culture. Their thought of divine king was expressed in inscriptions, sculptures, regalia, palaces, statues, tombs and anything in material forms. For example, a Sanskrit inscription found in the Sdok Kak Thom, mentioned Jayavarman II of Mehndraparvata as a *devaraja*. Mabbet refers to the verse written on the inscription that reads

“man vrah pada paramauvara pratipha kamrateñ jagat-ta raja naunagara urimahendraparvvata”. This inscription exhibited that the community was convinced their king had the attributes of god and it reflected the worldview of Malays which consisted of the larger polity of the Southeast Asian people toward their king was unique and special in nature. The community raised the status of the king higher than ordinary people. Even until the present day, special treatment is still given and preserved for the Malay royalty and their descendants. This absolute monarch is above the law. Certain regalia which go along with a king and the palace were believed to be sacred and possessed supernatural power. For example, position of a king when he sits on the throne indicates his position is higher than the ordinary people. Another situation where a king is carried using the palanquin also showed the same symbolism. There is no doubt the community highly respected their king as an ordinary mankind. “the cult of the devaraja was in some way a ritual process by which a king became a god or a “god-king”, the evidence of ritual and ideological connections between Cambodian kings and the god Siva is extensive, even if devaraja cult as such may not have played as large a part in the sacralization of Cambodian kingship as the authors of the Sdok Kak Thom inscription would like us to believe. The cult, in other words, was a royal cult, rather than the cult involved a statue of Siva, himself devaraja, or a king of the gods, that was paraded through the streets of Angkor-and other royal capitals”. According to the Indian epic, Mahabharata, the king is expected to be respected as a god (devavat) because he possessed magical power. All humans need to obey the king’s orders, he is a Great God who incarnated as human being.

DIVINE ORIGINS

During the medieval time, the idea of king’s sacredness was not a new subject. Although it has never been declared when the first idea of king was derived, the act of king’s holiness was clearly demonstrated during the 17th century. It could be from the ancient time or even before. Before the 13th century, that is to say, before the formulation of a genuine theory of the State, there could not be any strict sense a conscious monarchical principle; but in practice monarchy dominated Western political life. On the other hand, political societies that were organized not on a monarchical but on communal bases consisted only of such communities as were not in the ultimate sense independent but were rather in some way subordinate to a monarch, even if only to the supreme world-monarch, the Emperor. As humans need chieftains for their own tribes, then this leadership idea started to

develop and evolved as it created the divine kings in later time. As described by Sir Frederick Pollock, the doctrine of kingship sanctity started as early as the 17th century. He claimed that, it was, not rational, not indigenous and not even ancient. In some form the sanctity of kingship has been held from very early times. Although, the theory of the 17th century was mainly the expression of immediate needs, it is not possible to deny some part in it to a sentiment of loyalty which is as old as human society.

Previously, the discussion on divine-king or devaraja showed that the royal blood must have the essence of divinity. It becomes one of the important factors of king’s adoration and god-king legacy. In English history, it showed that the royalists belong to their ancient god named Wodi. “When the institution of royalty was developed by the circumstances of the Conquest among the communities that migrated to Britain, all the petty monarchs of the early English tribes found it well to strengthen their title by a direct claim to descent from Wodi, thus investing the new authority with something of a supernatural sanction. The Wodi or Odin is given in many royal genealogies, a direct expression of descent from the god.

In the Roman Empire later, the king was claimed as divine progeny and frequently emphasized as guided by the Holy Ghost. “But at another time, he spoke himself in official documents as being “guided by the Holy Ghost”. The Hohenstaufen poet Godfrey of Viterbo, addressing Henry VI, chanted: “Thou art a god from a race of gods,” and Peter of Eboli called him “resounding Jupiter, the sun-god”. The myth of sun-god, Jupiter seems to be similar with the Indian Raghus. The origins of Malay kingship as it always thought; inherited Indian tradition, his lineage was from the solar race. A Hindu holy scripture, Raghuvaa stated that the first king of the Indian race originated from sun or solar. It was the Raghus race which was from sun or manu. The Raghus’ origins are also mentioned in their biblical scripture like Vishu-Purana (IV) and Ramayana. In the Malay Annals, history also states that the first Malay king was Sang Sapurba or Sri Tri Buana. As narrated in the Malay Annals, Sang Sapurba was thrown out of a cow and the history of the Malays was strongly influenced by Hindu tradition. In the Hindu tradition, the cow is considered a very noble animal. According to the Malay Annals again, Sri Tri Buana was believed to be a descendant of Alexander the Great. Even now there is a king in this country, namely in Perak, who claimed to be a descendant of Alexander the Great as well. According to the saga, Sri Tri Buana, also known as Sapurba wanted to marry the daughter of Demang Lebar Daun, the head of a Palembang district. Both of them made the covenant known as wa’dat.

CLERICAL ALLIANCE

During the Frankish reign in Europe, kingship was seen as supported by papal authority. For instance, during the Holy Roman Empire reign, Pepin the Short in 751 was deposed as king but with the help of Pope Stephen II Pepin was again anointed as king of the Franks and appealed to him to protect the papacy from the Lombards and he managed to conquer former Roman territory and Pepin made the pope ruler of the territory between Rome and Ravenna which became known as the Papal States. In the beginning, with the clergy and Church help, the election by the people had doubtless transmuted the *de facto* power of the Arnulfinger dynasty into a power *de jure*; but Pepin went further and had himself anointed, probably at the hands of Boniface, the papal vicar and the most eminent prince of the Church north of the Alps. This act was altogether an innovation in the Frankish kingdom. It gave the new dynasty a supernatural sanction which in some measure compensated for the loss of the sanctity that the *reges criniti* had possessed; an ancient pagan symbol gave way to a modern theocratic one. From that day onwards, the ceremony of consecration, evoked by the political needs of the new dynasty, never disappeared from the usage of Western monarchy and soon became one of the principal features of Divine Right.

In Malay kingdoms, the clergy played a very significant role in establishing good connection between commoners and the king. Before the coming of Islam, Malays who adopted Hinduism and Buddhism had given their full loyalty to the priests namely Brahman or Brahmin. The cult of the king activities involved the relationship between the king himself, the priest and the people. "Royal Power" comes from the Sanskrit word, *Rajya*, the king intends circumstances, events and activities of a king. The cult and ritual are important to show the sovereignty of a king and his descendants. To ensure the continuity of the king to control people, certain rituals must be executed. In a historical perspective, some Southeast Asian kingdoms or empires such as Cambodia and Majapahit have institutionalized this cult. Prior to the establishment of Islam in the Malay world, Hindu and Buddhist priests in cooperation with local kings successfully spread the ideology of god-kings, resulting in the cult of god-king in the Malay land, Siam, Laos, Cambodia and southern China even until now. Technically, kings and priests depended on each other. The priest was important to continue the legacy of the god-king cult. Priests taught people how to execute the cult and indirectly strengthened the position of a king. The priests who serve the king would benefit and be rewarded for their cooperation with the king.

In addition, to demonstrate his holiness as incarnation of God and to ensure the continuity of the cult of deification of him, a king will maintain his relationship with his priests. "The King makes the priests as a matter or symbols in the cult worship of him. As heirlooms that have been mentioned such as gloves, umbrellas, palanquin, jewelry, castle, his wife, his phallus, cremation tower, leg and war were part of his regalia. It was not only by bringing in the famous pastors into the king's new territory, the most important was how the priests implemented the *devaraja* cult by conducting some rituals to symbolize the king as their god and, by this, a new dynasty that has just been built will last for long. So, the role of pastor seemed crucial in shaping any Southeast Asian government. If the priests are able to install the elements of *devaraja* cult among the people, they efficaciously made the local community more loyal to the king. In return, most of the priests hold a high position in the government such as the king's advisor. This was not a new thing since we know that in the ancient Indian tradition, every king would possess a religious advisor. For instance, Kautilya of Chandragupta's empire held a very important position in the government. He was a chief advisor to the king and contributed very intelligent ideas in defeating the Nanda Empire. Due to the influence of powerful ministers, kings always maintained religious institutions. In the present time, the role of scholars and kings are closely linked. Since the days of British rule, the institution of the Malay rulers and Islam came under one roof. Is this a coincidence or the British have shaped our system of government based on history? History states that the arrival of ministers, Hinduism and Buddhism to Southeast Asia was politically motivated, the legacy and the way it is seen still practiced to this day. In other words, political and religious institutions act interdependently on each other.

REQUIREMENTS OF THE KING

Justice has become of the highest importance in the divine-king trait. It was in the social contract between the ruler and the people orally or in written form. The feudal contract or feudal kingship in England proves that justice was the king's manner most required by his people. When Henry II therefore ordered, in the Assize of Clarendon, that "for the maintenance of peace and justice" criminals were to be arrested and brought before the king's justices, he did what any self-respecting king conscious of his duty would have done. The law decided by the people will be enforced by the king to establish justice. The law that was consent for enforcement must be properly conducted. Some past civilizations have shown the unjust ruler was

dethroned and opposed by the people. Therefore, the best law is very important. The king will appoint as justices, constables and so forth only those who know *legem regni* and are willing to enforce it. The justices are not to implement the royal law based on the *voluntas regia* but the law to which (explicit or implicit) consent was given.

How about limitation of the king's power? In most world civilizations, the king's power seems to be absolute. But, when he was unable to establish and enforce the state's law, this is considered as injustice. The limitation of power also can be seen in medieval politics. In Medieval Europe, we have seen that the monarch is not absolute in theory. He is bound by the law. But in respect of form and practice, he seems to us to be absolute; for he is not obliged to attain that harmony with the law which is required of him. The harmony between the ruler and the law is usually achieved without the observation of any fixed forms. In ordinary circumstances, it is presumed that all the monarch's acts are explicitly or implicitly in accord with the law and the community's sense of justice.

But, there is another concern about absolute kingship whereby the supremacy of the king is above the law. In Christian tradition, it was declared repeatedly that the king is God's vicar; that all persons in the realm are under him; that he is under none but God; that he has no peer: that if he break the law, it is enough that he await the vengeance of God, for none of his subjects may punish him; that no judgment to subjects may punish him; that no judgment to make void an act or charter of the king is valid; that our Lord of the King has ordinary jurisdiction over all in the land; that all rights are in his hand; that he was created king to the end that he should do justice to all; that the Lord should sit in him; that a jury may be fined for deciding against the king; that none may impose on him without his consent the necessity to amend an injury of his own doing, for necessity may not be imposed on him. Anyhow, in the earlier account was discussed the security and tranquility that a king must provide to his people. As long as he is upholding the law consented by him and his people, justice will take place. In the Malay world, the first *wa'dat* declared between Demang Lebar Daun, who was the people's representative, with the ruler, Sang Sapurba, indicated that, "On condition that, king stay to keep their promise to be a just ruler, people will pay their fidelity as return."

In the Malay tradition that was influenced by the Indianization process, *devaraja* as god-king, what is the connection between king as god if he sustains a good law? According to Gonda (1969), after someone was inaugurated a legal king, he was responsible to lead humans and protect the brahmins. The king is

responsible for upholding dharma. The true king is called *dharmâtman*-a personification of dharma, laws, norms and fairness. If the king practiced the dharma fully, then the people will honor him as a God.

The second requirement of a legal king is to have royal regalia. Royal insignia became a very significant element in the god-king's cult. Even in Medieval Europe, the kings also possessed their own regalia, for example the ring, crown and oil. During the coronation, the ring symbolized a legal establishment of a reign. In ancient times, the crozier was used by the king's office. The crozier replaces the scepter. The crozier represents a shepherd's staff which was one of the royal insignia in Assyria and Babylonia. The crozier is important regalia used by an authority like the Church. There were different types of croziers depending on the states or kingdoms and the materials made for this royal insignia also differ.

Besides that, the crown is also an important emblem to any crowned king or queen. In medieval history, the crown, doubtless under Byzantine influence, has become so important a part of the ritual that the putting it on has given its name to the whole ceremony. Previously, the ceremony involved fitting a shoe to the appointed king but the ritual has been discontinued since George II. The regalia include the sword which in most Western rites is brandished three times. The prayer used in the time of Charles V indicates as clearly as possible that the sword is intended to win spiritual victories. Lastly, was the anointing oil. From medieval times up until now, anointing the oil is an essential rite for the English monarch coronation. For instance, during the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, the anointing has the deepest significance during the ceremony. The recipe for the Anointing Oil contains oils of orange, roses, cinnamon, musk and ambergris. Usually a batch is made to last a few Coronations (Fig. 1).

In addition, the idea in the book of Manu explains some symbols that indicate exclusivity; a king as the sun, moon, wind, the mediation between heaven and the world, fire (*agni*), wealth abundance, especially gold (*kubera*). In India and also in the influenced Malay World, there are five royal regalia; white umbrella, fly-whisk (*cambuk*), sandals, turbans (*tengkolok*) and throne (*singhāsana*). In addition, there are also other objects such as vehicles, clothing, jewelry, palaces and other possessions used by the king and his family. As Malays adopted Buddhism at one time, they considered the king as *cakravartin* who is necessary to have seven objects (*ratnani*); wheels, elephants, horses, gem stones, empress, wealth and advisor. All of these symbols represent different meaning. For example, wheels symbolized universality (the universe that rotates), horses and elephant as vehicles to carry the



Fig. 1: In 1953, the coronation process provided the Queen with a formal initiation rite and an investiture with her official regalia

emperor, gem stones were believed to have the magical elements that can avoid plagues and calamities. On top of that, the usage of royal emblem in ceremonies (upacara) have made this regalia important.

Besides the abovementioned elements, the king is expected to have a stage or tiered-platform called as prasada. Prasada became the dwelling place of the kings of India. According to Amarako, a prasada was intended to shelter the gods and the king. Other than that, in every procession of kings, the king will use the elephant as his vehicle accompanied by chanting performed along the way to dispel evil elements. In addition, people will scatter fried rice to welcome their king. During the king's visit to someone's place, the water will be offered to wash his feet and mouth. This act is also called arghya.

The other important element is rituals. Now, here was the religious element in kingship brought out more clearly than in the sacrament of coronation, first used when Charlemagne's father became king of the Franks. Here again the guide to practice was scriptural precedent. After the manner described in the Old Testament, priests anointed the new ruler "with this holy oil of unction whence thou hast anointed priests, kings and prophets." This was a sign that, like David and Solomon of old, the king had been chosen by God to rule his people. The symbolism of the ceremony, the staff and ring which were placed in the king's hands and the vestments and sandals he wore, all were, moreover, nearly identical to those employed at the consecration of a bishop, thus emphasizing that, like a bishop it was to a spiritual as well as secular office that the king was called. The same kind of symbolism appears in the illuminations of contemporary manuscripts in their portraits of rulers. Thus, in a copy of the gospels presented to the abbey of Monte Cassino in 1022, Henry II is pictured sitting crowned upon a throne of justice, wrapped in a garb of

state similar to the 'pallium' of an archbishop, while the spirit of God, in the form of a dove, descends from heaven to inspire him. Otto II, in the Aachen gospels is portrayed with his feet resting on the crouching figure of Earth but with his head above the veil of cloud which divides earth and heaven. The authority such rulers wielded was accepted as more than merely terrestrial: it had priestly connotations as well as kingly ones.

The pagan monarchies of the East, down to the time of the Sasanids, offered many examples of royal consecration at the hands of priests. But we may ignore these proceedings as well as the earliest medieval coronations which took place in Byzantium, since these precedents, if they were known at all to the West, certainly exerted no influence there. It was rather the Old Testament account of the anointing of Saul and David by Samuel that provided the West with an example of royal consecration. Where royal unction appeared in the West, among the Britons in the 6th century, the Visigoths in the 7th century, the Anglo-Saxons and the Franks in the 8th century, the precise occasion for its introduction remains almost entirely obscure.

The realization of the god-king or divine-king cult must be integrated with ritual and sacrifice. What is the philosophy behind ritual sacrifice? Every religion requires sacrifice. Nevertheless, there are also components or features behind each sacrifice progression. According to Womack (2005), most anthropologists agreed that a good religious ritual is one that must be repeated. Sometimes the entire ceremony will be repeated or some of the elements will be repeated through the same act. Second, the ceremony must take place in an informal setting. In other words, rituals performed in religious ceremonies should be organized, formal and stylized. The third characteristic is consecutive or sequential. In any event, the correct sequence is an important aspect to ensure the

smooth process of a ceremony. Ritual is a complete process; the ceremony must have a progressive beginning, middle and end. The fourth characteristic is not habit in ceremony or non-ordinary. This means rituals are performed according to certain times or certain dates and require certain acts even using ordinary tools. In other words, all ritual proceeding showed great symbols of extraordinary acts.

In the Malay Archipelago, *devaraja* rituals can be seen in the Balinese kingdom among Hindus who strongly believed that their king was the incarnation of a Hindu god. This passive insight made the Balinese king as a center of worship. On one occasion, the ritual called *sathi* was practiced by the Balinese king. According to the anthropologist Clifford Geertz who had spectated this, "And finally, trailing like a shadow, came the funerary entourage of the sacrificial wives, the women as expressionless in their towers as the corpses they already were; following them, the *Sudras*, often hundreds of them, dozens of tower, whom (*sic.*) their families had disinterred to be cremated with their lord". The cremation of the wives and concubines of Balinese kings together with their king's corpse none other only with the hope that they will unite with their Lord after death showed the effectiveness of divine-king ideology on the Balinese people. The justification of honor suicide as something that their soul will be united with Krishna proved that their high spiritual psyche governed over their act.

One of important elements in prevailing good kingship is "a king must possess lands". Throughout world civilization, series of battles and warfare indicates the importance of acquiring new territories. In European kingship, they claimed that the king is not only the national representative but also supreme landowner: all land is held of him mediately or immediately. This, "the great generalization that governs the whole of Domes day" led not only ultimately to the conception of territorial sovereignty but assimilated the succession of the Crown to the developing law of inheritance of fiefs. According to Figgis (1896), the king was the landowner *par excellence*; his lands must descend by the same rules as those of other men. In the Malay World, the power of the king also depended on his relationship with property ownership. In the kingdom of Bali, for instance, the land ownership was called *druwe*, *mandruwe*, *padruwen* which means having the property (to own and possess property and wealth). Geertz argued that the king had everything under his colonies. One king not only owns the property, the land but also the people. Ownership king of all matters under its colonies (*druwé*) symbolizes his power as a king. As head of the country's customs, the king is also said to be the "owner" of nature. Like the god, one of his tasks was

to ensure the success and grant the wealth of natural resources, land productivity, female fertility, health of the occupants, freedom from drought, earthquakes, floods or volcanic eruptions. He needs to preserve social tranquility while protecting the beauty of nature. Therein lies the role of the king as he was given the full power to run the state with right on his land. In other words, he must all the time be in charge of his authority in fairness and if found to abuse the power will eventually weaken their administration and gradually lead to destruction of his kingdom.

The last requirement of kings is to have sacred inheritance and heirs. In the monarchy institution, they will protect the royal progeny from being mixed with the outsiders. That was why most monarchical institutions passed down the throne from father to son or the nearest heirs. Based on the view of the lawyers of the 13th century, that only God can make an heir, although expressed with reference to private inheritance, must have tended greatly to strengthen the sentiment in favor of strict hereditary succession. It led men to regard this mode of devolution of the Crown as in some mysterious way superior to the merely human method of election. The birth of an heir is the judgment of God and has the same sanctity attached to it as the ordeal or the lot. Although, the mystical belief was that the king was appointed by god and the royal line is a sacred inheritance, the rational idea was that the administrator from the same family makes the job to rule easier. The father was also able to advise the son and give some direction in order to maintain good governance. In Malay tradition, the hereditary kingship of monarchy is a customary process. Normally, the king will appoint his eldest son to succeed the throne. The title like *Raja Muda* or *Tengku Mahkota* is given to king's eldest son as he is expected to succeed the father later.

In any culture, absolute sovereignty is important. Indeed, society perceived it sinful to resist the King's will. It is because society believed that the king is given authority and responsibility to govern his territories and people. Some claimed that the king is the vicar of God. "kings and all in authority were the vicars of God and that resistance to their commands was, in general a damnable sin". Propagation of this idea might be related to strengthening the Church institution in Europe. The same thing can be observed in the Malay kingdoms whereby the spiritual authority (Brahmins) and states (king) collaborated to reinforce the effective realms. The divinity of the king through sovereignty included prohibition against cursing the king. In Medieval times, there was a law regarding this. As mentioned earlier, it was also created to cater to the needs of spiritual authority. As an

instance may be taken the report of the legates George and Theophylact of their (sic.) proceedings in England AD 787. They appeal as a non-juror might have done, to the fourth of Daniel, to the thirteenth of Romans, to the words of S. Peter. They quote the prohibition against cursing the king even in thought and speak of all who are accessory to regicide as on a level with Judas.

The inference of these civilizations, there was a similarity impression vis-à-vis the divinity of king in terms of its divine origins, clerical alliance and requirements. Although in the Malay World this notion has termed as *devâraja*; conceivably for its unique character or exclusive but the basis of this belief will be the same with any civilization which believing in the celestial idea never neglects to preserve the right of the king which is to be respected and honored. The divinity of the king might be seen as a gullible idea but if that is the best to serve people's understanding on sovereignty notion, henceforth, it has to be implemented at any cost. Nevertheless, after examining the concept divine-king or *devaraja*, there is not much difference. The cults and rituals were varied on the ground that they were created by different people, perspective, religion and culture. Indeed, this conception generated an exclusive worldview that preserved a good governance style.

CONCLUSION

This study aims to be used by the researchers in various fields of political science, social-history, cultural anthropology and socio-psychology. The study is expected to provide some initial insight into communal worldview towards the monarchical institution.

REFERENCES

- Figgis, J.N., 1896. *The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings*. Cambridge University Press, England.
- Gonda, J., 1969. *Ancient India Kingship*. Brill Publishers, Leiden, Netherlands.
- Indrani, M. and S. Sagara, 2015. How e-zakat has changed the way muslims pay their zakat in Indonesia. *Int. J. Humanities Arts Soc. Sci.*, 1: 118-120.
- Keen, M., 1968. *A History of Medieval Europe*. Penguin Books, London, England, Pages: 204.
- Kern, F., 1956. *Kingship and Law in the Middle Ages*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, UK., Pages: 64.
- Kobkua, S.P., 2011. *Palace, Political, Party and Power: A Story of the Socio-Political Development of Malay Kingship*. University of Hawaii Press, Singapore, ISBN: 9789971695071, Pages: 447.
- Nilakanta, S., 1969. *Ancient Indian Kingship from Religious Point of View*. Brill Publishers, Leiden, Netherlands.