KITLV

H. Sarkar

The Kings of Sri Sailam and the foundation of the Sailendra Dynasty of Indonesia

In: Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 141 (1985), no: 2/3, Leiden, 323-338

This PDF-file was downloaded from http://www.kitlv-journals.nl

H. B. SARKAR

THE KINGS OF ŚRĪ ŚAILAM AND THE FOUNDATION OF THE ŚAILENDRA DYNASTY OF INDONESIA

I

The problem of the origin of the Śailendra dynasty of Indonesia has taxed the ingenuity of scholars for many decades, but has defied solution until today. The acquisition of some new materials and the reinterpretation of the older data within the norms of historical circumspection have enabled me to make some progress on the road to a solution of the problem. The results are presented in the following pages. First, however, I must present as concisely as possible the main views of previous scholars, always at the same time pointing out the obstacles in the way of accepting the solutions proposed by them, as this will narrow down the limits of our choice.

One of the earliest scholars to discuss the problem was Hirananda Sastri (1923-24:310-27). After suggesting that the ancestors of the Śailendras may have been emigrants from Kaliṅga, or perhaps other parts of southern India, he put forward the view that they may have had some connection with the rulers of the areas now comprising the South Arcot and Salem districts of southern India, who bore the name Malaiyamān, whose meaning closely corresponds to that of the term Śailendra. Commenting on this suggestion, Nilakanta Sastri (1949:47) pertinently asserted that the Malaiyamāns were minor feudatory rulers of the interior without any maritime tradition. In the same connection he said that the Pāṇḍya rulers of South India perhaps had better claims, as they traced their origin from Śiva and used the title 'mīnāṅkīta Śailendra', meaning 'Lord of Mount Śailendra using the carp as emblem'. The flaw in this argument was that the Pāṇḍyas were staunch Śaivites, whereas the Śailendra monarchs of Indonesia were fervent Buddhists from the very beginning. The Pāṇḍyas no doubt sported a pair of carps on their banners, but I have found no evidence for Sastri's view that the Śailendras of Java also had carps as their royal emblem. He seems to have been misled by the fact that several centuries later King Jayanagara of Java

H. B. SARKAR, a professor emeritus who is specialized in the history of Southeast Asia in general and Indonesia in particular, has previously published, among others, *Indian Influences on the Literature of Java and Bali* and *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java*, 2 vols. Prof. Sarkar's address is Rabindrapalli, P.O. Inda, Kharagpur, W. Bengal, India.

(1309-28) assumed the coronation name Śrī Sundarapāṇḍyadevādhīśvara Vikramottuṅgadeva (Brandes and Krom 1913:199),[1] the latter part of which name is clearly reminiscent of Śailendra royal nomenclature. Moreover, this Javanese ruler, like his Pāṇḍyan counterpart, also used a *mīnadvaya-lāñchana,* i.e. double carp seal. The background of this unusual phenomenon is not known to us, but it is a fact that the Javanese king in question was not of the Śailendra lineage and that furthermore the earlier rulers of Java did not use a pair of carps as emblem on their royal banner.

The views of Majumdar are also hardly tenable. Regarding the original homeland of the Śailendras, he has observed (1937:226) that 'the Śailendras originally came from Kaliṅga and spread their power in the Far East through lower Burma and the Malay Peninsula', and that they may have originated from or been connected with the Eastern Gaṅgas, the Śailodbhavas or the Śailas of the Vindhyas. He accordingly proposed the view that 'the Gaṅga, the Śailodbhava and the Śaila dynasties may all be the source of the name like a Śailendra'. The most that can be said in favour of this view is that the name Śaila and Śailodbhava approximates the name Śailendra in sound; in every other respect, however, the hurdles raised by the proposition are insuperable. The very first inscription of the Śailendra dynasty, namely the Ligor inscription (cf. Coedès 1918; Chhabra 1935), is a document of a fervent Buddhist character, whereas the Gaṅgas as well as the Śailas and/or Śailodbhavas were followers of the Hindu faith.[2] The scripts of the Ligor inscription are also southern Indian, rather than Kaliṅgan, which has affinity with relevant north Indian scripts (cf. Sircar 1965b:204n).

Coedès did not subscribe to the views of Majumdar, but proposed, though tentatively, a Far Eastern origin for the Śailendra dynasty of Java. Laying stress on the meaning of the name Śailendra, 'lord of the hill', he drew attention to the fact that the Chinese refer to the earliest Indianized state of Southeast Asia as Funan, which is usually believed to stand for the Khmer term *bnom,* mod. *phnom,* i.e. 'mountain'. So the rulers of a mountainous territory could naturally claim to be *kurung bnam,* the equivalent of *parvata-bhūpāla* or *śailarāja.* Przyluski (1934: 70; 1935:25-36) raised objections to this proposal by stating: 'No inference can be drawn from the fact that in two distinct lands, the dynasties have borne the same name; that these kings were called Śailendras, Śailarāja or otherwise is no doubt instructive for the history of beliefs and culture, but we cannot draw from it any conclusion concerning the historical origin of these dynasties'.

As the views of Coedès have always commanded general respect, we shall quote the formulation of his views in his own words: 'I do not claim that the Śailendras of Java were the authentic descendants of the sovereigns of Funan, but after noticing on the one hand a synchronism between the fall of the kings of Funan and the accession of the Śailendras

and stating on the other that the attitude of Jayavarman II (802-50) towards Java is understood better, if he had to break the ancient bonds and an old tradition of several centuries, I think I have been able to formulate the hypothesis that after the eviction of the kings of Funan from Indo-China, a Javanese princely family having more or less real ties with them resumed their dynastic title of king of the mountains, and at the same time made their own political and territorial claim this title implied.' (Coedès 1934:61-70).

The above views of Coedès, expressed in 1934, underwent modifications as a result of his own later researches, however. He has assigned the period of the disintegration of Funan and the rise of Cambodia to between 550 and 630. So the linking up of the disintegration of Funan and the rise of the Śailendras in the Malayo-Indonesian world in the latter part of the eighth century is chronologically untenable. The attitude of Jayavarman II to Java can be explained in various ways, while moreover his association with the pre-Angkorean kings is exceedingly tenuous, as he says of himself in an inscription that he was like 'a great lotus no longer having a stem; he blooms like a new flower' (Barth and Bergaigne 1893:344-45).

It is well-known that after T'emu or Vyādhapura, the capital of Funan was shifted to Na-fu-na. The latter toponym was equated by Pelliot (1903:295) with Nava-nagara. Coedès identified this Na-fu-na with Angkor Borei and expressed the view that it should correspond to Naravara-nagara (Coedès 1943-46:3-4), the king's city, mentioned in a much later inscription. While Sinologists will have to ultimately decide whether or how the component *ra* can be infixed between the *Na* and *fu* of the Chinese toponym in the orthography of Naravara°, it can be emphasized as well that neither Pelliot nor Barth,[3] the first editor of the Sanskrit inscription, was sure about the Sanskrit equivalent of the Chinese term. The word Naravara-nagara could not by itself have caused much mischief, unless the word *Naravara* had also occurred in the last verse of the Kĕlurak inscription, dated A.D. 782 (Sarkar 1971:44, 46), where it must mean 'the most excellent of men', i.e. 'the king', and nothing else. De Casparis, however, has identified (1956:184ff.) this Naravaranagara, whose equation with the Chinese name is shaky, with a country called *Varanara* occurring in a ninth-century inscription, which mentions that it was ruled by a king called Bhujayottuṅgadeva, a name suspiciously like that of the Śailendra monarchs of Java, although we have already assessed the relevance of such names in the case of king Jayanagara.

A more serious objection to the proposal of Coedès is that the rulers of Funan were all adherents of the Hindu religion, the *liṅga*s being their favourite objects of veneration, and that they never took special pride in being referred to as members of the Śailendra dynasty. On the contrary, they styled themselves either 'descendants of *Māra-rājakula*' (Sircar

1965a:505), i.e., 'scions of the royal house of Māra', or 'descendants from the dynasty of the Brahmin Kauṇḍinya' (Coedès 1968:the genealogical table at the end of the book).

The main advocate of the Indonesian origin of the Śailendra dynasty is the Javanese scholar Boechari. On the basis of an Old Malay inscription found in the mountainous area of Pekalongan, in the northern part of central Java, which Boechari believes to date from the seventh century A.D., he says that the *ḍapunta* Selendra mentioned in the said inscription was an ancestor of the Śailendra dynasty of Java.[4] This does not seem to be the case, because this Selendra seems to be a personal name of a spiritual dignitary bearing the title *ḍapunta* (*ḍa+pu+nta*), who apparently came from Sumatra, where this designation first occurs in some Old Malay inscriptions. None of the *ḍapunta* dignitaries mentioned in over a dozen charters from central Java (Sarkar 1972: index 298) had any function other than a religious one, particularly in connection with the foundation of freeholds. None of the *ḍapuntas* of Java has ever been described as the father of such-and-such a person, as is usual in connection with the recording of the names of recipients of witness fees at the time of the foundation of freeholds. So such persons could not have been founders of a dynasty. I am almost certain that the translation of the term *ḍapunta hiyang* occurring in some Old Malay inscriptions of Sumatra with 'His Majesty', as given by some previous editors of the inscriptions concerned, is misleading.[5]

Now, after discussing the inadequacies of the views expressed by earlier scholars, I would like to formulate my own proposition in the clear light of positive facts as have come to my notice recently.

II

Previous scholars, including the present writer, had missed the significance of the expression *ārya-santatyā* ('by the scion of Ārya(land)') occurring in the Kalasan inscription, written in Sanskrit and dated A.D. 778 (Sarkar 1971:36,37). In point of fact, this expression indeed holds the key to the solution of the problem under discussion. I had earlier interpreted the expression as an independent phrase, translating it with 'by the nobility', in which the term *santatyā*, meaning 'by the scion', was not represented. It is only by chance that I read the different translation of the phrase by Lokesh Chandra (1979:41), which set my train of thoughts in a new direction. I can now agree with him that the instrumental case *ārya-santatyā* has to be tagged to *rāja-siṁhena* ('by the lion of kings'). Accordingly I now translate the whole Sanskrit stanza thus: 'The incomparable presents given in profusion to the congregation by the king, who is a lion among monarchs and scion of Ārya-land, must be protected by the rulers of the Śailendra dynasty'.

This Ārya-land has certainly to be sought in India, and not in South-East Asia. Some of the early Cambodian inscriptions use the term

Āryadeśa,[6] and scholars have generally understood it as designating India. I have not examined the Cambodian epigraphic data to check the translation, but in Old Javanese inscriptions the name Ārya-land denoted a limited geographical entity. The references may be tabulated thus:

1. The copper-plates of Kuṭi (Jaha), dated A.D. 840 (Sarkar 1971:80, 86)[7]:
   'Cĕmpa, Kling, Haryya, Singhā, Gola, Cvalikā, Malyalā, Karnake, Rĕman, Kmir . . .'
2. An inscription from the time of king Airlangga, dated A.D. 1021 (Brandes-Krom 1913:124):
   'Kling, Aryya, Singhala, Paṇḍikira, Draviḍa, Campa, Rĕmĕn . . .'
3. Undated inscription, apparently from the same reign (Brandes-Krom 1913:126-127):
   'Kling, Aryya, Singhala, Paṇḍikira, Draviḍa, Campa, Rĕmĕn, Kmir . . .'
4. Inscription of Airlangga, undated (Brandes-Krom 1913:146):
   'Kling, Aryya, Singhala, Karṇaṭaka . . . Campa . . .'

Regarding the retention or elimination of the initial or medial *h* in Old Javanese orthography, there is considerable flexibility in Old as well as Modern Javanese usage (Gonda 1952:247-48). So we have no difficulty in equating Haryya with the name Āryya occurring in the quotations cited above. Now, as far as the above lists are concerned, these are not stereotyped ones, as the order of the names is not identical in all the lists; omission and adding of names also occur. It is worth noting, however, that in every case the Kling and Haryya/Aryya regions are paired together. This seems at first sight to indicate that these two places are contiguous areas. Besides, it appears that, except for Gola = Gauḍa (West Bengal) and several other regions of South-East Asia, such as Campā (in mod. Vietnam), Kmir (Cambodia) and Rĕmĕn (Mon area of lower Burma, or the Malays of Ramni, i.e. Achin), all these places lie in or near southern India. They are all well-known places, such as Kling (Kaliṅga), Singhā/Singhala (Ceylon, mod. Sri Lanka), Cvalikā (Cola country), Malyalā (Malayalam-speaking area, i.e. Malabar region, now in Kerala), Karnake/Karṇāṭaka (mod. Karṇāṭaka), Paṇḍi-Kira (Pāṇḍya and Kera regions). The name Draviḍa in no. 2 can only refer to the Cola territory, which is not mentioned in this list; besides, the two names Cvalikā and Draviḍa are not mentioned in the same breath. Through a process of elimination of the known geographical names, we discover that the Andhra region has not been mentioned in any one of these lists. Consequently mentions of Ārya-lands in the Old Javanese inscriptions can only designate this area; this supposition is backed by the pairing of the names Kaliṅga and Ārya in a cluster form. As all these names cited above refer to the maritime regions of southern India, the Ārya-lands should obviously be traced between the Cola (= Draviḍa) lands and

Kaliṅga. This brings us to the Guṇṭur and Kṛṣṇā districts of Andhrapradesh, through which runs the famous river Kṛṣṇā.

Now, if the Ārya land meant in the Old Javanese inscriptions was the lower valley of the Kṛṣṇā in Andhrapradesh, it is only natural that we should come upon a Śailendra dynasty here; in fact, our expectations are more than fulfilled, because we find here not only 'Lords of the Hill', but also a capital city named (Śrī)Vijayapurī. It is here that the Ikṣvākus ruled. The purāṇic historiographers have described them as Śrīparvatiyas and Andhrabhṛtyas, i.e. 'lords of Śrī Parvata and servants of the Andhras'. This Śrī Parvata is also referred to as Śrī Śailam in the sources (Sircar 1967:103, 108), and the equation of these two places has been accepted throughout the entire course of Sanskrit literature.[8] The Ikṣvākus practised cross-cousin marriage (Sircar 1939:13),[9] and most probably had Vijayapurī as their capital (Nilakanta Sastri 1957:333). Vijayapurī is mentioned in the inscriptions. It was definitely located in Śrī Parvata/Śrī Śailam – an inscription of the Ikṣvākus says: *Śrīparvate Vijayapuryām,* i.e. 'at Vijayapurī in Śrīparvata' (Sircar 1965a:235) – probably in the western part of the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa valley of the Nallamalai range.

In the days of the greatness of the Ikṣvāku rulers, Vijayapurī was the most famous city of Andhra. Longhurst has observed that in the second and third centuries A.D., when the neighbouring Amarāvatī was at the height of its prosperity, Vijayapurī was the largest and most important Buddhist establishment in southern India, with a great reputation as a centre of learning and pilgrimage (Longhurst 1938:7). Visitors and pilgrims came here not only from various parts of India, but also from Ceylon, Nepal and China, as an inscription attests (Sircar 1965a:235). Scholars have praised the excellent work of architects and craftsmen at Jaggeyapeta, Bhaṭṭiprolu, Ghaṇṭasāla, Amarāvatī and Nāgārjunikoṇḍa. The beginnings of these architectural and sculptural activities can be traced as far back as the second century B.C., but the work of renovation and extension continued down to at least A.D. 200 (Nilakanta Sastri 1955:426-28). The largest of the Buddhist establishments at Amarāvatī was a stūpa. One scholar (Nilakanta Sastri 1957:754) has stated that 'Nowhere else (in India) such extensive Buddhist remains have been brought to light. It was mostly here that after the great age of Amarāvatī and the Sātavahanas, Buddhism and Buddhist art rose to prominence and flourished.' The great Buddhist philosopher Nāgārjuna (137-197) lived and propagated his views here under the tolerant rule of the Sātavāhanas, while his disciples carried on the tradition of their great master in that region under the Ikṣvākus. The diffusion of specimens of the Amarāvatī school of art in various places in South-East Asia, such as Malaya, Sumatra, Java (east), West Celebes, Korat (Thailand) and Dong Duong (Funan), bears testimony to the activities of the Buddhists of this region.

Another significant fact is that the rulers of the Ikṣvāku dynasty, and apparently other potentates ruling in that area after the Ikṣvākus, sometimes placed the name of the capital city before their own names, indicating their connection with it. Thus a successor of King Śivaskandavarman called himself *Śrīvijaya*skandavarman in an epigraph from the Guṇṭur district dating roughly from the fourth century A.D. (Sircar 1965a:467). Other local inscriptions also contain such names as *Śrīvijaya*sātakarṇi, *Śrīvijaya*buddhavarman, etc. (Sircar 1965a:468, 521). Another inscription refers to *Śrīvijaya*skandhāvārāt, i.e. 'from the military camp at Śrīvijaya' (Sircar 1965a:469). It is noteworthy indeed that ruins of forts have also been discovered in that region. Regarding the practice of prefixing the name of a place to the name of a person, as referred to above, I wish to observe that this still prevails in Andhra, where it indicates that the bearers of these names hail from the place whose name is put before their own name. In this context I wish to draw attention to the use of the expression *Śrīvijaye*ndrarāja in the above-mentioned Ligor inscription of Malaya, where the name of the king to my mind must be Indra, as otherwise the word *rāja* would be redundant in that context. It may be recalled that King Indra is specially mentioned in the Kĕlurak inscription (Sarkar 1971:43, 45) dated A.D. 782, and that Princess Prāmodavardhanī had an image of Ghanānātha, which means Indra, erected in a shrine, as the Kayumyungan inscription, dated A.D. 824, tells us (Sarkar 1971:67, 70).

Now let us return to the original subject. I think I have been able to show above that the Ārya-lands of the Old Javanese inscriptions can be identified with the Kṛṣṇā-Guṇṭur districts, where the Ikṣvākus ruled in the third century A.D. as lords of the hill, with Śrīvijayapurī as their capital. So we have here a Śailendra dynasty (lord of Śrī Parvata/ Śrī Śaila), whose kings were great patrons of the Buddhist religion, ruling from their capital Śrīvijayapurī in the third century A.D. This royal family has therefore been rightly acclaimed in the Kalasan inscription of Java as a scion of the Ārya-lands, which lay, as I have shown, in Andhra. It therefore had better claims than any other dynasty in South or South-East Asia to be considered as the ancestor of the Śailendra dynasty of the Malayo-Indonesian world. If this view is correct, the Śrīvijayan monarchs of Sumatra will turn out to have been Śailendras from the start.

The view propounded above is also supported by data from contemporary Andhra epigraphs and Śrīvijayan charters of Sumatra from the seventh century A.D. The structural pattern of these inscriptions is similar, as is the writing. Many of these inscriptions open with the words *siddham* or *svasti,* irrespective of whether those issuing the charters were Hindus or Buddhists. The Ikṣvāku and Pallava inscriptions found in the Kṛṣṇā delta (Guṇṭur district) usually open in a similar way (Sircar 1965a:228, 230, 231, 233, 236, 238, 457, 458, 460, 467). The early

Śrīvijayan epigraphs of Sumatra thus have remarkable affinity with the charters of the Ikṣvākus and the Pallavas. Even after the disappearance of the Ikṣvākus as a sovereign power in the lower Kṛṣṇā valley from the political scene, in about A.D. 300, the cultural influence of the region is reflected in the Śrīvijayan epigraphy of Sumatra from the last quarter of the seventh century A.D., both in the method of the dating of the inscriptions and in the script.

The first use of a date from the Śaka era is significant in this connection. In southern India this was in Siṁhasūri's *Lokavibhāga,* a Jain work completed in Kanchi in the Śaka year 380, i.e. A.D. 458. Sircar believes (1965b:264) that this dating system spread from south-western Deccan to the Far East during the reign of the Cālukyas. Of the six earliest Śrīvijayan inscriptions of Sumatra and Bangka, the Śaka system was used first in the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription (Palembang), then the inscription of Talang Tuvo (from the same region), and lastly in the Kota Kapur inscription from the island of Bangka.[10] It is worth noting in this connection that, unlike north Indian inscriptions, those from southern India and Sumatra are dated according to the *amānta* calendar and are written in prose. Sircar (1965b:224) has indeed stated categorically that 'in the land south of the Narmadā, the lunar month is *amānta*'. As regards the scripts, I have no reason to disagree with the view of Nilakanta Sastri (1949:27) that the four Śrīvijayan inscriptions he examined are 'all written in an unmistakenly south Indian script, very similar to that employed in the early inscriptions of the Andhra country and of the Pallavas'.

Besides the palaeographical and related features described above, specimens of the Amarāvatī school of art also reached Sumatra, apparently in the company of disinherited princes of the Ikṣvāku dynasty. A large Buddha image of this school was discovered on Bukit Sĕguntang, overlooking Palembang, which is usually believed to have been the first capital of the nascent Śrīvijaya realm. The image was carved out of granite, a material not found in Palembang or its environs, and was probably therefore imported by the newcomers as their guardian deity. Thus we have here a replica Lord of the Hill with his capital at Śrīvijayapurī, over which a benign Buddha image cast its protective spell. The *ḍapunta* of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription (see note 5) seems to have come here to receive its blessings before undertaking the journey (*siddhayātrā*) to Malāyu for the purpose of its colonization.

III

I would now like to discuss the probable reason and date of the migration of the scions of the Ikṣvāku royal dynasty from their homeland in the Kṛṣṇā valley to Sumatra. The Ikṣvākus lost their sovereignty some time in the second half of the third century A.D. and then continued on as local potentates. At that time, the political conditions in the valley were

very disturbed. This will be quite obvious if we pause to think that after the downfall of the Ikṣvākus and before the visit of Yuan Chwang in about A.D. 640, there were six or seven ruling dynasties in the lower Kṛṣṇā valley. Political and military disturbances reached their peak when in the late sixth century the Kalabhras overthrew all the established royal families of south India. Nilakanta Sastri (1955:139) says that this aggressiveness 'was provoked by religious antagonism'. The desolate state of the area will be quite clear from the accounts of Yuan Chwang. Referring to Pūrva Śaila and Apara Śaila, two parts of Nāgārjunikoṇḍa hill, the pilgrim says (Watters 1961:II, 214-15): 'During the millennium immediately following the Buddha's decease, a thousand ordinary brethren came here every year to spend the retreat of the rainy season . . . but for more than 100 years there had not been any brethren resident in the establishment, and visitors were deterred by the forms of wild animals which the mountain gods assumed'.

It will be quite obvious from this statement that about 100 years before Yuan Chwang's visit to the area, say about A.D. 540, it had already been desolate. About another one hundred years would have been needed to reduce a flourishing region to such a state. It may be quite significant in this context that the Viṣṇukuṇḍins who ruled the area between 440 and c. 616 A.D. had their family deity on Śrī Parvata, and this deity was called Śrī Parvatasvāmī, i.e. 'the Lord of Śrī Parvata'. As is well-known, the Viṣṇukuṇḍins were Brahmanical Hindus. It is very likely, therefore, that this Śrī Parvatasvāmī was none other than Śiva, the Lord of the Hill; or it is even possible that the Buddha image on the hill was worshipped as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. Nilakanta Sastri has observed (1963:68), 'The renascent Hinduism of Andhra began the worship of Buddha at Amarāvatī as an incarnation of Viṣṇu and converted many other Buddhist centres into Hindu shrines'. The remaining Buddhists must have moved to Kanchi and other places. These objective conditions further limit the period of the emigration of the founder of the Śrīvijaya/Śailendra dynasty of Indonesia prior to A.D. 440, when the Hindu Viṣṇukuṇḍins imposed their sovereignty over the region. The mighty effort required for the establishment of a neo-Śailendra Śrīvijayan rule in a foreign country must therefore have been made between the fall of the Ikṣvākus in c. 300 A.D. and the rise of the Viṣṇukuṇḍins in A.D. 440, say approximately A.D. 450.

I am now tempted to link up the situation described above with another set of circumstances which have defied satisfactory solution until today. I draw attention to the subdivision of the Karo-Batak tribe of central Sumatra comprising the ethnic groups of the Coliya (= Cola), Pāṇḍya, Měliyala (= Malayalam-speaking people), Pělavi (Pallava), and Tekang (= Deccan). Attention has previously been drawn to the strange phenomenon of these groups of people living in splendid isolation from the rest of the community all around, which forms a majority

(Kern 1915:67-72; Krom 1931:85-86). The conglomeration of so large a number of ethnic groups, all speaking mutually intelligible Dravidian languages[11] from southern India, in a circumscribed zone of central Sumatra suggests that these people must have made a concerted effort at an unspecified time to move to this area due to unstable political conditions at home, as described above, in the hope of finding better prospects in the land of their adoption. In this connection it is worth drawing the attention of scholars to a remark by Gonda (1952:62), who says: 'It is remarkable that the Bataks should have almost entirely succeeded in keeping off the penetration of Islam. On the other hand, they must have maintained rather intensive and prolonged connections with Hinduized circles, whose influence spread to various regions of Sumatra.'

Whatever one may think of my proposition, the phenomenon described above prompts me to take into consideration one neglected piece of Chinese evidence which fits into the overall course of events related above. After suggesting that the mighty colonization effort could have been made between c. 300 and 450 A.D., I think it is now possible to reduce the gap further by reference to the occurrence of the term Chö-ye in the Chinese translation of a Buddhist *sūtra* entitled *Che eul yeou king*, dated A.D. 392. Now, a commentator of the sixth century stated that Chö-ye meant 'victory'. From this Ferrand (1922:210) concluded that the Chö-ye of the Chinese text could denote no other place than (Śrī)vijaya. All these data taken together seem to indicate that the disinherited scions of the Ikṣvāku ruling house of the Guṇṭur-Kṛṣṇā districts and their compatriots left for Sumatra and established a new Śailendra dynasty and a new kingdom called Śrīvijaya in their newly adopted land between 300 and 392. The conclusion reached here does not conflict with any so far published.

NOTES

1 The relevant inscription was translated by me in the *Journal of the Greater India Society* II (1935).

2 The earlier rulers of the Eastern Gaṅga dynasty before the rise of the Śailendras in Indonesia generally styled themselves Parama-Māheśvara, i.e. 'staunch followers of Maheśvara (Śiva)', but later on Anantavikrama Coḍagaṅga (1078-1147) transferred his allegiance from Śiva to Viṣṇu (cf. Nilakanta Sastri and Venkataramayya 1950:237 ff.).

R. B. Hiralal, who edited the Rangoli copper-plate of the Śaila dynasty (Hiralal 1907-8:41), equated the Śailas with the Śailodbhavas, but this identity cannot be proved as yet. Rulers of the Śailodbhava dynasty are known to have performed the Vājapeya and the Aśvamedha sacrifices, which were repugnant to the Buddhist rulers. For these rulers, see Majumdar 1954:144 ff. and Banerji 1930:120 ff.

3 Pelliot (1903:295) equates Na-fu-na with Nava-Nagara, while Barth (1885,x) hesitantly rendered the expression *Naravara-nagara* as 'la ville du premier des hommes', adding the note 'c'est-à-dire la capitale, ou bien Naravaranagara, serait-il le nom propre d'un village?'

4 I have not seen an edition of this inscription published anywhere, but it has been quoted by Satyawati Suleiman (1977:19-20).

5 The Old Malay inscriptions have been edited and translated by Coedès (1930:29-80). The English translation from the French is to be found in Nilakanta Sastri (1949 Appendix:113-116).
Leaving some aspects of these Old Malay inscriptions for discussion in the Appendix below, it may be stated in passing that Stutterheim (1929:67) read the name *ḍapunta hyang jayanāśa* as Jayawaga. Majumdar (1937:122) thinks that 'the name may be a mistake for Jayanāga', a view to which I also subscribe. It is well-known that the Nāgas constituted an important element of the population of Andhra.

6 In the Angkor Stele. See K. 300 in Coedès and Parmentier 1923. See also Coedès 1951:255, as well as Barth and Bergaigne 1893 (no. lv:214; no. xliv:364) for other examples.

7 Brandes thought this to be spurious for various reasons (see the first and second editions of the *Pararaton*, Brandes 1897:94 ff.; and 1920:12-16), but it is believed by some, including the present writer, to revert to a genuine original, with some copyists from the Majapahit period, to whom the language was unintelligible in some parts, being responsible for the confusion.

8 See Burgess as quoted by Watters (1961 II:208). It may be noted that Śrī Parvata comprised two important parts, named Pūrva Śaila (Eastern Hills) and Apara Śaila (the Other, i.e. the Western, Hills) respectively. One of the later offshoots of the Buddhist Mahāsaṁghikas was known as the Selas (Sanskrit: Śailas), who lived in these two hill areas. Massive monasteries of diverse categories were built here due to the munificent support of the royal ladies of the Ikṣvāku dynasty, some of the names of the royal ladies having come down to us from the Nāgārjunikoṇḍa inscriptions along with those of the monk architects. For details see Chaudhury 1969:228-232.

9 Although the data are meagre, it may be worth examining if the Śailendras of Indonesia also had this custom.

10 For the Old Malay inscriptions see Coedès 1930:29-80 and Nilakanta Sastri 1949: 113-116. For comments on the language, see Teeuw and Emanuels 1961:9-11.

11 The principal languages of Dravidian India, namely Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kannada, which cover the ethno-linguistic groups mentioned in the inscriptions discussed earlier, had a common origin, but diverged later on. See Chatterji 1978:508, 535-536.

APPENDIX

There are various problems connected with the content and interpretation of Old Malay inscriptions. One of the first points to demand attention is the title of the dignitary referred to as *ḍapunta hiyang,* which is usually translated as 'His Majesty' or 'King'. It is of much significance to understand the expression properly, as a correct translation may altogether change our conception of the content of these inscriptions.

The *ḍapunta hiyang* seems to be the same as the *ḍapu hyang* of the charters of Central Java (Sarkar 1972:s.v. *ḍapu hyang*). I am almost certain that the use of the term *hiang* (a var. of *hyang*) in association with *ḍapu(nta)* testifies that the phrase must be connected in some way with the world of the spirits. In the copper-plate of Mantyāsiḥ I, for example (Sarkar 1972:68, 75), there occurs the statement: '. . . sakvaiḥ ta hyang i ruhur i sor ing maddhya . . .', which I have translated as 'all gods of the zenith, of the nether world (and) of the centre . . .'

Ḍapunta hiyang should therefore signify 'a spiritual dignitary who is magically connected with the spirit-world or the world of the ancestors'.

The bearers of the title of *ḍapunta* in Central Javanese charters – some are even referred to as *guru hyang* – are indeed connected with religious affairs, being especially associated with the foundation of freeholds. Pigeaud (1960 II:3) has stated in a similar way: '*Hyang* and *Sang Hyang* do not only indicate divinity, but also superhuman supernatural power, possessed by a variety of beings, things and places, v.gl. It is translated: spirit, spiritual and holy, sacred.' See also Geeroms 1943. As the Old Javanese charters have not yielded any evidence that a *ḍapunta* exercised high administrative, including military, powers, I have taken this functionary to be distinguished from the *nāyika* (Sans. and Old Jav. *nāyaka*: an officer of intermediate status met with in many charters of Central Java from A.D. 850 onwards) of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription.

As I understand the opening lines of the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription to indicate, the *ḍapunta hiyang* and the *nāyika* went to the shrine along with their followers on the 11th of Vaisākha to pray for the successful completion of a journey (*siddhayātrā*), and then undertook this journey. They reached Mināña Tāmvan, which they left on the 7th day of Jyaiṣṭha. Previous editors have translated the expression *vala dualakṣa* in the 5th line with 'an army of 20,000 (men)'. This is certainly wrong, as the phrase is a Prakrit form (from Sanskrit *dvi-lakṣa*), signifying 'twice (one) hundred thousand'. So the expression should simply mean 'a contingent (of people) two hundred thousand strong'. The beneficial role of the *ḍapunta hiyang* of this inscription is in conformity with that of his counterpart in the Taḷang Tuvo inscription. The Kota Kapur and Karang Brahi inscriptions, on the other hand, are undisguisedly military in purport. The designations of the leaders of the organization and the huge number of people involved in the enterprise lead me to believe that the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription refers to a mighty enterprise in the colonization of Malāyu (var. Malayu).

Now, Coedès has discussed some of the problems raised by these Old Malay inscriptions at length in his paper entitled 'A possible interpretation of the inscription of Kĕdukan Bukit (Palembang)' (1964). Here he discusses the views of earlier scholars, but retains the translation of *ḍapunta hiyang* by 'divine lord' (p. 27), taking it in the sense of 'king' (p. 31), which I consider to be unjustified. Apart from this he has proposed that 'the Kĕdukan Bukit inscription was engraved as an *ex-voto* to commemorate a victorious expedition from Śrīvijaya against the Khmer kingdom'. This interpretation is, however, open to the following serious objections:

1. There is nothing to show that the leader of this expedition was a king and that it was of a military character.
2. The interpretation suggested by Coedès leaves the statement of I-tsing about Malāyu in a sort of vacuum. It may be remembered that in 671 I-tsing halted at Malāyu for a short time on his way to India. During his last sojourn in Fo-che (Śrīvijaya), between 689-695 (except for a brief interruption in 689), however, I-tsing noted that Malāyu 'is now the country of Śrīvijaya'. Coedès' proposal regarding an expedition of a military nature from Śrīvijaya to Cambodia will remove the historical base of Malāyu's inclusion in Śrīvijaya between

671 and 695 simply to provide some sort of a foundation for a speculative theory.

3. It is absolutely certain that *dualakṣa* means 'two hundred thousand'. It is impossible to believe that such a huge mass of soldiers could have gone to Cambodia by land and sea in the last quarter of the seventh century A.D. Besides, in the period of the Chen-la interlude (c. 550-800 A.D.) there were nearly a dozen states in the Malay Peninsula (Wheatley 1966:289-92), and a Śrīvijayan army going to Cambodia would have had to fight every inch of the way. In the naval expedition of A.D. 1292 Kublai Khan sent three generals to Java with an army of 20,000 men in 1000 ships; here we have a religious dignitary at the head of a contingent of two hundred thousand persons! It seems rather absurd.

I have stated earlier that the prospective colonists set out under the leadership of the *ḍapunta hiyang* from Palembang for Malāyu along the river Musi in the month of Vaiśākha. The place Mināṅa Tāmvan was perhaps located at the mouth of the Musi, which was indeed a point of departure for outgoing ships. This becomes clear on reading a statement by I-tsing (see Takakusu 1966), which reads: *At the mouth of the Bhoja,* I went on board the ship to send a letter (through the merchant) . . . (to China)'. This possibility is also reflected in the disparity of the time taken by different Chinese travellers to reach Śrīvijaya. While I-tsing reached the place 'before sailing 20 days', and Chia Tan, around A.D. 800, reached the Straits in 18½ days, Wu-hing came to Sribhoja 'after a month's sail' (Takakusu 1966:xlvi). The main difference of about 10 days between the voyage of the first and the last-mentioned pilgrim is a result of the fact that, while the former landed at the mouth of the Musi river, the latter went to the capital, Palembang. In other words, the distance between the Musi estuary and the capital could be covered in about ten days.

Regarding the stretch of the journey between the Musi estuary and Malāyu, I-tsing is not so explicit, but he simply states (Takakusu 1966: xlvi) that Wu-hing 'went on board the king's ship to the country of Malayu, and arrived there after fifteen days' sail'. As the distance between Palembang and Malayu could not have been covered in 15 days, it is obvious that I-tsing had the mouth of the Musi in view; it is on record that he himself had gone there to despatch a letter to China. It was a place where the East-West trade route branched off in various directions. Without the control of the mouth of the Musi and the East-West traffic passing by it, it would have been impossible for Śrīvijayan monarchs to capture the Ligor region in the Malay peninsula in the eighth century. This has been clearly stated in the *Ying Yai Sheng lan* (1416), thus recording what had been a practice since earlier times. It says: 'From whatever place ships come, they enter the Straits of Bangka at the Fresh Water (i.e. Musi or Palembang River), and near a place with many pagodas built of brick, after which the merchants go up the river in

of the Sanskrit *Mināṅka Stambhān,* i.e. *stāmbha* (columns) having *mīnāṅka* (engravings of fishes), which was a royal emblem of the Pāṇḍya rulers of southern India.

The views postulated above may mean that the *ḍapunta hiyang* and the *nāyika,* after receiving blessings for the *siddhayātrā* along with their followers, set out for Malāyu by land and sea on 11th Vaiśākha, reached the mouth of the Musi, called Mināṅa Tāmvan, and left it on the 7th of Jyaiṣṭha. After guiding the colonists to the haven of safety that was Malāyu, the principal organizers came back to Śrīvijaya, or perhaps Mināṅa Tāmvan, on the fifth of Āṣāḍha. The thanks-giving of the organizers of the expedition is probably commemorated in the fragment of the Tĕlaga Batu inscription.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Banerji, R.D.
1930 *History of Orissa,* Vol. I, Calcutta: R. Chatterji.

Barth, Auguste, and Abel Bergaigne
1885, 1893 Auguste Barth, *Inscriptions Sanscrites du Cambodge,* Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque du roi et autres bibliothèques, Paris, v. 27, no. 1, pp. 1-180 (1885).
Abel Bergaigne, *Inscriptions Sanscrites de Campā* and *Inscriptions Sanscrites du Cambodge,* pp. 181-292 and 293-588 (1893).

Brandes, J. L. A.
1897[1], 1920[2] *Pararaton (Ken Arok) of het Boek der Koningen van Tumapel en van Majapahit,* VBG 49.1; second ed., revised by N. J. Krom with the help of J. C. G. Jonker, H. Kraemer and R. Ng. Poerbatjaraka, VBG 62.

Brandes, J. L. A., and N. J. Krom
1913 *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden,* Nagelaten transcripties van wijlen Dr. J. L. A. Brandes, edited by N. J. Krom, VBG, Batavia and 's-Gravenhage.

Casparis J. G. de
1956 *Prasasti Indonesia* II, Bandung.

Chatterji, S. K. (ed.)
1978 *Cultural Heritage of India,* vol. V, Calcutta: The Rama Krishna Mission Institute of Culture.

Chaudhury, B. N.
1969 *Buddhist centres in ancient India,* Calcutta: Sanskrit College.

Chhabra, B. Ch.
1935 'Expansion of Indo-Aryan Culture during the Pallava Rule, as evidenced by Inscriptions', *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,* Letters, vol. I, no. 1, pp. 1-64, Calcutta: The Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Coedès, G.
1918 'Le royaume de Śrīvijaya', *BEFEO* xviii, no. 6, pp. 1-36.
1930 'Les inscriptions Malaises de Śrīvijaya', *BEFEO* XXX, pp. 29-80.
1934 'On the origin of the Śailendras of Indonesia', *Journ. Greater Ind. Soc.* I, pp. 61-70, Calcutta.
1943-46 'Quelques précisions sur la fin du Fou-nan', *BEFEO* XLIII, pp. 3-4.

1951 *Inscriptions du Cambodge,* t. IV, Paris.
1964 'A Possible Interpretation of the Inscription of Kĕdukan Bukit (Palembang)', in: J. Bastin and R. Roolvink (eds.), *Malayan and Indonesian Studies,* pp. 24-32, London.
1968 *The Indianized States of South-East Asia,* Honolulu: University of Hawaii.

Coedès, G., and H. Parmentier
1923 *Liste Générale des Inscriptions et des Monuments,* Hanoi.

Ferrand, G.
1919 'Le K'ouen-louen et les anciennes navigations interocéaniques dans les mers du sud', *Journ. Asiatique,* onzième série, xiv.
1922 'l'Empire Sumatranais de Śrīvijaya', *Journal Asiatique,* onzième série, xx.

Geeroms, H.
1943 'Over de derde persoon meervoud in het Austronesisch', *BKI* 102-I/II, pp. 41-79.

Gonda J.
1952 *Sanskrit in Indonesia,* Nagpur (now New Delhi): The international Academy of Indian Culture.

Hiralal, Rai Bahadur
1907-8 'Rangoli plates of Jayavardhana II', *Epigraphia Indica* ix.

Hirananda Sastri
1923-24 'The Nalanda copper-plate of Devapāla', *Epigraphia Indica* xvii, New Delhi.

Kern, H.
1915 *Verspreide Geschriften* III, '-Gravenhage.

Krom, N. J.
1931 *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis,* '-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Lokesh Chandra
1979 'Yogatantra Buddhism in Indonesia and its bearing on Borobudur' (off-print), New Delhi: Ganganath Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeeth.

Longhurst, A. H.
1938 *The Buddhist Antiquities of Nāgārjunakoṇḍa,* Madras Presidency, Delhi: Manager of Publications, Government of India (Memoir, Arch. Surv. India, no. 54).

Majumdar, R. C.
1937 'Ancient Indian colonies in the Far East', vol. II, *Suvarṇadvīpa,* Dacca.

Majumdar, R. C. (ed.)
1954 *History and Culture of the Indian people,* vol. III, Bombay: Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan.

Nilakanta Sastri, K. A.
1949 *History of Śrīvijaya,* Madras: University of Madras.
1955 *A History of South India,* Madras: Oxford University Press.
1957 (ed.) *A Comprehensive History of India,* Vol. II, *The Mauryas and Sātavāhanas (B.C. 325-A.D. 300),* Calcutta: Orient Longmans.
1963 *Development of Religion in South India,* Madras: Orient Longmans.

Nilakanta Sastri, K. A., and M. Venkataramayya
1950 'Telugu Chola Records from Anantapur and Cuddapah', *Epigraphia Indica* vol. xxvii, New Delhi.

Pelliot, P.
1903 'Le Fou-nan', *BEFEO,* Paris.

Pigeaud, Th. G. Th.
1960 *Java in the Fourteenth Century,* vol. II, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Przyluski, J.
1935 'The Śailendravaṁśa', *Journ. Greater Ind. Soc.* II, pp. 25-36, Calcutta.

Sarkar, H. B.
1971 *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java,* vol. I, Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyaya.
1972 *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java,* vol. II, Calcutta: Firma K. L. Mukhopadh-

yaya.
Satyawati Suleiman
1977 *Concise Ancient History of Indonesia,* Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional.
Sircar, D. C.
1939 *Successors of the Sātavāhanas,* Calcutta.
1965a *Select Inscriptions,* Vol. I, Calcutta: University of Calcutta.
1965b *Indian Epigraphy,* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
1967 *Cosmography and Geography in early Indian Literature.*
Stutterheim, W. F.
1929 *Oudheden van Bali,* Singaradja: Kirtya Liefrinck-van der Tuuk.
Takakusu, J.
1966 *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and the Malay Archipelago,* Indian edition, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
Teeuw, A., and H. W. Emanuels
1961 *A Critical Survey of Studies on Malay and Bahasa Indonesia,* 's-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.
Watters, T.
1961 *On Yuang Chwang's Travels in India (A.D. 629-645)* II, First Indian edition, Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.
Wheatley, P.
1966 *The Golden Khersonese,* Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.

ABBREVIATIONS USED

BEFEO *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême-Orient.*
BKI *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land en Volkenkunde.*
VBG Verhandelingen Bataviaasch Genootschap.