

THE ŚAILENDRAS RECONSIDERED



Photo source: Gunkarta Gunawan Kartapranata, http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Sailendra_King_and_Queen,_Borobudur.jpg

Anton O. Zakharov



NALANDA-SRIWIJAYA CENTRE
WORKING PAPER SERIES NO. **12**

(Aug 2012)

THE ŚAILENDRAS RECONSIDERED

Anton O. Zakharov

Anton O. Zakharov obtained his PhD in History from the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow (2005). His PhD Thesis is entitled *Problems of Political Organization of the Southeast Asian Insular Societies in the Early Middle Ages (the 5th–8th Centuries) As Evidenced by Inscriptions*. Currently, he is Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences. He has published extensively on early Southeast Asian history. Email: antonzkhrv@yahoo.com

The NSC Working Paper Series is published electronically by the **Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre** of the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies in Singapore.

© Copyright is held by the author or authors of each Working Paper.

NSC Working Papers cannot be republished, reprinted, or reproduced in any format without the permission of the paper's author or authors.

ISSN: 2529-7287

Citations of this electronic publication should be made in the following manner:

Anton O. Zakharov, The Śailendras Reconsidered, **Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre** Working Paper No 12 (Aug 2012), http://www.iseas.edu.sg/nsc/documents/working_papers/nscwps012.pdf

NSC WPS Editors:

Geoff Wade

Joyce Zaide

Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre Editorial Committee:

Tansen Sen

Geoff Wade

Joyce Zaide

The Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre Working Paper Series has been established to provide an avenue for swift publication and wide dissemination of research conducted or presented within the Centre, and of studies engaging fields of enquiry of relevance to the Centre.

**The Nalanda-Sriwijaya Centre
Institute of Southeast Asian Studies**

30 Heng Mui Keng Terrace
Pasir Panjang, Singapore 119614

TELEPHONE : (+65) 6870 4549

FAX : (+65) 6775 6264

WEB : <http://nsc.iseas.edu.sg>

FACEBOOK : [facebook.com/nalandasriwijayacentre](https://www.facebook.com/nalandasriwijayacentre)

The Śailendras Reconsidered

Anton O. Zakharov

Abstract: The paper focuses on an aspect of the ancient history of Java, Sumatra and the Malay Peninsula, namely the role of the Śailendra dynasty. It analyses the main sources mentioning this clan, i.e. Central Javanese and Indian inscriptions, and contemporary debates on the number of dynasties on Central Java in the eighth-to-ninth centuries and the relations between the Śailendras and Srivijaya. There are three main questions: What role did the Śailendras play in Central Java; what were their relations with Srivijaya; and what was the origin of this dynasty?

The paper argues that the dynasty of Śailendras was of Javanese origin and the first ruler who was undoubtedly a Śailendra was Panankarana. In fact, there was no difference between the so-called “Sañjaya dynasty” and the Śailendras. The expansion of Panankarana’s power reached the Malay Peninsula where he left the famous inscription from Chaiya (also known as the Ligor stele). The relatives of the Śailendras also held sway over Kedah in Malaysia in the later tenth-to-early eleventh centuries.

Keywords: Sailendras, Central Java, Sanjaya, Srivijaya, inscriptions

Introduction

The Śailendras (“lords of mountains”) is one of the most enigmatic dynasties in world history. They appear in a handful of sources in various places and times and disappear almost in a moment. The first reference to them can be found in the famous Chaiya inscription (also known as the Ligor Stele) dated to 775 CE and the last is in the Small Leiden Charter of the Chola king Kulottunga dated from 1089–1090 CE. The Chaiya inscription also mentions the equally famous polity of Srivijaya that raises the question of relations between the Śailendras and this realm. This paper will focus on the three main questions: What role did the Śailendras play in Central Java from which majority of their inscriptions comes; what were their relations with Srivijaya; what was the origin of the dynasty?

Sources

In Central Java, the Śailendras are mentioned in the four inscriptions. The first and, to a certain degree, most informative is the stone of Kalasan dated from 778 CE and found on the plains of Prambanan. It is in Sanskrit and written in the “early Nāgarī” script. Due to its importance, I cite it in its entirety:

namo bhagavatyai āryatārāyai ||

(1) yā tārayatyamitaduḥkhabhavāddhimagnaṃ lokaṃ vilokya
vidhivattrividhairu[2]payaiḥ |

sā vaḥ surendranaralokavibhūtisāraṃ tārā diśatvabhimataṃ jagadekatārā ||

(2) āvarjya mahārājaṃ dyāḥ pañca[3]paṇaṃ paṇaṃkaraṇaṃ |

śailendrarājagurubhistārābhavanaṃ hi kāritaṃ śrīmat ||

(3) gurvājñayā kṛtajñāistārādevī[4]kṛtāpi tadbhavanaṃ |

vinayamahāyānavidāṃ bhavanaṃ cāpyāryabhikṣūṇāṃ ||

(4) pangkuratavānatīripa[5]nāmabhirādeśasāstribhīrājñāḥ |

tārābhavanaṃ kāritamādaṃ mapi cāpyāryabhikṣūṇāṃ ||

(5) rājye pravarddhamā[6]ne rājñāḥ śailendravañśatilakasya |

śailendrarājagurubhis tārābhavanaṃ kṛtaṃ kṛtibhiḥ ||

(6) śakanṛpakālātītai[7]rvarṣasataiḥ saptabhirmmahārājaḥ |

akarodgurupūjārthaṃ tārābhavanaṃ paṇaṃkaraṇaḥ ||

(7) grāmaḥ kālasanāmā[8]dattaḥ saṃghāya sākṣīnaḥ kṛtvā |

pangkuratavānatīripadesādhyakṣān mahāpuruṣān ||

(8) bhurada[9]kṣineyam atulā dattā saṃghāya rājasiṃhena |

śailendravañśabhūpair anuparipālyāryasantatyā ||

(9) [10] sang pangkurādibhiḥ santavānakādibhiḥ |

sang tīripādibhiḥ pattibhīsa sādhubhiḥ || api ca ||

(10) [11] sarvānevāgāminaḥ pāṛthivendrān bhūyo bhūyo yācate rājasiṃhaḥ |

sāmānyoyaṃ dharmmaseturna[12]rāṇāṃ kāle kāle pālanīyo bhavadbhiḥ ||

(11) anena puṇyena vihārajena pratītya jātārthavibhāgavi[13]jñāḥ |

bhavantu sarve tribhavopapannā janā jinānāmanuśāsanaññāḥ ||

(12) kariyāna paṇaṃkaraṇaḥ śrī[14]mānabhiyācate bhāvinṛpān |
bhūyo bhūyo vidhivadvihāraparipālanārthamiti || (Sarkar 1971: 35–6)

This can be translated as follows (Sarkar 1971: 37–8, with a few corrections given below):

Salutation to the divine Āryatārā! (1) May she, who, seeing the world immersed in the sea of existence, duly delivers it through the three means, may she, Tārā, the only guiding-star of the world, grant you (your) pleasure (consisting of) the best part of the wealth of the celestial and the mundane worlds. (2) After persuading the great king *dyāḥ* Pañcapaṇa Paṇaṃkaraṇa, the splendid temple of Tārā was caused to be built by the preceptors of the Śailendra-king. (3) By experts, at the command of the preceptors, were made (the image of) the goddess Tārā and a temple for her; so also was made an abode for the venerable monks who knew the Great Vehicle of Discipline. (4) By the executors of orders (*adeśasastrin*)¹ of the king named *pangkur*, *tavān*, and *tīrip*, this temple of Tārā as also (the abode) of the venerable monks were caused to be built. (5) As the kingdom of the king who is an ornament of the Śailendra dynasty was flourishing, the Tārā-temple was constructed by the accomplished preceptors of the Śailendra-king. (6) When seven centuries of the era of the *śaka* king had elapsed, the great king Paṇaṃkaraṇa² built the Tārā-temple for the worship of (his) preceptors.³ (7) The village named Kālāsa was bestowed on the congregation, after calling as witnesses the notable persons such as *pangkur*, *tavān*, *tīrip* and the chiefs of the country (*deśādhyakṣān*).⁴ (8) By the lion of kings was also bestowed on the congregation this incomparable gift in ample measure which is to be protected by kings of the Śailendra-dynasty, by the nobility, (9) by *pangkur* and his followers, by *tavān* and his followers, *tīrip* and his followers, masters (*pati*)⁵ and sages (*sādhubhiḥ*).⁶ (10) The lion of kings again and again makes this request to all the future kings, “this bridge of religion” which is in common property of (all) men should be protected by you at all times. (11) Through the merit accruing from (the construction of) the *vihāra* may all people who are subject to the three forms of existence and who are proficient in the teachings of the Jina obtain a (true) insight into the division of things originating from this chain of causation, for good rebirth (*jātārtha*).⁷ (12) The illustrious *kariyāna* Paṇaṃkaraṇa again and again requests the future kings to maintain the *vihāra* in a proper way’.

The most debatable point in the interpretation of the Kalasan inscription is the number of kings it mentions. Was Paṇaṃkaraṇa a member of the Śailendra-dynasty, or not? Nicolaas Krom and K.A. Nilakanta Sastri believed that he was, whereas Jean Philippe Vogel and Frits Herman Van Naerssen held that he was not (Krom 1931: 144; Nilakanta Sastri 1949: 55–6; Vogel 1919: 634; Van Naerssen 1947). Vogel and Van Naerssen supposed that the text mentions two kings, one of whom was a Śailendra and suzerain, while another was his vassal and was named Paṇaṃkaraṇa. Such scholars as Georges Cœdès and Roy E. Jordaan share this opinion (Cœdès 1968: 89; Jordaan 1999: 40–1). But the hypothesis of two kings seems unfounded: first, why is the suzerain called simply “king” (*rājan*) while his vassal claims to be “great king” (*mahārāja*); second, why does the name of the suzerain not occur as well as the lineage of his vassal? Using Ockham’s principle, the simplest answer is that there was only one king who was called *dyāḥ* Pañcapaṇa Paṇaṃkaraṇa, “ornament of the Śailendra dynasty” (*śailendravanśatilaka*), great king (*maharaja*), “lion of kings” (*rājasinḥa*), and *kariyāna* (see the text above). I shall return to the Paṇaṃkaraṇa question later.

The second mention of the Śailendra dynasty occurs in the Sanskrit inscription of 782 CE from Kēlurak to the north of *caṇḍi* Loro Jonggrang of Prambanan (Sarkar 1971: 41). It is also engraved in the “early Nāgarī” script. According to the text, the royal preceptor of Gauḍīdvīpa named Kumāraghoṣa established an image of Mañjuśrī who embodies Buddha, Dharma, Saṅgha (the Buddhist community), Brahma, Vishnu and Siva (under the name Maheśvara) at one and the same time. The fifth stanza calls the king an “ornament of the Śailendra dynasty” (*śailendravanśatilakena*) while the twentieth verse gives his name -- Śrī Sanggrāmadhanañjaya. One of the royal epithets is very significant: the fourth stanza calls him “destroyer of the best heroes of enemies” (*vairivaravīramardana*). However, Himanshu Bhushan Sarkar suggests that the king’s name was Indra or Dharaṇīndravarmaṇ, as F.D.K. Bosch supposed earlier (Sarkar 1971: 41, 45, 46, fn. 9; Bosch 1928: 24–5). This interpretation is based on the phrase *dharaṇīndranāmnā* from the fifth stanza. It may be translated as “of the name of

Dharaṇīndra” or, connecting it with previous words *rājñā dhṛtā*, as “the earth is held by the king named Indra”. But as Coëdes wrote, “as for his name of Dharaṇīndra, according to a communication by Johannes Gijsbertus de Casparis, this is the result of an incorrect reading: instead of *Dharaṇīndranāmnā*, the Kelurak inscription should read *Dharaṇīdhareṇa*, which simply means ‘king.’” (Coëdes 1959: 48; Coëdes & Damais 1992: 110) As I cannot verify De Casparis’ new reading *de visu*, I cannot judge how reliable it is. But I should say that the phrase *dharaṇīndranāmnā* may mean “(who is) called the king on the earth” because the word *indra* has this meaning (Monier-Williams 1899: 166).

For a third time, the Śailendra dynasty is mentioned in the Ratu Boko, or Abhayagirivihāra, inscription of 792–793 CE. The six fragments of this Sanskrit inscription written in the “early Nāgarī” script are known, but there is no complete edition. Sarkar did not include the last fragment found in his catalogue whereas De Casparis who published this, discussed only the two verses: XV and XII (De Casparis 1950: 11–24; 1961: 241–8; 1981: 73–4; Sarkar 1971: 48 (i–vii)). The latter says that the Abhayagiri Vihāra, i.e. a Buddhist community and cloister, was established by natives of Ceylon (*abhayagirivihāraḥ kāritaḥ siṅhalānām*) (De Casparis 1961: 242; cf.: Sarkar 1971: 48(iv)).

The name of the king who issued the Abhayagirivihāra inscription is a puzzle. De Casparis at first suggested Dharmmatuṅga but later preferred Samaratuṅga without substantiation (De Casparis 1950: 21–2; 1961: 245). Sarkar assigned it to the former while Jeffrey Sundberg has chosen the latter (Sarkar 1971: 48(iv); Sundberg 2006b: 20, n. 29; 2009: 337, 347)⁸. Unfortunately, I have had no access to the inscription itself and cannot judge the likely issuer. If the ruler’s name was Samaratuṅga, he appears in two records (see below), but if the name was Dharmmatuṅga, he is mentioned only in this text.

The fourth and last reference to the Śailendras looks rather doubtful. The stone inscription of Kayumvungan “was obtained from the village of Karangtengah in the Temanggung division of the residency of Kedu” (Sarkar 1971: 64). It is dated to 824 CE and consists of five fragments. Its first part is written in Sanskrit while the second is in

Old Javanese. The end of the ninth line contains the syllable *śai* -- which is completed by some scholars to form *śai(lendravañśatilaka)*, i.e. an “ornament of the Śailendra dynasty” (De Casparis 1950: 38; Sarkar 1971: 66). The eighth stanza gives the name of the king (*kṣitīndraḥ*) Samaratuṅga whose daughter was called Prāmodavarddhanī, according to the tenth stanza (Sarkar 1971: 66–7). The texts notes that the image of Śrīghananātha (probably, Buddha) and the temple of Buddha were established. But the Old Javanese text mentions neither Samaratuṅga nor Prāmodavarddhanī. It refers to the *rakarayān* of Patapān named Pu Palar who gave away irrigated fields *sawaḥ* as immunity, and the witnesses of this generous deed. That Pu Palar and Samaratuṅga referred to one and the same person requires definite proof. Unfortunately, there is no evidence for this identification.

These are the entirety of the data on the Śailendra dynasty from ancient Java. All of these texts appear in a Buddhist and Sanskrit context. The direct evidence concerns a very narrow historical period from 778 to 793 CE as the reference of the Kayumvungan inscription is problematic.

The term Śailendra occurs in the famous Chaiya, or Ligor, stele whose find-place is questionable (Cœdès 1918: 29–30, pl. 1–2). The only fact that can be asserted is that it was found in the Thai-Malay Peninsula (Jacq-Hergoualc’h 2002: 241–7; Jordaan & Colless 2009: 43–8, 55–7). It is in sandstone and engraved on both sides. The conventionally-designated sides A and B consist of 29 and 4 lines of Sanskrit text respectively. Side A gives the date of 697th year in the *śaka* era, i.e. 775 CE. Side A mentions the ruler of Srivijaya. Side B refers to the Śailendra dynasty. Ramesh Chandra Majumdar supposed that the two sides comprise two distinct inscriptions. (Majumdar 1933: 122). Bosch suggested that the text should be read from side B (Bosch 1941: 26–38). Cœdès at first thought it is one inscription but later accepted Majumdar’s thesis (Cœdès 1918: 2–3; 1959: 42–8; Cœdès & Damais 1992: 103–11). He pointed out that the royal titles differ on the two sides: side A calls the ruler “king” (*nṛpa*, *nṛpati*, *bhūpati*, *indrarāja*) and, perhaps, “king of kings” (*īśvarabhūpati*) while side B signifies the Śailendra ruler as “great king” and “king of kings” (*mahārāja*, *rājādhirāja*). But Majumdar’s and Cœdès’ hypothesis does not account for the opening words of both

sides.⁹ Side B begins with the term *svasti* “fortune, luck, success, prosperity” but side A begins with the gerund *visāriṇyā* “spreading, diffusing; coming forth” from the root *visārin* (Monier-Williams 1899: 1283, 1001) that radically differs from the epigraphic Sanskrit tradition of Southeast Asia. Both sides have identical scripts. This means that Bosch’s assumption is correct and that the Chaiya inscription (let us call it this for the sake of convenience) is a single text which should be read from conventional side B.

The ruler’s name is not mentioned in the Chaiya inscription. The only term which may be a name is *viṣṇvākhyo* “Vishnu by name” from the third line of side B. Unfortunately, it can also be translated as “(having an) appearance of Vishnu” (*ayant l’aspect de Viṣṇu*) (Coédès 1918: 32; 1959: 47; Coédès & Damais 1992: 110) as the term *ākhyā* means both (Monier-Williams 1899: 129). It should be noted that the fourth line of side B gives an example of similar usage: The compound *śrīmahārājanāmā* may be translated as “Śrīmahārāja by name” and “who is called illustrious maharaja”.

Side A tells about the construction of brick sanctuaries in honour of Buddha (“the destroyer of Māra”) and bodhisattvas Padmapāṇī (*kajakara*) and Vajrapāṇī (*bajrini*) (Coédès 1918: 29, 31). Therefore, the Śailendras again appear in Buddhist context.

One of the most important sources on early Indonesian history is the Nālandā copper-plate of Devapāladeva from Bengal (Shastri 1924: 310–27). Devapāladeva belonged to the Pāla dynasty. Unfortunately, this inscription only has the date of the 39th regnal year of Devapāladeva. Conventional chronologies of the Pāla dynasty, however, date his death between 843 and 850 CE (Sirkar 1977; Khandanavala & Gorakshkar 1986; Huntington & Huntington 1990; Jordaan & Colless 2009: 32–3). Therefore, the Nālandā copper-plate belongs to the first half of the ninth century instead of the second one as supposed by De Casparis (1956: 297). The inscription says that the ruler of *Suvarṇadvīpa* (Sumatra or part thereof, including Srivijaya), the “great king of kings” (*adhipamahārāja*) named Bālaputra founded a Buddhist monastery (*vihāra*) in Nālandā. Bālaputra was said to be a grandson of a king of *Yavabhūmi* (Java) who was an “ornament of the Śailendra dynasty” (*śailendravanśatilako yavabhūmipālaḥ*, line 52). A son of this king Samarāgravīra¹⁰ married a princess Tārā

who was a daughter of a certain “great king of the Lunar race” Dharmasetu (*rājñah somakulānvayasya mahataḥ śrīdharmasetoḥ sutā*) (Shastri 1924: 322–4; Nilakanta Sastri 1949: 126–7; Krom 1926: 139; Damais 1968: 364; Jordaan & Colless 2009: 42). As Sundberg (2011: 145) rightly points out, the terms *dharmasetu* and *tārā* both occur in the Kalasan inscription of Paṇaṃkaraṇa but in that case they are not considered to be personal names. Where Dharmasetu ruled is not known, nor do we know of other members of the Lunar race. The only person who clearly belonged to the Śailendra dynasty is the king of *Yavabhūmi*, a grandfather of Bālaputra. The latter was not called an “ornament of the Śailendra dynasty”.

The name Bālaputra, probably occurs as *wālaputra* in the metrical Old Javanese inscription of the king Lokapāla dated 856 CE (De Casparis 1956: 280–330, esp. 312). This inscription tells about the construction of a temple complex in honour of Siva identified with the famous Prambanan (Jordaan (ed.) 1996). *Dyaḥ* Lokapāla ascended the throne of the kingdom and *kĕraton* of Mĕdang (*rājya karatwan, maḍang kaḍatwan*) succeeding the king Jātiningrat (De Casparis 1956: 312, 318). According to the Wanua Tengah III inscription issued by king Balitung in 908 CE, Jātiningrat was the *raka* of Pikatan (Wissemann Christie 2001: 30, 52). Lokapāla is known as the *raka* of Kayuwangi whose personal name was Sajjanotsavatuṅga mentioned in the copper-plate of Ramvi, or the Ngabean VI inscription of 882 CE (Sarkar 1971, 278). The sixth strophe of the Lokapāla inscription says: “The young prince... protected the country of Java...” (*yuwanātha... mangrakṣa bhūmi ri jawa*). This prince is also called maharaja and victor (*jetā*) (De Casparis 1956: 311–2). De Casparis supposed that this is a reference to a battle between Bālaputra and Javanese rulers, namely *raka* of Pikatan and Lokapāla, resulting in the defeat of Bālaputra and the Śailendras eviction from Java to Sumatra (1956: 295–9). But the context of the term *wālaputra* is unclear as the first of the preceding two syllables is lost whereas the second – *hi* -- cannot be explained satisfactorily. It is equally possible that *wālaputra* means here “young man, child” instead of being a personal name (Zoetmulder 1982: 2179; Monier-Williams 1899: 729). If correct, this means that there was no battle on the Ratu Boko plateau.

One point is worthy of notice. The Kěkurak inscription calls the ruler a “destroyer of the best heroes of enemies” (*vairivaravīramardana*) (see above). Almost identical epithets occur in the Chaiya inscription and the Nālandā copper-plate: “destroying the pride of all his enemies” (*sarvvārimadavimathana*) (Coedès & Damais 1992: 108; cf.: Coedès 1918: 29) and “illustrious tormentor / destroyer of brave foes” (*śrīvīravairimathana*) (Nilakanta Sastri 1949: 126–7). This resemblance of epithets forces us to consider them as belonging to one and the same Śailendra ruler. Nilakanta Sastri held that he was Paṇaṃkaraṇa Dharaṇīndravarmaṇ (Nilakanta Sastri 1949: 55–6) but the name Dharaṇīndravarmaṇ seems inauthentic. Roy Jordaan and Brian Colless (2009: 43) think the ruler was Śrī Sanggrāmadhanañjaya. Sundberg believes that the “killer of haughty enemies” was Paṇaṃkaraṇa (2003, 176). The only thing that seems evident is that these references concern one and the same ruler. It is only his name which is a point at issue.

Later references to the Śailendras occur outside Java, in India. The Larger Leiden copper-plate inscription of the Chola ruler Rājarāja I dated to 1006 CE contains the Sanskrit part which was added by his son Rājendra I about 1019 CE. It tells that the king of Kaṭāha, i.e. Kedah in Malaysia, named Cūḷāmaṇivarman founded a Buddhist temple in Nagapattinam. Cūḷāmaṇivarman “was born in the Śailendra family, was the lord of the Śrīviṣaya (country), and was conducting the rule of Kaṭāha” (*Śailendra-varṃśa-sambhūtena Śrīviṣayādhipatinā Kaṭah-ādhipatyam-ātanvatā*) (Karashima & Subbarayalu 2009: 272–3; Nilakanta Sastri 1949: 128, 75; Aiyer 1933a: 213–66). Rājarāja Chola I bestowed a village to the temple. A son of Cūḷāmaṇivarman named Māravijayōttuṅgavarman finished his father’s construction. The temple was called *Śailendra-Cūḷāmaṇivarmavihāra*. The Smaller Leiden copper-plate inscription of Kulōttunga Chola I confirmed Rājarāja’s endowment (Majumdar 1933: 124; Aiyer 1933b: 267–81; Karashima & Subbarayalu 2009: 281). The Śrīviṣaya country is identified with Srivijaya. Two other inscriptions from Nagapattinam dated to 1014/1015 and 1015 CE make this identification beyond doubt as they offer different spellings of the name: Śrīviṣaya and Śrīvijaya (Karashima & Subbarayalu 2009: 275–6). Another text from Nagapattinam dated from 1019 mentions an envoy of the king of

Kiṭāra, another spelling of Kadāram and Kaṭāha (Karashima & Subbarayalu 2009: 278). These data show that the members of the Śailendra dynasty held sway over Kedah at the end of the tenth to the beginning of the eleventh century and also ruled Srivijaya.¹¹

As the Śailendras and their activities are recorded in so many contexts of Java, Sumatra, Thai-Malay Peninsula, and India, their history and legacy have become very complicated and disputable. Let me now turn to some problems in this research.

The Śailendras in Central Java

The Śailendras in Java occur only in a Buddhist context (see above). Early epigraphy from Java, however, begins with the Śaivite inscription of the king Sañjaya from Canggal dated 732 CE (Sarkar 1971: 15–24). The inscription says Sañjaya erected a lingam of Siva. In the early tenth century, the king Dakṣa who ruled in 913–919 CE introduced a new calendar -- the era of Sañjaya (Damais 1951: 42–63; Sarkar 1972: 123–34, 138–42; Wisseman Christie 2001: 32). Four inscriptions are dated by this system: Taji Gunung, Timbanan Wungkal, Tihang, and Tulang Er, which is dated to the 198th year of Sañjaya (Sundberg 2009: 343). The first of these is dated to the 194th year of Sañjaya, or 910 CE, and mentions the “previous camp of the king *śrī* Sañjaya” (*tarub nguni śrī sañjaya naranāttha*, Sarkar 1972: 125, recto, line 25).

The famous Mantyasih I inscription of 907 CE issued by the predecessor of Dakṣa, king Balitung, calls Sañjaya the first protector of the kingdom of Matarām:

“You deified beings of earlier times from Mēdang, from Poḥ pitu the *raka* of Matarām (such as) king Sañjaya, the illustrious great king (who is) the *raka* of Panangkaran, the illustrious great king (who is) the *raka* of Panunggalan, the illustrious great king (who is) the *raka* of Warak, the illustrious great king (who is) the *raka* of Garung, the illustrious great king (who is) the *raka* of Pikatan, the illustrious great king (who is) the *raka* of Kayuwangi, the illustrious great king (who is) the *raka* of Watu Humalang...” (*kamung rahyang ta rumuhun ri mḍang ri poḥ pitu rakai matarām sang ratu sañjaya śrī mahārāja rakai Panangkaran śrī mahārāja rakai panunggalan śrī mahārāja rakai warak śrī mahārāja rakai garung śrī mahārāja rakai pikatan śrī mahārāja rakai kayuwangi śrī mahārāja rakai watu humalang*) (Sarkar 1972: 68, 75).

The Sundanese chronicle *Carita Parahyangan* dating from the sixteenth century tells that Sañjaya conquered many lands in Sumatra and Bali, and pursued wars against the Khmers and even China (Poerbatjaraka 1920: 403–16; Majumdar 1937: 230; Chatterji 1967: 9). While this seems an obvious exaggeration (Krom 1931: 126; Cœdès 1968: 88; Chatterji 1967: 9; cf.: Van der Meulen 1979: 27; Mahdi 2008: 111–43), the chronicle shows the great significance of Sañjaya in the historical memory of the Sundanese and, indirectly, Javanese from whom the former got to know of him. As the kings Sañjaya and Lokapāla, as well many other rulers of Central Java in the ninth to early tenth centuries, were the devotees of Siva while the Śailendras were Buddhists (see the sources in Sarkar 1971–1972; Brandes 1913), many scholars have believed that there were the two dynasties in Java, i.e. the Śailendras and the “Sañjaya family”. One of the most prominent exponents of this theory was De Casparis (1956: 293–7). These dynasties were said to have been rivals for hegemony, and after the postulated defeat of Bālaputra in 856, the Śailendras seem to have been evicted from Java. The great monuments of Borobudur and Prambanan have been interpreted as the rival constructions of the Śailendras and the “Sañjaya family” respectively.

As we have seen earlier, the battle between Bālaputra and Lokapāla looks problematic. There are also data that show that there were no distinctions between the Śailendras and “Sañjaya family”. These data include the Mantyasih I and Wanua Tengah III inscriptions. Both the texts were issued under the king Balitung in 907 and 908 CE respectively. They both give lists of deified rulers as protectors of the kingdom of Matarām while their cognate ties are not mentioned. Jordaan and Colless offer their summary table:

| Mantyasih I (907) | Wanua Tengah III (908) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| Rakai Mātaram sang Ratu Sañjaya | Rahyangta ri Mḍang and Rahyangta i Hāra |
| Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Panangkaran | Rake Panangkaran (746–784) |
| Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Panunggalan | Rake Panaraban (784–803) |
| Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Warak | Rake Warak Dyaḥ Manara (803–827) |
| | Dyaḥ Gula (827–829) |
| Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Garung | Rake Garung (829–847) |
| Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Pikatan | Rake Pikatan Dyaḥ Salaḍū (847–855) |

| Mantyasih I (907) | Wanua Tengah III (908) |
|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Kayuwangi | Rake Kayuwangi Dyaḥ Lokapāla (855–885) |
| | Dyaḥ Tagwas (885) |
| | Rake Panumwangan Dyaḥ Dewendra (885–887) |
| | Rake Gurungwangi Dyaḥ Bhadra (887) |
| Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Watuhumalang | Rake Wungkal Humalang Dyaḥ Jěbang (894–898) |
| Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Watukura Dyaḥ Balitung | Rake Watukura Dyaḥ Balitung (898–) |

Source: Jordaan & Colless 2009: 37.

Jan Wisseman Christie points out that the rulers who were claimed as the Śailendras could have been members of “Sañjaya family” at one and the same time. The most obvious candidate for such an identification is the king Paṇaṃkaraṇa from the Kalasan inscription who may be identified with Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Panangkaran. Wisseman Christie notices that Javanese rulers bore names of several components. There are titles (*mahārāja, raka, ratu*), epithets (*dyaḥ, (m)pu, sang, śrī*), personal names, and coronation names (*abhiṣeka*) (Wisseman Christie 2001: 28). After their death, rulers were referred to by an apotheosis name. A monarch could have several coronation names. For example, Balitung is called *śrī mahārāja rakai Watukura dyaḥ Balitung śrī Dharmmodāya Mahāsambhu* in the Mantyasih I inscription, and *Śrī Išwarakeśawotsawatungga* in the Wanua Tengah III inscription (Sarkar 1972: 65; Wisseman Christie 2001: 52). As for an apotheosis name, *Śrī Mahārāja Rakai Warak Dyaḥ Manara* was called *Śrī Mahārāja sang lumāḥ i Kelāsa*, i.e. “Śrī Mahārāja who lies dead / whose ashes were interred in Kelāsa” (Wisseman Christie 2001: 28, 30, 51).¹²

The Wanua Tengah III inscription tells that a Buddhist monastery in the area of Pikatan was founded by a certain *Rahyangta i Hāra* who was called a younger brother of the *Rahyangta ri Mḍang* (Wisseman Christie 2001: 29–30, 51). As Sañjaya is connected with Mḍang in the Mantyasih I charter (see above), it is likely that he was this *Rahyangta ri Mḍang*. Wisseman Christie points out that *Rahyangta i Hāra* could have been either his real younger brother or ‘subordinate “brother” ruler of the state known to the Chinese as Heling (Ho-ling), whose capital had been in Hāra, and whose

territory had incorporated the Pikatan area until his state was annexed by Sañjaya (Wisseman Christie 2001: 34). She adds:

This Buddhist ruler may have belonged to the Śailendra family. If so, then the two families must have merged in the mid-eighth century, when Heling's annexation and subordination was reinforced by a marriage tie between Sañjaya and a woman related to Heling's ruler (Wisseman Christie 2001: 34).

Recognizing her hypothesis of "marriage tie" and annexation of Heling by Sañjaya as a true fact, Wisseman Christie identifies later rulers of Java in the dynastic diagram:

| 'Sañjaya' family | | Śailendra family |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Rake Panangkaran (<i>dyāḥ</i> Pañcapaṇa) (A.D. 746–784) | =? | Indra Sanggrāmadhanañjaya (A.D. 782) |
| Rakai Panunggalan / Panaraban (= <i>narendra</i> Sāraṇa ¹³) (A.D. 784–803) | =? | Dharmmottungadeva (A.D. 792–793) =(? Wiṣṇu of Ligor, after A.D. 775 r.) |
| Rake Warak Dyaḥ Manara (803–827) | =? | Samarattungga (A.D. 824) (whose daughter was Prāmodavarddhanī) |
| Dyaḥ Gula (A.D. 827–828) | =? | ? (no <i>abhiṣeka</i> name) (Bālaputra = possibly son of the ousted Dyaḥ Gula?) (c. A.D. 860) |

Source: Wisseman Christie 2001: 35.

Wisseman Christie's theory was criticized by Sundberg. He points out that Heling continued to send embassies to China until 818 CE and this argues against the idea of its annexation by Sañjaya (Sundberg 2009: 344). Another problem with Heling is that there was a polity Walaing whose name was transcribed by the Chinese as Heling (Sundberg 2009: 344; Damais 1964: 93–141). Sañjaya and his successors never claimed to possess Walaing. Sundberg also emphasises that the king's name

“Indra” attributed to Panangkaran by Wisseman Christie is out of date (see above). He adds that there is no proof that Sāraṇa is a personal name. Sundberg holds that the Abhayagirivihāra and Kayumvungan inscriptions both mention Samaratuṅga. This means that his reign covered both that of Rakai Panunggalan / Panaraban and Rake Warak (Sundberg 2009: 347). In any case, Wisseman Christie’s constructions look rather problematic.

Be that as it may, Sundberg shares the same one dynasty theory but his interpretation is rather different. He believes that the Wanua Tengah III list includes the Śailendras too because it mentions the great king Paṇaṃkaraṇa from the Kalasan inscription as Rake Panangkaran and this title also occurs in the Mantyasih I charter (see above) (Sundberg 2003: 174). I should note that it is the only clear identification which is doubtless.

One of the most important arguments by Sundberg is based on the Buddhist mantra found on the Ratu Boko Plateau. It contains the two lines: *oṃ takī hūṃ jaḥ svāhā* and *Panarabwan khanipa* (Sundberg 2003: 163–88, especially 164–165 and fig. 1). According to Sundberg (2003: 174), Panarabwan was identical to the Panaraban mentioned in the Wanua Tengah III inscription. But the scholar assumes that Panaraban was Samaratuṅga who had died in 803 CE as the Wanua Tengah III text states (Sundberg 2003: 175). As Samaratuṅga is mentioned in the Kayumvungan inscription of 824 CE, Sundberg declares that he had died long before it was issued, and the temple of Buddha was established by his daughter Prāmodavarddhanī, not him (Sundberg 2006b, 27; cf. 2009: 358).

Sundberg (2006: 95–136, especially 120–4) thinks Borobudur was constructed by the Rake Warak Dyaḥ Manara (803–827 CE). The arguments are as follows: There are place-names near Borobudur reminiscent of the king’s name, including the river-name Kali Warak and the Menoreh Hills. The inscription of Kamalagi dated from 821 CE contains the term *waragwarak* which may had been a place-name (Sarkar 1971: 57).¹⁴ Several undated inscriptions of Borobudur are written in a script resembling that of the Kamalagi inscription (Sundberg 2006a: 116, 121–3). The Sundanese chronicle “Carita

Parahyangan” refers to Rake Warak Dyah Manara as Sang Manarah (Sundberg 2006a, 123). All these data allow supposition that the domain of Warak lay near Borobudur.

According to Sundberg, the empire of the Śailendras was divided by Rake Warak and his hypothetical brother Bālaputra; and this is the only argument that Sang Manarah if he was Rake Warak, engaged in wars against his brother Rahyang Banga. The former obtained Java, while the latter held sway over Sumatra (Sundberg 2006a: 124, n. 50).

Sundberg’s theory contains two main defects. First, there is no data that suggests that Samaratuṅga was dead when the Kayumvungan inscription was made in 821 CE. The text of the inscription makes no such reference. If the Wanua Tengah III inscription includes the Śailendras and if Samaratuṅga was still alive in 821 CE, he also could be the Rake Warak Dyah Manara. I also would like to make some arguments for the supposition that the Abhayagirivihāra inscription, nevertheless, mentions Samaratuṅga, not Dharmmatuṅga.

Second, the hypothesis of the division of the Śailendra Empire between Rake Warak and Bālaputra seems ungrounded. At first, one needs to prove that the Śailendras ever held sway over Sumatra or at least its south-eastern part. The kinship relations of Bālaputra and the Śailendras does not prove that. First, one must show that his father Samarāgravīra was also father of Rake Warak; second, one needs to show that Samarāgravīra even ruled in Java because the title of ruler of *Yavabhūmi* (Java) belonged only to the grandfather of Bālaputra.

Therefore, Sundberg’s theory seems as problematic as that of Wisseman Christie.

A theory of many dynasties has now been proposed by Jordaan. He holds that there were three dynasties in ancient Java: the Śailendras, the descendants of Sañjaya (probably, self-proclaimed), and the clan of *rakarayān* of Patapān named *Pu Palar* mentioned in the Kayumvugan inscription (see above) (Jordaan & Colless 2009: 36; Jordaan 2006: 3–22; 1999: 44). Jordaan identifies the *rakarayān* of Patapān with a certain *ḍang karayān Part(t)apān* from an undated Old Malay inscription of Gondosuli II found in Central Java (Jordaan 1999: 44; Jordaan & Colless 2009: 196).¹⁵ This

inscription mentions a sanctuary of Siva *Sang Hyang Wintang*, or “sacred star” (*de heilige Ster*, line 11). The date of the inscription is debatable. De Casparis (1950: 55–7) dated it to 832 CE but Louis-Charles Damais (1970: 44) placed it a bit earlier, around 800 CE. Roy Jordaan strangely dates it from 847 CE without argumentation (Jordaan & Colless 2009: 194; cf. Jordaan 1999: 44).

Jordaan advances several arguments in favour of the Śailendra dynasty. First, he believes that the Kalasan inscription of 778 CE mentions the two rulers, one of whom was a Śailendra king. Second, the identifications of the Śailendras with the kings of the Wanua Tengah III and Mantyasih I lists are unconvincing. According to him, these lists include the paramount Javanese Śaivite rulers (Jordaan 1999: 44). The Śailendras were supposedly omitted due to their hypothetical foreign origin (Jordaan & Colless 2009: 38). That they would have been of foreign origin is because supposedly no Śailendra ruler bore the Javanese titles of *ratu*, *raka* or *rakarayān* (Jordaan 2006: 9). Jordaan states:

The other reason why I think that the Śailendras were of foreign origin and not a separate dynasty from another part of the country, is that the establishment of their rule in Java was accompanied by a number of exogenous changes... the introduction of a new script that in Dutch colonial times was generally known by the name of Pre-Nāgarī (*siddhamāṭṛka*), the earliest issuance of the silver Sandalwood-Flower coins, bearing legends in the same script, the introduction of the *māharāja* title and its subsequent adoption by the Javanese rulers, the transfer of the Javanese capital “to the East” (not necessarily to East Java), and the sudden blossoming of Mahāyāna Buddhist architectural art. In contrast, the departure of the Śailendras from Java was followed by such developments as the fall of Buddhism from royal favour as reflected in the disparaging remarks about Buddhist monks and nuns in the Old Javanese Rāmāyaṇa as well as the halt to Buddhist temple-building activities, the change from Sanskrit to Old Javanese, the shift from silver coinage to an indigenous gold currency (Jordaan 2006: 6).

Unfortunately, some of Jordaan’s observations are far from being well-grounded. First and foremost, the Kalasan inscription of 778 mentions the only great king *mahārāja dyāḥ Pañcapaṇa kariyāna Paṇamkaraṇa* who was an “ornament of the

Śailendra dynasty” (see above). This means that he belonged to this family and bore the Javanese titles *dyāḥ* and *kariyāna* as well as the title of *mahārāja*. *Kariyāna* seems to be a Sanskritised form of Old Javanese *karayān*. According to the Kalasan inscription, Paṅamkaraṇa patronised Buddhism. As he appears in the Mantyasih I and Wanua Tengah III lists as *Śrī Mahārāja Rakai* Panangkaran and *Rake* Panangkaran (see above) and the Wanua Tengah III inscription tells that a wet-rice field (*sawah*) was donated to a Buddhist monastery (*bihāra i pikatan*) by this Rake Panangkaran (Wisseman Christie 2001: 29–30, 51), Jordaan’s statement that these lists include the paramount Śaivite kings should be considered wrong.

Inscriptions written in Old Javanese appeared earlier than the last mention of the Śailendras was made in the Kayumvungan inscription. This text is bilingual and written in both Sanskrit and Old Javanese (see above). The earliest authentic Old Javanese inscription seems to have been the inscribed stone of the Dieng Plateau dated at 809 CE (Sarkar 1971: 49–52).¹⁶ Buddhism was flourishing in Java at the beginning of the tenth century as attested by the Wanua Tengah III inscription describing the history of a Buddhist monastery in Pikatan (see above).

The transfer of the Javanese capital “to the East” known from the Chinese chronicles is extremely obscure information as it covers both terms which are considered as designations of Java and its polities, i.e. Shepo and Heling: “The king (of Heling) lives in the city of Shepo; but his ancestor named Jiyan transferred (the capital) to the East, to the city of Polujiasi” (*Xin Tang-shu*, book 222, notice on Heling) and “during the epoch of *Tianbao* (742–755 CE) (the capital) of Shepo was moved to the city of Polujiasi” (*Ying huan zhe-liu*, chap 2) (Pelliot 1904: 225, n. 2). If Heling was Walaing, as Damais supposed (1964: 93–141), these references have nothing in common with the Śailendras.

Jordaan’s other arguments may be viewed in an opposite way. The “halt to Buddhist temple-building activities” could be caused by its own costs: After Borobudur and the Śaivite Loro Jonggrang complex in Prambanan were built; there were no other such huge constructions. The change to gold currency could be caused by the absence

of silver. The Early (or Pre-) Nāgarī script was used for the Buddhist inscriptions only but this does not imply that it was necessarily used by foreign rulers.

Therefore, no existing theory of early Javanese history seems to be convincing. The one-dynasty thesis is wrong simply because the Gondosuli II and Kayumvungan inscriptions mention a ruler *rakarayān* of Patapān / *ḍang karayān Part(t)apān* named *Pu Palar*. He most likely was not a member of the Śailendra dynasty, and his kinship with the postulated line of Sañjaya is also unfounded. It should be remembered that the ruler of Walaing Pu Kumbhayoni belonged to another royal family. One of his small Sanskrit records dated from 856 calls him “the bull of men”, i.e. king, and the protector of Valaing (*naraṣabha, valaiṅgagoptar*) (De Casparis 1956: 270). The second inscription which is also dated from 856 claims Pu Kumbhayoni a king and the “victor of Valaing” (*nrpatiḥ, valaiṅgajetar*) and perhaps mentions “the land of Sargabhava” (De Casparis 1956: 274, 276).¹⁷ De Casparis refers to the genealogy of Pu Kumbhayoni in one of the undated Ratu Boko inscriptions but gives no true transcription or selected terms which he translates as “god-king” or all other kings – predecessors of Kumbhayoni (De Casparis 1956: 342). This “god-king” was his great grandfather. Pu Kumbhayoni is called a great grandson (*puyut*) of *Sang Ratu i Halu*, i.e. “honourable king of Halu”, in the Vukiran inscription dated from 863 (Sarkar 1971: 172; De Casparis 1956: 269–79, 341–3). Pu Kumbhayoni bears the title *raka* here. Hence, there were other royal or ruling families in Java.

This conclusion is confirmed by other data. One of the most enigmatic persons in ancient Javanese history was Śrī Kahulunan who appears in the two Trui Tepussan (Caṅḍi Petung) inscriptions where s/he marked out a *sīma*, or immunity. Both the texts date from 842 CE. The first of them contains an expression *sīmā ning kamūlān i bhūmi sambhāra* “immunity of the Kamūlān in the land/country of Sambhāra” (Sarkar 1971, 100). The second inscription lacks the important term *bhūmi* (Sarkar 1971: 102). De Casparis (1950, 160–70) sees here an abbreviated form of the term *bhūmisambhārabhūdhara* “the mountain of accumulation of virtue of the (ten) stages (of the Bodhisattva)”. It seems risky to assume that the ancient scribes used shortened forms or made mistakes in both texts. I find it unlikely. More or at least equally

plausible is a hypothesis that there was another *bhūmi* comparable with *bhūmi ri jawa* and *bhūmi i mataram*.¹⁸ This was ruled by Śrī Kahulunan. De Casparis translates this term as “Queen Consort” whereas Boechari, Lokesh Chandra, Andries Teeuw, and Sergey Kullanda offer “Queen Mother” (De Casparis 1950: 85–6; Boechari 1982; Chandra 1994: 84; Teeuw 2001: 525–38; Kullanda 2008: 361). But we do not know to whom, or even if, she was a “queen mother”.

The only well-established fact concerning the Śailendra dynasty is that one of its members was *mahārāja dyāḥ Pañcapaṇa kariyāna Paṇaṃkaraṇa* from the Kalasan inscription of 778 CE. As he ruled in 746–784 CE, according to the Wanua Tengah III inscription, the two other records date from his reign, i.e. the Kĕlurak of 782 CE and the Chaiya, or Ligor, inscription of 775 CE. Therefore, Paṇaṃkaraṇa was likely Śrī Sanggrāmadhanañjaya. That the authors of these texts used different names and titles, is not a great problem as it should be remembered that, first, the Mantyasih I and Wanua Tengah III inscriptions give two different royal names of Balitung (see above); second, Paṇaṃkaraṇa, or *rakai* Panangkaran is not a personal or coronation name but an apanage (*watak/watĕk*) title. More difficult is the relationship between Paṇaṃkaraṇa and Srivijaya which is suggested on the basis of the Chaiya stele.

The Śailendras and Srivijaya

The Buddhist kingdom of Srivijaya which was centred in Palembang in Southeast Sumatra (Manguin 2009: 434–84) arose in the second half of the seventh century CE. Its ruler, Śrī Jayanāśa, left few Old Malay inscriptions dated around the 680s CE (Coédès 1930: 29–80; De Casparis 1956: 1–46). His clan affiliation is not known. There are some texts of Srivijaya in Sanskrit (De Casparis 1956: 1–16).

Vogel (1919: 626–37) and Krom (1919; 1926) held that Srivijaya was ruled by the Śailendra dynasty from the very beginning and its capital was transferred to Java in the middle of the eighth century CE. Their main arguments were the Buddhist nature of the Kalasan and Kēlurak inscriptions, the thriving of Buddhism in Srivijaya according to the Chinese pilgrim Yijing (Chavannes 1894; Takakusu 1896), and a punitive expedition of Srivijaya against a “land of Java” (*bhūmi Java*) mentioned in the Kota Kapur inscription of 686 CE (Coédès 1930: 45–50; Coédès & Damais 1992: 52–6).

On the other hand, Willem Stutterheim (1929) thought that the Śailendras who supposedly were of Javanese origin conquered Srivijaya in the middle of the eighth century CE (cf.: Jordaan 1999; 2006: 3–22). Jordaan refers to the sudden cessation of Srivijaya’s embassies to China in 742 CE and appearances of embassies from other countries: Gelo (Kedah in Malaysia) sent a mission between 742 and 759 CE, Heling sent embassies in 768–818 CE, Shepo did the same in 820–873 CE, and Zhanbei (Jambi in Sumatra) dispatched missions in 852 and 871 CE (Jordaan & Colless 2009: 67–9).

But both these theories have serious deficiencies. First, there is no evidence of the Śailendras in Sumatra before Bālaputra in the ninth century, and even he might have only been a relative of this family. Like the last Russian emperor Nicholas II was a relative of the German emperor Wilhelm II but belonged to the Romanoff dynasty. The theory of Vogel and Krom does not take into account the difference of languages used in Srivijaya and in the Javanese monarchy of the Śailendras, Old Malay in the first and Sanskrit in second. The supposed punitive expedition against a “land of Java” could be aimed against a place other than Java: Boechari pointed to a village named Bumijava in south of Sumatra while “Java” could also denote a part of Borneo (Boechari 1979: 31;

Kullanda 2001: 252, n. 2). Stutterheim's theory has no data on the Śailendra presence in Sumatra in the eighth century CE. It also confuses Chinese data on Shepo and Heling which were not as opposed as it is usually believed (see above). The theory mixes the question of polity and the question of dynasty.

The most profound examination of the relationship between the Śailendras and Srivijaya is that of Jordaan and Colless (2009). They state that from the second half of the eighth century CE, Srivijaya was an 'allied kingdom of the Śailendras, who were the true 'great kings' (Mahārājas) of the Malay-Indonesian archipelago" and the relations between Sumatra and Java were a "symbiosis" (Jordaan & Colless 2009: x). The Śailendras were thus the "maharajas of the isles" of the Arabian sources.

The first argument for the alliance between the Śailendras and Srivijaya is royal titles in the Chaiya, or Ligor, inscription. According to Stutterheim, Jordaan and Colless, the terms *Śrīvijayendrārāja* and *Śrīvijayeśvarabhūpati* should be translated as "King over the lords of Srivijaya" whereas the title *Śrīvijayanṛpati* was a short form (Stutterheim 1929: 14; Jordaan & Colless 2009: 55–7). But Coedès (1918, 3, 31) translated the first two terms as "king (of the country) of Srivijaya". The Sanskrit terms *indrarāja*, *īśvara*, *nṛpati*, *bhūpati*, and, certainly, *rājan* denote kings (Monier-Williams 1899: 171, 567, 761, 874, 1321), but the compound *īśvarabhūpati*, perhaps, may mean "king of kings" (or the "highest king").

A set of data on early insular Southeast Asia can be found in Arabian geographic literature. Medieval Near Eastern scholarship described many countries in the region due to the flourishing of international trade by land and by sea. The Arabian geographers Ibn Khurdādhbih (c. 850 CE) and Abū Zaid (916 CE) tell about a very fertile island country of Zābag which was identified with Srivijaya (Ferrand 1922: 52–61) or Java (Tibbetts 1979: 107)¹⁹, and about the powerful Mahārāja of "the islands of the eastern sea" (Tibbetts 1979: 25–9). Jordaan and Colless believe the second argument for the alliance between the Śailendras and Srivijaya is the description of an island country of Zābag by Ibn Khurdādhbih:

The authority of the Mahārāja [of Zābag] is exercised over these various islands and the island in which he resides is extremely fertile, and patches of habitation succeed each other without interruption. A very trustworthy man affirms

that when the cocks crow at daybreak, as in our country, they call out to each other throughout the whole extent of a hundred parasangs [c. 500 kilometres] or more, showing the uninterrupted and regular succession of villages. In effect, there are no uninhabited places in this country and no ruins. He who comes into the country when he is on journey, if he is mounted he may go wherever he pleases; if he is tired or if his mount has difficulty in carrying on, than he may stop wherever he wishes. (Tibbetts 1979: 33)

Jordaan and Colless (2009: 64) notice that the Mahārāja of the Isles threw a gold brick into a pond every day, according to the references of Ibn Khurdādhbih and Abū Zaid, but the ruler of Srivijaya kept his gold in his palace (*těngah rumah*) as the Sabokingking, or Telaga Batu II inscription states (De Casparis 1956: 39). That Zābag was not Srivijaya is confirmed by the fact that Sribuza which was the latter's name in the Arabian texts, was never referred to as the residence of the Mahārāja of the Isles (Tibbetts 1979: 113; Jordaan & Colless 2009: 66). Therefore, Zābag denoted Java and all the Śailendra Empire. The scholars also refer to the famous story about the founder of the Angkorian Empire, Jayavarman II, who supposedly was in Java before coming to Cambodia, as the Sdok Kak Thom inscription of 1052 CE says (Jordaan & Colless 2009: 61)²⁰. Jordaan and Colless (2009: 67–9) explain the cessation of Srivijaya = Shilifoshi's embassies to China by its submission to the Śailendras.

As a whole, Jordaan's and Colless' arguments look convincing. But there are some issues. First, why was the Śailendra ruler in the Chaiya inscription who presumably subdued Srivijaya or was proclaimed as its overlord, defined as the "king of Srivijaya"? Second, it needs to be proven that in 775 CE Srivijaya was in Palembang or somewhere else in Sumatra. However, there is no data for its existence there in the second half of the eighth century. Perhaps, the Śailendra ruler mentioned in the Chaiya inscription took a part of the Thai-Malay Peninsula under his control around 775 CE.

As for the first difficulty, it should be remembered that the full title of Paṇaṃkaraṇa is unknown and kings often included the titles of countries conquered or subordinated in their official titles; the Russian Tsars are a good example. For instance Nicholas II who was the Russian Emperor, was also King of Poland, Grand Duke of Finland and Tsar of Kazan at one and the same time²¹. It is also worthy of notice that

William the Conqueror was Duke of Normandy and kept this title after he became the King of England. Moreover, he did not absorb the kingdom into the Duchy of Normandy or vice-versa. This suggests that the Śailendra ruler could have subdued Srivijaya or part of it in the Thai-Malay Peninsula and kept the title “king of Srivijaya” in the new subordinated lands.

Many scholars speak of two rulers in the Chaiya inscription, i.e. a Śailendra and a king of Srivijaya (Majumdar 1933: 122; Coedès 1959: 47; Mahdi 2008: 128). The only argument in favour of such supposition is the numerals on side B of the inscription: *eka* “one” and *dvitīya* “second” which may mean “the one – the other” together (Monier-Williams 1899: 227). But these numerals do not occur on side A which is the only side of the Chaiya inscription on which the term Śrīvijaya appears. Therefore, the opposition of two kings looks problematic. The hypothesis of one king, i.e. the Śailendra ruler who was the king of Srivijaya at one and the same time, is more congruent with the textual evidence. The mentioning of Vishnu in the Chaiya stele is not surprising due to his appearance as an embodiment of Bodhisattva Mañjuśrī (see above).

The appearance of the Śailendras in the Chaiya stele may have been a result of pilgrimage activities, not of warfare. In such a case, their power would not have spread over a part of the Thai-Malay Peninsula. However, there are some facts which point to increasing military activities in the Indonesian-Malay archipelago in the second half of the eighth century. First, Shepo (Java) and the Kunlun (Malays?) raided the region of Tonkin in Vietnam in 767 CE (Coedès 1968: 91). Second, the inscriptions of Champa tell about invasions of certain barbarians from the sea or even from ‘Java’ in 774 and 787–788 CE.²² These data may suggest a politics of expansion of the Javanese rulers. But how the Śailendras became the lords of Srivijaya remains unknown.

The Origin of the Śailendras

Wherefrom the Śailendras came to Java is a problem which, being relatively unimportant, became a point at issue and generated many papers (For more details see Jordaan 1999; and Jordaan & Colless 2009). There are four main theories: of Sumatran, Javanese, Indian, and Funan origin; the first two may be named “Indonesian” origins whereas the last two are “foreign”. This distinction partially accounts for their existence: many theories of Indianisation were constructed to view Southeast Asia as a secondary region of the world always dependent on foreign influences from India, China or Western Europe. Nowadays these theories are no longer tenable but the question of the Śailendra origin looks like their echo.

The theory of a Sumatran origin was popular in the first half of the twentieth century and was advocated by Krom (1919), Coedès (1918; 1930), and Vogel (1919). It became outdated because there is no data on the Śailendra presence in Sumatra earlier than the ninth century and Srivijaya could not have subdued Java (see above). But the discovery of the undated Old Malay Sojomerto inscription prolonged popularity of this theory. Boechari (1966: 243), who edited the inscription found in Sojomerto in Central Java (*sic!*), supposed that the title *dapūnta Selendra* was a Malay form of the term Śailendra. Moreover, he dated the Sojomerto inscription from the beginning of the seventh century CE. As the text praises Siva (*namaḥ śśīvaya*, line 3), Boechari went further and supposed the existence of the Śailendra-Śaivites as opposing to the Śailendras-Buddhists.

But the identification *Selendra=Śailendra* appears to be problematic. Old Malay has Sanskrit loan-words with sibilants without vocalization as it is attested by Old Malay inscriptions of Srivijaya dated from 682, 684, and 686 CE: there are such terms as *Śrīvijaya* in the Kedukan Bukit, Kota Kapur and Palas Pasemah texts; *śakavarṣa* in the Kedukan Bukit, Kota Kapur and Talang Tuwo records; *śuklapakṣa* in the Kedukan Bukit source; *śrīkṣetra* and *śrījayanāśa* in the Talang Tuwo inscription; and *śānti* in the Kota Kapur texts (Coedès 1930: 34, 39, 48). Introductory formula in the oath inscriptions of Srivijaya written in an unknown language contains the diphthong *ai* in

the phrase *paihumpa* *hakairu* while the Sojomerto inscription itself contains the Sanskrit word *daiva* “divine” with the same diphthong as in the Śailendra. Therefore, the latter’s transition to Selendra looks unnecessary. Damais had some doubts in early dating of the Sojomerto inscription offered by Boechari and placed it before 800 CE (Damais 1970: 44). Hence, the theory of Sumatran origin remains unproved.

The theory of a Funan origin was offered by Coedès in 1934. He referred to the resemblance between the Sanskrit titles *śailendra*, *parvatabhūpāla* or *śailarāja* which mean “lord of mountains” with the Old Khmer title *kurung bnam* with the same meaning which allegedly was borne by the kings of ancient kingdom of Funan situated in the Lower Mekong River Delta (Coedès 1934: 67–70; 1968: 36, 88–9). However, Claude Jacques suggests that this title *kurung bnam* never existed as there is no evidence of its use (Jacques 1979: 375; Vickery 1998: 36).

The theory of an Indian origin of the Śailendras was offered by Majumdar (1933: 121–41) in the early 1930s and this was supported by Sarkar (1985: 323–39), Lokesh Chandra (1994: 64–102) and Jordaan (1999b: 210–43). Their main argument is the spread of foreign influence, and particularly Mahāyāna Buddhism under the baton of the Śailendras. This statement is a particular case of general assumption, that the adoption of a new religion implies dynastic change. But this assumption is fallacious. When Clovis I was converted to Christianity, the Merovingian dynasty did not give way to another family. When Vladimir Sviatoslavich the Great baptized all the Kievan Rus’, the Rurik dynasty kept its position. Therefore, the spread of Buddhism in Java during the second half of the eighth century CE may not have been connected with a change of dynasty. As the first undoubtedly Śailendra ruler of Java was Paṇaṃkaraṇa who succeeded to Sañjaya directly, according to the Wanua Tengah III inscription (see above), we can more convincingly suppose a Javanese origin of the Śailendra dynasty.

The theory of a Javanese origin was advocated by Stutterheim (1929), Poerbatjaraka (1958: 254–64), Boechari (1966, 241), and Wisseman Christie (1995, 273). It has its own problems: why was Sañjaya, the predecessor of Paṇaṃkaraṇa, not called a Śailendra; why did this designation disappear from Old Javanese sources at the

beginning of the ninth century; and what relationship existed between the Javanese Śailendras and the rulers of Kedah of the early eleventh century.

As for the first question, it should be remembered that whether Sañjaya was a relative of Paṇamkaraṇa or not, is unknown. The family ties of Javanese monarchs are often unknown. Even if Sañjaya and Paṇamkaraṇa were relatives it does not mean that they both used the family name of Śailendra. We can take the appearance of royal lists under Balitung as an example. Why did his predecessors not refer to the protectors of their kingdom(s)? Most likely, they did not need such references. Paṇamkaraṇa might have simply introduced a new family name to legitimise his power and/or emphasise his clan status in new religious circumstances. Mount Meru plays a very important role in Hindu and Buddhist cosmologies. Calling oneself a “lord of mountains” is to claim leadership in a symbolic universe and increase one’s power. The construction of Borobudur reinforced these claims. But it remains unclear whether Paṇamkaraṇa was its founder.

But it is also possible that Śailendra was the name of Sañjaya as the founder of a dynasty or his posthumous name, like Gaṅgārāja/Gaṅgeśa from the early Champa inscriptions (C.73 & C.96) (Finot 1903: 206–11, fig. 23; Finot 1904: 918–25). This would explain the appearance of Sañjaya in later Old Javanese epigraphy and in *Carita Parahyangan*, since he is mentioned there together with Sena who can be identified with Sañjaya’s father Sanna, or Sannāha, from the Canggal inscription. It is interesting that Sañjaya ruled over the “choicest island of Java” (*dvīpavaraṃ yavākhyam*, line 13; *dvīpe yavākhye*, line 15) (Sarkar 1971: 18) as did his successor Paṇamkaraṇa, or “killer of brave foes”, according to the Nālandā copper-plate (see above). I have already cited the reference to the king Lokapāla Kayuwangi in his inscription of 856 CE: “The young prince... protected the country of Java...” (*yuwanātha... mangrakṣa bhūmi ri jawa*). And this record also mentions the term *maḍang* which occurs in the Mantyasih I charter (*maḍang kaḍatwan*; De Casparis 1956: 312, 318). This shows continuity between the kingdoms of Sañjaya, Paṇamkaraṇa, Lokapāla, and Balitung. If this was the case, Javanese rulers could return to the proper name of Sañjaya after 824 CE. But the

equation Sañjaya = Śailendra remains hypothetical as there are no sources directly mentioning this.

But if Sañjaya was not a Śailendra, there are other possibilities of their history. First, the lineage of the Śailendras could have been broken: The only child of Samaratuṅga – his daughter Prāmodavarddhanī -- could have been childless and thus have been the last member of the dynasty. Second, if the name of the Śailendras was introduced by Paṇaṃkaraṇa and was used in Sanskrit texts only, later kings who preferred Old Javanese could have rejected this Sanskrit title as not possessing traditional legitimacy (contrary to the less ambitious *mahārāja*). Eventually, this could have been replaced by such synonyms as *parwatanātha* and *girinātha* mentioned in *Deśawarṇana* by Mpu Prapañca (1.1c; 1.5a) (Robson 1995: 25–6; Pigeaud 1960: 3; Supomo 1972).

The relationship between the Javanese Śailendras and the Śailendras of Kedah was likely cognate but we do not know the degree of this relationship. As a whole, it likely remained like the famous House of Habsburg with its many lines, including Spanish, Austrian, Albertine, and Leopoldine. In any case, it seems better to admit a lack in our knowledge than to fabricate endless “wars”, “evictions” or “divisions”.

Conclusions

The best-established member of the Śailendra dynasty was *mahārāja dyāḥ* Pañcapaṇa *kariyāna* Paṇaṃkaraṇa as described in the Kalasan inscription of 778 CE. It was he who left the Chaiya, or Ligor, stele of 775 CE, and took control over Srivijaya or those parts of it on the Thai-Malay Peninsula. How he subdued it remains unknown. Perhaps he introduced the new family name, i.e. the Śailendras, or this was a name of his predecessor Sañjaya. The Śailendras were of Javanese origin. Their relatives ruled Kedah at the end of the tenth century and into the beginning of the eleventh century.

References

- Aiyer, K.V. Subrahmanya. 1933a. "The Larger Leiden Plates (of Rājarāja I)." *Epigraphia Indica* 22: 213–66.
- Aiyer, K.V. Subrahmanya. 1933b. "The Smaller Leiden Plates (of Kulottunga)." *Epigraphia Indica* 22: 267–81.
- Bergaigne, A. 1893. *Inscriptions sanskrites de Campā et du Cambodge*. Paris (Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale, XXVII/1).
- Boechari. 1966. "Preliminary Report on the Discovery of an Old-Malay Inscription at Sodomerto." *Madjalah Ilmu-ilmu Sastra Indonesia* 3/2–3: 241–51.
- Böhtlingk, O. 1879. *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch in Kürzerer Fassung*. T. I. St. Petersburg: Buchdruckerei der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Bosch, F.D.K. 1928. "De inscriptie van Këloerak." *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde uitgegeven door het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* (hereafter – TBG) 68/1–2: 1–56.
- Bosch, F.D.K. 1941. "De inscriptie van Ligor." *TBG* 81: 26–38.
- Bosch, F.D.K. 1952. "Çrīvijaya, de Çailendra- en de Sañjayavaṃça." *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* (hereafter – BKI) 108: 113–23.
- Brandes J.L.A. 1913. *Oud-Javaansche Oorkonden. Nagelaten Transcripties van wijlen Dr.J.L.A. Brandes*. Uitgegeven door Dr. N. J. Krom. The Hague: Bataviaasch Genootschap (Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, D. LX).
- de Casparis J.G. 1950. *Incripties uit de Çailendra-tijd* [Prasasti Indonesia I]. Bandung: Nix.
- de Casparis J.G. 1956. *Selected Inscriptions from the 7th to the 9th Centuries AD*. [Prasasti Indonesia II]. Bandung: Masa Baru.
- de Casparis J.G. 1961. "New Evidence on Cultural Relations between Java and Ceylon in Ancient Times." *Artibus Asiae* 24/3–4: 241–8.
- de Casparis J.G. 1981. "The Dual Nature of Barabudur." In *Barabudur: History and Significance of a Buddhist Monument*, edited by L.O. Gomez & H.W. Woodward,

- pp. 47–83. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press (Berkeley Buddhist Studies Series, 2).
- de Casparis, J.G. 1986. "Some Notes on Relations between Central and Local Government in Ancient Java." In *Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th Centuries*, edited by D.G. Marr & A.C. Milner, pp. 49–63. Singapore: ISEAS and Australian National University.
- Chandra, Lokesh. 1994. "The Śailendras of Java." *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay* 67–68 for 1992–1993 (combined): 64–102.
- Chatterji, B.R. 1967. *History of Indonesia: Early and Medieval*. 3rd ed. Meerut: Meenakshi Prakashan.
- Chavannes, É. 1894. *Mémoire composé à l'époque de la grande dynastie T'ang sur les religieux éminents qui aller chercher la Loi dans les pays d'Occident, par I-tsing*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- Coe, M.D. 2003. *Angkor and the Khmer Civilization*. New York: Thames & Hudson.
- Cœdès, G. 1918. « Le Royaume de Çrīvijaya ». *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient* (hereafter – BEFEO) 18/6: 1–36.
- Cœdès, G. 1929/1961. *Recueil des inscriptions du Siam. Deuxième partie: inscriptions de Dvāravatī, de Çrīvijaya et de Lavo*. Bangkok: Fine Arts Department – Institut Royal du Siam, Service Archéologique.
- Cœdès, G. 1930. « Les inscriptions malaises de Çrīvijaya ». *BEFEO* 30: 29–80.
- Cœdès, G. 1934. "On the Origin of the Śailendras." *Journal of the Greater India Society* 1: 61–9.
- Cœdès, G. 1959. « L'inscription de la stèle de Ligor. État présent de son interprétation ». *Oriens Extremus* 6: 42–48.
- Cœdès, G. 1968. *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*. Ed. by W.F. Vella, translated by S. Brown Cowing. Honolulu: East-West Center Book, University Press of Hawaii.
- Cœdès, G. & Damais, L.-Ch. 1992. *Sriwijaya: History, Religion & Language of an Early Malay Polity: Collected Papers*. Ed. by P.-Y. Manguin. Kuala Lumpur: Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society.

- Damais, L.-Ch. 1951. « Études d'épigraphie indonésienne ». *BEFEO* 45: 1–63.
- Damais, L.-Ch. 1952. « Liste des principales inscriptions datées de l'Indonésie ». *BEFEO* 46: 1–105.
- Damais, L.-Ch. 1964. « Études sino-indonésiennes III: La transcription chinoise Ho-ling comme désignation de Java », *BEFEO* 52/1: 93–141.
- Damais, L.-Ch. 1968. « Bibliographie indonésienne: XI. Les publications épigraphiques du service archéologique de l'Indonésie ». *BEFEO* 54: 295–521.
- Damais, L.-Ch. 1970. *Répertoire onomastique de l'épigraphie javanaise*. Paris: École Française d'Extrême-Orient.
- Ferrand, G. 1922. « L'empire sumatranais de Çrīvijaya ». *Journal asiatique* 262: 1–104, 161–244.
- Finot, L. 1903. « Notes d'épigraphie : Stèle de Çambhuvarman à Mì-sòn ». *BEFEO* 3: 206–13.
- Finot, L. 1904. « Notes d'épigraphie : Les inscriptions de Mì-sòn ». *BEFEO* 4: 897–977.
- Griffiths, A. 2010. "The Problem of the Ancient Toponym J(a)vā and the Place of Śrī Satyavarman in 8th century Southeast Asian International Relations", 13th *International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists (EurASEAA13) "Crossing Borders in Southeast Asian Archaeology"*, 27 September – 1 October 2010: Program and Book of Abstracts, Free University of Berlin, 43.
- Huntington, S.L. & Huntington, J.C. 1990. *Leaves from the Bodhi Tree: The Art of Pāla India (8th–12th centuries) and Its International Legacy*. Seattle–London: The Dayton Art Institute.
- Jacq-Hergoualc'h, M. 2002. *The Malay Peninsula: Crossroads of the Maritime Silk Road (100 BC – 1300 AD)*. Leiden–Boston–Köln: E.J. Brill.
- Jacques, C. 1979. "'Funan', 'Zhenla': The Reality Concealed by These Chinese Views on Indonesia." In *Early South East Asia: Essays in Archaeology, History and Historical Geography*, edited by R.B. Smith & W. Watson, pp. 371–9. Oxford, New York, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.

- Jordaan, R.E. (ed.) 1996. *In Praise of Prambanan: Dutch Essays on the Loro Jonggrang Complex*. Leiden: KITLV Press (Koninklijk instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde Translation Series 26).
- Jordaan, R.E. 1999a. *The Śailendras in Central Javanese History: A Survey of Research from 1950 to 1999*. Yogyakarta: Penerbitan Universitas Sanata Dharma.
- Jordaan, R.E. 1999b. "The Śailendras, the Status of the Kṣatriya Theory, and the Development of Hindu-Javanese Temple Architecture." *BKI* 155/2: 210–43.
- Jordaan R.E. 2006. "Why the Śailendras were not a Javanese dynasty." *Indonesia and the Malay World* 34, no. 98: 3–22.
- Jordaan, R.E. & Colless, B.E. 2009. *The Mahārājas of the Isles: The Śailendras and the Problem of Śrīvijaya*. Leiden: Department of Languages and Cultures of Southeast Asia and Oceania, University of Leiden (Semaian 25).
- Karashima, N. & Subbarayalu, Y. 2009. "Ancient and Medieval Tamil and Sanskrit Inscriptions Relating to Southeast Asia and China." In *Nagapattinam to Suvarnadwipa: Reflections on the Chola Naval Expeditions to Southeast Asia*, edited by H. Kulke, K. Kesavapany, & V. Sakhuja, pp. 271–91. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Khandanavala, K., & Sadashiv Gorakshkar. 1986. "The Chronology of the Pālas." In *Eastern Indian Bronzes*, edited by Nihar Ranjan Ray, Karl Khandanavala, Sadashiv Gorakshkar, pp. 85–92. Vol. II. New Delhi: Lalit Kalā Academi.
- Krom, N.J. 1919. *De Sumatraanse periode der Javaansche geschiedenis*. Leiden.
- Krom, N.J. 1926. *Hindoe-Javaansche geschiedenis*. 1st ed. s'Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Krom, H.J. 1931. *Hindoe-Javaansche geschiedenis*. 2nd ed. S'Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Kullanda, S.V. 2008. "Kahulunan – Familia: A Javanese-Latin Parallel." In *Indonesians and Their Neighbours: Festschrift for Elena V. Revunenкова and Alexander K. Ogloblin*, edited by Maria V. Stanyukovich, pp. 361–4. Sankt-Petersburg: Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Maklay Publications 1).

- Mahdi, W. 2008. "Yavadvīpa and the Merapi Volcano in West Sumatra." *Archipel* 75: 111–43.
- Mahdi, W. 2010. "The Protohistorical Linguistic, Ethnic, and Political Situation around the Gulf of Thailand in the Light of Borrowing between Malayo-Chamic and Eastern Austroasiatic Languages." Paper Presented to the 13th International Conference of the European Association of Southeast Asian Archaeologists "Crossing Borders in Southeast Asian Archaeology", Berlin, 27 September – 1 October 2010.
- Majumdar, R.C. 1927. *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East: Vol. I. Champa*. Book III: *The Inscriptions of Champa*. Lahore: Punjab Sanskrit Books Depot.
- Majumdar, R.C. 1933. « Les rois Śailendra de Suvarṇadvīpa ». *BEFEO* 33: 121–41.
- Majumdar, R.C. 1937. *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*. Vol. II. *Suvarṇadvīpa*. Part I. *Political History*. Dacca: Asutosh Press.
- Manguin, P.-Y. 2009. "Southeast Sumatra in Protohistoric and Srivijaya Times: Upstream-Downstream Relations and the Settlement of the Penepplain." In *From Distant Tales: Archaeology and Ethnohistory in the Highlands of Sumatra*, edited by D. Bonatz, J. Miksic, J.D. Neidel, & M.L. Tjoa-Bonatz, pp. 434–84. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Meulen W.J. Van der. 1979. "King Sañjaya and his Successors." *Indonesia* 28: 17–54.
- Miksic, J.N. 2003. "The Mañjuśrīgrha Inscription of Candi Sewu, Śaka 714/A.D. 792." In *Texts and Contexts in Southeast Asia: Proceedings of the Texts and Contexts in Southeast Asia Conference, Yangon, 12–14 December 2001*, pp. 19–42. Yangon: Universities Historical Research Centre.
- Miksic, J.N., Widya Nayati, & Tjahjono. 2001. "Recent Archaeological Research at Candi Plaosan." In *Fruits of Inspiration. Studies in Honour of Prof. J.G. de Casparis, retired Professor of the Early History and Archaeology of South and Southeast Asia at the University of Leiden, the Netherlands, on the occasion of his 85th birthday*, edited by M.J. Klokke & K.R. van Kooij, pp. 319–32. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.

- Monier-Williams, M. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press [<http://www.sanskrit-lexicon.uni-koeln.de/monier/>].
- van Naerssen, F.H. 1947. "The Çailendra Interregnum." In *India Antiqua: A Volume of Oriental Studies Presented by his Friends and Pupils to Jean Philippe Vogel, C.I.E., on the Occasion of the Fiftieth Anniversary of his Doctorate*, edited by F.D.K. Bosch, Th. Van Erp, A.J. Bernet Kampers, R.A. Kern, F.B. Kuiper & P.H. Pott, pp. 249–53. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Nilakanta Sastri, K.A. 1949. *History of Śrī Vijaya (Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1946–1947)*. Madras: University of Madras.
- O'Reilly, D.J.W. 2007. *Early Civilizations of Southeast Asia*. Lanham, New York; Toronto; and Plymouth, UK: Altamira Press.
- Pelliot, P. 1904. « Deux itinéraires de Chine en Inde à la fin du VIII^e siècle ». *BEFEO* 4: 131–413.
- Pigeaud, T.G.Th. 1960–1963. *Java in the 14th Century. A Study in Cultural History: The Nāgarakṛtāgama by Rakawi Prapañca of Majapahit, 1365 A.D.* 5 vols. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Poerbatjaraka, R.Ng. 1920. "De Tjarita Parahijangan." *TBG* 59: 403–16.
- Poerbatjaraka, R.Ng. 1958. "Çrīvijaya, de Çailendra- en de Sañjayavaṃṣa." *BKI* 114/3: 254–64.
- Robson, S. 1995. *Mpu Prapañca. Deśawarṇana (Nāgarakṛtāgama)*. Trans. by S. Robson. Leiden: KITLV (Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde 169).
- Sarkar, H.B. 1971–1972. *Corpus of the Inscriptions of Java (Corpus Inscriptionum Javanicarum) (Up to 928 A.D.)*. Vols. I–II. Calcutta: Mukhopadhyay.
- Sarkar, H.B. 1985. "The Kings of Śrī Śailam and the Foundation of the Śailendra Dynasty in Indonesia." *BKI* 141/2–3: 323–39.
- Shastri, H. 1924. "The Nālandā copper-plate of Devapāladeva." *Epigraphia Indica* 17: 310–27.
- Sirkar, D.C. 1977. "The Pāla Chronology Reconsidered.", *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Supplement III, S. 964–69.

- Stutterheim, W.F. 1929. *A Javanese Period on Sumatran History*. Surakarta: De Bliksem.
- Sundberg, J.R. 2003. "A Buddhist Mantra Recovered from the Ratu Baka Plateau: A Preliminary Study of Its Implications for Śailendra-Era Java." *BKI* 159/1: 163–88.
- Sundberg, J.R. 2006a. "Considerations of the Dating of the Barabudur Stūpa." *BKI* 162/1: 95–132.
- Sundberg, J.R. 2006b. "The State of Matarām: A Review of Recent Efforts to Clarify its History", http://www.borobudur.tv/State_of_Old_Mataram.pdf (30 January 2012).
- Sundberg J.R. 2009. "Appendix A. The State of Matarām: A Review of Recent Efforts to Clarify its History." In Mark Long. *Caṇḍi Mendut: Womb of the Tathāgata* (Śata-piṭaka series; Indo-Asian literature, vol. 632), pp. 329–362.
- Sundberg J.R. 2011. "The Old Sundanese *Carita Parahyangan*, King Warak and the Fracturing of the Javanese Polity, c. 803 A.D." In *From beyond the Eastern Horizon: Essays in Honour of Professor Lokesh Chandra*, edited by ManjuShree, pp. 143–157. New Delhi: Aditya Prakashan.
- Supomo, S. 1972. "'Lord of the Mountain' in the Fourteenth-century Kakawin." *BKI* 128: 281–97.
- Takakusu, J. 1896. *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671–695) by I-Tsing*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Teeuw, A. 2001. "Kahulinan and Śrī Kahulunan." In *Fruits of Inspiration: Studies in Honour of Prof. J.G. de Casparis, retired Professor of the Early History and Archaeology of South and Southeast Asia at the University of Leiden, the Netherlands, on the occasion of his 85th birthday*, edited by M.J. Klokke & K.R. van Kooij, pp. 525–38. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Tibbetts, G.R. 1979. *A Study of the Arabic Texts Containing Material on South-East Asia*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Vickery, M. 1998. *Society, Economics, and Politics in Pre-Angkor Cambodia: The 7th–8th Centuries*. Tokyo: Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for UNESCO.

- Wissemann Christie, J. 1985. *Theatre States and Oriental Despotisms: Early Southeast Asia in the Eyes of the West*. Hull: University of Hull, Centre for Southeast Asian Studies, Occasional Paper No. 10.
- Wissemann Christie, J. 1995. "State Formation in Early Maritime Southeast Asia: A Consideration of the Theories and the Data." *BKI* 151/2: 235–88.
- Wissemann Christie, J. 2001: "Revisiting Early Mataram." In *Fruits of Inspiration: Studies in Honour of Prof. J.G. de Casparis, retired Professor of the Early History and Archaeology of South and Southeast Asia at the University of Leiden, the Netherlands, on the occasion of his 85th birthday*, edited by M.J. Klokke & K.R. van Kooij, pp. 25–55. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Zoetmulder, P.J. (with the collaboration of S.O. Robson). 1982. *Old Javanese-English Dictionary*. S'Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff.

Endnotes

- ¹ The compound *adeśaśastrin* was not translated by Himanshu Bhushan Sarkar, but Johannes Gijsbertus De Casparis wrote that "it literally means 'those carrying orders as (though they were) knives'" (1986: 59). The compound consists of the two words: *adeśa* "order" and *śastrin* "having weapons, bearing arms, armed with a sword" (Monier-Williams 1899, 1061; Böhtlingk 1879: 171). I suppose that the compound may be understood as "(who) is an instrument of (executing) an order".
- ² I omitted Sarkar's addition "*rakryan*" as the text looks clear.
- ³ Sarkar's addition "(to the deity)" was omitted as unnecessary.
- ⁴ Sarkar translates *deśādhyakṣān* as "headmen of villages" following one of the meanings of the word *deśa* in Old Javanese (Zoetmulder 1982: 393) but the inscription is written in Sanskrit, and the meaning "village" here is partially misleading.
- ⁵ Sarkar leaves the Sanskrit term *pāti* without translation due to its polysemy. But the meaning "master" is known both in Sanskrit and Old Javanese (Monier-Williams 1899, 582; Zoetmulder 1982, 1322).

⁶ Sarkar writes “all religious persons (for all ages)”. The word *sādhu* denotes “a holy man, saint, sage” in Sanskrit and Old Javanese (Monier-Williams 1899, 1201; Zoetmulder 1982, 1589).

⁷ The phrase was strangely omitted in Sarkar’s translation.

⁸ Sundberg “intend[s] to publish a complete study, including a full transliteration, of all the extant fragments on another occasion” (2003, 175, n. 20) but gives no arguments for his reading.

⁹ Coedès (1959, 42–8) strangely omitted this point in his consideration.

¹⁰ The first editor of the Nālandā copper-plate Hirananda Shastri read *samarāgradhaira* instead of *Samarāgravīra* (1924: 323, n. 4). But Nicolaas Krom improved the reading and found a personal name (1931).

¹¹ It should be emphasised, however, that the locality of Srivijaya in the epoch is debatable (Jordaan & Colless 2009). It may have been located only in Kedah, in Kedah and Sumatra, or in Palembang and Jambi in Sumatra. If the Chinese term Sanfoqi means “three Vijayas”, it may refer to the three polities from the early tenth century onwards bearing this name.

¹² *Lumāḥ* is an active form of the verb *lah* (Zoetmulder 1982: 955).

¹³ The phrase *narendra Sāraṇa* seems to occur in the Mañjuśrī inscription from the temple complex of Candi Sewu. It dates from 792 CE and was deciphered independently of one another by the two Indonesian epigraphists Kusen and Boechari. Kusen translated it into Indonesian. John Miksic, Widya Nayati and Tjahjono made a provisional translation into English. For more details see Miksic et al. 2001: 319–32; Miksic 2003: 19–42. Sundberg (2006b, 22, n. 33) indicated that he had prepared a monograph on the Mañjuśrī inscription but, unfortunately, it remains unpublished.

¹⁴ However, the term may be a title. The Old Javanese text says: *ri sang mapatiḥ ri sukun si wangun umilu ri waragwarak gusti si nanggap rama nīntap* (recto, lines 19–21), and it was translated by Sarkar as “of the Sang *mapatiḥ* of Sukun (wiz.) Si Vangun; in accompaniment with the *waragwarak gusti* (wiz.) Si Nanggap, father of Intap” (1971, 59). Another possible translation is “of (*kalang*) of *sang mapatiḥ* of Sukun Si Wangun, and of (a region) Waragwarak, and *gusti* Si Nanggap, father of Intap”. *Kalang*

means, perhaps, a carpenter but its exact meaning is unknown (Zoetmulder 1982: 772). Sundberg (2006a: 121) supposes that Waragwarak may mean a “Warak village in Warak district”.

¹⁵ The inscription was edited by De Casparis (1950: 61–2). The title of *karayān* is discussed in detail in Waruno Mahdi 2010: 14; cf.: Vogel 1919: 634, n. 2.

¹⁶ Recently Sundberg offered a new date for the Muṇḍuan charter – 807 CE – but gave no supporting argument. He also dates the Diëng inscription from 854 CE (Sundberg 2006a: 116, n. 35; 111, n. 9, referring to Damais 1952). But there are the two or even three inscriptions under this label which come from the Diëng plateau. Sarkar (1971, 49–50) noticed that the stone of 809 CE tells about the foundation of immunity (*manima* < *sīma*) by a certain *pamagat* (ruler of an area) named Si Dāma. Another inscription from the Diëng plateau is known as Vayuku and dates from 854 CE. It states that the *raka* of Sisaira named *pu* Virājā marked out wet-rice (*sawah*) fields at Vayuku as immunity for a Buddhist monastery (*vihāra*) at Abhayananda (Sarkar 1971: 127; see a discussion of the inscription’s date in Damais 1951: 29–31; 1952: 30–1). It implies that Buddhism continued flourishing after the supposed eviction of the Śailendras from Java.

¹⁷ Louis-Charles Damais (1964: 185) strangely holds that Pu Kumbhayoni was never called a king. The French scholar interprets the expression *valaiṅgajetrā* (the form of original) as “by him who conquered Valaiṅg” («par celui qui a vaincu Valaiṅg») and the term *valaiṅgagoptrā* “by the protector of Valaiṅg” ‘in the sense that after conquering the country he “protected” it from new enemies, real or imagined’ («dans le sens de celui qui, ayant vaincu un pays, le “protège” contre les nouveaux ennemis, réel ou supposé») (Damais 1964: 185).

¹⁸ Wisseman Christie (1985, 12, 19) calls *bhūmi*, or “land”, a “classical Javanese state” covering a territory under the effective control of a royal government situated in *kaḍatuan*.

¹⁹ Coédès supposed that earlier reports deal with Java whereas the story by Abū Zaid concerns Sumatra (1968: 93, 130–1).

²⁰ Unfortunately, the reference to the Sdok Kak Thom inscription is misleading. First, it is unknown what place was denoted in the inscription by the name *javā*. Scholars offer very different localities, among them are the Thai-Malay Peninsula and Champa in Central Vietnam (for more details see Coe 2003: 99; Vickery 1998: 387; O'Reilly 2007: 123). The Sdok Kak Thom inscription dates from 1052 CE and may have mythologised the past and life of Jayavarman (Griffiths 2010: 43).

²¹ Nicholas II's full title was "We, Nicholas the Second, by the grace of God, Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russians, of Moscow, Kiev, Vladimir, Novgorod, Tsar of Kazan, Tsar of Astrakhan, King of Poland, Tsar of Siberia, Tsar of Tauric Chersonesos, Tsar of Georgia, Lord of Pskov, and Grand Duke of Smolensk, Lithuania, Volhynia, Podolia, and Finland, Prince of Estonia, Livonia, Courland and Semigalia, Samogitia, Belostok, Karelia, of Tver, Yugra, Perm, Vyatka, Bulgaria, and other territories; Lord and Grand Duke of Nizhny Novgorod, Chernigov; Sovereign of Ryazan, Polotsk, Rostov, Yaroslavl, Boloozero, Udoria, Obdoria, Kondiam Vitebsk, Mstislav, and all the northern territories; and Sovereign of Iveria, Kartalinia, and the Kabardinian lands and Armenian territories; Hereditary Lord and Ruler of the Cherkass and Mountain Princes and others; Lord of Turkestan, Heir of Norway, Duke of Schleswig-Holstein, Stormarn, Dithmarschen, Oldenburg, and so forth, and so forth, and so forth".

²² Inscriptions C.38 of 784 CE from the Po Nagar sanctuary in Nha-trang, the province of Khánh Hòa, and C.25 of 799–800 CE from Yang Tikuḥ, in the province of Ninh Thuận (Bergaigne 1893: 242–60, 207–18; Majumdar 1927: 41–4, 46, 50 – B.6, stanza VI: "great army from Java coming by means of ships", *nāvāgatair jjavavalasaṅghair*). Majumdar omits the term *saṅgha* "heap, multitude, host" (Monier-Williams 1899: 1129).